

## CHAPTER TWO: A CHANGE OF LOYALTIES, 1649-1660

Unfortunately records during the Protectorate and Commonwealth periods contain few references to Annesley. Collections of personal letters combined with state papers provide a cursory overview of his actions, but more substantial records do not appear until the Restoration. This may have to do with Annesley's initial dislike of the new regime and its methods. His involvement with politics eventually commenced, but it appears he was hesitant after King Charles I's execution in January 1649. Annesley had been against the formation of the new republic, disapproving of both regicide and the abolition of the house of lords. However, rather than completely alienate himself and his family he chose instead to survive, a choice many had to make in these tumultuous years. Following Annesley's career during the 1650s will illustrate how he carefully walked the political tightrope, attempting to maintain his familial lands while at the same time working to restore some of the nobility's privileges. Never one to miss a political opportunity that could also salvage his conscience, Annesley later became part of the movement to restore Charles II and played a significant role in the king's return. This set in motion his rise to power, culminating in several high political positions, achievements no one would have predicted back in 1649. Thus, before his climb commences one must begin with his internal and external struggle to accept the new government.

Annesley has recently been credited with helping guide Ireland through the turbulent 1650s.<sup>1</sup> He and Roger Boyle, lord Broghill (future earl of Orrery) are described as two of the most astute Protestant politicians. Similar in their goals, yet different in their methods, their friendship and rivalry illustrates the factionalism of seventeenth

---

<sup>1</sup>T.C. Barnard, "The Protestant Interest, 1641-1660," in *Ireland From Independence to Occupation: 1641-1660*, ed. Jane Ohlmeyer (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 232.

century politics. All this is true, yet the author who makes these statements does not begin a detailed discussion of Annesley until 1659, though Broghill's activities during the 1650s are mentioned. It is apparent that there is not a great wealth of information regarding Annesley for this time period. Frustrating though it is, to gain a picture of Annesley's activities one must piece together what evidence exists and view it within the context of the turbulent events of the 1650s. The complicated relationship between England and Ireland must be studied to understand how the Restoration came about and the role that Annesley played.

Just after the king's execution Annesley remarked that though he disagreed with the new republic he could not take actions against it, citing promises to God.<sup>2</sup> This may have to do with the fact that in February 1648 Annesley had taken the National League and Covenant.<sup>3</sup> He emphasized his anger over the dissolution of the monarchy and house of lords, but initially made no move to try and change it. Although one author argued that Annesley "took no action to restore the old government" that is incorrect because he eventually did take action, though it was delayed.<sup>4</sup> Other politicians echoed Annesley's prudence and it is important to remember that many who survived the Interregnum by acquiescing with the new government later reaped rewards during the Restoration by jumping on Charles II's bandwagon in 1658-59.

It was impossible to remain completely inactive if one wished to preserve his lands and titles. It would be interesting to know what Annesley, who was in England at this time, thought of Oliver Cromwell's actions in Ireland in August 1649. The siege and capture of Drogheda and Wexford resulted in the death of almost 5,000, including civilians. Though Cromwell justified the executions by calling up images of the October 1641 rebellion and massacre of Protestants and citing the "righteous judgment of God," the death and destruction wrought must have horrified many. Cromwell left Ireland, leaving military command in the hands of his sons-in-law, Henry Ireton and Charles Fleetwood, as well as Edmund Ludlow. After Cromwell's departure this began a pattern

---

<sup>2</sup>*HMC, Ormonde, n.s.* 1:144-146.

<sup>3</sup>*CJ*, 5:470-471.

<sup>4</sup>Douglas Greene, "Arthur Annesley, First Earl of Anglesey: 1614-1686" (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1972), 40.

of land redistribution that was to have major repercussions during the Restoration. Annesley was anxious over the state of his Irish holdings, but could not leave England until he took the Engagement, vowing to be loyal to the new government. He did this in the fall of 1652, next appearing on the political scene in June 1654. At this point several major events had occurred.

