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ABSTRACT

William Blathwayt (?1649-1717) served five monarchs in as many
as five posts at one time, from the wholly clerical to the semi-minis-
terial. The career of such a prodigious and durable pluralist in a
period hardly noted for its political stability raises several interesting
questions. The most substantial study of Blathwayt, by Gertrude
Jacobsen, was written at a time when the leading interpretation of late
seventeenth century English history was substantially Whig and the
changes wrought by the Glorious Revolution seemed its most compelling
feature. Since the 1930s, other historians have suggested that the main
emphasis of studies of 1688-9 should be on continuity, a continuity
which, superficially, seems admirably illustrated by the career of William
Blathwayt. In recent years, the historiographical wheel has come full
circle and the emphasis has again been placed on the contrast between
pre- and post-revolution England.

Blathwayt's main posts, Secretary at War (1683-1704), acting
Secretary at State (1692-1701), Secretary to the plantations committee
(1679-1696) and then member of the Board of Trade (1696-1707), Auditor
General of plantation revenues (1680-1717) and clerk of the Privy Coun-
cil (1678-1717) put him at the centre of the English administrative sys-
tem. His career can serve as a test case. His success as client and
patron, his views on parliament and prerogative and on colonial adminis-
tration, his contribution whether as policy-maker, co-ordinator of the
policies of others, or plain clerical assistant, can help us reach con-
clusions concerning the precise significance of the Glorious Revolution.
If the personality of the man fails to impress, the dimensions of his
bureaucratic empire do, and so also do the spoils of that empire in the
form of his palatial country house, Dyrham Park near Bath. How did the
dimensions of that empire change over time, how far were the offices
which Blathwayt held integrated and what aid does this give in our in-
terpretation of politics and administration, both at home and in the
colonies, in the last three decades of the seventeenth century and the
first decade of the eighteenth?

An essentially narrative and biographical approach to Blathwayt
does not seem suitable, particularly in view of the existing Jacobsen
study. Instead a combined thematic and chronological approach is used;
the tripartite division of the thesis reflects the nature of the conclu-
sions reached. The three chapters of Part I consider three themes of
the period 1668-1688: Blathwayt’s connections as client, the major ob-
jectives of government policy, and Blathwayt’s rôle in their accomplish-
ment. These three themes remain a concern of Part II, but the framework
is altered to a chronological one. The chapter on the Glorious Revolu-
tion shows that continuity of personnel was an important feature of
1688-9; subsequent chapters demonstrate the slow but sure way in which
policy fragmented and how the implications of the revolution and of the
lengthy wars which followed became clear. In these circumstances the
rôles of William Blathwayt was substantially altered; chapter 7 closes
with a summation of the conclusions reached. Part III explores Blathwayt
through an analysis of the material results of his career. His place at
the centre of an extensive communications network demonstrates the wor-
kings of the European and Anglo-American communities even as his house,
its furnishings and gardens, display the rewards of government service
and the taste and character of their owner. Dyrham Park serves as a fit
memorial to William Blathwayt’s empire.
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INTRODUCTION

William Blathwayt (?1649-1717), clerk of the Privy Council, Secretary to the plantations committee, Surveyor and Auditor General of plantations revenue, Secretary at War, acting Secretary of State and member of the Board of Trade, has received a modest degree of interest from historians. If the conclusions reached have not always been, to paraphrase a Blathwayt comment on another matter, such as their subject would have wished or designed, this is hardly surprising. What matters for our purposes is the validity of these conclusions in the light of modern research, and the justification for further study of this bureaucratic Vicar of Bray, who served five monarchs and survived a revolution between the beginning of his career in the 1660s and his death some three years after George I's accession.

The first paper which dealt exclusively with Blathwayt was published in 1924. Its title, 'A Private Secretary to William III', sufficiently suggests its focus. Taking as its justification the need for historians to turn from the more prominent personages of history to investigate the actions of 'homely yet typical figures', the article comments on Blathwayt's skill, industry and prosperity during his secretarial service to William III. The sketch is brief and the documentary

---

1 M. Lane, 'A Private Secretary to William III', Contemporary Review CXXV (January-June, 1924), 639-644.
sources would appear to be few.  

Six years later, Blathwayt's career received much more detailed investigation at the hands of two historians working independently on either side of the Atlantic. An M.A. thesis on Blathwayt was submitted to the University of Leeds, and a book on Blathwayt was published by Yale University Press. The thesis, by R.A. Preston, discusses the life and career of Blathwayt; its subtitle, 'Civil Servant and Acting Secretary of State', shows which of Blathwayt's offices Preston considered the most important. In Preston's opinion, Blathwayt was 'more than a mere clerk' though not 'in the fullest sense of the word, a statesman'. The apex of his career, we are led to believe, came in the years immediately following 1696 and the key to his importance and influence lay in what was essentially an institutional development, the growth of the power of the Secretaries of State. Preston concludes that Blathwayt was therefore bound to stamp the Diplomatic Service and its policy with his personality.  

We may note in passing that Part I of the thesis, Blathwayt the Man, occupies 22 pages and is essentially a summary of the chief facts of Blathwayt's life. Part II, Blathwayt the Civil

---

2 There are no notes; but references to the lack of gossip and personal information in Blathwayt's letters show that the author was unaware of the frank and sustained correspondence between Blathwayt and Sir Robert Southwell and between Blathwayt and George Stepney. A reference to the 'only present' that we hear of Blathwayt receiving is also revealing; on the most modest estimate he received scores: see below, ch. VIII.

Servant, occupies 121 pages. The problem in any attempt to illuminate Blathwayt's personality was already apparent.

The historian's conclusions are no stronger than his sources; Preston, like Lane, knew nothing of the Southwell and Stepney letters and used as his major manuscript sources, the largely official correspondence in the British Museum and the Public Record Office. Gertrude Jacobsen's biography, published in 1932, draws on a much wider range of materials. Manuscripts at the Huntington Library and the Library of Congress gave Miss Jacobsen material for a much more telling picture of Blathwayt's colonial responsibilities than Preston affords, and access to the portion of the family papers at that time in the possession of George Wynter Blathwayt of West Porlock House, Somerset, allowed a little more to be said about a personality which still, however, turned out to be 'elusive'.

Arguing that Blathwayt's energetic and enduring pluralism enables his activities to serve as 'a cross section of adminis-

---

4 Preston's views on Blathwayt as Acting Secretary of State were further developed seventeen years later in an article: 'William Blathwayt and the Evolution of a Royal Personal Secretariat', History, new series, XXXIV (1949); 28-43. Again this is long on institutional development (or in this case institutional development manqué since 'the office of acting-secretary of state, like the wardrobe before it, failed to become permanently established' [p. 43]) and short on personal factors.

5 When Preston wrote he found 83 volumes of Blathwayt correspondence in the British Museum. This number has now been substantially increased.

trative organisation and development at that time' and that he fits into 'a critical period in constitutional development', Miss Jacobsen produced a lengthy and solid biography. Blathwayt emerges as a dull, efficient administrator, possessed of little or no originality and interested above all in the growth of English trade and the development of England's colonial possessions. For Miss Jacobsen, Blathwayt's chief offices were those connected with plantation affairs, and the function of those plantations was simple: they were 'economic adjuncts, not political units'. Blathwayt's best efforts were directed towards building up connections with the colonies and fighting the proprietary and company foundations. In this, so his biographer claims, he did as much as the times permitted.

Meanwhile, Miss Jacobsen argues, England's monarchy was undergoing transformation from an arbitrary to a constitutional system, while at the administrative level the modern departmental system was emerging. Blathwayt, blind to the full implications of the rise of the party system and of parliament, continued to prefer a mode of government modelled on the French example, preferring administrative orders to statutes. Pliable in his own party affiliations, he had little understanding of those of others.

It is remarkable in its accuracy and comprehensiveness. For one of the few factual flaws see ch. V, 96-9, where a report written c.1685 is attributed to c.1697. Blathwayt's colonial creed, implicit in the report, probably changed little in the interim, however, even if the colonies did. For a detailed discussion of the document see the beginning of ch. III of this thesis.

William Blathwayt, 474-5.

Although she feels he was inadequate in his stand on the extension of patent offices to the colonies.
With the publication of this substantial biography, the file on Blathwayt might have appeared to be complete. The interpretation remained unchallenged for thirty-five years. Then in 1968 and 1969, Stephen S. Webb in two articles in The William and Mary Quarterly radically challenged accepted notions of Blathwayt and of late seventeenth century colonial administration. Forty volumes of Blathwayt's colonial correspondence, unavailable to Miss Jacobsen, form the chief documentary underpinning of Webb's striking and novel theories. Challenging the method and arrangement of the Jacobsen biography, whereby separate chapters are devoted to Blathwayt's separate offices, Webb seeks to demonstrate the significance of the integration of the offices Blathwayt held, claims that his influence was expanding well into the nineties, and argues with much verve that 'the government of England's empire, even more than that of the mother country, was military, and the particular responsibility of the man who headed the war and plantation offices'. Webb's military empire is far removed from the economic organisation of Jacobsen.


11 Webb would appear to be unaware of Preston's work but in fact the same criticism would apply.

Since the publication of Webb's articles in the late sixties, certain new documentary materials on Blathwayt have become available. There has been a number of fresh accessions to the Blathwayt papers held by the Gloucestershire Record Office. There have been further sales at Sotheby's from the Phillips collection of manuscripts, chief among them being the 1,800 Blathwayt letters and papers acquired by the Osborn collection at Yale in 1974. Eleven volumes of Portland Papers at the University of Nottingham are really Blathwayt papers and include five volumes of frank letters to Sir Robert Southwell, invaluable for any judicious estimate of Blathwayt's career in the eighties.

A substantial new body of secondary work has also given room for certain shifts in our perceptions of politics and administration in England and her colonies in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries. Books by Jones, Western and Miller have demonstrated the growth of party before the Revolution and have established beyond doubt the existence of a powerful drive to extend state authority, especially in the eighties. Childs has shown the potential—and the limitations—of the armies of Charles II and James II. Aylmer's work on the civil service earlier in the seventeenth century has clear implications for the post-Restoration period. Questions regarding the continuity or change of the Glorious Revolution in England and her colonies have been

---

13 Sale at Sotheby's 26 June, 1974 (lot 2867). I am grateful to the staff of the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts and the Institute of Historical Research, London, for information on the present distribution of Blathwayt papers.

