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ABSTRACT

THE INTERACTION OF DOMESTIC POLITICS AND ENGLISH NAVAL OPERATIONS DURING THE CIVIL WAR AND INTERREGNUM, 1642-1660

Don P. Crowson
Old Dominion University,
Director: Dr. Douglas Greene

The interaction of domestic politics and the English Navy during the Civil Wars and the following Interregnum is analyzed. The period of interest is during the reign of Charles I (1646-1649); the Commonwealth (1649-1653), when the government functioned essentially as a republic; and the Protectorate, (1653-1660), when the executive function was performed first by Oliver Cromwell and then by his son, Richard Cromwell. A brief description of the immediate preceding years is included to establish the political climate of the time.

The major events with political implications are considered in detail. They are: (1) the struggle between Parliament and the King to gain control of the Navy at the beginning of the Civil War; (2) the revolt of a significant portion of the Navy in 1648 against Parliamentary control in favor of King Charles; (3) the "Western Design" application of the Navy by Oliver Cromwell to solve his financial problems by interdicting the Spanish plate fleet from the Americas; and (4) the involvement of the Navy in the restoration of Charles II to the throne during the politically chaotic period after Oliver Cromwell's death when his son, Richard, served as the Lord Protector.

Two themes throughout the thesis are the relative significance of the political bias of the senior naval officers and the administrative changes to support the current regime. A third theme involves the propensity of the crews to respond to a variety of factors including conditions of service, pre-conditioning to obey officers, and loyalty to the King.
The situations under which those inclinations were subject to change or complete breakdown are described.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The military operations of the civil wars that wracked the British Islands between 1642 and 1649 were largely conducted by ground troops. The battles fought by Oliver Cromwell's New Model Army in the parliamentarian cause were what finally defeated the Royalists and, in 1649, left England without a king. What is usually overlooked is the critical nature of what did not happen during those six bloody years mainly because of the Navy. Under Parliament control, the Navy protected British shipping that kept funds flowing for the rebels. In addition, France and Spain, already opposed to the Parliamentarians for their militant Protestantism, viewed an overthrow of the English King Charles I as potentially encouraging similar movements against their own monarchies. Either of those nations may well have intervened in support of Charles if he had agreed to return England to the middle way of religious toleration following the example of some of his Tudor predecessors. There was ample evidence that Charles would be sympathetic to such an event. But the English Navy, whose might had already been demonstrated in action against Spain, gave pause to such inclinations for foreign involvement.

A further deterrent was the Dutch who, after an eighty-year struggle, were free from Spanish rule. What emerged from the Treaty of Münster in 1648 was a maritime power, the United Provinces of the Free Netherlands. The United Provinces had also had

---

This paper follows the format requirements of *A Manual for Writers of Term Papers, Theses and Dissertations* 6th edition by Kate L. Turabian.
enough of kings and Catholicism. Although there were family ties between Charles and the Dutch House of Orange, neither France nor Spain would risk pushing the world’s two greatest navies (which were also Protestant) into a military alliance by supporting Charles.

With external logistic and military support effectively blocked by the Navy, Charles’ cause was lost. But overthrowing a governmental form that was founded in centuries of tradition proved to be considerably easier than replacing it. The leveling effect of Calvinism and its concept of predestination, when carried to its logical conclusion, effectively limited attempts to govern through a Parliament alone that had no widely recognized authority to exercise the executive function. When Charles was executed on January 30, 1649, leaving that executive position vacant, splinter groups of various persuasions, both religious and secular, proliferated. The only group that seemed to have any doctrinal cohesion at all was the Army. With that and the Army’s obvious ability to apply physical force, it is not surprising that a few years later, on December 16, 1653, the dominant military commander, Oliver Cromwell, replaced an ineffective Parliament with his own rule, the Protectorate.

While the roll of the Army in the political turmoil during the nineteen years of the Civil Wars and Interregnum has been a favorite topic for analysis by historians of the period, that of the English Navy has been largely ignored. Yet, it waged wars against the United Provinces, France, Spain, Portugal, and lesser powers involved mainly in piratical enterprises. Its operations extended from the Baltic and Mediterranean to the Americas. Normally, a country in a state of internal political disruption after a successful overthrow not only of its monarch but its system of government could reasonably be expected to
withdraw from international involvement. That did not happen in this case. Instead, during the 1650s, England embarked on a program of aggressive military operations. And all of these operations were almost exclusively naval.

With all of the political problems of governing England, it is obvious that such extensive foreign involvement was likely to have been undertaken with a serious concern for the strengthening of the regime at home. This relationship between foreign affairs and the precarious political position of the government in its several forms during the Interregnum has been the subject of many historical investigations. But historians have not analyzed and emphasized the interaction of the Navy and naval operations with the domestic political events of that time.

The intent of this thesis is to fill that gap for students of the English Civil War and the following Interregnum by examining the organization of the Navy as the country headed for war, the principal domestic political developments from that time until the restoration of Charles II in 1660, and the response of the Navy to those developments.

The historical significance of such an examination lies in the overall importance of the period covered. The restoration of Charles II in 1660 did not return the form of government to exactly what it had been previously. In the intervening time the most extensive changes in government in the history of England were initiated. This thesis will clarify and highlight the Navy's participation during that time.

Chapter II covers the pre-war events, gaining control of the Navy by Parliament, and the applicable operations during the first Civil War. Chapter III deals with the period from 1646 to 1649 marked by the second and third Civil Wars and the era of the Commonwealth from 1649 to 1653. The major events involving the Navy during that
time were the revolt of the Navy in 1648 and the pursuit of Royalist raiders throughout the period. Chapter IV covers the years of the Protectorate from 1653 to 1660. The major events during that time are an operation designated "The Western Design," which was an assault against the Spanish colonies in the Caribbean, the conclusion of the First Dutch War in April, 1654, and the restoration of Charles II in 1660.

The only significant attempt by a historian to deal with the post-Civil War Navy and the political scene was undertaken by Bernard Capp in his *Cromwell’s Navy: The Fleet and the English Revolution 1648-1660*. He devotes one chapter to politics and the Navy focusing on the political leaning of the officers and men. His treatment of naval operations during the Commonwealth and Protectorate provided one of the principal inputs to this thesis. The best treatment of the English Navy during the Civil War is John Rowland Powell’s *The Navy in the English Civil War*. In this thesis, most of the references to naval operations during the Civil War itself are to that work. The appendices of ship lists were especially useful. The *Civil Wars of England* is an excellent work by J.P.Kenyon and is extensively cited in this thesis for general information about the war, political events, and land operations by the Army.

The political information came from many sources. *The Personal Rule of Charles I* by Kevin Sharp yielded only a few citations, but this well-written book was invaluable for general background information. *A History of the Administration of the Royal Navy and of Merchant Shipping in Relation to the Navy* by M. Oppenheim is a very detailed work that was a useful source of information on the many reorganizations of naval administration and also for some ship lists. Valuable documentation came from two sources. The collection, *Documents Relating to the Civil War*, edited by John Rowland
Powell and E. K. Timings, covered the period of the Civil War from 1642 to 1646. Documentation for a larger period was provided by *The Stuart Constitution 1603-1688: Documents and Commentary*, edited and with commentary by J. P. Kenyon.

By far, the most useful primary source verifying official actions by Parliament was an internet site developed by History of Parliament Trust at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/>. The part of the site used in researching this thesis was the journals of both the House of Commons and the House of Lords. This site is a work in progress and, at the time of this writing, even includes the House of Commons Journals during its sporadic existence during the Protectorate.

Mainly because of the dates used in the House of Commons and House of Lords Journals mentioned above, the decision was made to use dates specified according to the Julian calendar which was used by England at that time. Most of the other European nations had already changed to the Gregorian calendar which skipped ahead by eleven days. To the best of this writer’s ability, dates have all been adjusted to the earlier Julian calendar. However, readers are advised to exercise caution as often, in the sources being cited, which calendar was being used was not readily identifiable.
CHAPTER II
THE CIVIL WAR
1642-1646

When Charles raised his standard at Nottingham on August 22, 1642, it seemed clear that the war, like most civil wars, was to be fought on the land. Because England was part of an island, the reasons to anticipate foreign intervention were minimal, although not non-existent. It might have been assumed, therefore, that the Navy was to be a secondary player. This notion could not have been more in error. Even historians have largely ignored the Navy’s role as one of the deciding factors in determining the outcome. At the time, it was not even clear for which side that role was to be played. The multiplicity of factors which brought about this uncertainty sheds light on the political significance of naval operations for the next eighteen years.

The first of these factors was the make-up of the Navy itself. It was not like the Army where individual men, be they members of the peasantry, townsfolk, gentry, or nobility, could choose their side according to their own convictions. The Army assembled only when there was a war to be fought.¹ The King appointed his favorites to general officer posts while the rest of the officer corps comprised noblemen and gentry who raised their own regiments locally. Parliament provided minimal pay, if any at all, for these largely untrained men. Instead, they were recruited with promises of loot and glory. On the other hand, semi-professional sailors made a career, in both peace and war,

¹ The exception to this was the trained bands of London. They constituted a fairly well organized and led militia that could be brought into service when the city was threatened. When the Civil War started there were about 20,000 men available in these bands. There were also county bands, but they were not well-organized and of little practical value.
of serving the King in the King’s ships. In short, unlike the Army, the Navy was
controlled centrally. Officially, the King himself directed the Navy, but in practice a
variety of bureaucratic organizations provided that control. Under circumstances such as
these, the Navy could normally be expected to serve on the side of the King. The men
owed no allegiance to a local landlord. Their service was bought and paid for by the King
and, in return, they gave their allegiance and obedience to the officers whom the King had
appointed to supervise them. That said, the crews must still be considered only semi-
professional. They did not enlist in the service as such, but signed-on for a particular
cruise on a given ship. When the cruise was over, the ship was usually taken out of
service for refitting or retirement. The crew was then paid off and dismissed.

This practice gave rise to the first and perhaps the most serious cause of
disaffection among the men. The government could put a ship in service when it had
been refitted and provisioned without regard for the eventual payment of the crew. When
the cruise was over, if there was no money to pay the crew (which happened often) the
ship was sometimes officially kept in service. In this way payment of the crew could be
postponed. Of course, this was counter-productive in that not only was the cost
increased, but the men were kept idle aboard ship while being fed increasingly rotten
food. Pay was also delayed by the method of payment. The ship’s purser could issue
“tickets,” a form of IOUs that could be converted to cash only at the Navy
Commissioner’s office in London.2 This could entail a considerable journey if the cruise
did not end at London. Alternatively, the men could spend the tickets with local
merchants at a discount that varied depending on the existing state of the King’s credit.

2 Bernard Capp, *Cromwell’s Navy: The Fleet and the English Revolution 1648-1660* (New York:
Oxford University Press, 1989; reprint, 2001), 279 (page citations are to the reprint edition).
Often, merchants would not accept them at all. When the Civil War started, some men, reluctant to sell their tickets at a discount, had not been paid in as many as seven years.

There were many other drawbacks to Navy service. The pay on merchantmen was better and generally more reliable. Even better was service on privateers where each seaman received a share of the prize. Privateering was also much safer than Navy service in that no warship was ever attacked; only easy prey were targeted. Consequently, recruiting Navy crews was often difficult. Even though volunteers received better treatment and had more freedom, it was frequently necessary to resort to the press. The magistrates of coastal towns were given quotas to be filled, but of the men assembled few actually showed up at the ships. Those who did were usually old, inexperienced, and of little use.³ A more productive method of impressment was to intercept incoming merchantmen and press the seamen before they had a chance to debark. The masters and their mates were not taken but all others were considered fair game. Ships were sometimes left with barely sufficient seamen to get to port. During the Dutch War about 30,000 men per year were pressed into the Navy by this method.⁴

Another reason for discontent among the seamen was the inconsistent and often humiliating missions assigned to the Navy during Charles’ reign. During his first year, a secret clause that had been included in the marriage agreement between Charles and Henrietta Marie, sister of the French King Louis XIII, brought about one such mission. That clause required England to lend ships to France to aid in putting down a Huguenot revolt at Île de Rhé. Thus, English ships were to be used by a Catholic nation against

³ Ibid., 259-266.
Protestants. To the English people, the plague that came in 1625 was retribution by God for this involvement with Papists.\(^5\)

In the event, Sir John Pennington, commander of a fleet of seven armed merchantmen, sailed to Dieppe where he received further orders in the King's name, delivered by the French ambassador, to hand the ships over to the French. The ambassador then tried to bribe the crews into joining in the military campaign. Pennington refused and returned his fleet to England where the Duke of Buckingham ordered him back to France to turn over the ships without their crews. Upon returning to Dieppe, a few captains still refused to release their ships to France. In response, Pennington fired several cannon shots near those ships. This persuaded the recalcitrant captains to turn over their ships. However, this willingness to fire on English ships would later be recalled as evidence that Pennington was a Royalist, perhaps a Catholic, and untrustworthy in the eyes of the Parliamentarians.\(^6\)

The war with Spain that Charles had inherited from his father was a failure. The House of Commons, suspicious of Charles' Catholic propensities, provided inadequate funds to prosecute the war vigorously even though it had popular support. As a result, the raid on Cadiz to interdict the Spanish gold fleet from the Americas was a disaster. Departing on 8 October, 1625\(^7\) (three months late), it was poorly planned, unsupported logistically, and incompetently led and executed. Three months later the ships began


straggling back individually, having accomplished nothing. Once more the English Navy was humiliated.