Between 1651 and 1659, Ireland had been reduced to the status of a “conquered colony.”<sup>5</sup> Parliamentary representation was restricted to thirty members at Westminster. A commissioner governed the country and reported to the commander-in-chief. The only three to hold the position of commissioner were Ireton, Fleetwood, and Cromwell’s son Henry.<sup>6</sup> The commissioner’s main task was to deal with the unpaid soldiers and officers demanding compensation. In August 1652, the English parliament passed the Act for Settling Ireland, punishing those who had aided the king or the Irish rebels and using expropriated land to reward parliamentary soldiers. It divided Protestants into two broad categories: those who had been loyal to the Crown and those who had cooperated with parliament. Individuals in the first group were “made liable to the forfeiture of one-fifth of their estates,” whereas those in the second were rewarded “in debentures.”<sup>7</sup> The Irish were especially targeted because the Cromwellian settlement aimed to reconstruct the “entire pattern of land ownership.”<sup>8</sup> It expropriated a great majority of Catholic landowners, who were forced to settle on smaller holdings in the west. The intention and end result were to secure sources of wealth and power even more firmly in the hands of Protestant colonists. Due to this act, the ‘Old English’ lost some political authority.<sup>9</sup> Long-term effects occurred for after the Restoration it was practically impossible to undo the Cromwellian settlement; royal authority would remain

---

<sup>5</sup>Margaret MacCurtain, *Tudor and Stuart Ireland* (Dublin: Gill and MacMillan, 1972), 153.

<sup>6</sup>R.F. Foster, *Modern Ireland: 1600-1972* (London: Penguin Press, 1988), 103-104.

<sup>7</sup>Aidan Clarke, *Prelude to Restoration in Ireland: The End of the Commonwealth, 1659-1660* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 11. Debentures were short-term, interest bearing notes representing indebtedness.

<sup>8</sup>Foster, 110.

<sup>9</sup>MacCurtain, 158.

dependent on the new landowners' goodwill.<sup>10</sup> Thus, in both England and Ireland in the years prior to and during the Restoration, Charles II was forced to rely on the support of men who had served Cromwell and who were firmly entrenched in their local governments. For men like Annesley and Broghill this helped secure their political positions.

Major changes within England had also occurred which would affect Irish policy. A new executive body in England was created in early 1649, the council of state whose members came from the house of commons and army officers. Cromwell decisively defeated Charles II at the Battle of Worcester on 3 September 1651 and abolished the Scottish parliament. The First Dutch War was currently raging (1652-54) though it would end in England's victory. Cromwell also negotiated a treaty with Portugal, opening up trade between Portuguese territories and England. Though successful overall in his foreign policies, Cromwell struggled on the domestic front regarding his relations with the Rump parliament. He became so frustrated with what he deemed its "stubbornness" that he ordered troops to dissolve it in April 1653. The new body called to meet by Cromwell and the council of state was the nominated assembly, also known as the Barebones parliament, which was made up of 140 men. They were not elected, but instead were selected by the council of state. This new body was responsible for the change from a Commonwealth to a Protectorate for on 13 December 1653 it presented Cromwell with the "Instrument of Government," naming Cromwell as the lord protector, the chief executive officer in England. Another major change occurred in 1657 when Cromwell accepted the "Humble Petition and Advice," agreeing to appoint an upper house of parliament.

Seven months after Cromwell became lord protector Annesley reappeared as a petitioner for the Irish Protestants, asking Cromwell to rescind the order to remove Catholics from five Irish counties. This would have left landowners without enough tenants and could have damaged both productivity and the economy. The government intended to replace these men with disbanded soldiers from Cromwell's Irish army. Other participants in this petition were Broghill, Sir John Clotworthy, Sir Paul Davies,

---

<sup>10</sup>Foster, 114.

and John Percival. The final decision was to allow some Catholic tenants to remain, but they had to convert to Protestantism in the next six months.<sup>11</sup>

Like Broghill, Annesley was savvy enough to realize that outright hostility to the new regime would be foolish and that some reconciliation could gain benefits. He traveled to London in May 1655 to pay homage to the lord protector. Cromwell at this time had named Fleetwood as the lord deputy of Ireland and Annesley was quick to proclaim his allegiance.<sup>12</sup> Again, one should not read too much into Annesley's claim to be Fleetwood's dutiful servant as this was most likely merely token acknowledgement of a new overlord. It was politically astute to state one's obedience and loyalty if one wished to obtain a grant or other favor, which was ultimately Annesley's goal, for just two years later he requested the positions of secretary of state (his father's former office) and clerk of the signet. He made sure to appeal to not just the Irish council of state but also to Henry Cromwell, whose 1657 appointment as lord deputy was forthcoming. Annesley was denied, but apparently had gained the approval of Henry who commented on how highly both he and his father thought of Annesley. The earl attended Oliver Cromwell's re-inauguration as lord protector in June 1657, writing to Henry that the ceremony was conducted "with magnificence and order."<sup>13</sup> It may be that Broghill's close friendship with Henry Cromwell also benefited Annesley as one scholar notes that Broghill had become extremely close and influential with Cromwell.<sup>14</sup> Broghill and Annesley had worked together regarding the earlier economic petition and though the earl did not play a large role in Broghill's push for an Irish militia, to replace the standing army, Annesley may have offered some support for Broghill. As usual Annesley did not fully commit himself to any one scheme, but a partial alliance with Broghill would have given him closer ties to Henry Cromwell who became lord-lieutenant of Ireland in 1658.

