Meanwhile elsewhere russian revolution answers key pdf online pdf

I'm not robot!

```
British revolution of 1688 "The Bloodless Revolution" redirects here. For the book on vegetarian history, see The Bloodless Revolution (Spain). For other uses, see Glorious Revolution (disambiguation). Glorious Revolution The Prince
of Orange landing at Torbay, by Jan Hoynck van PapendrechtDate1688–1689LocationBritish IslesParticipantsBritish and Dutch forcesOutcome Replacement of James II by William III of England and Mary II of England Jacobite rising of 1689 Williamite War in Ireland Nine Years' War with France; England and Scotland join Grand Alliance Drafting of
the Bill of Rights 1689 Part of a series on the History of England Timeline Prehistoric Britain Roman Britain Sub-Roman Britain Roman Britain Sub-Roman Britain Medieval period Economy in the Middle Ages Anglo-Saxon period Economy in the Middle Ages Anglo-Saxon period England Tudor Prehistoric Britain Roman Br
era English Renaissance Stuart period English Civil War Commonwealth Protectorate Restoration Glorious Revolution Georgian era Regency era Victorian era Edwardian era First World War Interwar period Second World War Social history of the United Kingdom (1979–present) Topics English overseas
possessions English society History of education in England History of England History of
Cheshire Cornwall Cumbria Derbyshire Devon Dorset Durham East Riding of Yorkshire East Sussex Essex Gloucestershire Lincolnshire Licestershire London Greater Hampshire Hertfordshire Hertfordshire Northumberland North Yorkshire
Nottinghamshire Oxfordshire Rutland Shropshire Surrey Tyne and Wear Warwickshire Workshire Works
Maidstone Manchester Margate Milton Keynes Newcastle Nottingham Plymouth Poole Portsmouth Reading Rochester Sheffield Shrewsbury Southampton St Albans Torquay Wetherby Worcester Worthing York England portalvte Part of the Politics seriesMonarchy Central concepts Monarch Monarchism Plymouth Poole Portsmouth Reading Rochester Sheffield Shrewsbury Southampton St Albans Torquay Wetherby Worcester Worthing York England portalvte Part of the Politics seriesMonarchy Central concepts Monarch Monar
prerogative Types Absolute Chinese Legalist Composite Constitutional Crowned republic Diarchy Dual Elective Emirate Ethnarch Federal Hereditary Pentarchy Personal union Non-sovereign Popular Regency Coregency Tetrarch Triarchy Universal Philosophers Aquinas Dante Bodin Bellarmine Filmer Hobbes Bossuet Maistre Chateaubriand Balzac
Crétineau-Joly Gogol Balmes Kierkegaard Youwei Maurras Seca Kuehnelt-Leddihn Bogdanor Scruton Hoppe Politicians Mazarin Pius VI Ruffo Consalvi Plessis Villèle Polignac Decazes Cortés Castillo Bismarck Mella Churchill Renouvin Zhirinovsky Popescu-Tăriceanu Zourabichvili History Birth of the Roman Empire Magna Carta Foundation of the
Ottoman Empire Glorious Revolution French Empire Liberal WarsSecond French Empire Liberal WarsSecond French Empire Unification 5 October 1910 Revolution Proclamation of the Republic in Brazil Chinese Revolution Russian Revolution Siamese revolution of 1932
Birth of the Italian Republic Spanish transition to democracy Iranian RevolutionModern Cambodia Nepalese Civil War Polity Aristocracy Autocracy Oligarchy Administration Court Appointment Great Officers Household Retinue Camarilla Courtier Privy council Crown Makhzen Related Ideologies Conservatism Despotism Enlightened absolutism
Legitimists Orléanist Royalism Ultra-royalist Tory Related topics Dynasty Lists Family Illegitimate Figurehead Kingmaker Nobility Peerage Realm Philosopher king Rank Regicide Regnal number Style Succession Anti-king Crisis Interregnum Rebellion War Politics portalvte In the Glorious Revolution of November 1688[1] James II and VII, king of
England, Scotland and Ireland was deposed and replaced by his daughter Mary II and her husband, stadtholder William III of Orange, the de facto ruler of the Dutch Republic. The term was first used by John Hampden in late 1689.[2] Historian Jeremy Black suggests it can be seen as both the last successful invasion of England and also an internal
coup.[3][4] Despite his Catholicism, James became king in February 1685 with widespread support as many feared his exclusion would lead to a repetition of the 1638–1651 Wars of the Three Kingdoms.[5] Over the next three years, he alienated his supporters by suspending the Scottish and English Parliaments in 1685 and ruling by personal decree
[6] Despite this, it was considered a short-term issue, as James was 52, and since his second marriage was childless after 11 years, the heir presumptive was his Protestant daughter Mary. Two events in June 1688 turned dissent into a political crisis. The first was the birth of James Francis Edward on 10 June, displacing Mary as heir which created the
prospect of a Catholic dynasty. The second was the prosecution of the Seven Bishops on 15 June; one in a series of perceived assaults on the Church of England, their acquittal on the 30th sparked anti-Catholic riots and destroyed James's political authority. The combination persuaded a broad coalition of English politicians to issue an Invitation to
William, inviting him to intervene militarily to protect the Protestant religion. With Louis XIV of France preparing to attack the Dutch, William viewed this as an opportunity to secure English resources for the Nine Years' War, which began in September 1688. On 5 November, he landed in Brixham in Torbay with 14,000 men. As he advanced on
London, most of the 30,000-strong Royal Army joined him. James went into exile on 23 December and in April 1689, Parliament made William and Mary joint monarchs of England and Ireland. A separate but similar Scottish settlement was made in June. While the Revolution itself was quick and relatively bloodless, pro-Stuart revolts in Scotland and
Ireland caused significant casualties.[7] Although Jacobitism persisted into the late 18th century, the Revolution ended a century of political dispute by confirming the primacy of Parliament over the Crown, a principle established in the Bill of Rights 1689.[8] The Toleration Act 1688 granted freedom of worship to nonconformist Protestants, but
restrictions on Catholics contained in the 1678 and 1681 English and Scottish Test Acts remained in force until 1828; while religious prohibitions on the monarch remain. Background James II & VII, King of England, Scotland and Ireland, by Sir Godfrey Kneller. National Portrait
Gallery, London Despite his Catholicism, James became king in 1685 with widespread support, as demonstrated by the rapid defeat of the Argyll and Monmouth Rebellions; less than four years later, he was forced into exile.[9] Often seen as an exclusively English event, modern historians argue James failed to appreciate the extent to which Royal
power relied on support from the county gentry, the vast majority of whom were members of the Protestant Church of England and Scotland, while
destabilising Catholic-majority Ireland.[10] Stuart political ideology derived from James VI and I, who in 1603 had created a vision of a centralised state, run by a monarch whose authority came from God, and where the function of Parliament was simply to obey.[11] Disputes over the relationship between king and Parliament led to the War of the
Three Kingdoms and continued after the 1660 Stuart Restoration. Charles II came to rely on the Royal Prerogative since measures passed in this way could be withdrawn when he decided, rather than Parliament. However, it could not be used for major legislation or taxation. [12] Concern that James intended to create an absolute monarchy led to the
1679 to 1681 Exclusion Crisis, dividing the English political class into those who wanted to 'exclude' him from the throne, mostly Whigs, and their opponents, mostly Tories. However, in 1685 many Whigs feared the continued
primacy of the Church of England. Most importantly, it was seen as a short-term issue; James was 52, his marriage to Mary of Modena remained childless after 11 years, and the heirs were his Protestant daughters, Mary and Anne.[13] There was much greater sympathy in Scotland for a 'Stuart heir', and the 1681 Succession Act confirmed the duty of
all to support him, 'regardless of religion.'[14] Unlike England, over 95 percent of Scots belonged to the Church of Scotland, or kirk; even other Protestant sects were banned, and by 1680, Catholics were a tiny minority confined to parts of the aristocracy and the remote Highlands.[15] Episcopalians had regained control of the kirk in 1660, leading to
a series of Presbyterian uprisings, but the bitter religious conflicts of the civil war period meant the majority preferred stability.[16] In England and Scotland, most of those who backed James in 1685 wanted to retain existing political and religious arrangements, but this was not the case in Ireland. While he was guaranteed support from the Catholic
majority, James was also popular among Irish Protestants. The Church of Ireland depended on the Crown for its survival, while Ulster was dominated by Presbyterians who supported his tolerance policies. However, religion was only one factor; of equal concern for Catholics were laws barring them from serving in the military or holding public office,
and land reform. In 1600, 90% of Irish land was owned by Catholics but following a series of confiscation during the 17th century, this had dropped to 22% in 1685. Catholic and Protestant merchants in Dublin and elsewhere objected to commercial restrictions placing them at a disadvantage to their English competitors.[17] The political background
in England James's attempts to allow tolerance for English Catholics coincided with the October 1685 Edict of Fontainebleau revoking it for Huguenots While James's supporters viewed hereditary succession as more important than his personal Catholicism, they opposed his policies of 'Tolerance' under which Catholics would be allowed to hold public
office and engage in public life. Opposition was led by devout Anglicans[18] who argued that the measures he proposed were incompatible with the oath he had sworn as king to uphold the supremacy of the Church of England. In an age when oaths were seen as fundamental to a stable society, by demanding that Parliament approve his measures
James was seen not only to be breaking his own word but requiring others to do the same. Parliament refused to comply, despite being "the most Loyal Parliament a Stuart ever had".[19] Although historians generally accept James wished to promote Catholicism, not establish an Absolute monarchy, his stubborn and inflexible reaction to opposition
had the same result. When the English and Scottish Parliaments refused to repeal the 1678 and 1681 Test Acts, he suspended them in November 1685 and ruled by decree. Attempts to form a 'King's party' of Catholics, English Dissenters and dissident Scottish Presbyterians was politically short-sighted, since it rewarded those who joined the 1685
rebellions and undermined his supporters.[20] Demanding tolerance for Catholics was also badly timed. In October 1685 Louis XIV of France issued the Edict of Nantes which had given French Protestants the right to practise their religion; over the next four years, an estimated 200,000 to 400,000 went into
exile, 40,000 of whom settled in London.[21] Combined with Louis' expansionist policies and the killing of 2,000 Vaudois Protestants in 1686, it led to fears P
establishment able to survive James's death, which meant replacing Protestant officials at a pace that was inherently destabilising.[23] Timeline of events: 1686 to 1688 The Seven Bishops prosecuted for seditious libel in 1688 The majority of those who backed James in 1685 did so because they wanted stability and the rule of law, qualities frequently
undermined by his actions. After suspending Parliament in November 1685, he sought to rule by decree; although the principle was not disputed, the widening of its scope caused considerable concern, particularly when judges who disagreed with its application were dismissed. [24] He then alienated many by perceived attacks on the established
church; Henry Compton, Bishop of London, was suspended for refusing to ban John Sharp from preaching after he gave an anti-Catholic sermon. [25] He often made things worse by political clumsiness; to general fury, the Ecclesiastical Commission of 1686 established to discipline the Church of England included suspected Catholics like the Earl of
Huntingdon.[26] This was combined with an inability to accept opposition; in April 1687, he ordered Magdalen College, Oxford to elect a Catholic sympathiser named Anthony Farmer as president, but as he was ineligible under the college statutes, the fellows elected John Hough instead. Both Farmer and Hough withdrew in favour of another
candidate selected by James, who then demanded the fellows personally apologise on their knees for 'defying' him; when they refused, they were never likely to succeed since English Catholics were only 1.1% of the population and Nonconformists 4.4%.[28] Both groups
were divided; since private worship was generally tolerated, Catholic moderates feared greater visibility would provoke a backlash. Among Nonconformists, while Quakers and Congregationalists supported repeal of the Test Acts, the majority wanted to amend the 1662 Act of Uniformity and be allowed back into the Church of England. [29] When
James ensured the election of the Presbyterian Sir John Shorter as Lord Mayor of London in 1687, he insisted on complying with the Test Act, reportedly because of a 'distrust of the King's favour...thus encouraging that which His Majesties whole Endeavours were intended to disannull.'[30] James Francis Edward Stuart, circa 1703; his birth created
the possibility of a Catholic dynasty To ensure a compliant Parliament, James required potential MPs to be approved by their local Lord Lieutenant; eligibility for both offices required positive answers in writing to the 'Three Questions', one being a commitment to repeal of the Test Act.[31] In addition, local government and town corporations were
purged to create an obedient electoral machine, further alienating the county gentry who had formed the majority of those who backed James in 1685.[32] On 24 August 1688, writs were issued for a general election.[33] The expansion of the military caused great concern, particularly in England and Scotland, where memories of the civil war left
huge resistance to standing armies.[34] In Ireland, Talbot replaced Protestant officers with Catholics; James did the same in England, while basing the troops at Hounslow appeared a deliberate attempt to overawe Parliament.[35] In April 1688, he ordered his Declaration of Indulgence read in every church; when the Archbishop of Canterbury and six
other bishops refused, they were charged with seditious libel and confined in the Tower of London. Two events turned dissent into a crisis; the birth of James Francis Edward Stuart on 10 June created the prospect of a Catholic dynasty, while the acquittal of the Seven Bishops on 30th destroyed James's political authority.[36] Dutch intervention
Prelude: 1685 to June 1688 In 1677, James's elder daughter and heir Mary married her Protestant cousin William of Orange, stadtholder of the main provinces of the Dutch Republic. The two initially shared common objectives in wanting Mary to succeed her father, while French ambitions in the Spanish Netherlands threatened both English and
Dutch trade.[37] Although William sent James troops to help suppress the 1685 Monmouth Rebellion, their relationship deteriorated thereafter.[38] French Huguenot refugees, October 1685; their expulsion in 1685 was one in a series of events that created a sense that Protestant Europe was under threat The Franco-Dutch War, continued French
expansion, and expulsion of the Huguenots meant William assumed another war was inevitable, and although the States General of the Netherlands preferred peace, the majority accepted he was correct. This view was widely shared throughout Protestant Europe; in October 1685, Frederick William, Elector of Brandenburg renounced his French
alliance for one with the Dutch. In July 1686, other Protestant states formed the anti-French League of Augsburg, with Dutch support; securing or neutralising English resources, especially the Royal Navy, now became key to both sides.[39] William III, King of England, Scotland and Ireland, stadtholder of Guelders, Holland, Zealand, Utrecht and
Overijssel. School of Willem Wissing, after Sir Peter Lely. Following a skirmish between French and Dutch naval vessels in July 1686, William concluded English neutrality was not enough and he needed their active support in the event of war.[40] His relationship with James was affected by the fact both men relied on advisors with relatively limited
views; in William's case, mainly English and Scots Presbyterian exiles, the latter with close links to the Protestant minority in Ireland, who saw Tyrconnell's policies as a threat to their existence. Having largely alienated his Tory support base, James depended on a small circle of Catholic converts like Sunderland, Melfort and Perth.[41] Suspicions
increased when James sought William's backing for repealing the Test Acts; he predictably refused, further damaging their relationship.[42] Having previously assumed he was guaranteed English support in a war with France, William now worried he might face an Anglo-French alliance, despite assurances by James he had no intention of doing so.