14 Portland Papers, Pw V 51-61, Nottingham University Library.
addressed by Roberts and Lovejoy, while historians such as Holmes, Speck and Harwitz have deepened our understanding of party development in the period after the revolution. Olson, Kammen and Henretta have shown the workings of the Anglo-American political system in this period and by implication rejected the Jacobsen view of the colonies solely as 'economic adjuncts', though they have not perceived the military linkages which have made such a strong impression on Webb. 15

The existence of these new primary and secondary sources, and my own disagreements with certain aspects of the work of Lane, Preston, Jacobsen and Webb, together form the justification for this thesis. The study which follows is not intended to be a full-scale biography of William Blathwayt. To essay such would be to repeat in smaller compass what Gertrude Jacobsen accomplished in over five hundred pages. However, the major points of Blathwayt's career are fully explored and,

from the development of this career, it is possible to reach conclu-
sions about the processes of change which were under way in the later
Stuart period and the implications of the Glorious Revolution for Eng-
lish administration and politics, both at home and in the colonies.
PART I

THE CREATION OF WILLIAM BLATHWAYT'S EMPIRE, 1668-1688
CHAPTER I

THE RISE AND RISE OF WILLIAM BLATHWAYT: THE CLIENT, 1668-1688

The official career of William Blathwayt spanned five reigns and six decades. It began in the 1660s and ended only with his death in 1717, at which time he still held two of the positions he had accumulated with such deceptive ease over the years and retained with such aplomb during the Glorious Revolution.\(^1\) Having survived the 'odium of holding 4 offices, of never having served a day without Payments' as an opponent put it in 1701,\(^2\) he had retired (albeit reluctantly) to his palatial country house, Dyrham Park near Bath, a testament to his success as a client and a promise of his potential as a patron.

The complete roll call of his offices is even more impressive than his jealous adversary had suggested. He had served as secretary to Sir William Temple at the Hague from 1668-1672, entered the plantations office in 1675, was made clerk in extraordinary of the Council in 1678, and in ordinary in 1686, retaining this last position until 1717. From 1679 until 1696 he was virtual secretary to the Lords of Trade. He held the Surveyor and Auditor Generalship of plantation revenues from 1680 until 1717. From 1681-83 he served as undersecretary to Lord Conway.

\(^1\)Only six months before his death he had been in attendance on the King in Council. R.A. Preston, 'The Life and Career of William Blathwayt, Civil Servant and Acting-Secretary of State', (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Leeds, 1932), 20.

\(^2\)Anonymous report on the Southwell/Povey Council clerkship dispute, 1701; Add. MSS. 38861, 74.
The Secretaryship of War he purchased in 1683 and retained for twenty-one years. He was acting Secretary of State to William III during the campaign season in Flanders from 1692-1701, and a member of the Board of Trade from 1696-1707. He had also acted as secretary to various committees, such as the Ecclesiastical Commission of 1681 and the Privy Council committee for Irish affairs in 1689. He was M.P. for Newton in the Isle of Wight from 1685-88, and for Bath from 1693 to 1710.

Such prodigious pluralism sheds light on the manner in which late seventeenth century patronage operated. There can be no doubt that Blathwayt followed the rules which were to be jotted down in 1693 by the young Edward Southwell, son of Sir Robert Southwell, one of Blathwayt's mentors in the 1680s. Young Southwell's notes had valuable lessons for all aspiring civil servants. The attention of one's superiors could best be drawn to one's merits by such actions as constant attendance at all councils, committees and hearings, mastery of all forms of 'Business passing at the Councill Board' and a superior style in French and Latin. But demonstrated ability and conscientious attendance were not enough. Connections were all-important. First in the memorandum came the heading 'How to Cultivate my Interest against an Opportunity shall happen'. The King was to be approached via the

---

3 This committee was far more significant than the title suggests: see Ch. 4.

4 A chronological chart of Blathwayt's life can be found in G. Jacobsen, William Blathwayt (New Haven, 1932), xi-xii.

5 The major portion is at Add. MSS. 38861, 64-5. Edward Southwell seems to have retained this propensity for making notes on bureaucratic minutiae: see his lengthy 'Proceedings relating to my getting my Sons life into ye Crown office Pattent', August, 1715; BY 17.
Earl of Portland, the Lord Lieutenant, the Lord Archbishop and Mr. Montagu, the Queen by the Lord Archbishop, Lady Derby, Monsieur d'Alonne and Dr. Stanley, the Lord President by 'the Bishop of London, etc.' Every seventeenth century aspirant to office had such a list, if not so ingenuously committed to paper. A place at court, wrote the Marquess of Halifax, like a place in Heaven, was to be acquired by being much upon one's knees. 6 When the diplomat George Stepney was hoping to exchange his position as envoy at one of the minor German courts for a more congenial employment, he was sure that 'favour & money must do the business' (and added despondently—if inaccurately—'& I have neither'). 7

A sufficient number of patrons was vital. While for purposes of graceful compliment the office-hunter might refer in correspondence to his 'sole patron', for success one needed aid from a multiplicity of sources; it was no use, judged Stepney, building too much on one interest, 'which may in turn fail as others have done', a mistake which his friend Matthew Prior seemed to be making. 8 Stepney himself could muster a substantial group of 'worthy Patrons', Godolphin, Montagu, Blathwayt and Vernon being the most significant. 9 This gave him room to manoeuvre; for example, on one of the innumerable occasions when he

---


7 Stepney to Blathwayt, 6/16 May, 1697; SP 105/57, unpaginated.

8 Stepney to Blathwayt, 13/23 May, 1699; SP 105/52.

9 Stepney to Vernon, 7 October, 1693; SP 105/60.
was soliciting his back pay from the Treasury, he chose to apply via Vernon, the Secretary of State, rather than have 'peculiar recourse to my Patron there', the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Montagu.  

The quality of one's patrons was as significant as their number. Best of all was the friendship of the monarch himself, something to be cultivated assiduously. When Seymour lost office in the early eighties, the English envoy to the Hanse towns was sure it was the result of his 'running so often into the Countrey & not being enough with the King'.  

Failing the favour of the King in person, there was that of his intimates. When Major General Kirk twice failed to keep dinner engagements at the English camp in Flanders in the summer of 1691, his disgruntled friends, out of pocket as well as out of temper, thought the reason was easy to find: he was keeping close to those who could do him greater kindnesses, such as Sidney and Portland.  

A dramatic illustration that one interest was certainly not as good as another is provided by the case of two colonial governors. When Francis Nicholson went off to govern Virginia in 1690, transportation was provided for six servants and two tons of household goods. When the Duke of Albemarle set out for Jamaica in 1687, the government agreed to pay for one hundred servants and five hundred tons of household goods:  

10 Stepney to Vernon, 7 February, 1698/9; SP 105/52. Stepney's multiple patrons are discussed in Stephen S. Webb, 'William Blathwayt, Imperial Fixer: Muddling Through to Empire, 1689-1717', WMQ third series XXVI (1969), 405. For other examples of multiple patrons see the comments on the cases of the envoys Cresset and Skelton, Add. MSS. 28878, 226, Add. MSS. 37983, 143.

11 Skelton to Blathwayt, 21 November, 1682; Add. MSS. 37984, 144.

12 to John Ellis, 10 August, 1691; Add. MSS. 28877, 84.
Albemarle also got leave to return to England whenever he considered he had sufficient reason, despite the recent Order in Council designed to keep governors at their posts, the Culpeper dismissal proceedings for absence without leave, and his own recently-issued instructions to the contrary.  

The Duke of Albemarle was hardly, however, of the same social standing as the career soldier Francis Nicholson, and uniformity of treatment was not a leading feature of seventeenth century administration. Patronage could only operate within certain defined limits. Some posts would never be given to men without titles, and foreign courts especially put great stress on noble birth in the representatives sent to them. When people were spreading rumours about his lack of social position, Stepney sourly remarked that in Berlin they had the notion that 'nothing is Quality under a Lord'. The title of Gentleman of the Privy Chamber which he had solicited from Montagu as a means of impressing the Saxons had apparently made little impact on the Berliners. When changes were made in the personnel of the Board of Trade in 1699, there was much discussion among the non-noble members about the taking away of peers and great relief felt when the new members were titled, this being interpreted as a sign of the stability of the Commission.  

---

13 CO 5/1358, 18; CSPC 1689-92, 436; CO 138/5, 309.

14 Stepney to Blathwayt, 16/26 August, 1698; SP 105/51. Stepney to Montagu, 24 October/ 3 November, 1693; SP 105/60. In 1699 when Stepney had an eye on the Danish embassy, Blathwayt had to tell him the King was resolved to send 'a Peer who is to make a great show...'. Blathwayt to Stepney, 12/22 September, 1699; SP 105/53.

15 Stepney to Blathwayt, 6 June, 1699, to Ellis, same date to Lexington, 10/20 June, 1699; SP 105/53.
Vernon resisted for a time becoming Secretary of State in the nineties because he felt that a man 'without quality...without estate, without elocution' was sure to be laughed at. 16

Could simple purchase of office circumvent the intricacies of interest? Sale of office was never so widespread in England as on the continent, and the government vacillated between attempts to eradicate it and efforts to profit from what it proved unable to prohibit. 17 Civilian as well as military offices were certainly sold--Lord Arlington told Sir William Temple in 1674 that he would have to pay £6,000 if he wished to become Secretary of State 18—but the practice was less widespread after the revolution; it lessened the freedom of choice of the crown and men like Vernon or Trumbull could never have raised the cash. It lingered on in some areas, however. 19 Sale of office existed, then: but


18 Temple to his father, 27 March, 1674; J. Swift (ed.), Letters written by Sir W. Temple and other ministers of state (London, 1700) III, 18. In 1681 the Countess of Sunderland was infuriated when her husband was dismissed from office 'without letting us have the money my Lord paid for it'. Countess of Sunderland to Henry Sidney, 25 January, 1681; R.W. Blencowe (ed.), Diary of the Times of Charles the Second by the Honourable Henry Sidney, (London, 1843) II, 165. Amounts advanced could be huge, and obviously depended on the profits one could legitimately expect. Narcissus Luttrell claimed that the Treasurer of the Custom House, who died in 1691, had advanced £50,000 for the job.

19 For examples see Swart, 65. When Stepney was angling for a clerkship of Council in the nineties, Blathwayt told him it would cost £1500 or £2000 to buy. Reported in a letter to Stepney, 23 October/2 November, 1694; SP 105/55.
not in a vacuum, for it always had to be combined with interest. Arlington's scheme for Temple's secretaryship necessitated the favour of the Lord Treasurer as well as the money.