The Peace of Madrid on 15 November, 1630, which ended the futile war with Spain, was followed by even more disgrace for the English Navy: English ships were immediately set to serving their erstwhile enemy by transporting Spanish gold to England. There it was minted into coin to pay Spanish soldiers fighting in the Netherlands against the rebelling Protestant Dutch. This helped Charles with his financial difficulties and was an immense help to the Spanish in that the sea lanes for logistic support for their troops were now open. But to the seamen and many other Englishmen, this was a double disgrace: Not only were the despised Papists aided in a war, but it was a war against fellow-Protestants.

The involvement with Spain came close to active naval support for Spanish forces. In 1639, Spanish troops were transported in English ships from Spain to Dunkirk. In one incident, three transports were intercepted by the Dutch and the troops taken off. One ship escaped and the troops debarked in Portsmouth. They then marched to Dover where they re-embarked, again in English ships, for the Netherlands.

During that same summer, England came near to entering a Franco-Spanish war on the side of the highest bidder. In 1635, a scheme to partition the Spanish Netherlands had led France to enter the Dutch-Spanish war on the side of the United Provinces. In need of money, Charles hired out some armed merchantmen to Spain for escort duty. He

---

8 Geoffrey Parker and others, eds., The Thirty Years War, 2d ed. (London: Routledge, 1997), xxxiv.


10 Ibid., 831.
also offered the ship-money fleet\textsuperscript{11} to protect a large convoy of Spanish troops and supplies bound for Flanders. But a Dutch fleet under Admiral Martin Tromp intercepted the convoy and all 60 ships of the convoy put into the Downs for protection. Charles capitalized on the situation by demanding a large payment from the Spanish. He also negotiated with the French. In effect, the English fleet was for hire. But he dallied too long. Tromp lost patience and entered the Downs where he routed the Spanish fleet. The English fleet under Captain John Pennington, stood by and did nothing. Spanish soldiers and sailors were forced ashore and crossed England by foot, all the while taunting English onlookers.\textsuperscript{12} The weakness and humiliation of the English Navy was not soon forgotten by the English seamen.

The reasons for Charles' unpopular friendly relationships with both France and Spain, often at the same time, had both foreign and domestic elements. The former revolved around Charles' attempt to acquire the aid of France or Spain in regaining the Palatinate for his brother-in-law, Frederick V, the exiled Elector of the Palatinate. Frederick had played a major role in the Protestant revolt in Bohemia against the Habsburgs by accepting the crown in 1618. That revolt came to an end at the Battle of White Mountain near Prague in 1620, but the war did not. Frederick established his court-in-exile in The Hague, and most of Europe became embroiled in the Thirty Years War.\textsuperscript{13} When Frederick died in 1632, Charles became even more determined to regain the Palatinate for Charles Louis, Frederick's son and Charles' nephew.

\textsuperscript{11} The ship-money fleet was paid for by a special tax that Charles levied on all the English counties. Previously, only coastal counties paid the ship-money tax to off-set the cost of providing protection from pirate raids.

\textsuperscript{12} Sharpe, 832-33.

\textsuperscript{13} Parker, 53-55.
The major domestic reason for the contradictory love/hate foreign relations was, as has already been noted, financial. But it was not the only one. Although the extent of her influence is difficult to assess, Queen Henrietta Maria provided a clear French bias based on her own French heritage. In addition, her Catholic convictions seemed to provide further evidence of a Popish Plot to import French Catholicism.\textsuperscript{14} Also the efforts of Archbishop Laud were more than just an attempt to extend English Episcopacy to Ireland and Scotland. They were tainted with Arminianism that implied a foreign anti-Protestant direction.\textsuperscript{15} Whether religion played a role in the naval operations described above may not be certain; but it can certainly be implied.

For all of these reasons – religion, English pride, and, most importantly, conditions of service – the men and officers of the Navy had cause to be disaffected in the King’s service. To what extent that disaffection caused the Navy to side with Parliament in the Civil War cannot be quantified; certainly it played some role as will be seen.

From early in the reign of Charles I until the restoration of Charles II there were many changes in naval administration, all of them with domestic political implications and significant effects on the Navy and its operations. In Elizabethan times, a Navy Board comprising four Principal Officers oversaw the business of the Navy. Those officers were the Treasurer, Surveyor, Comptroller, and Clerk. They managed the ship yards, victualling, manning, payrolls, outfitting, recruiting, and the myriad activities that kept the Navy going on a day-to-day basis. The actual division of duties among the


Principal Officers was unclear and generally dependent on the individuals who currently occupied the posts. They reported directly to the Queen’s Council.\textsuperscript{16} The system was marked by bribery and waste from the top clear down to the officers and even warrant officers of the fleet. This was not recognized as corruption but rather simply as an integral part of a system in which official pay was often insufficient.

James I had some success at naval reform in 1618 by replacing the Navy Board by a Board of seven Commissioners, usually Members of Parliament, who reported to the Lord High Admiral, the Duke of Buckingham. Under his leadership corruption was significantly decreased, but naval efficiency also declined.\textsuperscript{17} For this Parliament blamed Buckingham, and in February, 1628, Charles agreed to bring back the Principal Officers to run the Navy under the supervision of the Commissioners, the Lords of the Admiralty. Buckingham still had overall authority and the Commissioners functioned essentially as a committee of the Privy Council. When Buckingham was assassinated on August 23 of that same year, he was not replaced and the Board of Commissioners attempted to provide leadership. In the event, they had little success and naval administration was again essentially left to the Principal Officers with the same unfortunate results.\textsuperscript{18} In 1638, Charles appointed his second son, James, Duke of York, as Lord High Admiral for life and the Board of Commissioners was dissolved. As James was still only a child, Algernon Percy, the 10\textsuperscript{th} Earl of Northumberland, was appointed to serve in his place.\textsuperscript{19} Northumberland chose Robert Rich, Earl of Warwick, as his Vice-Admiral. For

\begin{footnotes}
\item[16] Oppenheim, xi.
\item[18] Oppenheim, 279.
\item[19] Ibid., 283.
\end{footnotes}
Parliament, it was a fortunate choice, as Warwick not only was an experienced mariner who had the respect of naval men of all ranks, but he was known to favor Parliament in the worsening disputes between Parliament and Charles.

This arrangement of administration was highly significant in the period immediately preceding the war. Not only were the Principal Officers accustomed to receiving their assignments and resources from the King and Parliament through Northumberland and Warwick, but the ship captains also were accustomed to receiving their orders through the Vice-Admiral. It was clear to both King and Parliament that, all else being equal, the political leaning of the men who occupied those two top posts would provide that side with an initial advantage in gaining control of the Navy.

Despite his failure either to understand or to respond to the disaffection of the men of his Navy, Charles, like his father before him, nevertheless appreciated the importance of the Navy to the security of the nation. In numbers of ships, he increased the fleet significantly. Charles added two first rates, five second rates, and three third rates. So when the Civil War started the Navy comprised twenty-six first, second, and third rate ships. These vessels were between 500 and 1500 tons and armed with thirty to ninety guns. Between 1628 and 1637 Charles added seven smaller ships bringing the total of fourth, fifth and sixth rates to ten. They carried between six and twenty-five guns. There were also two second and third rates and three of other rates that were not fit for service. In addition, the Navy was supplemented by armed merchant ships. The Summer Guard,

the fleet in service in the summer of 1642, comprised 18 regular Navy warships and 24 merchantmen that had been leased, complete with officers and crews.  

In 1640, that same shortage of money that caused so much disaffection with the men of the Navy motivated Charles to call another Parliament. The Bishop’s Wars had exhausted his resources and a Scottish army was then camped on English soil. Charles felt sure that Parliament would provide the money for an army that could drive off the Scots. But the Parliament which met on November 3, 1640, was more adamant than ever. During the following year Parliament made repeated demands that stripped away much of the King’s power. On February 16, Charles gave his grudging approval to the Triennial Act requiring a Parliament every three years. On Feb 24, the Commons voted unanimously to attaint the despised Archbishop Laud and sentenced him to death for treason. On July 5, Charles agreed to the abolishment of the Court of Star Chamber. What was to become known as The Long Parliament, encouraged by its success, extended its authority into religion. On 17 July, the Commons passed the Root and Branch Bill that effectively removed Charles as head of the state religion and abolished the episcopacy. On July 22, Charles gave his assent to the Tunnage and Poundage Bill by which fiscal feudalism and any form of taxation not specifically approved by Parliament

---

21 Penn, 22-23.


23 Ibid., 296.

24 Ibid., 404.

25 Ibid., 408.

26 Tunnage and poundage was in import tax on wine and wool. Traditionally, Parliament had granted the tax to the monarch for life. Fiscal feudalism included such sources of income as the sale of wardships and purveyance (the right to purchase stores at artificially fixed low prices.)
was denied to the King.27 This eliminated the controversial ship-money that had been the major source of income for the Navy. Parliament then promulgated the Grand Remonstrance that listed all of the grievances against Charles. For the Navy, the most significant action was the Militia Ordinance passed in January, 1642. It required that all military officers “receive Directions by his Majesty’s Authority, signified unto them by the Lords and Commons, assembled in Parliament.”28 In effect, the King’s orders to all military officers were what Parliament said they were. Charles refused to sign the ordinance, but Parliament began issuing naval orders anyway.

With all of the changes being imposed, it was clear to both King and Parliament that a Civil War was imminent if Charles was to retain any power at all, and both sides began to prepare for hostilities. As one of his first moves, Charles sent the Queen to Holland with the crown jewels to buy arms. With the marriage of his daughter Mary to William II of Orange, Charles had become closely associated with the Dutch aristocracy. The Queen sailed in the Lion, a third rater commanded by Captain John Mennes. The latter’s willingness to accept the assignment indicated that he was to be a Royalist.29

The next move by Charles was to try to gain control of the arsenal at Hull by replacing Sir John Hotham, the Governor at Hull, who was a known Parliamentarian, with William Cavendish, the Earl of Newcastle, a Royalist. That attempt failed, as


Parliament had sent orders to Hotham to secure the city and not to admit the King’s messengers.30

Parliament’s action was important not only because of the arsenal. If Parliament could gain control of the Navy, it would serve five major functions in the upcoming war. The first was to protect shipping from privateers and Royalist raiders. The second was to interdict Royalist merchant ships providing logistic support for the King’s forces.

Thirdly, Royalist warships were to be engaged and destroyed or captured. The fourth function was to provide support for Parliamentary ground forces wherever possible. The fifth function was to secure the major bases and ports. This last was the most important as without it the others could not be accomplished. It was in this regard that Hull took on added importance. Besides the arsenal at Hull, the city was located on the Humber River and in position to control access to the interior in the northeast. The other ports that had to be held or, at least, denied the use of to the Royalists, were London and the Downs, Portsmouth, Plymouth, and Milford Haven in southern Wales.

In spite of the Militia Ordinance, however, the King still controlled the Navy, in theory though not always in fact. Northumberland was still Lord Admiral and his politics were uncertain. In March 1642 he chose to keep them that way by excusing himself from duty on the grounds of ill health. Traditionally, when the Lord Admiral was unable to serve, he appointed a deputy to serve in his stead. On March 15, 1642, the King nominated Sir John Pennington, the same person who had commanded the fleet to be lent to the French, and, in the event, had been willing to fire on his own ships to force the

---

30 Powell, The Navy, 12.
reluctant crews to give them up. Nevertheless, on April 4 both houses of Parliament approved Warwick’s appointment and discharged Pennington from duty two days later. Warwick chose William Batten, an experienced sailor currently serving as Surveyor on the Navy Board, as Vice-Admiral. Both of these men were known Parliamentarians.

