MEDIEVAL WARFARE: HUNDRED YEARS WAR AND ITS SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES

Abstract

This article investigates the causes and economic and social consequences of the Hundred Years war. After a brief sketch of the history of the Hundred Years War, I evaluate the evidence of the causes of the war. Then, economic and social consequences of the war are elaborated. Feudal elements clearly affected the start of the war. England’s sea power also played a major role in the war. Economically, the war created many problems both for England and France. Accordingly these two countries had to respond to these problems differently. England resounded by raising taxation and France’s response was to debase the value of the coin. The Hundred Years War also affected the social structure of both countries. Towards the end of the war, the war practice of the nations in question started to change. Technological developments affected to this change.
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Introduction:

The Hundred Years’ War was composed of a number of different wars occurred between the years of 1337 and 1453 between England and France for the sovereignty of the French throne. The origin of the problem in fact goes back to William the Conqueror’s time. William was already possessing the duchy of Normandy when he conquered England. Therefore since he was holding land within the control of the French throne, he theoretically owed feudal homage to the King of France. Things went without problem until 1337 when Edward III refused to pay homage to the King of France. In return, the French king confiscated the lands of Edward III in Acquitaine. In response, Edward suggested that he was the rightful owner of the French throne due to the fact that he was a more close relative of the former king of France than the actual king Philip VI. This theme, namely, who was the rightful heir to the French throne played the central role in the whole war between these two kingdoms. The wars affected the development of English and French nationalisms. The war was seen by the historians as one of the most signif- icant events of the medieval Europe. The major cause of the war was as suggested by All- mand to be the ‘breakdown of the historic feudal order, no longer able to meet the demands of changing times, and its gradual replacement by an order of nations increasingly aware of their growing national characteristic’ (Allmand, 1988, ch. 1) Other causes of the war were the ques- tions of royal inheritance, the question of homage, and the dispute over the status of Aquitai- ne. (Fraioli, 2005, ch. 1). It has been also suggested by Maurice Keen in his review Professor Le Patourel’s essay which appeared in the book of Kenneth Fowler that

“To understand why the war that broke out in 1337 lasted so long we must look back, he says, to the history of French and English kingship during the whole of that preceding period in which the English kings were also great territorial lords in France; for at the root of the struggle was the problem of the overlapping and conflicting claims upon the same subjects of two developing systems of government, which the feudal arrangements of the Treaty of Paris (1259) proved ina- dequate to resolve”. (Keen, 1974, 883-4)

A similar view was also emphasized by Curry who argued that from the time of the
treaty of Le Goulet in 1200 until the starting of the Edward III’s reign, there was a degree of feudal relationship between the English and French kings which in turn affected Edward’s claim to the French throne. (Curry, 1993, chapter 2). According to her, before 1337, ten years after the accession of Edward III to the English throne, Edward did not lay any claim to the French throne but the issue came into consideration after some hostilities between Edward III and Philip VI. (Curry, 1993, chapter 2). The former part of the war is characterised by John Bell Henne
man in his review of the book The Hundred Years War: Trial by Battle by Jonathan Sumption. it was:

“the ineptitude with which both sides entered into their long conflict. In this first decade of the war, despite considerable knowledge of each other’s activities, both monarchies overestimated the capabilities of the other as well as their own ability to plan, finance, and execute massive undertakings on a realistic Schedule” (Henne
neman, 1994, p. 265)

Scholars usually looked at the immediate circumstances for explaining the start of the war. According to some for instance, from the beginning, Edward III was ‘intuitively aware that the problem of Gascony could not be solved except by force’. (Templeman, 1952, 74). Another scholar Professor Perroy thought that ‘the pressing of Edward’s claim to the French throne in 1328, a chance too good for the English to miss, superimposed a dynastic conflict upon the fes
tering problem of Gascony’. (Templeman, 1952, 75). This action created reaction from the French King and his entourage who ‘put relentless pressure on the English king in the matter of his French fief’. (Templeman, 1952, 75). The situation of Scotland was also similar. The relationship between Scotland and England had to be some sort of vassalage. That is to say the king of Scotland had to pay hommage to the King of England Edward III. This perhaps explains why France and Scotland made alliance against England in the Hundred Years War.

