Studies in Social History

The Army of Charles II

John Childs

STUDIES IN SOCIAL HISTORY

THE ARMY OF CHARLES II

THE ARMY OF CHARLES II

JOHN CHILDS

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published in 1976

This edition published in 2007 by
Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, OX14 4RN

Routledge is an imprint of Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

Transferred to Digital Printing 2010

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A CIP catalogue record for this book
is available from the British Library

The Army of Charles II
ISBN10: 0-415-41276-5 (volume)
ISBN10: 0-415-40266-2 (set)

ISBN13: 978-0-415-41276-6 (volume)
ISBN13: 978-0-415-40266-8 (set)
ISBN13: 978-1-134-52859-2 (ebk)

Routledge Library Editions: Studies in Social History

THE ARMY OF CHARLES II

John Childs

Department of History
University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne

LONDON: Routledge & Kegan Paul
TORONTO AND BUFFALO: University of Toronto Press

First published in 1976
in Great Britain
by Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd
and in Canada and the United States of America by
University of Toronto Press
Toronto and Buffalo
Set in Monotype Bell
and printed in Great Britain by
Ebenezer Baylis & Son Ltd
The Trinity Press, Worcester and London

RKP ISBN 0 7100 8301 7

UTP ISBN 0 8020 2180 8

To Ann and my parents

Contents

CONTENTS

PART THREE

Preface

THE need for a study of the British Army 'post Firth' has long been apparent, and hopefully this volume will fill the vacuum. Initially the topic was suggested to me by Professor J. P. Kenyon of the University of Hull, and throughout he has been a constant source of encouragement and advice. Originally, this book formed the essence of a doctoral thesis for the University of London, and whilst in that condition it was presided over by Dr Ian Roy of King's College. My debt to him is immense, particularly with regard to my style and presentation. These he made more coherent and manageable.

The transition from thesis to book was undertaken during the tenure of a Sir James Knott Research Fellowship in the University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. The relaxed atmosphere of the university helped greatly in bringing the work to a speedy conclusion.

I am grateful to Mr E. C. L. Mullins of the History of Parliament Trust for permitting me to make use of the Trust's abundance of unpublished biographical information. I doubt if Chapter 2 would have proved feasible without access to this source.

JOHN CHILDS
University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne

Abbreviations

BM	British Museum, now the British Library
PRO	Public Record Office, London
Add. MSS	Additional Manuscripts, BM
CO	Colonial Office Papers, PRO
CO 279	Colonial Office Papers relating to Tangier, PRO
PC 2	Registers and Minutes of the Privy Council, PRO
SP 29 and 30	State Papers Domestic, Charles II, PRO
SP 44	Domestic Entry Books, PRO
SP 71	State Papers Foreign, Barbary States, PRO
SP 77	State Papers Foreign, Flanders, PRO
SP 78	State Papers Foreign, France, PRO
SP 84	State Papers Foreign, the Dutch Republic, PRO
SP 89	State Papers Foreign, Portugal, PRO
WO	War Office Collection, PRO
CSPD	*Calendar of State Papers Domestic*
CSPV	*Calendar of State Papers Venetian*
CSPC	*Calendar of State Papers Colonial, America and the West Indies*
CJ	*Commons' Journals*
LJ	*Lords' Journals*
HMC	*Reports of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts*
SR	*Statutes of the Realm*
APC	Acts of the Privy Council, Colonial Series, vol. 1, 1613–80

JSAHR	*Journal of the Society of Army Historical Research*
EHR	*English Historical Review*
TRHS	*Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*
DNB	*Dictionary of National Biography*
Regt	Regiment

Note on dates

All dates referred to in the text and appendices are given in the English Old Style (O.S.) which was ten days behind the continental New Style (N.S.) in the seventeenth century. As in modern usage, the new year has been taken to begin on 1 January and not 25 March.

Introduction

THE first standing army in England during time of peace was that of Charles II. Since the earliest times kings of England had raised temporary armies in time of war, but the concept of a force which was not disbanded on the conclusion of hostilities was a radical departure. Cromwell's New Model was a standing army but it differed in some important respects from the Restoration army. It was a political force with an interest in and an effect upon politics acting both as a 'king maker' and an instrument of coercion. For many Englishmen the Interregnum was not a period of peace but a continuation of the Civil Wars and the new government had to rely upon the army for its very existence. Richard Cromwell fell from power because he lost the favour of this all-powerful machine. Sixteen sixty-one witnessed the formation of a new type of standing army: a non-political body concerned solely with the execution of the civil authority's wishes regarding national defence and the preservation of internal law and order. Not only was the army neutral in politics but not once did it attempt even to enter the theatre. Such qualifications were sufficient for this force to be regarded as the foundation of the modern regular army rather than the New Model.