At that point the King was unwilling to give up either the arsenal at Hull or control of the Navy. When Parliament notified the King that contents of the arsenal were to be removed, Charles went himself, with a sizeable force of troops, to Hull and demanded entry. On April 26, the Commons received a letter from the King accusing Sir John Hotham of high treason for refusing entry to the King and his military escort. Charles then went on to York. A short time later, Parliament sent two Fourth-Rates accompanied by four merchant ships to Hull and brought the armament to London.

The proximity of York, a Royalist stronghold, still made the Humber a desirable location for importing the munitions that the Queen had succeeded in purchasing in the Netherlands. In June she sent a small armed merchantman carrying munitions and several artillery pieces to the Humber. Learning of the mission, Warwick dispatched the Mayflower, a larger merchantman, which intercepted the Queen’s ship. When ordered to follow her into Hull, the smaller Royalist ship escaped into a shallow creek where the Mayflower could not follow. Her cargo was safely unloaded and carried off to York.

---


32 Ibid., 507-09

33 Parliament Trust, Commons 2, 542.

34 Powell, The Navy, 18.

35 Ibid., 19.
This was the first naval confrontation of the Civil War, even though the war was, officially, still two months off.

Later that month, Charles made another bid to take control of the fleet. On June 30, he sent Northumberland a letter dismissing him as Lord High Admiral. Since Warwick was Northumberland’s appointed deputy, that naturally invalidated Warwick’s appointment. In his place Charles appointed Pennington. At the same time, he sent letters to all the captains of the ships anchored in The Downs informing them of the change of command and ordering them to disregard any orders from Warwick and Batten. Warwick was ashore at the time and Batten was uncertain how to handle the situation. Unfortunately for the King, Pennington did not show up to take charge of the fleet until Warwick had returned to his flagship, the James, a Second Rate of 50 guns. Warwick ignored his letter of dismissal from the King and called a council of all his captains. All but the Rear-Admiral, Sir John Mennes, and three captains decided to stay with Warwick. By that time, Parliament had learned what was going on. When Northumberland declined Parliament’s offer to return to duty, both houses quickly confirmed Warwick’s position as deputy Lord High Admiral. Armed with this authority, Warwick threatened action against the four ships which still opposed him. Two of the captains acquiesced immediately. Warwick sent several ship’s boats with unarmed men to board the two remaining ships. The crews of the ships immediately seized the Rear-Admiral and the two captains. This was a clear case of the men taking action against their captain. Under other circumstances this would have been a mutiny.

---

37 Ibid., 176-181.
Another factor affecting the outcome was the background of the officers. Many of them had backgrounds in merchant ships and entered the Navy when their ships were leased for royal service. These men tended to be younger and less committed to the King than the older officers whom they were replacing. They also were less likely to be of the gentry class, many of them having risen through the ranks from common seamen. As such their religious inclination was more likely to be Puritan with an accompanying Parliamentarian political inclination.\textsuperscript{39}

Charles made one more attempt to gain control of his fleet. It led to the next major change in administration. On July 7 he instructed the Principal Officers, his appointees, to ignore commands from Warwick and Parliament without his express orders.\textsuperscript{40} When they attempted to carry out this instruction, Parliament dismissed all of them and replaced them by a board, the Commissioners of the Navy which was subordinate to the Parliamentary Navy Committee.\textsuperscript{41} One of the first acts of the Commissioners was to raise the wages of the common seamen from fifteen to nineteen shillings per month. Certainly this must have had a positive effect on the loyalty of the men.\textsuperscript{42}

The military actions described above were not the only ones before Charles raised his standard at Nottingham on August 22, 1642. The Royalist Earl of Lindsey, with three thousand troops, threatened Hull again, but not before the Parliamentarian, Sir John Meldrum, arrived by ship to reinforce the city. On July 12, 1642, Rear-Admiral

\textsuperscript{39} Andrews, 187-88.
\textsuperscript{40} Parliament Trust, \textit{Lords} 5, 222-227.
\textsuperscript{41} Parliament Trust, \textit{Commons} 2, 703-06.
\textsuperscript{42} Oppenheim, 287.
Trenchfield arrived with the *Jocelyn*, the *Sampson*, the *Unicorn*, and the *Rainbow*. The guns of those ships joined those of the *Mayflower* in repelling Lindsey's attack. Once again the Navy had come to the rescue of Hull.

In early August, Col. George Goring, the Governor of Portsmouth, who had been thought to be on the side of the Parliamentarians, made a surprise move by declaring for the King. Prompt action by the Navy in a joint operation with Army forces recovered the important port for Parliament on September 7, 1642.43

An odd situation developed in Ireland where two Third-Rates, the *Swallow* and the *Bonaventure*, left their post at Kinsale, presumably bound for Holland to join the King's cause. This left the Irish coast unprotected against Dunkirk privateers who were even taking ships in Dublin harbor. Guessing that the ships may stop to re-supply at Newcastle, Vice Admiral William Batten, commanding the Parliamentary ships in the north, found them at Tynemouth. Apparently recalling the earlier events at the Downs, Batten sent several ship's boats to board the vessels. On October 4, 1642, once again, the crews turned on their captains, Kettleby and Stradling. The latter managed to escape in his long-boat; Kettleby and the two ships were turned over to Batten.44

The *Swallow* and the *Bonaventure* were the last of the larger ships that had been in the service of the Royalists. This is not to say the Royalists had no warships. Ship lists are incomplete and their numbers varied as small merchant ships were leased (or captured), armed, and put into the King's service. The ships operated as privateers
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against Parliamentary commerce independently out of Ireland, Brittany, the Channel Islands, and Dunkirk. That they were a significant threat is indicated that during the Civil War forty-four of them were sunk or captured by the Parliamentary Navy. Warwick estimated that in 1644 there were 250 such privateers operating against the Parliamentarians.\textsuperscript{45} While these privateers were vexing, they operated independently with no central direction for their activities. They functioned mainly for their own profit which only coincidentally benefited the Royalists.

In contrast, Warwick remained mostly in London where he was able to coordinate naval operations to provide logistic and military support for the Army. During the first year and a half of the Civil War, Hull and Plymouth were repeatedly threatened by the Royalists, but those essential ports resisted attacks with the support of the Parliamentary Navy. Although Bristol had fallen and Newcastle was in Royalist hands, the Navy blockaded both ports. The Royalist ships refitting in Bristol were ineffective because of the Parliamentary ships in Milford Haven.

In the first two years of the war, Warwick was absent from command in the Navy for about six weeks in the fall of 1642. On October 11, 1642, after the King’s army that had just beaten the Earl of Essex at Edgehill threatened London, Warwick was called to command the army.\textsuperscript{46} On October 19, 1642, the post of deputy Lord High Admiral was put into a commission of nine members and Batten was put in charge of fleet operations.\textsuperscript{47}

\textsuperscript{45} Granville Penn, Memoria\\ls of the Life and Times of Sir William Penn, Knt.: Admiral and General of the Fleet during the Interregnum; Admiral and Commissioner of the Admiralty and Navy, after the Restoration, from 1644 to 1670 (London: James Duncan, 1833), 107; Powell, The Navy, 92.

\textsuperscript{46} Parliament Trust, Lords 5, 393-396.

\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 406-410.
The year 1644 saw a decline in Parliamentary fortunes. The powerful Navy of two years earlier declined not in numbers of warships, but in morale. Parliament experienced the same problem that Charles had faced: lack of money. Victuallers could provide only rotten food at the prices that Parliament could afford; or they simply refused to supply the ships at all. Parliament did not ignore Warwick's constant complaints; they simply did not have the means to correct the situation. Yet the Navy was able to fight off major attacks at Hull, Milford Haven, and Plymouth. The Parliamentary Navy had almost completely stopped the transport of Royalist troops from Ireland. As a reward, Parliament removed the "deputy" designation from Warwick's title; he was finally the Lord High Admiral.48

But on the ground there were serious problems. The Parliamentary Army functioned much the way the Royalist naval forces operated: without centralized direction. In December, 1642, Parliament created two military command areas: the Northern or Midlands Association and the Eastern Association.49 With little coordination between Association commanders other than that provided by the Parliament,50 the commanders tended to compete with each other rather than cooperate. The answer to this problem was the New Model Army. Promoted by Oliver Cromwell, one of the more successful generals, the New Model Army was to be a state-administered army paid for by taxes levied on all the counties, much as Charles had done for ship-money. Rather than being restricted to a specific geographic area, it could operate anywhere in the three

48 Powell, The Navy, 55.

49 Parliament Trust, Lords, 5, 492-93, 503-08.

50 The ineffective Committee of Safety, comprising ten members from the House of Commons and five from the House of Lords was established on July 4, 1642. See House of Lords, vol 5, 176-81. Its purpose was to enable Parliament to coordinate military operations.
kingdoms. To be sure that it would be free from political rivalries, Parliament passed the Self-Denying Ordinance which held that no member of Parliament could hold a high military commission. The New Model Army would have one commander: Lord Thomas Fairfax with Oliver Cromwell as second in command.

The odd thing about the Self-Denying Ordinance is that it had the potential of inflicting the opposite effect on the Navy than it had for the Army. Until the spring of 1645 one man, the Earl of Warwick, provided able direction for the Navy. On April 28 he had to resign as Lord High Admiral. The position was put into an Admiralty Commission of 12 members from the House of Commons and 6 members from the House of Lords. Warwick was named head of the Commission and Batten was appointed to operational command of the fleet for six months. Fortunately, except for the fact that Warwick no longer had personal contact with the men of the fleet, little actually changed in practice. The other members of the Admiralty Commission deferred to Warwick’s reputation, experience, and ability, allowing him to retain strategic control.⁵¹

1645 and 1646 showed a radical change in the military situation. Largely because of the New Model Army of Fairfax and Cromwell and the entry of the Scots into the war, the Parliamentary forces were successful almost everywhere. The Navy, under the direction of Batten and his new Vice-Admiral, Sir William Penn, continued to perform well but with a growing morale problem. Pay was slow and conditions of service continued to deteriorate in spite Warwick’s efforts. Major changes, both political and military were to follow the official cessation of hostilities on September 12, 1646.

CHAPTER III
THE SECOND AND THIRD CIVIL WARS AND THE COMMONWEALTH
1646-1653

The end of the Civil War did not signal the end of the Royalist cause; nor did it provide the victorious Parliamentarians with a mandate for peaceful governance. The Catholic rebellion in Ireland that had started in 1641 had escalated into a full blown war when the rebels officially organized into a Catholic Confederacy. That war took on international undertones when the Papal Nuncio Archbishop Rinuccini arrived and insisted on prosecuting the war until all the English Protestants had been driven out of Ireland. Both sides had dissenting factions. One Confederate faction negotiated a peace with Charles in return for liberalized treatment for Catholics. The peace did not hold; but Charles succeeded in recruiting a Confederate army to fight for the Royalist cause in Scotland. A Scottish army had been in Ireland since 1642 fighting, ostensibly, for Charles against the Confederates. In 1644, after Scotland had entered the Civil War against Charles, Parliament recalled part of that army to Scotland to fight against Charles' Irish force. Charles also recruited Protestant troops from the English in Ireland to join Royalists in England. Some 17,600 men were sent to England between September, 1643, and March, 1644. Once in England, however, these men were viewed as Papists. Many of them deserted and joined the Parliamentarians to continue their fight against what seemed to be a near-Catholic King.\footnote{Kenyon, 90.}

In England, also, there was confusion of loyalties. Diverse causes and views, under the dichotomizing effect of war, merged into a tenuous Parliamentarian alliance that only temporarily masked the significance of religious and political differences. Those differences took on major proportions in 1643 when Parliament, for whom the war
was going badly, gained an alliance with the Scots. The price of that alliance was the acceptance of the *Solemn League and Covenant* by which Parliament agreed to enforce Scottish Presbyterianism in England and Ireland. The agreement was signed on September 25, 1643. Those who supported the Covenant became known as Presbyterians, and those who opposed it were the Independents. But these labels were an over-simplification. The so-called Presbyterians were actually of many religious persuasions and can better be described as political moderates. They sought a peaceful settlement with the King and political reform within the traditional monarchial structure. Still, they willingly accepted Presbyterianism as the official religion in order to accomplish those goals. The Independent faction, on the other hand, comprised all religious sects, except Episcopalian, and even included the most radical versions of Calvinism. In addition the Independents sought a much more radical variety of political reform. It ranged from completely abolishing both the monarchy and the House of Lords to reinstating Charles with greatly reduced monarchial authority.