1. The Cause of the War

There are two groups of the causes of the war the first group is the long term causes and the second group is the short term causes. One study outlined the previous arguments which in fact caused the war between England and France and which goes back to 1259. According to Cuttino:

“(1) The Treaty of Paris of 1259, which recreated the feudal relationship that led eventually to war, was dictated by English commitments towards Sicily and by the desire to secure wealthy territory; and from the point of view of English interests, the treaty was a mistake. (2) The confiscation of Gascony by Philip VI in 1337, which was the immediate cause of war, was the inevitable result of French attempts to exercise superioritas et resortum in Aquitaine. (3) French policy was the reflection of a doctrine that is practically synonymous with the modern theory of sovereignty, and the nature of this doctrine was understood and expressed. (4) English policy changed from an attempt to work within the terms of the Treaty of 1259 and within the legal limits of the feudal relationship to a conscious effort to achieve unchallenged sovereignty over Gascony by assuming the title, King of France, and by going to war. This change of policy represents a change in basic attitudes”. (Cuttino, 1956, 472).

These are the long term causes of the Hundred Years War. As for the short term causes, after a series of wars between England and France, England’s holdings in the continent were reduced dramatically after the end of the Angevin period. When the king of France Charles IV died in

The Journal of Academic Social Science Yıl: 5, Sayı: 40, Şubat 2017, s. 99-112
1328, without leaving any male son, the problem for the throne arose as the nearest male relative was Edward III, the king of England. After some discussions between the French nobility and prelates, it was decided that Philip, Count of Valois, was the rightful king of France and that he must be crowned as Philip VI of France. At first Edward III of England paid hommage to Philip VI. In May 1337, Philip decided that the Duchy of Aquitaine, which at that time meant Gascony, should be taken back from the reign of Edward III as Edward III was not committing his obligations as vassal properly and also that he had guarded Philip’s enemy Robert d’Artois.

In response to this Edward III challenged Philip’s right to the French throne arguing that he was the rightful king of the France. Here perhaps what Edward III was aiming was to resurrect the Angevin Empire. (Curry, 1993, chapter 2).

Some members of the nobility who were formerly loyal to Philip declared their allegiances to Edward III as the ‘rightful king’ of France. When Edward started to the War in July 1338, he was allied to some rulers in Low Countries, to Lewis the Bavarian to some towns of Flanders and to the dukes of Austria. On the other hand, France made alliance with ‘John of Bohemia’ and ‘Charles of Moravia and the counts of Flanders and Savoy, and the Bishop of Liege’ (Offler, 1939, 608). For some reasons England and Lewis wanted to make alliance against France but this project did not come into existence. (Offler, 1939, 631). According to Deprez Philip made a mistake. His mistake:

“lay in his failure to realize that the things he did could have no other result. Philip’s scrupulousness in refusing to abandon the Scots wrecked the agreement with Edward over Gascony, which was on the verge of being concluded in 1334. Acts of this sort gave rise to fear and resentment on the other side of the Channel, which Philip’s conduct over the projected crusade and in the later stages of the Scottish war did nothing to allay.” (Templeman, 1952, 75).

This in turn created another situation in which Edward:

“required little persuading to believe that he was the chosen victim of deliberate French provocations, which thwarted his policies at every turn, threatened to destroy his Gascon inheritance, and were nourished by every concession he made. So by the autumn of 1336 he seems to have come to the conclusion that force was the only remedy for this intolerable state of affairs”. (Templeman, 1952, 75).

There are however other causes. Aquitaine is unique because it had an important impact for the beginning of the Hundred Years war. Who was to rule this Gascon land? England or France? The struggle over the sovereignty of Aquitaine was also one of the reasons for the start of the war. (Templeman, 1952, 78). Therefore the peculiar characteristic of the medieval politics affected the start of the war due to the fact that the feudal relationships were important.