Historians argue these were genuine, but James did not appreciate the distrust caused by his domestic policies.[43] In August 1687, William's cousin de Zuylestein travelled to England with condolences on the death of Mary of Modena's mother, allowing him to make contact with the political opposition. Throughout 1688, his English supporters
provided William detailed information on public opinion and developments, very little of which was intercepted. [44] In October 1687, after fourteen years of marriage and multiple miscarriages, it was announced the Queen was pregnant, Melfort immediately declaring it was a boy. When James then wrote to Mary urging her to convert to Catholicism
it convinced many he was seeking a Catholic heir, one way or the other and may have been a deciding factor in whether to invade.[45] Early in 1688, a pamphlet circulated in England written by Dutch Grand Pensionary Gaspar Fagel; this guaranteed William's support for freedom of worship for Dissenters and retaining the Test Acts, unlike James who
offered tolerance in return for repeal.[46] [47] In April 1688, Louis XIV announced tariffs on Dutch herring imports, along with plans to support the Royal Navy in the English Channel alliance, the Dutch began preparing a military intervention.[48] On the
pretext of needing additional resources to deal with French privateers, in July the States General authorised an additional 9,000 sailors and 21 new warships.[49] Invitation to William English support was vital for a successful invasion, and at the end of April William met with Edward Russell, who was acting as unofficial envoy for the Whig opposition
In a conversation recorded by the exiled Gilbert Burnet, he asked for a formal invitation from key leaders asking him to "rescue the nation and the religion", with a projected date of end September. [50] William later claimed he was 'forced' to take control of the conspiracy when Russell warned him the English would rise against James even without his
help and he feared this would lead to a republic, depriving his wife of her inheritance.[51] This version is disputed, but in June he sent Zuylestein to England once again, ostensibly to congratulate James on his new son, in reality to co-ordinate with his supporters.[52] Henry Sydney, who drafted the Invitation to William The birth of the Prince of Wales
and prospect of a Catholic successor ended the 'wait for better times' policy advocated by those like Halifax. This led to the production of the Invitation to William needed in order to commit to an invasion. They included the land magnates Danby and Devonshire, one
a Whig, one a Tory; Henry Compton, Bishop of London, for the church; Shrewsbury and Lumley the army, and finally Russell and Sydney for the navy.[53] [a] Intended for public consumption, the Invitation was drafted by Sidney, later described as "the great wheel on which the Revolution rolled".[44] It claimed "nineteen parts of twenty...throughout
the kingdom desired a change", that "much the greatest part of the nobility and gentry" were dissatisfied, that the army was divided, while "very many of the common soldiers do daily shew such an aversion to the Popish religion, that there is the greatest probability imaginable of great numbers of deserters ... and amongst the seamen...there is not
one in ten who would do them any service in such a war". They promised to rally to William upon his landing in England and to "do all that lies in our power to prepare others to be in as much readiness as such an action is capable of"; finally, they stressed the importance of acting quickly.[54] On 30 June, the same day the bishops were acquitted, the
Invitation was carried to The Hague by Rear Admiral Herbert, disguised as a common sailor. Meanwhile, William's confidante Willem Bentinck launched a propaganda campaign in England; in numerous pamphlets, William was presented as a true Stuart, but unlike James and his brother Charles, one free from the vices of crypto-Catholicism.
 absolutism, and debauchery. Much of the "spontaneous" support for William on his landing was organised by Bentinck and his agents.[55] Dutch preparations: July to September 1688 The Dutch were concerned by their vulnerable eastern border; in 1672, an alliance with the Electorate of Cologne allowed France to nearly over-run the Republic
William's key strategic purpose was the Grand Alliance (League of Augsburg) to contain French expansion, an objective not shared by the majority of his English supporters. In 1672, an alliance with the Electorate of Cologne enabled France to bypass Dutch forward defences and nearly over-run the Republic, so ensuring an anti-French ruler was vital
to prevent a repetition. As an Hochstift (ecclesiastical principality) of the Holy Roman Empire, Cologne's ruler was nominated by Pope Innocent and James were in dispute with Innocent and James were in dispute with Innocent XI, in conjunction with Emperor Leopold. [56] Both Louis and James were in dispute with Innocent and
Leopold ignored the French candidate in favour of Joseph Clemens of Bavaria. [57] After 1678, France continued its expansion into the Rhineland, including the 1683 to 1684 War of the Reunions, demands in the Palatinate and construction of forts at Landau and Traben-Trarbach. [58] This presented an existential threat to Habsburg dominance,
guaranteeing Leopold's support for the Dutch, and negating French attempts to build German alliances.[59] William's envoy Johann von Görtz assured Leopold English Catholics would not be persecuted and intervention was to elect a free Parliament, not depose James, a convenient fiction that allowed him to remain neutral.[60] Although his English
supporters considered a token force sufficient, William assembled 260 transport ships and 14,000 men, nearly half the 30,000 strong Dutch States General and Bentinck hired 13,616 German mercenaries to man Dutch border fortresses, freeing elite units like the
Scots Brigade for use in England.[61] The increase could be presented as a limited precaution against French aggression, as the Dutch would typically double or triple their army strength in wartime; William instructed his experienced deputy Schomberg to prepare for a campaign in Germany.[62] Decision to invade Dutch herring fleet; French tariffs
release Austrian resources for use in Germany, this greatly reduced the threat to the Dutch.[63] Instead, Louis attacked Philippsburg. With France now committed in Germany, this greatly reduced the threat to the Dutch.[63] Instead, Louis attempted to intimidate the States General, and on 9 September, his envoy D'Avaux
handed them two letters. The first warned an attack on James meant war with France, the second any interference with French operations in Germany would end with the Dutch there was no secret Anglo-French alliance against them,
although his denials only increased their suspicions. By confirming France's primary objective was the Rhineland, the second allowed William to move troops from the eastern border to the coast, even though most of the new mercenaries had yet to arrive.[65] On 22 September, the French seized over 100 Dutch ships, many owned by Amsterdam
merchants; in response, on 26 September the Amsterdam City Council agreed to back William.[66] This was a significant decision since the Council dominated the States of Holland, the most powerful political body in the Dutch Republic which contributed nearly 60% of its budget. French troops entered the Rhineland on 27 September and in a secret
session held on 29th, William argued for a pre-emptive strike, as Louis and James would "attempt to bring this state to its ultimate ruin and subjugation, as soon as they find the occasion". This was accepted by the States, with the objective left deliberately vague, other than making the English "King and Nation live in a good relation, and useful to
their friends and allies, and especially to this State".[67] Following their approval, the Amsterdam financial market raised a loan of four million guilders from the banker Francisco Lopes Suasso.[68] [b] The biggest concern for Holland was the
potential impact on the Dutch economy and politics of William becoming ruler of England; the claim he had no intention of "removing the King from the throne" was not believed. These fears were arguably justified; William's access to English resources permanently diminished Amsterdam's power within the Republic and its status as the world's
leading commercial and financial centre.[70] English defensive strategy Admiral Dartmouth, who spent more time on monitoring his support would continue only so long as it coincided with French interests, while Mary of Modena
claimed his warnings were simply an attempt to drag England into an unwanted alliance. [71] As a former naval commander, James appreciated the difficulties of a successful invasion, even in good weather, and as they moved into autumn the likelihood seemed to diminish. With the Dutch on the verge of war with France, he did not believe the Statesand invasion, even in good weather, and as they moved into autumn the likelihood seemed to diminish. With the Dutch on the verge of war with France, he did not believe the Statesand invasion, even in good weather, and as they moved into autumn the likelihood seemed to diminish. With the Dutch on the verge of war with France, he did not believe the Statesand invasion, even in good weather, and as they moved into autumn the likelihood seemed to diminish.
General would allow William to make the attempt; if they did, his army and navy were strong enough to defeat it.[72] Reasonable in theory, his reliance on the loyalty and efficiency of the military proved deeply flawed. Both the army and the navy remained overwhelmingly Protestant and anti-Catholic; in July, only personal intervention by James
prevented a naval mutiny when a Catholic captain held Mass on his ship. The transfer of 2,500 Catholics from the Royal Irish Army to England in September led to clashes with Protestant troops, some of his most reliable units refused to obey orders, and many of their officers resigned. [73] When James demanded the repatriation of all six regiments of
the Scots Brigade in January 1688,[74] William refused but used the opportunity to purge those considered unreliable, a total of 104 officers and 44 soldiers.[75] Some may have been William refused but used the opportunity to purge those considered unreliable, a total of 104 officers and 44 soldiers.[75] Some may have been William refused but used the opportunity to purge those considered unreliable, a total of 104 officers and 44 soldiers.[75] Some may have been William refused but used the opportunity to purge those considered unreliable, a total of 104 officers and 44 soldiers.[75] Some may have been William refused but used the opportunity to purge those considered unreliable, a total of 104 officers and 44 soldiers.[75] Some may have been William refused but used the opportunity to purge those considered unreliable, a total of 104 officers and 44 soldiers.[75] Some may have been William refused but used the opportunity to purge those considered unreliable, a total of 104 officers and 44 soldiers.[75] Some may have been William refused by the opportunity to purge those considered unreliable, a total of 104 officers and 44 soldiers.[75] Some may have been William refused by the opportunity to purge those considered unreliable, a total of 104 officers and 104
The promotion of Catholic former Brigade officers, which included senior veterans like Charles Trelawny, Churchill and Percy Kirke.[76] On 14 August, Churchill offered their support to William, helping convince him it was
safe to risk an invasion; although James was aware of the conspiracy, he took no action. [77] One reason may have been fears over the impact on the army; with a notional strength of 34,000, it looked impressive on paper but morale was brittle while many were untrained or lacked weapons. It also had to fill policing roles previously delegated to the
militia, which had been deliberately allowed to decay; most of the 4,000 regular troops brought from Scotland in October had to be stationed in London to keep order. In October, attempts were made to restore the militia but many members were reportedly so angry at the changes made to local corporations, James was advised it was better not to
raise them.[78] Lord Danby; one of the Immortal Seven and William's agent in North-East and South-West England, the two landing places identified by William. A Tory whose brother Jonathan was one of the Seven Bishops, Trelawny's
defected in June but many captains owed him their appointments and were of doubtful loyalty. Dartmouth suspected Berkeley and Grafton of plotting to overthrow him; to monitor them, he placed their ships next to his and minimised contact between the other vessels to prevent conspiracy.[80] Lack of funds meant exclusive of fireships and light
scouting vessels, only 16 warships available in early October, all third rates or fourth rates, short of both men and supplies.[81] While The Downs was the best place to intercept a cross-Channel attack, it was also vulnerable to a surprise assault, even for ships fully manned and adequately provisioned. Instead, James placed his ships in a strong
defensive position near Chatham Dockyard, believing the Dutch would seek to establish naval superiority before committing to a landing.[82] While this had been the original plan, winter storms meant conditions deteriorated rapidly for those on the transports; William therefore decided to sail in convoy and avoid battle.[83] The easterly winds that
allowed the Dutch to cross prevented the Royal Navy leaving the Thames estuary and intervening.[82] The English fleet was outnumbered 2:1, undermanned, short of supplies and in the wrong place. Key landing locations in the South-West and Yorkshire had been secured by sympathisers, while both army and navy were led by officers whose loyalty
was questionable. Even early in 1686, foreign observers doubted the military would fight for James against a Protestant heir and William claimed only to be securing the inheritance of his wife Mary. While still a dangerous undertaking, the invasion was less risky than it seemed.[84] Invasion Embarkation of the army and the Declaration of The Hague
Equestrian portrait of William III by Jan Wyck, commemorating the landing at Brixham, Torbay, 5 November 1688 The Dutch preparations, though carried out with great speed, could not remain secret. The English envoy Ignatius White, the Marquess d'Albeville, warned his country: "an absolute conquest is intended under the specious and ordinary
pretences of religion, liberty, property and a free Parliament". Louis threatened an immediate declaration of war if William proceeded and sent James 300,000 livres.[85] Embarkations, started on 22 September (Gregorian calendar), had been completed on 8 October, and the expedition was that day openly approved by the States of Holland; the same
day James issued a proclamation to the English nation that it should prepare for a Dutch invasion to ward off conquest. On 30 September/10 October (Julian/Gregorian calendars) William issued the Declaration of The Hague (actually written by Fagel), of which 60,000 copies of the English translation by Gilbert Burnet were distributed after the
landing in England,[86][87] in which he assured that his only aim was to maintain the Protestant religion, install a free parliament and investigate the legitimacy of the Prince of Wales. He would respect the position of James william declared: It is both certain and evident to all men, that the public peace and happiness of any state or kingdom cannot be a surface of the Prince of Wales. He would respect the position of James william declared: It is both certain and evident to all men, that the public peace and happiness of any state or kingdom cannot be a surface of the Prince of Wales. He would respect the position of James will a free parliament and investigate the legitimacy of the Prince of Wales. He would respect the position of James will be a surface of the Prince of Wales. He would respect the position of James will be a surface of the Prince of Wales. He would respect the position of James will be a surface of the Prince of Wales. He would respect the position of James will be a surface of the Prince of Wales. He would respect the position of James will be a surface of the Prince of Wales. He would respect the position of James will be a surface of the Prince of Wales. He would respect the position of James will be a surface of the Prince of Wales. He would respect the prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales. He would respect to the prince of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface of the Prince of Wales will be a surface 
be preserved, where the Laws, Liberties, and Customs, established by the lawful authority in it, are openly transgressed and annulled; more especially where the alteration of Religion is endeavoured, and that a religion, which is contrary to law, is endeavoured to be introduced; upon which those who are most immediately concerned in it are
indispensably bound to endeavour to preserve and maintain the established among them; and to take such an effectual care, that the inhabitants of the said state or kingdom may neither be deprived of their Religion, nor of their Civil Rights.—William of
Orange[88] William went on to condemn James's advisers for overturning the religion, laws, and liberties of England, Scotland, and Ireland by the use of the suspending and dispensing power; the establishment of the "manifestly illegal" commission for ecclesiastical causes and its use to suspend the Bishop of London and to remove the Fellows of
Magdalen College, Oxford. William also condemned James's attempt to repeal the Test Acts and the penal laws through pressuring individuals and waging an assault on parliamentary boroughs, as well as his purging of the judiciary. James's attempt to pack Parliament was in danger of removing "the last and great remedy for all those evils".
"Therefore", William continued, "we have thought fit to go over to England, and to carry over with us a force sufficient, by the blessing of God, to defend us from the violence of those evil Counsellors ... this our Expedition is intended for no other design, but to have, a free and lawful Parliament assembled as soon as is possible".[89] On 4/14 October
William responded to the allegations by James in a second declaration, denying any intention to become king or to conquer England. Whether he had any such intention at that moment, is still controversial. [90] The swiftness of the embarkations surprised all foreign observers. Louis had in fact delayed his threats against the Dutch until early
September because he assumed it then would be too late in the season to set the expedition in motion anyway, if their reaction proved negative; typically such an enterprise would normally have meant that the Dutch could have profited from the
sessions that this "popish wind" might endure. However, on 14/24 October, it became the famous "Protestant Wind" by turning to the east.[92] Crossing and landing The square formation in which the Dutch invasion fleet sailed through the Strait of Dover William boarding Den Briel William landed at Torbay, whose sheltered position makes the
weather unusually moderate (note non-native cabbage trees) The invasion was officially a private affair, with the States General allowing William use of the Dutch army and fleet. [59] For propaganda purposes, English admiral Arthur Herbert was nominally in command, but in reality operational control remained with Lieutenant-Admiral Cornelisation (note non-native cabbage trees).