Thus far merit has received no mention. However, the situation described above by no means precluded it: many patrons became so because they recognised the abilities of the individuals concerned, as Temple recognised William Blathwayt's. And all the family connections one could hope for would not always save one from dismissal: one of the vast tribe of the Berties lost his job as patent secretary to the Customs because his relative, Dudley North, and the other Customs Commissioners judged him incompetent. 20 It had to be admitted, however, that to wish for a society where ministers recommended the most deserving people to positions, and did not prefer people 'merely because they think them their friends or creatures', was to wish for Utopia. 21 The interplay of what one historian has called the three Ps, Patrimony (family patronage), Patronage and Purchase, was continuous, the quest for place never-ending. No wonder William III wished every man in office immortal. 22

20 Roger North, Lives of the Norths (London, 1826) III, 199.

21 Vernon to Shrewsbury, 10 June, 1699; Vernon Letters I, 306.

22 G.E. Aylmer's excellent discussion of conditions of entry to and service in the bureaucracy in the first half of the seventeenth century has relevance for the second half also: see The King's Servants (London, 1961) ch. 3. Aylmer distinguishes between favour and patronage, using the former to represent a temporary attitude on the part of the King or some other influential individual towards the recipient. In analysing a particular career, however, it proves impossible to make this distinction: see below. William's comment is quoted in a letter from Codolphin to Sunderland: see E.L. Snyder, 'Codolphin and Harley: A Study of Their Partnership in Politics', Huntington Library Quarterly XXX (1967), 245.
The rise of William Blathwayt illustrates the general processes sketched above. How had Blathwayt's career begun? His social origins were not particularly distinguished, though the Earl of Ailesbury was excessively harsh when he claimed that Blathwayt was 'born to rub my shoes, his uncle having been a servant in a low post to my great Aunt'. Blathwayt's family had belonged to the merchant class. His paternal grandfather was a leading member of the London Cutlers' Company. His father had deserted trade for the professions. A lawyer who had trained at the Middle Temple, he had died just after his son was born leaving an estate encumbered by lawsuits. William's maternal grandfather had held various minor government positions, including a post as accountant general to Queen Anne of Denmark. It was through family connections that the young Blathwayt was first brought to official notice. His mother's brother, Thomas Povey, himself a civil servant of some standing, made it his business to launch his nephew's career: it was at his urging that Arlington persuaded Sir William Temple to employ Blathwayt in the Hague embassy in 1668. As an undersecretary in Whitehall assured Blathwayt

---

23 W. E. Buckley (ed.), Memoirs of Thomas Bruce, Earl of Ailesbury (London, 1890) II, 495. Ailesbury had fled to the continent in the aftermath of the assassination plot of 1696. The Electress of Hanover was working for his return to England and had received little encouragement on this score from Blathwayt.

24 Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 28 April, 1696; DL799/C8, E3. In another letter to Southwell Blathwayt claimed his father had ruined his estate by trusts and being security for others; 5th October, 1686; DL799/C8, E3. For further details of Blathwayt's antecedents see Jacobsen, Blathwayt, 34-44.
in 1671, the 'placing of your virtues in a good light' and the disposing of friends 'to a due consideration of your services' were constant concerns of his Uncle Povey.25 Once acquainted with Blathwayt, Temple was prepared to offer what Povey had solicited for him, the post of secretary. His knowledge of languages, but 'most your recommendation', Temple informed Povey, had inclined him to the decision. Blathwayt was now bombarded with family advice which must surely have conflicted. His mother and stepfather, Thomas Vivian, insisted that constant attendance on the ambassador, not withdrawal to his chamber, was the road to success, while Povey urged on him a course of reading that would daunt the most industrious. Nonetheless he made the most of his position and even fought off a challenger for his post.26

By 1671 he was anxious for a change; his secretaryship was not especially lucrative and he thought the time had come to broaden his experience. He wondered about the possibility of a job with Sunderland in the Secretary of State's office but his uncle found Sunderland 'engaged as to secretaries' and thought a secretaryship to another embassy might suit.27 It was not until Lord Conway received the seals in 1681

25 J. Cooke to Blathwayt, 6 June, 21 November, 1671; Add. MSS. 56240.

26 Temple to Thomas Povey, 2 October NS 1668; D1799/X1, BQ; Vivian to Blathwayt, 22 September, 1668; D1799/C2, BQ; Blathwayt to Povey, 7 April, 1671; D1799/C3, BQ. Merit allied to family patronage won the day: his rival, the son of Sir Charles Wolsely, had no knowledge of languages except for a very little Latin and lacked even Blathwayt's slight experience. See Blathwayt to his mother, 13 November NS 1668; D1799/C2, BQ.

27 Vivian to Blathwayt, 29 October, 1671; D1799/C2, BQ; Povey to Blathwayt, 17 August, 1671; D1799/C5, BQ. Povey stressed however that it must be a position with an ambassador in extraordinary not in ordinary (more honour and an allowance).
that he was made an undersecretary of State, and by then Povey's connections had ceased to be a major factor in his nephew's advancement. When Blathwayt was engaged in delicate marriage negotiations in 1686 he merely pretended to ask Povey's advice, 'wch is a forme I must preserve'. It was natural enough, however, that 'the Master', as Blathwayt liked to call his uncle, should stand as godfather to his first son in 1687. This had been the limit, then, of strictly family patronage on Blathwayt's behalf. It had given him an excellent start but it could not sustain his ambitions.

It was, however, through a friend of the family that Blathwayt made his first major advance in colonial business. Thomas Povey had held colonial positions and another uncle, Richard, had held the post of secretary for Jamaica, to which Blathwayt (unsuccessfully) solicited the reversion in 1674. But it was with the help of Sir Robert Southwell, constrained to retire from the Plantation Office for health reasons, that Blathwayt was appointed an assistant to the clerks of the Privy Council in plantation business in 1676. Luck gave scope for Blathwayt's ambitions; the declining health of one of the clerks, Sir Philip Lloyd, meant, Blathwayt was sure, that Lloyd would 'not long give his attendance on the business, & he has already been pleased to

Blathwayt to Southwell, 23 September, 1686; D1799/C8, BG; Blathwayt complained his uncle had been 'very peevish of late'; same to same, 30 September, 1686, ibid. Povey was then in his seventies; he was, however, being complimented on his general fitness as late as 1701; Sir Stephen Fox to Thomas Povey, 11 September, 1701; D1799/C9, BG. The other godfather to Blathwayt's son was Blathwayt's father-in-law; Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 12 November, 1687; Portland MSS. 53.

\[1/31.24.\]
leave six or seven reports to me...'. Seventeen months later, Blathwayt was petifining for a salary increase; the Council thought him diligent and granted him £100 p.a. as an addition to his original £150 p.a. There was no doubt it was deserved; even when visiting the continent on other business, Blathwayt was accumulating 'a very good collection of Books and Pamphlets relating to Trade and Plantations' for the use of the Committee. Southwell was kin to the Earl of Nottingham, so that Blathwayt now had a connection with the vast Finch clan.

At the end of the decade he widened his circle of acquaintance still further through his work in the office of another relative of Nottingham, the Earl of Conway. Conway encouraged his undersecretary to remedy his own deficiencies as a correspondent, and used Blathwayt in negotiations other than the merely routine: to help him open a correspondence with the Earl of Rochester, for example. As letters and lamprey pies passed from Ragley to Whitehall, Blathwayt served as the intermediary. Southwell, too, received Blathwayt's thanks for putting him 'in the way of being usefull to my Lord Hyde...'.

30 Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 2 September, 1676; Portland MSS. 50; CSPC 1675-6, 899; Add. MSS. 9767, 3, 5, 8, 35, 37.

31 Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, Paris, 2 July, 1678; Portland MSS. 50.

32 Add. MSS. 37990, 30, 34, 36, 40, 46. 'I know sir, wrote an English envoy from Genoa in 1702, 'you have a very great interest with the Earl of Rochester'. Sir Lambert Blackwell to Blathwayt, 10 December, 1702; Add. MSS. 34356, 52. Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 1 October, 1681; Portland MSS. 52.
By now he had caught the eye of the King. While the posts with Temple and with Conway were essentially private service, attendance at the Council meant royal employment. He was sworn clerk of the Council in extraordinary in 1678, 'as a mark', wrote Southwell, 'of hopes and encouragement to him for the pains he has taken in the plantation business'. But immediately after this statement, Southwell suggested to the Duke of Ormonde that a more personal motive had disposed Charles II in Blathwayt's favour. Blathwayt had been cured of an illness by a Dr. Tabor, whom Charles sent over with him to Paris to treat his niece. Fortunately the niece was cured 'with the very first dose', the result being that Blathwayt 'stood so fair with His Majesty, who seems to have kindness for him', that the Council clerkship followed almost at once. Perhaps it was on the basis of these advancements that Blathwayt decided, at this time, to open an account at Hoare's Bank in Cheapside, where his uncle was also a customer. A year later the King allowed Southwell to transfer 'the care of my place in the Excise Office' to Blathwayt as well. When Southwell left England to take up the post of English envoy to Brandenburg, he left the whole of the Duke of Ormonde's business papers with Blathwayt, too. Another valuable connection had been gained.

33 Every ambassador and Secretary of State appointed his own office staff.

34 Southwell to Ormonde, 13 July, 27 August, 1678, 6 December, 1679; Blathwayt to Ormonde, 6 March, 1679/80; HMC Ormonde, 444, 449, 565, 581. The bank account was opened on 28 October, 1678; I am grateful to Messrs. Hoare for information concerning Blathwayt's bank account.
In 1680 the King, influenced by the recent war scare, the cost of assembling—and disbanding—an army, the £80,000 spent in putting down Bacon's rebellion in Virginia and the continuing loss of customs revenue through the dislocation of the tobacco crop, resolved to put his revenues 'into a more easy and certain way of accompt than hath hitherto been used'. The necessity of reorganising colonial finance was obvious; in colonies such as Virginia great sums raised yearly had been 'unduly' disposed of and 'ill accompted for'. Blathwayt had already made a report to the Commissioners of the Treasury on the management of the 4 l/2% revenue in the Leeward Islands. What was more natural than the Treasury recommendation of the appointment of William Blathwayt as Surveyor and Auditor General of his Majesty's revenues in America?