In spite of the wide range of religious and political causes and convictions, Parliamentary leaders prioritized their causes and the two groups described above emerged as distinguishable political parties: the Presbyterians, or Moderates, and the Independents, or Radicals. As might be expected, the Moderates predominated in the House of Lords but held only a narrow majority in the House of Commons. In the Commons the split between Moderates and Radicals became pervasive and replaced the usual formation and dissolution of constantly changing factions based on individual issues. The basic system of legislative functionality changed. Rather than debating
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3 Parliament Trust, *Commons* 3, 254.

issues in committees until an agreement was reached to which all, at least officially, subscribed, decisions were made by a majority vote which often reflected the alignment of the members as Moderates or Radicals. The centuries-old system of English consensual politics gave way to modern adversarial politics.\textsuperscript{5}

Political fracturing did not end there; it was only the beginning of divisions that led to the Second Civil War. After Charles surrendered his person to the Scots, three-sided negotiations between Charles, the Scots, and Parliament representatives began on July 23, 1646.\textsuperscript{6} From the beginning they went badly. Charles rejected out-of-hand the Newcastle Propositions, the conditions under which Parliament would allow him to return to the throne.\textsuperscript{7} The document provided for the establishment of Presbyterianism as the official religion and control of the armed forces by Parliament. Nor would such an arrangement have been satisfactory to the Independents who represented a growing, although not universal, radical movement in the population. The Levelers, led by John Lilburne, advocated complete religious freedom and election reform that included extension of the franchise to all adult men.\textsuperscript{8}

The Scots, the third party in the negotiations at Newcastle, chaffed under accusations by the New Model Army that they had contributed little to the victory, and demanded heavy payment for their contribution to the war. They negotiated from a strong position: They had an army in England that might readily switch sides; and they had the King.


\textsuperscript{6} Parliament Trust, \textit{Lords} 8, 450-53.

\textsuperscript{7} Ibid., 460-63.

\textsuperscript{8} Kenyon, \textit{Civil Wars}, 161.
The Army also was adding to Parliament's problems. It demanded payment of wages that were far in arrears at a time when the economy of the country was struggling to recover from four years of war. The soldiers also sought indemnity from prosecution for war crimes and from suits against them to receive compensation for all manner of goods that had been confiscated during the war. Anti-military sentiment among the people was high, and in some counties there was a breakdown of law and order. Unlike 1642, there was no common objective to unify the various political and religious positions.

In this environment, the Navy also experienced political disagreement. As in 1642, Navy leadership played a significant role. An early sign of disaffection between Navy leaders and Parliament was Batten’s resentment over his appointment to command of the Navy for only six months. The temporary nature of his appointment is a clear indication of the growing influence of the Independents in the House of Commons. Batten was firmly in the Presbyterian camp, both religiously and politically. As such, the Independents even suspected Batten of possibly attempting a rescue of the King and spiriting him off to the continent.

Nevertheless, on December 21, 1646, the Committee of the Admiralty sent Batten to Newcastle with instructions to prevent any rescue attempt. There was good reason to suspect such an event. Newcastle was located near the mouth of the Tyne River, and two warships, one Dutch of 32 guns and one of 25 guns from Dunkirk had been in the mouth
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9 Ibid., 165.

of the Tyne several weeks, ostensibly for repairs. Batten took with him a third-rate, the *Leopard* with 38 guns; an armed merchantman, the *Constant Warwick* with 30 guns; and a sixth-rate, the *Greyhound* with 12 guns. They arrived just in time to foil a rescue plot on Christmas eve.\(^{11}\)

The political significance of this event lies in the opportunity for extended contact between Batten and the Scots. During his time in Newcastle Batten probably indicated to the Scots a preference for finding an accommodation with the King rather than replacing him. The acquaintances made then are likely to have been the contacts he was to make later.\(^{12}\)

The stalled negotiations at Newcastle were finally resolved when, in February, 1647, the Scots accepted an offer of £400,000 from the Parliament representatives,\(^{13}\) turned the King over to the English commissioners, and took their own army back to Scotland. Charles was taken to Holmby House in Northamptonshire where he remained until June 4, 1647.\(^{14}\)

The summer of 1647 was politically chaotic. The Independents increasingly challenged the Presbyterian control of Parliament, even though the people of London generally supported the Presbyterians. The New Model Army was in near revolt, mainly over the issues of back-pay, indemnity, deactivation, and service in Ireland which
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\(^{11}\) Powell, *Navy*, 126 - 27.

\(^{12}\) Ibid., Powell emphasizes this point by citing “the long months” of Batten’s presence at Newcastle. The date of Batten’s orders from the Committee of the Admiralty, however, indicates that his stay could not have been more than about five weeks.


\(^{14}\) Ibid., 134.
Parliament insisted was the only alternative to deactivation. On June 14, the Army issued a declaration to Parliament adding the immediate dissolution of Parliament and the purge of its corrupt members to the list of demands. Attempts by Parliament to appease the Army were met with rioting and demands from the citizens of London to continue negotiations with Charles. These were quelled only when both houses of Parliament voluntarily put themselves under the protection of the Army, and Fairfax led it into London on July 6, 1647.

The arrival of the Army marked the beginning of the end of Presbyterian control of Parliament and the beginning of Navy disaffection with Parliament. Eleven Members of Parliament were accused of treason. After obtaining passes from the Speaker, six of them attempted to flee by ship. The man who arranged their passage betrayed them, and the ship was intercepted and taken to the Downs. Batten examined their passes and released them to continue their journey. For this Batten was called before the Committee of Both Houses where his resignation was demanded and given on September 24, 1647. Batten was fortunate that he was allowed to keep his position as a Navy Commissioner. It is probable that he so readily resigned his command of the Navy


16 Parliament Trust, Commons 5, 231-32.


18 Parliament Trust, Commons 5, 234-36.

19 Powell, in *The Navy*, indicates the number of fleeing MPs as five. However, Batten, cited below, identified the members as Mr. Denzil Holles, Sir Philip Stapleton, Sir William Waller, Sir William Lewes, Sir John Clotworthy, and Mr. Walter Long.

20 Powell and Timings, 285-86. Batten's written account to the Admiralty Committee.

21 Ibid., 289. Record of the Admiralty Secretary.
because he feared that deeper inquiry might reveal his on-going communication with the Scots and his offer of twenty-two ships to help restore Charles to the throne. On October 1 the House of Commons voted to replace him with an Army colonel, Thomas Rainsborough.  

In the Putney debates of October and November between the Army and the Levelers, all aspects of a new constitution were discussed. The debates produced the Agreement of the People which advocated a unicameral Parliament and universal suffrage for all adult males. However, the only conclusion was that the Army should denounce the Levelers entirely and negotiations with Charles should be resumed. This split with the Levelers was also a split within the ranks of the Independents. The group led by Fairfax and Cromwell still hoped for reconciliation with the King whereby Parliament support could be retained, but Rainsborough sided with the Levellers and proceeded to incite a radical revolt in the Army. Fairfax exerted his considerable political power both by mending the split between the Independent MPs and the Levelers and by bringing the Leveler-inspired revolting elements of the Army back into line. Rainsborough apologized for his part in the Army mutiny. The House of Lords, however, was adamant and withdrew their approval of his appointment to command of the Navy. In spite of the failure of the mutiny, any hope of bringing the Army into concert with the still Presbyterian-controlled Parliament was short lived. Likewise the agreement between the Independents and the Levelers was mostly cosmetic. There were rumors of
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22 Parliament Trust, Lords 9, 458-61.

23 Kenyon, Stuart Constitution, 274-76. First Agreement of the People dated October 28, 1747.

24 Parliament Trust, Lords 9, 616-17.

25 Kenyon, Civil Wars, 172-75.
assassination attempts on the King and on November 11, the King escaped from his Army captors and fled to Carisbrooke on the Isle of Wight.\textsuperscript{26}

In Scotland there was as much disagreement about the political future of the kingdom as there was in England. Also as in England, the political moderates who sought an accommodation with Charles held a tenuous control of the Scottish Parliament. They secretly negotiated with Charles, and, unlike the English, succeeded. The Engagement, signed on December 24, 1647, provided for the establishment of Presbyterianism as the official, although not mandatory, religion of England. It also committed Charles to accept Scotsmen on the English Privy Council and the Scots to provide an army to back up the Engagement.\textsuperscript{27}

When news of the Engagement became known, Charles’ duplicity caused some Presbyterian MPs to change sides. It was enough to change the balance of power to favor the Independents. An early indication of that change was the order from Commons for Rainsborough to put to sea in command of the Winter Guard. Objections were immediately raised by the House of Lords. On December 27 the Lords were informed by the House of Commons that Rainsborough had been found innocent of the earlier charges and his appointment as Vice-Admiral and as Commander of the Navy would stand.\textsuperscript{28} Further evidence came two weeks later when, on January 11, 1648, Parliament passed the Vote of No Addresses making it a treasonable offence for anyone to continue negotiations with Charles.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{26} Parliament Trust, \textit{Lords} 9, 519.

\textsuperscript{27} Kenyon, \textit{Civil Wars}, 176-77.

\textsuperscript{28} Parliament Trust, \textit{Lords} 9, 614-15.

\textsuperscript{29} Parliament Trust, \textit{Commons} 5, 461-63.
The radical shift in Parliament combined with the King’s escape and newly-found support in Scotland gave a new life to the Royalist cause. The Scots were further alienated when Parliament disbanded the Committee of Both Kingdoms, making it clear that there was no longer a place for the Scots in English government. Its replacement was the Darby House Committee in which Independents outnumbered Presbyterians. In Ireland the Catholics viewed Parliament as a far greater threat than the tolerant Charles, and Irish ports joined Jersey and Guernsey in welcoming Royalist privateers. Merchants blamed the increasing privateer activity on the removal of Batten from command. The officers and men of the Navy also resented the Army’s political power and the shabby treatment afforded to Batten by Parliament. A significant portion of the Navy was about to follow its popular leader into revolt while the rest of it would be unreliable at best.

The so-called Second Civil War began in February of 1648 with an uprising at Pembroke in South Wales. In April and May resentment of Parliament and the Army became militant as armed rebellion spread throughout Wales. The Army, led by Cromwell and convinced that the King had to be dealt with severely, marched to Wales to put down the rebels. There were also uprisings at Newcastle, and Berwick-on-the-Tweed in southeastern Scotland. On April 24, Essex submitted a petition with 30,000 signatures calling for a personal treaty with the King. On May 16 a similar petition came from Surrey. In London, mobs declared their support for the King.
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The most serious outbreak occurred in Kent where Royalist sentiment had been strong throughout the First Civil War. On May 11, the Grand Jury of the spring assizes defied the authority of the county committee by dismissing charges against accused rioters. The jury also drafted a petition similar to the petitions of Essex and Surry calling for a personal treaty with the King. By the end of the month a rebel army of 10,000 had been assembled, and Parliament sent Fairfax with another army to oppose it.\(^\text{34}\)

Rainsborough's naval resources were stretched thin as he tried to blockade ports, pursue privateers and support threatened garrisons. He was further hampered by the question of his command status that delayed the naming of the Summer Guard until May 17. When finally available, it was impressive. The thirty-nine ships included 6 new fourth-rates: the *Nonesuch*, *Assurance*, *Adventure*, *Phoenix*, *Dragon*, and *Elizabeth*. The badly-needed Irish Guard received 19 ships.\(^\text{35}\)

The settlement of command was far too late. The many new captains who were politically reliable did not have time to gain the respect of their crews. Instead, they were resented as unwelcome replacements just as Batten had been replaced by Rainsborough. The men were already well disposed to listen to criticism by Samuel Kem, Batten’s former chaplain. Since early April, Kem had been agitating the crews in the Downs against Rainsborough. Batten himself still retained his position as a Navy Commissioner even as he was secretly meeting with Royalist agents.\(^\text{36}\)

\(^{34}\) Ibid., 182.

\(^{35}\) Powell, *The Navy*, 151.

\(^{36}\) Ibid., 153.
The rebellion in near-by Kent emboldened the crews of the ships in the Downs. On May 19, the crew of the Providence, a fourth-rate, readily welcomed a man claiming to be the Prince of Wales. The local citizenry also accepted his claim and seized the nearby towns of Sandwich, Faversham, and Rochester. The gentry assumed leadership and appointed themselves Royalist Commissioners. Darby House responded to the news immediately, ordering Rainsborough to retake Sandwich and arrest the imposter.37

The situation at Chatham also deteriorated rapidly. On May 23, the Darby House Committee directed Rainsborough to deploy ships to protect the Medway River to keep open access to the Navy yards.38 The action came too late. Dockyard workers and officials had already joined the rebellion, and taken possession of two ships in reserve, the Sovereign and the Prince, first and second-rates respectively. Rainsborough ordered the Fellowship, a fourth-rate (prize); and the Hector, a fifth-rate, to sail north to avoid subversion. The latter escaped, but rebels took-over the Fellowship.39

Back in the Downs, Rainsborough seemed to have regained control. On May 24, he ordered the Providence to sail north along with the Convertine, a third-rate which he also considered to be unreliable.40 On May 26, Rainsborough received assurances from his captains at a council that all were dedicated to the service of Parliament. However, these new officers did not represent the attitude of the men. The next day, thinking all was well, Rainsborough went ashore to inspect defenses at Deal Castle. In his absence, Kem took copies of the Kent petition to the ships where the crews received it with cheers.