Evertsen the Youngest and Vice-Admiral Philips van Almonde.[93] Accompanied by Willem Bastiaensz Schepers, the Rotterdam shipping magnate who organised the transport fleet, William boarded the frigate Den Briel on 16/26 October.[c][94][95] The invasion fleet consisted of 463 ships and 40,000 men on board, roughly twice the size of the
Spanish Armada,[91] with 49 warships, 76 transports carrying soldiers and 120 for the five thousand horses required by the cavalry and supply train.[96] [d] Having departed on 19/29 October, the expedition was halfway across the North Sea when it was scattered by a gale, forcing the Brill back to Hellevoetsluis on 21/31 October. William refused to the five thousand horses required by the cavalry and supply train.
go ashore and the fleet reassembled, having lost only one ship but nearly a thousand horses; press reports deliberately exaggerated the damage and claimed the expedition would be postponed till the spring. [98] Dartmouth and his senior commanders considered blockading Hellevoetsluis but decided against it, partly because the stormy weather
when the wind shifted again, the Dutch fleet sailed south into the Strait of Dover. [98] In doing so they twice passed the English fleet, which was unable to intercept because of the adverse winds and tides. [100] On 3/13 November, the invasion fleet entered the English Channel in an enormous formation 25 ships deep, the troops lined up on deck,
firing musket volleys, colours flying and military bands playing. Intended to awe observers with its size and power, Rapin de Thoyras later described it as "the most magnificent and affecting spectacle...ever seen by human eyes". The same wind blowing the Dutch down the Channel kept Dartmouth confined in the Thames estuary; by the time he was
able to make his way out, he was too far behind to stop William reaching Torbay on 5 November.[101] As anticipated, the French fleet remained in the Mediterranean, in order to support an attack on the Papal States if needed,[91] while a south-westerly gale now forced Dartmouth to shelter in Portsmouth harbour and kept him there for two days,
allowing William to complete his disembarkation undisturbed.[102] His army totalled around 15,000 men, [e] consisting of 11,212 infantry, among them nearly 5,000 members of the elite Anglo-Scots Brigade and Dutch Blue Guards, 3,660 cavalry and an artillery train of twenty-one 24-pounder cannon.[105] [106] He also brought weapons to equip
20,000 men, although he preferred deserters from the Royal Army and most of the 12,000 local volunteers who joined by 20 November were told to go home. [107] The collapse of James's rule Panicked by the prospect of invasion, James met with the bishops on 28 September, offering concessions; five days later they presented demands returning the
religious position to that of February 1685 and calling a free Parliament. They hoped this would be enough for James to remain king but there was little chance of this; at a minimum, James would have to disinherit his son, enforce the Test Acts and accept the supremacy of Parliament, all of which were unacceptable. By now his Whig opponents did
not trust him to keep his promises, while Tories like Danby were too committed to William to escape punishment.[108] SalisburyFavershamLondonTorbayWincantonExeterPortsmouthHungerfordReadingPlymouthclass=notpageimage| Key locations November 1688 While his veterans were potentially capable of defeating the Royal Army, William and
his English supporters wanted to avoid bloodshed and allow the regime to collapse on its own. Landing in Torbay provided space and time for this, while heavy rainfall forced a slow advance regardless and to avoid alienating the local population by looting, his troops were well supplied and paid three months in advance. When he entered Exeter on 9
November in an elaborate procession,[f] he publicly pronounced his objectives were securing the rights of his wife and a free Parliament; despite these precautions, there was little enthusiasm for either James or William and the general mood was one of confusion and distrust.[110] After Danby had the Declaration publicly read in York on 12
November, much of the northern gentry confirmed their backing and the document was widely distributed.[111] On 19 November James joined his commanders doubtful. Three regiments sent out on 15th to make contact with William
promptly defected, while supply problems left the rest short of food and ammunition. On 20 November, dragoons led by Irish Catholic Patrick Sarsfield, these were the only substantial military actions of the campaign. After
securing his rear by taking Plymouth on 18 November, William began his advance on 21st, while Danby and Belasyse captured York and Hull several days later.[79] James' commander Feversham and other senior officers advised retreat; lacking information on William's movements, unable to rely on his own soldiers, worn out by lack of sleep and
debilitating nose-bleeds, on 23rd James agreed.[112] Next day Churchill, Grafton and Princess Anne's husband George deserted to William, followed by Anne herself on 26th. The next day, James held a meeting at Whitehall Palace with those peers still in London; with the exception of Melfort, Perth and other Catholics, they urged him to issue writs
for a Parliamentary election and negotiate with William.[113] On 8 December, Halifax, Nottingham and Godolphin met with William at Hungerford to hear his demands, which included the dismissal of Catholics from public office and funding for his army. Many viewed these as a reasonable basis for a settlement but James decided to flee the country.
convinced by Melfort and others his life was threatened, a suggestion generally dismissed by historians. William made it clear he would not allow James to be harmed, most Tories wanted him to retain his throne, while the Whigs simply wanted to drive him out of the country by imposing conditions he would refuse.[108] John Churchill, circa 1685; a
close friend of James and uncle of his illegitimate son Berwick, his defection to William was a serious blow The Queen and Prince of Wales left for France on 9 December, James following separately on 10th.[114] Accompanied only by Sir Edward Hales and Ralph Sheldon, he made his way to Faversham in Kent seeking passage to France, first
dropping the Great Seal in the Thames in a last ditch attempt to prevent Parliament being summoned.[115] In London, his flight and rumours of a "Papist" invasion led to riots and destruction of Catholic property, which quickly spread throughout the country. To fill the power vacuum, the Earl of Rochester set up a temporary government including
members of the Privy Council and City of London authorities, but it took them two days to restore order.[116] When news arrived James had been captured in Faversham on 11 December by local fishermen, Lord Ailesbury, one of his personal attendants, was sent to escort him back to London; on entering the city on 16 December, he was welcomed by
cheering crowds. By making it seem James remained in control, Tory loyalists hoped for a settlement which would leave them in government; to create an appearance of normality, he heard Mass and presided over a meeting of the Privy Council.[117][g] However, James made it clear to the French ambassador he still intended to escape to France
while his few remaining supporters viewed his flight as cowardice, and failure to ensure law and order criminally negligent. [118] Happy to help him into exile, William recommended he relocate to Ham, London, largely because it was easy to escape from. James suggested Rochester instead, allegedly because his personal guard was there, in reality
conveniently positioned for a ship to France. On 18 December, he left London with a Dutch escort as William entered, cheered by the same crowds who greeted his predecessor two days before.[119] On 22 December, he left London with a Dutch escort as William entered, cheered by the same crowds who greeted his predecessor two days before.[119] On 22 December, he left London with a Dutch escort as William entered, cheered by the same crowds who greeted his predecessor two days before.[119] On 22 December, he left London with a Dutch escort as William entered, cheered by the same crowds who greeted his predecessor two days before.[119] On 22 December, he left London with a Dutch escort as William entered, cheered by the same crowds who greeted his predecessor two days before.[119] On 22 December, he left London with a Dutch escort as William entered, cheered by the same crowds who greeted his predecessor two days before.[119] On 22 December, he left London with a Dutch escort as William entered, cheered by the same crowds who greeted his predecessor two days before.[119] On 22 December, he left London with a Dutch escort as William entered, cheered by the same crowds who greeted his predecessor two days before.[119] On 22 December, he left London with a Dutch escort as William entered, cheered by the same crowds who greeted his predecessor two days before the left London with a Dutch escort as William entered his predecessor two days before the left London with a Dutch escort as William entered his predecessor two days before the left London with a Dutch escort as William entered his predecessor two days before the left London with a Dutch escort as William entered his predecessor two days before the left London with a Dutch escort as William entered his predecessor two days before the left London with a Dutch escort as William entered his predecessor two days before the left London with a Dutch escort as William entered his predecessor the left London with a Dutch escort as William entered his predecessor the left L
leave, "they should not prevent him, but allow him to gently slip through".[120] Although Ailesbury and others begged him to stay, he left for France on 23 December.[115] The Revolutionary Settlement William III and Mary II reigned jointly until her death in 1694, when William became sole monarch James' departure significantly shifted the balance
of power in favour of William, who took control of the provisional government on 28 December. Elections were held in early January; the Whigs had a slight majority in the Commons, the Lords was dominated by the Tories but both were led by moderates. Archbishop Sancroft and other
Stuart loyalists wanted to preserve the line of succession; although they recognised keeping James on the throne was no longer possible, they preferred Mary either be appointed his regent or sole monarch.[121] The next two weeks were spent debating how to resolve this issue, much to the annoyance of William, who needed a swift resolution; the
situation in Ireland was rapidly deteriorating, while the French had over-run large parts of the Rhineland and were preparing to attack the Dutch.[122] At a meeting with Danby and Halifax on 3 February, he announced his intention to return home if the Convention did not appoint him joint monarch, while Mary let it be known she would only rule
jointly with her husband. Faced with this ultimatum, on 6 February Parliament declared that in deserting his people James had abdicated and thus vacated the crown, which was therefore offered jointly to William and Mary.[123] Historian Tim Harris argues the most radical act of the 1688 Revolution was breaking the succession and establishing the
idea of a "contract" between ruler and people, a fundamental rebuttal of the Stuart ideology of divine right.[124] While this was a victory for the Whigs, other pieces of legislation were proposed by the Tories, often with moderate Whig support, designed to protect the Anglican establishment from being undermined by future monarchs, including the
Calvinist William. The Declaration of Right was a tactical compromise, setting out where James had failed and establishing the rights of English citizens, without agreeing their cause or offering solutions. In December 1689, this was incorporated into the Bill of Rights[125] However, there were two areas that arguably broke new constitutional ground
both responses to what were viewed as specific abuses by James. First, the Declaration of Right made keeping a standing army without Parliamentary consent illegal, overturning the 1661 and 1662 Militia Acts and vesting control of the military in Parliament, not the Crown.[126] The second was the Coronation Oath Act 1688; the result of James
perceived failure to comply with that taken in 1685, it established obligations owed by the monarchy to the people. At their coronation on 11 April, William and Mary swore to "govern the people of this kingdom of England, and the dominions thereunto belonging, according to the statutes in Parliament agreed on, and the laws and customs of the
 same". They were also to maintain the Protestant Reformed faith and "preserve inviolable the settlement of the Church of England, and its doctrine, worship, discipline and government as by law established".[127] Scotland and Ireland Main articles: Glorious Revolution in Scotland and Williamite War in Ireland Parliament House, where the
Convention of Estates met in March 1689 While Scotland was not involved in the landing, by November 1688 only a tiny minority supported James; many of those who accompanied William Carstares and Gilbert Burnet. [128] News of James's flight led to celebrations and
anti-Catholic riots in Edinburgh and Glasgow. Most members of the Scottish Privy Council went to London; on 7 January 1689, they asked William to take over government. Elections were held in March for a Scottish Convention, which was also a contest between Presbyterians and Episcopalians for control of the Kirk. While only 50 of the 125
 claiming to fear for their safety and others changed sides.[130] The 1689-1691 Jacobite Rising forced William to make concessions to the Presbyterians, ended Episcopalianism was the key determinant of Jacobite support in
1715 and 1745.[131] The English Parliament held that James 'abandoned' his throne; the Convention argued that he 'forfeited' it by his actions, as listed in the Articles of Grievances and the Claim of Right Act, making Parliament the primary legislative power
in Scotland.[133] On 11 May, William and Mary accepted the Crown of Scotland; after their acceptance, the Claim and the Articles were read aloud, leading to an immediate debate over whether or not an endorsement of these documents was implicit in that acceptance.[citation needed][134] Under the 1542 Crown of Ireland Act, the English monarch
was automatically king of Ireland as well. Tyrconnell had created a largely Roman Catholic army and administration which was reinforced in March 1689 when James landed in Ireland before the new regime controlled Ireland. Anglo-Dutch alliance Though
he had carefully avoided making it public, William's main motive in organising the expedition had been the opportunity to bring England into an alliance against France. [135] On 9 December 1688 he had already asked the States General to send a delegation of three to negotiate the conditions. On 18 February (Julian calendar) he asked the convention
to support the Republic in its war against France; but it refused, only consenting to pay £600,000 for the continued presence of the Dutch army in England.[citation needed] On 9 March (Gregorian calendar) the States General responded to Louis's earlier declaration of war by declaring war on France in return. On 19 April (Julian calendar) the Dutch
delegation signed a naval treaty with England. It stipulated that the combined Anglo-Dutch fleet would always be commanded by an Englishman, even when of lower rank; also it specified that the butch navy in the future would be
smaller than the English.[citation needed] The Navigation Acts were not repealed. On 18 May the new Parliament allowed William as King of England joined the League of Augsburg against France. The decline of the Dutch Republic Having England as an ally meant that
the military situation of the Republic was strongly improved, but this very fact induced William to be uncompromising in his position towards France. This policy led to a large number of very expensive campaigns which were largely paid for with Dutch funds. In 1712 the Republic was financially exhausted; it withdrew from international politics and
was forced to let its fleet deteriorate, making what was by then the dominant maritime power of the world. The Dutch economy, already burdened by the high national debt and concomitant high taxation, suffered from the other European states protectionist policies, which its weakened fleet was no longer able to resist.
To make matters worse, the main Dutch trading and banking houses moved much of their activity from Amsterdam to London after 1688. Between 1688 and 1720, world trade dominance shifted from the Republic to Britain.[136] Assessment and historiography While the 1688 revolution was labeled "Glorious" by Protestant preachers two decades
later,[137] its historiography is complex, and its assessment disputed. Thomas Macaulay's account of the Revolution in The History of England from the Accession of James the Second exemplifies the "Whig history" narrative of the Revolution as a largely consensual and bloodless triumph of English common sense, confirming and strengthening its
institutions of tempered popular liberty and limited monarchy.[138] Edmund Burke set the tone for that interpretation when he proclaimed that: The Revolution of government which is our only security for law and liberty.[139][140] An alternative narrative
emphasizes William's successful foreign invasion from the Netherlands, and the size of the corresponding military operation. Several researchers have emphasized that aspect, particularly after the third centenary of the event in 1988.[141] The invasion story is unusual because the establishment of a constitutional monarchy (a de facto republic, see
Coronation Oath Act 1688) and Bill of Rights meant that the apparently invasion by Dutch forces, and "Glorious
Revolution". It has been argued that the invasion aspect had been downplayed as a result of British pride and effective Dutch propaganda, trying to depict the course of events as a largely internal English affair. [142] As the invitation was initiated by figures who had little influence, the legacy of the Glorious Revolution has been described as a
successful propaganda act by William to cover up and justify his invasion. [143] The claim that William was fighting for the Protestant cause in England was used to great effect to disguise the military, cultural and political impact that the Dutch regime had on England. A third version, proposed by Steven Pincus (2009), underplays the invasion aspect
but unlike the Whig narrative views the Revolution as a divisive and violent event that involved all classes of the English population, not just the main aristocratic protagonists. Pincus argues that it was
momentous especially when looking at the alternative that James was trying to enact - a powerful centralised autocratic state, using French-style "state-building". England's role in Europe and the country's political economy in the 17th century rebuts the view of many late-20th-century historians that nothing revolutionary occurred during the
Glorious Revolution of 1688-89. Pincus says it was not a placid turn of events. In diplomacy and economics William III transformed the English state's ideology and policies. This occurred not because foreign affairs and political economy were at the core of the English state's ideology and policies.
revolutionaries' agenda. The revolution of 1688-89 cannot be fathomed in isolation. It would have been inconceivable without the changes resulting from the events of the 1640s and 1650s. The ideas accompanying the Glorious Revolution were rooted in the mid-century upheavals. The 17th century was a century of revolution in England, deserving of
the same scholarly attention that 'modern' revolutions attract. [144] James II tried building a powerful militarised state on the mercantilist assumption that the world's wealth was necessarily finite and empires were created by taking land from other states. The East India Company was thus an ideal tool to create a vast new English imperial dominion
by warring with the Dutch and the Mughal Empire in India. After 1689 came an alternative understanding of economics, which saw Britain as a commercial rather than an agrarian society. It led to the foundation of the Bank of England, the creation of Europe's first widely circulating credit currency and the commencement of the "Age of Projectors".