After 1681, Blathwayt was also secretary to the commission appointed to manage the ecclesiastical affairs of the crown. He had no salary from the King and was not allowed to put the clergy to any charge. He could, however, afford to submit to this arrangement with equanimity, since he certainly had hopes of 'finding the effects of their favor one way or other'. Three years after his appointment as Auditor General, Blathwayt acquired the last of his major offices when the King allowed

---

35 T64/88, 22. For a discussion of the parliamentary problems over disbandment supply in 1679 and the economy drive of the Treasury Commission which replaced Danby, see C.D. Chandaman, The English Public Revenue, 1660–1688 (Oxford, 1975) ch. VI. See also ch. I of Chandaman for an assessment of the significance of customs to the royal revenue.

36 Blathwayt to Nathaniel Bacon, 17 October, 1681; BW XIII; Blathwayt to the Earl of Carlisle, 4 July 1680; BW XXII.

37 Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 23 August, 1681; Portland MSS. 52.
him to purchase the Secretaryship at War from the incumbent, Matthew
Locke, a distant relative of Southwell. The governor of Jamaica con-
gratulated the new Secretary on the 'easy terms' on which he had bought
the office. The striking pluralism here did not prevent the King
from considering Blathwayt for yet another post. In 1684 when Godol-
phin was to resign from his Secretaryship of State in order to replace
Rochester at the Treasury, Charles called him in and explained he was
somewhat at a loss to fill the Secretaryship. He asked Godolphin his
opinion of Dr. Trumbull and of Blathwayt, and seemed 'to incline more
to Mr. Blathwaite than any other that had been nam'd to him'. But it
came to nothing: perhaps Charles felt that even this indefatigable
servant would be over-extended, or perhaps Blathwayt lacked sufficient
status.

Charles's death did not impair Blathwayt's interest at court. His
access to confidential material was clearly unchecked. Early in 1686 he
sent off to Sir Robert Southwell, quite without authorization, transcripts
of what was found in the late King's closet; understandably, he entreated
Southwell to return them by the first post. There were other favourable
signs. When Sir William Petty had some of his works on political economy

38 The purchase agreement, 16 August, 1683, is to be found in D1799/X4,
BG, where the price mentioned is £1100. Sir Thomas Lynch to Blathwayt,
25 February, 1683/4; BW XXIV.

39 Godolphin to Rochester, 7 August, 1684; Add. MSS. 15892, 169-70.
Blathwayt had some of Vernon's problems: see note 12 and accompanying
text.

40 Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 16 January, 1685/6; Portland
MSS. 53.
presented to James II, it was Blathwayt who read them to the monarch.\textsuperscript{41} When Blathwayt entered the House of Commons in 1685, as M.P. for Newton in the Isle of Wight, it was as a government nominee. James himself had ordered Sunderland to write to the Governor of the island, Sir Robert Holmes, to engage his assistance for Blathwayt and his fellow candidate.\textsuperscript{42} On the death of one of the Council clerks in ordinary, Sir Philip Lloyd (the very same whose imminent demise Blathwayt had eagerly awaited in 1676), Blathwayt was pleased to report to his mentor Southwell that the King, informed that he was next in line for the post, replied 'He was glad of it as being very well satisfied with my services in all my Employments'. When another clerk in extraordinary, Bridgeman, challenged his claim, the King at the Cabinet Council took Blathwayt's part. (Bridge-
man's backer was Sunderland). The result was assured, and Blathwayt put a 'double value' on his success, having the King 'my Advocat & Champion' and 'from Him before & since that day many expressions of kindness'. Subtract from the above the favourable gloss on the King's actions which was bound to be conveyed by a man trying to impress not only his patron but also his prospective father-in-law, John Wynter, and still one is left with an impression of an easy relationship between servant and royal master. Furthermore, Blathwayt was to get the full profits of his new position with no obligations or encumbrances, while Bridgeman,

\textsuperscript{41} Petty to Sir Robert Southwell, 14 August, 1686, 18 January, 1686/7; Marquis of Lansdowne (ed.), \textit{Petty-Southwell Correspondence}, 1676-1687 (London, 1928), 231, 252.

though he too became a clerk in ordinary, was left with the prospect of a lawsuit. 43

Blathwayt's reliance on royal favour was almost total. 'I have no shelter but ye King to retire to', he admitted to Southwell in 1686. Less than a year later it was demonstrated that the reliance was not misplaced. An attack on Blathwayt by various army officers over the fees he charged for issuing the warrants for army pay led to a hearing at the Cabinet Council where Blathwayt became convinced that 'not only my Profit [c. £600 p.a.] but my disgrace was principally aim'd at'. But the Duke of Somerset, the Earl of Arran, Colonel Kirke and the other accusers were bested when the King expressed his satisfaction with Blathwayt's services. Although the fees were abolished, a regular salary was substituted by special order. Nothing could have been better, in Blathwayt's opinion, especially since he and the Paymaster of the Army, Ranelagh, were on excellent terms. 44

Blathwayt was not, however, blind to the political problems which James's policies were causing; indeed, he had never been blind to the necessity of cultivating the reversionary interest. He had certainly met William of Orange while on Temple's staff at the Hague. In 1674, he had informed his Uncle Povey that he hoped to be of some service to the Prince. Henry Sidney's diary shows that when the Prince of Orange complained to him in 1681 that 'he had nobody to write to near

43 Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 7 October, 1686; same to same, 23 October, 1686, where the complexities of the Bridgeman/Blathwayt dispute are described in detail; DL799/C8, BG.

44 Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 22 May, 1686; 3 March, 1686/7; 24 December, 1685; Portland MSS. 53.
the King', Sidney sent the news to Blathwayt and a few days later took him to see William: Blathwayt returned 'well satisfied'. In 1687, at the time of the Declaration of Indulgence and the three questions, Blathwayt constructed a careful letter to his old patron Southwell, advising him to make 'as many friends as is possible' but not until there was an 'absolute necessity'. This guarded advice did not, obviously, fall on deaf ears. After the Glorious Revolution, Southwell was made a Customs Commissioner; in 1690, he accompanied William III to Ireland and was made principal Secretary of State for Ireland; the King visited Southwell's estate at King's Weston on his way back from the campaign.

Blathwayt had risen through a combination of circumstances. Family patronage had begun his career. Purchase had advanced it. The cultivation of 'great men' such as Nottingham and the brothers Hyde had enhanced his position. By the eighties he rested secure in the good opinion of his monarch, and could boast of his frequent attendance on the King in his closet and at the Council Board. An excellent marriage in 1686 to a Gloucestershire heiress guaranteed his financial security. Finally, underlying all the advancements, were bureaucratic abilities of a high order. John Evelyn's diary entry for June 18th, 1687, summarises the impression made on one discerning observer: 'I din'd this day at Mr. Blathwaites...'

45 Blathwayt to Thomas Povey, 3/13 December, 1674; DL799/C3, BG; Blencowe (ed.), Sidney Diary, II, 198, 199; Plot to Blathwayt, 4 November, 1681; Add. MSS. 37979, 69; Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 29 September, 1687; Portland MSS. 53.

46 DNB XVIII, 709.
the Gent. is Secretary of Warr, Cl: of the Counsel etc. having raised himselfe by his Industry, from very moderate Circumstances: He is a very proper handsome person, and very dextrous in businesse, and has besids all this married a very greate fortune, his incomes alone by the Army, & his being Cl: of the Counsel, & Secretary to the Committee of Forraigne Plantations brings him in above 2000 pounds per Annum. 47

Our next concern must be to analysé the context in which the dextrous Mr. Blathwayt was operating in the period before the Glorious Revolution.

CHAPTER 2
EXTENSION OF STATE POWER IN THE 1670s AND 1680S

In the 1670s and 1680s, the English administration was characterised by certain distinct underlying principles. As early as 1673, the Whig polemicist Gilbert Burnet purported to see an attempt on the part of the crown to govern on the French model. While Clayton Roberts refers to the permanent erosion of the prerogative between the rise of Danby and the fall of Shaftesbury, the thesis seems questionable when one considers the eighties: certainly, what remained was adequate for the task at hand.¹ No parliament met in Charles II's reign after the Oxford parliament of 1681, and the climate of public opinion created by the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis was probably even more favourable to the crown than was the Restoration itself.² The Rye House Plot strengthened this effect and the disgrace and death of Shaftesbury appeared to have completed the ruin of at least the more extreme section of the Whig party. The domination of the Hyde brothers in the early eighties helped ensure a Tory stranglehold on the administration, and politicians such as Sunderland (who returned to office in 1682) and Godolphin led the way in pressing for an efficient, centralised system.


using the French bureaucratic example. As a Whig satirist put it, it seemed not impossible that 'slimy Portsmouth's creatures' would 'bring French slavery in fashion'. Even the not-very-astute Lord Conway could see the writing on the wall for the moderates. As he confided to Blathwayt, his former undersecretary, in 1683, the fact that he heard nothing of Halifax 'makes me think the Whiggs decline'. The eclipse of Halifax, on the verge of dismissal by the time of Charles's death in 1685 and finally ousted a few months later, indicated the direction in which policy was proceeding, in the colonies as well as at home. The extension of state power in the early eighties, the attempt to bring the City of London, towns in general, and the countryside, under tighter royal control, had their counterpart imperially. 'The King', wrote Blathwayt to Governor Lynch of Jamaica in 1682, 'being in authority at home as he is at present, cannot fail of respect abroad'. In 1679 it had been Halifax who, as Lord President of the Council, led the group which opposed a new form of government for Jamaica on the grounds that it would drive away the planters who claimed

3 J. Miller, James II (Hove, 1978), 112; J.P. Kenyon, Sunderland (London, 1958), 90-91. Kenyon suggests that Sunderland with his visions of transplanted French autocracy was going far beyond the 'patriarchal concept of the promoted aquirearchs' such as the Osbornes and the Hydes.

4 'Satire on Old Rowley' (1680), printed in Elias F. Mengel Jr. (ed.), Poems on Affairs of State II, 1678-1681 (New Haven, 1965), 185. On the Duchess' favour to Sunderland see, for example, Blathwayt's comment to Governor Dutton, 6 August, 1682; BW XXX.

5 Conway to Blathwayt, 3 April, 1683; Add. MSS. 37990, 34.

6 Blathwayt to Lynch, 1 November, 1682; BW XXIII.
the rights of Englishmen and would not be governed like the Irish;\(^7\) and it was Halifax again who in 1684 became involved in a furious dispute in Council with the Duke of York over the principles that might be used to govern New England under a new charter. Most ministers felt, wrote the French ambassador, that the King could and should govern colonies in the manner that appeared to him the most suitable for preserving or augmenting the strength and riches of the mother country. But Halifax enraged James by speaking of the necessity of an assembly, and the rights and privileges of Englishmen.\(^8\)

The accession of James, who had opposed the creation of an assembly in his own proprietary of New York in the mid seventies and whose part in the new Massachusetts charter is obvious from the above,\(^9\) simply served to add fuel to the royal drive for power. The 1685 parliament, which if not subservient was favourable to the royal interests, voted the new king the customs revenue for life and thus unwittingly freed him from the necessity of calling another.\(^10\)

The main theme of the eighties was thus, as J.R. Western indicates, the extension of state power. Imperial policy, as A.P. Thornton has

\(^7\) Blathwayt to the Earl of Carlisle, 31 May, 1679; BW XXII.