---

<sup>11</sup>*HMC, Egmont*, 1:543, 549, 551, 552, 565; Greene, 41.

<sup>12</sup>MS Lansdowne 821, f. 3.

<sup>13</sup>*A collection of the state papers of John Thurloe. Containing authentic memorials of the English affairs from the year 1638, to the restoration of King Charles II*, ed. Thomas Birch (London, 1742), vol. 6, 777; Clarke, 82; Greene, 42; Kathleen M. Lynch, *Roger Boyle First Earl of Orrery* (Knoxville: University of Tennessee Press, 1965), 89.

<sup>14</sup>Barnard, "The Protestant Interest," 233.

After the death of Oliver Cromwell in September 1658, the political situation in England became increasingly unstable, which gave royalist conspirators fresh hopes. The new colonists in Ireland split between those who wished to continue the Protectorate and those who wanted to recall the Rump parliament and the rule of the army leaders. The established Protestants (or Old English) had been forced to come to terms with the commonwealth government and the recognition that they had gained more from Cromwell and parliament than Charles I. As political disunity continued and it became apparent that the restoration of Charles II was increasingly probable, there was a unified demand from the Protestant community to preserve the benefits obtained under the Commonwealth.<sup>15</sup>

Though Ireland had lost its parliament it was allotted thirty seats out of four hundred in the new English Parliament called by Richard Cromwell, now lord protector. Annesley was elected as the Dublin representative, pledging to improve the Irish economy by reducing customs duties between Ireland and England.<sup>16</sup> One scholar has called Annesley the “undoubted star” of the 1659 parliament.<sup>17</sup> However, he failed in his biggest effort, which was to create a separate Irish legislative body. During the Protectorate the Irish parliament was abolished and a legislative union between the two countries was proposed. Annesley was in the minority in his opposition to the union, as the majority of English politicians were not ready to provide Ireland with a distinctive legislative system. Within the English parliament, Ireland’s thirty seats were clearly miniscule and Annesley may have believed that an unfair taxation system would result. He opposed the legislative union of Ireland and England, but it passed parliament anyway. He must have been quite disappointed that the “old constitution” was not restored.<sup>18</sup> One can theorize that this disappointment might have helped convince him that only a return to monarchy under Charles II would bring about the “old constitution.”

---

<sup>15</sup>Clarke, 19.

<sup>16</sup>MS Lansdowne 823, f. 287.

<sup>17</sup>Barnard, “The Protestant Interest,” 237.

<sup>18</sup>MS Lansdowne 823, f. 259; Richard Bagwell, *Ireland Under the Stuarts and During the Interregnum*, vol. 2, 1642-1660 (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1909), 356; Greene, 44.

Further frustration is noted in his speeches regarding the restoration of the house of lords. Annesley, among others, pushed for the return of hereditary peers believing it was necessary if the country was to be whole again. He argued that the “Humble Petition and Advice” was not legal and a country without all its constituent parts could never work, that balance would never be achieved without a house of lords.<sup>19</sup>

In April 1659, the general council of the army dissolved the English parliament. The general council recalled the 1653 parliament and the day it assembled some of the secluded members, including Annesley, demanded admission to the chambers. Although they were denied, Annesley continued to lead the push for re-admittance, returning several times, including an incident in January 1660.<sup>20</sup> Richard Cromwell relinquished his position on 25 May. Upon hearing this news, the lord deputy of Ireland, Richard’s brother Henry, sent word to Ulster, Munster, and Connaught to bring soldiers to Dublin. Fearing possible uprisings by royalists or Catholics, Henry prepared Dublin to withstand a siege. In England, there was speculation as to what would happen in Ireland and Scotland, as the forces of Henry Cromwell and George Monck were much larger than those in England.