[145] This subsequently gave weight to the view, advocated most famously by Adam Smith in 1776, that wealth was created by human endeavour and was thus potentially infinite. [146] Impact With the passage of the Bill of Rights, the Glorious Revolution stamped out once and for all any possibility of a Catholic monarchy and ended moves towards
absolute monarchy in the British kingdoms by circumscribing the monarch's powers. These powers were greatly restricted; he or she could no longer suspend laws, levy taxes, make royal appointments or maintain a standing army during peacetime without Parliament's permission - to this day the Army is known as the "British Army" not the "Royal
Army" as it is, in some sense, Parliament's Army and not that of the King. (This is a complex issue, as the Crown remains the source of all executive authority in the British army, with legal implications for unlawful orders etc.)[147] Since 1689, government under a system of constitutional monarchy in England, and later Great Britain and the United
Kingdom, has been uninterrupted. Parliament's power has steadily increased, while that of the English civil wars of the majority of the bloodshed occurred in Ireland). This fact has led many
historians, including Stephen Webb, to suggest that, in England at least, the events more closely resemble a coup d'état than a social revolution. [148][h] This view of events does not contradict what was originally meant by "revolution": the coming round of an old system of values in a circular motion, back to its original position, as England's
constitution was reasserted, rather than formed anew. [149] Prior to his arrival in England, the future king William III was not Anglican but a member of the Dutch Reformed Church. As a Calvinist and Presbyterian he was now in the unenviable position of being the head of the Church of England, while also being a Nonconformist. This was not his
main motive for promoting religious toleration. More important in that respect was the need to keep happy his Roman Catholic allies, Spain and the Holy Roman Emperor, in the coming struggle with Louis XIV.[150] Though he had promised legal toleration for Roman Catholics in his Declaration of October 1688, William failed in this respect, owing to
opposition by the Tories in the new Parliament.[151] The Revolution led to the Act of Toleration to Nonconformist Protestants but not to Roman Catholics. Catholic emancipation would be delayed for 140 years. The Williamite War in Ireland can be seen as the source of later ethno-religious conflict, including The
Troubles of the twentieth century. The Williamite victory in Ireland is still commemorated by the Orange Order for preserving British and Protestant supremacy in the country. In North America, the Glorious Revolution precipitated the 1689 Boston revolt in which a well-organised "mob" of provincial militia and citizens deposed the hated governor
Edmund Andros. In New York, Leisler's Rebellion caused the colonial administrator, Francis Nicholson, to flee to England. A third event, Maryland's Protestant Rebellion was directed against the proprietary government, seen as Catholic-dominated. Explanatory notes ^ We have great reason to believe, we shall be every day in a worse condition than
we are, and less able to defend ourselves, and therefore we do earnestly wish we might be so happy as to find a remedy before it be too late for us to contribute to our own deliverance ... the people are so generally dissatisfied with the present conduct of the government, in relation to their religion, liberties and properties (all which have been greatly
invaded), and they are in such expectation of their prospects being daily worse, that your Highness may be assured, there are nineteen parts of twenty of the people throughout the kingdom, who are desirous of a change; and who, we believe, would secure
them from being destroyed. ^ When asked what security he desired, Suasso allegedly answered: "If you are victorious, you will surely repay me; if not, the loss is mine." [69] ^ His standard was hoisted, displaying the arms of Nassau quartered with those of England. The words Pro Religione et Libertate ("For Liberty and [the Protestant] Religion"), the
slogan of William's ancestor William the Silent while leading the Dutch Revolt against Catholic Spain, were shown next to the House of Orange's motto, Je maintiendrai ("I will maintain") ^ There were seventy-five vessels of the confederal Dutch navy. Forty-nine were warships of more than twenty cannon. Eight of these could count as third rates of
60-68 cannon. Additionally there were nine frigates, twenty-eight galliots and nine fireships. Transports included seventy-six fluyts to carry the soldiers, 120 small transports to carry five thousand horses and about seventy supply vessels. Also, sixty fishing vessels served as landing craft.[97][96] Most of the warships had been provided by the
Admiralty of Amsterdam As was then common, many were foreigners, including Scots, English, German, Swiss, Swedes and Laplanders, [91] as well as 200 freed slaves from the Dutch colony of Surinam. [103] A large number were also Catholic. [104] After the magistrates had fled the city, he entered on a white palfrey, with the two hundred black
men forming a guard of honour, dressed in white, with turbans and feathers.[109] ^ Those in attendance were William Hamilton, Duke of Hamilton, William Craven, 1st Earl of Craven, George Berkeley, 1st Earl of Berkeley, Charles Middleton (Southern Secretary), Richard Graham, 1st Viscount Preston (Lord President of the
Council and Northern Secretary), Sidney Godolphin, 1st Earl of Godolphin (Chamberlain to the Queen and Treasury Commissioner), John Trevor, Master of the event has divided historians ever since Friedrich Engels judged it "a relatively puny event". Engels 1997, p. 269 Citations ^ (Irish: An Réabhlóid
Ghlórmhar; Scottish Gaelic: Rèabhlaid Ghlòrmhor; Welsh: Chwyldro Gogoneddus), the invasion also known as the Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 3. Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing by the Dutch Schwoerer 2004, p. 143. Historical Notes: Glorious Crossing
p. 144. ^ Harris & Taylor 2015, p. 147. ^ Pincus 2009, pp. 441–442. ^ Quinn. ^ Miller 1978, pp. 124–125. ^ Harris 1999, pp. 28–30. ^ Stephen 2010, pp. 55–58. ^ Miller 1978, pp. 189. ^ Jackson 2003, pp. 38–54. ^ Baker 2009, pp. 290–29Ĭ. ^ Harris 2006, pp. 153–155. ^ Harris 2006, pp. 106–108. ^ Harris 1993, pp. 124. ^
Wakeling 1896, p. 91. ^ Harris 2006, pp. 179–181. ^ Spielvogel 1980, p. 410. ^ Bosher 1994, pp. 6-8. ^ Harris 2006, p. 103. ^ Miller 1978, pp. 130. ^ Field 2012, p. 695. ^ Miller 1978, pp. 171–172. ^ Harris 2006, p. 235. ^ Miller 1978, pp. 127–129. ^ Jones 1988,
p. 146. ^ Jones 1988, p. 150. ^ Childs 1987, p. 184. ^ Childs 1987, p. 184. ^ Childs 1980, pp. 235-236. ^ Miller 1978, pp. 213-214. ^ Harris 2006, pp. 235-236. ^ Miller 1978, pp. 213-214. ^ Harris 2006, pp. 256. ^ a b Jones 1988, p. 222. ^ Hoak 1996, p. 24. ^ Harris 2007, pp. 235-236. ^ Hoak 1996, pp. 235-236. ^ Hoak 1996, pp. 24. ^ Harris 2007, pp. 235-236. ^ Hoak 1996, pp. 235-
2006, pp. 256–257. ^ Fagel 1688. ^ Troost 2005, p. 191. ^ Prud'homme van Reine 2009, p. 287. ^ Baxter 1966, p. 225. ^ Baxter 1966, p. 271. ^ Harris 2006, p. 271. ^ Duffy 1995, p. 20. ^ a b Troost 2005, p. 198.
^ Young 2004, p. 255. ^ Jardine 2008, p. 38. ^ Baxter 1966, pp. 232–33. ^ McKay & Scott 1984, p. 41. ^ Jardine 2008, p. 37. ^ Jardine 2008, p. 52. ^ Swetschinsky & Schönduve 1988, p. 53. ^ Troost 2016, pp. 206–207. ^ Miller 1978, p. 194. ^ Miller 1978, p. 195.
Miller 1978, p. 196. ^ Troost 2001, p. 196. ^ Troost 2001, p. 196. ^ Childs 1984, p. 61. ^ Holmes 2009, p. 136. ^ Troost 2005, pp. 195-196. ^ Miller 1973, pp. 671-672. ^ a b Harris 2006, p. 285. ^ Davies 2004, p. 138. ^ Prud'homme van Reine 2009, p. 291. ^ Miller 1973, pp. 679. ^ Western 1972, pp. 259. ^ Jardine 2008, pp. 196. ^ Davies 2004, pp. 196. ^ Davies 2004
p. 29. ^ Williams 1960, pp. 10–16. ^ Speck 1989, pp. 74. ^ Speck 1989, pp. 74-75. ^ Troost 2001, p. 199. ^ a b c d Rodger 2004, p. 137. ^ Jones 1973, pp. 201–21. ^ Prud'homme van Reine 2009, p. 288. ^ Jardine 2008, pp. 10–11. ^ Bander 2014, p. 276. ^ a b Prud'homme van Reine 2009, p. 289. ^ Western 1972, p. 260. ^ a b Prud'homme van Reine 2009, pp. 10–11. ^ Prud'homme van Reine 2009, pp. 288. ^ Jardine 2008, pp. 10–11. ^ Prud'homme van Reine 2009, pp. 288. ^ Jardine 2008, pp. 10–11. ^ Prud'homme van Reine 2009, pp. 289. ^ Western 1972, pp. 260. ^ a b Prud'homme van Reine 2009, pp. 288. ^ Jardine 2008, pp. 10–11. ^ Prud'homme van Reine 2009, pp. 288. ^ Jardine 2008, pp. 10–11. ^ Prud'homme van Reine 2009, pp. 289. ^ Western 1972, pp. 260. ^ a b Prud'homme van Reine 2009, pp. 288. ^ Jardine 2008, pp. 10–11. ^ Prud'homme van Reine 2009, pp. 288. ^ Jardine 2008, 
2009, pp. 290-291. ^ Harris 2006, p. 203. ^ Rodger 2004, p. 139. ^ Miller 1978, p. 199. ^ Rodger 2004, pp. 137-139. ^ Beddard 1988, p. 19. ^ Schuchard 2002, p. 762. ^ Childs 1980, pp. 175. ^ Sowerby 2013, pp. 347-348. ^ Harris 2006, p. 283. ^ a b Miller 1978, p. 204. ^ Jardine 2008, pp. 16. ^ Jardine 2008, pp. 15-16. ^ Jardine 2008, pp. 31-32.
```

^ Miller 1978, pp. 201–202. ^ Harris 2006, p. 284. ^ Miller 1978, p. 205. ^ a b Jardine 2008, p. 17. ^ Harris 2006, pp. 296–300. ^ "No. 2410". The London Gazette. 17 December 1688. p. 2. ^ Miller 1978, p. 208. ^ Jardine 2008, p. 19. ^ Harris 2006, pp. 319. ^ Harris 2006, pp. 319. ^ Harris 2006, pp. 325. ^ Miller 1978, pp. 209. ^ Harris 2006, pp. 329. ^ Pincus 2009, pp. 292–293. ^ Harris 2006, pp. 341. ^ Maer & Gay 2008, pp. 4. ^ Harris 2006, pp. 379–381. ^ Szechi & Sankey 2001, pp. 379–381. ^ Szechi & Sankey 2001, pp. 379–381. ^ Szechi & Sankey 2001, pp. 379–381. ^ Szechi & Sankey 2008, pp. 379–3

```
Coward 1980, p. 460. ^ Troost 2005, p. ?. ^ Israel 1989, p. 37-38. ^ Vries & Woude 1997, pp. 673-87. ^ Pincus 2009, pp. 369-370. ^ Windeyer
1938[page needed] ^ Webb 1995, p. 166. ^ Mitchell 2009, xvi, xviii, xix. ^ Israel 2003, pp. 137-38. ^ Israel 2003, pp. 20. General and cited sources Baker, Derek (2014). Dutch Warships in the Age of Sail 1600 - 1714. Seaforth
Publishing. ISBN 978-1848321571. Baxter, Stephen B (1966). William III. Longmans. OCLC 415582287. Beddard, Robert (1988). A Kingdom without a King: The Journal of the Provisional Government in the Revolution of 1688. Phaidon. ISBN 978-0-7148-2500-7. Black, Jeremy (2016). A History of the British Isles. Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN 978-0-7148-2500-7.
1137573612. Bosher, JF (February 1994). "The Franco-Catholic Danger, 1660-1715". History. 79 (255): 5-30. doi:10.1111/j.1468-229X.1994.tb01587.x. JSTOR 24421929. Burchett, Josiah (1703). Memoirs of transactions at sea, during the war with France, beginning in 1688 and ending in 1697. The Admiralty. Carpenter, Edward (1956). The
Protestant Bishop. Being the Life of Henry Compton, 1632-1713. Bishop of London. London: Longmans, Green and Co. OCLC 1919768. Childs, John (1984). "The Scottish brigade in the service of the Dutch Republic, 1689 to
1782". Documentatieblad Werkgroep Achttiende Eeuw. Childs, John (1987). The British Army of William III, 1689-1702 (1990 ed.). Manchester University Press. ISBN 978-0719025525. Claydon, Tony; Levillain, Charles-Édouard (2016). Louis XIV Outside In: Images of the Sun King Beyond France, 1661–1715. Routledge. ISBN 978-1317103240. Coffey
John (2013). "Chapter 4". In Pope, Robert (ed.). Church & State 1570-1750; the Emergence of Dissent in T&T Clark Companion to Nonconformity (2016 ed.). Bloomsbury T&T Clark. pp. 19-20. ISBN 978-0582067226. Dalrymple, John (1790)
Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland; from the Dissolution of the last Parliament of Charles II till the Capture of the French and Spanish Fleets at Vigo. Strahan & Cadell. Davies, D. (1989). "James II, William of Orange and the admirals". In Cruickshanks, Eveline (ed.). By force or default? The revolution of 1688–1689. John Donald. ISBN 978-0-85976.
279-3. Davies, JD (2004). "Legge, George, first Baron Dartmouth". Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/ref:odnb/16352. (Subscription or UK public library membership required.) De Krey, Gary S. (2008). "Between Revolutions: Re-appraising the Restoration in Britain". History Compass. 6 (3): 738-10.1093/ref:odnb/16352. (Subscription or UK public library membership required.)