\(^8\) Barillon to Louis XIV, 7 December, 1684; quoted in C.J. Fox, Early Part of the Reign of James II (London, 1808), appendix, vii.

\(^9\) And see the comments in Kenyon, Sunderland, 108.

\(^10\) The trade boom of the eighties raised customs levels enormously; see C.D. Chandaman, The English Public Revenue, 1660–1688 (Oxford, 1975), 34.
demonstrated for the West Indies, reflected this theme. Though it was still possible, on occasion, to disregard the colonies (in 1678 the Privy Council, and the Plantations Committee itself, hardly noticed that Lord Vaughan had arrived home from governing Jamaica) increasingly they were regarded as an important field for government activity. Policy was all of a piece, and that unity was reflected in the multiple responsibilities of a man such as William Blathwayt.

The effort to expand state power demanded a variety of methods. Extension of the bureaucracy, centralisation of the administrative departments and judicial process were the major ones in which Blathwayt was involved. Only peripherally was he concerned with that manipulation of politics and the building up of parties which has occupied many historians of this period. However, among Blathwayt's responsibilities was the post of Secretary at War. In recent years Stephen S. Webb has argued forcefully for the existence of what he terms 'garrison government' in England and her colonies, a system backed by the Duke of York, extended largely through the military officers who were his clients and

---


12 Blathwayt to Carlisle, 19 July, 1678, BW XXII.

13 See, for example, the work of J.R. Jones and A. Olson. It should be noted that the emphasis throughout the chapter is on the extension of power over one's own subjects rather than over new populations and territories. The threat to popular assemblies, an obvious part of the centralisation story, has been dealt with extensively elsewhere and will only be touched on here. For references to the literature see P. Haffen-den, The Crown and the Colonial Charters, 1675-1688: Part I, WMD 3rd series XV (1958), 298.
choreographed by Blathwayt in his capacity of Secretary of War and Plantations. Our analysis of the extension of metropolitan power and Blathwayt's part in it, the concern of this chapter and the next, will therefore begin by considering the possibility of military government.

Armed force was never a practicable method of enforcing the royal will and its use was rarely regarded as desirable by the monarchs. Since the Civil War public opinion had of course been extremely sensitive over the existence of a standing army. As Colonel Titus put it to the Commons, 'In peace there is nothing for an army to subdue but Magna Carta'. On two occasions in the seventies, after the Dutch War in 1673 and the French war scare in 1678, Charles II showed signs of wanting to keep in pay the forces that had been raised, but in both instances contrary advice prevailed. In 1679, with the bulk of the Flanders army disbanded, Charles tried to keep a company of guards consisting of two hundred disbanded officers so that he would have officers ready if he should wish to raise troops at some future date, but the Earl of Essex dissuaded him, pointing out the popular apprehension of some design of 'governing by an army' and the impossibility of finding funds for them.

14 Webb's conclusions have received full expression in a recent book: The Governor General: The English Army and the Definition of the Empire, 1569-1681 (Chapel Hill, 1979).

15 Quoted by J. Miller, 'Catholic Officers in the Later Stuart Army', English Historical Review 88 (1973), 35.

In fact the fears of militarism, assiduously cultivated by the opposition, were far greater than the reality could justify. Neither in quantity nor in quality were the armed forces of 1678-88 impressive. Charles II's army was tiny; though swollen somewhat by the return of the Tangier garrison in 1684, even then it was barely six thousand men. Some expansion occurred under James; troops had to be raised against Monmouth at the beginning of the reign. However, most of these were disbanded immediately after the rebellion and the argument that James considered his army in a primarily defensive light is strengthened when one considers that it was not expanded between July, 1685 and March, 1688, when Blathwayt was asked to prepare an establishment for three new regiments of foot. Not until late '88 did James's army exceed twenty thousand men. If we compare these numbers with the approximately eighty thousand troops in pay in the 1690s, it is not surprising that one biographer of William III makes reference to the 'toy army' which James possessed in 1688. Moreover, the reliability of this army was suspect for some time before the revolution. The Florentine envoy cast doubts on it in 1686, while the Imperial envoy informed his master on observing the universal rejoicing at the freeing of the seven bishops that 'was diese Leute so insolent undt kühn machet, ist, dass sie nichts von der Soldatesca...zu förchten haben'.

---

17 Childs, 13. This compared with a French army of 16,000 in 1678—see ibid., 20.

Given that the number of troops available to Charles and James, especially the former, was small, was this compensated for by efficiency in distribution, training and administration? The evidence hardly suggests it. The distribution of regular troops made their use for the maintenance of internal order difficult. Quartering problems were one reason for regimental dispersal, and since a single regiment might be spread over a county or even the whole country, regimental staffs can have been of little use. 19 The garrisons were of even less use than the dispersed regiments as instruments of military absolutism. That experienced soldier the prince of Orange considered England in 1688 open and unprovided with forts. The only troops in garrison were invalid or unregimented companies, holding their appointments as retiring allowances. 20 'Very littl or ould men' of uncertain health were the typical garrison troops, and such energies as they did possess were allowed to dissipate, since privates in garrisons were permitted to work at their trades. The work of garrison officers was strictly part time and governors were local gentlemen such as the Shakerleys at Chester who regarded their commands as family perquisites. 21 The reliability of such

19 M. Beloff, Public Order and Popular Disturbances 1660-1714 (Oxford, 1938), 143; Childs, Army of Charles II, 91. For the problem of running a dispersed regiment see Lt. Col. Lauriston to Blathwayt, 16 September, 1688, Add. MSS. 34152, 21.


21 Description by the Governor of Chester, 1687, Add. MSS. 38694, 87. For more complaints on the state of Chester see Add. MSS. 38695, 86.
local gentlemen and their independent companies as agents of a central government is questionable. Officers who were M.P.s could get unlimited leave of absence while parliament met and absenteeism in general was widespread. In 1679, Henry Sidney found only 'a corporal and three files of musketeers' at a Tilbury fort; seven years later, Blathwayt told the Lieutenant Governor of Berwick that the king was highly displeased that all his captains should be absent at the same time, and all except one without the Lieutenant Governor's leave. 22

The experiences of the loyal Sir John Reresby at York show how little was the interest taken by the central government in inland garrisons in the eighties. Reresby was one local gentleman whose loyalty to the crown was never in doubt. When he was appointed to the government of York in 1682 with the help of Halifax, defeating the Duke of York's candidate, he found only one company of foot in residence, though York was 'at that time one of the most factious towns of the kingdom'. In December he heard the unwelcome news that the king was considering reducing 'such garrisons as were thought least necessary', including York, and using the money saved to fortify the coastal ones. Three months later Lord Dartmouth said that it was simply not worth spending the £30,000 that would be needed to put York in proper defensive shape. Though York was not reduced, neither was it improved, despite all Reresby urged about the town's disloyalty. In 1686 James told Reresby that it was only for his sake that York was kept up as a garrison at all. In the event, it proved the work of only a few minutes to take York for

22 Childs, Army of Charles II, 41, 42; Blathwayt to Lieutenant Governor of Berwick, 29 August, 1686: WO 4/1, 33. For attempts to deal with this at the colonial level see below, p. 46.
the Orange faction in 1688. As Reresby had written to Blathwayt in October of that year, the garrison had neither powder nor ammunition and in any case the gunner was refusing to work any longer without wages. Only the seaport garrisons such as Hull and Portsmouth received close military attention and the major impetus was external not internal threats. Fear of invasion by the French or Dutch, and the necessity of having easy access to the sea if flight should ever prove imperative, weighed heavily on the royal mind.

In sum, England in the decade before the Glorious Revolution was far from militarised. From 1670 on, the army was commanded and run by civilians and politicians, Blathwayt among them, and every effort was made to propitiate civilian sensibilities when military/civil disputes arose. Before 1689 there was no legally established military as distinct from civil law, although the monarch could frame regulations by prerogative for the maintenance of discipline; military offences such as desertion could be adjudged treason or felony and brought before a common law court. The Judge Advocate of the Forces, George Clarke (Blathwayt's future deputy as Secretary at War) found that there were few occasions for Courts Martial in the early eighties, 'there being hardly any land forces in England but the Horse and Foot Guards'.

---


25 NMC Leyborne-Popham, 262.
When problems of military discipline did arise, time and again the Secretary at War urged that common law should be used in their settlement. In response to some queries from Colonel Kirke in 1685, Blathwayt informed the Tangier veteran, recently active against Monmouth in the west, that the Articles of War had only applied to the rebellion, which was now over, and common law should be reintroduced. 26

Clearly the garrisons of England (except perhaps for Hull with its two regiments) lacked, individually and collectively, the powerful, indeed terrifying aspect ascribed to them by Webb. English society could not be so effectively militarised: one Cromwell had been enough. But it may be argued that this did not preclude the existence of a military empire. The small core of professional officers usually served abroad: in Tangier, until its evacuation; in the Anglo-Dutch brigade; in French units—and in the colonies. However, the presence of troops in the colonies was highly sporadic. They tended to be raised for a specific purpose and disbanded when that purpose was achieved or no longer relevant. Thus the two companies of foot raised for Jamaica in 1677 were disbanded in 1682. 27 The Earl of Carlisle's request in 1679 for an additional fifty men, some powder, cannon and small arms and a fourth rate frigate was flatly refused; the Plantations Committee would not urge the king to an outlay of over £500, especially since the French fleet which had been 'hovering over the island' had now returned to Europe. An Order in Council of June, 1679 ordered the paring of American expenses, and Pepys at

26Blathwayt to Kirke, 21 July, 1685; WO 4/1, 12. For other examples see WO 4/1, 15, 45, 47, 54, 57, 72.