Three strands were woven into the fabric of the new army of 1661: the exiled royalist army fighting with the Spaniards in Flanders, disbanded officers and men from the New Model, and old royalists who had endured the Interregnum in England. Following the flight of their monarch in 1649 a number of ardent royalists sought employment in the French army. This

came to an end in 1655 when Cromwell signed an alliance with Louis XIV forcing Charles II to vacate France and seek refuge in the Spanish Netherlands. Here, on 2 April 1656, he made an agreement with Spain whereby he undertook to raise some troops of his own to fight against France in return for a promise of armed support should an opportunity arise of regaining his throne. Initially three regiments were recruited; one of English Guards under Henry Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, a Scottish formation under the Earl of Middleton, and an Irish unit commanded by the Duke of Ormonde. A further three regiments were added in the first half of 1657; a Scottish regiment under the Earl of Newburgh, and two Irish regiments under the Earl of Bristol and the Duke of Gloucester. Nearly all the officers and men were exiled royalists who were destitute and desperately in need of paid employment having been either forced to leave England by the Cromwellian government, or loyal volunteers. Lists of these regiments read like a roll-call of the principal royalist soldiers of the Civil Wars; Edward Sackville, Charles Wheeler, Thomas Ashton, William Carless, and Thomas Throckmorton. Reluctantly, the Duke of York assumed command of this corps and formed a small Life Guard of fifty horse under his life-long supporter, Sir Charles Berkeley, to bring the army up to a strength of seven regiments by April 1657.[1] The brigade first took the field under the Spanish flag in June of that year.[2]

The existence of this force was common knowledge in England where Cromwell was preparing to step into continental land warfare. In return for the possession of Dunkirk and Mardyke the Lord Protector agreed to send an expeditionary force of 6,000 men to fight for France under the command of Turenne who was instructed to campaign during 1657 and 1658 with the specific objective of taking these twin towns. Only a quarter of this brigade was drawn from the regiments of the New Model, the remainder being fresh volunteers. Sir John Reynolds, commissary-general of the Irish army, was given command with Major-General Thomas Morgan as his deputy. The four other regiments were directed by Samuel Clarke, Roger Alsop, Henry Lillingston, and Bryce Cochrane. Interestingly, the French requested that all the soldiers were to be English without any Irishmen or Scotsmen. After landing at

Boulogne in May 1657 the six regiments took the field with Turenne in June.

Not until September did the French commander-in-chief turn his attention to the promised goal of Dunkirk and Mardyke, but when he did the latter fell rapidly and was handed over to the English. Reynolds's troops took up winter quarters in and around Mardyke but suffered dreadfully from the unhealthy conditions. Already action casualties had cost them 2,000 men, but even after these had been replaced the brigade emerged from the winter with only 3,000, half their official establishment. Reynolds himself was dead having been drowned whilst sailing to England in December 1657. He was succeeded by Sir William Lockhart.

With the valued English reinforced, Turenne invested Dunkirk in May 1658. Almost immediately the Spanish marched to relieve the town, forcing the French to meet them in open combat at the Battle of the Dunes on 4 June. All Lockhart's regiments were present as a separate corps, whilst all Charles II's units were with the Spanish army although so weak in numbers that they could only form three battalions. The battle was decided by the Cromwellian regiments decisively defeating the royalists, driving them off the field. After the action Charles could muster only 800 men.

In the wake of the victory half of Lockhart's troops remained to garrison the twin towns whilst the rest fought in the French field army. Then, in April 1659, a truce was arranged between France and Spain which allowed all Lockhart's command to retire into the two fortresses, a sensible precaution as both France and Spain had their eyes fixed in that direction. At no time after the battle did the brigade have more than 3,000 men, as Dunkirk was extremely unhealthy, and the ranks were thinned still further when three regiments were recalled into England in the wake of the panic caused by Sir George Booth's uprising in 1659. During the ensuing political strife in England Lockhart and his men were able to achieve nothing and so they acquiesced in the Restoration as the only possible solution to England's instability.