2. The Start of the War

The first battle of the Hundred Years War was a naval battle called the battle of Sluys, which occurred on 22 June, 1340. After the end of the battle, the French navy was completely destroyed. This battle was significant because of the fact that due to this victory, from that point until the end of the Hundred Years War, English navy dominated the English channel. If England wanted to win the battle which would mostly occur in the French soil, it was imperative that the sea security had to be taken first. Six years later then the battle of Crécy occurred in order to solve another inheritance problem for the dutchy of Brittany. It is no surprise that the battle of Crécy in particular and the hundred years war in general took place in the French soil. Because it was the English royal family who targeted the French throne, not vice versa. In the
case of Battle of Crécy, Edward III supported John of Montfort and Philip VI supported Charles of Blois. In 1346 Edward passed the English Channel landing in Normandy and facing to the forces of Philip VI. The Battle of Crécy was a decisive victory for the English forces. In fact, Philip was wise enough to see that a pitched battle was not as much a favourable situation as one thinks for the French chivalry however the situation arose in a way that French forces had to accept the battle at the Crécy. The hesitancy of the French forces to attack when the situation was in their favour led the battle was a complete disaster for the French forces. As France and Scotland were allies, France requested from the Scots to attack England. The Scots agreed but the attack was unsuccessful. Then Edward advanced northward capturing Calais which was to be a strategic stronghold for the rest of the war for the English forces.

3. Economic Effects of the War:

Economic considerations certainly affected the starting of the war. On the other hand, Money did not necessarily mean victory as financially feeble nation occasionally defeated the rich nation. What was really important was the fact that the personalities played a more central role in the war than the money. Some part in starting the war, their influence was minor, and the richer nation was consistently defeated by the poorer. Joan of Arc and Plantagenet kings were more central than any other element. (Perroy, 1951, 75-150) One other aspect of the financial impact of the hundred years war was that for financing the war England raised the English Merchants in the fourteenth century. Edward III was particularly important as he played the key role in doing so. His purpose was to augment the national resources and supplying revenue and loans to the crown. Accordingly the campaign was an alibi for the king to raise the taxation for the middle class merchants. (Schuyler, 1914, pp. 70-90) The roots of the modern taxation in England may well go back to Edward III’s time indeed. Borrowing Money was also another solution for financing the increasing financial needs of the war. (Schuyler, 1914, pp. 70-90) 1340 was an important date for the war as both parties having spend a lot came only to a stalemate gaining no significant benefit. (Henneman, 1994, p. 265) On the other hand victory in the battle certainly eased the work of the rulers as after the victory increases in taxes were done more easily. A similar instance can be seen in the so-called ‘Black Death’ period of England. Immediately after the Black Death some economic changes occurred in the English Economy. (Karaimamoğlu, 2016, pp. 594-599).

One other economic aspect of the war was the suggestion that while France was affected negatively from the war, England may have profited from it. (McFarlane, 1962). It has been also suggested that by means of the Hundred Years Wars the fortunes of the gentry classes in England showed a real increase. However, this suggestion is ameliorated by another suggestion which stated that ‘what made the fortunes of the smaller men was not the war or at least not the war alone, but the general configuration of social and political circumstances’. (Postan, 1964, p. 53). Furthermore the development of the war was also affected from the economic situations. For instance rebel movements which occurred throughout the war were resisting to the introduction of the new taxes while on the other hand they were supporting the war. (Fraioli, 2005, ch. 2). It has been also suggested that ‘these rebels were not exploited masses rebelling against oppressive systems; instead they were individuals, including those of the middling sort, who were revolting against challenges to a rise in living’ (Staples, 2006, pp. 411-2). The economic consequences of the war also created political crisis. According to Jones:
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“Exasperated by the inability or unwillingness of the government of regency under Archbishop Stratford to provide him with money and materiel for his continental campaign, an outraged Edward returned to England on November 30, 1340, determined to purge the government of those corrupt and disloyal officials whom he blamed for his humiliation”. (Jones, 1973, p. 1).

This fiscal crisis caused a political one at the end and Edward III and Stratford played the key role in solving the crisis. (Jones, 1973, pp. 1-20). Accordingly a governemntal reform was one of the consequences of the former phase of the hundred years war. The crisis affected the constitutional development of England and the role of some of the institutions in England started to be re-evaluated. (Jones, 1973, p. 1). On the other hand ‘the judicial aspect of the crisis’ is also important to note. It affected the development of the legal system of England. (Jones, 1973, p. 2).