773. doi:10.1111/j.1478-0542.2008.00520.x. Duffy, Christopher (1995). Siege Warfare: The Fortress in the Early Modern World 1494–1660. Routledge. ISBN 978-0415146494.; Engels, Friedrich (1997). "Introduction to Socialism: Utopian and Scientific". In Feuerbach, L.; Marx, K.; Engles, F. (eds.). German Socialist Philosophy. Continuum
International Publishing Group. ISBN 978-0-8264-0748-1. Fagel, Gaspar (1688). A LETTER, Writ by Mijn Heer FAGEL, PENSIONER of HOLLAND, TO Mr. JAMES STEWART, Advocate; Giving an Account of the PRINCE and PRINCESS of ORANGE's Thoughts concerning the Repeal of the TEST, and the PENAL LAWS. Retrieved 8 January 2021. Field
Clive (2012). "Counting Religion in England and Wales: The Long Eighteenth Century, c. 1680-c. 1840" (PDF). The Journal of Ecclesiastical History. 63 (4): 693-720. doi:10.1017/S0022046911002533. Glozier, Mathew (2000). "The Earl of Melfort, the Court Catholic Party and the Foundation of the Order of the Thistle, 1687". The Scottish Historical
Review. 79 (208): 233–238. doi:10.3366/shr.2000.79.2.233. JSTOR 25530975. Goodlad, Graham (2007). "Before the Glorious Revolutionaries and English Republicans: The Cordeliers Club, 1790–1794. Royal Historical Society. ISBN 978-1794. Royal Historical Society. Royal Historical Royal
0861932733. Harris, Tim (2006). Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685–1720. Allen Lane. ISBN 978-0-7139-9759-0. Harris, Tim; Taylor, Stephen, eds. (2015). The Final Crisis of the Stuart Monarchy. Boydell & Brewer. ISBN 978-1783270446
Harris, Tim (1999). "The People, the Law, and the Constitution in Scotland and England: A Comparative Approach to the Glorious Revolution?"". Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies. 38 (1): 28–30. doi:10.1086/386180. S2CID 144374498. Hertzler, James R. (1987). "Who Dubbed It "The Glorious Revolution?"". Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies. 38 (1): 28–30. doi:10.1086/386180. S2CID 144374498.
Studies. 19 (4): 579–585. doi:10.2307/4049475. JSTOR 4049475. JSTOR 4049475. Hoak, Dale; Feingold, Mordechai (eds.). The Anglo-Dutch revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspectives on the Revolution of 1688–89 in 'The World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspective on the World of William and Mary: Anglo-Dutch Perspe
England's Fragile Genius. Harper Press. ISBN 978-0007225729. Horwitz, Henry (1977). Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III. Manchester University Press. ISBN 978-0-7190-0661-6. Huygens, Constantijn (1881). Journaal van Constantijn Huygens, den zoon, gedurende de veldtochten der jaren 1688, Volume I. Kemink & Zoon.
Israel, Jonathan; Parker, Geoffrey (1991). Israel, J.I. (ed.). Of Providence and Protestant Winds: the Spanish Armada of 1688 in The Anglo-Dutch Moment; Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its world impact. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-39075-0. Israel, Jonathan I (2003). The Anglo-Dutch Moment:
Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0521544061. Israel, Jonathan (1989). The Dutch Republic and the 'Glorious Revolution' of 1688/89 in England. Greenwich: Trustees National Maritime Museum. pp. 31-44. ISBN 9780948065033. Jackson, Claire (2003). Restoration Scotland, 1660-1690.
Royalist Politics, Religion and Ideas. Boydell Press. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. Harper. ISBN 978-0851159300. Jardine, Lisa (2008). Going Dutch: How England Plundered Holland's Glory. Harper. 
S2CID 145465379 Jones, J. R. (1988). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay, Thomas Babington (1889). The Revolution of 1688 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay (1889). The Revolution of 1889 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay (1889). The Revolution of 1889 in England. Weidenfeld and Nicolson. ISBN 978-0-297-99569-2. Macaulay (1889). The Revolution of 1889 in England. Weide
House of Commons Library. p. 4. Marquess of Cambridge (1966). "The March of William of Orange from Torbay to London – 1688". Journal of the Society for Army Historical Research. XLIV. McKay, Derek; Scott, H. M. (1984). The Rise of the Great Powers: 1648–1815. Longman. ISBN 0582485541. Miller, John (1978). James II; A study in kingship.
Menthuen. ISBN 978-0413652904. Miller, John (1973). "The Militia and the Army in the Reign of James II". Historical Journal. 16 (4): 659-679. doi:10.1017/S0018246X00003897. JSTOR 2638277. S2CID 159475416. Mitchell, Leslie (2009) [1790]. "Introduction". In Burke, Edmund (ed.). Reflections on the Revolution in France. Oxford University Press
ISBN 978-0-19-953902-4. Pincus, Steve (2009). 1688: The First Modern Revolution (2011 ed.). Yale University Press. ISBN 978-0-300-17143-3. Prud'homme van Reine, Ronald (2009). Opkomst en Ondergang van Nederlands Gouden Vloot – Door de ogen van de zeeschilders Willem van de Velde de Oude en de Jonge. Amsterdam: De Arbeiderspers.
ISBN 978-90-295-6696-4. Quinn, Stephen. "The Glorious Revolution". Economic History Association EH.net. Retrieved 1 October 2020. Rodger, N.A.M (2004). The Command of the Ocean: A Naval History of Britain 1649–1815. Penguin Group. ISBN 978-0-393-06050-8. Schuchard, Keith (2002). Restoring the Temple of Vision: Cabalistic Freemasonry
and Stuart. Brill. ISBN 978-90-04-12489-9. Schwoerer, L.G. (2004). The Revolution of 1688-89. Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1977). "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89." Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1977). "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89." Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1977). "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89." Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1977). "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89." Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1977). "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89." Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1977). "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89." Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1977). "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89." Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1977). "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89." Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1977). "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89." Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1977). "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89." Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1978). Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1978). Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1978). Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1978). Changing Perspectives. Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-52614-2. Schwoerer, Lisa (1978). Changing Perspectives. Cambridge Univ
(2013). Making Toleration: The Repealers and the Glorious Revolution. Harvard University Press. ISBN 978-0-674-07309-8. Speck, William Arthur (1989). Reluctant Revolutionaries. Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688. Oxford University Press. ISBN 978-0-582-28712-9.
Spielvogel, Jackson J (1980). Western Civilization. Wadsworth Publishing. ISBN 1285436407. Stanhope, Philip Henry, 5th Earl of (2011). Notes of Conversations with the Duke of Wellington 1831–1851. Pickle Partners Publishing. ISBN 978-1-908692-35-1. Stapleton, John M. (2003). Forging a Coalition Army; William III, the Grand Alliance
and the Confederate Army in the Spanish Netherlands 1688-97 (PHD thesis). Ohio State University. Stephen, Jeffrey (January 2010). "Scottish Nationalism and Stuart Unionism: The Edinburgh Council, 1745". Journal of British Studies. 49 (1, Scotland Special Issue): 47-72. doi:10.1086/644534. JSTOR 27752690. S2CID 144730991. Swetschinsky.
Daniël; Schönduve, Loeki (1988). De familie Lopes Suasso: financiers van Willem III. Zwolle. ISBN 978-90-6630-142-9. Szechi, Daniel; Sankey, Margaret (November 2001). "Elite Culture and the Decline of Scottish Jacobitism 1716-
1745". Past & Present. 173. Troost, Wouter (2016). "The Image of William III in Amsterdam after His Ascent to the English Throne: The Case of the Sheriffs' Election in 1690". Dutch Crossing. 40 (3): 206–218. doi:10.1080/03096564.2016.1139783. S2CID 155630754. Troost, Wouter (2016). "The Image of William III: Een politieke biografie. Hilversum
Uitgeverij Verloren. ISBN 90-6550-639-X. Troost, Wouter (2005). William III the Stadholder-king: A Political Biography. Routledge. ISBN 978-0754650713. Vallance, Edward (2007). "The Glorious Revolution". BBC History. Retrieved 15 August 2010. Van der Kuijl, Arjen (1988). De glorieuze overtocht: De expeditie van Willem III naar Engeland in
1688. Amsterdam: De Bataafsche Leeuw. ISBN 978-90-6707-187-1. Vries, Jan de; Woude, Ad van der (1997). The First Modern Economy: Success, Failure, and Perseverance of the Dutch Economy, 1500–1815. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. ISBN 978-0-521-57061-9. Wakeling, George Henry (1896). King and Parliament (A.D. 1603-1714).
Scribner. ISBN 978-0-524-03867-3. Retrieved 26 March 2021. Walker, Peter (1956). James II and the Three Questions: Religious Toleration and the Landed Classes, 1687-1688. Verlag Peter Lang. ISBN 978-3039119271. Webb, Stephen Saunders (1995). Lord Churchill's Coup: The Anglo-American Empire and the Glorious Revolution Reconsidered
Alfred Knopf. ISBN 978-0394549804. Williams, E. N. (1960). The Eighteenth-Century Constitution; 1688–1815. Cambridge University Press. OCLC 1146699. Western, John R. (1972). Monarchy and Revolution. The English State in the 1680s. London: Blandford Press. ISBN 978-0-7137-3280-1. Windeyer, W. J. Victor (1938). "Essays". In Windeyer, University Press. OCLC 1146699. Western, John R. (1972). Monarchy and Revolution. The English State in the 1680s. London: Blandford Press. ISBN 978-0-7137-3280-1. Windeyer, W. J. Victor (1938). "Essays". In Windeyer, University Press. ISBN 978-0-7137-3280-1. Windeyer, W. J. Victor (1938). "Essays". In Windeyer, University Press. ISBN 978-0-7137-3280-1. Windeyer, W. J. Victor (1938). "Essays". In Windeyer, University Press. ISBN 978-0-7137-3280-1. Windeyer, W. J. Victor (1938). "Essays". In Windeyer, University Press. ISBN 978-0-7137-3280-1. Windeyer, W. J. Victor (1938). "Essays". In Windeyer, University Press. ISBN 978-0-7137-3280-1. Windeyer, W. J. Victor (1938). "Essays". In Windeyer, University Press. ISBN 978-0-7137-3280-1. Windeyer, W. J. Victor (1938). "Essays". In Windeyer, University Press. ISBN 978-0-7137-3280-1. Windeyer, W. J. Victor (1938). "Essays". In Windeyer, University Press. ISBN 978-0-7137-3280-1. Windeyer, W. J. Victor (1938). "Essays". In Windeyer, University Press. ISBN 978-0-7137-3280-1. Windeyer, W. J. Victor (1938). "Essays". In Windeyer, W. J. Victor (1
William John Victor (ed.). Lectures on Legal History. Law Book Co. of Australasia. Wormsley, David (2015). James II: The Last Catholic King. Allen Lane. ISBN 978-0141977065. Young, William (2004). International Politics and Warfare in the Age of Louis XIV and Peter the Great: A Guide to the Historical Literature. IUinverse. ISBN 978-0595813988
Further reading Ashley, Maurice (1966). The Glorious Revolution of 1688. Hodder & Stoughton. Also published by Panther History (1968). Cruickshanks, Eveline (2000). The Glorious Revolution in Britain: A Political
History of the Era of Charles II and the Glorious Revolution. Palgrave Macmillan. ISBN 978-0-333-65103-2. A scholarly history of the era. Glassey, Lionel K. J., ed. (1997). The Reigns of Charles II and James VII and II. ISBN 978-0-333-62500-2. Articles by scholars. Hamowy, Ronald (2008). "Glorious Revolution". The Encyclopedia of Libertarianism
Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE; Cato Institute. pp. 208-11. doi:10.4135/9781412965811.n125. ISBN 978-1-4129-6580-4. LCCN 2008009151. OCLC 750831024. Harris, Tim (2006). Revolution: The Great Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720. Allen Lane. ISBN 978-0-14-101652-8. Harris, Tim and Stephen Taylor, eds (2013). The Final Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720. Allen Lane. ISBN 978-0-14-101652-8. Harris, Tim and Stephen Taylor, eds (2013). The Final Crisis of the British Monarchy, 1685-1720. Allen Lane. ISBN 978-0-14-101652-8.
the Stuart Monarchy: The Revolutions of 1688–91 in their British, Atlantic and European Contexts. Boydell. ISBN 978-1-84383-816-6. MacCubbin, R. P.; Hamilton-Phillips, M., eds. (1988). The Age of William and Mary II: Power, Politics and Patronage, 1688–1702. College of William and Mary II: Power, Politics and Patronage, 1688–1702. College of William III and Mary II: Power, Politics and Patronage, 1688–1702. College of William and Mary II: Power, Politics and Patronage, 1688–1702. College of William and Mary II: Power, Politics and Patronage, 1688–1702. College of William III and Mary III and Mary
(2006). In Search of Ireland's Heroes. Ivan R Dee. ISBN 978-1-56663-615-5. Miller, John (1997). The Glorious Revolution (2 ed.). ISBN 978-0-582-29222-2. Ogg, David (1956). William III. A brief scholarly biography. Onnekink, David (2007). The Anglo-Dutch Favourite: The Career of Hans Willem Bentinck, 1st Earl of Portland (1649–1709). Ashgate
Publishing. ISBN 978-0-7546-5545-9. Pincus, Steven C. A. (2005). England's Glorious Revolution: England, 1688. Anchor Books. OCLC 644932859. Vallance, Edward (2006). The Glorious Revolution: 1688 – Britain's Revolution: 1688 – Britain's Revolution: 1688 – Britain's Revolution: England (2006). The Glorious Revolution: 1688 – Britain's Revolution: 1688 – Britain's
Fight for Liberty. Brown Little. ISBN 978-1-933648-24-8. Wennerlind, Carl (2011). Casualties of Credit: The English Financial Revolution, 1620–1720. Harvard University Press. ISBN 978-0674047389. External links Wikiquote has quotations related to Glorious Revolution. Weiss, B.: "Medals of the Glorious Revolution: The Influence of Catholic-
Protestant Antagonism", ANS Magazine, Vol. 13, Issue 1, pp. 6-23. American Numismatic Society, New York, 2014. Glorious Revolution on In Our Time at the BBC BBC staff. "Charles II (1630-1685)". BBC History. Retrieved 15 August 2010. Catholic Encyclopedia editors. "English Revolution of 1688". Catholic Encyclopedia. {{cite encyclopedia}}
CS1 maint: uses authors parameter (link) The Civil War team, presented by Tristram Hunt (7 January 2001), Aftershocks – The Glorious Revolution of 1688", in Whaples, Robert (ed.), EH.Net Encyclopedia Royal Household at Buckingham Palace, ed. (2008-
2009). "History of the Monarchy > United Kingdom Monarchs (1603-present) > The Stuarts > Mary II, William III (r. 1689-1694)". Official web site of the British Monarchy. Wilkes Jr., Donald E.; Kramer, Matthew. "The Glorious Revolution of 1688". Retrieved 15 August 2010. Retrieved
from "2Coup d'état in Portugal; monarchy overthrown, republic established 5 October 1910 Revolution Of the Proclamation of the Proclamation of the Proclamation of the Proclamation of the republic. King
Manuel II is exiled and flees to England. Belligerents Kingdom of Portugal Republicans Commanders and leaders Manuel II Teixeira de Sousa Paiva Couceiro Machado Santos Teófilo Braga Afonso Costa Manuel de Arriaga José Relvas Strength About 7,000 men About 2,000 revolutionaries 3 cruisers Casualties and losses 37 dead and dozens wounded
with at least 14 more dying in the following days. The 5 October 1910 revolution was the overthrow of the centuries-old Portuguese Republic. It was the result of a coup d'état organized by the Portuguese Republican Party. By 1910, the Kingdom of Portuguese Republic. It was the result of a coup d'état organized by the Portuguese Republican Party. By 1910, the Kingdom of Portuguese Republican Party.