From the time of the Dunes to the truce Charles was unable to effect much with his tiny, demoralised army; he could not afford to pay them, food was in short supply, and the troops

lacked nearly all basic necessities.[3] Cromwell's death revived hopes of an armed restoration and this so assisted recruiting that Charles again possessed 2,500 soldiers by July 1659. Booth's uprising provided another boost to morale and resources, but following this failure Charles had no more use for his army and it survived as best it could in Flanders. After the Restoration it was drawn little by little into Dunkirk and gradually dissolved.

Part One

I

The New Royalist Army

WHEN Charles II landed at Dover in May 1660, two professional armies existed, both owing him allegiance: the New Model in England and the army of exiled royalists in Flanders and Dunkirk. Neither force was very healthy, being in arrears of pay, and although the New Model was still technically formidable it was broken in spirit and thoroughly demoralised. John Lambert had led this force north in an effort to halt Monck's victorious Scottish regiments but it had disintegrated through desertion before even coming into contact with them. At the Restoration it was Monck's troops quartered in and around London which represented the remains of the New Model, with the additional support of Lockhart's brigade in Dunkirk. If there was to be a military danger to Charles's return it was likely to come from across the Channel.

Whatever its condition the mere existence of the Cromwellian army was a grave threat to the sovereign, standing as it did for an alien theory of government and society. Moreover it was politically experienced in achieving its constitutional aims having served as the keystone of English politics since the end of the Civil Wars. At the Restoration the army stood aside and did not oppose but it could never be said that the military actively supported the return of Charles Stuart. As the new monarch reviewed 'his' troops on Blackheath his reception was at best unenthusiastic, for these were men who had built and run the country without a king and were quite capable of repeating their actions. That they did not was largely due to the power and influence of General George Monck. In his sane and

practical manner he had removed all the odiously republican officers and men before Charles set foot in England, and one of the king's first duties was to appoint loyal colonels to all the Cromwellian regiments.[1] One of the most curious factors of the Restoration was this seeming about-face by the army, 'which if it had captured Charles II in 1659, would assuredly have demanded that he should share his father's fate', yet meekly accepted his restoration twelve months later. Monck was one of the few men, along with Cromwell and Fairfax, able to impose his will upon his soldiers. As a military administrator and disciplinarian he has had few equals, and these abilities absolutely swayed the New Model.[2] He earnestly believed that the military should be subordinate to the civil power,[3] and with his immense prestige and bearing he was able to carry the army with him. If the army did not actually approve of the Restoration, Monck was able to ensure that it did not actively oppose it. Charles's debt to him was huge.

Quiet and passive though they were, the rank and file could not be relied upon, and it was certain that the ultra-royalist Convention Parliament would never consent to a continuation of the New Model army. Before Charles came over to England he was undecided as to what policy to adopt towards the Cromwellian armed forces and he toyed with the idea of taking the entire army into the royal service. The Declaration of Breda offered to adopt the army and, 'to consent . . . [to] the full satisfaction of all arrears due to the officers and soldiers of the army under the command of General Monck, and that they shall be received into our service, upon as good pay and conditions as they now enjoy'.[4] However, once in England Charles opted for the disbandment of the army. One of the most pressing causes of this alteration in policy was the appearance of the spectre which was to haunt him all his life—shortage of money. The Cromwellian legacy of a war with Spain swallowed Charles's meagre funds at the rate of £6,000 a day, the upkeep of the New Model amounted to £55,000 a month, whilst Dunkirk drained the Treasury of £73,868 between December 1660 and July 1661.[5] A substantial reduction in the armed forces was urgently required and over this king and Parliament found themselves in complete accord. With his revenue unsettled, Parliament against any form of standing army, and the New Model

posing a potential threat to both himself and his nation, Charles had to disband the army.