37 Powell and Timings, Letter from Darby House to Rainsborough, 329.

38 Hamilton, vol. 22, 74.

39 Capp, 17-18.

The ships that declared for the King were the *Swallow*, a third-rate; the *Roebuck*, a-sixth rate; the *Hind*, a fifth-rate; the *Satisfaction*, a fifth-rate (prize); the *Pelican*, an armed merchantman; and even the *Constant Reformation*, a first-rate and Rainsborough’s own flagship. When Rainsborough tried to return to his ship the crew refused to allow him to come aboard.\(^{41}\)

Aboard the *Constant Reformation*, Thomas Lendall, the boatswain’s mate of the ship, called all of the captains to a council. Captain Francis Penrose of the *Satisfaction* claimed that a council could not be held without a Vice-Admiral and attended only under duress. He refused to sign the petition, and urged that a Vice-Admiral be appointed. To the surprise of the plotters, a cry went up not for Batten but for Warwick. The men vowed to obey Warwick if he were sent to them, and Penrose was deputed to carry the news of these proceedings back to London.\(^{42}\)

The revolt of the Navy was immediately recognized as the gravest of events. The King might be rescued; London could be blockaded; Catholic troops from Ireland could be brought in. The best hope was to re-appoint the Earl of Warwick to the post of Lord High Admiral. The affection and respect the men of the Navy held for their old war-time leader was well known, and he had held the fleet for Parliament once before; perhaps he could do it again.\(^{43}\)

On May 30, the day after his re-appointment to the fleet, Warwick arrived at the Downs aboard the *Nicodemus*, a sixth-rate. He was met by Captain Penrose and Captain

\(^{41}\) Ibid., Letter from Rainsborough to William Lenthall, Speaker of the House of Commons, 330.

\(^{42}\) Capp, 20-21.

Harris aboard the *Hind*. In the past few days the rebellious position of the sailors had hardened, and Penrose and Harris informed Warwick that things had changed and the men would not follow him unless he first met with the Royalist agents. Clearly, the rebelling crews hoped that Warwick would join their cause. He was known to be a Presbyterian and to favor a personal treaty with the King. In addition his own brother, Henry Rich, Earl of Holland, was commander of all Royalist troops presently operating against Parliament. But Warwick refused even to meet with the agents or to present their case to Parliament. In response, the men spurned an offer of indemnity and only after lengthy negotiations did they allow Warwick to take the *Nicodemus* back to London.44

The ketch *Rebecca* also took the opportunity to cut her cables and escape from the rebel fleet.45

Fairfax, with his army of about 7000, had a successful campaign in Essex. On June 1, he regained Maidstone after a bitter battle and continued his advance toward the Downs.46 The rebelling sailors perceived this as a threat to their supplies, and on June 4 the *Constant Reformation*, the *Satisfaction*, the *Hind*, the *Roebuck*, the *Swallow*, and the *Pelican* sailed for Yarmouth. But that town was securely held by Parliament forces, so they returned to the Downs on June 7.

At Yarmouth, the *Warwick*, a fifth-rate; the *Antelope*, a third rate; and the *Crescent*, a sixth-rate; also mutinied and put their captains ashore. The crews of the *Greyhound*, a sixth-rate, and the *Providence* mutinied, but their captains managed to
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regain control of their ships while most of the sailors were ashore and sailed for Harwich with partial crews. The *Warwick* also slipped her cable and appeared to sail in pursuit. In fact, she continued into the Thames and rejoined the Parliament fleet. At Harwich, the *Greyhound* and the *Providence* joined the *Tiger*, a fourth-rate; the *Dolphin*, a merchantman of six guns; and the *Hunter*, a sixth rate. Although Parliament still had nominal control of these ships their crews were untrustworthy.  

The success of Fairfax’s campaign in Kent also changed the situation in Chatham and the Medway. The dockyard workers quickly changed sides, and the *Fellowship*, the *Sovereign* and the *Prince* were returned to Parliament control. Near the mouth of the Medway the *Nicodemus*, the *Greyhound*, the *Adventure*, the *Unicorn*, a second-rate; the *St George*, a second-rate; and the *Hector*, a fifth-rate were also still loyal to Parliament.  

The squadron at Portsmouth comprised the *Lion*, a third-rate; the *Garland*, a third-rate; the *Bonaventure*, a third-rate; the *Mary Rose*, a fourth-rate; the *John*, a fourth-rate; the *Robert*, a sixth-rate; the *Phoenix*; and the *Nonesuch*. Although these ships had not joined the revolt, they could not be trusted. The crews of the *Garland* and the *John* refused to serve until they were paid.  

With their base in the Downs likely to be taken by Fairfax at any time, the rebel crews resolved to join the Royalists and sailed for Helvoetsluys, Holland on June 10, 1648.
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The difference between this revolt and the Navy’s break from the King at the beginning of the First Civil War is dramatic. As was shown in Chapter II, in 1642 the Navy’s alignment with Parliament was largely a matter of gaining administrative control. This is not to say that the seamen did not have significant cause for dissatisfaction with the King. But the impetus came from the Earl of Warwick at the very top of naval command and was supported by most of the officers. In 1648, on the other hand, the revolt was led entirely by the crews. Only three captains of the rebelling ships sailed to Holland, and two of them did so only under duress.\(^5^1\)

The reasons for the revolt were political, rather than dissatisfaction with conditions of service. In the main, they involved a deep resentment against the Army and its radical opposition to the monarchy. The reasons were spelled out in a declaration from the crews of the ships in the Downs to the Navy Commissioners in June, 1648:

1. The parliament, of late, grant commissions to the sea-commanders in their own names, leaving out the King.
2. Several land-men made sea commanders.
3. The insufferable pride, ignorance, and insolence of Colonel Rainsborough, the late vice-admiral, alienated the hearts of the seamen.\(^5^2\)

In another declaration in July the crews complained that the Independent party and the Army “have seized into their hands, and garrisoned all the strong places of the kingdom, overrunning, disarming, and plundering the country, as if it were a conquered nation.”\(^5^3\)
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\(^5^1\) Capp, 29.

\(^5^2\) Powell and Timings, A Declaration of the Navy from the crews of the ships in the Downs to the Navy Commissioners, 334.

\(^5^3\) Ibid., A Declaration from the crews of the Constant Reformation, the Convertine, the Swallow, the Antelope, the Satisfaction, the Hind, the Roebuck, the Crescent, the Pelican, and the Blackmore Lady, 354. The type ship of the Blackmore Lady is not known.
This willingness of the crews to mutiny on a mass scale is indicative of an awareness of their own political power. Oddly, the newly-found right to exercise this power derived from the egalitarianism of the Leveller philosophy which, to some extent, had become embedded in the Independent party – the party against which the men were rebelling. While they were only too happy to exploit this proclivity by the seamen to act on their own political inclinations, the Royalists were soon to find that it could work against them as well.

By mid July, Batten’s treason was known and he was summoned to appear before Parliament. But he fled to Holland instead, taking the *Constant Warwick* with him.\(^5\) In Holland, the Prince of Wales took personal command of his newly-acquired fleet. Immediately there was disagreement over what should be done. The men wished to sail directly into the Thames. They were convinced that other ships and many seamen would join them. The Prince, however, insisted on going back to the Downs. From there he sortied against shipping to and from London. This brought pressure on London merchants to agitate for a settlement with the King, but it lacked the forcefulness of a full blockade. To make matters worse, the merchant ships that were taken simply paid a negotiated ransom and went on their way. The men were deprived of their expected prize money while their commanders grew rich. When Batten joined them the men's expectations of changes were shattered. Batten approved of the procedures and quickly lost the support of the men. Nor was Batten wholeheartedly accepted by the Royalist leaders. Prince Rupert in particular had little faith in his old enemy.\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) Ibid., Communications from Darby House to Batten dated June 19 and July 18, 1648, 352; Powell, *The Navy*, 166-67.

\(^5\) Powell and Timings, An account by a seaman, 377-79.
On August 29, 1648, the men took matters into their own hands and refused to sail back to Holland to re-supply. Instead they made for the Thames where it was hoped that at least some of Warwick's ships would join them. The Prince had little choice but to follow. The leadership of the fleet had passed out of the Prince's hands and there were suspicions all around. The Prince feared that his fleet, possibly led by Batten, would desert and surrender him to Warwick's fleet.\(^{56}\)

Warwick was also having troubles assembling a fleet to oppose the Prince. Dockyard workers and seamen could not be trusted. So few seamen volunteered for service that Parliament authorized Warwick to press his crews.\(^{57}\) Trinity House refused his request for help. Instead, on June 29 Trinity House presented a petition for a personal treaty with the King.\(^{58}\) In late August, as the Royalist fleet approached the Thames, the leaders of neither the Parliament nor the Royalist fleets were eager to give battle for fear that if the battle went badly their ships may quickly change sides.

Warwick had a fleet of 14 ships to oppose the 18 ships of the Prince. In addition, Warwick had another nine ships in the squadron at Portsmouth.\(^{59}\) When the Royalists arrived on the morning of August 29, Warwick withdrew up the Thames followed by the Royalists. That evening the fleets anchored within sight of each other. Communications were established and both sides made appeals to the other to defect. The next day, the Royalists withdrew down the river, followed by the Parliamentarians, until afternoon when bad weather forced both fleets to anchor. The stalemate continued through the day

\(^{56}\) Capp, 35-36.

\(^{57}\) Parliament Trust, Commons 4, 642-43.

\(^{58}\) Parliament Trust, Commons 5, 615-17.

\(^{59}\) Powell, The Navy, 171.
of August 31. Warwick welcomed the delay as he expected the arrival of the Portsmouth squadron at any time. This would give a significant numerical advantage to Warwick with the Royalists trapped between the London and the Portsmouth squadrons. The Portsmouth ships did arrive during the night of August 31 just as the Royalists were departing for their base at Helvoetsluys.\(^6^0\) In the dark the ships passed by each other. A few shots were fired, but no general engagement ensued.\(^6^1\)

Warwick fully deserved criticism for having missed an excellent chance not only to defeat the revolting fleet but also to capture the Prince of Wales and the despised Prince Rupert. Yet, he was heartened by the fact that his crews had stood firm and resisted the opportunity to join the rebels. Two weeks later he was ordered to take his fleet, now numbering 23 ships, to Helvoetsluys.\(^6^2\) He was urged to take quick action to "have the revolted ships brought back to their obedience."\(^6^3\) He arrived on September 19, 1648, and once more anchored his ships within sight of the Royalist fleet. Again, Warwick's failure to act quickly and in accordance with his orders meant a missed opportunity. Not until the September 22 did Dutch authorities inform Warwick of their neutrality and insistence that he take no offensive action. Three days later a Dutch fleet commanded by Admiral Martin Tromp arrived and anchored between the Royalists and the Parliamentarians to enforce Dutch neutrality. A military engagement was then out of

---

\(^6^0\) The modern city of Hellevoetsluis located near the mouth of the estuary of the Maas River.


\(^6^2\) Powell, The Navy, 178. The ships were the *St George, Unicorn, Lion, Phoenix, Nonesuch, Adventure, Tiger, Mary Rose, Providence, Fellowship, Hector, Warwick, Recovery, Greyhound, Tenth Whelp, Nicodemus, Hunter, Dolphin*, and several ketches.

\(^6^3\) Powell and Timings, Orders from Darby House, 374-75.
the question and the only action that Warwick had taken was to renew the offer of indemnity for rebelling seamen.

Morale in the Royalist fleet was low. The defeats of the land forces at Preston and Colchester in August gave a clear signal that the Second Civil War was winding down. The perceived futility of their cause exacerbated the disaffection among the seamen that had begun with the mishandling of the shipping interdiction while at the Downs. Ashore, the men of the two fleets mingled, and the temptation for the rebel seamen to accept Warwick's indemnity offer and return to their homes and families in England was hard to refuse.

