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Introduction

“Here lies our sovereign lord the king,
Whose word no man relies on;
He never says a foolish thing,
Nor ever does a wise one\(^1\)”

This poem was written on the bedchamber door of Charles II by John Wilmot, 2\(^{nd}\) Earl of Rochester. Charles’ response shows that the wit that his court was famous for started at the top “This is true, for my words are my own, but my actions are those of my ministers\(^2\).” Charles II is often remembered as the Merry Monarch or the Playboy Monarch or the King with the common touch. He is remembered for his mistresses more than his ministries, his pleasures more than his policies. If his political actions are ever remembered it is during the difficult climate of the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis, where he was able to use his duplicity to outmaneuver his enemy, Shaftesbury, to keep power within the Monarchy and out of the hands of Parliament. Far less attention is given to the other period where Charles deceitfully outwitted others to achieve his objectives. Between 1668 – 1674, Charles outmaneuvers his own ministers to drag an unwilling Britain into alliance with France and war with the Netherlands, both were dreadfully unpopular in Parliament and between his own ministers. To achieve these aims, Charles purposefully creates a fractured government that he was able to

\(^2\) Chambers, Miscellany, 221
influence and exploit. These ministers, not Charles, suffered the wrath of an angry Parliament. Charles deserves far greater credit for his Machiavellian skill in attaining his goals despite their difficulty and his ability to personally avoid blame for unpopular actions. His response to the Earl of Rochester’s ditty was absolutely true with a slight twist. The words may be his own but they lead to his desired actions even if they are officially the actions of his ministers; by differentiating between the two Charles was able to make sure that his words didn’t bring him trouble while the actions he wished for were still carried out.

On the day of his birth “a star\(^3\) glimmered faintly in the sky at midday\(^4\)”. There was no clearer omen of the grandeur of Charles II, future king of England\(^5\), Scotland and Ireland. Charles II would endure a difficult life of civil war, exile, and despair before returning to the throne at the age of 30\(^6\). Charles II returned to an England heavily divided between militant extremist non-conformists, moderate Presbyterian, and Anglicans\(^7\). The Three Kingdoms had been through a brutal civil war between 1642 – 9 and an even more brutal military dictatorship between 1653 – 8. Ireland was the most brutalized by the military dictatorship of the New Model Army, which had decimated the population and wealth of Catholic Ireland\(^8\). Scotland also dealt with internal divisions and a thriving Covenant religion which Charles had gained a disdain for during his brief attempt to regain his birthright in 1651\(^9\). Charles II did not have

---

\(^3\) Modern historians and astronomers believe that the ‘star’ that was visible during the day was actually the planet Venus as evidence suggests it was visible during the day on May 29\(^\text{th}\), 1630.


\(^5\) The territory of England at this time encompassed Wales and both were considered England. To avoid confusion, I will also write England while meaning England and Wales.


much experience with governance as he had been exiled from his home as a teenager. Instead he had experience in struggling, duplicity and strategic political thinking. Charles’ first attempt at governance would be a trial by fire\textsuperscript{10}.

Charles did have help when first thrust into governance. Edward Hyde had been made Lord Chancellor to the young king in exile\textsuperscript{11}. Once Charles was crowned, Hyde took control of most governance in the Three Kingdoms. Hyde had been an advisor to Charles for sixteen years, since Charles was fourteen years old. Their close relationship had meant that Hyde had become a father figure to the young King whose own father had been executed when he was only eighteen\textsuperscript{12}. Charles also had a difficult relationship with his mother who was a controlling influence who favoured Charles’ younger brother James. Edward Hyde became James’ father in law, after James married Hyde’s daughter Anne. Hyde was an able, if not particularly gifted, administrator with experience in governance from the reign of Charles I\textsuperscript{13}. A committed Anglican, Hyde believed in the importance and ascendancy of the Church of England but understood the need for the religious toleration Charles favoured in England, Ireland and Scotland with religious divisions plaguing their kingdoms. Lord Clarendon would lead Charles’ first government, from 1660 to 1667\textsuperscript{14}.

When Charles first returned, Hyde took control of Charles’ government. Charles gained the reputation as uninterested in politics and governance, preferring to spend time with his friends and mistresses. This was not at all unfair as Charles was well known to have found the

\textsuperscript{10} Fraser, Charles II, 31
\textsuperscript{11} John Miller, Charles II, London: Wiedenfeld and Nicolson, 1991.28
\textsuperscript{12} Miller, Charles II, 33
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid, 23
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid, 58
mundane details of governance rather dull. He sparsely attended Privy Council Meetings and when he did so he passed notes to Chancellor Hyde, most of them were little more than witty observations or irrelevant queries.\textsuperscript{15}

While Charles might not have been the administrator Hyde was, especially with day to day operations, he was much more skilled politically. Throughout his twenty-five-year reign, Charles was able to outmaneuver both his enemies and his own advisors to constantly achieve his aims. His political flexibility allowed him to survive in both foreign and domestic affairs even though both his predecessor\textsuperscript{16} and successor\textsuperscript{17} were overthrown in revolutions. Charles II not only survived but thrived, leaving the Three Kingdoms on a much more stable footing than when he inherited it. Charles advanced the cause of science with the establishment of the Royal Society\textsuperscript{18}. Colonial gains in India, Morocco and the Americas helped to cement Britain as a colonial power\textsuperscript{19}. Charles was also able to greatly improve the economic revenue streams to the Monarchy and establish England and a political force in Europe\textsuperscript{20}. Charles II was a much more able statesmen and politician than he has been previously given credit for.

There are two periods of Charles’ reign when this becomes evident. In 1678, Charles began to experience difficulty in ruling due to the Popish Plot\textsuperscript{21}. This ultimately culminated into

\textsuperscript{16} Charles I, father of Charles.
\textsuperscript{17} James II, his brother.
\textsuperscript{21} The Popish plot was a conspiracy theory that suggests Catholics were attempting to seize power by murdering Charles. It was invented by a man named Titus Pope and led to the execution of twenty two men. The conspiracy theory quickly gathered steam after an Anglican Magistrate who had supported Pope was found dead, believed to
the exclusion crisis, where Lord Shaftesbury was able to manipulate the House of Commons and Lords to attempt to change Charles’ successor. Charles outmaneuvered Lord Shaftesbury and his Whig allies\(^{22}\) by deceiving them into believing he may change the succession while planning to take back control municipal governments and popular opinion with his Tory allies, ruling without a Parliament from 1681 – 85\(^{23}\).

The second period Charles II showed his skill as statesmen and politician was 1668-74. During this period, Charles achieved his aims despite a lack of support from Parliament and disagreements on the policy with most of his advisors. In 1667, Charles removed his old mentor, Edward Hyde, from governance\(^ {24}\). He supported a group to replace Edward Hyde known as the CABAL but actively took steps to prevent a single minister from taking power, as Edward Hyde had done. This creates a system of rivalries that Charles exploited to sign a secret treaty with France that held an inconceivable amendment\(^ {25}\). Charles continued to use the divisions in the government he created to coax his Kingdoms into an alliance France and war with the Netherlands despite the unpopularity of both. Ultimately, Charles was then able to absolve himself of blame for the endeavor. Charles was undoubtedly a skilled schemer, able to achieve his aims cementing his legacy not just as the Playboy King, the Merry Monarch or the loveable rouge but as the puppet master as well.

---

\(^{22}\) The Whigs was the name of the political party given to those who supported Shaftesbury. This time period marks the birth of both the Whig and Tory parties.  
\(^{23}\) John Miller, Charles II, 489 – 508  
\(^{24}\) Edward Hyde Clarendon, The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon, 489  
\(^{25}\) The Secret Treaty of Dover contained a secret clause that supported the conversion of Charles II from Anglican to Catholic in return for additional French subsidies and support to keep his reign. Charles was quite aware that an explosive action such as this could easily result in another Civil War.
Charles walked a tightrope. He managed a Parliament that was suspicious of his every action and miserly. He excelled in the world of advisors and courtiers, able to keep his own close council while listening to all advisors. More importantly, “Charles was universally beloved, beloved not only by the crowd of individuals with whom he came in contact, not only adored by his dependents, but thoroughly popular with the mass of his subjects and particularly with the poorer populace of London who knew him best.” He governed without managing day to day operations, still finding time to engage in a highly performative flamboyant private life. Charles ultimately died as a Catholic, finally converting as he had promised in the treaty. The momentous act of conversion, and an appreciation of Charles’ simple ability to reestablish the Monarchy can only properly be understood with the relevant history of the path to Protestantism, the English Civil War and life in the Interregnum.

26 Hilaire Belloc and Dr John McCarthy, Charles II: The Last Rally (Norfolk, VA: IHS Press, 2003). Pg 146
27 Although this conversion was not made public initially. The secret treaty was not made public for over a century.
Chapter 1. A troubled inheritance

The Path to Interregnum

Religion

In 1517, Martin Luther wrote the 95 Theses and broke the hegemony that had existed in the Western Christian World for over a millennium. This was the birth of the Reformation, a movement that successfully opposed the dominance of Rome in Western Europe. Martin Luther was a German professor of theology and a priest. He was distraught with what he believed to the growing corruption of the Catholic Church, especially over the issue of indulgences. Indulgencies had been a relatively recent practice where those with wealth could buy forgiveness from sins, they had committed. Luther found this intolerable. The 95 Theses started a revolution in Germany and throughout Continental Europe.

Henry VIII was King of England during the rise of Lutheranism. Originally, Henry VIII attacked Luther’s Heresy in his own writing, ‘The Defense of the Seven Sacraments’ in 1521. By the 1530’s the situation had changed. Henry VIII had failed to produce a male heir, which he deemed to be of the utmost importance to ensure stability in his dynasty. However, after many miscarriages and failed pregnancies, his wife, Catherine of Aragon gave birth to a daughter and not a son. Henry determined that the only solution to this issue was to obtain a divorce. At the time, the only way for royalty to obtain divorce was from the Pope. But Queen Catherine’s

29 Henry VIII (King of England), Defence of the Seven Sacraments (English Court, 1521).
nephew was then Holy Roman Emperor, perhaps the most powerful man in Europe. There was no chance the Pope would grant an annulment and risk offending the Holy Roman Emperor\textsuperscript{31}.

Henry VIII was thus stuck. He was unable to legally obtain a divorce. He was unable to produce a male heir with his current wife. Any heir he produced outside his marriage would be illegitimate. Illegitimate heirs would not provide the stability that Henry VIII needed in his line of succession. His solution was the change the legal code surrounding the marriage of Monarchy. In 1534, King Henry VIII passed the (First) Supremacy Act. The act declared that the Monarch was “the only supreme head on Earth of the Church of England, the English Crown shall enjoy all honours, dignities, preeminences, jurisdictions, privileges, authorities, immunities, profits and commodities to the said dignity\textsuperscript{32}.” In short, Henry VIII became the spiritual head of his nation. This meant that the right for divorce was not up to the Pope but to Henry VIII himself, which he granted for himself and married Anne Boleyn. He eventually produced a son from the third of his six marriages\textsuperscript{33}.

The abandonment of Rome and the rise of Protestantism was a boon to England’s economy which had been struggling at the time due to a series of unsuccessful and expensive wars in the decades prior on the European continent. Earl Thomas Cromwell of Essex, during his time as Chief Minister, started a program of confiscating Catholic monetary wealth and lands to revive the English treasury. The Catholic Church had previously been the greatest landowner in England and their monasteries were often filled with gold, silver and other precious metals.

\textsuperscript{32} Gerald Lewis Bray, ed., \textit{Documents of the English Reformation}, Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994. 113  
\textsuperscript{33} Kinney, Tudor England, 392 – 3
Confiscation meant that England gained enormous wealth in a short amount of time, as had happened in other European kingdoms that had forsaken Catholicism\textsuperscript{34}.

Negatively, it would lead to widespread unrest throughout England, especially in the north. Up to 40,000 people rose up in rebellion and occupied York, the greatest city in northern England. Henry VIII was unable to muster an army large enough to deal with this rebellion and was forced to negotiate with the leaders of the rebellion. After the negotiations were accepted the rebellion dispersed and the crown’s representatives reneged on their deals. The crown hunted the opposition leadership, proposed martial law, and publicly executed 216 activists within the protest\textsuperscript{35}. Anglicanism would soon take root throughout England as the primary religion, although there were pockets of Catholics and of non-conformists (Puritans, Quakers, Presbyterians and other more extreme\textsuperscript{36} sects of Protestantism) that dotted the landscape. England and Scotland would both become bastions of Protestantism in northern Europe.

Scotland would not initially succumb to Protestantism, James VI, king of Scotland made an arrangement with the Pope where he exchanged his loyalty for the right to heavily tax church lands in Scotland\textsuperscript{37}. His death left an infant Mary as Queen of the Scots, which resulted in a divide between English supported Protestants and French supported Catholics. In 1546 a civil war broke out between the Scottish Protestants and Catholics. The English invaded and occupied south east Scotland on behalf of the Protestants, which resulted in the Catholic

\textsuperscript{34} Kinney, Tudor England, 372
\textsuperscript{35} Ibid, 373 – 5
\textsuperscript{36} Extreme in this case means that these forms of Protestantism normally that disregarded the classic form of religious rites and preaching. Many non-conformists did not have the same ritualistic Sunday mass ceremonies that Catholicism and Anglicanism still held. English royalty often found these subjects the most difficult to control.
\textsuperscript{37} John H. S. Burleigh, A Church History of Scotland, London : Oxford University Press, 1960. 203
Scottish faction asking for French assistance who granted it in exchange for a marriage proposal between Mary and the French Dauphin (heir) and Mary’s upbringing as a Catholic and departure for France\textsuperscript{38}.

The Catholics would ultimately win the war and hold power in Scotland though grass root support for Protestantism spread throughout Scotland. Mary returned in 1560 following the death of her husband and remarry, producing a child (James VI). Another rebellion occurred in 1567 which resulted in Mary abdicating in favour of her son who was raised as a Protestant. As James VI grew up, he faced issues with growing support for the Covenant. James VI supported a more moderate church and while King of Scotland, he was able to limit its growth. However, once he also became King of England, Scotland became a stronghold of Covenanters, a sect of Protestantism that was more extreme than the Anglicanism practiced in England\textsuperscript{39}.

In Ireland Catholicism remained strong despite attempts by Henry VIII and his son to encourage the growth of Protestantism. The ascension of the Catholic Mary, to Queen of England was celebrated in Ireland. Ironically, it was during her reign that the first two plantation colonies (Philipstown and Maryborough) named after Queen Mary and her husband, King Philip of Spain. Initially, the plantation colonies were to grow valuable commodities for English markets, but they later were used by her sister, Elizabeth I and her successors, as a way to encourage the growth of Protestantism through relocation of English and Scottish settlers into Ireland\textsuperscript{40}. Queen Elizabeth I also made attendance at the Church of Ireland, which

\textsuperscript{38} Mitchison, History of Scotland, 180 – 211
\textsuperscript{39} Mitchison, History of Scotland, 220 – 32
\textsuperscript{40} Canny, Making Ireland British, 202
practiced Anglicanism, mandatory. Those who refused could be fined or physically punished. This caused in a series of rebellions by the most powerful Irish Families between 1569 – 1607. These results all proved unsuccessful and the land these powerful families held was confiscated by the Crown and turned into more Plantations. The rebellions were destructive with some estimates of the dead Irish thought to have perhaps topped a million (mostly civilians) during the various uprisings\textsuperscript{41}. In 1607, many Lords of the defeated Tyrone’s rebellion left Ireland in the ‘Flight of the Lords’. James VI aggressively encouraged English and Scottish colonization of Ireland. Native Catholic Irish were often treated as second class citizens to Protestants, but despite this most native Irish never became Protestant as Protestantism was linked with English Imperialism on Irish soil\textsuperscript{42}.

\begin{center}
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{map.png}
\end{center}

\textit{Asarlai, English: A Map Highlighting the Areas Subjected to British Plantations in Ireland. June 17, 2009, Map}

\textsuperscript{41} Ibid, 354
\textsuperscript{42} Ibid, 523
Charles I

Anthony Van Dyck, *Charles I in Three Positions*, 36 1635, Oil on Canvas, 83.8 cm x 99.0 cm,

Charles I was the second son of King James I (VI). Born in 1600, he assumed the title of heir at the age of 12 after his elder brother passed away. Charles I’s sister later married

---

43 Father of Charles II
44 First King James of England and Ireland, but sixth King James of Scotland.
Frederick V of Palatine who became heavily involved in the Thirty-Year War against the Hapsburg Empire. Following this, King James wanted to marry his son to a Spanish princess to resolve peace between England and the Hapsburg Empire, a move that was heavily criticized by Parliament, who had come to see this war as Protestants against Catholic Hapsburg and wanted to support their Protestant brethren. In defiance of this, Charles I travelled incognito to Spain to meet the Spanish Infanta in 1623. The trip was a resounding failure as the requirements that the Spanish Monarchy put in any marriage proposal was unacceptable to the English, including the conversion of Charles I to Roman Catholicism. When Charles I returned to London, he pushed his reluctant father towards formally declaring war to regain public support. King James recalled Parliament to gain war subsidies. Charles I defied his father and supported Parliament’s impeachment of the Lord Treasurer, who opposed the war. This set a dangerous precedent for future impeachments. Charles I became King following his father’s death in 1625.

Following the failure of his match with Spain, Charles I turned to France marrying Henrietta Maria in 1625, delaying Parliament until the marriage was consummated to forestall Parliament’s attempt to stop the marriage. Charles I and Parliament both preferred to engage in cheaper state sponsored privateering acts to direct engagement with Hapsburg Spain, but as these failed Parliament began criticizing key advisors to Charles I. Charles I and Parliament

---

46 Hibbert, Charles I, 31
47 Princess
48 Hibbert, Charles I, 32-3
49 Ibid, 37
50 Ibid, 51
51 None more so than the First Duke of Buckingham, a close friend of Charles I
also clashed over funding as Parliament was increasingly displeased with actions from the
Monarchy and his advisors. Charles used a ‘Forced Loan\textsuperscript{52}’, to gain funds for the continuation of
the war, an action that greatly upset Parliament.

Ultimately, disagreements between King and Parliament caused an extended
prorogation\textsuperscript{53} of eleven years, referred sometimes to as the eleven years of Tyranny\textsuperscript{54}. During
this time, Charles I was strapped for funds as he was unable to tax without Parliament and his
attempts to do so were disregarded by the people and eventually, he was not given any more
loans by the city’s wealthy. Charles I ultimately seized the silver held in the Tower of London
that was to be used to create currency. He also seized the property of merchant ships; most
notably spices and peppers from the East India Company. He promised to pay for all property
he seized at a later date but without Parliament, he lacked the funds to do so\textsuperscript{55}. Charles I was
forced to call for both the Irish and English Parliaments in 1640 due to religious dissention in
Scotland that resulted in an invasion by Scottish Forces into northern England.

The Irish Parliament voted for both supply and troops. Unfortunately for Charles I, the
English Parliament was more unyielding. The House of Commons only agreed to provide funds
for Charles I if he supported the Triennial Act which forced Parliament to meet once every three
years, even if the Monarch did not want this to happen. The English Parliament also began to

\textsuperscript{52} A tax that was issued directly from the Crown without the approval of Parliament, which was illegal for English
Monarch’s to do following the Magna Carta

\textsuperscript{53} The King held the right to not call a meeting of the Parliament. However, as the House of Commons was the only
legal body that could tax the populace, King and Parliament had to work together to ensure the functionality of the
country

\textsuperscript{54} Hibbert, Charles I, 62 – 109,

\textsuperscript{55} Hibbert, Charles I, 84 – 88
impeach and imprison key advisors to Charles I, most famously Lord Strafford. Charles I allowed for the trial and execution of Lord Strafford, partially to gain funding and partially out of fear at the boisterousness of both Parliament and London. This execution led to a loss of control over Ireland, resulting in a rebellion against English rule in 1641. This along with the Scottish invasion leads Charles I in desperate need of more funds. But opposition to the Monarch is strong in the English parliament, and instead they begin planning to potentially target the Queen for impeachment due to claims that she was supporting the Catholic Irish Rebellion. Charles I under advice from his wife attempted to seize the 5 top MPs who oppose him accusing them of colluding with the Scottish invasion army. However, Charles I failed in his attempt. When Charles attempted to arrest the MPs he had entered the House of Commons with troops. The failure was politically disastrous and Charles I was forced to retreat from London and gather his forces, as did Parliament. Thus, began the First English Civil War, although Scottish involvement and Continental aid meant that this Civil War was much larger than simply England itself, even if much of the war occurred there.

56 Lord Strafford ruled Ireland in the name of the King. He had become the King’s right-hand man in 1637 and was recalled to London in 1639 to assist Charles I.
57 Hibbert, Charles I, 118
58 Canny, Making Ireland British, 443
59 As she is a French Catholic. France often supported Irish Catholics against Protestant England.
60 Which was probably accurate
61 Which has been the heart of opposition to Charles I
62 Tim Harris, Rebellion: Britain’s First Stuart Kings, 1567-1642, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. 387
In 1642, both sides began gathering strength while continuing to hold correspondence with hopes towards a peace agreement or settlement before the war even began. The King retreated from London to Hull but was denied access by Sir John Hothman, the governor of Hull who declared the city for Parliament. Charles II did not have the strength to siege the city and set his banner at Nottingham instead. In general, urban areas tended to favour Parliament while rural areas favoured the King. The Navy also supported Parliament. The gentry nobility,
especially those from the country, supported the King. Most merchants and middle-class urban people supported Parliament. Parliament, also known as Roundheads, often had better supplies in terms of weaponry due to their urban power centres while the Charles’ army, also known as Cavaliers, tended to have more aristocrats which led initially to superior commanders especially in cavalry. Prince Rupert\textsuperscript{63}, Charles I’s nephew, would prove to be a particularly adept cavalry general. 1642 had only one major battle, the Battle of Edgehill\textsuperscript{64}.

The battle initially began with skirmishes of cavalry where Rupert with 1,000 calvary men was able to quickly deal with the Roundhouse cavalry which opened up the way to London for the Cavaliers. Charles I decided to take this path rather than engage the enemy forces which then had to catch up and meet him at Edgehill. On the morning of October 23\textsuperscript{rd}, 1642, both sides lined up for war in the typical formations from thousands of years. The wings were often cavalry troops while the centre of the line consisted entirely of infantry. The battle began with Prince Rupert’s cavalry on the right wing defeating the Parliamentary cavalry and stopping the movement of the infantry on their left flank, although their lack of discipline showed itself here when many of Prince Rupert’s troops chased fleeing enemies and therefore did not have an impact on the battle. This ultimately allowed the Roundhouses to settle and apply more pressure onto the Cavalier lines. Parliament’s troops had better equipment and soon managed to force the right flank of Charles I’s infantry to buckle. The standard of the King was briefly lost before it was recaptured by Cavalier forces. By the time Prince Rupert and his troops returned,

\textsuperscript{63} Nephew to Charles I, Cousin to Charles II
\textsuperscript{64} Hibbert, Charles I, 162
both sides were exhausted with heavy losses and mutually backed away from each other. The first major engagement of the war ended in a draw\textsuperscript{65}.

1643 proved to be the kindest year for Royalist forces. It started off poorly as one of the Parliamentary armies captured Reading, a stronghold for the Royalists that was near Oxford. However, Essex, the commander of the Parliamentary army, was now forced to keep his army there partially for want of supply and partially to keep the prize. The Royalists soon responded by defeating the Parliamentary army in the west and cementing control of Cornwall and advancing into south west England. This opened up all of western England, and later that year a Royalist force led by Prince Rupert captured the Parliamentary stronghold of Bristol. This was a major victory for the Royalist side and brought the majority of west England under control of Charles I. In the north, the Royalist armies had defeated Roundhouse forces and laid siege to the Parliamentary stronghold in Hull but were unable to capture it\textsuperscript{66}.

It was here that Charles I made one of the two major mistakes of 1643. He decided that the next course of action for the western Royalist forces was to capture the final great Roundhouse fortress in the west, Gloucester. Parliament was facing a shortage on manpower and was forced to call upon the people of London to help make up the ranks (while also engaging in press ganging\textsuperscript{67}). These completely untrained troops marched with General Essex to relieve the fortress. After a series of maneuvers, the two armies met at the first battle of Newbury when the Royalist forces blocked the road to escape forcing Essex to break the

\textsuperscript{65} Hibbert, Charles I, 165
\textsuperscript{67} Press ganging was a standard practice of forcing men to join the military to fill out the numbers. These men often had low morale and were unskilled until they had had proper training which often never took place
Royalist line. Essex was unable to do so but did greatly damage the Royalist forces. The London troops even managed a near impossible feat, they held their ground to Prince Rupert’s cavalry which were arguably the best cavalry troop currently in the Three Kingdoms. While the Roundhouses were unable to break through the Cavalier line, the horrific losses convinced the Cavaliers not to block the path the next day and Essex retreated to Reading. The Cavaliers would follow them and reconquer Reading, one of the last major successes for the Royalist camp.

Charles I’s second mistake was the peace agreement with Catholic Ireland. Since 1641, Ireland had revolted against the King’s rule. Some of Charles I’s forces were tied up in Ireland and this peace agreement freed them for use in England. The issue with this was that it completely united their enemies. Parliament’s large peace party suddenly evaporated and fears that Charles I was becoming overly familiar with Catholics started to ring true. Catholic aid also started coming from the continent through his wife, Queen Henrietta. These actions convinced the remaining neutral forces in England to join Parliament’s side. More damningly, it convinced the Scots to enter the war on the side of Parliament. It was only ten days after that the Scottish Covenanters allied with Parliament in Westminster, in an agreement known as the Solemn League and Covenant. From here onwards, the war would swing toward Parliament’s side.

1644 marked the third year of war. Both sides at this point were very weary and desertion became an increasingly difficult problem for both, especially for Parliament. Armies

---

68 Hibbert, Charles I, 163  
69 Royle, Civil War, 283  
70 Hibbert, Charles I, 176
throughout England had not been given money for some time which also lowered the morale of both. Scotland’s entry to the war had greatly damaged the King’s prospects in the North, as the Scottish moved south. Prince Rupert, Charles I’s most competent and daring commander, was sent to relieve the situation. The Prince was able to relieve some of the tension but was unable to completely stop the advance of Parliament’s armies north. They joined with the Scottish and outnumbered the King’s armies substantially, who retreated to York and gave the enemy most of the north. This was a horrific blow to Charles I.\textsuperscript{71}

In the west, Parliament dealt with mutinies that prevented them from offering stern resistance to the Cavalier side. When troops under Essex did march west, they were thoroughly defeated by the newly minted professional Royalist Foot army in the west at the battle of Lostwithiel. Prince Rupert was able to harry Parliaments eastern forces and prevent them from effectively joining any location. In the centre, Parliament combined several armies to force an engagement with Charles I who was severely outnumbered at the Second Battle of Newbury. The Royalist army drew up a defensive battle line and were attacked repeatedly but Parliament’s army was unable to act in unison due to the different tactics of the three generals in the field. By nightfall, Royalists were able to slip past Parliament’s army although they were forced to leave their heavy guns. This was deemed a successful victory for Parliament but in truth was most likely one for Charles I who was able to escape a very difficult situation with his army intact to join Prince Rupert.\textsuperscript{72}
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The only advantage to Charles I was the ill-discipline of Parliamentary forces. Parliament had continued to gain forces as they introduced more untrained urban men, notably from London, into their armies. This had the advantage of giving Parliament more armies in the field than the Royalists, and those armies were often better armed than the Royalists. London and the other key urban centres were the financial centres of England and Parliament controlled most of them. This meant that while Charles I was struggling for both men and money, Parliament didn’t struggle as much for either. Though despite this, Parliament’s forces were owed backpay and this made them dangerous. While Parliament was successful in the north and applied pressure through the midlands, they were entirely unsuccessful in the west where their armies deserted at horrifically high rates.