27Sir H. Morgan to the Committee, 8 March, 1682; CO 138/4, 68. See also George L. Beer, The Old Colonial System, 1660-1756 (New York, 1933), 114-119.
the Admiralty was busy preparing a scheme whereby the country's total naval expenditure would not exceed £300,000 p.a. 28 When the Lords of Trade were considering in 1686 the Duke of Albemarle's request, as designate Governor of Jamaica, that there be two foot companies stationed in the island, as in the Earl of Carlisle's time, the report stated that they could not possibly advise putting the king to such expense but, 'a sufficient Fund being first settled within the Island for their Raising, Transportation and Maintenance', something might be arranged. The chances of a 'sufficient Fund' being raised by the Jamaican Assembly, well known for its fractious behaviour in tax affairs, were slender. 29 The only standing forces in the West Indies between 1682 and 1688 were the two St. Kitts companies, since Sir Tobias Bridge's Barbados regiment had been disbanded in 1671 having only been kept in existence after the Treaty of Breda because the Treasury was having trouble raising the cash to pay for its disbandment and shipment home. Without the troops the command structure was useless; Governor Dutton in 1681 declared the post of Major General of Barbados 'altogether unnecessary and useless' and abrogated the incumbent's commission. 30

These colonial units lasted far longer as administrative concerns than as effective military forces; troop payment in the colonies was even

28 Blathwayt to Carlisle (1679); BW XXII; A.P. Thornton, West India Policy, 242-244. Though Carlisle's troops may have worried some Jamaicans, there was never any attempt made to use them against the colonists during the struggle with the assembly. For a very different view of the troops see Webb, Governors-General, ch. 6.

29 CO 138/5, 257.

30 This was Christopher Codrington senior; see Stede to Blathwayt, 20 September, 1681; BW XXXIV.
slower than at home and some of Bridge's veterans were still petitioning for their arrears of pay in 1679. In October, 1680, Governor Stapleton of the Leeward Islands complained to the Treasury that royal orders for the payment of the Bridge remnants (his two companies on St. Kitts) had been totally ineffectual: 'Please to consider', wrote the harrassed Governor, 'that we are daily in sight of the French soldiers upon that island who are well paid and accounted...'. The situation was not improved by 1685, when Stapleton was forced to admit that he was paying what had been owed to soldiers who had since died to their starving wives and children. False musters, whether motivated by philanthropy or the greed of the officers, make it difficult to assess the real strength of units which even on paper were not very impressive. The theoretical size of a company was a hundred; this was reduced to eighty, sixty or even forty at various stages in the eighties, as economic exigency dictated. The appalling mortality rates for troops in the West Indies reduced these numbers still further, as did desertion. Colonial service was so unpopular that every effort was made to get troops on board ship before their destination was known to them. They might then spend weeks or even months in the transport ships waiting for the provisions for the voyage to catch up with them. The effect on health is self-evident. Moreover, the troops sent to the colonies were, when possible, what the historian


32 T64/88, 35; CTB VII, 1681-1685, 624, 1316. The French soldiers were getting 9 a day and 'without defalcations or fees' except for a small contribution to l'hôtel des Invalides, reported Blathwayt to the Treasury in his memorandum on Stapleton's petition.

33 T64/88, 87.
of Charles's army calls 'expendable Scotsmen and Irishmen'. This can only have detracted from their military effectiveness since the inefficiency of the Irish units of the English army was notorious. In 1676 the Lord Lieutenant, the Earl of Essex, thought the troops there in worse condition than they had been since the Restoration and complained that the ragged state of his guard was such that when he went out he looked as if he were attended by a company of bailiffs. There was little improvement over the next ten years as the Earl of Clarendon found. 34

If disease did not strike the troops, the local environment might claim them in a different way, as they melted into the local population to take advantage of high colonial pay rates. A garrison of three hundred men occupied New York after its capture from the Dutch in the sixties. By the time Edmund Andros arrived as Governor in 1674, only one company remained, and there were no soldiers left in 1679. New York was then costing £1000 p.a., to be expended on the maintenance of forts and military buildings for a non-existent military. Whether such maintenance really took place is in doubt; Colonel Dongan's correspondence is full of complaints about the state of the colony whose government he took over in 1683. Similarly, the fort on St. Kitts was reported by Sir Nathaniel Johnson in 1687 to be in execrable condition, with only sixteen guns mounted when it ought to have fifty, and only one ladle to load all the guns. 35 Colonists themselves, frustrated at the inadequacy of defence


35 See, for example, Dongan to Blathwayt, 22 August, 1687; BW XI. For St. Kitts, see CSPC 1685-1688, xxix.
provided against Spaniards, French and Indians, sometimes petitioned for troops, being conscious too of the substantial impact garrisons could have on a local economy. This hardly suggests an overpowering fear of the military. 36

In Virginia, the crisis of Bacon's rebellion in 1676, endangering annual tobacco revenues of approximately £100,000, occasioned the only substantial shipment of troops to the colonies in the latter part of Charles's reign. Five hundred men were drawn from the standing regiments in England, and an additional five hundred volunteers made up a total battalion strength of a thousand. By June 1677 news had arrived from the colony that half these soldiers were already dead of disease; no tents had been sent with the expedition and with James City burnt the men had been forced to live on shipboard, with predictable results. Once the rebellion was over, most of the regimental remnants were shipped home, two hundred men being left as a permanent garrison for Virginia. Between the departure of the regiment for England and May, 1679, these two companies remained unpaid. By early 1680 the numbers would sustain only one company; Blathwayt told the Governor of Jamaica that Lord Culpeper had left for his Virginia command with an additional company of a hundred. 37 However, eighteen months later Culpeper was being asked to

36 See, for example, the Barbados petition of 1693 for a regiment, with its stress on the need for manpower in the island; CSPC 1693-6, 759. For an interesting Scottish parallel see Webb, Governors-General, 52 on the impact of Cromwellian troops on the Scottish economy in the 1650s. Note too the comments of Richard S. Dunn, 'Imperial Pressures on Massachusetts and Jamaica' in A.G. Olson and R.M. Brown (eds.), Anglo-American Political Relations, 1675-1775 (New Brunswick, 1970), 64.

37 Blathwayt to Carlisle, 26 March, 1680; BW XXII.
give reasons why the two Virginia companies should not be disbanded. Despite the report of the Lords of Trade recommending continuance, when it was read in Council in the king's presence the verdict was for disbandment—unless, of course, Virginia itself was prepared to pay the upkeep. Only with difficulty did the Lords of Trade save the men from having to sell themselves as indentured servants in the colony. The suggestion by the Secretary of Virginia that a standing guard of one hundred was needed to ensure stable government was also disregarded. 38 Culpeper's successor as Governor, Lord Howard of Effingham, attempting to cope with the disturbances caused by the plant cutters, went so far as to raise twenty men on his own initiative so that there should be at least 'the face of a force': it was a disgrace, he wrote to Blathwayt, that there should 'not be one Person in his Mā'ys Pay for the Defence of ye Governm't'. But the king ordered this little force discontinued. 39

After James's accession, a few troops were sent to the northern colonies; two companies for New England were placed on the military establishment as of 1st September, 1686, and sent out with Andros, now appointed Governor of the newly created Dominion of New England. 40 It is questionable whether this was enough to subdue the local population, if indeed this was the object. The story behind the Andros appointment, retailed for Sir Robert Southwell's benefit by Blathwayt's clerk, John

38CSPC 1681-1685, nos. 259, 268, 300, 335, 336, 341; Nicholas Spencer to Blathwayt, 12 August, 1682; BW XVI.

39CO 5/1357, 41; Effingham to Blathwayt, 21 June, 1685; T64/88, 93.

40Add. MSS. 9755, 6.
Povey, is instructive. The government had intended sending Andros without any troops at all. The governor-designate indicated his unwillingness to depart without them, and the King gave way and seconded a hundred soldiers from the troops then encamped on Hounslow Heath. In that same year, a document entitled 'The present state of New England' suggested that a whole regiment of soldiers would be needed to discipline and encourage the local militias of New England. Three years later Edward Randolph, writing from the Boston gaol from which the two companies had been unable to save either him or his Governor in the revolutionary disturbances, insisted that, on the basis of his fourteen years experience of the New Englanders, fifteen hundred or at the least one thousand good soldiers should be sent to reduce the people.

Polite amusement can have been the only reaction to such demands at Whitehall. It is obvious from the foregoing that problems of expense and organisation severely limited military operations. Even Governors who were not professional soldiers (such as Culpeper and Effingham) were trying to push the home government further than it was prepared to go in supplying troops to the colonies. Those who were soldiers, such as Andros and Dongan, were likely to be even less pleased with the situation. The professional soldiers themselves were brought to the realisation that

---

41 John Povey to Sir Robert Southwell, 26 May, 12 June, 3 July, 1686; Portland MSS. 60. Andros' main concern may well have been the prestige and profit elements of a military establishment rather than a naked display of force. My conclusions differ from Webb's: see 'William Blathwayt, Imperial Fixer: From Popish Plot to Glorious Revolution', WMQ third series XXV (1968), 15-16.

42 'The present state of New England by R. Daniel gent.'; BW VI (undated, but internal evidence and arrangement in the volume suggest 1686). Randolph to the Committee, 5 September, 1689; R. N. Toppan, Edward Randolph (Boston, 1898-1909) III, 296.
the views of local inhabitants had to be taken into account, if only as a means of tapping their pocket books; it was Andros who urged on a reluctant Duke of York the establishment of an assembly for New York, Andros who, at the same time he was insisting on his one hundred soldiers in 1686, was expressing his displeasure at the lack of an assembly for the Dominion of New England.  

The colonies were not readily to be militarised, even in times of internal crisis; Colonel Hender Molesworth, Lieutenant Governor of Jamaica, whose military rank should not conceal the fact that he was essentially a merchant, could not persuade his Council of the necessity for martial law even at a time of severe slave unrest. Instead the island was forced to rely on a couple of volunteer parties, with results which Molesworth had gloomily predicted: one party marched to the place of rendezvous and then marched home again, and the other stirred up 'a wasps' nest'.  

But Jamaica, Massachusetts and the rest were not Tangier, and the home government, even at the height of the power drive of the eighties, perceived that the colonies could not be handled in the same way. The appointment of Colonel Percy Kirke (late of the Tangier garrison) to the government of New England by James II was countermanded when Kirke and his 'Lambs' committed a series of atrocities in the aftermath of the Monmouth rebellion.

---

43 For the Duke's reaction see CSPC 1675–1676, no. 795. John Povey to Sir Robert Southwell, 20 May, 1686; Portland MSS. 60.