The economic aspect of the Hundred Years War is also significant and deserves special attention here. According to McFarlane, except for the war at Calais, the number of Englishmen participating to the war were less than one per cent of the total population of England at that time. (McFarlane, ‘War the Economy’ 1962, 5). Accordingly the collection of the armies did not lead to any increase in the labour force in the market of England. (McFarlane, ‘War the Economy’ 1962, p. 5). According to McFarlane ‘England experienced the horrors of war scarcely at all’, while France did not gain anything. (McFarlane, ‘War the Economy’ 1962, p. 9). For the French economy in war the case was not favouring the French side:

“one has only to begin looking into the periods of English retreat after 1369 and 1429 to realise how overwhelmingly French gains then were outweighed by French losses earlier in terms of financial advantage. As for the pitched battles, the English did not lose at Bauge what they had won at Agincourt, nor at Jargeau, Patay and Castillon the rich harvest of Verneu.” (McFarlane, ‘War the Economy’ 1962, 10).

Accordingly it is clear that for France the Hundred Years War was more a disaster than England. Apart from that England also profited from war:

“the greatest profit to the English arose from their systematic exploitation of the occupied provinces of France, of Brittany and Gascony in the fourteenth century and of Normandy, Maine, Anjou and the other northern lands in the fifteen”

(McFarlane, ‘War the Economy’ 1962, p. 10).

The victories over the lands they gained returned as profit of the war for England. The profit went to the landed aristocracy and then it was canalyzed to the other parts of the economy giving a dynamism to the English economy as a whole. (McFarlane, ‘War the Economy’ 1962, 11).

The spoils of the war throughout the Hundred Years War was also an important topic both for average soldiers and the magnates. It also mattered even for the crown. The ransom from the prisoners such as a rich merchant, or any movable utensil or a horse could be a spoil of war during the Hundred Years War. (Hay, 1954, p. 91). The relationship between the slaughter of common men and the nobles was also striking as Hay puts:

“The slaughter was, of course, usually restricted to the common soldier. The gentlemen participating were too valuable to be killed, and in fourteenth-century campaigns in the West we normally find the destruction of considerable numbers of potential prisoners only in conditions of civil war, as in Brittany and Castile”. (Hay, 1954, p. 92).
Therefore, except for the civil war, nobles who were taken as prisoner were commonly bartered in return for a good sum of ransom. Taking prisoner of a magnate thus was a lucrative business for the participants of the war. Not only the soldiers but the kings also profited from the ransoms caused by the wars. Edward III for instance was lucky for taking prisoners and ransom as he took the king of Scotland and the king of France as well as many other lesser magnates as prisoner. (Hay, 1954, 93). However, it is plausible to suggest that what was acquired as ransom was spent to the war directly or indirectly as ‘it soon became a criticism of the crown that war did not pay for itself as it seemed that it should be easy for it to do’. (Hay, 1954, p. 93).

Hundred Years War also affected the England’s sea power and her engagements of her resources to the sea. Sea power of England affected the war in two different ways in the first half of the Hundred Years War. Firstly manpower which was to be used both as seamen or as soldiers was a primary concern and secondly the situation of the shipowners was another concern for the English throne. It has been suggested for example that:

“the maritime communities of England made very considerable contributions to the war effort. Many hundreds of ships and tens of thousands of sailors were impressed for the king’s service. Shipowners and sailors had no alternative but to acquiesce in the royal requirements, seeking only to persuade the crown to treat them with consideration and hoping that there might be profits from spoils”. (Sherborne, Jul., 1967, p. 175)

Clearly then, Hundred Years War had some impact on the use of the naval forces of England. Apart form the royal will, the hope of some sort of war profit probably played the key role for the English maritime community to involve in the war. On the other hand the war also affected the practice of trade and similar entreprises:

“Shipowners, moreover, favoured strong naval policies, for government neglect of the seas exposed their trading ventures to serious hazards. Losses in ships and merchandise engaged in commerce proved more expensive than disruptions of trade and loss of freights caused by impressment. There can be no doubt that the war made a greater impact on those who earned their livings from the sea than it did upon the vast majority of Englishmen.” (Sherborne, Jul., 1967, p. 175).