Conflict between the former Parliament officers and their Royalist leaders was acrimonious with accusations of incompetence and treason. In late October Prince Rupert was given command of the Royalist fleet. This was an assignment that had been anticipated by Batten and to which he reacted in the same manner as he did when he did not get command of the Parliament fleet: He accepted Warwick's standing offer of indemnity and deserted to the other side; during the night of November 5, he took the Constant Warwick and joined Warwick's fleet. By that time Batten had lost the respect of both his revolted crews and his associates in England. He returned home and dropped from the public scene.

A few days later, on November 8, about half of Tromp's fleet departed for other duties, and Warwick made a move on the other revolted ships. The Satisfaction; the

65 Kenyon, Civil Wars, 191-93.
Hind; and the Love, a merchantman, were all recovered but the rest of the Royalist ships escaped through the sluice into the inner harbor.\textsuperscript{67}

Low on provisions and convinced that the Royalists would conduct no more operations until spring, Warwick departed with his entire fleet on November 21. This was another mistake as Rupert quickly refitted his fleet and sailed with eight ships for Ireland on January 29, 1649.\textsuperscript{68}

In December, 1648, all pretense of moderate Presbyterian control of Parliament came to an end. The Army occupied London on December 2 and on December 6 Col. Thomas Pride led a unit of troops into the House of Commons and ejected the moderate Presbyterian members. What was left, the Rump, passed a resolution on January 4, 1649 declaring the House of Commons to be the supreme power in the land. The House of Lords was out of business two days later. Charles was put on trial, and, on January 30, 1649, executed. His executive function was assumed by a 40-member Council of State on February 13.\textsuperscript{69}

During the first few weeks of the Interregnum, Warwick continued to serve as an active member of the Navy Committee whose functions were expanded to cover all areas of naval affairs instead of just financial matters. However, his preference for a personal treaty with the King rather than trial and execution was well-known so his support for the new regime was suspect. Further evidence was his repeated failure to engage and defeat the revolted fleet. It is not surprising, then, that Commons restricted his authority as Lord

\textsuperscript{67} Capp, 39.

\textsuperscript{68} Powell and Timmings, Letter to Lenthall from Alexander Bence, liaison commissioner accompanying Warwick, 396.

\textsuperscript{69} Parliament Trust, Commons 6, 138-40.
Admiral by a resolution specifying that his appointments had to be approved by Commons.\textsuperscript{70} Commons wasted no time in exercising the new authority when, on February 12, they appointed three Army colonels, Edward Popham, Robert Blake, and Richard Deane, to command the Navy Summer Guard.\textsuperscript{71} Two weeks later, on February 22, Commons defined the Admiralty to be a function of the Council of State thus eliminating the office of Lord High Admiral, and Warwick's service with the Navy ended.\textsuperscript{72}

Obviously, all of the duties of the Admiralty were far too numerous to be handled by the whole Council of State, so an Admiralty Committee was appointed to perform the function previously done by the Lord High Admiral. Sir Henry Vane, a long-time Admiralty Commissioner, and Valentine Walton, Cromwell's brother-in-law, were the most influential members, remaining on the committee throughout the time of the Commonwealth.\textsuperscript{73}

In light of the recent naval revolt, it is natural that political reliability in all aspects of naval administration and operation should be a major concern to Commons. It was in this regard that Commons appointed a committee of regulators on January 16, 1649 to investigate and report on the efficiency, honesty, and political reliability of anyone associated with naval affairs.\textsuperscript{74} Comprising mostly London merchants, it was called the Committee of Merchants. Even the Navy Commissioners themselves were investigated,

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., 109-10.
\textsuperscript{71} Ibid., 138.
\textsuperscript{72} Ibid., 148-49.
\textsuperscript{73} Capp, 47.
\textsuperscript{74} Parliament Trust, Commons 6, 119.
eliminating such obvious misfits as Batten. The shipmaster's association, Trinity House, had shown a clear preference for a personal treaty with Charles, so its old membership was almost completely replaced with politically correct merchants.\textsuperscript{75}

The international response to the regicide was understandably unfavorable. A strong, politically reliable Navy was a requirement to assure that the Commonwealth survived. To that end, the officers of the Summer Guard were thoroughly vetted and a fourth of the previous commanders were not reassigned. An extensive naval expansion program was put into effect that almost doubled the size of the Navy by 1652. It included twenty new ships and twenty-five that had been captured or purchased. Some of the old ships were renamed, eliminating any reference to royalty. The Rump's preoccupation with political reliability at times seemed to verge on paranoia as the captains on station in Scotland and Ireland were directed to follow the orders of Army commanders ashore.\textsuperscript{76}

As previously noted, Irish disaffection for the Protestant Parliament was manifested by identification with the Royalist cause, even after the regicide. When Rupert left Helvoetsluys in January with his eight ships he established his base at Kinsale on the coast of County Cork. His warships substantially reinforced the twenty odd privateers already operating out of that port. All three of the Generals at Sea, as Deane, Popham, and Blake were then called, were dispatched to confront Rupert's force in April, 1649. However, they could only blockade the port as it was well protected by shore batteries.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{75} Capp, 48-49.
\textsuperscript{76} Ibid., 52-54.
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid., 62-63.
Parliament was determined to avoid the humiliation of a repeat of the events at Helvoetsluyys and sent Cromwell with a force of 8000 foot and 4000 horse to add to the 8000 foot already in Ireland under the command of Michael Jones. Proceeding south from Dublin with his large force, Cromwell presented an imminent threat to Kinsale by land. Rupert prudently took advantage of some bad weather that had blown Blake's blockading squadron off station and escaped with seven ships. He made for Lisbon where he expected to be welcomed by King John IV who was known to be sympathetic to the Royalist cause.

In March of 1650, Blake headed for Lisbon to attack Rupert wherever he was even at the risk of going to war with Portugal. He was driven off, however, by shore batteries and had to settle for interdicting Portuguese shipping. Popham joined Blake with reinforcements and the occasional sortie by Rupert with his Portuguese allies was quickly driven back to the shelter of the shore guns. By September, the need to re-supply had forced Popham and the captured ships to return to England leaving Blake with only seven ships. These he used to intercept the Portuguese Brazil fleet, capturing seven ships. Rupert, probably at the urging of the Portuguese King who had no desire for a full scale war with the English, used the opportunity to escape from Lisbon with six ships. Rupert entered the Mediterranean where he raided Spanish ports and English shipping. In

---
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November, 1650, Blake finally caught up to him and destroyed his fleet. Rupert escaped with one ship but was no longer a significant factor to the Commonwealth.81

As indicated earlier, the survival of the Commonwealth depended to a significant extent on its acceptance in the international community. The Dutch had supported the Royalists during the Civil War; but with the death of Charles' son-in-law, William of Orange, in 1650, Holland recognized the new government in England. However, the Dutch refused a close alliance with England and Parliament retaliated with the Navigation Act in October, 1651. It required that English ships or ships of the country of origin be used for all English imports. The Rump also demanded the right to stop any merchant ship and confiscate any goods of the Irish or Scottish rebels. The First Dutch War followed.

It was completely a naval war. Denmark joined on the side of the Dutch, stopping access to necessary shipbuilding materials from the Baltic. Blake's defeat at the Battle of Dungeness on November 30, 1652 was largely blamed on the refusal of about half of Blake's fleet to fight. The twenty leased armed merchantmen had little stomach for a pitched battle.

The defeat at Dungeness led to a major reorganization of the Navy. The use of leased merchantmen was reduced by the large shipbuilding program already underway. Seamen's pay was increased as a morale factor. The Admiralty Committee of the Council of State was replaced by an Admiralty Commission of six members that reported directly to Parliament. To facilitate better tactical control, operational fleets would go into action divided into squadrons, each under a flag officer. Finally, even more emphasis was to be

81 Capp, 64-65.
given to the political vetting of officers.\textsuperscript{82} This was the fleet, with the addition of George Monck, which went into the critical campaign of 1653.

\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., 78-80.
After the regicide, the new commonwealth struggled to find a way to govern without a king. And military problems were still not over. The rebellion in Ireland had to be dealt with; and the Scots officially recognized Charles II as their new king. Oliver Cromwell, the Lord General, attended to those matters ruthlessly and effectively in what has been called the Third Civil War. Returning home from Scotland in September, 1651, he and the Army expected the Rump to develop a constitution, reform the religious institutions, and dissolve itself. None of these things happened. Cromwell and his Council of Officers repeatedly petitioned Parliament for action, but they were ignored. On April 20, 1653, Cromwell took direct action. Supported by a unit of troops, he forcefully ejected the Members of Parliament. The Long Parliament was finally over.¹

An appointed Parliament of saintly men, sometimes called "The Barebones Parliament" proved to be no better and it dismissed itself on December 12, 1653.² Three days later, the Instrument of Government, written by an Army officer, was accepted by the Council of Officers. Under its terms, Cromwell was appointed for life to the office of Lord Protector with complete executive power. Also, there was to be a standing army of 30,000.³

² Parliament Trust, Commons 7, 363.
These changes seemed to have had little effect on the Navy, involved as it was in the war against the Dutch. A document from the senior officers offered congratulations and declared support for the Lord Protector. Just how wide-spread this sentiment was is hard to assess; subsequent events indicate that it was not universal throughout the Navy. The spring and summer campaign of 1653 had gone well with a victory over the Dutch off Portland on February 18 and another on June 2–5 off the Gabbard shoal east of Harwich. Another defeat in the North Sea off Texel, the southern-most of the West Frisian Islands, on July 31 convinced the Dutch that the war should be ended.

The Treaty of Westminster was signed on April 5, 1654, by the Dutch envoys and the English commissioners. The terms of the treaty ending this all-Navy war are significant. No economic demands were made on the Dutch regarding shipping or the right of search and seizure. Even the Navigation Acts were not mentioned although the Dutch voluntarily respected them. This is not to say that there were no economic benefits for the English. The Baltic was finally reopened to English shipping for the badly needed timber for shipbuilding. Also, London merchants who had interests in Dutch shipping would no longer suffer financially when the English Navy took Dutch prizes.

Another windfall in the treaty for the Protectorate came in the settlement of the Amboyna massacre in the East Indies suffered at the hands of the Dutch in 1623. The total amount in damages and indemnity came to £1,681,816.

---

4 Capp, 128.

5 Ibid., 80-84.


7 Ibid., 242.
However, the only requirement on Dutch ships by the Treaty of Westminster was that they must strike their flag when meeting an English ship. All of the other concessions demanded were related to the preservation of the English Protectorate. One of the requirements was that neither side was to provide assistance of any kind to an enemy of the other. The effect was that Royalist privateers were denied the use of Dutch ports. It also meant that the Dutch could no longer shelter Charles Stuart and his family. Because of the closeness of the Orange and Stuart families, the treaty even had a clause barring any member of the Orange family from being appointed Stadholder in the United Provinces.\(^8\) Internationally, relations with Denmark and Sweden were normalized. Other than the reduction of the threat of a Royalist uprising by the isolation of the royal family from the Dutch, the greatest benefit derived from ending the war was the approval of the populace for finally ending an unpopular war.

With the ending of hostilities, the Navy conservatism observed in the revolt of 1648 returned. As before, it was opposition to governmental control by radical political elements that motivated the Navy as a political entity rather than pro-Royalist sentiment. The Navy had supported Parliament throughout the Civil War under the assumption that the fight was over governmental reform, not an overthrow of the monarchy. At the war's end, the Navy viewed Cromwell's New Model Army and its leadership as a hotbed of radicalism that was largely to blame for the regicide. Even so, the Navy accepted the execution of the King as a \textit{fait-accompli} and was willing to be governed by Parliament.

When the Dutch War started, it was popularly considered to be justified for reasons of state. It was still considered so when Cromwell forcefully ended the Long

\(^8\)Ibid., 256
Parliament, although some officers were not enthusiastic about Cromwell's takeover. Vice-Admiral John Lawson began his surreptitious activities to undermine the Protectorate, and Captain John Best and Captain Owen Cox both resigned. Just how much of the general displeasure with the change was due to the loss of political power by Parliament and how much was a result of the increased political power of the Army is hard to assess. Certainly, the strong resentment of the Army and its radicalism by the Navy was exacerbated by the new governing document, the Instrument of Government, written by the Council of Officers – all Army officers. As a further insult to the Navy, many new ships were named glorifying Cromwell and the land battles of the campaigns in the Civil Wars. The Marston Moor, Langport, Preston, and Richard are only a few examples. But only one ship, the Portland, was named to provide recognition for the naval victory over the Dutch.9

Many Navy officers also resented what they perceived to be the fact that their victory over the Dutch had been sacrificed to advance and make more secure the political positions of power of Cromwell and the Army. Even General George Monck, who had transferred to duty with the Army, described it as "a thing infamous and dishonourable to the nation."10 As has been seen, the perception was justified.