44 Molesworth to Blathwayt, 2 November, 1686; BW XXV.

45 Kirke's disregard for civilians and civil law have already been alluded to: see above, p. 37.
The military option of control was severely limited. However, there existed others. Administrative capacity, we are reminded by one historian, sets limits on the activity of any government. If the royal will was to be effectively enforced, it was vital to expand the bureaucracy and create the fiscal and administrative machinery lacking in the localities. Administrative areas had to be made more uniform and more dependent on the central government.\[46\] Such a programme was never so clearly articulated as this suggests. 1660 had been a victory for oligarchy; the administrative reforms of the Long Parliament (such as fewer life grants, fees and sinecures, higher salaries and no reversions) disappeared and the gentry recaptured the middle ranks of the administration; but it was obvious that any schemes for greater government control, whether of counties or colonies, would necessitate a revival of the methods of the fifties. Though the programme was beset by difficulties and limited in execution, the attempt was made and formed the basis of the much more striking changes of the 1690s.\[47\]

Lord Culpeper's view of colonial administration, as expressed in a letter written to the Lords of Trade and Plantations the month after

---


his Virginia government was declared forfeit to the crown, was a little
dated for the eighties. 'No doubt', he wrote sarcastically, 'another
Governor of greater ability will outdo my poor endeavours; but what the
wit of man can expect from a Governor beyond peace and quiet, and large
crop of tobacco, I know not'. As Culpeper's own case clearly revealed,
it was certainly expected that one be resident at one's command. Cul-
peper's departure from Virginia, confided Blathwayt to his deputy audi-
tor in the colony in 1683, had not only been without leave but 'contrary
to his Ma* express commands in Councill...'. The Order in Council
of 3rd November, 1681, forbidding Governors to absent themselves from
their governments without leave, had been renewed less than a year later
directly because of Culpeper's earlier actions when he had left Virginia
on a previous occasion and then proved tardy in his return. It was re-
peated in April, 1688. If a Governor did gain leave of absence, for
health or other reasons, provision had to be made for it; in December
1682 it was decided that one half of his salary, and of all perquisites
and emoluments, should go to the Lieutenant Governor or Commander in
Chief for the time being.

This flurry of Privy Council activity came in part as a result of
the major reorganisation of that body which took place in 1679. Blathwayt

48 CSPC 1681-1685, 1258.
49 Blathwayt to Bacon, 8 September, 1683; BW XIII,
50 CO 5/1357, 211-12; CO 138/4, 74; Blathwayt to Lynch; 21 September,
1682; BW XXIII. Blathwayt told the Governor of Jamaica Culpeper had
loitered so much that the frigate to take him to Virginia had been ordered
not to receive him if he was not already on board.
51 CO 138/4, 140.
informed the Earl of Carlisle that the king had resolved to 'lay aside the use of any single ministry or foreign Committees' and bring all business into the Privy Council. Though the plan proved unwieldy and a standing committee of Trade and Plantations was reconstituted, there had still occurred a certain revitalization of Privy Council activity. The administrative initiatives of the new Plantations committee of 1675 were strengthened. The membership of the committee was such, Blathwayt warned the Governor of Barbados, who was proving annoyingly recalcitrant in sending home information on the island, that 'nothing is neglected by them nor do they want continual opportunities to lay before His Majesty the State of all things...'. In the same year that this warning was issued, the Lords of Trade began to demand that Governors send over the journals of their provincial assemblies to supplement the papers and reports of debates which had been requested since 1675.  

Financial administration was also undergoing reform at this time, in part in response to the new debts incurred at the end of Danby's period of power in preparation for a war which had never taken place. Expenditure had increased, too, because of the Virginia rebellion and hostilities against Algiers. The King, wrote Blathwayt to an official in St. Kitts, 'could never less spare money than at present'.

---


53 See A. Browning, Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and Duke of Leeds, 1632-1712 (Glasgow, 1944-51), I, 324.

54 Blathwayt to Crisp, 23 October, 1680; BW XXII.
officials were always being assured that their schemes were too costly; nonetheless, it was obviously crucial to conserve resources, especially while the embargo on trade with France was in operation. Five sixths of Crown revenues came from customs and excise; the customs had been returned to direct collection in 1671 and were never farmed again, while farming was abandoned in the excise in 1683. Increased wages and the introduction of promotion by merit to all vacancies in the customs in 1685 helped improve the efficiency of the department. Closer central supervision of finance also extended to the colonies, to which customs officers had been sent since 1673 to ensure the enforcement of the Navigation Act of that year. Now further measures were taken. Blathwayt's report to the Treasury on the state of all revenues and profits arising or due to the King in the plantations led directly to the creation of a new post, Surveyor and Auditor General of Plantation Revenues, to which Blathwayt was promptly appointed in the summer of 1680. As investigations of the farming of the 4 1/2% revenue in the Leewards and Barbados, and the alienation of the Virginia quit rents to Lord Culpeper proceeded, the necessity of direct revenue control became increasingly obvious.

---


56 Culpeper gave up his revenue rights in the settlement reached when he surrendered his government; see CTB VII, 1681-85, 1067. The Customs Commissioners took over the management of the 4 1/2% in Barbados and the Leewards in 1684; Thornton, West India Policy, 206. For a discussion of Blathwayt's role as Auditor General and his assertion of royal control of colonial revenues see Beverley W. Bond, Jr., The Quit Rent System in the American Colonies (Gloucester, Mass.; 1965, reprint of 1919 edition), 389ff, and R.A. Preston, 'The Life and Career of William Blathwayt' (unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Leeds, 1932), 33-43.
Meanwhile Blathwayt's deputies were taking up their appointments in the colonies, and some Governors were attempting to cooperate with the policy they embodied; Sir Thomas Lynch in Jamaica suggested the creation of a system of collectors for each parish so that an accurate rent roll could be made up.\(^{57}\) In England, the Treasury office was in the process of acquiring an adequate, permanent establishment of clerical staff, part of that new body of salaried servants which was springing up behind the old institutions.\(^{58}\)

This programme did not, of course, proceed unhindered. Mere multiplication of offices did not of itself ensure administrative improvement. A cardinal tenet of seventeenth century administration was that different officers should act as checks and balances on each other; in practical terms this frequently meant constant bickering over responsibilities. Royal appointees interfered with the Governor's patronage powers and were correspondingly resented: 'being noe pfitt to the Govern'\(^{59}\) but may tell tales and truth', they were likely to be sacrificed if not countenanced from home, the Lieutenant Governor of Barbados informed Blathwayt. Moreover, it was often difficult to erect new offices because of fears that fees and other income for existing ones would be lower; Blathwayt was very dubious about Lynch's proposal that the chief collector of

\(^{57}\)Lynch to Blathwayt, 9 June, 1683; BW XXIV.


\(^{59}\)Stede to Blathwayt, 15 May, 1684; BW XXXIII.
the royal revenue in Jamaica should have 8% of the total and his own
deputy 2% because he did not want an arrangement whereby he benefitted
by someone else's misfortune (traditionally, the collector got the full
10%). 60 Edward Randolph's commission as Blathwayt's deputy in New Eng-
land was delayed by the opposition of the Customs Commissioners.

Then there was the problem of getting rid of the administrative
dead wood. Dismissal was never easy in this period. In letter after
letter Lynch complained that the Jamaican revenues were in total disorder
and he could not send the accounts because of the incompetence of the
Receiver, Mr. Martyn. Martyn was also making the life of Blathwayt's
deputy a misery by his 'refractoriness & impertynence'. Their lordships
would never see a rent roll of Jamaica through the methods employed by
the Receiver, claimed Lynch. But Blathwayt's laconic comment on the
contents of one of Lynch's lengthy letters summarised the problem.
'Martin (sic) a Cdxcomb', wrote the Plantations Secretary '—but a
Patentee'. 61 Only death or legal process could remove the Martyns from
the bureaucracy. 62 However, efforts could be made to cut down on problems
for the future; after 1679, there was a decline in the number of posts
granted on life tenure, and in the number of reversions. 63

60 Aylmer, King's Servants, 134, 446; Blathwayt to Lynch, 18 July, 1683;
BW XXIV.

61 Lynch to Blathwayt, 12 June, 1682, 8 October, 1682; BW XXIII.
Lynch to Blathwayt, 28 July, 1683, 23 February, 1683/4; BW XXIV.

62 On the application of the latter see below, pp. 53-5.

63 For a detailed discussion of the point see J.C. Sainty, 'A Reform
in the Tenure of Offices during the reign of Charles II'. Bulletin of
the Institute of Historical Research 41 (1968), 150-171.
Despite the caveats noted above, then, substantial administrative changes were effected in the decade after the fall of Danby. The ethic of a reformed civil service was well expressed by Blathwayt when he warned a colonial Governor that he expected no opposition to his patent as Auditor General since it was not 'a benefitt intended originally for me but a constitution found necessary for the king's service...'. The growth of royal administrative capacity depended on the multiplication of conscientious officials such as Blathwayt.

It has become a truism that the seventeenth century was a period obsessed with legal process, and that constitutional and other problems were seen in legal terms. England, we are told by one historian, was a legal rather than a geographical expression, its history only to be written through interpreting its law. The very fact that lawyers constituted the largest group who obtained their offices because of their professional qualifications was bound to give a legal slant to administration.

This said, however, most historians have then turned to what they consider the 'realities' underlying the legal terms. No-one would deny

64 Blathwayt to Witham, 29 January, 1680/1; BW XXXV.


the existence—and the utility—of legal fictions. But the events of the eighties show that the use of the law to strengthen the power of the crown was not just a subsidiary affair, a footnote to military or administrative techniques. The law was a major, probably the major, weapon in the hands of the monarchs. As Lord Keeper Guilford told his king, 'his majesty's defensive weapons were his guards [the army] and his offensive weapons the laws...': A man could not be a good lawyer, and honest, went on the Lord Keeper, 'but he must be a prerogative man'.

These were not just the sycophantic outpourings of some time-serving lackey. Francis North, Lord Guilford, was a highly respected lawyer. The law was itself authoritarian; once this was recognised it was logical to exploit it. After 1668, the professional judiciary was brought under stricter control; judges were appointed at pleasure not on good behaviour. The triumph of Toryism in the last years of Charles was reflected in the composition of the bench. But though Landon, the historian of the Whig lawyers of the eighties, quite rightly emphasises the completeness of the judicial defeat of the Whigs between 1681 and 1685, he is wrong to assume that his chosen group of Whigs must represent the bulk of the legal profession. There was widespread support for Charles's actions, from

---

67 Roger North, Lives of the Norths (London, 1826), II, 80, 81.

lawyers and from country gentlemen too. Reresby was happy to take an active rôle in the remodelling of the York charter, and indeed, Roger North (regarded by Clarendon as one of the 'only two honest lawyers I have met with') claimed that the first overtures for the regulation of the corporations came not from the court but from the country gentlemen. Furthermore, even some of the leading Whig lawyers were not averse, at least initially, to the crown's legal offensive. One of the first suggestions of crown action against the charter of a corporate borough in the eighties came from Henry Pollexfen, future champion of London's charter. In the aftermath of Monmouth's rebellion, Pollexfen, as senior member of the Western circuit, was perfectly willing to function as the crown's chief prosecutor. Until 1686, the Stuart use of law was sophisticated and successful. Only when James, hardly the most subtle of men, pushed it to extreme limits was the weapon blunted. For example his request to Attorney General Sawyer to draw up warrants authorizing Catholic clerics to hold benefices in the Church of England met with the stinging rebuke it deserved. Henage Finch, Solicitor General and up to this point a supporter of the crown's legal schemes, was dismissed in the same month.