The situation of the shipowners was slightly different than the soldiers who were somehow related to the sea. For the shipowners’ primary concern was to make trade and the Hundred Years War certainly affected their trading ventures.

4. Societies, Religion and the War

The situation in Gascony the dutchy of England in the southwest of France determined the faith of the battle in some occasions. The French forces were about to gain a victory but for some reasons this did not happen. Perhaps one of the reasons for this was the competition among the aristocratic powers between the Gascon lords. (Sumption, 1991). (Vale, 1970). Although the land was inherited by Edward III, the quarel over Gascony did not end easily. There had been no coherence between the landed aristocracy of the Gascony, therefore they never acquired to unite and fight efficiently. In some occasions the sovereignty of the area passed to England and later on it became the land of the France. The status of Gascony played the key role in triggering the war. According to Vale, neither countries were able to attain the sovereignty in Gascony by the armed forces alone. Instead both England and France sought the support of the local aristocratic powers by promising them some priviledges and offices. (Herlihy, 1971, 184). At the end in 1454, the last English forces left Gascony retaining only Calais as their remaining land in the continent.
English Church was extensively used by the royal forces to make royal propaganda of the Hundred Years' war. The usage of the royal propaganda extensively affected the development of public institutions both in England and France during the Hundred Years War. (Jones, 1979, 18) Both parties used different kind of technics to explain to their subjects the importance of the war and its excencies. For example:

“Although both kings employed a variety of communication techniques, French royal propaganda usually took the form of pamphleteering, whereas English kings showed a marked preference for using royal writs to achieve the same end. Writs to secular and clerical officials served the direct and obvious purpose of announcing royal decisions and of ordering compliance or else of convening assemblies at which the king's "will" could be "expounded" to his subjects.” (Jones, 1979, p. 19).

Therefore both parties were willing the propaganda war at home so that they would raise the taxes arbitrarily and profit from it accordingly. From this network of propaganda system, came the church praying aimed at making the war propaganda. Many of the church praying types were used as ‘news service’ for the crown and thus constituiting an important element in war propaganda. (Jones, 1979, 20). The operation of this system was pretty straightforward. First King requested from the clergy to hold special prayers and the prayers and masses were arranged accordingly. (Jones, 1979, p. 21). In this respect, a new concept, ‘public opinion’ in England was first introduced due to the Hundred years war. (Jones 1979, p. 30). The ultimate aim was clear: ‘to exalt the king as spokesman for and defender of community interests and to convince the people that they were or should be full participants in the defense of those interests’. (Jones, 1979, p. 30).

5. The Important Battles:

The Battle of Poitiers was also one of the most important battles of the Hundred Years Wars. The war was fought in September 1356. English army was commanded by Edward, the prince of Wales, also known as the Black Prince’ and the French army was commanded by King John. Initially Edward’s army was in defensive position. (Burne, 1938, 22). However, English forces won a decisive victory over the French army after the battle. King John was held hostage. He died in England in 1364, and Charles V succeeded him. After the battle Edward the Black Prince wanted a firm result. He made a couple of moves and at the end the Treaty of Brétigny was signed between England and France. Although accoding to this treaty, England some lands in the French territory, Edward III abandonned his claim to the French throne. According to Chris Given-Wilson and Françoise Bériac:

“the outmoded tactics and indiscipline of French armies led, with a terrible and grim consistency, to a succession of national humiliations and gruesome massacres of a nobility which, just a few years earlier, had prided itself on its virtual invincibility.” (Given-Wilson and Bériac p. 802).