the 1890 British Ultimatum,[1] the royal family's expenses,[2] the assassination of the King and his heir in 1908, changing religious and social views, instability of the two political parties (Progressive and Regenerador), the dictatorship of João Franco,[3] and the regime's apparent inability to adapt to modern times all led to widespread resentment
against the Monarchy.[4] The proponents of the republican Party, found ways to take advantage of the situation.[5] The Republican Party presented itself as the only one that had a programme that was capable of returning to the country its lost status and place Portugal on the way of progress.[6] After a reluctance of the
military to combat the nearly two thousand soldiers and sailors that rebelled between 3 and 4 October 1910, the Republic was proclaimed at 9 o'clock a.m of the next day from the balcony of the Lisbon City Hall in Lisbon.[7] After the revolution, a provisional government led by Teófilo Braga directed the fate of the country until the approval of the
Constitution in 1911 that marked the beginning of the First Republic, [8] Among other things, with the establishment of the republic, national symbols were changed: the national anthem and 31 January rebellion Main article: 1890 British
Ultimatum The Pink Map project: Portugal's claim of sovereignty over the lands between Portuguese Mozambique. On 11 January 1890 the British government of Lord Salisbury sent the Portuguese military forces led by
Serpa Pinto from the territory between the colonies of Angola and Mozambique (in the current Zimbabwe and Zambia), an area claimed by Portugal under the Pink Map.[10] The swift compliance by the government to the British demands was seen as a national humiliation by a broad cross-section of the population and the elite.[11] This ramified deep
dissatisfaction with the new king, Carlos I of Portugal, the royal family and the institution of the monarchy, all of which were seen as responsible for the alleged process of "national decline". The situation was aggravated by the severe financial crisis that occurred between 1890 and 1891, when the money sent from emigrants in Brazil decreased by
80% with the so-called crisis of encilhamento following the proclamation of the republic in Brazil two months previously, an event that was followed with apprehension by the monarchic government and with jubilation by the defenders of the republic in Portugal. The republic in Portugal.
of their social support base that would climax in the demise of the regime.[12] Commemorative plaque on 31 de January, the progressive government fell and the leader of the Regenerador Party, António de Serpa Pimentel, was chosen to form the new government.[13] The progressivists then began to attack the king,
voting for republican candidates in the March election of that year, questioning the colonial agreement then signed with the British. Feeding an atmosphere of near insurrection, on 23 March 1890, António José de Almeida, at the time a student in the University of Coimbra and, later on, President of the Republic, published an article entitled
"Bragança, o último",[14] considered slanderous against the king and led to Almeida's imprisonment. On 1 April 1890, the explorer Silva Porto self-immolated wrapped in a Portuguese flag in Kuito, Angola, after failed negotiations with the locals, under orders of Paiva Couceiro, which he attributed to the ultimatum. The death of the well-known
explorer of the African continent generated a wave of national sentiment,[15] and his funeral was followed by a crowd in Porto, on 31 January 1891, a military uprising [pt] against the monarchy took place, constituted
mainly by sergeants and enlisted ranks.[19] The rebels, who used the nationalist anthem A Portuguesa as their marching song, took the Paços do Concelho, from whose balcony, the republican journalist and politician Augusto Manuel Alves da Veiga proclaimed the establishment of the republic in Portuguesa as their marching song, took the Paços do Concelho, from whose balcony, the republican journalist and politician Augusto Manuel Alves da Veiga proclaimed the establishment of the republic in Portuguesa as their marching song, took the Paços do Concelho, from whose balcony, the republic in Portuguesa as their marching song, took the Paços do Concelho, from whose balcony, the republic in Portuguesa as their marching song, took the Paços do Concelho, from whose balcony, the republic in Portuguesa as their marching song, took the Paços do Concelho, from whose balcony, the republic in Portuguesa as their marching song, took the Paços do Concelho, from whose balcony, the republic in Portuguesa as their marching song, took the Paços do Concelho, from whose balcony, the republic in Portuguesa as their marching song, took the Paços do Concelho, from whose balcony, the republic in Portuguesa as their marching song, took the Paços do Concelho, from whose balcony, the republic in Portuguesa as their marching song, took the Paços do Concelho, from whose balcony, the republic in Portuguesa as the page as
the Federal Democratic Centre. The movement was, shortly afterwards, suppressed by a military detachment of the municipal guard that remained loyal to the government, resulting in 40 injured and 12 casualties. The captured rebels were judged. 250 received sentences of between 18 months and 15 years of exile in Africa. [20] A Portuguesa was
forbidden. Despite its failure, the rebellion of 31 January 1891 was the first large threat felt by the monarchic regime and a sign of what would come almost two decades later. [21] The Portuguese Republican Party This section needs additional citations for verification. Please help improve this article by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced
material may be challenged and removed. Find sources: "5 October 1910 revolution" - news · newspapers · books · scholar · JSTOR (October 2017) (Learn how and when to remove this template message) Thinking and science are republican, because creative genius lives on freedom and only a Republic can be truly free [...]. Labour and industry are
republican, because the creative activity wants security; in the state, liberty [...]; in industry, production; in labour, security; in the nation, strength and independence. For all, wealth; for all, equality; for all, light."—Antero de Quental, in República, 11-05-1870[22] The
revolutionary movement of 5 October 1910 occurred following the ideological and political action that, since its creation in 1876, the Portuguese Republican Party (PRP) had been developing with the objective of overthrowing the monarchy, the Republican Party
managed to define itself as distinct from the Portuguese Socialist Party, which defended a collaboration with the regime in exchange for the rights of the working class and attracted the sympathy of the dissatisfied sections of society. Disagreements within the party became more connected with matters of political than ideological strategy. The
ideological direction of the Portuguese republicanism had been traced much earlier by the works of José Félix Henriques Nogueira, little changed through the years, except in terms of later adaptation to the everyday realities of the country. The works of Teófilo Braga contributed to this task by trying to concretise the decentralising and federalist
ideas, abandoning the socialist quality in favour of democratic aspects. This change also aimed to attract the small and medium bourgeoisie, which turned into one of the main bases of republican support. In the election of 13 October 1878 the PRP elected its first member of parliament, José Joaquim Rodrigues de Freitas, for Porto.[24] There was also
an intention to give the overthrow of the monarchy overtones of unification, nationalism and being above the particular interests of individual social classes. [25] This panacea that would cure, once and for all, all the ills of the nation, elevating it to glory, emphasised two fundamental tendencies: nationalism and colonialism. From this combination
came the final desertion of Iberian Federalism, patent in the first republican theses by José Félix Henriques Nogueira, [26] identifying the monarchy as anti-clericalism, patent in the theorisation of Teófilo Braga, who identified
religion as an obstacle to progress and responsible for the scientific retardation of Portugal, in opposition to republicanism, which was linked by him to science, progress and well-being. [28] Eudóxio César Azedo Gneco, also known as Azedo Gneco, one of the main leaders of the Portuguese Socialist Party, giving a speech at a republican gathering in
Lisbon (1 May 1907) Ideological issues were not, ultimately, fundamental to the republican strategy: for the majority of sympathisers, who didn't even know the texts of the main manifestos, it was enough to be against the monarchy, against the political corruption of traditional parties. This lack of ideological preoccupation
doesn't mean that the party didn't bother to spread its principles. The most effective action of dissemination was the propaganda made through its rallies and popular demonstrations and bulletins such as A Voz Pública (The Public Voice) in Porto, O Século (The Age, from 1880) O Mundo (The World, from 1900) and A Luta (The Struggle, from 1906) in
Lisbon. The republican propaganda managed to take advantage of some historical facts with popular repercussions. The celebrations of the true representatives of the
purest national sentiments and popular aspirations. The third centenary of Camões was commemorated with great celebrations: a civic entourage that went through the streets of Lisbon, in the middle of great popular enthusiasm and, also, the transfer of the remains of Camões and Vasco da Gama to Jerónimos Monastery. [29] The atmosphere of the
national celebration that characterised the commemorations complemented the patriotic exaltation. The idea of the Camões commemorations came from the Lisbon Geographic Society, but the execution was entrusted to a commission constituted by, amongst others, Teófilo Braga, Ramalho Ortigão, Jaime Batalha Reis, Magalhães Lima and Pinheiro
Chagas, leading figures of the Republican Party.[30] Besides Rodrigues de Freitas, Manuel de Arriaga, José Elias Garcia, Zófimo Consiglieri Pedroso, José Jacinto Nunes, and Francisco Gomes da Silva were also elected members of parliament,
representing the PRP in various legislative sessions between 1884 and 1894. From this date to 1900 there was no republican parliamentary representation. In this phase, while separated from parliament, the party committed itself to its internal organisation. After a period of great repression of PRP, the republican movement could reenter the
legislative race in 1900, electing four parliament members; Afonso Costa, Alexandre Braga, António José de Almeida and João de Meneses. 1908 Lisbon regicide Main article; Lisbon Regicide Anonymous reconstruction of the regicide Main article; Lisbon Regicide Anonymous reconstruction of the regicide Main article; Lisbon Regicide Anonymous reconstruction of the regicide Main article; Lisbon Regicide Anonymous reconstruction of the regicide Main article; Lisbon Regicide Anonymous reconstruction of the regicide Main article; Lisbon Regicide Main
stemming from a system of rotating government of the Progressive and Regenerator Parties kept alternating in government. The king, as arbiter of the System under the Council of Ministers (government chief).[33] João Franco, dissident of the Regenerator Party, convinced the
king to dissolve the parliament so that he could implement a series of measures with an aim to moralise Portuguese political rivals of Franco who accused him of governing as a dictator. The events were aggravated by the issues of the advanced payments
to the Royal House and the signing of the decree of 30 January 1908 that foresaw the banishment to the colonies, without judgement, those involved in a failed republican coup two days prior.[35] I saw a man with a black beard [...] open a cape and take out a carbine [...]. When I saw [him] [...] aiming at the carriage I realised, unfortunately, what it
the attackers who had climbed onto the carriage. The prince, D. Manuel was struck on an arm. Two of the attackers, Manuel Buíça, a primary school teacher, and Alfredo Luís da Costa, a commerce employee and editor, were killed in the scene, others managed to escape. The carriage entered the Navy Arsenal, where the deaths of the king and his
have had direct involvement, some of whom went into hiding in Brazil and France, though at least two had been killed by the Carbonária.[39] Europe was shocked by the attack, since King Carlos was highly regarded by other European heads of state.[40] The Lisbon regicide hastened the end of the monarchy by placing the young and inexperienced
D. Manuel II on the throne and throwing the monarchical parties against one another. The agony of the monarchy Their [the republicans'] shows of strength on the streets of Lisbon – for example, on 2 August 1909, which brought together fifty thousand people, with an impressive discipline – echo the riots organised in the Assembly by some
republican Parliament representatives. It was on the night of 2 August that I understood that the crown was at stake: when the king, rightly or wrongly, is contested or rejected by a part of the opinion, he can no longer fulfil his unifying role.—Amélie of Orléans[41] Due to his young age (18 years) and the tragic and bloody way in which he reached
power, Manuel II of Portugal obtained an initial sympathy from the public.[42] The young king began his rule by nominating a consensus government of pacification, as it became known, despite achieving a temporary calm, only lasted for a short amount of time.[43] The
political situation degraded again quickly, leading to having seven different governments in the space of two years. The monarchical parties rose against each other once more and fragmented into splinter groups, while the Republican Party continued to gain ground. In the election of 5 April 1908, the last legislative elections to occur during the
 monarchy, seven members were elected to parliament, among which were Estêvão de Vasconcelos, Feio Terenas and Manuel de Brito Camacho. In the election of 28 August 1910 the party had a resounding success, electing 14 members to parliament, 10 for Lisbon.[44] Meanwhile, in spite of the evident electoral success of the republican movement
the most revolutionary sector of the party called for armed struggle as the best means to achieve power in a short amount of time. It was this faction that came victorious from the party congress that took place in Setúbal between 23 and 25 April 1909.[45] The directorate, composed by the moderate Teófilo Braga, Basílio Teles, Eusébio Leão, José
Cupertino Ribeiro and José Relvas, received from the congress the imperative mandate to start the revolution. The logistic role for the preparation of plot was assigned to the most radical elements. The civil committee was formed by Afonso Costa, João Pinheiro Chagas and António José de Almeida, while the admiral Carlos Cândido dos Reis was thee
leader of the military committee.[46] António José de Almeida was assigned the role of organising the secret societies such as the Carbonária – in whose leadership was integrated the naval commissary António Machado Santos[47] —, the freemasons and the Junta Liberal, led by Miguel Bombarda. This eminent doctor played an important part in the
dissemination of republican propaganda among the bourgeoisie, which brought many sympathisers to the revolution was marked by great instability and political and social unrest, [49] with several threats of uprising risking the revolution due to the impatience
of the navy, led by Machado Santos, who was ready for action. The uprising On 3 October 1910 the republican uprising foreshadowed by the political unrest finally took place. [50] Although many of those involved in the republican cause avoided participation in the uprising, making it seem like the revolt had failed, it eventually succeeded thanks to
the government's inability to gather enough troops to control the nearly two hundred armed revolutionaries Prime Ministers (Prime Ministers) (Prime Minister
Teixeira de Sousa was warned of imminent coups d'état.[52] The revolution was not an exception: the coup was expected by the government,[53] who on 3 October gave orders for all the garrison troops of the city to be on guard. After a dinner offered in honour of D. Manuel II by Brazilian president Hermes da Fonseca, then on a state visit to
Portugal, [54] the monarch retreated to the Palace of Necessidades while his uncle and sworn heir to the throne, prince D. Afonso, went on to the Citadel of Cascais. [55] After the murder of Miguel Bombarda, shot by one of his patients, [56] the republican leaders assembled with urgency on the night of the 3rd. [57] Some officials were against the
meeting due to the strong military presence, but Admiral Cândido dos Reis insisted for it to take place, saying "A Revolução não será adiada: sigam-me, se quiserem. Havendo um só que cumpra o seu dever, esse único serei eu." ("The Revolution will not be delayed: follow me, if you want. If there is one that fulfills their duty, this one will be me.").[58]
[59] Rebels congregate on Rotunda Square. Machado Santos had already got into action and did not attend the assembly. Instead, he went to the military quarters of the garrison. A commander and a captain were killed when they made
an attempt to control it. Entering a barracks with dozens of members of the Carbonária, the naval officer went on with about 100 soldiers that entered the 1st Artillery Regiment, [61] where Captain Afonso Palla and a few sergeants and civilians, had already taken the administration building and captured all officers that refused to join them. [62] With
the arrival of Machado Santos two columns were formed which were placed under the leadership of captains Sá Cardoso and Palla. The first went to meet the 2nd Infantry Regiment and the 2nd Caçadores Regiment, also sympathisers of the rebellion, to go on to Alcântara where it was to support the naval barracks. The original route intersected with
a Municipal Guard outpost which forced the column to follow a different route. After a few confrontations with the police and civilians, it finally found the column led by Palla. Together, the columns advanced to Rotunda, where they entrenched at around 5am. The stationed force was composed of around 200 to 300 men of the 1st Artillery Regiment,
50 to 60 men of the 16th Infantry Regiment and around 200 civilians. The captains Sá Cardoso and Palla and the naval commissary Machado Santos were among the 9 officers in command. Meanwhile, Lieutenant Ladislau Parreira and some officers and civilians entered the barracks of the Naval Corps of Alcântara at 1am, managing to take arms,
provoke a revolt and capture the commanders, one of whom was wounded.[63] The aim of this action was to prevent the exit of the Municipal Guard, an aim that was achieved.[64] For this end, they required the support of 3 warships anchored in the Tagus. By this time, Lieutenant Mendes Cabeçadas had already taken command of the Municipal Guard, an aim that was achieved.[64] For this end, they required the support of 3 warships anchored in the Tagus. By this time, Lieutenant Mendes Cabeçadas had already taken command of the Municipal Guard, an aim that was achieved.[64] For this end, they required the support of 3 warships anchored in the Tagus.