Ultimately, Parliament realized that something had to be done or that Charles I may begin to win the war. More importantly, in July one of the militia armies attempted to murder their general rather than continue the war effort. This absolutely terrified Parliament who ordered new professional protection troops for all generals from their own units, this also encouraged Parliament to look into creating a professional force to compete with the newly professional armies of the Royalist foot following the campaigns of 164473.

Parliament passed the New Model Ordinance which disbanded all non-professional armies from the field. Parliament turned to Sir Thomas Fairfax and Oliver Cromwell to reorganize Parliament’s war efforts in 1645. Cromwell had already successful changed Parliaments’ horsemen into the famed Ironsides who were able to take on and defeat many of
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the Cavalier horse units. Now, they attempted to remake the army by taking elements of the various armies but mostly bringing in new recruits from urban centres. This army was led almost entirely by religiously Independent\textsuperscript{74} officers who had been fighting for the past three years. Discipline was particularly brutal and the army was drilled mercilessly throughout the winter. It was named, the New Model Army. Royalists first dismissed this army but it was soon to show just how effective it had become\textsuperscript{75}.

In 1645, Charles I sent his son Charles II to the west with Edward Hyde as his chief advisor, partially to bring royal authority and quell the infighting among generals there, partially to protect Charles II. Charles I also finally assented to the urgings of Montrose, his largest Scottish ally, to allow Montrose to equip an army in Scotland for the King furnished through Monarchical funds and primarily made up of those not Covenants. This created an enemy for Scottish Covenants and resulted in a large number of Scottish troops in northern England to return home. This assent by Charles I had been given too late as months before, Newcastle had fallen to Parliamentary hands and the entirety of the north had been lost\textsuperscript{76}.

Charles I with Prince Rupert took his army at Oxford and marched north to reestablish Royalist presence in the north. Cromwell prevented this march by destroying Charles scout and employing a scorched horse policy that ultimately meant that the supplies and guns from Prince Rupert’s army could not move north for the lack of horses needed to transport cannons and supplies. Instead the Royalists stayed in the midlands, conquering Leicester. It was here in the

\textsuperscript{74} Religiously independent, also known as non-conformists as they didn’t believe in any highly organized religion
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midlands that Charles I came face to face with the New Model Army. Due to the insubordination of the generals of the western army, he was forced to face Fairfax by himself. The western army was now mostly under the control of Goring who above all else feared losing control of the army had had fought so hard for\textsuperscript{77}.

Charles I came face to face with the New Model Army on June 14\textsuperscript{th} at Nasebay. He was greatly outnumbered due to fresh troops brought by Oliver Cromwell to the Parliamentary side. The New Model Army was to show its professionalism and its fighting abilities in this heavily advantaged environment. This was the first professional vs professional battle in England at the time, as Charles I had taken the majority of the professional western army in 1644. The Royalist army under Goring was ill-trained and ill-disciplined, part of Goring’s excuse not to join Charles. With overwhelming odds, Fairfax charged the Royalist army that was swamped by sheer numbers. Charles and Prince Rupert managed to escape with a small number of horsemen. The famed Royalist Foot army stood their ground but eventually were defeated as they were killed or captured to the man. Not one escaped. This was the deathblow to the Royalist cause. It was here that Prince Rupert, who had been considering peace as the only option since early 1644, openly argued for it forming the large peace faction of the Royalist army. Many Lords who had served the Royalist cause would now march to Westminster to place fealty to Parliament\textsuperscript{78}.

Fairfax found correspondence between King Charles and Catholic leaders on the continent. This killed the new peace talks that had been ongoing throughout 1645 as Parliament once again took a hard line to Charles I’s attempts to bring in Catholic help. The New
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Model Army marched into western England to deal with Goring’s army. Goring’s forces had been besieging Taunton which he had attempted to capture in 1644 with a smaller army but had been repulsed by Cromwell and his Ironsides. Now the march of the New Model Army forced Goring back to a more defensible position. Goring now came up with a daring plan, he left his infantry and cannons at Langport while he secretly marched with his horse to Taunton. The castle was now very lightly defended as Fairfax had taken the units to fight Goring and Goring believed that if he captured it, he would be able to crush Fairfax’s forces from both sides. Unfortunately for Goring, Fairfax heard of this plan and set out his own horsemen to attack Goring. The Roundheads routed the Cavalier horsemen, injuring Goring himself who retreated. Bereft of horsemen, the army at Langport was defeated by a frontal charge of Fairfax’s infantry along with an attack in the rear by Cromwell with the remainder of Parliament’s cavalry. Goring’s army, without their commander, marched to Bridgewater where it resolutely held out for almost two weeks before it too capitulated. 

The war was almost over. Fairfax moved the uber successful New Model Army to siege Bristol, which was under the command of great Cavalier general Prince Rupert. He saw that the position was entirely hopeless and surrendered the castle to Fairfax in return for safe passage. The only true army still fighting for Charles I was now in Scotland under Montrose. Charles I stripped Rupert of his generalship for surrendering Bristol. Rupert along with most of Charles I’s remaining generals left the Royalist camp and negotiated with Parliament for the right to leave for the continent. Charles I now had no armies in England, and the few forces he could raise did
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not stand a chance against the New Model Army. The New Model Army spent the rest of the year sieging and decimating Royalist strongholds throughout England. The following year, Charles would march north from Oxford to Newark and surrender to the Scottish on May 5th.

Second Civil War

There were now three key forces in Scotland and England. The first was Parliament which was legally in control of England. The second was the New Model Army which had proven their skill in battle the previous year. The third were the Scottish Covenants who held the King in 1646. In January 1647, Scotland agreed to give Charles I to Parliament in exchange for funds and future funding along with greater Scottish independence. Parliament now held
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Charles I although their relationship with the New Model Army was strained. Parliament began offering terms for the reintroduction of the King. The proposal was known as the Newcastle propositions\textsuperscript{81}. These included: The King was to sign the Covenant and declare Presbyterianism the religion of England abolishing episcopacy as had occurred in Scotland; leading judges and the King’s advisors would be chosen by Parliament; the army and navy were to be controlled by Parliament for twenty years before reverting to the crown; a number of Royalists were to not be given pardons and tried for war crimes; Parliament was to be given control of the army and to recommence the war in Ireland and strict laws against Catholics were to be enforced\textsuperscript{82}. Charles outright refused to change the religion to Presbyterianism indefinitely or to try any Royalists but was willing to listen to other details, although he told the Marquis of Ormond, his leader of his Protestant Irish forces, to ignore any declarations he made while in captivity\textsuperscript{83}. The New Model Army was horrified with these propositions\textsuperscript{84}.

Since 1646, Parliament had been in fear of the rise of the Puritanical New Model Army. The Army in turn was disgusted with some of the proposals of the Presbyterian Parliament. They believed that great social changes needed to be made or else what had they fought for, while Parliament more conservatively supported limited changes to the current system. In June of 1646, the Army captured the King from Parliament. Parliament and Army were on a collision course for supremacy. Charles I briefly managed to escape the following year and contact
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Scotland. He made a deal with the Scots to invade England in return for the establishment of a Royally approved Presbyterian central Church throughout England for three years, this was called the Engagement. During this time, Parliament was attempting to raise new forces that were loyal to them rather than loyal to the New Model Army. They also ordered the disbandment of the New Model Army without paying the arrears that were owed to them.

In retaliation, the New Model Army formed the General Council of the Army and issued the ‘Solemne Engagement’ under General Fairfax. The document asserted that they would not disband until negotiations between them and Parliament occurred. The New Model Army wanted the money that was owed to them. They also demanded blanked immunity for all crimes committed during the Civil War. They also wanted a greater say in any agreement between Parliament and the King, demanding greater democratic reforms. Later that year, two factions in the army began to reveal themselves.

The first was heavily tied to the Leveller movement, a movement that believed in near universal male suffrage, an end to debt prisons, biennial elections in Parliament, and religious freedom and toleration. This faction issued the ‘Agreement of the People’ which showed all their demands. Fairfax was horrified by this extremist response and sought the culprits within the army to soften their tone. This was not the case, as in 1649 the final version was published. It demanded: The right for all men over 21 to vote (except for servants beggars and Royalists);
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annual elections to Parliament with MPs only serving one term; equality of all people before the law where trials had to have 12 jury men of the community and no trial could last longer than six months and the death penalty only applied in murder cases; Landed titles were to be abolished and parishioners chose their ministers; taxation in proportion to personal property and finally the abolition of military conscription, monopolies and excise taxes.

The second faction was the more conservative officers, supported by Fairfax. They issued the ‘Heads of Proposals’ which was much less extreme. They asked for: reduced power of bishops; an act to repeal the mandatory church meetings, to repeal the use of the Common Prayer book, and to repeal the forbidding of holding non sanctioned religious meetings; they also demanded biennial elections for Parliament; termination of the sitting Parliament with reorganization of Parliamentary constituencies; necessity of Parliament to make war or peace and no Royalists to hold office for the next five years. This was criticized by some in the army as being far too lenient as it doesn’t hold with the destruction of title or the introduction of universal suffrage, but it was supported by Cromwell, Fairfax and the rest of the New Model Army generals.

The spark for a second war began in February 1648. Colonel John Poyer had been placed in command of Pembroke Castle by Parliament, in February he refused to hand control of the castle to one of Fairfax’s officers. In March, he openly declared for the King and was
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joined by hundreds of soldiers and officers throughout England and Ireland. Carlisle and Berwick were soon taken by Royalist forces. Soon all of southern Wales revolted against the New Model Army. Scottish Covenants invaded England, agreed upon by Charles I and Scotland a year prior. Charles I was attempting to build a coalition of Presbyterians, Royalists and Scots to retake power. Charles I was also supported by Ireland. He had made an agreement with Catholic Ireland which placed their forces in the Marquis of Ormond’s hand. Ormond now had an army of Irish Catholics and Protestants, although he would stay in Ireland. A big blow to the New Model Army was the declaration of the Navy to support Charles I.

Seeing the danger, Fairfax sent Cromwell to Wales to put down the bulk of Presbyterian revolts. Before Cromwell even arrived, the New Model Army detachment in Wales had managed to put down the revolts at the battle of St Fagans. This battle marked the end of Presbyterian involvement who were unwilling to work with English Royalists, Scots and Irish and soon melted away. Most Royalists also did not take part in the war as they had sworn to Parliament to not take up arms and abided by their word. Thus, the major forces that supported the King in the war were the Navy and the Scots. The Navy set sail for the Netherlands after a few brief military engagements. They were to rendezvous with Charles II and further help the war effort. Unfortunately, by the time they arrived in the Netherlands and were ready to set sail back for England, the war had already been decided. Dejected, the Navy set sail without Charles II or any plan of an invasion.
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The Scottish invasion began quite successfully. Without major opposition, they were able to march through most of north England, while receiving reinforcements from some local Royalist forces plus detachments of troops from Ulster in Ireland. The New Model Army leader, general Lambert, brilliantly managed to harry and harass the Scottish troops so that they were unable to effectively lay siege to any great cities (like York). Cromwell soon marched from Wales to northern England with a large detachment of the New Model Army. The Scots and the New Model Army met at Preston for the first and only major engagement of the Second Civil War. The Scottish army was the not the veteran army that had fought in the First Civil War as the Kirk had not agreed to the agreement with Charles I and that army decided to abstain from the invasion. The invasion was led by the Duke of Hamilton and consisted mainly of raw recruits who were unable to stand to the trained professionalism of the New Model Army. The New Model Army was outnumbered 8,500 to 11,000 but managed to split the Scottish forces by attacking the vanguard before the Scots had even prepared for the battle. The New Model Army crushed the 3,000 infantry and 500 horse vanguard which caused the rest of the army to flee. The New Model Army was thought to have captured up to 9,000 troops after killing 2,000. This marked the end of the Second Civil War\textsuperscript{94}.

The question became what to do with Charles I. Parliament wanted to negotiate with Charles I, reinstating him in return for increased power to Parliament. The New Model Army preferred a trial of Charles I for crimes against England. Ultimately, the decision would determine who was the preeminent power in England.
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What to do with Charles I was the great question on all minds as the Second Civil War came to a close. Parliament continued to want to negotiate with Charles I while the Army wanted to put Charles I on trial, blaming him for the continuance of the Civil War and Scottish the invasion. In September, 1648, Parliament began negotiations with Charles I. This was known as the Treaty of Newport. Radicals elements within the army demanded that the negotiations should be abandoned and the King should be brought to justice for the Second Civil War. These factions brought first suggested that Parliament should be purged until it was more willing to
listen to the suggestions of the army. However, conservative members of leadership like Fairfax and Cromwell disagreed with this more extreme action. However, under pressure from radicals and with the urgings of Cromwell and some of the other generals, Fairfax decided to call a meeting of the General Council of the Army, although he excluded the representatives of the common army.

These meetings took place in November where radical officers came to discuss the grievances of the men. A few days into the meeting, Fairfax was shown a draft of the Army Remonstrance. The Army Remonstrance proclaimed the sovereignty of the people under a representative government. It argued that the King must answer for his crimes against the people, declaring the New Model Army the protector of the people. It called for the current Parliament to dissolve itself and have new elections held, with elections then being held every or every other year with a reformed electorate that was more representative of the people. It even suggested the possibility of an elective monarchy and that all Monarchs and Nobility were to subscribe to the ‘Agreement of the People’ that had so horrified Fairfax in the past.

Unsurprisingly he and the other more conservative Army generals rejected the motion entirely.

This rejection would change a few days later. Word came that Parliament was planning on returning the King to London. Parliament held a vote on whether or not to hold a vote on the motion of bringing back the King. This scared the Army as the terms that the King had proposed were even less radical than the initial Parliamentary proposal back in 1647. To unify
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the army, Fairfax and the other conservative officers agreed to the Army Remonstrance. On November 15th the Army sent their manifesto to Parliament which voted to refuse to debate upon it until after negotiations with the King had finished. In response, Fairfax sent divisions of the more radical elements of the Army close to London. On December 5th, after much debate, Parliament seemed poised to accept the King’s alterations with a slight majority although a plurality voted to abstain (roughly 250 voted to abstain, 129 voted yes and 83 voted no98). In response members of the Army commenced with a purge, called Pride’s Purge under the name of the Colonel whose regiment carried out the purge. It’s thought that Fairfax was not involved in the purge but that Cromwell was at least knowledgeable of its existence beforehand if not actively involved in some of the planning99.

On December 6th, Pride’s regiment guarded the entrance to the House of Commons. Members of Parliament were forced to pass between the regiment and their names were checked on a list provided by MPs sympathetic to the New Model Army. The Army kept watch for 6 days and in that time arrested 45 MPs, more than half of whom were released in less than two weeks. Only 80 members were let into the to parliament building, although the final Rump Parliament consisted of about 200 people. Some were simple banned entrance and others refused to join a Parliament so evidently under control of the Army. The banned members of Parliament did not return until 1659 when Monck invited the full Parliament back.

This reduced Parliament was called the Rump Parliament. This Parliament supported the Army and stopped negotiating with Charles I. Instead, they began to draw articles to try Charles
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I for crimes against the people. This trial would begin on January 20th but it was opposed by the House of Lords. The House of Commons voted to ignore the actions of the House of Lords and continue with the trial. The trial was held at Westminster Hall where Charles I refused to enter a plea as he believed that as a Monarch, they, the Court that was appointed, had no right to try a Monarch. Despite its widespread lack of popularity, the trial commenced and the verdict was deemed guilty. On January 27th, King Charles I of England, Ireland and Scotland was executed.

Fairfax would retire from the New Model Army soon after the execution of Charles I, an action evidence suggests that he did not support. From here on out the Three Kingdoms was under control of the Rump Parliament. The Rump Parliament were the members of Parliament who had supported or had come to support the New Model Army and thus survived Pride’s Purge. This parliament consisted of two groups, the back-benchers and benchers, a term also used during Charles II’s reign. Benchers were those who actively participated, they were often lawyers, merchants and other upper-class professions. The back-benchers were often from the country and often did show up. As such the actions and focus of the legal actions of the Rump Parliament were on topics important to the upper middle class. They involved trade, colonial ventures and domestic legal codes.

While the Rump Parliament continued to rule, the bulk of the New Model Army under Oliver Cromwell were dealing with the Irish Rebellion. The Irish rebellion had begun in 1641. Charles I had struck an agreement with the Irish to join his coalition in 1648 though most troops did not leave Ireland. The New Model Army launched an invasion of the island. This also gave
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Cromwell the ability to deal with the most radical officers and troops in the New Model Army. These troops did not want to leave for Ireland and when ordered to they disobeyed rebelled. These troops were put down viciously by Cromwell and his more conservative allies. This ended the more extreme elements in the New Model Army and completely ended Leveller involvement in the New Model Army. Cromwell now sailed to Ireland where he began the defeating the Marquis of Ormond’s coalition of Protestant Royalist forces and Catholic forces that Charles I had allied with before his execution102.

In 1651, Charles II invaded England with a Scottish Army. This time, he had the veterans that participated in the First Civil War, a hardened Covenant army. Cromwell left Ireland and travelled to Northern England to defeat this Scottish Army. He began an invasion of southern Scotland before Charles II could march. Charles ultimately bypassed these engagements and marched south into England, collecting Royalist support while he did so. Cromwell left Scotland with a few divisions of the New Model Army under general Monck taking the rest of the army south. Charles II stopped at Worcester and this was where Cromwell’s forces caught his. Charles’ army had been purged by religious elements in Scotland and was no longer as effective as the Scottish army had been during the First Civil War. Against this, Cromwell had best troops in the New Model Army. The result was slaughter, while Charles II escaped many nobles both Royalist and Scottish were captured and imprisoned103.

Ireland would continue to stay in rebellion until 1652 when at last Irish forces were defeated by the New Model Army with much destruction and devastation brought to Ireland.
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Cromwell stayed in England and began taking an increasingly active role in governance of the Three Kingdoms. The Rump Parliament was called to dissolve itself by the Army so fresh elections could take place. When the Rump failed to do so, Cromwell forcefully dissolved it. He entered the chambers of the House of Commons and harangued the MPs for their lack of duty toward their constituents, declaring them no Parliament at all. He called for army units to come through the door and they escorted the Rump Parliament from the House of Commons. They would not be recalled until 1659\textsuperscript{104}.

**Military Dictatorship**

For a brief time, a new Parliament was called. With no plan as to how to call a new Parliament, Cromwell and his top generals came together to think of a solution. Eventually it was agreed that it would be religious Puritans who would guide the Three Kingdoms as they were the most holy of men and therefore the best to make decisions. These men were selected by Cromwell and his allies and they ranged from all over the Three Kingdoms. These men joined together in a Parliament that was known as the Parliament of Saints formed in June 1653, at Westminster. They were ridiculed by most, being named the Little Parliament or the Barebones Parliament. This Parliament soon fell to infighting and Cromwell would dissolve it in a few short months. Instead, he himself would rule as Lord Protector through the Council of State, an advisory military committee originally set up by the Rump Parliament years earlier. He accepted the role of Lord Protector and began the rule of the Major Generals\textsuperscript{105}.
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The reign of the Major Generals began in 1655 as England was divided into ten regions, each region was ruled by a Major General. Oliver Cromwell was declared the Lord Protector. Scotland and Ireland were ruled by military generals bringing the total number of Major Generals to 12, although in truth two of the Major Generals, Fleetwood and Lambert, served on the Council of State and thus their rule was often carried out by deputies. Cromwell ruled as with the powers of the King, advised by the Council of State. This was the executive branch of government. The legislative branch was the First and Second Protectorate Parliaments. Both were quickly dissolved as they did not acquiesce to the Rule of the Major Generals, though the second Protectorate Parliament offered the Crown to Cromwell in 1657. He rejected the physical crown but accepted the right to name his successor. He named his son, Richard Cromwell. The following year, Oliver Cromwell died\textsuperscript{106}.

This military rule was very unpopular with the populace, who resented the high taxes needed to continue the upkeep of the New Model Army\textsuperscript{107}. The high taxes and lack of true representation made many angry with the government. The unpopularity of the New Model Army made taxes difficult to collect as ordinary citizens didn’t cooperate with soldiers who were gathering taxes. Taxes that were collected went into the First Anglo Dutch War and then to pay for the upkeep of all the soldiers that it required to keep the population subdued. This meant that the soldiers themselves were often not fully payed for their services. This rule was also extremely unpopular because of its religious zeal. Cromwell and most of the Major Generals were Puritans who deemed it necessary to remoralize England, Ireland and Scotland.
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through the banning of entertainment and holidays\textsuperscript{108} while encouraging morality above all else\textsuperscript{109}. They would arrest citizens for drunkenness, lewd behavior and other unchristian actions. This led to a grand dislike of the Major General System and for the New Model Army in general. This reign would become untenable when Oliver Cromwell died and his son succeeded him\textsuperscript{110}.

\textbf{After Oliver Cromwell}

Richard Cromwell was named Lord Protector but did not have the support of the military that his father had. Furthermore, the extreme dislike of military rule made it very difficult for the Major General system to continue governing. Without Oliver Cromwell, the New Model Army lost its unifying force and began to splinter. Most supported continuing the Major General system under a different Lord Protector, but some preferred a return to the Rump Parliament\textsuperscript{111}. The New Model Army soon removed Richard Cromwell from power. Under pressure from the people, Charles Fleetwood\textsuperscript{112} reestablished the Rump Parliament. However, when the Parliament began attacking the New Model Army, Fleetwood expelled the Rump and resumed control through the Committee of Safety along with other English Major Generals\textsuperscript{113}.

There was absolutely no support for this new government. Presbyterians had long been pushed to the side through military rule and were unhappy. Even those who had been extreme
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enough to be included in the Rump Parliament sided with their moderate Parliamentary allies. The lower rungs of the army were owed several years in arrears which the new committee were unable to repay\(^{114}\). The Committee of Safety was unable to tax the populace due to their unpopularity and the prevailing thought amongst the populace that this was an illegal unpopular government. The Major Generals in England were thus unable to effectively rule the Three Kingdoms\(^{115}\).

The most powerful man in the Three Kingdoms had become General Monck\(^{116}\), Major General of Scotland. Unlike his peers, Monck had a strong working relationship with Scottish Gentry\(^{117}\). Monck was not of the puritan ilk that most other Major Generals were and was therefore able Following the defeat of Charles II\(^{118}\) in 1651, Monck led forces to reconquer Scotland, which was quite easily accomplished. Besides pockets of the Highlands and south east Scotland, most of the country did not oppose the military rule. Unlike many of his colleagues, Monck worked with Scottish nobles while ruling. By doing so, Monck was able to gain a reliable stream of revenue through legal means in the Scottish Parliament. Unlike most of the New Model Army, his soldiers were not owed as much back pay and continued to support him following the death of Oliver Cromwell\(^{119}\).
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Monck waited as events unfolded following the death of Lord Protector Cromwell. When Fleetwood and his supporters expunged Parliament, Monck moved into action. He and his troops moved from Scotland south, declaring the military rule of Fleetwood as illegitimate\textsuperscript{120}. Fleetwood sent an army to meet him under general Lambert\textsuperscript{121}, however desertion in the army was high. Desertion rates soared after Thomas Fairfax, the old Supreme General of the New Model Army, endorsed Monck with the ability to find the most acceptable way to govern. Thomas Fairfax, although retired was still deemed a living legend and revered by many in the New Model Army. In fact, as he had retired his legend grew as he was not deemed responsible for much of the damage the Army had done once Cromwell took over. Within the Army itself, he was still beloved by the conservative officers who at this stage were simply calling an end to war and rule and a need to collect their pay. Fairfax’s endorsement marked the end of rule by the New Model Army. There was no battle between Monck’s army and Lambert’s forces and Monck was able to march into the city of London unopposed, throwing his old colleagues into the Tower of London and reestablishing the Rump Parliament\textsuperscript{122}. After the Rump Parliament attempted to take control of his army\textsuperscript{123}, Monck reintroduced the moderate Presbyterians who had been purged more than a decade earlier by the New Model Army in Pride’s Purge.

Monck was the authority in the Three Kingdoms. He had kept control of Scotland and now had effective control of England as well. He had allied himself with the Major General in
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Ireland against the English Major Generals and thus had control of Ireland too. Monck was not only a strong military leader; he was also a consummate politician. Initially, he had been a Royalist in the English Civil War but had switched to the Parliamentary side as the Royalist cause began to falter\textsuperscript{124}. He gained the trust of Oliver Cromwell for his military prowess but was never as tied to the religious extremism that many others in the New Model Army were\textsuperscript{125}.

Monck could see that the time for military dictatorships was over, the vast majority of people hated the New Model Army and the high taxes it demanded. Monck could also see that this truncated Parliament was also disliked by many as it was seen as a vassal of the New Model Army, even with the purged Presbyterians remerging in Parliament\textsuperscript{126}. Monck began to see Charles II as a way to unite the Kingdoms once again and began secret negotiations with him for his return\textsuperscript{127}. Following the declaration of Breda, Charles was invited to return to England and reestablish the Monarchy. Charles himself had lived an exceptionally wild life in comparison to most Monarchs that shaped his personality and gave him a unique viewpoint as a ruler\textsuperscript{128}.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[124] Reese, Life of General George Monck, 45
\item[125] In fact, Monck repeatedly purged religious extremists from his army in Scotland, which was partially the reason he maintained such authority over them.
\item[126] Ibid, 191
\item[127] Charles II had been attempting to negotiate with Monck since 1655, but only began an active correspondence in 1659
\item[128] Hutton, Charles II, 83
\end{footnotes}
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The Life of Charles II

Early Life

William Dobson, Charles II, 1630 - 1685. King of Scots 1649 - 1685. King of England and Ireland 1660 - 1685 (When Prince of Wales), 1642, Oil on Canvas, 153.6 x 129.8 cm,
Charles was born Prince of Wales and heir to the throne. Charles was not interested in book learning, he never learned either Latin or Greek and only learned French and Italian when in exile. Instead Charles preferred learning from experience and was very active, especially socially. He was quite the womanizer and had many mistresses, unlike his father. Charles I and II shared little in common except for a love of art. A dislike for book learning did not mean that Charles was uninterested in learning. On the contrary, Charles was fascinated with the sciences such as anatomy, chemistry and especially mechanical mathematics and shipbuilding/navigation.129

Charles would establish the Royal Society and actively participate in experimentation while also nurturing a scientific tradition that gave the world Isaac Newton, Charles Darwin, Francis Crick and James Watson and would train many other famous scientists. However, it was Charles II’s other fascination, shipbuilding and navigation, that had the greater impact on history. Charles christened the East India trading company, took control of the first British Colony in Africa (Tangier) and India (Bombay – present day Mumbai) and encouraged the expansion of British colonialism both in the Americas and elsewhere. Charles was arguably the pioneer of British Imperialism. Charles while not outwardly religious, but he “showed a knowledge of the Bible which found some surprised and proved and astute and severe critic of court preaching. On the other hand, he had little time for formal worship and his attitude toward the clergy was ambivalent.” Unlike his father, Charles was not a zealous believer, he

129 Miller, Charles II, 3
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committed what he believed to be relatively harmless sins. He once wrote to his sister “I am one of those bigots who think that malice was a much greater sin than a poor frailty of nature.” He spent his “early years in a large, loving family in a court insulated from the harsh realities of life outside.” This would all change.