Sir William Doyley reported a systematic programme for the disbandment of the New Model to the House of Commons from the Committee for the Army on 30 August 1660.[6] Under this scheme all the officers and soldiers who were in pay on 25 April 1660 and had not deserted since that date would receive their full arrears and be paid off with a bonus of an extra week's pay from the king's own purse. This was accepted by Parliament and shortly afterwards two acts were passed which sealed the fate of the old army. 'An Act for the Speedy Provision of Money for Disbanding and Paying Off the Forces of this Kingdom both by Land and Sea',[7] continued the hated monthly assessments for a further two months at the rate of £70,000, whilst a Poll Bill was raised to yield £210,000. With these sums it was hoped to be able to pay off the arrears of the army and keep it in full pay up until the time of its disbandment. A second act, 'for the Speedy disbanding of the Army and Garrisons of this Kingdom',[8] arranged for the army to be broken up three regiments at a time the order of which was to be chosen by lots drawn by the Privy Council. Exceptions were made of the regiments of the Dukes of York and Gloucester and those commanded by Monck, now Duke of Albemarle,[9] all of which were to be disbanded at the very end of the proceedings. Likewise, companies guarding the arsenal at Hull and the Scottish border at Carlisle and Berwick were also retained in pay until the completion of the disbandment. These relevant acts received the Royal Assent on 13 September 1660.

The disbandment commenced immediately with Albemarle in overall charge. This fate was accepted quietly and calmly by the army, a mentality no doubt assisted by the inclusion of a clause in the Act for the Speedy Disbanding which withheld the arrears from any man who attempted to jeopardise the operation. The full payment of arrears amounted to a considerable sum of money and this must have served as a weighty bribe to ensure the good behaviour of the troops and the smooth running of the disbandment. Parliament's wisest precaution was in relaxing the laws relating to apprenticeship permitting disbanded officers and men to practise a trade in their own towns or counties without having to undergo the rigours of an appren-

ticeship.[10] This must have greatly eased the return of 40,000 men into civilian life. The king and his wealthier subjects did their best to employ disbanded soldiers on building houses and gardens, the canal in St James's Park being constructed by ex-soldiers.

It cost the country £835,819 8*s* 10*d* to disband the army. The Poll Bill and the monthly assessments raised £560,000, but the king had to find the balance from his own resources.[11] The disbandment went more slowly than had been hoped, as the money from the Poll Bill did not materialise very quickly and even the monthly assessments had to be hurried along by a proclamation from the king.[12] On 6 November fifteen regiments of foot, four of horse, and twenty-two garrison companies had been dissolved, leaving three of foot, nine of horse, and eleven garrison units. By Christmas 1660 the New Model army had ceased to exist except for Albemarle's foot, the 'Coldstream Regiment', and his own regiment of horse. Ludlow was deeply incensed at the death of this magnificent fighting machine:

> The Army which had so long stood in the way of the Court, was now wholly disbanded, except only Monck's Regiment of Foot; and that was balanced by a Regiment of Horse under colour of being a guard to the King. This together with the payment of their arrears and a liberty of trading in corporations was the reward they received for their services, notwithstanding all the fair promises of Monck and the King. And thus these men who had accumulated treachery upon treachery, were dismissed with infamy.[13]

Burnet was of a more reasoned opinion:

> The Army was to be disbanded, but in such a manner, with so much respect, and so exact an account of arrears, and such gratuities, that it looked rather to be a dismissing them to the next opportunity, and a reserving them till there should be occasion for their service, than a breaking them. They were certainly the bravest, the best disciplined, and the soberest army that had been known in these latter ages: every soldier was able to do the functions of an officer.[14]

Whatever the political rights and wrongs of the disbandment the actual process was a great success with little record of disturbance by the soldiery. Pepys, writing in 1663, leaves the impression that the old soldiers settled down into civilian life with ease:

Of all the old Army now you cannot see a man begging about the street; but what? You shall have this captain turned a shoemaker; the lieutenant a baker; this a brewer; that a haberdasher; this common soldier a porter; and every man in his apron and frock etc, as if they had never done anything else . . . the spirits of the old Parliament soldiers are so quiet and contented with God's Providences, that the King is safer from any evil meant him by them one thousand times more than from his own discontented Cavaliers.[15]

For the majority of the New Model this return into trade and commerce was natural as it had been from these employments that they had originally been recruited.