The commissioners of the Irish parliament were officially appointed by the English parliament on 7 July. The act that authorized their appointment also declared certain laws and ordinances that were to be enforced in Ireland. Most of these dealt with matters that had been altered by acts of the Long parliament. Seven of the Irish commissioners were instructed to review officers of the Irish army in England. The commissioners had orders to replace any officers suspected of doubtful religious opinions or hostility to the republic. After the removal of the Cromwell brothers and Fleetwood, thirteen of forty-three regimental command positions were changed. Overall, about a forty percent turnover in officers resulted.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup>*Diary of Thomas Burton, esq., Member in the Parliaments of Oliver and Richard Cromwell from 1656 to 1659*, ed. John Rutt (London, 1828), vol. 4, 241-243, 288; *Ibid.*, 3:591.

<sup>20</sup>Ronald Hutton, *The Restoration: A Political and Religious History of England and Wales, 1658-1667* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 43, 88.

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*, 66.

Ludlow was appointed commander-in-chief of the Irish forces on 4 July, and the speaker invested him on the eighteenth.<sup>22</sup> Ludlow's immediate concern arose in early August after Sir George Booth's rising broke out in Lancashire and Cheshire. This linked some royalists and Presbyterians but not the exiled monarchy. Booth was defeated on 19 August and captured several days later; however, some feared that another uprising might follow in Ireland. Many people were placed under house arrest, orders were issued to expel Catholics from Galway town, and city governors were reminded to license those who sought to leave their provinces. Widespread nervousness continued as rumors of plots led to the disarming of the Irish in various cities.<sup>23</sup>

The tensions between the English parliament and the army continued, and even the royalists in exile were aware of the situation. One observer remarked that "Parliament is in a very unstable condition. Most think it will be shortly dissolved, or at least purged by Lambert and the Army."<sup>24</sup> The army presented parliament on 22 September with the 'Derby petition' protesting against its failure to prepare for dissolution and the arrangements for the army's command. Though parliament rejected this petition, a second one followed. Parliament cashiered nine army officers, annulled Fleetwood's commission, and gave control of the army to seven commissioners. The army responded on 13 October by preventing the house from meeting. The council of state only stepped down on 25 October when the army council proposed a committee of safety to replace it. The new government, which included Ludlow, was formed on 26 October.<sup>25</sup>

Before leaving his post in Ireland on 18 October, Ludlow selected commissioner John Jones as his successor, and he also left Sir Charles Coote with increased power. After his arrival in England, Ludlow discovered that the army's attempt to establish a government had failed. Most members of parliament had refused to deal with the army.

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., 67. Ludlow had served as an Irish commissioner from 1650 to 1654 and as commander-in-chief from 1651 to 1655. He had joined the Dublin Baptist congregation in 1654.

<sup>23</sup>Ibid., 68-75.

<sup>24</sup>*CSPD, 1659-1660*, 234.

<sup>25</sup>Clarke, 87-88.

Nine members on the council of state claimed authority and were backed by a promise from Monck to bring his army from Scotland if necessary. Monck wrote to the committee in Ireland declaring his support for the expelled parliament “against ambition and tyranny”<sup>26</sup> and asked Ludlow to do the same. However, the response from Ireland was probably not what Monck expected. On 4 November, he received an answer from several officers who stated that they were troubled by Monck’s attitude and would not approve of anything that would engage “any part of the Armyes or fforces of these nations against their brotheren” and offered to mediate between him and the English army.<sup>27</sup> However, another faction in Ireland (including Sir Charles Coote and Sir Theophilus Jones) had reassured Monck that it would assist him. Thus, he was well aware that the army in Ireland was not united.<sup>28</sup>

The next major event for Ireland was the Dublin coup, which was a bloodless event. It began at 5:00 p.m. at Dublin Castle when approximately thirty soldiers rushed through the postern gate. They gained access through the efforts of colonel William Warden and captain John Joyner who had asked the sentinel to let them leave. The invading soldiers overpowered the castle guard, and horse troops rode through the town with Sir Theophilus Jones and major Edward Warren at their head. They secured the five Irish commissioners as well as the commanders of the Dublin garrison. Fellow conspirators seized Carlow, Drogheda, and other garrison towns throughout Ireland. Their associates included Coote, Broghill, lord Montgomery, and possibly Sir Audley Mervyn.<sup>29</sup>

A week after the coup, the council of officers asked Coote and Broghill to come to Dublin and establish a provisional military government. This council attacked Ludlow’s recent behavior, accusing him of having “disobliged the parliament’s friends” as well as failing to return to his post in Ireland. In the letter, the council members asked

---

<sup>26</sup>*Ireland’s Fidelity to the Parliament of England, in Answer to a Paper, Entitled The Petition of the Officers and Soldiers of Duncannon* (London: n.p., 1660), cited in Clarke, 97.