At the tender age of twelve Charles saw his birthright split into opposing armies, King and Parliament, fighting for the supremacy of the state. Charles participated in the war in a tangential nature, as he was considered too young to really take part in the active fighting. Charles II, with his brother James, travelled with the army and grew to understand the nature of military campaigns. He also met and came to admire his cousin Rupert. James was fascinated by the entirety of military operations. He would grow up to be a fine military commander, both on land and at sea. By the age of fifteen “the king [Charles I] sent him [Charles II] to command his armies in the west.” Charles proved surprisingly capable but was too young to be taken seriously. In 1646, Charles I ordered his son to escape from England and join his mother in France. On March 2nd of the same year, Charles sailed for France via Jersey one of the few remaining Royalist strongholds.

---
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Now on the continent, Charles travelled between France and the Low Lands (modern day Belgium/Netherlands) plotting his next move. The First English Civil War had ended in 1646 and King Charles I was now a prisoner to Parliament, but he refused to make the concessions which Parliament demanded. There was a growing rift between more moderate Presbyterians who controlled parliament and extreme Puritans sects heavily represented in the officer corps of The New Model Army. The New Model Army pushed for a harsher punishment for the deposed king. During this time, Charles was desolate as his options dwindled\textsuperscript{135}. Charles’

\textsuperscript{135} Geyl, Pieter. \textit{Orange and Stuart}, London, 1969. 44-5, 66-7, 74
mother (Henriette Marie, sister to King Louis and aunt to Louis XIV) suggested that he marry Anne Marie Louise d'Orléans, his extremely wealthy cousin. Many viewed this as a good match,

“the queen regent [France] and her father urged Anne Marie now to consent to the proposal. They told her that Charles’s prospects were brightening ... [that] he had already acquired several allies – that there were whole provinces in England that were in his favor; and that all Ireland, which was, as it were, a kingdom itself, was on its side\textsuperscript{136}”

However, Anne Marie didn’t desire a match to a pauper with no real power who would squander her fortune trying to regain his birthright. Unable to simply reject the marriage and offend the Queen Regent, her own father, and Charles II, she stated that she would only marry Charles if he converted to Catholicism. Aware that Charles would never acquiesce, Anne Marie was able to reject a marriage she wanted no part of without insulting the honour of any involved. Charles saw through the ploy and grew to dislike his cousin despite repeated attempts of wooing her between 1646 and 1651\textsuperscript{137}.

In 1648 the Second English Civil War started as widespread resentment at Parliament and army burst out in a series of revolts encouraged discreetly by Charles I while he was imprisoned. This attempted revolution was joined by an invading Scottish army sent to liberate Charles I from his Army overseers, also orchestrated by the imprisoned King. Large portions of the navy revolted against the New Model Army and sailed for the Dutch Republic. Charles

\textsuperscript{136} Abbot, Charles II, 56
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having learned of this news rushed to the Dutch Republic to lead it against his father’s enemies. Unfortunately, by the time Charles was ready to set sail news broke of Cromwell’s victory over the Scots at Preston. Many Presbyterians in English Parliament were unwilling to put the King on trial, they argued that they lacked the authority to judge a man chosen by God. The New Model Army, thus engaged in a political coup known as Pride’s Purge where “on 6-7 of December 231 MP’s were refused entry into Parliament ... 45 were imprisoned.” The ensuing Parliament was no longer known as the Long Parliament, it was now known as the Rump Parliament. Less than two months later, after a trial, the Rump Parliament agreed to execute King Charles I in front of the Banqueting House on the 30th January 1649.

Sir James Balfour, *Scottish Crowning of Charles II*, 1651, Gold Crowning Medal, 31.5 mm.

---

A Failed Return

With the death of his Father, Charles became King; even if he was unrecognized in his own territories. Gaining control of his Kingdoms were a different matter entirely. England, Ireland and Scotland were now under control of the New Model Army and the Rump Parliament. England was especially subjugated and there was no hope of inciting rebellion in the most populous kingdom of his domain. Instead there were two other options before him. Either Charles could follow the path his father had and join the Royalist Catholic cause in Ireland, making religious toleration concessions in hopes that he could retake his kingdom, or he could join the Covenant cause in Scotland and make the concessions his father had refused to in hopes of defeating the New Model Army and retaking his birthright.\textsuperscript{140}

Both options had their supporters, his closest advisor and soon to be Lord Chancellor Edward Hyde pushed for Charles to join the Irish led by Hyde’s longtime political ally the Marquis of Ormond.\textsuperscript{141} A strict Anglican, Hyde argued that granting religious toleration to Catholics would be less harmful than the endorsement of the Covenant that the Scots were certain to demand should Charles join them. His mother and brother in law (William II Stadholder of the Dutch Republic) urged Charles to join the Scottish. In the eyes of the Dutch, Calvinist Scots were more agreeable than Catholic Irish. The Queen who hated Hyde and had no affection for the Church of England, urged Charles to come to terms with the Scots. In the end, Charles would travel to Scotland and rally the Scots and agreeing to nearly all their conditions.

\textsuperscript{140} Miller, Charles II, 9
\textsuperscript{141} Ibid, 9
despite Hyde’s warning that if did so it would be difficult to rally the Anglican majority in England. Hyde’s warning would prove prophetic.

Charles did not find Scotland to his liking. The Scots proved to be very difficult negotiators, originally demanding that Presbyterianism become the main religion in all three Kingdoms. Charles “refused to promise to change the religion of England and Ireland without the approval of their Parliaments, but he accepted the Covenanters’ demands as far as Scotland was concerned\textsuperscript{142} even agreeing to “encourage his family to subscribe to the Covenant, the founding document of Scots Presbyterianism\textsuperscript{143},” which horrified both his mother and Hyde.

Relations between the Scots and Charles only got worse when Charles got to Scotland as they did their best to force Charles to impose the Covenant on England and remove any presence of the Anglican Church\textsuperscript{144}. Furthermore, Charles grew distasteful of Scotland and in particular of the Presbyterian clergy. He wrote that their hypocrisy only seemed to confirm his attachment to the Church of England\textsuperscript{145}. He also found the Scottish military to be a disappointment. The clergy had attributed their crushing defeat by Cromwell to be God’s angers and their remedy was a purge of the army that left it weakened\textsuperscript{146}. Disgusted Charles attempted to flee Scotland but was unsuccessful and brought back\textsuperscript{147}. Nevertheless, Charles
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resolved to make the best of a bad situation and was coronated as the King of Scotland on January 1, 1651.

Despite his enhanced prestige granted by his coronation, the road to war still held many difficulties. The Scottish Presbyterian clergy valued religious orthodoxy above military competence and pushed to eliminate undesirables from Charles’ household. Charles exasperated tried to distance himself from the clergy. Despite this as time went on, Charles built up his army and played an increasingly dominant role in the war effort. Cromwell, aware of Charles II’s presence in Scotland left the subjugation of the Irish resistance to his officers and travelled to Scotland at the head of a veteran army. Charles “attempted for a time to resist Cromwell in Scotland, but without success. Cromwell penetrated into the heart of the country.”

Charles decided instead to lead his Scottish army into England itself. He knew that England was full of those sympathetic to his cause and he believed if he were to enter the country they would rise up and join him; “the king accordingly put forces his motions and crossed the frontier, issued his manifestoes and sent courtiers and heralds, announcing to the whole population that their king had come, and summoning all his subjects to arm themselves and hasten to his aid.” This plan backfired spectacularly, not only did few of his English subjects show up, but many of his Scottish soldiers began to desert as he moved further south. Cromwell, hearing of Charles thrust into England left Scotland under the command of
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General Monck and took most of his forces south in pursuit of Charles II. Cromwell found Charles at the fortified town of Worcester and annihilated his forces even though “Charles did his utmost to rally his forces.” Disheartened, Charles was now on the run.

Hollar, Wenceslaus. Charles II in Exile. 1650. Etching and Engraving, 44.6 x 33.3 cm.

The most famous action of his six weeks on the run, hiding in an oak tree while parliamentary forces searched for him in the nearby buildings and woods, led to a national holiday on the 29th of April (also the day of his English and Irish coronation) known as the Royal Oak day, “This day is kept strictly as a holy-day, being the King’s Coronation.” This event also

---
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inspired the names of countless taverns\textsuperscript{155}, ships\textsuperscript{156} and was even a Royal Order, the Order of the Royal Oak\textsuperscript{157}. The holiday was celebrated until the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century and some continue to celebrate it up until the present day. Throughout the six weeks, Charles’ and his entourage were hidden by his Catholic subjects despite the great difficulty of hiding a man so tall (the king was taller than 6 feet at a time where the average was shorter than the present day\textsuperscript{158}) and of his Latin complexion. Their loyalty toward him made a deep impression on Charles and throughout his reign he did his best to defend his Catholic subjects from persecution and would himself convert on his deathbed. Charles had many close calls during the six-week period, his closest perhaps when he met a smith after a shoe fell of his horse’s foot. Charles was rumored to have asked of the news of the day, the smith replied

“‘no news that I know of since the grand news of beating the rouges, the Scots and Worcester’

The king then asked ‘were any English officers who were with the Scots had been taken in the battle’

The smith replied that ‘some officers had been captured but he [the smith] could not learn if the rouge Charles Stuart had been take’

the king replied that ‘if that rouge were taken, he deserved to be hanged more than all the rest for bringing the Scots in’

To which the smith is rumoured to have said, ‘you speak like an honest man’\textsuperscript{159}"

For weeks the king crept through England with little to no supplies, entirely reliant on common men and women that royalty never connected with previously. After six long weeks,
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Charles left England from a small cove a few miles east of Shoreham in a little vessel that Charles once restored turned into a pleasure yacht. Charles was followed by English ships but outran them and land safely on the continent. His ill-fated expedition was at an end.

Charger. *Royal Oak Commemorative Ware*. 1680. Faience, 6.2 x 44.5 x 44.5 cm.

**Exile**

Charles returned to France in failure and found the exiled court divided as ever. His mother had converted his youngest sister, Henriette, to Catholicism while he had been away. His brother, James, had left the court to become a professional soldier\(^ {160} \) (although he was never hired). Charles chief minister, Hyde, was in an ongoing conflict with Charles’ mother. The only access Charles had to the French court was through his mother and this caused considerable tension between the two. The largest issue of contention was conversion.

Henriette Marie pushed Charles to convert, arguing that continental forces such as France and Spain might be more sympathetic to his cause if he was a Catholic. Hyde was horrified at these events fearing (understandably so) that if Charles was to convert England would never welcome him back. His mother often starved Charles of money trying to bend him to her will. This was generally an unhappy time for Charles II¹⁶¹.

With the political rise of Cromwell and the seeming longevity of the new Commonwealth government, Charles II’s chances were bleak. Mazarin, French chief minister and alleged father of Louis XIV¹⁶², began negotiations with Oliver Cromwell and the new English Republic. Initially Charles was a useful bargaining chip, Mazarin threatened French support for the exiled king to seek improved terms. However, as talks progressed Charles was less welcomed in the French court. On June 30th, 1654, Charles left Paris. Initially, he travelled through Germany, settling in Cologne and opening dialogue with the Spanish Empire who were currently at war with Oliver Cromwell¹⁶³. Cromwell’s spies reported that most of Charles’ time was spent “drinking, wenching, and hatching schemes to retake his birthright¹⁶⁴.” Thurloe, the famed spy master for Cromwell, argued that they seemed remote and fanciful, and argued that Charles II did not present a large threat to Cromwell’s reign personally¹⁶⁵.

¹⁶¹ Claredon, Edward Earl of Clarendon, 188, 211, 224-230
¹⁶² Levi, Louis XIV, 23
¹⁶³ Miller, Charles II, 13
¹⁶⁵ Thurloe, A collection of State Papers volume 3.
In January 1656, Charles traveled to Spain and raised four regiments of British and Irish soldiers to join the Spanish army. Even with the death of Oliver Cromwell in 1658 the situation looked bleak. His son, Richard Cromwell was assumed by many on the continent as an able successor to his father. Madrid began to scale down their assistance as they became convinced that Charles’ cause was hopeless. Key advisors like Bristol, formerly his foreign minister, converted to Catholicism in 1659 convinced it would improve his chances of advancement on the continent. But as luck would have it, the winds were changing. Charles II’s destiny awaited.

Charles did little to cause the collapse of the Commonwealth. Following the death of Oliver Cromwell, the military dictatorship that had held the Commonwealth together began to crumble. The people were opposed to naked military rule without some form of authority beyond violence. At the turn of the year to 1660 the question was who would lead the Three Kingdoms. Pepys\textsuperscript{166} reveals the mood of the country in his diary. On January 2\textsuperscript{nd} he writes “Great is the talk of a single person, and that it would now be Charles, George, or Richard\textsuperscript{167}.” The three men mentioned are Richard Cromwell, Charles II and George Monck. Charles was still an outlaw but widespread public opinion favoured him, many longed for the restoration of divinely mandated Monarchy\textsuperscript{168}.

George Monck, leader of the New Model Army in Scotland, was the most powerful man in the Commonwealth. The Rump did their best to woo Monck. Old royalists, who had come to

\textsuperscript{166} Samuel Pepys was a high-ranking naval officer during the reign of Charles. Between 1660 – 1669 he kept a daily diary that has become an invaluable primary source for any historian attempting to understand any aspect about the Restoration.
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represent both Charles’ interests and the interest of the people also attempted to woo him. Pepys describes “All the world is at a loss to think what Monck will do." In February, Monck and the Rump fell into disagreement. Monck sent a long letter to the speaker of the Rump ordering fresh elections. From this point on it became more and more clear that Monck would welcome Charles back as Monarch.

However, there were still issues to be decided. Monck represented the interests of the Army which diverged from the interests of Charles. The Army were wary that Charles might hold for their part in the execution of his father and feared that he would take away the lands and riches they had taken during the Interregnum. Charles realized the precarious situation he was in. If he promised no reprisals than those who had fought for his father would be unhappy, however if he did not promise leniency the army would never let him return as ruler. In answer, Charles sent out a declaration, the Declaration of Breda

“This morning my Lord showed me the King’s declaration and his letter to the two Generals to be communicated to the fleet. The contents of the letter are his offer of grace to all that will come in within forty days, only excepting them that the Parliament shall hereafter except. That the sales of lands during these troubles, and all other things, shall be left to the Parliament, by which he will stand. The letter dated at Breda, April, 4 1660."
This was enough to convince the army of his good intentions and Charles was invited back as Monarch. Charles would return to England on the 29th of May, his 30th birthday.

King Charles II. John Playford. *Original 1660 Printing of King Charles II’s Famous Declaration of Breda -- Charles Promised to Pardon Those Who Committed Crimes During the English Civil War*. 1660. Eight-page circular, 6” x 8.5”. 
The Return of The King

A Restoration

His Crowning Achievement

Wright, John Michael. *Charles II (1630-1685)*. c 1676. Oil on Canvas, 281.9 x 239.2 cm.

The crowning of Charles took place on April 23rd, 1661. Samuel Pepys, an important naval officer with a detailed diary, exclaimed “Now, after all this, I can say that, besides the pleasure of the sight of these glorious things, I may now shut my eyes against any other objects, nor for the future trouble myself to see things of state and show, as being sure never to see the
like again in this world. The coronation of Charles was the most lavish since Queen Elizabeth’s. Charles from his time in the luxurious courts of Europe understood the value of splendor to project authority. This was especially important considering the decade of active desacrament of all Monarchical actions. Charles had to display the power and value of the king to the population.

Walton, Robert. The Coronation Procession of Charles II. 70 1662. Engraving with Etching, 52.0 x 43.6 cm.

Royal entrance to a city was often a very ritualistic practice. Muir likens the entry of the prince into the city with Jesus into Jerusalem because “this imagery compared the human prince with the divine Christ and the city with Zion, bringing the eternal into the temporal and defining the relationship between the ruler and the city in spiritual rather than just legal
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The body of the Monarch is sacred as it channels the soul of the nation. How the body of the Monarch was shown was equally important, power is all about spectacle. Spectacle and prompt had been under siege by Cromwell during the interregnum. To reestablish the Monarchy, Charles had to bring back the splendors of the court as well as the beauty that accompanied it. That was why the Restoration was a time of great flourishing in the arts, sciences and expression, there was a freedom that was lacking from the earlier government. Charles understood the value of beauty expressed in art or science. He also valued the need for fantastical demonstrations of power and authority to renew the Monarchy. His entrance into the city was nothing short of spectacular. Specialized music was created simply for the King’s entrance.

---
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This large procession was of the utmost importance to Charles II. That was why he chose for his entire procession into the city to be catalogued (above) so that every person who entered behind the king was known, from earls and dukes to army officers and courtiers. The power Charles wished to portray was amplified by the number of people who followed directly behind him and those who watched the awe-inspiring procession. Not only was this simply an elaborate ceremony, but it also reestablished order in the hierarchical structure of English society. The reestablishment of the House of Lords, which had been removed as a House of Parliament during the Interregnum, meant a renewal of the old peerages and titles of Monarchical supporters. Having Earls and Dukes parade behind the King showed two things. Most importantly it resurrected these old powers, stabilizing a new government by creating a bridge from the reign before the Interregnum, thus lessening the interruption it caused. Secondly, it showed their support of the new Monarch, even in their weakened state these were still very important men who’s support mattered. That was also why army officials followed him. The procession was a vast show of political might, wealth and royal authority.
The crowning itself was extremely lavish. Samuel Pepys claimed “the sight of these glorious things, I may now shut my eyes against any other objects 177 for no other sight could compare. While the entrance into the city was viewed by the common people, only the people of means witnessed the actual coronation. The exclusivity of the coronation made it that much more valuable to attend, Pepys described “I sat from past 4 till 11 before the King came in. And a great pleasure it was to see the Abbey raised in the middle, all covered with red, and a throne (that is a chair) and footstool on the top of it; and all the officers of all kinds, so much as the very fiddlers, in red vest 178.”
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The spectacle of the ceremony was used to create legitimacy to the crowd of people who may have been involved in the civil war or had positions of power during the Interregnum. Charles had to impress legitimacy unto this specific population, those who may attempt to overthrow him once again. Charles had to recreate authority in royalty. He had to reestablish legitimacy in the Stuart Monarchy. The lavish ceremonies showed the wealth and power that Charles possessed, now he needed to legitimize his reign by reestablishing a Monarchy and Church that had been systematically weakened by Oliver Cromwell.

**Cavalier Church**

When Charles returned, he entered a country religiously divided. In the years since the reign of Charles I religious diversity had increased in the form of multiple protestant sects at the cost of Anglicanism. Cromwell deliberately attacked organized Christianity, from more mundane acts such as the banning of Popish festivals to more extreme measures such as abandoning the enforcement of church attendance\(^{179}\). The institution of Anglican religion that had existed in the time of Charles I was largely obliterated. Charles had to deal with an increasingly unstable situation. Many clergy which had once been Anglican had been replaced by other sects, mostly Presbyterians. Charles had a deep dislike of non-conformists, his experience of Scotland convinced him that these sects were no religion for gentlemen. However, Charles also realized he needed Presbyterians and had no wish to be their enemy, they held considerable power and were preferable to the other more extreme sects who had

\(^{179}\) Miller, Charles II, 54
executed his father. Therefore, at least initially, Charles was careful in his treatment of sects when he first arrived in England. This changed when the new Parliament was voted in.

The first session of the Cavalier Parliament was held on May 8th, 1661 and was overwhelmingly Royalist Anglicans. This could be perhaps be partially attributed to the rebellion of the Fifth Monarchy Men, a radical Puritan sect of mostly New Model Army veterans who believed 1666 indicated the end of earthy rule by human beings. In January 1661 the Fifth Monarchy Men, under their leaders Pritchard and Venner, attempted a revolt for King Christ. Pepys explained the event as “Fanatiques rising again” and later describes “meeting Venner and Pritchard upon a sledge who with two more Fifth Monarchy Men hanged today; and the two [Venner and Pritchard] drawn and quartered.” This attempted revolution created mass sympathy and popular outpouring for Charles which showed itself in the strong Royalist Parliament. With the support of the people and of new parliament, Charles could finally establish order.

Charles had learned the lessons of his father’s mistake. Charles I was inflexible with religious sects choosing to attack them despite their strength and popularity, as was the case during the Bishop wars against Scottish Covenanters which ultimately led to the English Civil war and the fall of the Monarchy. Charles worked with Presbyterians initially refusing to eject Presbyterian ministers and only removing less than 700 of the most extreme sectarian

---
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ministers, an action that were generally regarded as fair and provoked little disturbance\textsuperscript{183}. Only when he was pushed by Parliament did Charles changed tactics, and only reluctantly.

Between 1661 and 1665, Charles passed four laws that came to be known collectively as the Clarendon Code (though Clarendon did not publicly support it). The first passed in 1661, was the Corporation Act which forced all members of government to take the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy and swear belief to the Doctrine of Passive Obedience, which together meant that the participator swore to follow the King in all things, falling to do so would be seen as treasonous. Most importantly the act forced possible (and current) officials to renounce the Convenient. This meant that technically all non-Anglicans would be banned from seeking office in His Majesties government in any form\textsuperscript{184}, though many found their way around such laws. This stripped Presbyterians of much of the power they had previously held. Nonetheless, those with Republican leanings continued to hold some power in urban areas, especially in finance. Even if they were weakened in official government, their power was still vitally important.

The second act was known as the Act of Uniformity. The act prescribed the form of public prayers, administration of sacraments, and other rites of the Established Church of England, according to the rites and ceremonies prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer. It also explicitly required episcopal ordination for all ministers, priests, and bishops, which had to be reintroduced since the Puritans under Cromwell had abolished this requirement. In short, it forced all services to be carried out in the Anglican tradition by ordained ministers and placed all political rituals linked to religion solidly back in the hands of the church and by extension
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Charles II who was the head of the Anglican Church\textsuperscript{185}. This Act was followed by exodus of clergy as more than 2000, mostly Presbyterian ministers, refused to comply and were forced out of their parishes. The next two acts, The Conventicle Act and the Five Mile Act, passed in 1664 and 1665 respectively, further strengthened the Anglicism. The former banned all religious meetings of more than five people that weren’t state approved. The latter forbade any clergy who had not conformed from living within five miles of the parish they had once preached at\textsuperscript{186}.

Parliament had taken the first steps toward reestablishing the control of the Three Kingdoms. Parliament believed “an implicitness in religion was necessary for the safety of government ... Once common and ignorant people began to read the Bible, they started to question types of authority”\textsuperscript{187.”} Charles disliked the heavily handed attempts of parliament to impose their will on the country but it weakened future dissenter opposition to his rule. Hyde would use this Cavalier Anglican coalition in Parliament to rule. Once again, the leader of religion in his Kingdoms, Charles could feel more secure in his position as the masses under his domain travelled week after week to royally sanctioned ceremonies that extolled his virtues. Taking control of the political ritual of the people, the Sunday service, helped protect Royal Authority despite the continued strength of sects that would not participate. This Royal Authority would face strain following the disasters that started in 1664.

\textsuperscript{185} Green, The Re-establishment of the Church of England, 72-5
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Disaster

Plague

For the first four years of the reign of Charles life was quite peaceful. This was surprising as the two earlier tumultuous decades suggested difficulties for the new king. The Anglican Church was weaker than it had ever been, and various sects dotted the landscape. Some like the Fifth Monarchists actively attempted to overthrow the fledgling government\textsuperscript{188}. Others such as the Quakers refused to bow to King as leader of Christianity in the Three Kingdoms. Even the Presbyterians, considered the most moderate of the sects, could have been trouble as they were loath to give up the power, they had gathered during the Interregnum. Beyond this, the New Model Army was heavily armed, dangerous, and owed years in back pay. General Monck had placed Charles on the throne with support of the New Model Army, but that support wouldn’t last long while pay was still not given. Also, many of the King’s old loyal supporters demanded position, power and wealth from those currently in charge, causing a headache for the King as he had to balance between Royalist supporters and the Presbyterians that were already in power. Finally, the financial situation of the King, and of the country, was quite dire. The fact that the King managed to solve (or delay) these many serious issues was beyond remarkable. Of course, as any newlywed will tell you, the honeymoon period never lasts. In 1665, Charles II’s honeymoon ended.

\textsuperscript{188} Brown, Baptists and Fifth Monarchists, 239
On March 1st, 1665, a comet was detected over the streets of London. At the time it was merely a curiosity and a marvel, but some viewed it as a sign of impending doom. Plague had hit the continent a few years before, with Amsterdam and Hamburg affected in late 1663. Charles had employed a strict thirty-day quarantine that later extended to forty-days following the spread of disease throughout the Netherlands. The quarantine was spread through every major port in Britain specifically targeting ships from the Netherlands another source of tension between the two powers. Despite these precautions, plague would come to ravage the British Isles.

No one is sure where the disease first struck, but many believe it to be the docks of London. Conditions here were very poor, many were crammed into small unclean living spaces. In April, the mortality rate in London jumped from 290 to 398 per week. Despite the increase in mortality not officially being attributed to plague, Charles acted. The Privy council introduced household quarantines, where Justices were instructed to investigate households for plague signs and shut up houses that showed them. This caused a riot in St Giles, when rioters broke down the door and released inhabitants of the first house that was shut. Despite these attempts, warmer weather brought a renewed vigour to the disease. The plague spread throughout the city. A quarantine was placed upon the entire neighbourhood of St Giles to
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attempt to slow down the pace of the plague, it failed. Samuel Pepys, who stayed in London due to his position at the Admiralty, wrote “The sickness in general thickens round us, and particularly upon our neighbourhood.”