During the early years of the Commonwealth, finances were not a great problem. Funds were available from the requisition and sale of estates of Royalists. But expenditures to finance the Dutch War and the land campaigns in Ireland and Scotland consumed money at a rate that exceeded income. At the beginning of the
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9 Capp. 134.
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Commonwealth, the debt inherited in 1650 was £1,115,000. That year it increased by another £71,000. The annual deficit remained in that general range until 1656 when it advanced by £229,000. In 1660, the annual deficit was £421,000. The Army, which was required by the *Instrument of Government* to be held at a constant 30,000 man level, and the Navy, upon which the security of the regime rested, were an expense which Cromwell's administration simply could not meet. The country was being bled dry with taxes and tithes and could not provide more. The answer to the problem, as Cromwell saw it, lay in the Spanish plate fleet from the new world.

On June 5, 1654, the Council settled on a plan to send a fleet of twenty-four ships to the Mediterranean and another fleet of fourteen ships to the West Indies. The latter came to be known as the Western Design. As the fleets were being assembled their destinations were kept secret, leading to speculation that the intended targets could be either France or Spain – this in spite of the fact that both countries were actively seeking alliances with England and offering monetary aid for English support in their current war against each other. The plan for the Western Design was to attack and occupy the Spanish colony on Hispaniola. That was to serve as a base to intercept the Spanish plate fleet and confiscate the gold from American mines. In that way the expedition was expected at least to pay for itself.

The plan was ill-starred from the beginning. The Levellers opposed the regime of the Lord Protector and agitated both in the Army and the Navy for a return to

---

11 Oppenheim, 369-70.

12 Cromwell, 325.

13 Ibid., 260-61.
Parliamentary control. This made the recruiting task of Major-General Desborough, Cromwell's brother-in-law, even more difficult. His request for 2500 men for the army gave the commanders of other units the opportunity to get rid of their misfits by "volunteering" them for the expedition. The number acquired was still insufficient and Desborough resorted to impressment to fill out his ranks with untrained men.\textsuperscript{14}

The situation was just as bad for the fleet, and the naval commander, Admiral William Penn, also had to resort to impressment to man his ships. There were also difficulties in victaling and equipping the ships because of lack of funds. When the fleet stopped at Spithaven in October, 1654, to complete preparations, Vice-Admiral John Lawson, commander of the channel squadron and a Leveller sympathizer, took advantage of the situation and endorsed a petition of the seamen complaining of conditions aboard ship, impressment, and arrears of pay.\textsuperscript{15}

Leadership problems were inevitable because of the command structure. Three civilian commissioners were appointed to share command with Penn and General Robert Venables who commanded the land forces. Daniel Searle, the Governor of Barbados, was to provide local information and advice. Edward Winslow and Gregory Butler sailed with the fleet because they had been to the area on earlier expeditions. Such a division of command was almost certain to lead to problems. They began with the manner in which the orders were given. Venables was given detailed orders while Penn was told to receive his instruction from Venables. In spite of last-minute cajoling from Cromwell, Penn's


attitude remained bad and the natural antipathy between the seamen and the land forces
was exacerbated by the disaffection of their leaders.¹⁶

When the fleet arrived in the West Indies, more troops were recruited from the
local populations at Barbados and St. Christopher to bring the total force up to about
9000. That exacerbated an already bad food shortage. The supply ships did not sail until
six weeks later. Yet, Penn and Venables decided to press on to Hispaniola with the entire
force. The men were put on two-thirds rations.¹⁷

The attack at Santo Domingo with untrained, underfed, ill-equipped men led by
quibbling and often incompetent officers was exactly what could be expected. The plan
was for Venables to command the main force to be put ashore secretly just west of the
city. Vice-Admiral Goodson was in charge of the ships transporting the troops. Penn
was to command a smaller diversionary force landing east of the city. The plan was put
into action on the morning of April 14, 1655. Somehow, all of the guides wound up with
Penn. Believing the water too shallow, Goodson refused to put in where Venables
thought he should land, and the prevailing easterly winds carried the troops far beyond
where they should have been. They finally went ashore some thirty miles west of Santo
Domingo and did not arrive at the outskirts of the city until April 17. Venables did not
attack the city until a week later during which time the force suffered attrition due to lack
of food and sporadic guerilla action. When the attack was finally mounted it was
piecemeal and easily repulsed.¹⁸

¹⁶Ibid., vol. IV, 125-27.
¹⁷Taylor, 19.
Both landing forces encamped to discuss what to do next. Penn favored renewing the attack, but Venables refused. The latter was probably right. By that time there were only about 2000 men able to fight. On May 4, 1655, the troops returned to their ships. About a thousand men had been lost due to sickness and enemy action while inflicting 40 casualties on the Spanish.\textsuperscript{19}

A council of war decided to try something easier and the fleet moved on to Jamaica, landing on May 10, 1655. Things went better there and eventually the entire island was subdued and colonized. Penn, however, did not stay to the finish. Leaving Goodson in command of 12 frigates, he sailed for England on June 25, arriving on August 21, 1655. Venables also deserted his command, arriving in England on September 9.\textsuperscript{20} Both men were sent to the Tower for leaving their commands but were later released.\textsuperscript{21}

Without doubt, the Western Design campaign was one of the poorest performances of the English Navy during the Interregnum. Cromwell himself was to blame for the command structure that pitted two rivals against each other. And they, in turn, let their personal feelings interfere with their judgement in both the planning and execution of military operations. The final assessment is that the campaign not only did not provide the anticipated economic strengthening of the Protectorate, but was an embarrassment and left the country in yet another war with Spain.

\textsuperscript{19} Taylor, 31-36

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 73-77.

\textsuperscript{21} Cromwell, 824.
On September 3, 1658, Oliver Cromwell died. The *Humble Petition and Advice*, the revised *Instrument of Government*, empowered the Lord Protector to name his successor who was assumed to be Oliver's son, Richard. However, Richard was not of the Army; and the Army was the basis upon which the Protectorate was founded and from which Parliament derived its authority. Since the Lord Protector was also the Commander in Chief of the standing army, the fear among the professional Army officers, the Grandees, was that their political influence was slipping away into the hands of a civilian and a civilian-controlled Parliament. They would have much preferred to see Lt. Gen. Charles Fleetwood named as Lord Protector.

In this atmosphere of uncertainty, various factions became active. The Republicans opposed rule by one person, either King or Cromwellian, and above all resented the domination of the Army in the government. They wished a return to the republic in which Parliament provided both the legislative body and, in the form of its Council of State, the executive. And there were just enough Republicans in Parliament to delay the official recognition of Richard as Lord Protector. From January 31 until February 16, 1659, the vote on the issue was daily postponed until it was finally decided that the bill should be modified to restrict Richard's powers. In this manner the issue was avoided.

The Cromwellians also resented the political power of the Army, but had no desire to return to the republic in which the Council of State exercised the executive function. They preferred the civilian Richard as executive and could be considered latent


23 Parliament Trust, *Commons* 7, 596-605.
Royalists. The Royalists also became active. Oddly, their best hope of recruiting support was among the Cromwellians. The protectorate had come very close to being a monarchy, and Royalists hoped that the Cromellians could be persuaded that replacing Oliver with Charles was a relatively small step. Certainly it would be preferable to the Republican alternative. The people of London, many of them also fifth monarchists, were predominantly Republican and petitioned Parliament for a return to the republic.24

Matters came to a head over the issue of who would control the military. Edward Mountagu had been a long-time friend of Oliver Cromwell and had risen quickly in the Navy. He was not only a General at Sea but the Treasury Commissioner and a member of the Council. Richard's right to appoint Mountagu to the command of a fleet being sent to the Sound26 was at the center of a three-way dispute. Parliament, Richard, and the Council of Officers all claimed control of the military. In the event, the Grandees supported Richard, and Mountagu obtained command of the fleet and sailed for the Baltic in March.27 In all likelihood, the Council of Officers finally agreed to the appointment simply to get the confirmed Cromellian out of London.

The issue of military control, however, had not been settled. Commons took the initiative and, on April 18, 1659, passed a bill stating that when Parliament was in session, consent of the Lord Protector and of both houses of Parliament would be

---

24 The fifth monarchists believed the millennium was near. They opposed tithes and taxes. Politically, they supported the short-lived Barebones Parliament and opposed both Cromellians and Royalists.
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27 Capp, 332.
required before the Council of Officers could meet. Another bill had the astounding requirement that all commanders in the Army and the Navy must pledge never to interrupt a meeting of Parliament.\textsuperscript{28} This tacit acknowledgement of Richard's authority apparently persuaded him to side with Parliament. The Army officers probably were not going to acknowledge him as Commander-in-Chief anyway. To exercise the authority granted to him by Parliament, he ordered the Council of Officers to disband. When Fleetwood refused, Richard tried, but failed, to have him arrested. Nevertheless, Fleetwood still tried to pacify Richard. Fleetwood assured Richard that if he would dissolve Parliament, the Army would back him as Protector. On April 23, 1659, Richard dissolved Parliament and the Council of Officers took over the government. The Army \textit{coup} was complete.\textsuperscript{29}

Two weeks later, the Council recalled the Rump which reconvened of May 7.\textsuperscript{30} Fleetwood's promise to Richard turned out to be a promise unkept. The Council of Officers continued to exercise executive authority and Richard was ignored. The Rump, having been restored by the Army, had no interest in championing Richard's cause, and Richard resigned on May 25, 1659.\textsuperscript{31}

The response of the Navy was largely a function of its leaders and they were split. The Cromwellian Mountagu, with a fleet, was safely in the Baltic for the moment. But he
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was well liked by his officers and men, and they would probably follow his lead. With Richard Cromwell out of the picture, however, he was an unknown quantity. Mountagu's response when he heard the news of the restored Rump was hard to interpret. He indicated that his fleet was dedicated to serve the state and would remain on station to keep an eye on the Dutch. This could very well have meant that if Charles were to be restored, he would support him also. With a large fleet at Mountagu's disposal, the Rump had to be conciliatory and not risk a confrontation. Nevertheless, on April 31, Parliament passed an act naming the Admiralty Commissioners, and Mountagu was conspicuously absent from the list.

The suspicions that the Rump held for Mountagu were well founded. Exactly how much of the breach between Mountagu and the Rump may have been brought on by the Rump itself is hard to say. An Indemnity Act of July 12, 1659 requiring all officers to swear allegiance to the new government raised a question in Mountagu's own mind of exactly how far he could trust his own officers. In the event, he was involved in various plots and communications with Charles. He gave his good wishes to the King, but at the time could do little else. Until significant Royalist uprisings occurred, he could not risk his already precarious position with the Rump.

A Royalist uprising did occur in Cheshire in August of 1659, but it was quickly crushed and its leaders sent to the Tower. However, Mountagu must have heard of it

---


33 Parliament Trust, Commons, 7, 669-70.

34 Capp, 336-39.

35 Keeble, 11.
and departed the Sound for London. He claimed that he had to return due to a lack of victuals. He later claimed that he simply did not want his fleet to be used by the Rump in action against Sweden, but there can be little doubt that had the Cheshire uprising succeeded he would have supported it. With no hard evidence against him, the Rump allowed him to retire.\textsuperscript{36}

When the Rump was restored, the Army grandees petitioned the Rump to enact religious toleration reforms, abolish tithes, and hold an election for a new Parliament. By September, not only had the Rump done nothing to implement these reforms, it canceled the commissions of several officers who had supported the petition. In addition, Fleetwood was replaced as commander-in-chief by a committee of officers and commissioners. The Army response was not long in coming. Led by Major General John Lambert, the Rump was forcibly dismissed on October 13, 1659. A military \textit{junta}, the Committee of Safety, was set up to run the government on a temporary basis. This \textit{coup} was a mistake, for it split the Army. George Monck, commander of the army in Scotland and former General-at-Sea, expressed support for the Rump.\textsuperscript{37} In response, Lambert was sent with a force to intercept Monck if he decided to intervene personally. Also the \textit{Yarmouth} and the \textit{Fox}, forth rates,\textsuperscript{38} were sent north to aid Lambert in any way they could and to prevent Monck from contacting the Army forces in Ireland.

Another naval personality who was to play a major role in the restoration was Vice-Admiral John Lawson. He was a known Republican whom the Rump had trusted

\textsuperscript{36} Capp, 341.

\textsuperscript{37} Davies, 162.