Whilst only the two regiments of Monck and a few garrison companies remained in England at the end of 1660, the entire Dunkirk brigade was unaffected by the general disbandment. Charles appointed Sir Edward Harley to the governorship on 14 July 1660 in place of Sir William Lockhart. Harley had originally fought for Parliament during the Civil Wars but fell foul of Cromwell over the disbandment of the New Model in the late 1640s. As in England, the Cromwellian regiments in Dunkirk were purged of their republican officers and royalists commissioned in their stead, whilst some supernumeraries were paid off. The new governor was given a warrant for £5,000 to pay off 200 horse and 400 foot as they were 'unserviceable', but whether these men were politically or physically unserviceable is a matter for conjecture.[16] Given the generally high standards of the New Model these men were probably political undesirables. One thousand men were sent over to Dunkirk to fill these vacancies from the pool of disbanded men in England. Once under the command of Harley and the royalist colonels the discipline of the garrison deteriorated so that on 30 December 1661 Secretary Nicholas was forced to write to Lord Rutherford, who had succeeded Harley in May 1661, complaining that there was too much drinking and debauchery within the garrison and that the officers were never present with their commands but spent all their time in London.[17]

For the two years which Charles retained Dunkirk the garrison numbered 6,000 foot and 600 horse, half of which were stationed in the fort at Mardyke. The only non-Cromwellian troops in the garrison were the remains of Charles's army of exiled royalists. At the Restoration the survivors of this corps

were taken into Dunkirk and formed into a single regiment of foot guards under Lord Wentworth and the few cavalry later amalgamated with the Duke of York's Troop of Life Guards.[18] The enforced coexistence of these two forces, the Cromwellians and the royalists, in one confined garrison town might well have accounted for the loss of discipline. Two years before they had fought one another at the Battle of the Dunes; one clause in the new articles of war summed up the tension between the two factions:

> No man shall presume by word or deed to transgress against His Majesty's Gracious Pardon in the Act of Indemnity, or to utter any reproachful words to the disrepute of the Three Nations, or the inhabitants of this garrison, or of any person in them, for former actions, on pain of punishment as an Incendiary.[19]

Wentworth's Guards were soon in a miserable condition having received no pay for six months, and in a petition to the king in October 1660 the officers stated that they were 'daily constrained to sell one thing or other of clothes, as some already have to the very last shirt they had to put on'.[20]

Without sufficient money to maintain this garrison Charles realised that the only possible solution was evacuation but this conveniently coincided with another reason for wishing to be rid of the place. Dunkirk was full of republican troops and was viewed with the deepest suspicion in England, for it was both strong enough and correctly positioned to invade across the Channel. Negotiations were opened for the sale of Dunkirk to France. In October 1662 England parted with her colony for 5 million livres and the English and Irish troops dispersed. Prior to this Lewis Farrell's and Edward Harley's regiments had been sent to Tangier late in 1661, and on the sale the three troops of horse went to serve with the British brigade sent to fight in Portugal, Wentworth's Guards sailed for England, and the Duke of York's regiment entered the French army as a mercenary unit, whilst Rutherford's, Falkland's and Taafe's regiments were disbanded in Dunkirk. The policy was to permit only Wentworth's to return to England as a formed unit, all the Cromwellian formations being broken up abroad so that the men came back to England as individuals or were sent into foreign service *en bloc*. In this way no political danger developed

from the Dunkirk garrison and the dispersal of the last reservoir of the New Model passed off without any serious incident.

The old army had virtually disappeared by the end of 1660 and yet by March 1661 Charles had founded the nucleus of a new army. He was certainly no opponent of a standing army, provided that it was controlled by him and not by Parliament, having been very proud of the little army which he had raised to fight with the Spaniards in Flanders. Ludlow stated that the king was in favour of establishing a new army,[21] and, according to Burnet, Clarendon held similar views:

> And there was a great talk of a design, as soon as the army were disbanded, to raise a force that should be so chosen and modelled that the King might depend upon it; and that it should be so considerable, that there might be no reason to apprehend tumults any more.[22]

However, the scheme found an opponent in Lord Treasurer Southampton as 'they had felt the effects of a military government, though sober and religious, in Cromwell's Army: he believed vicious and dissolute troops would be much worse: the king would grow fond of them: and they would quickly become insolent and ungovernable'.[23] Southampton's fears were soon justified even though the new army was minute in comparison with that of Cromwell:

> They go with their belts and swords, swearing and cursing, and stealing; running into people's houses, by force oftentimes, to carry away something, and this is the difference between the one and the other.[24]