Many tried their best to leave the city. For the rich it was considerably easier. Charles fled the city along with the rest of the court to Salisbury. They then fled from Salisbury to Oxford in September following plague outbreaks in Salisbury. Most London City authorities opted to stay at their posts including the Lord Mayor. It was more difficult for London’s poor to leave. Even those who were physically able to leave had to obtain a certificate of good health from the Lord Mayor, and those became more difficult to get even for those who were healthy. Even for those who did manage to receive a certificate, life was not easy. Nearby townsfolk were afraid of the plague and resented the exodus of refugees and often refused to help, even if refugees had a certificate. Many were forced into the countryside where malnutrition became rampant.

By the end of July, over 3000 people were dying each week. The devastation became so horrendous that there were not enough people to dig pits for the dead whose decomposing bodies were sometimes left in great mounds in poorer neighbourhoods. As Samuel Pepys revealed “Lord! How empty the streets are and how melancholy, so many poor sick people in the streets full of sores... in Westminster, there is never a physician and but one apothecary left, all being dead.” It was only due to the foresight of Sir John Lewis who had elected to
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remain behind that the entire city did not starve. By paying above normal price, he was able to procure food from nearby villages and further afield which he then returned to the city. By September, the number of dead officially exceeded 7000 a week. This was almost certainly an underestimate as most record keepers had either left the city or had died by this point. Even if this had not been the case, mass graves dug in poor neighbourhoods were rarely counted and the Quaker community was virtually ignored. In places where records are intact, anywhere from 30-50% of the population were killed, though some districts had as high a mortality count as 80%\textsuperscript{197}.

It was not just the city of London that was affected. Throughout the nation, plague ravaged cities. The countryside was often less affected but was not immune to the spread of plague. By late autumn the cold weather had slowed the impact of the plague. By February of the following year, it was deemed safe enough for the King and his entourage to return to London. This brought back the return of the merchants and shopkeepers and the city began to return to normal. However, the devastation had significant impacts, As Burnet wrote “A most terrible plague broke out, that depopulated the city of London, ruined the trade of the nation, and swept away about a hundred thousand persons. These were looked upon as characters of Divine wrath and gave but a melancholy prospect of the issue of war\textsuperscript{198}.” It certainly had an adverse effect on the British war efforts. There was a major shortage in manpower especially in volunteers and the British Navy was forced to press gang to make up the numbers. To pressgang was to force men into serving the navy by kidnapping them and leaving them on
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boats with no way to escape. The plague also greatly hampered logistical abilities for the British Navy and lessened their ability to continue the war effort. The morale of the troops was also at an all-time low following the plague as many feared it a negative sign from God. The death and destruction that this plague caused would not simply affect the course of the war, but would play into the British psyche for a long time. Yet there was worse to come.

Fire

When Charles was crowned, London was the largest city in the Three Kingdoms with an estimated population over 500,000. The Plague had reduced that number, but London was still the largest metropolis of the British Isles. London did not have the grandeur as the great cities of the continent such as Paris or Amsterdam, John Evelyn called London “wooden, northern, and inartificial congestion of Houses”\(^{199}\). By inartificial Evelyn meant unplanned resulting from the increasing growth of London as an urban centre without foresight. London had initially been a Roman settlement with well-developed walls. However, by the time of Charles II only a sixth of the city’s population was within the walls. Most lived in the inner suburbs right outside the city. The wealthy lived either in the outer suburbs far from the population density centres or in the Westminster district where the Court was located. The city itself had narrow winding streets with thatched roofed housing that towered over the alleys. Charles recognized the danger, in 1661 he issued a proclamation against overhangs which was ignored by city officials.

In 1665 he authorized the demolition of buildings and imprisonment of those who opposed the demolitions, but these were mostly not carried out and were ineffective when done so\textsuperscript{200}.

The fire began a little after midnight, September 2\textsuperscript{nd}, 1666. There had been a drought all year. The fire began in Pudding Lane, right near the London Bridge. It spread rapidly; Pepys revealed, “that above 300 houses had been burned down tonight by the fire\textsuperscript{201}.” This was partially due to the fault of the Lord Mayor of London, Sir Thomas Bloodworth\textsuperscript{202}. Pepys would blame the Mayor in his diary a few days after the fire ended writing “People do all the world over cry out of the simplicity of my Lord Mayor in generall; and more particularly in this business of the fire, laying it all upon' him\textsuperscript{203}.” The Lord Mayor refused to allow for demolition of buildings in the way of the fire due to the fear of complaints from the owners. this created more fuel for the fire which destroyed those buildings anyways. This hamstrung London’s parish constables who were already undermanned in the face of this catastrophe\textsuperscript{204}.

Demolition was often the most successful method at stopping fires as it stopped the fire’s ability to spread.

Water towers were another important method at stopping the fire, however the fire burnt the water wheels located under the London Bridge. This destroyed the water pipes from the River Thames and stopped the effective use of water hoses and fire engines. The following day Samuel Pepys met with King Charles and York. Charles ordered Pepys to demand of Bloodworth to have demolition take place. York offered the use of the Royal Lifeguard.
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Bloodworth refused York’s offer and dithered on the order from Charles II\textsuperscript{205}. Instead, unable to stop the spread of the fire and unwilling to take help from the crown, Bloodworth went home around noon on Sunday\textsuperscript{206}.

The city of London had a proud history of independence from the Crown. It had been the stronghold of Parliamentary Republican forces during the English Civil War. It had been the base of operation for Cromwell’s Interregnum government. Many of those Republican forces still held sway in the city proper. These magistrates were often men, or the sons of men, who had fought against Charles and his father during the Civil War. Even with the Clarendon Code London, like most urban centres, were controlled by revolutionary republicans rather than conservative Monarchists. London would continue to be a pro-republican stronghold throughout the reign of Charles II. London had been the epicenter for uprisings against the reign of Charles including those of the Fifth Monarchists\textsuperscript{207}. This difference in political opinion often led to a tense relationship between the City and the Crown. Bloodworth was loath to follow directly orders from the King in destruction of property of his constituents. The thought of Royal troops destroying property in London, even if it was to save the city was unpalatable to some republican elements in the city. These delaying tactics caused greater devastation than if decisive action had been taken\textsuperscript{208}.
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On Sunday afternoon, Charles sailed from Whitehall to the area of London affected by the fire. He later found that his orders were not being carried out to the full effect. Unable to find Bloodworth, Charles took decisive action and ordered the Royal Guards to assist constables in fighting the fire. He authorized the wholesale destruction of areas west of the fire zone but by then it had been too late. The fire was large and completely out of control. Pepys describes the fire’s arch as “over a mile long” calling it “a bow with God's arrow in it with a shining point.” Charles II’s efforts were hampered for two reasons. Firstly, the time that had passed meant the fire had grown in strength such that it was high enough to navigate above the demolition projects attempted to stop it. Secondly, the streets were completely crowded with refugees fleeing the areas of the fire with their worldly possessions. The streets were already often very narrow and windy, which was why the fire was able to spread so rapidly from building to building. Now thronged with people, firefighters were often unable to reach the affected areas to begin demolitions due to the crowds.

The following day, the fire moved north. This led the fire directly to the financial heart of London, the Royal Exchange. In the morning, the houses of bankers on Lombard street began to catch fire. The bankers rushed out of their houses with as much gold as they could bring, but the fire destroyed much of the wealth of the city. As the day progressed the fire continued to move closer to the Royal Exchange, finally reaching it in the late afternoon. A few hours later, there was nothing but smoking rubble where the Royal Exchange used to be. The entire district,
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one of the wealthiest in all of London, was torched. By Monday evening the fire had rapidly spread. Evelyn wrote “the whole City in dreadful flames near the water-side; all the houses from the Bridge, all Thames-street, and upwards towards Cheapside, down to the Three Cranes, were now consumed.” Monday also marked the opportunism of those outside the city with carts and boats, who were in great demand from the upper and middle classes to carry their possessions to safety. The exodus of people both leaving and arriving caused great confusion at the gate to the city walls. Magistrates ordered the closing of the gate to encourage those inside to help fight the fires rather than flee. This proved disastrous and the order was rescinded the following day.

Monday also marked the beginning of vigorous action from the Crown. Unable to find Bloodworth Charles overrode the independence of London, putting his brother York in charge of fighting the fire. York immediately began to clear the streets, press-ganging able-bodied men into fighting the fire. James created several command posts to organize fighting the fires and began large scale demolitions. Contemporary accounts had both York and Charles in person attempting to manually demolish buildings and throw water on the flames, winning the hearts of the people through their willingness to put themselves in dangerous situations. Charles was hands on when the situation required it, he was often a man of action rather than of careful governance. He was an ineffective leader with day to day detail, but proved to be quite extraordinary when the need arose. Charles provided effective leadership with a keen grasp of
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political importance. He understood the great detriment it would bring to see all of London go up in flames. He was willing to cut the leg to save the body, purposefully destroying swathes of London to ensure that the whole city did not burn. Here, he showed a ruthlessness in achieving his aims.

Another issue York had to deal with was the lynching of foreigners. Monday sparked mass hysteria that the fire was not accidental and was instead an act of terrorism from French and Dutch saboteurs hoping to damage the British fighting capabilities. Rumours spread that a foreign army was planning to land on British soil with the fire acting as a distraction for British troops. The destruction of the printing presses of local news sources such as the London Gazette meant that ordinary people had no access to reliable information. Instead, rumour took hold. Another rumour claimed that the fire was started by Catholics to bring the King out into the open to plan another assassination, like the Gunpowder plot over 50 years beforehand. Mobs of people rounded up foreigners and Catholics, often beating and occasionally killing them. York and his troops started arresting Catholics, Foreigners and other suspicious people to stop the mobs’ access to them\textsuperscript{215}.

Despite this vigorous defense, the fire continued to spread into Tuesday. Tuesday marked the last and most destructive day of the fire. York had hoped to use the River Fleet to stop the spread of the fire to the west, assuming that it would be unable to cross the river. York also demolished a large section of buildings to the north, hoping to stop its progression. Both attempts failed. The winds pushed the fire beyond the length of the river, outflanking York’s
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control centre forcing him and his men to flee west. The fire also moved north, destroying the luxury shopping centre of Cheapside and continuing north all the way to the ancient Roman walls where it was eventually stopped. But the biggest shock of Tuesday was the destruction of St Paul’s Cathedral. With its thick stone walls many thought that it would be immune to the fire and so stored their valuables within (especially many books and records from other nearby affected churches). However, the church had been undergoing a renovation and thus had wooden scaffolding around it. This scaffolding eventually caught fire and provided the fuel needed to ignite the timber roof beams. This led to the melting of the roof and the subsequent collapse of the Cathedral. The Tower of London was directly in the path of the fire to the east, but luckily the tower was equipped with large stores of gunpowder that was used to demolish the nearby buildings and create a firebreak effective enough to halt the fire before it engulfed the tower. The fire was unable to spread south due to the river Thames.216

On Wednesday the roaring winds of the previous few days suddenly died down. This along with York’s demolition of the Temple district stopped the fire spreading further west. The fire was finally contained. Many who had fled the city were now encamped in Moorfields, a public park just outside the city walls. Evelyn described how “Many [were] without a rag or any necessary utensils, bed or board ... reduced to extremest misery and poverty.”217 The crowd once again rose up against foreigners and only the presence of Royal troops was enough to calm them. The crowd was so volatile that fear of a city-wide revolt came into effect. Charles announced the intention of the Crown to supply food for those who had been forced from their
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homes. Charles also encouraged those who had been made homeless to move away and settle elsewhere. He issued a declaration ordering all towns and cities to accept refugees from London and give them employment in their original field. This helped to clear Moorfields and encouraged an exodus from the city. Below is an image to show the extent of damage from the fire.


The aftermath of the fire ranged far and wide. The first was the execution of Robert Hubert who was accused of starting the fire. It was later revealed that he had not even been in the city until two days after the fire making it impossible for him to have started it. Nonetheless He was executed on September 28th following his (believed to be) coerced confession in which
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he claimed to be a French agent working on behalf of Louis XIV and the Pope. During the Popish Plot the fire would be blamed on pro-Catholic forces to help spread support for Shaftesbury’s attempt to exclude York, a known Catholic, from succeeding his brother Charles II as Monarch. Another consequence of the Fire was the increased strain it had on war efforts. Much like the earlier plague, it was seen as Divine retribution against the British and caused great alarm in the perception of the Anglo-Dutch war on the side of the British.

Another consequence was the death and destruction that the fire caused. While reported deaths from the actual fire are few, many historians believed that the death was higher than reported due to starvation and lynchings that the Fire caused. Finally, the destruction of such a large part of London resulted in a Royal rebuilding plan. Led by John Evelyn, Christopher Wren and Robert Hooke, London was transformed into a modern city.\textsuperscript{219} There were great difficulties in achieving this due to property rights. Nonetheless, the city changed in a few key ways. The streets were created much wider, reducing congestion. The houses were also built of stone which prevented the spread of any future fires.\textsuperscript{220} Some historians argue that the fire actually helped the city in the long run, not only because it made it more traversable but that the fire would have killed many of the areas affected by plague, and it was true that there were no other major plagues following the fire.\textsuperscript{221} However other historians point out that the areas that were affected worst by the plague were not those
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affected by the fire, and these areas often remained squalid. In short, the Fire of London had a great effect on the city, in the short run it added to the string of disasters that Charles faced.
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War

The first Anglo-Dutch War occurred between Cromwell’s Republican Britain and the Netherlands between 1652–54. Cromwell had ostensibly won the war. He had defeated the Dutch attempt to break the English blockade at the Battle of Scheveningen however did not have the ships to continue the blockade. Cromwell was also unhappy at the continued fight with another Republican Protestant power. This led to a peace treaty, the 1654 Treaty of Westminster, remarkably kind to the Dutch considering they had been defeated. The Dutch were able to continue to carry on expanding the gap in trade between the two powers. The Dutch free trade policy made Dutch merchants more competitive than their English counterparts whose system was based on tariffs and customs. The English Restoration initially led to a rapprochement between the two powers. Charles felt indebted to the House of Orange and by extension the Netherlands for the aid they had given his father during the English Civil War. When Louis XIV lay claim to portions of the Spanish Netherlands (modern day Belgium), Charles supported the Netherlands.

There was still tension between the two powers. Charles believed his nephew William III was being denied his birthright as an influential figure in the Netherlands and saw it as his responsibility as his guardian and as repayment to the House of Orange to give William III the position his father had held. He also thought that William III in charge of the Netherlands would
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lead to closer comradery between the two merchant powers and greater advantages for the British. More importantly, Charles expanded the Navigation Acts in 1660 and 1663. These acts forced trade with English colonies to be done by English ships, cutting out the Dutch from the trade entirely. This angered influential Dutch figures such as De Witt who regarded this as an attack on Dutch commercial interests. Many influential English figures were also unhappy with the Dutch and believed a victory over them would set England up as the premier mercantile power. To this effect York allied himself with Arlington, who was rising in the King’s favour, to convince Charles to go to war with the Netherlands.

York had already begun matters. As head of the Royal African Company he had sent Sir Robert Holmes to begin trouble off the coast of West Africa. Holmes began a series of very successful attack on the WIC (The Dutch West India Company). This provoked the Dutch who began to prepare for war. They had already been improving their navy since their defeat in the First Anglo Dutch war, but those efforts were redoubled. In increasingly aggressive actions, the English captured New Amsterdam in 1664 and renamed it New York. The Dutch responded to these aggressions by attacking the new British positions in West Africa, recapturing most of the strongholds they had lost. The British retaliated by attacking the Dutch fleet in the Mediterranean in December of 1664. Despite the attack failing, the Dutch were worried enough to issue orders that allowed Dutch ships to attack any British ships they felt might be threatening. King Charles used this declaration to declare war in March of 1665.
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The official Second Anglo-Dutch War was from 1665-67. Skirmishes in the colonies had been ongoing for the past couple years, but now the war focused on the English Channel. On June 13th, 1665, the English and the Dutch met in the channel each with more than 100 ships. The Flagships of both nations, The Royal Charles and the Eendracht dueled. The duel, much like the rest of the battle, was an English victory. England’s heavier more powerful vessels ended up winning the day causing the Dutch to flee with more than 1/6th of their fleet destroyed or captured. The admiral in charge of the operations was killed when the Eendracht was sunk. The British lost only a single ship229. This great victory buoyed British morale, but this shortly ended with the spread of the London plague which meant the British were unable to capitalize on the victory. Furthermore, the success of the British along with negotiations between Britain and Spain greatly alarmed the French. The French would honour their 1662 treaty with the Dutch and officially join the war in January 1666 on the side of the Netherlands230.

Charles had initially proposed peace talks at the end of the year in 1665. The Dutch had categorically rejected these. De Witt later declared that only a status quo ante bellum (territories revert to whoever controlled them before the war) or a uti posseiditis (whoever controls the territory keeps it as peace is made) were acceptable to the Netherlands231. Charles attempted another peace negotiation in February following the declaration of war by both France and Denmark. Again, the Dutch rejected these overtures232. During the winter, De Witt had ordered the restructure and rebuild of the Dutch Navy. Thirty new ships were built, heavier
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and more powerful than anything the Dutch had previously. England was still reeling from the effects of the plague which meant that despite Parliament voting a record budget of £2,500,000 for the war, very little of it made it to the Royal coffers\(^{233}\).

In 1666 another battle ensued between the Dutch and the British. The Four Day’s Battle between the Dutch and the English was largely indecisive. Reports that the French fleet was leaving the Mediterranean and joining the Dutch fleet in the channel worried Charles and the Privy council. They ultimately split the English fleet in two, with Prince Rupert taking 20 ships to defend the channel while Monck commanded the rest of the Navy. This gave the Dutch a numerical advantage of roughly 80 to 60 which they used to attack Monck on June 1\(^{st}\), 1666. The Dutch used their numerical advantages to pressure Monck, almost winning the battle on the second day\(^{234}\). On the third day, Prince Rupert returned with the 20 English vessels having learned that the French were not near enough to affect the battle. The French were in fact still in port, a fact that later heightened tension between the Dutch and the French, ending the possibility of any joint operations between the two for the rest of the war\(^{235}\). With Prince Rupert’s fresh ships in hand, Monck decided to attack the Dutch. The resulting battles on the fourth day were largely inconclusive with both sides claiming victory. The English claimed victory as they had killed more Dutch men than they had lost and Prince Rupert (incorrectly claimed) that the Dutch had retreated. The Dutch claimed victory as they had sunk ten ships.
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and lost only four. The Dutch also pursued the English and ultimately blockaded the river Thames\textsuperscript{236}.

The British would break the blockade at the end of July with their final victory of the Second-Anglo Dutch War. While they only managed to sink two ships, the damage they did to the Dutch fleet forced the Netherlands in putting their fleet into port to begin repairs. This allowed for Holmes (the man who York had sent to West Africa) to mount a raid on the Netherlands. Later nicknamed Holmes’ Bonfire, the Englishman burnt 140 Dutch merchant ships and burnt the town of Terschelling. While very successful, the raid had the aftermath of strengthening Dutch resolve. De Witt was able to amplify the event into an atrocity. It gave De Witt the political capital needed to continue to reject English peace treaties and to mount the daring battle of the Midway the following year. Three weeks later when the Great Fire of London occurred, many in the Netherlands viewed it as Divine retribution for the Holmes’ Bonfire.

The British position was now dire. Even before the war, Charles struggled with cash flow. While the population of the Three Kingdoms was four times larger than that of the Netherlands, the vast majority of that population was in the countryside with often poor peasants. As was the case throughout Europe, the wealth of the nation was in the cities and urban centres. The larger Dutch urban population meant that they were able to outspend the English even in an English best-case scenario\textsuperscript{237}. Following the plague and the fire, the best-case
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scenario never looked farther away. Charles was unable to properly tax his population and the devastation to London meant that he was unable to obtain the credit needed to rebuild his navy. As the winter of 1666 approached, the British position was indeed dire\textsuperscript{238}.

The crown was desperate for any cash infusion. The British were unable to properly arm their largest and most important ships for lack of funds. Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon suggested that the only solution would be to come to terms with the Dutch\textsuperscript{239}. Charles began to do so in March but also secretly began to negotiate with the French who were upset at the Dutch following miscommunications between the two at the Four Day’s Battle. The negotiations between the French and the English were finished by April, in May the French invaded the Spanish Netherlands starting the war of Devolution. Charles hoped that this would distract the Dutch who would be worried about war on their boarders and force them into accepting one of the many peace agreements that he had sent earlier. De Witt instead, authorized the Raid of Medway. A regiment of Dutch troops had been training as Marines since 1665. In 1667, they were called into action. The Marines captured the fort at Sherness which left the strength of the British fleet defenseless. The Dutch now sunk the core of the English fleet, ultimately capturing the English flag ship, the Royal Charles, and bringing it back to the Netherlands as a prize. This humiliating defeat damaged the psychological state of the entire nation with realistic fears that if they desired, the Dutch could attack London\textsuperscript{240}.
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Clarendon quickly ordered a peace treaty to be signed. The ensuing treaty of Breda was very favourable to the Dutch. The Dutch were able to dictate terms under uti posseiditis which meant the English were able to keep New Netherlands (later renamed New York) while the Dutch kept the sugar island of Suriname, which was more valuable at the time. The Dutch also moderated the Navigation act to allow the free trade that their mercantile empire depended on. Finally, the Dutch were able to pressure Charles into joining the Triple Alliance along with Sweden to check French ambitions. The entire war proved to be a major disaster for Britain and the Crown, Boxer wrote “It can hardly be denied that the Dutch raid on the Medway vies with the battle of Majuba in 1881 and the Fall of Singapore in 1942 for the unenviable distinctor of being the most humiliating defeat suffered by British arms”. It caused serious questions to be called into effect and resulted in a change of personnel at the highest levels of Charles II’s government.

This change was led by some members of opposition to the Clarendon regime, like the previously mentioned Arlington. To better understand the situation that caused the fall of Clarendon, a better understanding of the individuals who replaced Clarendon is needed, especially as many of them also took part in opposing and finally ending the Clarendon government.
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A Transition of Power

The Fellowship of the King

CABAL

Cabal was derived from the Jewish word ‘Cabbala’ initially meant reception or tradition but became associated with secret. In the 17th century it came to be used by both Charles I and Oliver Cromwell as the secret intrigues of a small politically important group. This contradicts the belief that the phrase originated from 1667 as an acronym for the ministers who signed the Treaty of Dover with France. The CABAL took the common name of 5 key ministers during this time: Clifford, Arlington, Buckingham, Ashley (becoming the Earl of Shaftesbury in 1672), and Lauderdale. The name itself is also a misnomer as it suggests that the ministers worked together on a unifying policy, or these ministers ruled secretly. In truth, these ministers often fought amongst themselves and were more likely to undermine, than aid, each other. These ministers were also clearly recognized as those in charge from 1668 – 1673. There was no unifying political advisor as there was before (Hyde) or after (Danby) this time period.
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Henry Bennet, first earl of Arlington
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Henry Bennet began his career for country during the Civil War where he entered as a volunteer for the Royalist cause. Following the failure of the Royalist cause, Bennet joined the court in exile, shifting between the Queen mother (Charles II’s mother), York, and Charles himself. In 1657 he was sent as ambassador to Madrid and there was thought to have gained pro Catholic sympathies. He returned to England after Charles and quickly gained a position as Secretary of the South. He used this position to gain others (including an MP) and grew in power and status. He also began to build a stable of supporters (Most notably Sir Clifford) throughout all levels of government. He conspired with George Villiers, Second Duke of Buckingham to oust Chancellor Hyde following the disasters of 1664-67. He was later created Earl of Arlington and appointed to the house of Lords247.

After the fall of Hyde, he was one of the most powerful men in the 3 Kingdoms with clients stationed throughout Europe, Parliament and the Court. Generally anti French (partially due to his time in Spain, partially to his Dutch wife) he used his influence to create the Triple Alliance between England, The Netherlands and Sweden to reduce the power of France. However, following Charles II’s desire for an alliance with France, Arlington began secretly negotiating with Louis XIV, becoming one of the few English ministers to know of the secret conversion clause. The conversion clause was a highly controversial clause attached to the Treaty of Dover that stated that Charles II would convert to Catholicism with support from Louis XIV. It was not made public until over 100 years after his death. Along with other members of the Cabal, Arlington saw his power base severely damaged by the Third Anglo-Dutch War.

Unlike others, Arlington’s successful defense to the House of Commons assuaged most of the ill-will the House of Commons previously felt toward him\(^2\). 

He resigned his post as Secretary of the South and assumed the post of Lord Chamberlin, never again held the influence he had before. He was generally against Lord Danby, resenting him for systematically levelling the remainder of Arlington’s network of clients. Arlington had some influence including the joining of Mary (daughter of the Duke of York) to William of the house of Orange (eventual leader of the Netherlands). He remained neutral during the crisis of 1679-81 and died in the same year as Charles II\(^3\).


George Villiers, second Duke of Buckingham


Referred to as Buckingham.

250 Referred to as Buckingham
Buckingham grew up as a childhood friend to Charles II. He was involved in both the Civil War, and the brief attempt by Charles to regain his throne in 1651. Buckingham joined Charles in exile but later returned to England due to strife between the two friends and married the new heir (Mary Fairfax) of most of his family’s estates after they were seized by Cromwell, thereby regaining his wealth. Between 1657 and 61 he was thrown into the tower of London by Cromwell and later released. However, his departure from Charles II’s exiled court in 1657 was remembered and Buckingham was not given an office when Charles returned. Through the help of Charles’ mistress at the time, Barbara Villers (Buckingham’s cousin), Buckingham received an appointment as gentlemen of the bedchamber\textsuperscript{251}.

During the Second Anglo-Dutch War, Buckingham yearned for a significant command and was dejected at not having received it. He began to create a party of loyal followers throughout government who opposed Monarchical plans in the House of Commons. This led to Charles II’s exasperation and a trumped-up charge that pushed Buckingham into hiding. He remerged after the war and was briefly imprisoned in the Tower of London before he was pardoned. He allied himself with Arlington in pushing out Chancellor Hyde and became a significant advisor to Charles II, joining the ruling government as a member of the CABAL. He was officially sent to Versailles in 1670 to officially work on the public Treaty of Dover but was uninformed to the secret clause or that most of the negotiation had already been carried out. Buckingham was blamed for the failures of the Third Anglo Dutch War and increased toleration (as were all the members of the CABAL). He disobeyed protocol to defend himself before the

House of Commons without asking permission. This along with his abrasive style did not endear himself to the House of Commons and he lost his influence\(^{252}\).

Following his fall, he allied himself with the Earl of Shaftesbury against the members of the House of Commons during prorogation argument, some Lords argued that due to the long prorogation time the House of Commons had to be dissolved and a new Parliament reelected, something both the King and the House of Commons disagreed with. For this he was once again thrown into the Tower of London but was released due to kind words from his friends and one of the King’s new favourite mistresses, Nell Gwen (Nelly). Buckingham kept his ties to Shaftesbury and was amongst those who pushed for the legitimization of Monmouth and the removal of York from the line of succession. He campaigned for Whig candidates during the elections of 1679 and 1680. For this he was accused of Sodomy (often used by the Crown as punishment as it had the same punishment as treason, removal of estate and possibly banishment and in this case was most likely true\(^{253}\)). The charge fell through but poor health stopped Buckingham from further interfering in politics and died in 1687\(^{254}\).