The same study emphasizes that some 2000 important people were taken as prisoners of war. (Given-Wilson and Bériac, 2001, p. 804). This is especially important because it makes the battle significant along with the Battle of Agincourt as for example in the Crecy campaign the English forces took no prisoner of war. (Given-Wilson and Bériac, 2001, p. 804) although it is probable that some common names may have been taken. (Given-Wilson and Bériac, 2001, p. 805). It is also important to note that the ferocities seen in the battles were not uncommon as in other less important wars of the period similar instances were available. (Given-Wilson and Bériac, 2001, p. 807-8). Thus the prisoners taken in Poitiers were somewhat significant as in other wars.
of the medieval era the prisoners were usually killed after the battle. The captives in battle were significant:

“Given both the number and the quality of the prisoners taken by the Anglo-Gascon army at Poitiers, Edward III would have realized from the moment that news was brought to him of his son’s victory that the potential gain to be derived from it was much greater than that from Neville’s Cross. The question was, how should he play his hand? His trump card was, of course, the capture of King John himself. By the same token, most of the 2,000 or so captives were going to be of no political value whatsoever, and in fact the great majority of them were released within weeks, if not days, of the battle, upon payment (or promises of payment) of whatever their captors could persuade them to agree to”. (Given-Wilson and Bériac p. 814).

The battle of Agincourt was also significant for after a complete defeat, France was pushed to a chaotic situation as the negative consequences of the defeat was the first reason and the struggling factions among the French nobility for the political power was another. In 1415 the Agincourt defeat led to the risk of disintegration for France and in 1418, a Burgundian coup took place. Afterwards the treaty of Troyes came. According to this treaty, French throne passed to the England. Joan of Arc emerged in this critical situation. But before that the French throne’s incomes were somewhat exhausting. There was one solution: the debasement of the money and therefore the Dauphin made it. According to Sussman the debasement of coin was crucial for the Dauphin’s survival. (Sussman, 1992, 453).

6. The Later Phase

The incentive to make war was also gradually changing with the Hundred Years War. While in the previous centuries ransom and spoils of war were primary incentive, by 1417, acquiring new land and distributing it to the vassals became one of the mere incentives for Henry V to make war. (Allmand, 1968, p. 461-2). Many lands in the French territory were given to Henry V’s followers after they were conquered by him in return for some military obligations. (Allmand, 1968, p. 463). Moreover by granting lands to his lesser lords, Henry V was easing the defence of these lands. (Allmand, 1968, p. 464). In addition, economic considerations that is to say the aim of making profit and creating new terrain for settlement also affected the Englishmen for taking land in the continent. (Allmand, 1968, p. 464). There were certainly other people who profited from the war. They were ‘the administrators and office holders’, ‘civil officers’, and the third group were the retinues of the lesser barons. Clergy may also be added to those who profited from the Hundred Years War (Allmand, 1968, p. 466-7). Another striking aspect of the possession of land and its political implication lies in the fact that the purchase of the lands in Normandy happened only between Englishmen in accordance with Henry V’s ordinance. According to Allmand the reason for this was that the land was seen as a strategically significant possession. (Allmand, 1968, p. 467). After the loss of some of the territories in the continent the resentment from the nobles was almost inevitable. Because the loss of land meant the loss of revenue. This had to be compensated. However, this was difficult. (Allmand, 1968, p. 479).

7. The Hundred Years War and the Domestic Politics:

The Hundred Years War also affected the domestic politics of both nations. For instance the loss of the French war affected the domestic politics in England, though its extent is complicated. Both economics and the domestic politics were intermingled. The defeat of the English
forces in Normandy and Gascony in 1450’s somewhat diminished the popularity of the Lancastrian government and gave rise to the Yorkist power. (McCulloch and Jones, 1983, p. 96). The duke of York attacked the Lancastrian regime and accordingly popular feelings about the regime declined. (McCulloch and Jones, 1983, p. 96). Popular element and the French defeat affected together the domestic politics in England. On the other hand, prior Kings of England were also affected from the Hundred Years Wars. For instance when Henry V:

“undertook the siege of Harfleur it was at the head of a unified political nation, and although his council advised against the march to Calais, Henry was vindicated by the brilliant success of Agincourt. Plans were laid for the conquest of Normandy and the promise of immense war profits played its part in the initial enthusiasm for his campaign.” (McCulloch and Jones, 1983, p. 99).