the mutinied crew of the NRP Adamastor [65] while the mutinied crew of the São Rafael waited for an officer to command it. At about 7am Ladislau Parreira, having been informed by civilians of the situation, sent the Second-Lieutenant Tito de Morais to take command of the São Rafael, with orders for both ships to support the garrison of the
barracks. When it became known that on the ship D. Carlos I the crew had begun a mutiny but the officers had entrenched, Lieutenant Carlos da Maia and a few sailors left the São Rafael. After some gunfire from which a lieutenant Carlos da Maia and a few sailors left the São Rafael. After some gunfire from which a lieutenant Carlos da Maia and a few sailors left the São Rafael. After some gunfire from which a lieutenant Carlos da Maia and a few sailors left the São Rafael.
republicans. Portuguese cruiser Dom Carlos I painted by Giovanni Battista Castagneto That was the last unit to join the rebels, which included by then part of the 1st Artillery Regiment, 16th Infantry Regiment, the naval corps and the three warships. Navy members had joined in large numbers as expected, but many military sections considered
sympathizers with the cause hadn't joined. Even so, the republican forces included about 400 men in Rotunda, 1000 to 1500 in Alcântara counting the naval crews, as well as having managed to take hold of the city's artillery, with most of the ammunition, to which was added the naval artillery. Rotunda and Alcântara were occupied, but concrete plans
for the revolution had not yet been decided and the main leaders hadn't yet appeared. In spite of this, the beginning of the events did not occur favorably for the rebels. The three cannon shots – the accorded signal for the events did not occur favorably for the rebels. The three cannon shots – the accorded signal for the events did not occur favorably for the rebels.
signal to take command of the warships, was informed that everything had failed, which prompted him to retire to his sister's house. The next morning his dead body was found in Arroios. In desperation, he had committed suicide by a shot to the head. Meanwhile, in Rotunda, the apparent calm in the city was so discouraging to the rebels that officers
preferred to give up. Sá Cardoso, Palla and other officers retired to their houses, but Machado Santos stayed and assumed command. This decision proved fundamental to the success of the revolution. The government forces The military garrison of Lisbon was composed by four infantry regiments, two cavalry regiments and two Caçadores (light
infantry) battalions, with a theoretical total of 6982 men. However, in practice, there were other useful units in military outposts used for lookout and general police duties, especially in the industrial district of Barreiro due to the bout of strikes and syndicalist activity that had been ongoing since September. [66] Ever since the previous year the
government forces had a plan of action, drawn up by order of the military commander of Lisbon, General Manuel Rafael Gorjão Henriques. When, on the evening of the 3rd, the President of the military commander of Lisbon, General Manuel Rafael Gorjão Henriques. When, on the evening of the arrive transfer of the military commander o
Artillery 3 and Light Infantry 6 were called from Santarém, while Infantry, 2nd Caçadores and 2nd Cavalry regiments and the artillery battery of Queluz, went to the Palace of Necessidades to protect the king, while the
5th Infantry and the 5th Caçadores moved to Rossio Square, with the mission to protect the military headquarters. As for the police force and municipal guards, they were distributed through the city as set out in the plan, intended to protect strategic points such as Rossio Railway Station, the gas factory, the Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda (the
Portuguese mint), the postal building, the Carmo barracks, the ammunition depot in Beirolas and the residence of the President of the Council of Ministers, where the government had assembled. Little is known of the Fiscal Guard (a total of 1397 men), only that a few soldiers were with the troops in Rossio. The civil police (total of 1200 men) stayed
entrenchment in Rotunda and Alcântara, led to a situation of impasse throughout 4 October, with all manner of rumours about victories and defeats spreading through the city organised a detachment to break them up. The column, under the
command of Colonel Alfredo Albuquerque, was formed by units that had been removed from the protection of the Palace of Necessidades: 2nd Infantry, 2nd Cavalry and the mobile battery of Queluz. The latter included the colonial war hero Henrique Mitchell de Paiva Couceiro. The column advanced until near the prison, where it assumed combat
positions. However, before these were completed, the column was attacked by rebels. The attack was repelled but resulted in a few wounded men, several dead pack animals and the infantry that remained during 45 minutes, ordering an attack that was carried out
by around 30 soldiers, but which was beaten with some casualties. Continuing the gunfire, he ordered a new attack, but only 20 soldiers followed the order. Thinking that he had found the right time to assault the barracks of Artillery 1, Paiva Couceiro requested reinforcement to the division's command. However, he received the perplexing order to
retreat.[68] While in transit through Lisboa, the Brazilian president Hermes da Fonseca witnessed the revolution from the Brazilian battleship São Paulo (pictured). Meanwhile, a column had been formed with the intention to attack simultaneously the rebels in Rotunda, a plan that was never carried out because of the order to retreat. The column had been formed with the intention to attack simultaneously the rebels in Rotunda, a plan that was never carried out because of the order to retreat.
expected by the government throughout 4 October, never arrived. Only the units already mentioned and called for the preventive measures received orders to advance. Since the beginning of the revolution, members of the Carbonária had disconnected the telegraph lines, thus cutting communication with units outside Lisbon. In addition, the rebelse of the carbonária had disconnected the telegraph lines, thus cutting communication with units outside Lisbon. In addition, the rebelse of the carbonária had disconnected the telegraph lines, thus cutting communication with units outside Lisbon. In addition, the rebelse of the carbonária had disconnected the telegraph lines, thus cutting communication with units outside Lisbon. In addition, the rebelse of the carbonária had disconnected the telegraph lines, thus cutting communication with units outside Lisbon. In addition, the rebelse of the carbonária had disconnected the telegraph lines, thus cutting communication with units outside Lisbon. In addition, the rebelse of the carbonária had disconnected the telegraph lines, thus cutting communication with units outside Lisbon. In addition, the rebelse of the carbonária had disconnected the telegraph lines, the carbonária had disconnected the telegraph lines, the carbonária had disconnected the carbonári
had cut off the railway tracks, [69] which meant that even if the troops followed the orders to advance on Lisbon, they would never arrive on time. Reinforcements from the Setúbal peninsula were also unlikely to arrive, since the Tagus river was controlled by rebel ships. [70] Towards the end of the day the situation was difficult for the monarchical
forces: the rebel ships were docked beside the Terreiro do Paço Square and the cruiser São Rafael opened fire on the ministries buildings[71][72] in the bewildered sight of the Brazilian diplomatic corps aboard battleship São Paulo, whose passenger list included the elected president Hermes da Fonseca.[73] This attack undermined the morale of the
pro-government forces in Rossio. The king's departure from Lisbon King Manuel II of Portugal After the dinner with Hermes da Fonseca, D. Manuel II had returned to the Palace of Necessidades, keeping the company of a few officers. They were playing bridge[74] when the rebels began an attack on the building.[75] The king attempted some phone
calls but, finding that the lines had been cut, managed only to inform the Queen Mother, who was in Pena National Palace, about the situation. Soon afterwards, groups of units that were loyal to the king arrived at the scene and managed to defeat the attacks of the revolutionaries. At 9 o'clock the king arrived at the scene and managed to defeat the attacks of the revolutionaries.
battery from Queluz, the pieces were arranged in the palace gardens so that they could bombard the quarters of the revolutionary sailors, which were located at no more than 100 metres from the palace. However, before they had time to start, the commander of the battery received the order to cancel the bombing and join the forces that were
leaving the palace, integrated into the column that would attack the rebel forces of the 1st Artillery in the Rotunda. At around midday the cruisers Adamastor and São Rafael, which had anchored in front of the sailors' quarters, started the bombardment of the Palace of Necessidades, an action which served to demoralise the present monarchical
forces. The king took refuge in a small house in the palace's park, where he could ring Teixeira de Sousa, since the revolutionaries had only cut the special state telephone lines and not the general network. The king ordered the prime minister replied that
the main action was happening in Rotunda and all the troops that were there were needed. Taking into account that the available troops were not sufficient to defeat the rebels in Rotunda, the prime minister made it obvious to the king that it would be more convenient to retire to Sintra or Mafra so that the stationed forces of the palace could
reinforce the troops in Rotunda. At two o'clock the vehicles with D. Manuel II and his advisors set out to Mafra, where the Infantry School would provide enough forces to protect the monarch. While approaching Benfica the king dismissed the municipal guard squad that escorted him so that they could join the fight against the rebels. The escort
arrived in Mafra at around four o'clock in the afternoon, but then discovered a problem: due to the holidays, the Infantry School contained only 100 soldiers, as opposed to the expected, and the person in charge, Colonel Pinto da Rocha, admitted to not having the means to protect the king.[77] In the meantime, Counsellor João de
Azevedo Coutinho arrived and advised the king to call to Mafra the queens D. Amélia and D. Maria Pia (respectively, the king's mother and grandmother), who were in the palaces of Pena and Vila in Sintra, and to prepare to continue on to Porto, where they would organise a resistance. In Lisbon, the king's departure did not bring a large advantage to
by José Relvas Act of the Proclamation of the Portuguese Republic On the night of 4 October morale was low amongst the monarchical troops stationed in Rossio Square, due to the constant danger of being bombarded by the naval forces and not even Couceiro's batteries, strategically placed there, could bring them comfort. In the headquarters there
were discussions about the best position to bomb the Rotunda. At 3am, Paiva Couceiro departed with a mobile battery, escorted by a municipal guard squad, and positioned himself in Castro Guimarães Garden, in Torel, waiting for daybreak. When the forces in Rotunda began to fire on Rossio, revealing their position, Paiva Couceiro opened fire,
the monarchical troops, which considered themselves helpless, deteriorated even more due to the threats of bombardment by the naval forces. [79] Infantry 5 and some members of Light Infantry 5 insisted that they would not oppose a naval landing. Confronted with this fraternisation with the enemy, the commanders of these formations went to the
headquarters, where they were surprised with the news of the armistice. Proclaimed by major military forces, all armed and aided by the popular contest, the Republic now has its first day of History. The unfolding of the events, by the time of writing, can feed all hope for a definite triumph. [...] It's hard to imagine the enthusiasm that runs through
the combat zone represented a great danger which prompted the diplomat to intervene. He addressed himself to the General Gorjão Henriques to request a cease-fire that would enable him to evacuate foreign citizens. Without notifying the government, and perhaps hoping to buy time for the arrival of the reinforcements, the general agreed.[81] The
German diplomat, accompanied by a man with a white flag, ment to the Rotunda to discuss the armistice with the revolutionaries. The latter, however, at the sight of the white flag, mistakenly thought that the king's forces were surrendering, prompting them to join with crowds a celebration of the new republic. In the square, Machado Santos initially
populace onto the streets, was very confusing but advantageous to the republicans, given the obvious public support. Machado Santos spoke to General Gorjão Henriques and invited him to keep the role of division commander, but he refused. António Carvalhal, known to be a republican sympathiser, then received command. Soon afterwards, at 9
o'clock in the morning, the Republic was proclaimed by José Relvas[82] from the balcony of the Lisbon City Hall. A provisional government was then nominated, presided by members of the Portuguese Republican Party, with the mandate to govern the nation until a new constitution was approved. The revolution caused dozens of casualties. The exact
number is unknown, but it is recognised that as of 6 October 37 people killed in the revolution were registered in the morgue. Several injured turned up at the hospitals, some of whom later died. For example, out of 78 injured victims checked into Hospital de São José, 14 died in the following days.[83] The royal family's exile The Praia dos Pescadores
in Ericeira, location of the departure of King Manuel II after 5 October, the king was looking for a way to reach Porto, an action that would be very difficult to carry out due to the almost non-existence of an escort and the innumerable revolutionary hubs spread throughout the country. At around the innumerable revolution is a country. At around the innumerable revolution is a country out due to the almost non-existence of an escort and the innumerable revolution is a country. At around the innumerable revolution is a country out due to the almost non-existence of an escort and the innumerable revolution.