Buckingham had a mercurial political career during the reign of Charles II. He was always able to return to the King’s good graces due to his quick satirical wit, their old friendship and his powerful personality. Many argue that Buckingham could have been much more powerful in Monarchical politics (perhaps acting as the sole advisor akin to Hyde or Danby) had he dropped the witty antics and instead put more efforts into governance and staying in the constant good


\(^{253}\) Wilson, George Villiers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham,

graces of the King. He, like Hyde, had the long closer personal relationship that could have
made him a stable advisor for the entirety of Charles’ reign if his personality was amenable to
governance. Nonetheless, Buckingham remains one of the most colorful characters of the era
an accomplished artist, unpredictable courtier and fine gentlemen\textsuperscript{255}.

\textsuperscript{255} Wilson, George Villiers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham,
John Maitland, Duke of Lauderdale\textsuperscript{256}

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{256} Referred to as Lauderdale
Lauderdale was the most distant of the five CABAL members. His political career was focused in Scotland, his homeland. Lauderdale’s political emergence began in the wake of the Bishop Wars\textsuperscript{257}. Originally part of the delegation to treat with the King, Lauderdale became involved in the alliance between Scottish Covenanters and English Parliamentarians. This changed with the rise of Cromwell and the New Model Army. Lauderdale became a key linchpin in the Second English Civil War, convincing his fellow countrymen to join in the revolt against the New Model Army along with English Royalists and Irish Loyalists\textsuperscript{258}.

The failure of the invasion resulted in Lauderdale fleeing from the British Isles. There he became instrumental to the negotiations between the Scottish Covenanters and Charles II. He assisted the young king when Charles journeyed to Scotland and then again when Charles invaded England with his Scottish army. Lauderdale was captured after the invasion fell to Cromwell and the New Model Army. He was not executed but imprisoned in the tower. He was only released in 1660 when Charles returned to the throne. On his return, Charles sent Lauderdale north. He defeated his main rival (Middleton) for Charles support by 1662 and took a leading position of power. The disasters of 1664-7 changed the situation; Lauderdale briefly became involved in English politics, allying himself with Buckingham and Anthony Ashley Cooper to remove Edward Hyde from power. This alliance increased Lauderdale’s power back home, where he became the powerful force for the next decade. Despite not being heavily

\textsuperscript{257} Fissel, Mark Charles. The Bishops’ Wars: Charles I’s Campaigns Against Scotland, 1638-1640. Cambridge University Press, 1994. 60 - 91

involved in English politics, Lauderdale was one of the five members of the CABAL to sign the Treaty of Dover, unaware of the secret clause it contained\textsuperscript{259}.

Lauderdale was rarely remembered English politics, and when done so he was often viewed in a negative light as he was disliked by many contemporaries (Bishop Burnet\textsuperscript{260} and Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon\textsuperscript{261}). Lauderdale did not succumb to the issues that befell the rest of the CABAL. Despite Parliaments dislike of Lauderdale, his success in controlling Scotland convinced Charles to stand by him during the difficult period of 1673-74. Lauderdale kept control of Scotland until 1679, when his opponents were able to both diminish his ability to rule and discredit him to Charles II. Lauderdale, seeing his power falling away convinced Charles II of a plan to put York in charge of Scotland, both keeping York in a position of power in the Three Kingdoms and Lauderdale with a royal supporter. However, while in control, York worked with Lauderdale’s opponents to control Scotland, finally casting Lauderdale from power. He died a few years later in 1682\textsuperscript{262}.

\textsuperscript{259} Hutton, “Maitland, John, Duke of Lauderdale”, \url{https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/17827}.
\textsuperscript{260} Burnet, Burnet’s History of His Own Time, 351
\textsuperscript{261} Clarendon, The Life of Edward Earl of Clarendon, 373
\textsuperscript{262} Hutton, “Maitland, John, Duke of Lauderdale”, \url{https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/17827}. 

263 Referred to as Clifford
Thomas Clifford was the youngest of the 5 members of the CABAL and the only member younger than King Charles II. Clifford emerged briefly as a student at Oxford before he was purged for pro Royalist and pro Anglican beliefs. During the Interregnum, Clifford was politically quarantined. Unable to find suitable employment, Clifford spent some time in Europe, however the experience seems to have been negative as he never learnt another language while his attitude towards foreigners was almost always negative. Clifford’s political career began with the fall of the Republican regime. He joined the interim House of Commons and was elected to the Cavalier Parliament the year later (1661). He formed a fast friendship with Arlington in 1662 and could reliably be called upon to eloquently defend crown interests in the House of Commons, especially the crown’s desire for religious toleration. His rise to stardom occurred during the Second Anglo-Dutch War. Clifford showed himself to be a remarkable administrator, while also arguing in the commons for increased financial support for the war, while also serving himself in active duty with the fleet\textsuperscript{264}.

By 1667, Clifford had joined the Privy council and was promoted to the newly established Treasury Commission. The following year, Clifford was appointed Treasurer of the Household, becoming one of the most powerful men in the country. It was here where his relationship with Arlington began to fracture. Clifford didn’t follow his mentors lead in disparaging Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon. They also disagreed on the Triple Alliance, where Arlington’s general support of the Dutch was countered by Clifford’s complete distrust of them. During this time, Clifford also moved into the orbit of York, Duke of York. In 1670, Clifford was

\textsuperscript{264} Hutton, “Clifford, Thomas, First Baron Clifford of Chudleigh”, \url{https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/5664}. 
one of the few who was involved in the secret Treaty of Dover and knew of everything, including the conversion clause. He supported this as he (at the very least) had Catholic leanings and sympathies. Part of the treaty required Charles to declare war on his current allies, the Dutch. This was another point of contention between Arlington and Clifford as Clifford supported the war and Arlington did not.

As war loomed, Charles made two bold actions. The first was the Stopping of the Exchequer. This was almost certainly Clifford’s idea he had become the senior voice in the Treasury and would soon become Lord Treasurer himself. He was created a Baron following the Stop. The second was a declaration of tolerance, while not entirely Clifford’s idea it was a policy he supported. Parliament was incensed at both actions. As the war continued into 1673, all the chief ministers understood they would be in trouble. Parliament began the session by demanding the refutation of the Declaration of Indulgence and the Test Act, an oath of allegiance to Anglicanism which meant that anyone who was a sincere Catholic or Presbyterian or Puritan would not be allowed in the King’s government. This forced Clifford to choose and he ultimately refused to adhere to Anglicanism, and resigned. Rather than continuing to be an influence even without any formal position, Clifford retired from public life. He died a few months later from urinary stones.

---

Anthony Ashley Cooper, first Earl of Shaftesbury\textsuperscript{267}

Adriaen Hanneman, Anthony Ashley Cooper (1621–1683), 1st Earl of Shaftesbury (1672–1683), Politician | Art UK, 1641 1636, Oil on Canvas, 71.0 x 61.0 cm,

\textsuperscript{267} Referred to as Shaftesbury
Anthony Ashley Cooper (later Earl of Shaftesbury), was born to a long line of nobility with roots in Dorset. At the outbreak of the Civil War, Shaftesbury returned to his own lands to determine which side to join. In 1643, Shaftesbury joined the Royalist cause using his own wealth to raise both a cavalry and infantry troop. He did quite well and was given several titles including a governorship. He was even promised a future peership. However, he notably switched sides following his fear that the Royalist cause was becoming too Catholic. They had recently allied themselves with the Catholics in Ireland, while the Queen was attempting to convince Charles I to ask for Catholic aid from the Continent. He retired from military service following the reformation of the Parliamentary army to the New Model Army. Shaftesbury continued serving the Parliamentary side while also working on private business ventures in Barbados.

It was only after Cromwell began ruling the Three Kingdoms through military dictatorship that Shaftesbury began his opposition to Cromwell and Army. He was brought back to serve in Parliament in 1659 following the death of Oliver Cromwell as his son, Richard Cromwell, took the mantle of Lord Protector. During this tumultuous period, he did not respond to letters of reconciliation from Charles yet continued to oppose army interference in politics and governance, often allying himself with the Presbyterian Parliamentarians who had been driven from power by Olivier Cromwell and the New Model Army. Shaftesbury became a key advisor to Monck who had brought the army from Scotland to occupy London.

---

268 A Hereditary Lordship, it means that one is a member of the House of Lords and allowed to participate in that Parliamentary body without being formally elected.
Only in 1660, did Shaftesbury begin to warm to Charles II. He was a key member of the negotiations between King and Parliament (and Monck). He voted for Charles II’s return to England and was elected as one of the twelve members of the House of Commons to go to the Hague and welcome Charles as King. Following his pardon, Shaftesbury was invited to be a member of the privy council because of a recommendation from Monck. He used his position to join with Arlington in convincing Charles to issue a declaration of indulgence in 1662 which was overturned by the House of Commons the following year. As a former Republican, he shared sympathies with many dissenters and often pushed for indulgence. It is believed that he opposed the Clarendon Code, but no evidence points to this as he was absent each time the bills were voted on. He was also known to oppose Charles II’s marriage to the Portuguese Princess Catherine of Braganza due to the implicit alliance it created with France as France and Portugal were allied against Spain\(^\text{271}\).

This brought him into league with Lauderdale and Buckingham. Him and Buckingham would clash with Hyde on several matters, most notably the Irish Cattle Bill\(^\text{272}\). Through his alliance with Lauderdale and Buckingham, he was appointed into a few ministerial positions in trade. This ultimately led to him joining the two men in the CABAL (under the name Ashley). His primary concerns were dissent, the King’s marriage and trade. Trade was why, despite his misgivings, he approved of the Treaty of Dover. He was unaware of the Secret Treaty and would have undoubtedly been terrified by the implications of Charles II’s conversion. He was focused on the Roos Remarriage Bill. It provided the template and opportunity for Charles to remarry so

---

\(^{271}\) Harris, “Cooper, Anthony Ashley, First Earl of Shaftesbury”, [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/6208](https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/6208).

\(^{272}\) Henning, The House of Commons, 1660-1690, 81
to produce an heir (as he had been unable to do so with Catherine). Shaftesbury spoke out in favour of the bill which eventually passed; however, the King never utilized it, which became a source of tension between the two. Charles II did not want to give Parliament the power to interfere in any way with the line of succession, be that through divorce or changing the heir. That was why Shaftesbury’s effort to convince the King to legitimize his eldest son, Monmouth, failed.

Shaftesbury was involved in both two major actions of 1672 to prepare for the Third Anglo Dutch War. He was a strong proponent of the Indulgence Bill but bitterly opposed stopping the payments to the Exchequer, even though he was blamed when it was carried out. Shaftesbury (Lord Ashley) was given the title of Earl of Shaftesbury to encourage his support for the Crown during the war. However, Shaftesbury began to side with the House of Commons, who wanted both an end to the war and the implementation of the Test Act. He supported the latter despite his own dissenter sympathies. This along with subversive actions against York, started his fall from power. York had recently remarried Mary of Modena, an Italian Catholic Archduchess with links to France. York refused to take Anglican Sacrament fully declaring himself a Catholic. Shaftesbury feared the possibility of a continued Catholic Succession should York, and later his sons from his new Catholic marriage rather than his Protestant daughters from his previous one, become King. Shaftesbury attempted to block the marriage but failed. York called for Shaftesbury’s removal from power and Charles agreed. Shaftesbury would find a group of republican dissenting malcontents and start the forerunner for the Whig party.

---

274 Ibid,
This was the period in which Danby held power as the King’s top advisor, a role only previously held by Edward Hyde. Danby ruled with a strict Anglican support party and forcefully implanted laws against both non-conformists and Catholics, creating a situation where York and Shaftesbury found themselves allies through coincidence. Throughout this period, York and Shaftesbury worked with Buckingham in creating trouble for Danby and his Anglican Tory Party. For his part in it, Shaftesbury ended up in the Tower of London with Buckingham, but unlike the latter he refused to apologize for his subversive actions until much later when he was eventually released.

Far from humbling him as had been the intention, this mythicized Shaftesbury as the hero of the opposition party. Following the actions of the Popish Plot\(^\text{275}\), Shaftesbury had gained the power to call for the Exclusion of York from the royal line. He supported Monmouth as heir or for the King to remarry a Protestant, as the precedent for divorce of a Lord of England had been set by Roos. Charles did not choose to utilize this over fears of giving Parliament too much power in succession, which he believed was derived solely by God. These disagreements led to a rather tumultuous time led and eventually to a new House of Commons and another after that. Each time it was called the Whig party was in the strong majority as urban centres had unequal voting power in the House of Commons. Shaftesbury was now at the height of his power, but it would soon all fall\(^\text{276}\).

\(^{275}\) A plot brought forward by Titus Oates that accused Catholics of attempting to kill the King. It was seized upon by Shaftesbury as it gained popularity throughout Parliament and the city of London

\(^{276}\) Harris, “Cooper, Anthony Ashley, First Earl of Shaftesbury”, [https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/6208](https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/6208).
Through 1680-82, Charles successfully outmaneuvered Shaftesbury. He stabilized his finances to the point where he had no need of additional revenue from Parliament. He broke the republican urban power bases by finding a legal way to renew the charters of these urban centres. They now needed to seek a new charter from the King who would only allow it once he placed his own supporters in key positions in these towns, retaking control of them. He then permanently dissolved the House of Commons and ruled without Parliament. This redistribution of charters would aid Charles’ brother York when he sought a new Parliament as the town makeup was changed in such a way that York would also receive a Tory house of Parliament who believed in the supremacy of the Monarch in all things. Though more difficult, Charles was able to take London back from Shaftesbury and the Whig party though an understanding of the law, a loss of momentum for the various anti-Catholic plots of 1679-81, and municipal elections which placed positions of power back in the hand of Charles II. Charles had done something that would have been deemed impossible, he made London, the city that had thrown out his father and later executed him, as a stronghold of Monarchy. This forced Shaftesbury to flee or face execution in London. He fled to the Netherlands in the winter of 1682 and died a month later²⁷⁷.

---
James, Duke of York\textsuperscript{278}

Unknown Artist, King James II - National Portrait Gallery, Circa 1690, Oil on Canvas, 127.0 x 98.4 cm,

\url{https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw03425/King-James-II}.

\textsuperscript{278} Referred to as York, later King James II
Much like his older brother, York spent some of his youth fighting in the Civil War. Unlike Charles II, James was ultimately captured by Parliamentary forces. He later escaped to his older sister Mary in the Netherlands. While in Europe, York began his career as a military man in the French Army. Serving under the famous general Turenne, York showed great courage and a keen grasp of military strategy. Following the alliance between France and Cromwell, York was forced by his brother to join the Spanish and abandon the French. Despite protest, York ultimately joined the Spanish army in the Spanish Netherlands (modern Belgium) to fight against the French. In 1658, the news of Oliver Cromwell’s death reached the front and York hurried back to his brother’s side. It was then that he married Anne Hyde, Edward Hyde’s daughter. Anne was named to the household of James’ older sister Mary in 1655 in the Netherlands. In 1659, York got Anne pregnant. While there was a period where York wavered eventually under the direct supervision of his older brother Charles, York married Anne. The marriage produced a severe backlash from York’s mother Henrietta and sister Mary and an even bigger backlash from his new father in law Edward Hyde. Hyde eventually resentfully came to accept the marriage as inevitable. This would create an alliance between Hyde and York politically even though the two men did not like each other personally.

Charles’ successful return meant the return of York. He was promoted to Lord Admiral. As Lord Admiral, in the Second Anglo-Dutch War, York personally fought against the Dutch until

---


he was ordered off the front lines by Charles II, anxious over the death of his heir. Despite his position, York didn’t initially show much interest in politics, only regularly attending and participating in the House of Lords in 1667 to defend Edward Hyde, his father in law, against the wishes of the King. After Hyde’s fall, York became a more important figure in the court, drawing Clifford into his camp and beginning to influence court actions. He was aware of the secret clause in the Treaty of Dover although was not one of the members to sign it. Despite his increasing Catholic sympathies, he was not in favour of a Third Anglo Dutch war realizing that the fleet was not prepared for an engagement without substantial funds which could only be derived by the House of Commons who would undoubtedly have demands for the funds. Nonetheless, at the outbreak of war, he brilliantly led the Navy until he was once again ordered off the front lines. York proved to be correct as Parliament demanded the abolition of the Declaration of Indulgence, and the implementation of the Test Act\textsuperscript{281}.

York resigned his commission, leading to (correct) rumours that York had become Catholic. No one is sure exactly when this conversion occurred or why it did so, it was certainly after his return to England as he resisted his mother’s attempt to convert him and his younger brother. He could have gained sympathy for Catholicism while on the continent. It was known that he admired the autocratic rule of the Monarchies in Spain (and especially) in France, believing it was negotiation with a Parliament that led to his father’s loss of power. Whatever the reason, by 1670 he truly believed that Catholicism was the only path to salvation. This could only have been heightened by the disclosure of his wife’s conversion shortly before her death.

In 1676, he married Mary Modena, an Italian Archduchess and French ally. Following the actions of the Popish Plot, he was exiled to the Netherlands, and later to Scotland. Following his brother’s success at dealing with the Whigs, York was brought back to England where he increasingly played a role on governance as his brother’s health worsened. In 1685, he took the Crown following the death of Charles II.\textsuperscript{282}

York’s reign began quite well, where he capitalized on a boost of popularity following his brother’s death and the rise of Tory power in urban centres for a favourable Tory Parliament. York defeated the rebellion of Monmouth (his nephew) quite easily and had him executed. Initially, York reigned with a mixture of Tories and Anglicans (although MPs were both) to keep support in King and Church against the Whig party (that were often dissenters). The Parliamentary makeup was quite confusing. Tories and Whigs became the 2 parties following the CABAL government. The Tories were often Monarchical supporters and the Whigs were against the Monarchies of Charles II and James II. The Tories were conservative and therefore often Anglican. The Whigs were often republicans and therefore often non-conformists, though in both cases often did not mean always. It was only when York lost the support of moderate Anglican Tories that his government was in trouble, once this happened York struggled with ruling over England (he had great success in his other 2 kingdoms, Scotland and Ireland). It was his desire to promote religious toleration throughout that created these difficulties.\textsuperscript{283}

By 1687, he had largely abandoned his Anglican advisors for Catholics and dissenters. However, he was still opposed by most Whigs who clung to their republican beliefs more than

\textsuperscript{282} Ibid, https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/14593

their religious ones. In 1687, he dissolved parliament upon learning the extent to which William III (leader of the Netherlands) was attempting to manipulate it. The birth of his son in 1688 created even more tension with moderate Tory Anglicans. So too did his belief that the issue his brother and father had was being too weak, an issue he would not succumb to.

Ironically, the true issue was that both he and his father were inflexible where his brother was flexible. Both believed in autocratic rule without Parliament and were unwilling to compromise with them. They had a much stronger belief in autocratic rule and the divine power of Kings. James was at times a good politician, but he stuck to his personal beliefs and values even at the loss of his throne. Charles II had given James II one of the strongest positions a British monarch found himself when succeeding to the throne. Britain was both peaceful and prosperous. The Whig party had been greatly weakened and the Tory party increased. There was not even a major grudge with most people (except for Whigs) that Charles II had ruled without Parliament at the end of his reign. James would fail to hold power because he was unwilling to compromise on his values. He forced religious toleration, the issue his brother had been unable to achieve throughout his lifetime, down Parliaments’ throat in the very beginning of his reign. It was a testament to how strong Charles II had left the Monarchy that there wasn’t a revolution right there and then. It was only when James II removed moderate Tory Anglicans from his cabinet and openly replaced them with Catholics and non-dissenters (who did not have the power of the Whig party behind them) did Parliament finally decide that enough was enough.

Even in this case, it was a rebellion of the Tory establishment rather than a revolution. Instead of seizing power for themselves or for Parliament they focused on the strength of
monarchy. This led to members of nobility and those in positions of power in England to invite William III and his wife (York’s oldest daughter Mary) to invade and co-rule the Three Kingdoms. York ultimately retreated from England and left for France. He briefly traveled to Ireland to lead their rebellion against William but was ultimately defeated. Following this he returned to France becoming a recluse in St Germain to atone for his sins. In the end, York desire for more autocracy and his desire for strength was his undoing; the Jacobites would continue to fight in his name (especially in Scotland where he had ruled for a brief period), but neither he nor any of his male decedents would rule the Three Kingdoms.

Anthony Van Dyck, *Five Children of King Charles I* - National Portrait Gallery, 1637, Oil on Canvas, 89.5 x 176.2 cm, [https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw00154/Five-Children-of-King-Charles-I](https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw00154/Five-Children-of-King-Charles-I).
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284 From his second marriage
A theoretical basis to the CABAL rule

The CABAL was a government that ruled in chaos. Primarily made of two rivals, the government seesawed on many important issues. This type of government has been referred to as the Political Bureaucratic system. In this type of system, the overall ruler, be that president, Chancellor or King, takes advice from a large range of ministers and advisors who often oppose each other. This gives the leader a wide range of ideas, and also keeps the advisors focused on combatting each other who are thus more susceptible to the manipulation or guidance of the leader. This type of government also existed during the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Third Reich and the FDR regime. Charles II created a government with ministers completely dependent on his support to achieve his aims, even if those individual ministers disagreed with it. This government was the CABAL ministry.

Bureaucratic Politics Model

The Bureaucratic Politics Model was first argued for in 1971 to explain the Cuban Missile Crisis. This theory argues that decisions are made by multiple powerful entities (advisors, bureaucracies, cabinet members, etc.) who often argue amongst each other. Rather than seeing authority act as one rational actor, the leader of the government, it looks at power through the lens of multiple competing interests within the government. In the Cuban missile crisis, it looks at various actors in the vicinity of American Policymaking and JFK (such as his brother) as squabbling with each other to gain power or undercut their opposition within the
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same governmental structure. Despite weaknesses in the theory such as: an underappreciation for the power of the central authority (King or President), lack of focus on minor officials who may have been involved, and smaller emphasis on established department precedents or limitations; the theory is quite effective for the government in place during the CABAL period under the reign of Charles II.

Between 1668 and 1673, there was no universally regarded top ministers, as there would be both before and after this period. Instead, the period was run by many ministers who often undermined each other and sought the King’s favour. During this time period, The British Isles were not ruled by an autocrat, but by constitutional Monarchy. Despite this, King Charles had control of most policy issues in the same way as autocrats on the European mainland, the Parliament had control over the budget. Parliament could use the budget to produce changes they desired to see in government, but the decisions themselves were made by the King and his ministers. Parliament had no control over domestic or foreign policy outside of taxation, import/export fees, and other governmental economic policies. Due to this, large decisions were made by Charles and his group of ministers allowing this period to be understood through the Bureaucratic Politics Model.

Factionalism

---


Factionalism refers to disputes between various small groups in a larger group. In current British politics, this could refer to the Tories who follow Boris Johnson and those who want a no-deal Brexit and those who oppose a no-deal Brexit. In the court of Charles between 1668 and 1673 there were two main factions within the court of Charles II, Arlington’s and Buckingham’s 291. Smaller factions surrounded the Duke of York and Shaftsbury (which would rise in power a decade later). Lauderdale often had a small faction but was more involved in Scotland rather than the factional fighting carried out in London. Clifford originally emerged from the Arlington faction but later allied himself with the Duke of York over their shared Catholic beliefs 292. The factions often fought each other for power and influence, occasionally allying to suit their own purposes. This added to the chaos and uncertainty during the time period ‘ruled’ by the CABAL. The members of the CABAL initially joined together to remove Lord Clarendon from power.

291 Hutton, Charles II, 367

292 Ibid, 412
Hyde Away

Lord Chancellor

Edward Hyde began his career as a lawyer and a very skilled one at that, Pepys later wrote in his diary that he knew of no one more eloquent than Edward Hyde\textsuperscript{293}. Edward Hyde first began an interest in Parliament following the elections of the Long Parliament in 1640. He began as a moderate, in opposition to some of the King’s more autocratic policies. Hyde was one of the moderate ministers that the King brought his side against more extreme Parliamentarians that had begun to gain increasing power in the House of Commons. While he disapproved of Charles I’s attempts to arrest the five ministers in the House of Commons, he understood why it may have been necessary especially as it had received the support of other moderate ministers. Hyde would travel with Charles I to Oxford. Hyde joined the Privy Council and became the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It was his idea to reconvene Parliament in Oxford to legitimize the actions of Charles I, a move that brought him the enmity of Charles I’s wife Henrietta\textsuperscript{294}. Ultimately, this led to Hyde being sent with Charles II, partially perhaps as punishment but also partially as a trusted counsel to the son and heir of Charles I\textsuperscript{295}.

Edward Hyde was 20 years senior to Charles II. Initially sent to Charles as an advisory during the English Civil War, the two men struck up a close relationship. Edward Hyde became a close advisor and a father figure, especially after Charles II’s failed invasion of England in 1651. Edward Hyde was regularly entrusted with the most important duties and in 1658 Charles made Hyde Lord Chancellor. That was not to say they had a perfect relationship. Charles found Hyde too inflexible, strict and pure. Hyde did not enjoy partaking in the frivolity that Charles II’s court

\textsuperscript{293} Pepys, Diary of Samuel Pepys, 671
\textsuperscript{294} Also Charles II’s mother
was famous for. Hyde for his part found the young King too immature and not able to take the office of Monarchy seriously enough. Hyde often bemoaned Charles II’s personal relationship with both mistresses and chief advisors. They were often able to convince him to change his mind in an informal setting that Hyde did not participate in.

While Hyde greatly admired both Charles and his father, he believed they shared a fatal flaw. They would both doubt themselves and “would follow the advice of a man who did not judge as well as himself.” Edward Hyde’s daughter Anne would secretly marry York right before Charles returned home as King. Hyde was horrified by this prospect. He allegedly told his daughter he would rather see her dead than to so disgrace her family with this marriage.

Hyde wrote and advised the Declaration of Breda that Charles issued in 1659 which was thought to have been part of the reason he was welcomed back as Monarch.

When Charles returned as King, Edward Hyde accompanied him as Lord Chancellor. Hyde was in control of all aspects of government as Charles was often bored by the discussions of the Privy Council. The early years of Charles II’s reign were an unprecedented success, showing the Lord Chancellor in a heroic light. He was able to settle disputes between moderate Presbyterians and old Royalist supporters without great difficulty. He was able to successfully pay and disarm the New Model Army without largescale rebellions. He was also able to reestablish Royal order throughout the nation. Most impressively, he was able to reform the
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institution of Monarchical authority to its former position after its degradation during the Interregnum. Charles was involved in all these activities, but often handed off the detail-oriented work to his Chancellor while he met with Barbara Villiers, his favourite mistress. The Chancellor also played a large role in the choice of Charles II’s bride. Catherine of Braganza would go on to be a popular queen, but initially her inability to become produce an heir was weighed against Clarendon. This would mark the beginning of nearly five years of constant attacks on his character which would ultimately lead to his downfall.