<sup>27</sup>Joseph Meyer, ed., “Inedited Letters of Cromwell, Col. Jones, Bradshaw and Other Regicides,” *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, n.s., 1 (1860), 274.

<sup>28</sup>Clarke, 98.

<sup>29</sup>Clarke, 1-2, 109.

the commissioners to advise them if they should accept Ludlow as commander. Dr. Henry Jones drafted the letter, which was signed by his brother Theophilus and John Warren. On 26 December, the council unanimously agreed that Ludlow's conduct in England demonstrated that he did not support parliament, and it refused to admit him unless parliament, the parliamentary commissioners at Portsmouth, or the council of state ordered it. Unknown to many, the council of officers was also reporting to Monck, who in late December had marched into England, his intentions unknown.<sup>30</sup> James Butler, earl of Ormond, writing in January 1660, was unsure of Monck's motives:

that Monck should declare . . . for this individual parliament and a free commonwealth, and march towards London (as some say) with his whole army, leaving Scotland to be kept upon the matter by the Scots, are matters which induce me to expect something from him, at least beyond what he pretends; . . . But what his further intentions are, or for whom, I will not so much as guess. . . . It is true all of our side write as if they were pleased with the face of things; but I see no particulars that warrant so much satisfaction. I will hope it is a general inclination towards the king, grounded on as general a despair of settlement without him; which they are better able to observe than describe.<sup>31</sup>

The officers in Ireland needed solid approval from parliament. Ultimately, their relationship with parliament was affected by Ludlow, who did not believe they were committed to serving parliament. On 9 January, the officers proclaimed Ludlow a traitor and wrote to parliament requesting his recall. Several days later, Ludlow was asked by parliament to come to London and account for his affairs in Ireland. The house was only slowly recognizing the tensions between Ludlow and the officers, for parliament did not receive the declaration of 28 December or the articles of impeachment against Ludlow until 19 January. The documents were read aloud and a new commission was appointed for Ireland.<sup>32</sup> However, the council of state never issued the new commissioners' instructions. Thus, Ireland had no authorized government. Instead, it was ruled by an

---

<sup>30</sup>Clarke, 119-130; *HMC 78, Hastings*, 2:362.

<sup>31</sup>Thomas Carte, *The Life of James Duke of Ormond; Containing an Account of the Most Remarkable Affairs of His Time, and Particularly of Ireland Under His Government*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 6 vols. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1851), 3:698-699.

<sup>32</sup>Clarke, 136-143. This new commission consisted of Sir Charles Coote, Sir William Waller, Henry Markham, John Weaver, and Robert Goodwin.

interim government consisting of a committee of safety and an army commission chosen by the council of officers.<sup>33</sup>

In England, Monck decided to end the Long parliament by allowing the purged members to re-take their seats on condition that they dissolve and summon a new parliament. Annesley was one of these members and in fact had been the leader of the 1659 push to readmit the secluded representatives. They met at his London residence to plan their campaign. Annesley also served as part of a three-man committee that recommended the manner and method by which parliament should be summoned. On 21 February 1660, these members took their seats, and on the twenty-third, they elected a new council of state. Annesley's hard work paid off as he was appointed president of this council. This must be marked as the beginning of his rise in power and the obvious recognition of his influence and ability. Scholar Aidan Clarke comments that this council had an obvious opportunity to influence Irish events and as president Annesley steered Irish policy. From here on he would continue to climb the ladder of political authority. Another interesting fact is that by this time Annesley had been in touch with royalists abroad and at home, most notably John Mordaunt, viscount Avalon. Those in England reported that Annesley was trying to convince Monck to work with the royalist agents. Royalists commented that the "Council of State are for the greater part moderate, if not right men. Mr. Anesly is President, a very able and good man, one of the best there . . . ."<sup>34</sup> They felt he was definitely the king's man and so they were confident Annesley would succeed. Not just royalists, but the king himself was delighted to have Annesley working for the restoration. Charles wrote a letter stating his pleasure with Annesley's actions and praising the earl's "great zeal to advance my interest . . . ."<sup>35</sup>

Regarding the new council of state, it had immense powers over Irish affairs as it was instructed to establish civil government and officers for both Ireland and Scotland. It immediately began revising the Irish government, for on the twenty-first the council of officers in Ireland was removed from power. Parliament appointed Monck commander-

---

<sup>33</sup>Ibid., 146.