Hence some sort of popular element also played at least a minor role in the previous parts of the Hundred Years War. The economics on the other hand affected the domestic politics in Henry IV’s time:

“With Henry V’s "piecemeal" conquest of France after 1417, it came to the fore again. Normandy's inability to pay for itself, combined with the desire to expand the conquest, resulted in a severe drain on English resources that manifested itself in Parliament's increasing reluctance to subsidize Henry V's war efforts.” (McCulloch and Jones, 1983, p. 100).

To some extent it is plausible to suggest that when the war was in favour of England, the popular element was in favour of war, however, when the war was turning that is to say when England was losing the war, the popular element went against the war. Henry V was as successful as Edward III to rouse the popular feelings for the war against France. (McCulloch and Jones, 1983, 103). In England, popular literature was also affected by the victories of the War with France. (McCulloch and Jones, 1983, p. 104).

The Hundred years war was also witnessing the change of the war practice. The medieval warfare where chivalric deeds played the key element gradually vanished by the end of the Hundred years war. Although at the beginning the chivalric ideals were important with the introduction of the gunpowder and the efficient use of archers, the wars were gained and lost not by the chivalric ideals but by different considerations. The unwillingness of the French forces to refrain from their chivalric backgrounds also affected the end of the war. (Fraioli, 2005, ch. 3). The feudal armies declined by the end of the Hundred Years War, while on the other hand the war itself ‘threatened to reestablish in England a feudal regime on the ruins of the Lancaster monarchy’. (Postan, 1942, p. 1). Perhaps the war itself have ‘destroyed the feudal order’. (Postan, 1942, p. 1). Although nationalism in France was raising during the period of the Hundred Years War, it is difficult to sustain that the feelings of nationalism became different in England due to the war. (Postan, 1942, p. 1). While the effects of the war affected both England and France, its economic effects were more clear in England. The Hundred years war did not drastically affect the French society but, the foreign trade of England was affected due to the Hundred Years war. The urban life in England changed. (Postan, 1942, pp. 3-4). In defining the effects of the war it is difficult to identify what social consequence was really the consequence of the Hundred Years war and what consequence was the real consequence of social change of roughly Hundred and fifty years. (Postan, 1942, p. 4). One thing is clear however that the war affected the ‘wastage of national wealth’. Since the income of England was not increasing the England became poorer due to the war. (Postan, 1942, pp. 4-5). Social mobility in England was hastened due to the war. (Postan, 1942, p. 7). Military leaders and gentlement of cloth gained
some wealth from the war. (Postan, 1942, p. 8). The wealth gained were put into land. (Postan, 1942, p. 9). War also effected the agricultural crisis of England. (Postan, 1942, p. 11).

8. The Strategy and Military Revolution

In the medieval era, there has been a belief among scholars that the strategy in the war was absent. (Rogers, May, 1993, p. 83). However there appears to be contrary evidence at least for Edward III’s reign. According to Rogers, ‘The most important error made by Hewitt and his followers is to portray the chevauchie as a battle-avoiding rather than a battle-seeking strategy’. (Rogers, May, 1993, 84). According to him in fact, the opposite was true. However, Rogers also argued that the ‘political destabilisation’ of France and the weakening the position of the Valois king and the ‘economic attrition’ of France were significant strategies of Edward III. This thesis is in accordance with what he argues Hewitt saw as Edward III’s strategy in the Hundred years war. Rogers furter argued that Edward III ‘was probably the finest commander of his day’ due to his tactic of chevauchées. (Rogers, May, 1993, 102). The war tactics of Edward III had both economic and military aspects. The chevauchées had economic consequences for the France and they also led the French army to make war. In this respect strategy was not something totally absent from the Hundred years War. It is also important to emphasize that Edward III’s strategy was successful as it attained what it aimed.