Initially these attacks were mere nuisances. In 1663, George Digby, Earl of Bristol attempted to impeach Clarendon for high treason in July. Bristol claimed that Clarendon was somehow attempting to bring Catholicism into the country through his appointment of junior advisors which can only be considered ironic considering Bristol had converted to Catholicism five years earlier. Bristol also claimed that Clarendon arranged for the match between Charles and Catherine despite knowing of her infertility. These charges were quickly dismissed as not even Clarendon’s enemies could believe they were true, and Bristol was disgraced. Pepys calls believes them to be absurd noting that Bristol was the one with the greatest sympathy for Catholics. However, despite those events the rumour that Clarendon had purposefully married Charles to someone who was barren stuck with him. The grand dowry including Tangiers and Bombay ended up becoming more troubled than they were worth as they drained
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the resources of the English crown\textsuperscript{304}. This too was blamed on Clarendon. The unpopular sale of Dunkirk to the French was also blamed on Clarendon. Even during the relative tranquil early years of Charles’ reign these started the seeds for his dismissal\textsuperscript{305}.

**Pressure Point**

The pressure truly began to rise in 1665. By this point his stubborn conservative policy and manner had put him at odds with many influential men, both advisors of the King and members of Parliament. His abrasive style and dismissal of opposition voices had created resentment in both his policies and in himself. Clarendon was often dismissal of this disapproval as well, more interested in achieving his aims than doing so in a politic manner. In a court with such a reputation of gentlemanly wit and courtly manner, this would come to haunt Clarendon. The first set of offence came at the implementation of the Clarendon Code. The Clarendon Code was a set of Penal laws implemented Parliamentary Acts. A Penal law is any type of law that defends the Church of England against Non-conformists and Catholics. These laws were voted in by a heavily pro-Anglican House of Commons who were eager to enact retribution on the non-conformists who had been in control of the nation for the previous decade.

The four acts between 1661 and 1665 made it virtually impossible non-conformists to continue practicing as they: banned any non-conformist from officially being part of a municipal government, banned any religious services that did not use the Anglican book of prayer, banned any unauthorized religious meetings that were made up of more than five people, and banned any recognizable non-conformist ministers from living closer than five miles from any

\textsuperscript{304} Pincus, Protestantism and Patriotism, 236
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town they had preached in (this final act also banned non-conformist ministers from teaching anywhere). Together these four acts alienated all non-conformists, even the moderate Presbyterians who had initially welcomed the arrival of King and his Court to release them from the military dictatorship of Lord Protector Cromwell. While Clarendon did not support most of these measures, he was blamed for their implementation. However, it was chiefly the three setbacks of war, plague and fire that produced his downfall. Ironically, none of these had been his fault as he (along with Charles II) had been trying to improve the city of London to prevent the disasters of Plague and Fire. Furthermore, Clarendon had been strongly against the war with the Netherlands unlike most of those who now openly plotted his downfall\(^{306}\).

What ultimately led to his downfall was his stubbornness in being unwilling to adapt, his lack of political acumen and his health. His health had been rapidly declining for years before his final impeachment. In 1665 Pepys reveals that his gout was so bad he couldn’t stand and was forced to lie on a couch during Council Meetings\(^ {307}\). Even those who believed him to both be a good minister and who were not envious of his position felt that it was time for Edward Hyde to step down. His health would plague him immensely in his later years during his exile. His lack of political acumen was key in his demise. His open contempt for Barbara Villiers (the Kings favourite Mistress) led to a rift between Charles and himself. His dislike for the majority of Charles II’s other key advisors meant that they were willing to put aside their mutual animosity to work together.
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His dislike for Charles II’s lifestyle in general was only acceptable when Clarendon was still able to control policy. As his health worsened and the number of his opponents increased, he was unable to control the House of Commons or the House of Lords, as was evident in the Irish Cattle Bill\textsuperscript{308}. Finally, Clarendon was unable to adapt to changes of the latter half of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century. His insistence on large Privy Councils limited the expedience at which things could get done. He was also unwilling to adapt to the changed situation in England where the strength of the Church had eroded with the cities becoming greater hubs of diversity in religion and in action. Unable to keep up with the times, Hyde was doomed to fall behind\textsuperscript{309}.

In August of 1667, only a few weeks after the disaster at Medway, Charles dismissed Clarendon as Lord Chancellor. It was difficultly done, Clarendon initially believed he would be able to change the mind of the King who was so unwilling to stick to any one single decision, preferring to keep his options open. However, in this case Charles was surprisingly firm, with urgings from Barbara Villiers and several courtiers like Buckingham and Arlington. When Hyde refused to leave England, Charles encouraged his allies to begin impeachment proceedings in the House of Commons. While these were successful, Edward Hyde’s allies primarily Anglican bishops led by York defeated the proceedings in the House of Lords risking the anger of Charles II. It was only in November, under threat of trial by a special (and most likely biased) court that Clarendon finally fled to France\textsuperscript{310}.
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Charles II forced out Edward Hyde for several reasons. As time had passed, his gout had become increasingly worse. He was becoming unable to continue governing the country. Clarendon had also created a great many enemies and was unable to manage Parliament. Charles realized that sacrificing Edward Hyde would give him a potential boost of support in Parliament. Most importantly, Charles had been unable to create opportunities to pursue his agendas, both in domestic and foreign affairs, due to Edward Hyde’s stranglehold on power. Charles’ next government would be divided, so that Charles could implement his aims. This led to the rise of the CABAL government.

The Rise of the CABAL

Those who forced out Clarendon then took his place and rose to power. Allied through this procedure of impeachment, the factions split apart once in government, initially in two main powers, those who supported Arlington and those who supported Buckingham. Clifford entered the CABAL as Arlington’s protégé. Lauderdale and Shaftesbury both allied themselves with Buckingham. Both Shaftesbury and Clifford played large parts in modernizing the economy as part of the Commission of the Treasury. With the absence of Clarendon, Lauderdale convinced Charles to make him Lord Commissioner to the Parliament of Scotland, while he was already Secretary of Scotland. This gave him virtual autocratic control over Scotland. Lauderdale’s primary concern was Scotland. He very rarely participated in English politics and due to unwavering support of both Charles and York he had no fear of distrust and enmity from the English Parliament while both men still believed in his ability to effectively govern
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Scotland. It would be Arlington and Buckingham who would run most of the domestic and foreign policies during this time, especially the more detail-oriented issues that Clarendon had taken care of before this time.

Arlington and Buckingham were the two leaders of the CABAL, each representing a different These men were constantly at odds and argued over every and any policy option. J.P Kenyon has even argued that Charles actively encouraged his ministers to argue amongst themselves. Even without his influence, Arlington and Buckingham were often at ends with each other. Buckingham believed that Arlington had pushed for his execution while he was in the Tower of London. Arlington believed that Buckingham’s influence over Charles and close ties with dissenters would jeopardize Arlington’s position. The fight over the Duke of Ormond evidently highlights their political squabbles.

Ormond was positioned as Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. An older gentleman, he had been political allies with Clarendon before his fall. He became the next target of Buckingham’s who desired to install a political client in his place. Along with Thomas Osborne, Viscount of Osobrne (the later Earl of Danby), Buckingham opened a commission into Irish revenues. Ormond went to Arlington who after learning of Buckingham’s intentions sided with the Lord Lieutenant. Neither Buckingham nor Arlington had strong interests in Ireland, but because one
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supported an action the other almost always opposed it. Ultimately, Buckingham’s attempt failed after a poor showing by his chosen replacement for Ormond. Ormond was replaced the following year, 1669, but his chosen successor was a member of the Arlington camp rather than Buckingham’s. The arguments between the two rivals occurred throughout government during the reign of the CABAL\(^{317}\). When Arlington’s political protégé Clifford was named one of the key members of the new treasury commission, Buckingham ensured that his political ally Shaftesbury would be the other. In fact, the only thing the two men could agree on was the continued exile of Clarendon.

Initially it was Buckingham who commanded the most power in the CABAL. Charles used Buckingham as a counterweight to the increasing influence of Arlington in both the House of Commons and the House of Lords as Charles had no wish to create another Clarendon Ministry\(^{318}\). The issue with this was Buckingham’s volatile conduct and mercurial personality. Burnet wrote “He had no principles of religion, virtue, or friendship. Pleasure, frolic, or extravagant diversion was all that he laid to heart. He was true to nothing, for he was not true to himself. He had no steadiness nor conduct: he could keep no secret, nor execute any design without spoiling it\(^{319}\).” Opinions of Buckingham worsened following his duel with the Earl of Shrewsbury for engaging in an affair with his wife. After fatally injuring the Earl (who soon died), the Lady of Shrewsbury moved into the Duke’s house. This was shockingly scandalous even in comparison to the merry court that Charles had.

\(^{317}\) Miller, Charles II, 205 - 291
\(^{319}\) Burnet, Burnet’s History of His Own Time, 612
Furthermore, Buckingham had the same attention span as his friend and master, Charles II, when it came to detail work. Buckingham had projects that he would work on, but often was bored by the day to day occurrences of government. Due to all this, Arlington was often (but not always) able to outmaneuver Buckingham. Buckingham’s clever wit when put to the test was often able to beguile his opponents, his play the Country Gentlemen was a brutal attack on Sir William Coventry, the Naval treasurer. Buckingham was able to get Coventry removed from the position and given to his new protégé Danby. Both Arlington and Buckingham were unscrupulous politicians who relied on their force of personality over the King to achieve their aims. Arlington was a classic Restoration politician; he was a skilled courtier unmatched in wit and clever phrases, however, he regarded personal office and titles as a way to enrich himself rather than benefit the nation at large. Clarendon wrote, “he knew no more of the constitution and laws of England than he did of China, nor had he in truth a care or tenderness for church and state.” Both men ultimately struggled for solo leadership which made them easier to control but made government proceedings much slower and often ineffective.

The rise of the CABAL led to a fractious time in Charles II’s government. The infighting between Arlington and Buckingham led to a cabinet who often did not have a clear direction, but was quite effective when they were given one by Charles II, as they did in establishing the Treaty of Dover and preparing for the Third Anglo Dutch War. What was often the issue was the actions that they were taking. An alliance with France was dreadfully unpopular, especially after
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funds had been given to Charles to improve the Navy by arguing for the defense on England from France. The cost of war also meant that Charles did not have the funds to engage in it, leading the CABAL government to drastic actions they themselves probably did not individually support\(^{323}\). While not included in the initial CABAL, York also plays a key role in government in this time although he was a strong opponent of the war plans as he felt the British Navy was not ready for the challenge\(^{324}\).

There are others who played parts in the government including: Gilbert Sheldon, the Archbishop of Canterbury who represented the interests of the Anglican Church in the House of Lords\(^{325}\); William Coventry, a key naval officer, who had been the chief architect in the downfall of Clarendon but was outmaneuvered by Buckingham for influence over proceedings and was soon removed from power much to the dismay of Pepys\(^ {326}\); George Monck (now the Duke of Albemarle) who had moved from the Navy to the leading position in the Treasury Commission although he was not as involved as either Shaftesbury or Clifford and often not made aware of key events\(^ {327}\); Barbara Villiers the King’s previous mistress and mother to his 5 children who still had great influence over the King even if they were no longer romantically involved and Queen Catherine, who had settled into both her place and her role as Queen of England becoming a confident and sometimes\(^ {328}\) an advisor to Charles II. During this time, Charles was between mistresses but would soon settle on his two favourites for the rest of his life, Nell Gwyn the
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English actress and Louise de Kerouaille the French aristocrat. Both would also have influence over him during this time and members of the CABAL were aware of this, Buckingham often kept good relations with Gwyn to try and further undermine Arlington’s position.329

‘This was Charles II’s initial push into gaining a greater role in governance through managing his ministers in a more robust manner than he had been able to do so with Clarendon, this would serve him well during the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis where his experience with Machiavellian manipulation and skill as an actor would allow him to convince Shaftesbury that Shaftesbury was achieving his aims in government while at the same time using his Tory allies to remove Shaftesbury’s power bases in London and throughout England. The ability of the Cabal Government to maintain power and achieve sizeable objectives despite its deliberately tumultuous nature was nothing short of incredible. Charles encouraged this form of chaotic government so that he was able to complete his objectives despite a lack of support from Parliament, his people and his very own ministers. By creating the chaotic government that depended entirely on him, Charles was able to force advisors into doing his bidding and set them up to take the fall, especially with the events that led to the coming alliance with France and war with the United Netherlands.

329 Wilson, George Villiers, 2nd Duke of Buckingham, 192
The Treaty of Dover

Signing the Treaty

A Difficult Position

Jacob Huysmans, *Catherine of Braganza (1638-1705)*, 64 1662, Oil on Canvas, 216.5 x 148.7 cm, RCIN 405665, https://www.rct.uk/collection/themes/exhibitions/charles-ii-art-power/the-queens-gallery-buckingham-palace/catherine-of-braganza-1638-1705.
In 1667, Charles found himself fighting the Dutch, French and Danish in the Second Anglo-Dutch War which was not going well. England was still technically at war with Spain since the 1654 war between Oliver Cromwell and the Spanish. The English had sent an expeditionary force in Portugal to help fight for Portuguese freedom following the marriage agreement between Catherine and Charles II. The English were very isolated diplomatically at this stage\textsuperscript{330}. To add insult to injury, Charles II was extremely broke. The money Parliament had promised him at the outset of the war arrived late and was much less than what had been promised on paper. However, the House of Commons still believed that Charles II held much of the money that they had given and were reluctant to help the Monarchy balance debts they believed did not exist. This was arguably the largest low that had occurred in the reign of Charles to date.

Charles would remove his chief advisor, Lord Clarendon, and move from the Clarendon ministry to the CABAL ministry. The CABAL ministry contained a set of 5 key advisors, but was dominated by 2 men: Arlington and Buckingham. The infighting within this ministry allowed Charles to pursue his objectives more easily, as he didn’t contend with a monolith in his own advising team but was instead able to play the rivals against each other making them more likely to support an option they may not have necessarily agreed with.

Charles began to turn it around. In 1667 he signed Lord Sandwich’s treaty\textsuperscript{331} with the Spanish. He pushed for favourable terms, getting the same favourable trading status that had been given to the Dutch, greatly benefiting English trade. England would also keep Jamaica and
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the Cayman Islands, conquered by England during the Interregnum. Charles also made peace with the Dutch in less favourable conditions due to the Dutch raid in the Medway. Charles now attempted to negotiate an alliance with Louis XIV. France saw no benefit to an alliance and rejected the proposals unless Charles would declare war on the Spanish while Charles preferred war with the Dutch. Louis XIV also refused to subsidize Charles which Charles desperately needed if he would go against Parliamentary wishes which were notoriously anti-French.

Instead, Charles offered a treaty with the Dutch in January, 1668 with the goal of ending the war between Spain and France in the Spanish Netherlands and the Pyrenees. France had long been an ally of the Netherlands, but their encroachment on the Spanish Netherlands worried the Dutch over the security of their own border. Charles made overtures to Louis XIV to assure the Monarch that the treaty was not made directly against him, but he expressed bitterness with Louis XIV in letters to his sister, Minette. Minette would go on to play an important role in realigning the relationship between Charles and Louis XIV. Charles would convince the Swedish to join the alliance, named the Triple Alliance.

Despite joining, Charles was never comfortable with the Triple Alliance. Unlike his countrymen, Charles had a disdain for the Dutch States General who ran the nation, more so after the recent war. Charles was noble in his mannerism and his personality. He also felt
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great misgivings about Republics ever since his own country had fallen to the Parliamentarians and Cromwell. Charles felt kinship with France, his mother was French and he had spent his early years in exile in the French court. He had also come to know Louis XIV personally from his time there. Finally, he was angry with the way that the Dutch States General, and De Witt in particular, treated his nephew William III and especially his sister Mary. Charles felt that his nephew should have been treated as a future Monarch and given powers in the Netherlands that he was not. The Netherlands had two parties: The Organists that supported the Orange family line and by extension William III and the merchants who were against a hereditary ruler and often supported the States General and De Witt. Currently it was the latter who were in power, something Charles was also unhappy about. The Triple Alliance was also experiencing difficulties. Initially, the alliance included subsidizing for Sweden by the Spanish, but the Spanish failed to hold up their end of the bargain. It was later decided that both England and the Netherlands would do so. Charles never did.\footnote{Pincus, Protestantism and Patriotism, 472}

It was at this time, that Charles began to look away from the Triple Alliance and back towards an alliance with France. The Triple Alliance had achieved its aim with the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle that forced France to give up some of their conquests against Spain in the Spanish Netherlands. Louis XIV was unhappy with this treaty and with the Dutch in particular, who he believed were the architects. Charles meanwhile, was experiencing difficulties with the Dutch. Both had overlapping commercial interests that affected each other.
Ultimately, Charles and Louis XIV would explore their mutual feelings of distrust and anger at the Dutch into a secret treaty. This secret treaty was to later be called the Treaty of Dover. To keep it secret, the intermediary of the treaty was Charles II’s sister and Louis XIV’s sister in law (and possibly his mistress\(^{339}\)). The treaty would ultimately lead to the Third Anglo-Dutch War\(^{340}\).

\(^{339}\) Levi, Louis XIV, 201  
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A Secret Negotiation

Henrietta (Minette) of England was the youngest daughter of Charles I and Henrietta Maria of France. She was born in 1644 while the Civil War raged around her. Her mother left her soon after birth to travel to France to get aid for her husband. In 1646, Minette would travel with her caretaker to be at her mother’s side in Paris. Minette would spend most of her life in Paris, even after the Restoration. In 1649, Henrietta Maria of France decided to raise her daughter as a Catholic, which was the religion she would remain.

Charles became very close to his sister while in exile. This continued after he was invited back to England, as both his mother and his sister (both named Henrietta) accompanied him along with York. Charles and Minette would go on to have the closest relation of any of their siblings, despite being 14 years apart as he was the eldest child and she was the youngest of Charles I and Henriette Maria of France.

Charles II’s return to power also made his sister a more desirable match. Initially, Henriette Marie of France had even suggested her as a match for Louis XIV but this was refused by Louis XIV’s mother. Minette had already been proposed to by Charles Emmanuel of Savoy and the Grand Prince of Tuscany, but following Charles II’s return to power the Duc D’Orleans began to pursue her. The Duc was Louis XIV’s brother, and was deemed an acceptable match by all involved. Charles agree to pay a dowry, and unusually agreed to provide a set income for his sister independent from her husband. After this Minette would take the title of Madame D’Orleans, more often shortened to Madame. A year later, Minette gave birth to a daughter although the paternity was a matter of rumour at the court as the Duc was well known as
bisexual and evidence suggests homosexual\textsuperscript{341} who engaged in relations with women as a sense of duty rather than choice. There were rumours that the child was actually Louis XIV’s. Other rumours attributed her to the Count of Guiche, an ex-lover of her husbands. This greatly damaged the relationship between the husband and wife, as did 6 miscarriages and stillborn births (along with a son who died after 2 years) between 1661 and 1668. Throughout this period, she wrote endlessly to Charles who wrote endlessly to her as well.

Charles had wanted an alliance with France since 1663 and felt betrayed that Louis XIV had sided with the Dutch in 1666. In 1668 there were signs that the two powers could lean into an alliance. Charles brought this up through a coded letter with his sister, who passed the message on to Louis XIV. Louis XIV and Charles continued to pass messages about the alliance through Minette, who also urged both to join. It was the conversion clause proposed by Charles that initially sparked interest in the agreement, although Louis XIV became more interested in a war with the Dutch. Ultimately, the agreement reached a stage in 1670 where details needed to be worked out in person, but without raising suspicions. Charles did not want to alert his House of Commons and even some of his own councilors: Buckingham, Shaftesbury and Lauderdale, who were all against the spread of Catholicism in England\textsuperscript{342}. Charles also wanted to openly keep the Triple Alliance as it assuaged fears in the House of Commons who supported the Calvinist (Protestant) Netherlands against Catholic France. Arlington, who was aware of the whole treaty, supported union with the Netherlands rather than France. It was only fear of
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losing his favoured position to a rival such as Buckingham\textsuperscript{343}. The details to the agreement would be ironed out by Madame and Charles when she visited Dover between May 26\textsuperscript{th} and June 1\textsuperscript{st}, 1670.

The agreement stipulated that Charles would gain approximately £200,000 for his conversion to Catholicism along with 6,000 troops from France. Charles £230,000 to outfit 50 ships to join the French 30 as part of the combined fleet to engage with the Dutch under the primary command of the English commander York. If the war was successful, Charles would receive Walcheren, the mouth of the Scheldt, and the isle of Cadzand, as his share of the conquered province. Louis XIV also would not violate the terms of the Aix la Chappelle treaty that had been agreed upon in 1668 about the defense of the Spanish Netherlands. Louis XIV would also support Charles II’s nephew, William III, as ruler of the truncated Netherlands\textsuperscript{344}. Following the agreement, Minette tragically died. Charles was distraught and refused to leave his room for 5 days. When he did so, he blamed the Duc D’Orleans for poisoning her although most historians now believe she died of natural causes. The loss of Minette did not ultimately affect the outcome of the Treaty. Buckingham would soon go to France to sign the Treaty of Dover, unaware that the full treaty had already been agreed upon by Charles and Minette. The new treaty held all the details of the old one except the secret clause containing the terms of conversion, the new treaty had a ‘secret clause’ about British and French war aims and alliances covering the true secret clause beyond Charles II’s lifetime.

\textsuperscript{341} Which would not of happened due to Buckingham’s unreliability and political volatility but was nonetheless promoted by Charles II as a way to continue to control Arlington.
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Charles had finally achieved his ultimate aim, an alliance with France that would subsidize his efforts so he would not be dependent on Parliament for funds. As it turns out, he was as the money offered by Louis XIV did not come close to covering British costs to the war. Both Charles and Louis XIV had believed that privateering and capturing Dutch trade after managing to defeat their navy would provide the rest of the funding for the British. As it turns out, defeating the Dutch navy was easier said than done and the privateering war went worse for the English than the Dutch. Nonetheless, Charles had now managed to achieve his aim. He was able to bully his ministers into following his plans despite their reservations. He kept secrets from the ministers that would be horrified at his conversion clause and managed to initially obtain all their support for the war. Charles used the splintered factional ministry that he promoted to gain his aims.
Preparing for War

Stopping the Exchequer

Thomas Hawker, *King Charles II - National Portrait Gallery*, 1680, Oil on Canvas, 226.7 x 135.6 cm,
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In 1640, Charles I was short of money he desperately needed. Normally when this happened, the King would have to call on Parliament to gain more funds. However, Charles I had spent the last eleven years not calling on Parliament and thus ‘creatively’ gaining the money often with unfair fines on his citizens which earned him much spite. This time, Charles I needed money badly. He was dealing with a rebellion from Scotland but did not have the money to raise an army. He thus recalled parliament for the first time in 11 years. The Parliament that was called in England was understandably hostile to the King. It was named the Long Parliament. They did not give money, and the money they had given came with severe consequences. Charles I was forced to pass an act that gave Parliament the right to convene every three years\(^3\) even against the King’s wishes in exchange for much needed funds. Despite this, Charles I still needed money. His solution was to rob his own citizens. The Royal Mint in London held the silver of the merchant class of the city, Charles I simply seized this with promises to repay it with interest. This angered the merchant class and was a key issue in the build up to the First English Civil War\(^4\).

In 1672, Charles II, the son of Charles I, faced a similar problem to his father. He desperately needed money for his upcoming war with the Dutch. He needed to fund the Navy for this war. Initially he asked for a loan from the wealthy class of London, who had always offered loans before against guarantees from taxes and duties that Parliament would give to the King. Yet there were some issues. A new war with the Dutch was not necessarily popular, especially if it came with an alliance with the French. There was no guarantee that money
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would be given to fund the war. Parliament had agreed to partially fund a revamp of the Navy but this was not enough for the war effort. Ironically, Charles managed to gain the funding by claiming the need for Britain to defend themselves from hostile forces such as Catholic France. Eventually this became a moot point as the money lenders became unwilling to once again fund Charles II. Between the devastation of the Plague and the Fire of London many of the wealthiest members of London who would often gamble in their investments opted for safer choices.

This ultimately hurt Charles II. He now had limited options on how to gain the funds. The subsidies offered by Louis XIV were not enough to equip the fleet. The subsidies may have been enough to partially equip the fleet but that was not seen as enough to face the Dutch. The Dutch Fleet after all had defeated the English in the Second Anglo Dutch War despite the fact they were in a transitional period. The Dutch had been experimenting with heavier more powerful ships, similar to the most powerful class of ships the British had such as the flagship the Royal Charles that the Dutch captured and took back to the Netherlands following their success in the war. The French were prepared to offer their fleet to act with the English but this mattered little. While the French Army was second to none, the same could not be said for the Navy. Treated as secondary, the French Navy often lacked resources and personnel. Their ships were old and decrepit, their sailors inexperienced. In the war on the water, it would be the British who carried the weight. Due to this, the need for funds became even more pronounced.

---

347 Pincus, Protestantism and Patriotism, 498

Members of the CABAL were weighing options to find funding. This effort was led by Shaftesbury and Clifford who were the two members of the CABAL who were also part of the Treasury Commission. Clifford came up with the idea of halting payments on the Exchequer to gain the necessary initial funding for the war. This could compensate and the repayment could be guaranteed by acts of Parliament in the next session. This was similar to the often carried out practice of borrowing from money lenders, the difference this time was that it was non-voluntary. These were debts that the Crown already had to repay. The Crown also had money laying around in the form of gold that was owned by the goldsmiths of London who kept their gold with the Crown. This money was not that of the Crown. The idea was that the crown would seize this ready-made source of funds and use as down payments for the upgrade of the Navy so desperately needed. There was no other way to receive the amount of funding needed in such a short time when the money lenders refused to lend to the Crown. Parliament would then repay the debt and the financial situation in London would be no worse for wear.349

While Clifford supported the motion, Shaftesbury was very much against this action. He saw it as a danger to the independence of London and of its merchant class. However, there were no other suggestions on how such a large sum of money was to be raised in the short time frame needed. Shaftesbury was still very opposed to this action. Despite that, on January 2nd 1672 King Charles officially implemented the Stop of the Exchequer. Shaftesbury was also moved from the Treasury to the position of Lord Chancellor and Clifford was given sole control of the Treasury. Shaftesbury was also given his title as Earl of Shaftesbury at this time having up

to this point simply been Lord Ashley Cooper. Clifford was named a Baron for his own contributions to the project. The Stop of the Exchequer would go on to have severe consequences\textsuperscript{350}.

When it occurred, the city was absolutely shocked. The stopping of payments was common on the continent, especially in places like France and Spain. However, since the reign of Elizabeth I, this simply did not happen in London. It destroyed faith in the financial system in London and distrust in the Monarchy as a whole. Burntt wrote “the bankers were broken, and multitudes who had put their money in their hands were ruined by this dishonorable and perfidious action\textsuperscript{351}.” In a single stroke, the lives of many were completely changed forever. This had ripple effects that moved beyond the city and effected all parts of Britain and even beyond\textsuperscript{352}. Despite all the dangers and negativity that would come from the action, at the moment Charles had the money he needed to reoutfit the Fleet. Later that year, he would begin the Third Anglo Dutch War.