<sup>34</sup>*The Nicholas Papers: Correspondence of Sir Edward Nicholas, Secretary of State*, ed. Sir George F. Warner (London: Camden Third Series, vol. XXXI, 1920), 4:205; Clarke, 156.

<sup>35</sup>MS Clarendon 70, f. 46.

in-chief on 25 February. Monck's appointment included command of land forces in all three countries. In late February, he wrote to the regiments in Ireland reassuring them that writs would be issued for a parliament representing all three countries. On 8 March, a bill was introduced that called for a new parliament on 25 April, and on the sixteenth, the Long parliament dissolved itself.<sup>36</sup> The next body assembled called itself the Convention parliament and met between April and December 1660. Annesley's royalist relations probably helped him win a seat for the county of Carmarthen and he retained his position as president of the council of state.

In late January, a representative assembly, the general convention of Ireland, chaired by Sir James Barry, organized but did not meet until 2 March. This body was not asserting its rights over the English parliament but met out of political necessity. The country needed some type of government to help guide it through those confusing times. Standing committees were created to deal with universities, trade, and revenue. One committee was formed to justify the convention's existence and state its purposes. Its primary concerns involved religion and land. The convention wanted an orthodox church supported by tithes and would not countenance any form of religious dissent. The convention also issued orders to civil and military authorities that dangerous Papists should be removed from cities, forts, and garrison towns for a distance of two miles. While it was dealing with internal affairs, the English council of state appointed new commissioners for Ireland on 8 March, though the convention did not receive notice of the appointments until mid-March. These commissioners were lord Broghill, Sir Charles Coote, Sir William Bury, and Hugh Clotworthy. All of these men, except for Coote, were Presbyterians, a fact that historian Ronald Hutton does not believe is coincidental. Clarke also argues that the reason Presbyterians were chosen is because Annesley was primarily responsible for selecting the commissioners. By now Annesley's Presbyterian sympathies were becoming known. Also, the connections between Broghill and Annesley have already been well established. Annesley, acting as president of the council of state, had the authority to profile and approve all of these men and parliament had earlier designated Irish affairs to this council. One observer noted that Annesley

---

<sup>36</sup>Carte, 3:702-703; Clarke, 154-155, 168, 246.

ruled over all decisions concerning Ireland.<sup>37</sup> Two items Annesley did involve himself with were taxation and the courts of justice in Ireland. On 7 March he went to parliament, asking for Irish and Scottish taxes to be reduced or have the payment period extended. The latter occurred and then later on the fifteenth he brought a bill to continue the existing proceedings of the Irish justice courts. This was also agreed upon.<sup>38</sup> After learning of the new appointments, the convention responded by issuing a declaration to Annesley, stating that it was dealing with important affairs and would inform the council of its decisions. The commissioners from England arrived in late March and began to take charge. In early April, the council of state ordered the convention to dissolve but it refused until late April when it decided to adjourn on 1 May; it planned to meet again on 7 June.<sup>39</sup>

The exiled royalists began talks with Monck in early March 1660. As has already been mentioned, Annesley had been trying to convince Monck to meet with the royalists and was successful.<sup>40</sup> Annesley was already in contact with Ormond and Mordaunt. The earl's importance was known to the royalists, for lady Mordaunt commented that Annesley "most certainly rules the whole affaires of Ireland."<sup>41</sup> Annesley went one step further by agreeing to spy on certain individuals, mainly Political Presbyterians his former allies, who sought to prevent royalist nobles from taking their seats in the house of lords.<sup>42</sup> This was part of the larger issue regarding amnesty. Though some scholars, Hutton and Douglas Greene, have condemned Annesley as treacherous for these actions one should not. First, in Annesley's mind he was already committed to the king's restoration and second, Annesley had always pushed for a powerful house of lords. It would make no sense at this point for Annesley to side with those who wanted to prevent

---

<sup>37</sup>*CJ*, 7:860; Clarke, 256. Historian T.C. Barnard notes that the "helmsmen" who helped steer Ireland through the "reefs of the 1650s" were Broghill and Annesley who were the "most adroit Old Protestant pilots." See Barnard, "The Protestant Interest," 232.