\textsuperscript{38} Oppenheim, 334.
implicitly. While Mountagu was still in the Sound, Lawson had been sent with a fleet of sixteen ships to the Flemish coast to guard against French or Spanish intervention on behalf of Charles. From there he could also provide a force to counter Mountagu's in case the latter took aggressive action on behalf of either Richard or Charles.39

Lawson's Republican preference for the Rump was well known and he was therefore not trusted by the junta. At the time, he had only one ship with him in the Downs so he was no immediate threat. As for the majority of naval officers in London, their dislike of the Army was exacerbated by the coup. But, like Mountagu had been, they were unwilling to risk their own well-being by taking independent action against the junta. Some of them took part in planning meetings with the junta and civilian leaders in London. The meetings held throughout November were directed at producing a new constitution. Lawson refused to attend.40

During that same time, meetings of ousted Council of State members and members of Monck's staff were being held with civilian authorities in Portsmouth. On December 3, 1659, Governor Nathaniel Whether openly defied the junta by inviting Parliament to reassemble in Portsmouth. A force sent to quell the uprising deserted and joined it instead. The Grandees feared that Lawson would join the uprising and increased their efforts to gain his support, assuring him that a freely elected Parliament would soon be convened. They also sent out ten ships under loyal officers ostensibly to prevent Royalist intervention but actually to oppose Lawson in the event that he decided to move with his fleet, now numbering twenty-two ships, from the Downs. Their fears were well

40 Capp, 344-45.
grounded. With the knowledge of a reliable base for his ships at Portsmouth, Lawson not only rejected their arguments but, on December 13, sent a letter to officials in London demanding the return of the Rump and describing what he expected it to do. It included the usual demands of freedom of worship, end of impressment, indemnity, and so on.\textsuperscript{41}

The next day, Lawson took his fleet to London. Meetings with representatives of the junta proved futile. Lawson was convinced that a Parliament elected under the auspices of the Grandees would simply again reflect the political domination of the Army. Apparently it did not occur to him that a Rump reinstated by naval force could be subject to a similar criticism. Emboldened by news that a land force was then advancing from Portsmouth to support him, he demanded that the London authorities renounce both an elected Parliament and Charles Stuart. They refused both demands, and Lawson responded with a blockade that stopped all shipping in and out of London.

Data on the average cargo tonnage and value for the port of London during the Interregnum are not available. However, with the disappearance of woodlands, firewood and charcoal had largely been replaced by coal. Between 1603 and 1642 the amount of coal shipped from Newcastle tripled. By that time there were about 300 colliers, each of about 250 tons, supplying London with coal.\textsuperscript{42} Just by cutting off that coal supply the effect of the blockade on London must have been devastating. In addition, the wealthiest London merchants owned, or partially owned, their own ships.\textsuperscript{43} Undoubtedly, their political influence was a major factor in persuading the authorities to reverse their
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decision. They recalled the Rump on December 27. For the moment, it was a total victory for the Republican cause.44

On January 1, 1660, Monck put his army in Scotland on the march south. His exact motives were unknown. In a letter to Fleetwood, Monck had condemned the action of dissolving the Rump. Later he had expressed his desire for a free Parliament with its former authority.45 This latter could well imply bringing back the full Long Parliament by reinstating the secluded members. That could also include Charles Stuart. So exactly what his intentions were was a mystery.

On January 2, 1660, the Rump passed a resolution thanking Lawson and another disavowing the right of Charles Stuart or any member of the Stuart family to have any part of the government. They also elected Lawson and Monck to positions on the Council of State.46 The views of the Rump, however, were not shared by the London authorities or populace. A number of known Royalists were on the city council and various petitions calling for a free Parliament and the admission of the members who had been excluded were circulated and submitted. The trained bands were active and it was likely that they would support the regular troops in the city if they offered resistance to Monck when he arrived.

Monck arrived at London on February 3, 1660. He quickly crushed any resistance from the mutinous troops and dismissed the city Council. The pleasure of the Rump did not last long as on February 11 Monck informed Parliament that all of its vacancies were

44 Capp, 349-50.
45 Davies, 164, 266.
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to be filled within a week and they were to dissolve themselves by May 6 after arranging for a full new election. Parliament did not move quite quickly enough and on February 21 Monck decreed that the members who had been excluded in 1648 were to return to their seats. Enough did so that the moderates outnumbered the Republicans.\(^{47}\)

Lawson undoubtedly felt betrayed by Monck. But the feelings of his men for him must have stood him in good stead. He may have still hoped that an elected Parliament would not necessarily mean a return to the monarchy; but if it did, there was no point in ruining his naval career. Monck bore him no animosity and may even have felt some guilt at misleading his old friend. Although the new Parliament certainly could have had little confidence in Lawson's assurances of support it nevertheless appointed him as vice-admiral, but removed him from the Council. The appointment may well have reflected Monck's influence. On March 4, 1660, Monck was named General at Sea as was Mountagu who was persuaded to come out of retirement and take command of the Summer Guard.\(^{48}\)

On March 16, 1660, the Long Parliament dissolved itself for the last time and on April 25 the new Parliament met.\(^{49}\) With that, it seemed that everyone knew and accepted the fact that the monarchy would follow shortly. Both Monck and Mountagu had been in communication with Charles for some time. So it was appropriate that Monck be the commander to take a fleet to the United Provinces to fetch the King. Some of the ships had already been renamed; the \textit{Nasby} was now the \textit{Royal Charles} and the \textit{Richard} was the \textit{James}.\(^{50}\)

\(^{47}\) Keeble, 21-23.

\(^{48}\) Parliament Trust, Commons, 7, 858-60.
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CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The political inclination of the Navy, or a significant part of it, was inconsistent throughout the period. There were a number of factors in play and they were influenced by the circumstances at the time. Moral conviction on the part of both crews and officers certainly was a part of the incident in 1625 when they were reluctant to turn over their ships to the French at Dieppe. On the other hand, the crew of Pennington’s ship did not refuse to fire on other British vessels. This could only be attributed to the conditioning of the men to obey their commander.

Nevertheless, that incident and the following humiliation of aiding the hated Spanish Papists must have had an undermining effect on the men’s affection for their King. Certainly, the slowness of pay and deterioration of living conditions aboard the ships also lessened the impact of feelings of loyalty to Charles when, in 1642, they actually had a choice of supporting the King or Parliament.

During that same critical time before hostilities began, administration was also a major factor. So long as the Principal Officers, who accomplished the outfitting of ships, received their orders from Parliament, Charles had no way to control directly that all-important function. When Charles directed the Principal Officers to take their orders only from him, Parliament foiled the attempt by the simple expedient of replacing all of them with Parliamentarians.

Without doubt, the political inclination of the leaders was the most important part in determining whether the Navy would serve the King or Parliament. The Vice-Admiral,
the Earl of Warwick, acting in the place of the Lord Admiral, was a Parliamentarian. The failure of Charles’ many efforts to wrest that position from Warwick was key to retaining control of the Navy by Parliament. The fact that Warwick was well-liked by the men virtually assured that they would follow his orders against a king for whom the men had a long-standing disaffection.

Warwick's personal political convictions had a major impact on naval operations on at least two other occasions. In August of 1648, he had a rebel Royalist fleet caught in the Thames between two of his own squadrons and again in November of that same year he had that same rebel fleet at his mercy at Helvoetsluys; on both occasions he failed to engage. There are two possible explanations for that failure and they both are political. He may have feared that his own crews would desert and join the rebels; or, as a political moderate, he was reluctant to fire on English ships with English crews because he sympathized with their cause and still had hopes for a settlement that would return Charles to the throne.

The political convictions of the men, however, are not to be discounted. The earliest evidence of this was the mutiny of the crews of the Swallow and Bonaventure in 1642 when the officers ordered the crews to make for Holland to offer their services to Charles. The next independent action by the men occurred in 1648 in conjunction with the Second Civil War. The naval revolt against Parliament at that time was almost completely led by the sailors rather than their officers. Their grievances were mostly political in nature. They resented the virtual takeover of the government by the radical elements of the Army. They even rejected the arguments of Warwick, one of their favorite leaders, when he was sent by Parliament to dissuade them.
The men of the fleet that rebelled against Parliament also led in the counter-revolt that returned many ships to Parliamentary control in November of 1648. This occurred when they became disillusioned with the leadership provided by their Royalist officers. One of them, Vice-Admiral William Batten, was particularly involved in that disillusionment. After serving faithfully and well for Parliament during the first Civil War, he became resentful when an Army officer was selected to replace Warwick as Lord High Admiral when the latter had to resign as a result of the Self-Denying ordinance. This personal pique led Batten to change sides in 1648, and he took an active, although secret, part in the revolt of the Navy. When he openly joined the revoluted fleet in Holland he was welcomed enthusiastically by the men. But he failed to meet their expectations by using the fleet to intercept shipping and to line his own pockets by accepting bribes from the captured captains of the ships. Thus the men were deprived of their rightfully-earned prize money. Even worse, his fleet was functioning merely as privateers rather than serving the cause of restoring the King. Clearly, the self-serving behavior of this officer was detrimental to the political cause for which the men had revolted against Parliament.

After the regicide in January of 1649, Parliament reorganized the Navy entirely to assure both administrative and operational control of all aspects of naval functions. It also embarked on a massive shipbuilding program. All of this was for the purpose of preserving the political life of the new regime. Naval operations were devoted almost exclusively to hunting down Royalist privateers which were being commissioned in the name of Charles' successor, Charles II. Even the first Dutch War, which was started in May of 1652 ostensibly for economic purposes, was finally settled by Oliver Cromwell with terms that were related exclusively to the political preservation of his Protectorate.
Another use of the Navy for a domestic political purpose was the ill-fated Western Design in 1654-1655. It was supposed to help relieve Cromwell's severe financial problems by preying on the Spanish plate fleet in the Americas. Although it did result in the colonization of Jamaica, it failed to acquire the needed financial resources. It failed because of a poor command structure and also because it was itself under-funded.

In the politically chaotic two years following the death of Oliver Cromwell in 1658, the Navy played a key role in the restoration of the monarchy to the Stuarts. When the only government was a military junta run by the Army grandees in London, Vice-Admiral John Lawson moved his fleet from the Downs to the Thames and blockaded London. Lawson, an avid Republican, forced the dissolution of the junta and the recall the Rump.

The final decision to restore Charles II came from George Monck, one-time General-at-Sea, and commander of the Army in Scotland. When he brought his army to London in February of 1660, he had the power to enforce his decision and he used it to end the Interregnum.

As has been shown, the impact of the Navy on the domestic political scene of England during the Interregnum was extensive. The lasting significance of that impact lies in two general areas: political results and changes to the Navy itself.

The political results are easy to discern but impossible to assess. These were the result of judgements and actions of individuals in leadership positions. It is only speculation to wonder what would have happened if Warwick had not secured the Navy for Parliament in 1642; or if Batten had been true first to Parliament or then to Charles in 1648 and thereby not lost the confidence of his men. All of the events recounted in this
thesis had imponderable effects on the course of events and their eventual outcome. One can only note their occurrence and give credit or lay blame as appropriate; but noting their occurrence and considering their impact is an essential activity for historians.

The changes in the Navy are also fairly easy to discern but much harder to assess. The men of the Navy discovered their own ability to recognize incompetence and duplicity in their officers. They also discovered that as individuals they could hold political views. Most importantly, they had the right to act on these newly-found perceptions. These results were the product of the opportunity presented by events and the egalitarian atmosphere that was a major factor in bringing about the revolution and sustaining the Interregnum.

By good fortune, while Charles II was being restored Samuel Peyps was just emerging on the scene of naval administration. Peyps, working in the environment of the modified relationship between King and Parliament, acted on the new concepts relating to the officers, crews, and administration to make widespread changes to the Navy. For this, he is often called the father of the English Navy.
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Provided here is a description of each of the ships mentioned in the thesis. In some instances the data on tonnage, guns and men are not available. When those data are available, note that numbers of crewmen and, less often, numbers of guns vary depending upon factors such as mission and availability. The ships rated as "prize" had been captured and refitted for service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHIP</th>
<th>RATE</th>
<th>TONS</th>
<th>GUNS</th>
<th>MEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adventure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>512</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonaventure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant Reformation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant Warwick</td>
<td>merchantman</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convertine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crescent</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dolphin</td>
<td>merchantman</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dragon</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship</td>
<td>prize</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fox</td>
<td>prize</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greyhound</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hector</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hind</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jocelyn</td>
<td>merchantman</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leopard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>602</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Royalist merchantman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Rose</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayflower</td>
<td>merchantman</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasby/Royal Charles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicodemus</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonesuch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelican</td>
<td>merchantman</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providence</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainbow</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reformation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHIP</td>
<td>RATE</td>
<td>TONS</td>
<td>GUNS</td>
<td>MEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard/James</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1108</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roebuck</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>prize</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td></td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>792</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swallow</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiger</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unicorn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yarmouth</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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