This action had serious aftermaths. In the short term, the bankers of London were ruined. Goldsmiths had traditionally played the role as money lender as they had gold capital. The loss of this capital meant the loss of them. Many were forced into debtors’ prison as they were unable to pay their own debts and did not have the resources to get gold to continue to ply their trade. They lost their own lines to credit as well as they now had no way to guarantee their wealth with the loss of their gold. The stop on payments was meant to be for a year.
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Shaftesbury, who was by then Lord Chancellor, gave a one-year injunction to protect bankers from the courts and their own creditors but refused to make it permanent. The biggest blow to these men was the actions of Parliament who refused to bail out the bankers. Charles would extend the stop payment until 1674 when interest would begin to be paid on the deposit rather than the deposit itself. Throughout this time many of the bankers became bankrupt. In 1675 these goldsmiths appealed to the House of Commons but the ‘ad misericordiam’ complaint fell on deaf ears. In 1677 many of the most famous goldsmiths appealed to Lord Danby for financial relief. While he promised to do so that promise proved to be false as the commission that was set up to provide relief ended up falling to bureaucratic infighting\textsuperscript{353}.

This ultimately confusing situation would last beyond the reign of Charles and his brother York and would only be resolved in the reign of William III and Mary, though calling it resolved at this point is contentious. Ultimately while the legal court\textsuperscript{354} ended up voting in favour of the bankers, the Lord Chancellor Somers in 1696 reversed the judgement on technical grounds leaving a sense of dissatisfaction with the whole ordeal. The situation would ultimately lead to the creation of the Bank of England which would hold funds so the Crown could not abuse its power. The Bank of England would not be directly part of government but would ultimately provide the loans to the government needed instead of the loose banking/goldsmith system that existed in England before this point. Before that system, a series of banks emerged

\textsuperscript{353} Ibid, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59987-8.
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to hold gold and other valuables so as not to leave them to the crown. Hoare’s bank, one that sprung up during this time, still exists today\textsuperscript{355}.

The Great Stop of the Exchequer was the last time the British government would not repay its debt. From this point forward, the British Monarchy and by extension the government would not default on its debt. This event showed the power of Charles’ divided government for Charles II. The stop was not blamed on Charles but instead his 2 ministers. Even though Shaftesbury opposed the action he took the blame for it as the rivalry between himself and Clifford for the treasury caused a share of the blame on both men. Charles II was a master manipulator, not because he was the one who convinced of the plan but because he was able to blame his ministers for a plan that was clearly designed for his alliance with France, something only he supported within the government.

\textbf{Granting Indulgence}

Religion had been a very fractious issue during the Reign of Charles II. Initially, the Declaration of Breda had promised religious toleration to all under the rule of Charles II\textsuperscript{356}. This was seen as vitally important to Charles and his supporters as those who currently held power in England and Scotland were mostly non-conformists. The Presbyterians in England and the Covenanters in Scotland were particularly powerful. The New Model Army was often even more extreme religiously than the non-conformist Parliamentarians. It was partially through this appeal that Charles gained the support needed to return. Once in power, Charles

\textsuperscript{355} Moshe Arye Milevsky, The Day the King Defaulted, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59987-8.
implemented religious toleration. He also called for a new Parliament. The Parliament that emerged was called the Cavalier Parliament and many of the members had Royalist sympathies. They often had either fought personally in the English Civil War or their fathers had. They were often quite bitter with the Presbyterians who had been in power and had actively kept them out of it.

They were also proud Anglicans who felt that their religion had been under threat and that it was up to them to restore it. Accordingly, they voted, against the desires of the King, for the Clarendon Code. These were a series of Penal Laws implemented from 1661-5 that made life much more difficult for non-conformists and Catholics. Charles attempted to combat this rise in religious bigotry. In 1662, he issued a declaration granting tolerance to both Catholics and non-dissenters. Parliament rebuked the action and refused to ratify the declaration. Charles eventually retracted his declaration under advisement from Edward Hyde, Lord of Clarendon.

Edward Hyde was a staunch Anglican who had the support of the Bishops. The members of the CABAL were not: Lauderdale was a Covenant as was much of Scotland, both Shaftesbury and Buckingham were non-conformists though Shaftesbury had no qualms occasionally receiving Anglican Sacrament for political purposes, Clifford was later to revealed to be a Roman Catholic, only Arlington held Anglican belief but even he would convert on his death bed much like his master Charles II. York, who also held influence in this government, was a Roman Catholic
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Catholic. As such, government sympathy lay with those who wanted toleration, not those attempting to prevent it. In 1670, Charles made a Treaty with Louis XIV, the King of France. There was a secret clause in the Treaty where Charles promised to announce his conversion and France would support him both monetarily and militarily. Charles also agreed to join France in war with the Netherlands\(^{360}\).

Britain now prepared for war with the Netherlands. The Netherlands was a Protestant Calvinist country and was mostly popular in England, or more accurately, more popular than France was. This caused pause in the CABAL as to just how could England make the war against the Dutch more popular. The members of the CABAL and York convinced Charles that the non-conformists could potentially be a fifth column in the British war efforts as they were very closely religiously related to the Dutch Calvinist majority, especially as most of Scotland was non-conformists and some of England was. More importantly, the non-conformists were consolidated in the urban centres of England. Cities were very important militarily as they held most of a power’s economy. This consolidation of wealth in a particular area was very useful to the Crown who would often go to these groups to get the quick start up capital needed for war. They would later pay them back with the taxes and customs voted for by Parliament which would often take more time for the cash needy belligerents. Those who loaned money to the King would gain interest on that return. Goldsmiths in particular were very involved in this action and often lent large sums of money to the crown. However, on this occasion the goldsmiths and other lenders were not interested in lending Charles such a large amount. This led

\(^{360}\) Levi, Louis XIV, 415
to Charles had issued the Stop of the Exchequer to gain the capital needed for this endeavor. Charles thus needed to reduce the tension that had built up to due to this. The solution brought to him was the 1672 Royal Act of Indulgence\textsuperscript{361}.

The CABAL, and York, were all in great favour of Indulgence. Charles was as well. This moment also made sense politically as the support of non-dissenters in the cities were vital in mounting an effective war. Thus, the Act of Indulgence was carried out. It caused quite the stir as the Holder of the Great Seal, a devout Anglican, refused to put the seal on it as he saw it as too generous to Catholics. He was sacked and the Declaration was carried out. It would be the target of much criticism when Parliament next met in 1674.

\textsuperscript{361} Charles Stuart Rex II, “Royal Declaration of Indulgence,” 15 March 1672
A Series of Unfortunate Events

Tricked into War

War again

The Anglo Dutch War began in 1672, a day after the French declared war on the Netherlands. The main focus for the French was the land invasion that took place in 1672. France avoided the Spanish Netherlands as agreed upon by Louis XIV and Charles II. Instead he marched his troops through the principality of Cologne, an ally in the initial stages of the war. France launched their invasion on May, 4th. It was brilliantly successful. The Dutch army was underfunded and undermanned due to the rivalry between the merchants and the Organists. Everyone was shocked at the speed and ferocity of the French advance. The Dutch fortress of Utrecht elected to hand the keys to their gate to the French rather than be plundered. Several eastern Dutch provinces surrendered to France and their allies. To heal the divide between the States General and the Organists, William III was given control of the army for a year. The Dutch also decided to employ the Water Line to protect their western provinces. The Water Line was a series of inundations that protected Amsterdam and other western provinces. It was impassible by the French. This would mark the end of the land campaigns in 1672. Louis XIV would spend his remaining time subduing the provinces he had conquered. His striking success would scare much of continental Europe who would then join the war against him including the Holy Roman Empire and Spain.

The Netherlands was thus in great danger. De Witt, leader of the States General and merchant, needed a victory. He ordered De Ruyter, leader of the Dutch Naval forces, to initiate a naval engagement with the British and French forces. De Ruyter surprised the combined fleet
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on June 7th 1672 off the cost of Norfolk in England. The surprise attack worked in splitting the
French from the English, making both less effective. During the battle, the Dutch managed to
sink the Royal James, one of England’s best ships. The Ear of Sandwich who was leading a
section of the English Navy while on board died when the ship went down\footnote{Jones, The Anglo-Dutch Wars of the Seventeenth Century. 274 – 6}.

Ultimately, both the combined English/French fleet and the Dutch fleet suffered heavy
damage. Neither fleet lost many ships but many of the ships were too damaged to continue
outside of port. Tactically the battle was inconclusive as both sides suffered heavy damage.
Both sides claimed victory. The English claimed victory as it was the Dutch who retreated
following the heavy fighting of the morning. The Dutch claimed victory as the combined fleet
was now too damaged to continue blockading Dutch ports as it had been doing up to this point.
Most historians agree with the Dutch, claiming that the removal of the combined fleet allowed
Dutch privateers a free run at English merchants. However, the victory was not enough for De
Witt in the face of overwhelming losses to the French. The Battle of Solebay would be the only
serious engagement between the two fleets in 1672\footnote{Ibid, 278}.

**Parliament’s Response**

As Parliament met in 1673 their mood was far from happy. Both the alliance with France
and the war with the Netherlands were not popular, especially following the rapid success the
French gained. Many were more afraid of the French advances than Dutch mercantile rivalry.
The naval battle of Solebay had also been damaging to the Crown as it was not an outright
victory. Many in Parliament were not sure why the war was even taking place. The Dutch had
also reconquered New York in 1673 which was a humiliation to the British if not very significant tactically. Parliament was most upset with the Declaration of Indulgence. Parliament had already fought against such a declaration a decade ago, at the time the King had retreated from the engagement with Parliament.

This was still the Cavalier Parliament that had initially formed at the beginning of Charles’ reign. It still held a strong Royalist tinge and supported Anglicanism above all else. The majority of its members were for Church, Monarchy and traditional rights. It distrusted many of the King’s ministers, especially those who were not Anglican, almost all of them, or who had ties to republicanism, such as Shaftesbury. All the members of the CABAL knew that Parliament would come for them, that was why they continuously urged Charles to delay the introduction of Parliament, however the need for funding meant that Charles called Parliament despite this. The lack of British success, plus the strong French campaign meant that MPs were more worried that France would dominate the Netherlands and create a worse position for Brittan. With French domination of the Netherlands, the continental side of the English Channel would be heavily French dominated and controlled. Charles had tricked Parliament in their last session, in this session the price to continue the war would be high.

Now Parliament made the redaction of the declaration a price for the increased supply of funds that the Navy so desperately needed. Charles disregarded the advice of most of the CABAL and of York in revoking Indulgence and capitulating to Parliament. These were not the funds to repay the initial ‘loan’ that the government had seized, merely the funds to reequip
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the fleet for the upcoming year. Many in the CABAL were unhappy with this choice, only Arlington actively supported the measure and only Shaftesbury was neutral. Some historians argue that it was this moment that was the beginning of the end for the CABAL. The Test Act would remove Clifford from the equation, while at around this time Buckingham would drift away from the CABAL due to internal struggle and loss of relationship with Charles II. Shaftesbury would soon begin to become a more vocal critic of the Anglo Dutch War and would become suspicious of York’s desire to retire following the Test Act, rightfully suspecting him of Catholic sympathies.

Parliament was not willing to simply trade Indulgence for supplies. The Test Act of 1673 was also put into effect. A decade ago, a set of Penal Laws called the Clarendon Code had been put into effect. This set of laws was for the most part aimed against the Dissenters who had run the country during the Interregnum. As feelings of enmity between Anglicans and protestant Dissenters died down, the Code itself was less utilized. The House of Commons still feared the rise of Catholicism, even as non-conformists were seen as less of a threat by most. Some, especially among Anglican Bishops, saw all non-Anglicans as a major danger and continued to do so. Nonetheless, the majority of the House of Commons now feared the spectre of Catholicism with greater fear than non-conformism.

The Test Act of 1673 extended to all formal positions both within the government and the House of Commons. Only the House of Lords was exempt. Those who took office had to
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claim “I, name of person, do declare that I do believe that there is not any transubstantiation in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, or in the elements of the bread and wine, at or after the consecration thereof by any person whatsoever.” This was a direct rebuke of the teachings of the Catholic Church and ultimately meant that no one who was a Catholic could take the oath without renouncing their Catholicism openly. Non-conformists who did not believe in the rituals that Catholics did had less trouble with the Test Act, which was how men such as Lauderdale could stay in power following the implementation of the Test Act.

This would ultimately lead to the departure of many Catholics within government, most notably Sir Clifford who had served previously as the Lord Treasurer, and York who had served as the top Admiral of the Navy. There is scholarly thought that Charles encouraged the introduction of the Test Act. He had been worried and angered at his brothers increasing fascination with Catholicism, suspecting him of harbouring Catholic sympathies. Charles II believed that this would force York to forego these sympathies and create a much more stable succession as both men were aware of the dangers of being Catholic and in line to the throne. Unfortunately, Charles did not suspect how deep his brother’s sympathies were, how much he was influenced by the conversion of his first wife Anne, and how much he was willing to risk for his principals. Even though this failed in bringing his brother back in line, it did give Charles a bulwark for support. He could raise the spectre of his brother to bring Parliament in line, and

this worked until the Popish Plot sparked such a visceral fear of Catholicism that Charles II could not contain it.

The plan worked twice as not only did it weaken support for his brother while boosting his own credentials, Charles also got parliament to agree to provide £1,260,000, to fund war effort. This budget allowed Charles to reequip the fleet under his cousin, Prince Rupert. The Prince would lead the Navy into a series of battles in 1673 but he was not as skilled a commander as York and would ultimately be unable in defeating the Dutch Navy.

The Test Act forced those who were not Anglicans out of government. It forced Clifford to formalize and publicly reveal his conversion to Roman Catholicism or to lie. Catholicism had appealed to Clifford for several years prior to this, Evelyn’s observation a few years earlier revealed “I had lately observed of Mr Treasurer’s conversation on occasion, I suspected him of a little warping to Rome.” Once he formally announced his conversion, he was no longer able to formally hold office, but he still carried good will from the King and was even closer to York.

It would not have been inconceivable for Clifford to remain in London as an influential figure for his access to both the Monarch and his heir. Instead Clifford decided to retire from public life as he had been experiencing great fatigue since 1671. In 1672 Clifford had become quite ill and was forced to take time away from the treasury to look after his health. He often expressed envy at those ministers who had been able to comfortably retire, so perhaps this was not the blow to Clifford many had perceived it to be. Clifford was unable to enjoy his retirement, as he would die in October of the same year (1673) from natural occurrences. Clifford died at the
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age of 43 from urinary stones. There was a rumour that Clifford had committed suicide, this was false.

York also failed the Test Act and openly declared himself a member of the Roman Catholic Church. He was thus forced to give up his post as Lord of the Admiralty which passed to his ally and friend, the Scottish Lauderdale. Practical control of the Navy passed to Prince Rupert. While officially out of position, York still help influence in the proceedings of government. York would oppose the rise of the Earl of Danby who was the protégé of Buckingham. While his former patron was being pushed from office, Danby was building his own power base.

Danby began his parliamentary career as an ally and protégé of Buckingham. In the initial beginning of the CABAL, Danby assisted Buckingham in his attacks on Ormond for control of Ireland. In 1670, Buckingham successfully schemed to remove William Penn as treasurer of the Navy. He installed Danby in his place. Danby excelled at this job, modernizing the system of finance in the Navy and managing to achieve repairs despite the limitations with the money he was allotted. When Clifford was forced to retire as Lord Treasurer, Danby was promoted to the position. This gave Danby the ability to control of the King’s finances. Using this treasured position, he managed to take control of the government. The Earl of Nottingham was made Lord Chancellor under the recommendation of Dany, but between 1674 – 79 the purview of government was controlled by Danby. Much like Edward Hyde before him, Danby managed to act as the single voice of governance.
The Fall of the CABAL

Defeat

Following York’s resignation Prince Rupert was given command of the Navy. Charles II had looked up to his older cousin during the English Civil War. Prince Rupert was a singularly skilled cavalry officer, but he was simply not as skilled as York was as a naval commander. In June 1673, Prince Rupert along with French allies would attack the Dutch position. The land battle had waged to a halt adding pressure to the Naval component. There was the hope that an amphibious assault could become feasible, the issue was this could not be carried out while the Dutch Fleet was not yet blockaded. Prince Rupert brought the larger combined fleet to near where the Dutch fleet was located, hoping to pressure them to retreat to the naval fortress of Hellevoesitus so that a combined French and English army could land on Dutch shores uninterrupted\(^{372}\).

Instead, De Ruyter stayed in the shallows of Schooneveld. The previous year, the French navy had sailed away from danger and had engaged in fighting on the skirmishes with the Dutch fleet while the British bared the brunt of the force. This had created tension between the allies. This time, the French navy took the centre of the line to show their bravery against the Dutch. This was a mistake as the French were not experienced seamen. De Ruyter used his superior understanding of the shoals in the area to outmaneuver the larger combined fleet. The French middle was broken by the Dutch advance. De Ruyter himself sent his flag ship\(^{373}\) as the first ship through the gap. Once they broke the French, they were able to isolate the English from both the side and the rear. The Dutch separated the combined fleet into 4 distinct groups, forcing the French and English to break off the attack. The Dutch superior tactical skill and
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maneuverability resulted in a great victory for the Dutch. The English and the French blamed each other for the disaster\textsuperscript{374}.

A week later, Prince Rupert was once again defeated. Prince Rupert did not believe that the smaller Dutch fleet would dare to engage his larger fleet away from the safety of the shoals. He left his ships out of position. On June 14\textsuperscript{th}, the second battle of the Schooneveld commenced when De Ruyter attacked the larger combined fleet that was in disarray. Prince Rupert did not help matters by confusing his own men and the French with his tactical maneuvers. At the last minute, Prince Rupert tried to invert his squadron order, without telling either his allies or his own commanders. This completely muddled the battlefield and confused all who witnessed it. The extreme absurdity of the Prince’s actions resulted in the Dutch being wary of the English allowing Rupert to escape with considerable damage to his fleet and almost none to the Dutch\textsuperscript{375}.

The final engagement between the two fleets was the battle of Texel. The Dutch fleet had been called out of port to defend the return of the treasure fleet from the Dutch colonial areas. The English desperately needed to capture the fleet in its entirety to continue to fund the war. They believed that with the larger fleet fully prepared, they would be able to defeat the smaller Dutch fleet. De Ruyter did not want to leave his defensible position, but was ordered to do so by William III who had taken over from De Witt. Dutch finances were in shambles as half the country was occupied by French forces and the flooding that prevented further French advances also prevented Dutch agricultural output. Without the treasure ships,

\textsuperscript{374} Jones, The Anglo-Dutch Wars of the Seventeenth Century, 303
\textsuperscript{375} Boxer, The Anglo-Dutch Wars of the 17th Century, 46
the Dutch ability to continue the war would be in jeopardy. Reluctantly De Ruyter left his position to engage the enemy. De Ruyter brilliantly managed to once again divert the French from the English fleet, separating the two. He also separated the English rear guard from its centre and isolated the two sections making both more vulnerable and nullifying his numbers disadvantage. While both sides suffered great damage, neither was able to gain a decisive tactical victory\(^{376}\). The combined fleet of English and French eventually retreated. This was an important psychological victory for the Dutch as they prevented the capture of the treasure ships, that Charles desperately needed to continue to war effort. The Dutch ability to protect these ships meant that the English need for cash became even more pressing. Furthermore, the French and British hoped that defeating the Dutch Navy would allow the combined Navies to transport troops directly into the Netherlands, bypassing the Holland Water Line. The final defeat of the combined Navies showed that this would not be possible while De Ruyter was commander\(^{377}\). As York would later write that amongst admirals “he [De Ruyter] was the greatest ever to that time was in the world\(^{378}\).” The lack of funds and the increasing unpopularity meant that Charles had no choice but to end the war.

During the war Buckingham had increasingly withdrawn from the CABAL. Through encounters with York he believed there had been more to the Treaty of Dover than he had been told\(^{379}\). He had also been pulled from the fleet after only a day and not allowed to serve with the Navy. To compensate, Charles gave him leadership of an infantry division and made
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him third in command of the British forces, behind only York and Prince Rupert\textsuperscript{380}. His association with the CABAL’s unpopular policies made it difficult for him to recruit in the winter of 1672-3. When a Huguenot Count was promoted above him, he refused to serve in the military at all. He ultimately would be formally pushed from government the following year\textsuperscript{381}.

The loss of Buckingham’s support for the war was significant as both he and Shaftesbury, who began to build his own group of supporters partially from Buckingham’s faction, later named the Whig party, would begin advocating for ending the war. Their loss of support damaged Charles II’s ability to manage parliament. Buckingham also began to suspect secret dealings in the treaty of Dover and began to leak articles of the document to fellow politicians which revealed that Charles had made an agreement to invade the Dutch back in 1670. This despite the fact that in 1671 he convinced Parliament to upgrade the fleet due to dangers posed by France, who he planned to ally with. Arlington soon followed with the leaks, though not with the conversion clause. Soon both men officially supported ending the Anglo Dutch War, along with Shaftesbury. Lauderdale was mostly neutral to the effort as his focus was Scotland, though he would gain the title of Lord Commissioner of the Admiralty from York. York suggested that Lauderdale be the man to replace him\textsuperscript{382}. However, Lauderdale would not take part in Naval warfare.
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So far, the English War effort had yielded no results. The Anglo-French combined fleet had failed to manage to defeat the smaller but superbly commanded Dutch fleet. Parliament had already voted financial support in exchange for the dissolvement of the Act of Indulgence and the introduction of the Test Act. No one in the CABAL, or Charles himself were aware of what Parliament would demand next in exchange for funding. Additionally, beyond the failures in the North Sea, the war was going badly throughout the globe. In September of 1673, the Dutch reconquered New York, briefly naming it New Orange. The Dutch VOC also defeated the British East India Company and captured several of their ships while limiting them from trade internationally. The Dutch also conquered St Helena from the British in 1673\(^{384}\).

The greater pressure than the efforts of conquering by the Dutch were the efforts in propaganda. The British already had moral reservations about joining with Catholic France against Protestant Netherlands. The major victories for the French made these reservations higher as many in Britain did not want a homogenous empire on the other side of the channel\(^{385}\). John Evelyn, the noted diarist wrote “The loss of my Lord Sandwich redoubled the loss to me, as well the folly of hazarding so brave a fleet, and losing so many good men, for no provocation in the world but because the Hollander exceeded us in industry, and all things else but envy\(^{386}\).”

This feeling was greatly amplified by the extremely successful propaganda campaign that William III started in 1673. Pierre du Moulin was Arlington’s former secretary before he
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fled to the Netherlands. Using his in-depth knowledge of the English psyche and Parliamentary politics, du Moulin began his propaganda campaign on behalf of the Netherlands. The Dutch had the world’s largest per capita printing ability, and it was put to good use. Britain (and especially London) was soon flooded with tens of thousands of pamphlets claiming that the Treaty of Dover was an attempt to suppress Protestantism. The pamphlets accused Charles of wanting to make the country Catholic again in conspiracy with Louis XIV. The plan was a complete success as it convinced, not only most Londoners and other city people where the pamphlets were focused, but also in both the Houses, Commons and Lords. The propaganda campaign was greatly aided by the retirement of both York and Clifford. Many thought York had become Catholic and feared a Catholic succession.

The loss of Clifford to the Test Act convinced many in parliament that there had been some Catholic conspiracy in the CABAL, another sign of its withering power. Both Arlington and Buckingham began leaking details of the Treaty as they became aware of public opinion. Shaftesbury responded particularly negatively to the propaganda campaign as he sincerely feared the growing strength of Catholicism in England, it had been the initial reason he had left the Royalist cause for Parliament’s during the English Civil War. This caused the break between Shaftesbury and Charles as the relationship between the two men would now almost exclusively be adversarial. The power of the CABAL was also beginning to depart as Lord Danby used his position as the replacement Treasury Minister to begin to influence proceedings. Danby would proceed to take control of government as the CABAL faded from power. Clifford
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had retired and later died in 1673. Shaftesbury and Buckingham would both be removed from power in early 1674. Arlington would enter a safer but less influential position of Lord Chamberlain later that year. Only Lauderdale would continue to stay in a position of influence in Scotland, and he would ally himself with Danby, recognizing who was now in control of the King’s ministry in England.

The infighting of the CABAL meant that none of the ministers were able to launch a serious defense of their positions and influence, as they were too busy fighting each other. Arlington managed to get the better of Buckingham but even he was not in a position to resist the onslaught of Danby as he had lost many key political allies such as Clifford. The CABAL ministry destroyed itself due to infighting, a shining example of the Bureaucratic Politics Model. These ministers were unable to defend themselves against both each other and outside organizations of power (The House of Commons). Struggling against both, these ministers succumbed to positions of little influence or lost their positions entirely. Charles II had created a government that was weak enough so that he could pursue his aims while not being blamed for any negative effects that may have come from them. This also proved that they were too weak to stand against increased scrutiny from an angry Parliament. Charles II had, with his trademark ruthlessness, had left his ministers to fend for themselves and they had faded away.

Following the death of the CABAL, the position of government also changed, though this was not entirely fair as many of the members of the CABAL had moved to the peace party
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before they had lost power (as early as 1673). Danby’s own personal opinions also favoured peace, but even if they had not that would matter little. By the time the House of Commons was recalled in 1674 events had changed. The French had stalled on the Holland Water Line in 1673. This had given the naval engagements increased importance but as the combined fleet failed to defeat the Dutch the French were forced to give up their plans of further invading the Dutch homeland. This set up the possibility of an invasion of the Spanish Netherlands\(^{391}\). This was very much against British interests. Charles had even issued a clause in the Treaty of Dover to be able to assist in the Spanish Netherlands if the French invaded.

It was completely against British foreign policy interest to allow France to conquer the region, that was what the Triple Alliance had been aimed at in 1668\(^{392}\). The French invasion put Charles in a difficult position as it made the alliance with France virtually impossible to defend. The House of Commons began by attacking both Buckingham and Arlington, both of whom were seen as the leaders of the CABAL. Shaftesbury had already left the government and Clifford was dead. Attacks on Lauderdale fizzled out as he had the support of York and Charles and was not as involved in English politics to begin with. Following this, the House of Commons told Charles that they would not give any more money to the war effort. The Dutch propaganda was effective, but even so the war had yielded no benefits\(^{393}\).

Without the support of Parliament, Charles was unable to continue the war. He did not have the funds to do so and had no way of easily procuring new money to continue the war.

\(^{391}\) Modern day Belgium
\(^{392}\) Pincus, Protestantism and Patriotism, 471 – 4
\(^{393}\) Henning, The House of Commons, 1660-1690, 182
The government around Charles was also no longer interested in the war as Danby disapproved of French ascendency. Even Charles was troubled by French engagements in the Spanish Netherlands. Charles was also displeased when the States General revealed that Louis XIV had made peace proposals to the Dutch despite the agreement form England and France that neither would make a separate peace. The time had come for Charles to terminate the war with the Dutch.