<sup>38</sup>*CSPI, 1647-1660*, 718.

<sup>39</sup>Clarke, 245-255, 266, 272, 289.

<sup>40</sup>Richard Baxter, *Reliquiae Baxterianae* (London, 1696), 2: 215.

<sup>41</sup>Clarke, 257.

<sup>42</sup>MS Clarendon 72, f.19; *CCSP*, 3:721, 729-732.

hereditary peers from taking their traditional places. One of those same scholars, Greene, notes how deeply Annesley felt regarding the “old constitution” so it is odd that this author would suggest Annesley’s behavior was unsavory and surprising.<sup>43</sup>

Monck met with the royalist representative, Sir John Grenville, reassuring him he had always intended to restore Charles. After several weeks of negotiating, the Declaration of Breda was signed and issued on 4 April. Its construction was a joint effort between the king, Ormond, Sir Edward Hyde, and Sir Edward Nicholas.<sup>44</sup> The Irish convention, though it was without news from England, issued a declaration on 1 May condemning the execution of Charles I.<sup>45</sup> On the same day, the Convention parliament received the Declaration of Breda, and both houses voted for the restoration of the monarchy. Annesley was part of the majority who voted for the king’s return without limitations or restrictions.<sup>46</sup> The Irish convention’s representatives in London must have been disappointed that the king’s declaration made no mention of Ireland. Annesley, as president of the council of state, did address one issue for Ireland by drawing up Broghill’s commission as lord president of Munster and appointed John Percival, William Penn, William Fenton, and William Hawkins as members of Broghill’s council.<sup>47</sup>

The king was proclaimed in London on 8 May and in Dublin on 14 May. He entered London on 29 May and began establishing his government. He appointed a privy council, which mixed royalists, Cromwellian supporters, and “middle of the roaders.” This last group describes those who had supported parliament during the Civil War but opposed some of the following regimes. Annesley belonged to the latter category and was one of the king’s appointees to the new privy council. More than anything this illustrates how important Annesley’s recent roles in government had been. He had

---

<sup>43</sup>Greene, 45, 52; Hutton, *Charles the Second: King of England, Scotland, and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989), 134-135. Scholar Andrew Swatland states that Annesley and others began organizing themselves in early 1660 to achieve a Stuart restoration partly because they wanted a reinstated house of lords. See Swatland, *The House of Lords in the Reign of Charles II* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 16.

<sup>44</sup>Hutton, *Charles II*, 128-129.

<sup>45</sup>Clarke, 290.

<sup>46</sup>Hutton, *Charles II*, 131.

<sup>47</sup>Clarke, 294, 295.

proven his worthiness as a member of parliament and as head of the council of state. Also, his contributions to the king's cause had been rewarded. Clearly his diligence and caution had paid off. Shortly after this, the Irish convention sent a delegation to the king with a list of requests. It asked him to appoint royal courts, call an Irish parliament containing Protestants, and establish the Church of Ireland as it had existed under Charles I.<sup>48</sup> The king met with the delegation in mid-June, and on the twentieth the privy council appointed a sub-committee to deal with Irish affairs. The negotiations that followed indicated that the priority in Ireland was to "exorcise the Catholic threat once and for all."<sup>49</sup> This concerned not just religion but also the land settlement. Though there were divisions among Irish Protestants, the latter were determined to prevent the restoration of Catholic land owners. Cromwellian officers who had gained Irish holdings during the 1650s expected to retain their land while royalists assumed they would be compensated for their loyalty to the king. The Catholics hoped for toleration and the recovery of their estates. In Ireland, these divergent interests would repeatedly clash during the Restoration and would provide an endless source of frustration for Annesley, Broghill, Ormond, and every Anglo-Irish politician who attempted to impose their visions onto Ireland.

---

<sup>48</sup>J.G. Simms, "The Restoration, 1660-1685," in *A New History of Ireland*, vol. 3, *Early Modern Ireland (1534-1691)*, ed. Moody, Martin, and Byrne (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1976), 420.

<sup>49</sup>Clarke, 312, 317.