The question that whether the military revolution of Europe can be pushed back as early as the Hundred years war is open to discussion. Since the Hundred Years War covered nearly a century, significant changes in the war practice was somehow inevitable. According to Rogers, important changes in the military affairs of the Hundred Years War occurred. This may probably be called as the ‘Military revolution of the Hundred Years War’ (Rogers, Apr. 1993, 243). According to him:

“The armies that dominated the battlefields of Europe from the mid-eleventh century through the early fourteenth were composed primarily of feudal warrior-aristocrats, who owed military service for lands held in fief. They served as heavily armored cavalry, shock combatants, relying on the muscle power of man and steed, applied directly to the point of a lance or the edge of a sword. They fought more often to capture than to kill. The armies which conquered Europe’s first global empires, on the other hand, differed from this description on every single count. They were drawn from the common population (albeit often led by aristocrats); they served for pay; they fought primarily on foot, in close-order linear formations which relied more on missile fire than shock action; and they fought to kill”. (Rogers, Apr. 1993, 243).

Both the aims of the soldiers in war and the way in which they were collected changed during the war between England and France. Accordingly the Hundred years war witnesses a dramatic change in war practice which may well be characterized as a ‘revolution’. The characteristic of the feudal armies was as suggested by Rogers was to capture rather than to kill. On the other hand, the main aim of the military armies after the change occured was to kill. Other characteristic such as army formation and fire capacity also chaged during the Hundred Years War. Moreover, both ‘Infantry’ and ‘artillary’ revolutions occurred during the Hundred Years War. (Rogers, Apr. 1993, 244). One particular thing to note is that since France was the strongest in cavalry force, it was his neighbours who made the military revolution of infantry. By the first half of the fourteenth century infantry forces started to become able to win wars and the importance of the cavalry as the winning force of the medieval army started to diminish.(Rogers, Apr. 1993, 247).
The supply and tactics of war in the Hundred years war was subject to debate by various historians. (Harari, 2000, 297). It has been formerly believed that the supply of the medieval armies was mostly coming from the plunder and the spoils of the war. (Harari, 2000, 297). However, this view have been challenged. Thus, there is a tendency in historians to believe that ‘large quantities of provisions were being regularly collected by the English government to provide for its armies’. (Harari, 2000, 298). Accordingly the supply of the medieval armies was much more complicated than had been previously thought. However, the role of the plundering was still crucial for the supply of the war in the medieval era.

The indenture as a system of recruiting military men for creating armies for the medieval era played a crucial role in war. (Sherborne, 1964, 718). At least the first half of the hundred years war was no exception. The men-at-arms participating to the war were constituting retinues, and retinues were of different number. (Sherborne, 1964, 719). Archers were specified as a different rank. (Sherborne, 1964, 719). Sometimes the wars were postponed for various reasons. In 1369 for example a number of aristocrats collected a significant number of reinforcements. While Edward III decided to start the war in an earlier date, the date was delayed probably due to the illness of the Queen Philippa. (Sherborne, 1964, 720). The indentured soldiers were a good source of manpower for making war and Edward III succeeded to do so well. It was based on being volunteer, therefore the system was somewhat effective. (Sherborne, 1964, 746).

Conclusion:

The Hundred Years War had social and economic effects on both the English and French nations. Why those series of wars started? The causes of the war were many. First of all, The Treaty of Paris of 1259, and then The confiscation of Gascony by Philip VI in 1337, and the related changes between the English and French international policies caused these two nations to fight each other for a period of roughly hundred years. The wars affected to the economic development of these two countries. For instance, the taxation system of both of the nations evolved throughout the period due to these wars. The war expenses necessitated new taxes for both countries and this led to the introduction of the new taxes. Moreover, kings had to address to their people in order to receive loans from their nobilities. This in turn led the aristocracy to demand new priviledges. In this respect, the wars also affected England and France socially. The fight for the sovereignty in Gascony, the duchy of England in the southwest of France affected the faith of these wars. Until 1454, when the English forces left the area to the French army, this quarrel between the aristocratic powers of both of the nations did not come to an end. Both England and France used the power of the church for their support of the war. The Battle of Poitiers and the battle of Agincourt were the main battles in the period. The battles were won not because of the power of the chivalry but because of the strategic usage of the archers. The wars affected the domestic politics of the England. For instance the loss of the battles in Normandy and Gascony in 1450’s by the English forces perhaps decreased the popularity of the Lancasterian which in turn led to the rise of the Yorkist side. The military tactics and strategy also evolved through the Hundred Years War. However it is impossible to demonstrate whether these changes were due to the Hundred Years Wars or because of the a century of timespan.
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