The military defeat of his father and the harrowing time which he had endured in exile left deep scars on Charles II, so that one of the guiding principles of his reign was the avoidance of having to go on his 'travels' once more. Security was all-important. In the experience of the king this was impossible to achieve without armed force of some kind. This did not mean that Charles ever planned to govern the country by a standing army as Southampton feared, for even during the final years of his reign when he managed affairs without the assistance of Parliament the army did not significantly increase in size. Indeed it was only swelled by the return of the Tangier garrison in 1684 but this made the total number of troops barely 6,000. Any fears that Charles would attempt to rule by an army should have been quashed by the appointment of Albemarle as Lord

General. Already he had demonstrated his desire for the military to be subordinate to the civil power, for this had been the direct cause of his entry into politics in 1659 and 1660. Unfortunately England was in a slightly hysterical condition in the early 1660s and did not see the army for what it was: a weak and often poorly run police force. Neither did Parliament appreciate the king's real motive in establishing a standing army, which was to secure his throne and his own position in relation to Parliament and not to overawe the Lords and Commons. It was Charles who suffered from political weakness after 1660 and not Westminster. He had been forced to accept both his crown and his financial settlement on the terms of Parliament, but, even so, Parliament delighted in the masochistic idea that it was they who were being threatened by a pro-monarchical and popish standing army. Parliament and the king held opposite views upon the nature and value of an army in England.

The period from 1660 to 1663, and for some years afterwards, although to a lesser degree, was filled with plots and rumours of plots. Some of these conspiracies were real, others imaginary, but most possessed an element of fact surrounded by mystery and exaggeration. Nearly all were supposed designs by ex-Cromwellian soldiers and politicians to overthrow the restored monarchy and many were connected with Ludlow, Lambert and Desborough. To both the government and the people this threat must have seemed very real indeed.[25] Carolian England was ripe for plots at any time[26] and during the first three years of the reign there were a huge number. During his speech to Parliament at the dissolution of the Convention Lord Chancellor Clarendon urged the houses to consider the state of the militia and settle it as soon as possible due to the uncertain mood of the country, for already 'many suspected and dangerous persons' had been 'clapped up'.[27] When the Militia Bill reached the upper house on 18 July 1661 Clarendon informed their lordships that the measure had become essential for the safety of the kingdom as yet another plot had just been uncovered. In this one hundred and sixty officers of the New Model intended to instigate a nation-wide rebellion at the end of January 1661, seizing Shrewsbury, Coventry and Bristol.[28] Excitement had reached such a pitch by the end of 1661 that a joint committee of both houses was summoned to sit through the Christmas recess

owing to the 'apprehensions and fears that are generally abroad'.[29] For the security of the nation a small, permanent army was necessary, if only to gain some public confidence for the new order.

The conspiracies in the last two months of 1660 were followed by the formation of a regiment of foot in England, the 1st Foot Guards. John Russell was commissioned colonel on 23 November 1660[30] and his regiment consisted of twelve companies each of 100 men. Russell, the third son of Francis Russell, the fourth Earl of Bedford, had fought throughout the First Civil War as colonel of Prince Rupert's Guards. During the Interregnum he was active for the King's cause, being a member of the 'Sealed Knot', the secret organisation founded in 1652 which worked for the restoration of Charles II. He suffered imprisonment in 1659 for his part in Sir George Booth's abortive uprising. Russell was forty-eight years of age in 1660, well past the prime of life, but this was a failing common to most royalists who gained office after the Restoration. No sooner was the regiment formed than an incident occurred which illustrated the wisdom of organising a new army. On Sunday, 6 January 1661:

> About 50 Fifth Monarchymen at 10 of the clock came to Mr Johnson, a bookseller, at the north Gate of St Pauls, and there demanded the keys of the Church, which he either not having, or refusing, they broke open the door, and setting their sentries, examined the passengers whom they were for, and one with a lantern replying that he was for King Charles, they answered they were for King Jesus, and shot him through the head, where he lay as a spectacle all the next day. This gave the alarm to the Main Guard at the Exchange who sent 4 files of musketeers to reduce them, but the Fifth Monarchymen made them run, which so terrified the City that the Lord Mayor in person came with his Troop to reduce them. But before he arrived they drew off, and at Aldersgate, forcing the Constable to open the Gate, and so marched through Whitecross Street, where they killed another Constable, and so into the woods near Highgate; where, being almost famished, on Wednesday morning about five of the clock fell again into the City, and with a mad courage fell upon the Guard, and beat them; which put the City into such confusion, that the King's Life Guard, and all the City Regiments advanced against them. These 40 men beat the Life Guard and a whole Regiment for half an hour's time. They refused all quarter, but at length, Venner, their Captain, a wine cooper, after he had received three shots, was taken, and nine

more and twenty slain. . . . The Duke and the Duke of Albemarle with 700 Horse fell into the City, but all was over before they came.[31]