midday the President of the Municipal Chamber of Mafra received a message from the new civil governor ordering the switching to a republican flag. Soon afterwards the commander of the Infantry School also received a telegram from his new commander informing him of the current political situation. The position of the royal family was becoming
unsustainable. The solution appeared when news arrived that the royal yacht Amélia had anchored nearby, in Ericeira, as it was the closest anchorage. D. Manuel II, knowing that with
the proclamation of the Republic he would be imprisoned, decided to go to Porto. The royal family and some company departed for Ericeira where, by means of two fishing ships and in the presence of curious civilians, they embarked on the royal yacht. [84] Once on board, the king wrote to the prime minister: My dear Teixeira de Sousa, forced by the
circumstances I find myself obliged to embark on the royal yacht "Amélia". I'm Portuguese and will always be. I have the conviction of having put my heart and my life on the service to the Country. I hope that it, convinced of my rights and my dedication, will recognise this! Viva
Portugal! Give this letter all the publicity you can. — D. Manuel II[85] After ensuring that the letter would reach its destination, the king announced that he wanted to go to Porto. He met with an advisory council, the officer João Jorgee
Moreira de Sá opposed this idea, claiming if Porto turned them away, they would not have enough fuel to reach a different anchorage. Despite the king's insistence, the Chief Officer argued that they carried on board the whole royal family, so his main duty was to protect their lives. In the end, the chosen port was Gibraltar. Upon arrival, the king
received word Porto had also joined the republican cause. D. Manuel II ordered that the Amélia, as Portuguese State property, be returned to Lisbon. The deposed king would live out the rest of his life in exile. [86] The first steps of the Republic Performance of the Provisional Government Portuguese Provisional Government, 1910 On 6 October 1910 on 19
newspaper Diário do Governo announced: "To the Portuguese people — Constitution of the Provisional Government of the Provision
Provisional Government was constituted immediately: Presidency, Dr. Joaquim Teófilo Braga. Interior, Dr. António José de Almeida. Justice, Dr. Afonso Costa. Treasury, Basílio Teles. War, António Xavier Correia Barreto. Navy, Amaro Justiniano de Azevedo Gomes. Foreign (Relations), Dr. Bernardino Luís Machado Guimarães. Public Works, Dr. António
Luís Gomes."[87] By decree on 8 October, the Provisional Government determined the new names of the ministries of the mi
the 12th, it was given to José Relvas.[89] On 22 November, Brito Camacho entered government after the departure of António Luís Gomes, appointed Portuguese ambassador in Rio de Janeiro.[90] The ministers [of the Provisional Government], inspired by a high sense of patriotism, always sought to reflect in their actions the highest and most
pressing aspirations of the old Republican Party, in terms of reconciling the permanent interests of society with the new order of things, inevitably derived from the revolution.—Teófilo Braga, 21-06-1911[91] During its time of power, the Provisional Government took a series of important measures that had long-lasting effects. To calm tempers and
make reparations with the victims of the monarchy, a broad amnesty was granted for crimes against the security of the State, against religion, of disobedience, of forbidden weaponry usage, etc.[92] The Catholic Church resented the measures taken by the Provisional Government. Among these were the expulsion of the Society of Jesus and other
religious orders of the Regular clergy, the closure of convents, the prohibition of the State by the separation of the religious oath in civil ceremonies and a secularisation of the state by the separation of the religious oath in civil ceremonies and a secularisation of the state by the separation of the religious oath in civil ceremonies and a secularisation of the state by the separation of the religious oath in civil ceremonies and a secularisation of the state by the separation of the religious oath in civil ceremonies and a secularisation of the state by the separation of the religious oath in civil ceremonies and a secularisation of the state by the separation of the state by the separation of the religious oath in civil ceremonies and a secularisation of the state by the separation of the separation of the separation 
and women, the legal regulation of "natural children":[94] the protection of childhood and old age, the reformulation of the Press laws, the elimination of royal and noble ranks and titles and the acknowledgment of right to strike action.[95] The Provisional Government also opted for the dissolution of the then municipal guards of Lisbon and Porto,
creating instead a new public body of defence an order, the National Republican Guard. For the colonies, new legislation was created in order to grant autonomy to overseas territories, an essential condition for their development. The national symbols were modified — the flag and the national anthem, a new monetary unit was adopted — the escudo,
equivalent to a thousand réis, [96] and even the Portuguese orthography was simplified and appropriately regulated through the Orthography continuing Assembly on 19 June 1911, following the election of 28 May of the same year. [98]
At that time, the president of the Provisional Government, Teófilo Braga, handed over to the National Constituting Assembly the proposal presented by their president, Anselmo Braamcamp Freire to the congress: "The National Constituting Assembly approved with acclaim the proposal presented by their president, Anselmo Braamcamp Freire to the Congress: "The National Constituting Assembly approved with acclaim the proposal presented by their president, Anselmo Braamcamp Freire to the Congress: "The National Constituting Assembly approved with acclaim the proposal presented by their president, Anselmo Braamcamp Freire to the Congress: "The National Constituting Assembly approved with acclaim the proposal presented by their president, Anselmo Braamcamp Freire to the Congress: "The National Constituting Assembly approved with acceptance of the Provisional Constitution approved with acceptance of the Provisional Constitution approved with acceptance of the Provisional Constitution approximate the Provisional Constitution approximate approximate approximate the Provisional Constitution approximate a
confirms, until future deliberation, the functions of the Portuguese Republic — Manuel de Arriaga — on 24 August, the Provisional Government of the Republic — Manuel de Arriaga — on 24 August, the Provisional Government
presented its resignation, which was accepted by the president of the Republic on 3 September 1911, marking the end of a government term of more than 10 months[99] and the beginning of the First Portuguese Republic. Modification of national symbols With the establishment of the Republic, the national symbols were modified. By a Provisional
Government decree dated 15 October 1910, a committee was appointed to design the new symbols. [100] The modification of national symbols, according to historian Nuno Severiano Teixeira, emerged from the difficulty that republicans faced with representing the Republic: In a monarchy the king has a physical body and is therefore a recognisable
person, recognised by citizens. But a republic is an abstract idea.—Nuno Severiano Teixeira[101] The flag Flag of the Portuguese Republic. Main article: Flag of Portuguese Republic is an abstract idea.—Nuno Severiano Teixeira[101] The flag Flag of the Portuguese Republic. Main article: Flag of Portuguese Republic. Main article: Flag of Portuguese Republic. Main article: Flag of Portuguese Republican" colours: green
and red. The committee's proposal suffered several alterations, with the final design being rectangular, with the first two-fifths closest to the flagpole to be green, and the three remaining fifths, red.[102][103] Green was chosen because it was considered the "colour of hope", while red was chosen as a "combative, hot, virile" colour.[104] The project
of the flag was approved by the Provisional Government by vote on 19 November 1910. On 1 December was celebrated the Flag in front of the Municipal Chamber of Lisbon.[105] The National Constituting Assembly promulgated the adoption of the flag on 19 June 1911.[106] The National Constituting Assembly promulgated the Flag in front of the Municipal Chamber of Lisbon.[105] The National Constituting Assembly promulgated the adoption of the flag on 19 June 1911.[106] The National Constituting Assembly promulgated the Flag in front of the Municipal Chamber of Lisbon.[105] The National Constituting Assembly promulgated the Flag in front of the Flag in front of the Municipal Chamber of Lisbon.[105] The National Constituting Assembly promulgated the Flag in front of the Flag in front o
Constitutional Assembly proclaimed A Portuguesa as the national anthem, [107][108] replacing the old anthem Hymno da Carta in use since May 1834, and its status as national symbol was included in the new constitution. A Portuguesa was composed in 1890, with music by Alfredo Keil and lyrics by Henrique Lopes de Mendonça, in response to the
1890 British Ultimatum.[109] Because of its patriotic character, it had been used, with slight modifications, by the rebels of the 1891 uprising[110] in a failed attempt at a coup d'état to establish a republic in Portuguesa (1910–
present) The anthem was later modified; the official version used today in national civil and military ceremonies and during visits of foreign heads of state[111] was approved on 4 September 1957.[112] The bust Two versions of the bust on coins from the Portuguese Republic: by Francisco dos Santos, above; by José Simões de Almeida, below.[113]
The official bust of the Republic was chosen through a national competition promoted by Lisbon's city council in 1911,[114] in which nine sculptors participated.[115][116] The winning entry was that of Francisco dos Santos[117] and is currently exposed in the Municipal Chamber. The original piece is found in Casa Pia, an institution from which the
sculptor was alumnus. There is another bust that was adopted as the face of the Republic, designed by José Simões de Almeida (sobrinho) in 1908.[118] The original is found in the Municipal Chamber of Figueiró dos Vinhos. The model for this bust was Ilda Pulga, a young shop employee from Chiado.[119][120] According to journalist António
Valdemar, who, when he became president of the National Academy of Art asked the sculptor João Duarte to restore the original bust: Simões found the face of the girl funny and invited her to be a model. The mother said that she would not be
undressed. The bust shows Republic wearing a Phrygian cap, influence of the French Revolution. Simões' bust was soon adopted by Freemasonry and used in the funerals of Miguel Bombarda and Cândido dos Reis, but when the final contest took place, despite its relative popularity, it was second place to the bust by Francisco dos Santos.
Anticlericalism Republican leaders adopted a severe and highly controversial policy of anti-clericalism.[121] At home, the policy polarised society and lost the republic potential supporters, and abroad it offended American and European states which had their citizens engaged in religious work there, adding substantially to the republic's bad press.
[122] The persecution of the church was so overt and severe that it drove the irreligious and nominally religious to a new religious institutions in a grave dispute over their rights and property, threatened to deny recognition of the young republic.
[123] The revolution and the republic which it spawned were essentially anticlerical and had a "hostile" approach to the issue of church and state separation, like that of the French Revolution, the Spanish Constitution of 1917. [124] Secularism began to be discussed in Portugal back in the 19th century, during
the Casino Conferences in 1871, promoted by Antero de Quental. The republican movement associated the Catholic Church with the monarchy, and opposed its influence in Portuguese Republican Party and the
Freemasonry. Monarchists in a last-ditch effort sought to outflank the republicans by enacting a severe restriction on the Jesuits on the day before the revolution. [122] Soon after the establishment of the Republic, on 8 October 1910, Minister for Justice Afonso Costa reinstated Marquess of Pombal's
laws against the Jesuits, and Joaquim António de Aguiar's laws in relation to religious orders.[125][126] The Church's property and assets were expropriated by the State. The religious oath and other religious elements found in the statutes of the University of Coimbra were abolished, and matriculations into first year of the Theology Faculty were
cancelled, as were places in the Canon law course, suppressing the teaching of Christian doctrine. Religious solemn events, Divorce and family laws were approved which
considered marriage as a "purely civil contract" [127] [128] Bishops were persecuted, expelled or suspended from their activities in the course of the secularisation. All but one were driven from their dioceses. [129] the property of clerics was seized by the state, wearing of the cassock was banned, all minor seminaries were closed and all but five major
seminaries.[129] A law of 22 February 1918 permitted only two seminaries in the country, but they had not been given their property back.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given their property back.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given their property back.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given their property back.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given their property back.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given their property back.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given their property back.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given their property back.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given their property back.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given their property back.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given their property back.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given their property back.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given the country, but they had not been given the country.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given the country, but they had not been given the country.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country, but they had not been given the country and the country are constant.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country are constant.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country are constant.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country are constant.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country are constant.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the country are constant.[129] Religious orders were expelled from the
primary and secondary school.[129] In response to the several anticlerical decrees, Portuguese bishops launched a collective pastoral defending the Church's doctrine, but its reading was prohibited by the government. In spite of this, some prelates continued to publicise the text, among which was the bishop of Porto, António Barroso. This resulted in
him being called to Lisbon by Afonso Costa, where he was stripped from his ecclesiastic functions. The secularisation peaked with the Law of Separation of the State and the Church on 20 April 1911,[130] with a large acceptance by the revolutionaries. The law was only promulgated by the Assembly in 1914, but its implementation was immediate
after the publishing of the decree. The Portuguese Church tried to respond, classifying the law as "injustice, oppression, spoliation of Catholicism in the space of three generations.[131] The application of the law began on 1 July 1911, with the creation of a "Central
Commission".[132] As one commentator put it, "ultimately the Church was to survive the official vendetta against organized religious civil liberties and the "incredible series of excesses and crimes which has been
enacted in Portugal for the oppression of the Church."[134] International recognition Bernardino Machado was Minister of Foreign Affairs in the Provisional government. A major concern of the new republican government was recognition by other nations. In 1910, the vast majority of European states were monarchies. Only France, Switzerland and
San Marino were republics. For this reason, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Provisional Government, Bernardino Machado, directed his agenda exercising extreme prudence, [135] leading him, on 9 October 1910, to communicate to diplomatic representatives in Portugal that the Provisional Government would honour all the international
commitments assumed by the previous regime. [136] Since marshal Hermes da Fonseca personally witnessed the full process of transition of the regime, having arrived in Portugal on an official visit when the country was still a monarchy and left when it was a republic, [137] it is not unusual that Brazil was the first country to recognise de jure the new
Portuguese political regime. On 22 October the Brazilian government, and for the prosperity of the new Republic".[138] The next day would be Argentina's turn; on the 29 it was Nicaragua; on the 31, Uruguay; on 16 and 19 November,
Guatemala and Costa Rica; Peru and Chile on 5 and 19 November; Venezuela on 23 February 1911; Panama on 17 March.[139] In June 1911 the United States declared support.[140] Less than a month after the revolution, on 10 November 1910, the British government recognised de facto the Portuguese Republic, manifesting "the liveliest wish of His
Britannic Majesty to maintain friendly relations" with Portugal.[141] An identical position was taken by the Spanish, French and Italian governments. However, de jure recognition of the Republic. The French Republic was the first to do it on 24
August 1911, [142] day of the election of the Fortuguese Republic, accompanied by Germany, the Nutro-Hungarian Empire, [143] Denmark, Spain, Italy and Sweden. On 12 September, they were followed by Belgium, the Netherlands and Norway; on 13
September, China and Japan; on 15 September, Greece; on 30 September, Russia; [144] on 23 October, Romania; on 23 November, Turkey; on 21 December, Monaco; and the Holy See was suspended, and the Holy See did
not recognise the Portuguese Republic until 29 June 1919. See also History of Portuguese history References ^ "Implantação da República". Infopédia. 30 August 2010. ^ "A Ditadura de João Franco e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos". avenidadaliberdade.org. 30 August 2010. ^ "A Ditadura de João Franco e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos". avenidadaliberdade.org. 30 August 2010. ^ "A Ditadura de João Franco e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos". avenidadaliberdade.org. 30 August 2010. ^ "A Ditadura de João Franco e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos". avenidadaliberdade.org. 30 August 2010. ^ "A Ditadura de João Franco e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos". avenidadaliberdade.org. 30 August 2010. ^ "A Ditadura de João Franco e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos". avenidadaliberdade.org. 30 August 2010. ^ "A Ditadura de João Franco e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos". avenidadaliberdade.org. 30 August 2010. ^ "A Ditadura de João Franco e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos". avenidadaliberdade.org. 30 August 2010. ^ "A Ditadura de João Franco e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos". avenidadaliberdade.org. 30 August 2010. ^ "A Ditadura de João Franco e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos". avenidadaliberdade.org. 30 August 2010. ^ "A Ditadura de João Franco e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos". avenidada e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria moral e política de D. Carlos e a autoria mo
January 2012. ^ "João Franco". Vidas Lusófonas. 30 August 2010. Archived from the original on 15 May 2011. ^ "1ª Republica - Dossier temático dirigido às Escolas" (PDF) on 23 April 2015. ^ "5 de Outubro de 1910: a trajectória do
republicanismo". In-Devir. 30 August 2010. Archived from the original on 22 June 2011. ^ Quental, Antero de (1982). Prosas sócio-políticas ; publicadas e apresentadas por Joel Serrão (in Portuguese). Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda. p. 248. ^ "Primeira República – Biografia de João de Canto e Castro". leme.pt. 30 August 2010. ^
"Constituição de 1911 - Infopédia". infopedia.pt. 9 September 2010. ^ "Política: O Ultimato Inglês e o 31 de Janeiro de 1891". Soberania do Povo. Archived from the original on 30 September 2011. Retrieved 27 August 2010.
 ^ "Trinta e Um de Janeiro de 1891". Infopédia. Retrieved 30 August 2010. ^ Vicente, Paulo. "O 5 de Outubro de 1910: a trajectória do republicano [...] soube capitalizar em seu favor a crise económica que se abateu sobre o país e o descrédito
em que se encontravam os partidos do rotativismo monárquico. Num tom violento e populista, desdobrava-se em violentas críticas ao rei e aos seus governos, que identificava com a "decadência nacional". Ao longo da década de 80 do século XIX, a expressão eleitoral do Partido Republicano foi crescendo e, com ela, cresceu também o clima de
```

country in the price of the the price