Charles began by informing the French ambassador Colbert de Croissy that he had to terminate the war effort. He then spoke to the Netherlands through Spanish intermediaries about his desire to end the war. He claimed that the point of the war had been to install his nephew as Stadholder of the Netherlands, and seeing this completed he felt his work was done. Initially he had entered war with the Netherlands to put his nephew in control, it was one of the ways that Charles had legitimized his war.

Charles told the States General that he no longer wished for war between Protestant brothers as long as they gave a small indemnity to Charles II. At first the States General were unwilling to acquiesce Charles II’s demands, England had accomplished nothing in the war and this meant that in their opinion they not entitled to any reward. Many members admitted their personal satisfaction in the thought that the British might be kept suffering a bit longer. It was only through William III that they finally agreed to the terms. He believed that he would be able to bring Charles into the war on their side, especially after aggressive French actions in the Spanish Netherlands. William III had recently signed an alliance with Spain, but the Spanish
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were unwilling to declare war on France until the British were out of the war as they feared attacks on their colonies by the British. For these reasons, William agreed to pay Charles his small indemnities to end the war. The Treaty of Westminster was signed by the British on February 10th and ratified by the Dutch on March 5th. Charles only received a very small amount of money owed through the treaty396. William III was able to successfully argue that the payment was offset by the support that the House of Orange had given Charles I during the English Civil War.

Before the House of Commons

396 Boxer, The Anglo-Dutch Wars of the 17th Century, 63-4
Buckingham and Arlington were the two leaders in place during the CABAL ministry. The House of Commons knew this and went after both of them following the events of the 3rd Anglo Dutch War. Both men knew they would soon be questioned and began preparing their defenses. Arlington in particular, focused on drawing upon support in the House of Commons and preparing. Buckingham was less prepared, as would soon be revealed.

Buckingham’s growing distance from the Court proved to be dangerous for his political career. The first session of the House of Lords occurred in January, 1674. In the House of Lords, Buckingham was accused by the new Earl of Shrewsbury for living a “wicked and scandalous life” with regards to Buckingham’s behavior with the previous Earl of Shrewsbury’s wife who had since moved into Buckingham’s estate as his mistress. This opened him up to an address for removal by the House of Commons. Unlike an Impeachment in the House of Lords, Buckingham would have been unable to defend against this. He did so anyways, showing up to the House of Commons unannounced to deflect blame on his longtime political rival, Arlington. His speech was deemed frivolous, incoherent and impressed few of the members of the Commons. After two days of deliberation the House of Commons addressed Charles for the Duke’s removal from power, Charles obliged.

---


The testimony of Buckingham, while unsuccessful in his defense did cast aspirations upon Arlington. The House would open an investigation into Arlington. Unlike Buckingham, Arlington would ask and gain permission to address the House of Commons directly. Arlington’s defense was eloquent and persuasive as he was able to turn an inherently hostile House of Commons unto his side. Arlington was a Restoration politician, where one of the chief requirements for the part was eloquence. Arlington showed it here. Arlington would also claim “I should think myself happy, could I with convenience retire.” The House of Commons would find Arlington not guilty on all counts. In fact, it was his supporters who pushed forward judgment knowing what the verdict would be so as to get Arlington completely acquitted from all blame. Despite this, Arlington had been put on edge by the inquiry and investigation. He asked and received the lesser position of the Lord Chamberlain to the King’s household in September 1674. At the same time, he sold his position as Secretary of the South. Arlington would never again rise to the level of influence he had during the CABAL ministry.

Shaftesbury’s dismissal from power came at the hand of the King for attempted interference in the line of succession. Shaftesbury had often tried to either get Charles to divorce Catherine and marry a Protestant woman, or to legitimize Monmouth. Charles would do neither. York’s rise to power, coupled with the attacks on his inheritance by Shaftesbury, resulted in York using his increasing influence to move Shaftesbury out of power. Shaftesbury bring together a group of likeminded individuals, forming the Whig Party. These were men who feared the presence of a Catholic in the line of succession and who desired greater Protestant
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indulgence. These were often men with Republican sympathies. Shaftesbury was also famous for hiring John Locke as his personal physician. Shaftesbury’s political attitudes would encourage Locke to write his Two Treaties on government. Shaftesbury would continue to be a nuisance to King Charles II in the coming years.

Lauderdale was the only member of the CABAL to both stay relevant while keeping the support of the King. By 1674 Lauderdale had managed to turn the Scottish Privy council into a body of his own supporters rather than the diverse alliances of different political groups in Scotland that it had been in the 1660s and early 1670s. The change in power meant Lauderdale was more able to act as autocrat and push agenda through Scotland, even when it was unpopular. Lauderdale was also able to leverage his access to both York and Charles into political power by disallowing any other voices on Scottish issues. This forces Charles to rely even more heavily on Lauderdale which meant that the attacks of the English Parliament on his position would prove ineffective. Lauderdale was given English peerage by the King as an act of protection against political attacks in the House of Commons. Lauderdale would continue both his alliance with Danby and his stranglehold of power in Scotland for the rest of the decade.
The Earl Danby formed a coalition in the House of Commons as he took power. Danby was a Royalist Anglican. He disapproved of religious freedom, either Catholic or non-conformist.
He believed in the power and supremacy of the Anglican Church. He disapproved of alliances with France considering them a common enemy to Protestants. In a similar vein, he supported closer ties with the Netherlands who he thought of as Protestant brothers in arms. Danby would find a large number of like-minded individuals within this Royalist Cavalier Parliament. He believed that the back-benchers, those who normally didn’t participate in the House of Commons, could be induced to do so. With this overwhelming majority, he formed a party that was loyal to the King if the King continued to be loyal to Anglicanism and conservative values. Danby pushed for harsher measures against both Catholics and non-dissenters. This party, the Tories, would also push to join the war between France and the Netherlands; only this time, on the side of the Dutch. Danby and his Tory party became quite a successful coalition, despite the efforts of Charles II.

Arlington would become much less influential as Lord Chamberlain. Danby thought Arlington a threat despite his self-chosen removal from the upper stratosphere of English Court politics. Danby worked on dismantling much of Arlington’s power. Arlington would attempt to undermine Lord Danby by proposing and attempting to carry out a match between York’s daughter Mary and William III as Arlington had many contacts in the Netherlands due to his wife. Charles disapproved and pushed Arlington to the fringes of power. Arlington continued to attempt to thwart Danby but without much success. Charles believed Arlington to be behind the unsuccessful impeachment attack on Danby in 1677 which would isolate the two men for the rest of both of their lives. Arlington remained neutral during much of the commotion of the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis, staying friendly with Shaftesbury while supporting the Crown in

Buckingham joined the Whig Party in fighting against his old protégé, Danby. In 1677, Buckingham joined Shaftesbury and other prominent Whigs in supporting Dissolution arguing for an archaic statue that if a Parliament did not meet for a full year, a new Commons must be called. The House of Commons, surprisingly, did not see things the same way. Neither did the King who was benefiting from a friendly House of Commons following the creation of the Tory party by Danby. Buckingham with the other conspirators were thrown in the Tower of London, though Buckingham would soon be released. Buckingham briefly rose again during the Popish Plot to push Whig agenda but would not embrace the legitimization of Monmouth as he personally disliked Charles II’s son. The Crown would go after Buckingham for Sodomy, a useful charge as it held the same punishment as treason but was much easier to prove\footnote{Evidence showed that Buckingham most likely had engaged in relations with men and women throughout his life although this is not absolutely confirmed.}. Buckingham faded from view in 1680. He would briefly return to the House of Lords during York’s first year as Monarch\footnote{1685} but would die the same year\footnote{Bruce Yardley, “Villiers, George, Second Duke of Buckingham”, \url{https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/28294}.}.

Despite the support of the King and York, Lauderdale found it prudent\footnote{Camden Society (Great Britain). \textit{The Lauderdale Papers}. London Longmans, Green [etc.], 1838. \url{http://archive.org/details/lauderdalepapers01camduoft}.} to ally himself with Lord Danby who had taken control of the government following the fall of the CABAL. Danby was able to use the country backbenchers (the forerunners for the Tories) to protect Lauderdale in England. This support came at the cost of allying himself to the Anglican Party...
base. This meant he had to implement Anglican policies that were hugely unpopular in Scotland where the primary sect of Christianity was not Anglican but Covenanter\textsuperscript{406}.

Danby’s party pushed Lauderdale to take increasingly harsher steps against the non-conformist Covenanters which forced Lauderdale to virtually ignore the Scottish Parliament and use the King’s authority to execute these orders. Lauderdale attempted to introduce leniency in 1677\textsuperscript{407} but was unable to do so without losing Danby’s support. In 1678, Lauderdale was ultimately forced to use Highlander levies to police and terrorize the most dissatisfied areas of Scotland\textsuperscript{408}. Scotland erupted into rebellion. This shook Charles’ confidence in Lauderdale and ultimately would result in his fall from power. The factionalism within Parliament meant that despite this rebellion, Danby was able to protect the impeachment attempt by the Commons (but only by a single vote\textsuperscript{409}).

Danby would lose power in 1679. Initially, he managed to succeed in creating a stable government following the fall of the CABAL. With the support of the back-benchers, Danby was able to defeat the scheming of the Whigs and other opponents. Ironically, the Anglican Danby would create a situation where both York and Shaftesbury believed it was advisable to join together to combat Danby’s grip on power. At this stage, Shaftesbury still supported either Charles’ remarriage as the precedent had been determined in the Roos Remarriage Case in the House of Lords, or the legitimization of Monmouth who was Protestant. Nonetheless,
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Shaftesbury and the other Whig party members were prepared to accept York’s succession as he would later be succeeded by his daughters, Mary and Anne, both of whom were Protestant with the former married to William III. It was only in 1676 with the issue of York’s second marriage to the Catholic Mary of Modena that the Whigs became increasingly alarmed at the prospect of a Catholic dynasty. This ultimately spoiled the alliance between the two men that lasted between the two men.

It was Charles himself who caused the fall of Danby. Charles continued to have a closer relationship and correspondence with Louis XIV. Charles encouraged Louis to continue to use English troops in the French army and continued to allow the French to recruit British troops. Louis and Charles also struck a different sort of agreement. Louis would continue to fund Charles if Charles did not call for a session of Parliament. The French were well aware that they were inherently disliked by the House of Commons and that if the House of Commons was called, Charles may be forced to either suspend some of the French privileges or perhaps even worse actively begin supporting the Dutch, or even worse joining the war on the side of the Dutch. Instead, Louis struck an agreement with Charles. He continued to subsidize Charles if Charles refused to call Parliament. This agreement consisted throughout Danby’s government. While Danby disapproved of this, he was forced to agree to these conditions.

Another issue was that Danby had no friends. He had political allies who agreed with his intentions but he had no friends. John Evelyn, who was better acquainted with him than almost any other, described him as “a man of excellent natural parts but nothing of generosity or
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gratefulness. Much like his mentor Buckingham, Danby too had expensive tastes and was almost always in debt. To relieve his cash flow problems, Danby participated in blatant corruption. He was more than willing to sell offices in exchange for cash, some of which he would personally pocket. Despite all this, Danby was an accomplished administrator, perhaps the greatest in the reign of Charles II to date. He also benefited from the modernization effects that Shaftesbury, and especially Clifford, had begun. Along with the subsidies of the French, Charles II’s finances were finally somewhat adequate. They were nowhere near adequate for any war positions or to build up the fleet, but in peace time these funds were enough to avoid bankruptcy. While not able to change the relationship with France, Danby was able to improve Anglo Dutch relations. He managed to convince Charles Arlington’s initial idea, to marry York’s daughter Mary to William III in 1676. This would solidify relations between the two powers.

In 1678, due to personal disagreement, the details of letters between Danby and his French counterparts were revealed to the House of Commons. It showed that Danby was taking money from the French to delay Parliament. What was not revealed in the House was that these letters were supported by Charles II, at the bottom of these letters was a note that read “I approve of this Letter. C.R,” CR stood for Charles Rex or King Charles. However, this was not read by the Speaker of the House and was entirely ignored by the MPs of the House. The House of Commons immediately drew up articles of impeachment for assuming Royal power and for embezzlement. Danby was obviously guilty of corruption and his lack of true friends
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meant that no one was willing to support him in the House of Commons. He was voted guilty by the House of Commons.

In the House of Lords, proceedings went more slowly. While Shaftesbury and his allies urged a quicker decision, many in the House of Lords were hesitant to impeach a minister for carrying out the desires of the King. In a particularly witty speech, the Earl of Carnavorn reminded his peers how many in the House of Lords eagerly participated in impeachments before they too became impeached. Ultimately, this did not truly matter as the Cavalier Parliament was dissolved soon after and with it the impeachment of Danby.

A new Parliament formed in 1679. This parliament was not like the old Royalist one. The fear of the Popish Plot had brought about a Parliament that was heavily anti Catholic. Even Anglicans were deemed as too soft on Catholicism as many of the old Anglicans still supported York to succeed Charles II, deeming that God had made Succession and Parliament could not interfere in God’s work. The new Parliament did not agree. Bereft of his old allies, Danby resigned as Lord Treasurer. The new House of Commons was uncompromising and recontinued the impeachment that the old House of Commons had started. They demanded an answer from the House of Lords. The House of Lords suggested that banishment, as had occurred to Edward Hyde, should be appropriate punishment. The House of Commons disagreed. This situation eerily reminded many, including Evelyn\textsuperscript{413} and Burnet\textsuperscript{414}, of the trial of Lord Strafford back in 1640 before the English Civil War. In 1680, facing pressure from the House of Commons and Lord Shaftesbury, Charles II would place Danby in the Tower of London. However, Danby would
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not be executed and simply stayed in the Tower until 1684 when he was released on bail. Danby would return to the House of Lords in 1685 and would slowly find himself turning against York for his attacks on Anglicans and Anglicanism. Danby was a member of the ‘Immortal Seven’ who invited William III and Mary to take control of the Three Kingdoms.

The fall of Danby in 1679 to the Whig Party destroyed the support that Lauderdale had in the English Parliament. Danby was only saved of impeachment through Charles’ dissolution of Parliament. In 1679, a rebellion against Lauderdale’s rule in Scotland sprung up from Scottish Covenants who rebelled against the force that Lauderdale had been employing to continue with Danby’s desire for a suppression of non-conformists. Charles II would send his illegitimate son Monmouth to deal with the rebellion. Monmouth would succeed in suppressing the rebellion which raised his credibility significantly, he was seen as a hero and Shaftesbury would use this to once again try to get Charles II to legitimize his son. Lauderdale was rebuked by Charles for his use of Highland levies to keep order against Covenants which sparked the rebellion. This marked the end of Lauderdale’s reign in Scotland.415

Lauderdale proposed that York take over as leader of Scotland with Lauderdale as an advisor, which was readily accepted by both Charles and York. York surprised Lauderdale with his vigour in ruling, inviting those who disagreed with Lauderdale back into government.416 York was also allegedly disgusted by the corruption that Lauderdale had engaged in while controlling Scotland, which created enmity between the two men.417 Lauderdale’s decision to vote for the
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execution of the Catholic Viscount Stafford, in 1680 at the height of the frenzy, won him Charles II’s support but at the cost of his brother. In 1680, Lauderdale was allowed to retire quietly where he died a few years later418.

In 1678, the Popish plot sprung all throughout England when a man called Titus Pope claimed that Catholic forces were working on killing the King and seizing power. Shaftesbury used the paranoia to gain entice the mob of London to support him. He also managed to use the paranoia to make the current House of Commons unusable to Charles II. Their attempts to impeach Danby forced Charles to dissolve them at the end of 1678.

The following Parliament had many members the Whig Party. This was known as the Habeas Corpus Parliament. The Whigs would use the hysteria from the Popish Plot to seriously threaten York’s position as heir, known as the Exclusion Crisis. This resulted initially in York’s exile to the Netherlands in 1679 to protect him. Charles II dissolved this Parliament, only months after it first formed. After this, Charles II fell ill. York briefly returned following a grave illness to King Charles but was once again sent away with Charles II’s recovery419. This time however, he was sent to Scotland. This was important would serve as a power base for York and his successors for years. During his time in Scotland, York was able to push through religious toleration and a more autocratic form of government by working with a coalition in Parliament. He ruled as a King during this period, in much the way Lauderdale had done previously. This entrenched York’s belief that through strength one could rule how they saw fit.
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This period reinforced his ideas on Monarchical government through increasingly autocratic policies.\footnote{Miller, York, 414}

Between 1680 and 1682 Charles would outmaneuver Shaftesbury. The Parliament that emerged in 1680 following the dissolved of the Habeas Corpus Parliament came to be known as the Exclusion Parliament. This too was filled with a great number of Whigs who supported Shaftesbury. Shaftesbury’s allies in the House of Commons once again called for the Exclusion of York. However, the House of Lords refused to support the notion, voting it down 62 – 30. Shaftesbury went on the offensive and passed a bill in the House of Commons that made it illegal for a Catholic to be a member of the House of Lords. The House of Lords itself approved the bill with the caveat that York, as heir to the throne, was exempt. This destroyed the character of the bill as it was targeted at damaging the influence of York by removing him from the House of Lords.

Shaftesbury instead began a rumour that Irish Catholics were planning to attack England. This was dismissed by most of the members of the House of Lords but they were forced nonetheless to investigate it. However, by now the hysteria of the mob was dying. Titus Oates and others who brought the plots forward were being shown as false and duplicitous. The claims of Catholic interference began to become seen as ridiculous and unbelievable. This greatly damaged Shaftesbury’s ability to continue to incite the mob. Charles II was again dissolved Parliament, setting the next one to be held at Oxford rather than Westminster. Oxford was traditionally a Monarchial stronghold. Shaftesbury and other members of the Whigs
protested but they were now not strong enough to change the decision. In 1681, the Oxford Parliament met in Oxford. Deprived of the mob from London, Shaftesbury did not have the power base had had earlier in the crisis. Charles II dissolved this parliament too when it also attempted to pass an Exclusion Bill. From this point onwards, Charles II would rule without Parliament.

Charles II could rule without Parliament because managed to rework the conditions for town charters. These were documents were legally required by towns to have to continue to operate with the autonomy to elect their own officials or to participate in the elections of the House of Parliament. Charles II was able to suspend most town charters and only renew them once he was able to change the rules so that his allies had unequal power in urban centres. This meant that in the future, the historical weakness of Monarchy became a strength. Traditionally, as was seen in the English Civil War, it was the urban centres that opposed Monarchy. Charles II managed to turn that around and make cities a place of strength for the Royalist cause. Charles II also managed to rearrange his finances in such a way that he was no longer dependent on Parliament for funding. When he dissolved the Oxford Parliament, he ruled without Parliament.

A desperate attempt by Whigs in 1682 to assassinate both York and Charles II at Newmarket. The Rye House Plot, gave Charles II the excuse he ended to target the leadership of the Whig movement. Monmouth fled to the Netherlands while the other leaders of the Whig movement were improved. One member committed suicide while others were executed. This marked the end of the influence of terror that the Whigs had proliferated.

The rest of Charles II’s reign was much more peaceful. York would return to England in 1682. Charles II would die a few years later at the age of 55. Even on his deathbed, his famous
wit stayed with him. He was claimed to have said “you must pardon me gentlemen, for being a most unconscionable time a-dying.” When his brother died in 1685, York would take the crown. York’s time as King would be short. While he was able to defeat a rebellion by Monmouth, the birth of his son along with his increasing tendency for autocratic rule and forced religious toleration scared the moderate Anglicans who had previously been supporting him. This led to the Immortal Seven’s invitation to William III to invade England and become the ruler of the Three Kingdoms. York forced from government and William III and Mary became co-rulers of the Three Kingdoms.
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Conclusion: The Merry King’s difficult reign, and his legacy

John Riley, *King Charles II - National Portrait Gallery*, 1685 1680, Oil on Canvas, 72.4 x 57.8 cm,

[https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw01239/King-Charles-II.](https://www.npg.org.uk/collections/search/portrait/mw01239/King-Charles-II.)
The Earl of Ailesbury would later describe Charles in his memoir as “my good and gracious master, the best that ever reigned over us.” His famous wit personified the Restoration era. He was fond of saying “If we are understood, more words are unnecessary; if we are not to be understood, they are useless.” He truly was a man who understood the power of speech over action. By keeping his involvement mostly to speech rather than direct action, Charles was able to have others fall for his objectives.

Charles achieved his ultimate aims by manipulating the CABAL ministry, his alliance with France and war with the Dutch. Charles created a system of maintained rivalry so that he could use them against each other to push for greater obedience to his desires. The Bureaucratic Politics Model is so important in understanding this reign of the CABAL as the situation itself was fostered by the man in charge, Charles II. Charles’ entire personality involved deception and acting. He managed of his own advisors and used them to manage Parliament. Charles was ruthless when need be and trusted no one. He abandoned both Edward Hyde and the CABAL so that they would take the blame.

This practice at deception, duplicity and manipulation helped Charles survive through the Exclusion Crisis of 1678 – 82. Charles mastered the ability to manipulate his advisors, obfuscate his objectives and achieve his aims during the CABAL ministry. This was essential between 1678 – 82. Throughout all this, Charles was able to play off the attacks of Shaftesbury and the Whigs while discrediting them and sowing dissent in their ranks, ultimately
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using the power of the law to defeat the Whigs. These skills were honed during the CABAL period.

Charles was a much beloved prince by nobility and common people alike. Charles was arguably the second most popular Monarch, second only to perhaps Henry VIII, as a man of the people. He spent a great deal of time Newmarket where he encouraged horse racing and even raced himself as he was an accomplished jockey. Charles was well known to all inhabitants in area and was nicknamed Old Rowley after his favourite horse, notably a stud stallion. Charles was very much a people’s Monarch, the Merry Monarch. During his reign, Charles founded the Royal Observatory and was a patron of the Royal Society. He had a great interest in science, particularly in the practical sciences such as chemistry and mechanics. Charles also loved dogs, both the King Charles Spaniel and Cavalier King Charles Spaniel were both popularized by Charles II. Charles also greatly expanded the British Empire by gaining Bombay, Tangiers and New York. India and the US would both become key British colonies for the next century. Charles had great interest in the British Colonial projects. The Carolinas were named after him. So was Charleston, the capital of South Carolina today.
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Evelyn once wrote that Charles was “a prince of many virtues and many great imperfections, debonair, easy of access, not bloody or cruel." The Earl of Rochester, perhaps the greatest literary mind in England at the time wrote the more scandalous version

“Restless he rolls from whore to whore
A merry Monarch, scandalous and poor”

It was with the political parties that viewed Charles’ legacy in a much more partisan light. Tories remembered him fondly as a benevolent if uninvolved King while Whigs often remembered him as the cruel dictator who took power from heroic Cromwell. He was neither. Cunning and calculating, Charles when he was interested, was able to achieve his aims. Day to day governance did not appeal to the bold King who aimed for big projects rather than daily taxes. Charles also suffered under a great lack of financially security that a nation like France, or even the Netherlands, didn’t suffer from. That was the issue Rochester’s witty ditty referred to along with Charles’ famous pursuit of pleasure. Charles was a successful King in achieving his aims, especially with the resources at his disposal. Charles, the Merry Monarch, should also be better remembered for his ability manipulate both his rivals and his allies to pursue his own ends.

Charles II entered government in a particularly dangerous time. The Monarchy was the weakest it had ever been in the Stuart era when he took control in 1660. In fact, it could be
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argued that Charles II became King at a time when Monarchy was at its weakest period since the rule of William the Conqueror. Charles left the Monarchy in a strong state. It was financially stable. In fact, it was operating at a surplus following Charles’ reining in his extravagant lifestyle at the end of his life. Any major rivals he had were either dead or completely out of power. The Whig party had been virtually dismantled and its architect, Shaftesbury, was dead. Ireland and Scotland were both pacified and peaceful. England openly supported the Monarchy and the redistribution of town charters meant that Charles’ successor had a position where for the first time in living memory, the leadership of most urban centres supported the Crown. York’s first Parliament following his succession was named the Loyal Parliament as it was known chiefly for its loyalty. Charles II left the Monarchy in a much stronger position than he had found it, proving that he was an underappreciated as a successful Monarch for two key reasons.

Firstly, Charles trusted no one and was a deceiver. He deceived both ally and adversary. He managed to deceive more than half of the members in his own CABAL government by hiding the Conversion Clause from them in the Treaty of Dover. He deceived the entirety of Parliament when he negotiated the Secret Treaty of Dover with his sister Minette during her visit in 1670. He routinely acted in such a way that his ministers were always on their toes as no one could predict his next step or whose advice he would follow. His perchance for also listening to political advice from his mistresses as well as to rescind decisions made in the Privy Council while in an informal setting forced ministers who wanted to advance to participate in Charles’ social network where he exerted more control and influence than he did so in government.
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Charles did not fully trust any of his advisors or confidents and it showed in the rapid way he changed his mind and unwillingness to fully follow a single path. This made him unpredictable, forcing ministers to agree with him or be cast aside.

Secondly, Charles was Machiavellian and a skilled manipulator, willing to ruthlessly abandon his own advisors. He showed this ruthlessness when discarding Hyde to continue to stay in Parliament’s good graces. He refused to defend Arlington or Buckingham from Parliament, only shielding Lauderdale as he believed no other man could keep Scotland in control the way Lauderdale did. Charles’s skill as a manipulator revealed itself during the CABAL ministry. It was his ability to manipulate the various members of the CABAL that allowed him to drag England into a war that few, if any, Englishman supported. With a brilliance Machiavelli himself would have envied, Charles II purposefully created a government that would rival and undermine each other, clashing at all turns. This made each member dependent on the support of Charles II to continue to operate in the government and not be destroyed by a rival. This forced CABAL members to undertake actions that they would otherwise question as a matter of course, lest they be removed from power. This made each vulnerable to Charles II who ruthlessly exploited this advantage.

In conclusion, Charles used the skills he honed and practiced during the CABAL government to keep power during the Exclusion Crisis and leave the Monarchy in a position much stronger than he felt it. He is not simply the Merry Playboy Monarch; he must also be remembered as the manipulative deceitful Monarch who brilliantly manage his allies and enemies alike and continue to survive and thrive as Monarch. Few managed to so drastically improve the position of the British Monarchy from weakness to strength in their reign. Even
fewer experienced such a tumultuous reign and survived as Monarch. It was Charles’ flexibility that formed the foundation for the personality traits, his deceit or ruthlessness, that allowed for his success. Unlike his father or brother, Charles didn’t not stick to personal values that could have prematurely ended his reign. Charles ended his life as a true gentlemen courtier of the Restoration Court, a breath of fresh air following the rigidness of the Interregnum. His was a court famous for its pleasure, wit and frivolity. Perhaps this is the reason that Charles II has been so grossly underestimated as the political genius I argue he was.
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