Burnet thought Venner's party closer to twenty than fifty, making the impotence of the City Militia even more apparent. The insurrection came as a climax to a series of supposed conspiracies and the government was so alarmed that Russell's Guards were almost immediately expanded into a standing army by the addition of three new regiments. Albemarle's Foot had still not been disbanded but under the regulations of the disbandment procedure all the units of the New Model had to be officially broken up. On 14 February 1661 the regiment was drawn up on Tower Hill, disbanded by the commissioners, and then re-engaged in the service of Charles II as the 2nd Foot Guards, the 'Coldstreamers', with Albemarle as colonel.[32]

These two infantry formations had to be balanced by some cavalry. Charles had possessed a Life Guard of eighty gentlemen during his exile under the command of Charles, Lord Gerard of Brandon, and when the king left Holland for England in 1660 this force had increased to 600.[33] These attended Charles at his coronation but then 200 were 'retired' and the remaining 400 sent to Dunkirk where they were known as the Duke of York's Life Guard of Horse.[34] After the defeat of Venner this force was withdrawn from Dunkirk, augmented to 500 men, and then formed into three separate troops; the King's Own, the Duke of York's, and the Lord General's. Although these three were distinct from each other they were looked upon as one regiment with the captain of the King's Troop ranking as the colonel of the Life Guard. Cromwell's Life Guard of Horse was disbanded simultaneously with Albemarle's Foot, but again the majority of the soldiers were retained in the king's service to form the basis of a new cavalry unit, the Royal Horse Guards, known later as the 'Blues'. Aubrey de Vere, the 20th Earl of Oxford, was commissioned colonel and he recruited his regiment from loyal volunteers to augment the Cromwellian Life Guard during February 1661.

Venner's insurrection was not the sole reason for the foundation of the army. An 'intended establishment' had been drafted as early as August 1660, five months before Venner's uprising, allowing for two regiments of foot and two of horse at an annual cost of £118,529.[35] The intention of forming a standing army

was in the minds of Charles and Clarendon long before Venner acted as a catalyst. The first official establishment appeared on 26 January 1661 providing for the 1st and 2nd Foot Guards, the Life Guards and the Royal Horse Guards, at the overall charge of £122,407 15*s* 10*d* per annum.[36]

It was to be a ceremonial, household army of royal guards based on the model of the French armed forces under Louis XIV. Such a tiny army was able to guard the king's person, present itself on state occasions, execute police duties, and act as a trained cadre for a rapid expansion in time of war. In addition to the four standing regiments there were a number of independent, non-regimented companies of foot stationed as garrison troops in the forts and castles which occupied England's strategic points. At the Restoration these units were Cromwellian, but their officers were then removed and royalists who had business or landed interests in that particular region replaced them.[37] An establishment for the garrisons appeared in June 1661 with the twenty-eight stations costing £67,316 15*s* 6*d* a year. This made a total charge for the Guards and Garrisons in England of £189,724 11*s* 4*d*. For a monarch who was saddled with debt and whose annual revenue was only £1,200,000 this was a considerable sum showing the reliance which he placed on the army as the only sure means of securing his own future.

This charge accounted for the standing army in England, but by the Portuguese Marriage Treaty of 1661 England gained the city of Tangier in North Africa. To use this port as either a naval station or a commercial post for the Levant trade a large garrison was required to protect it from the Moors of Barbary.[38] In effect the acquisition of Tangier cancelled out the sale of Dunkirk.[39] Two regiments from Dunkirk, Farrell's and Harley's, were transferred to Tangier late in 1661, whilst two foot regiments and a troop of horse were raised in England by the Earl of Peterborough, the first governor of the new colony.[40] Farrell's men were old royalists from the exiled army in Flanders whereas Harley's were republican to a man, but political sympathies mattered little in the far-off lands of Africa. The troops recruited by Peterborough came from the pool of soldiers disbanded from the New Model, for their performance against the Moors in 1662 and 1663 suggested that they knew their duties very well, whilst their discipline was tight and of a sort