What could be achieved by legal process? *Scire facias* and quo warranto proceedings could be used to nullify the patents of individual

---


70 Landon, *Triumph of the Lawyers*, 179, 107, 183, 191. Sawyer was forced out of office in the following year. The striking differences between Charles's and James's programmes are also suggested in Sinner, *Charles II and Local Government*, 20.
office holders and the charters of any incorporated body. More care, too, could be taken to ensure uniformity of law, and to bring the laws of colonies into conformity with those of England. Thus the Governors of the four royal colonies were instructed to provide copies of all laws for the consideration of the Lords of Trade, and the process of judicial review of colonial laws was much increased after 1680. The King's legal powers were pushed to their utmost limits or even slightly beyond; Blathwayt informed Governor Dutton of Barbados that the penal laws Dutton had sent to England in the hope of having them repealed had been made by virtue of the Earl of Carlisle's charter 'whereby the King did not reserve to himself any such power but yet if they shall appear unfitt to be continued the King's Prerogative may as well extend to abrogate them...'. Any threats to royal jurisdiction by colonial courts were speedily dealt with; the Lieutenant Governor of Barbados, Sir John Witham, was assured that all proceedings against him by Governor Dutton were "Extrajudicial and Incompetent" since the King expected to have the "Cognizance of them alone without having them examined or punisht by Inferior Courts...".\(^7^1\)

It is difficult to be sure whether actions against individuals were stepped up in the eighties. Royal and Treasury displeasure with Slingsby at the Mint, because of the revenue shortages when he made up his 1670-1677 accounts, led to a *scire facias* action by the Attorney General.

---

\(^7^1\) On judicial review see Bieber, *The Lords of Trade and Plantations*, ch. V. A detailed account can be found in Elmer B. Russell, *The Review of American Colonial Legislation by the King in Council* (New York, 1976, reprint of 1915 edition), especially ch. 1. For the tardiness of Barbados in providing its laws see Blathwayt to Atkins, 25 November, 1678; BW XXIV. The complexity of the problems for all the West Indian colonies is discussed in Thornton, *West India Policy*, ch. V; the discussion of Jamaica is particularly illuminating. Blathwayt to Dutton, 29 April, 1682; BW XXX. On the Witham case see Blathwayt to Witham, 20 January, 1684/5; BW XXXIV.
he was replaced by Commissioners. 72 The problem of Martyn, Receiver of Jamaica, alluded to earlier, was also attacked by legal means, a scire facias action being brought against his patent. The court case outlasted the life of the Receiver, but Governor Lynch emphasised to the Treasury that the action was continuing and that it was important to grant no new patent except during pleasure. 73 If scire facias were judged too slow a process, faster action could be instituted. In the case of Culpeper, wrote Blathwayt to Lynch, there was 'a more compendious way found out to vacate his Patent for life than by a Scire facias. An Inquisition is to be immediately found and My Ld. Howard of Effingham is designed to succeed him immediately.' 74 But here the circumstances were exceptional.

There can be no doubt that actions against corporate bodies greatly increased in numbers in the period under consideration. The method proved speedy, effective and cheap. The threatened bodies, on the other hand, found the process dispiritingly expensive. The Whig lawyers charged the corporation of London over £3500 for their unsuccessful plea on its behalf, and when a case was lost there were fines to be paid and then substantial expenses in securing a new charter. 75

The challenge posed by corporate bodies to an expanding central

72 Blathwayt to Carlisle, 9 July, 1680; BW XXII; CSPD 1679-80, 531; CSPD 1680-81, 429.

73 The suggestion for legal action against Martyn's patent came from Lynch: see Lynch to Blathwayt, 9 June, 1683; BW XXIV. See also same to same, 23 July, 8 August, 1684; BW XXIV.

74 Blathwayt to Lynch, 18 July, 1683; BW XXIV.

75 Sinner, 'Charles II and Local Government', 139, 141, 142: it had cost Bristol almost £1500 for its new charter in 1664.
authority is obvious. Corporations, as Thomas Hobbes reminded his readers, were 'many lesser commonwealths in the bowels of a greater, like worms in the entrails of a natural man'. Governor Lynch echoed the thought when he complained to the Plantations Secretary about the arrogant behaviour of the monopolistic Africa company. The company was sure, reported Lynch, that Blathwayt was against their charter, and seemed to want to 'set up a Commonwealth in a Monarchy, or shewe us, That as soon as one comes into a Comp[a], ones out of Engld'.

A quo warranto challenged the corporate body to show by what right it exercised particular privileges. Proceedings were channelled through the offices of the Secretary of State or Attorney General; Secretaries Jenkins and Conway directed the onslaught in the early stages. By mid 1682, Narcissus Luttrell could note that the mayors of several corporations had surrendered their charters to the crown; and a combination of local landed influence and judicial threats achieved mass surrenders through the work of the Earl of Bath, the Duke of Beaufort, George Jeffreys and the Duke of Newcastle. The chief corporation which chose to fight for its charter was London, and it is impossible to exaggerate the interest shown by the crown in every detail of London affairs in the early eighties. As Blathwayt informed one colonial Governor, the election of the London

---

76 Hobbes' remark is quoted in Landon, Triumph of the Lawyers, 100; Lynch to Blathwayt, 23 July, 1683; BW XXIV.

sheriffs had caused the king to come to town 'on purpose to be near at hand upon the occasion'. These city squabbles were not just 'low history', wrote Roger North: for was it not a 'battail rangee' between the king and city authorities? In June, 1683, King's bench gave judgement against London in the quo warranto proceedings and the common council agreed to submit. All city officers were removed from their posts, Jeffreys was appointed City Recorder and a royal commission was set up to oversee the administration of municipal affairs.

With the surrender of London, the campaign against corporations turned into a rout. Between December 1681 and October 1688, approximately two hundred and forty corporations of varying types were regulated. The livery companies were dealt with, and by 1686 Luttrell was reporting that there was 'hott discourse' of quo warranto proceedings against bishoprics and deaneries, and of regulation of the law societies. In all cases, the new charters were most carefully drafted in order to give the crown the right of nomination, or at least approval of nominees, to the important posts in the company or corporation. Thus, it was hoped, political management of any future elections and control of local juries would be easier.

78 Blathwayt to Carlisle, 9 July, 1680; BW XXII. North's comment is quoted in H.H. Schless (ed.), Poems on Affairs of State III, 1682-1685 (New Haven, 1968), 216. The vast number of poems in this volume on the London shrieval elections, the London charter proceedings and writs of quo warranto in general indicates the impact of crown actions in these fields: see, for example, 207, 380, 423, 444.


80 Sinner, 'Charles II and Local Government', 17; Luttrell I, 368, 378. See also North's reference to 'the trade of procuring charters': Lives of the Norths II, 67. On political management as a technique of royal control see Jones, Revolution of 1688, esp. chs. 3, 6. For the significance of new charters to local trials see Keeton, 'The Judiciary and the Constitutional Struggle', 60.
The extension of this policy to the colonies was both logical and inevitable, particularly in view of the overlap of personnel: Francis North, Lord Guilford, was a member of the Plantations Committee after 1680 and very active in colonial administration, 81 while Blathwayt's stint as undersecretary to Conway meant that he had had to handle much of the initial paperwork in the early quo warranto proceedings. Blathwayt's father had been a lawyer and the son too had trained at the Middle Temple before embarking on a career in administration. The attack on the Bermuda charter in 1679, and those which followed, may also have owed something to the increasing influence of the Duke of York, who had been active in the much more minor English corporation remodelling schemes of the sixties. 82 If the acire facias against the Bermuda company proceeded somewhat slowly in contrast to the cases against the corporations in England, it was not so much because of a lack or will, (though Bermuda was not, certainly, regarded as a colony of major significance), but because of a commendable caution: Blathwayt stressed to the Treasury that the Attorney General should delay his decision until the inhabitants of the island promised to vote a revenue in the assembly, thus freeing the crown from possible future expenses in support of the government. Not until November, 1684 was judgement brought down against the Bermuda

81 Bieber, The Lords of Trade, 34; North, Lives of the Norths II, 102.

company on a writ of quo warranto. 83

Meanwhile, the efficacy of legal proceedings seemed obvious to colonial governors and other officials as well as to the authorities at Whitehall. The news that the king had overcome the London charter led Governor Cranfield to suggest a quo warranto against Rhode Island; two years later, Edward Randolph was convinced that with charters 'at so low an ebb', Mason's rights in New Hampshire would never hold out on a trial at the Council Board. Randolph had already been instrumental in beginning quo warranto proceedings against the Massachusetts Bay company. 84 Though Richard Wharton told Blathwayt that some malcontents were explaining to the people that a writ was a 'poore toothless creature', those same opponents of the crown's policy certainly spared no trouble or expense in defending their charter in England; according to Randolph, monies designed for Indian education were diverted to the defence fund. 85 But Massachusetts could hardly achieve what London had not, and the charter was duly annulled. No wonder Blathwayt was surprised

83 T64/88, 32-3; CSPC 1681-1685, 1967. For a Bermudian comment on the proceedings (and request for official employment in the necessary re-organisation) see George Turfrey to Blathwayt, 6 April, 1683; BW V. A detailed account can be found in Philip S. Haffenden, 'The Crown and the Colonial Charters, 1675-1688', I, WMQ 3rd series XV (1958), 302-305. See also the suggestions of Richard S. Dunn regarding the delays in the Bermuda case: 'The Downfall of the Bermuda Company: A Restoration Farce', WMQ 3rd series XX (1963), 487-512.

84 Cranfield to Blathwayt, 5 October, 1683; BW I. Randolph to Southwell, 3 October, 1685; Toppen, Edward Randolph IV, 59. For the report of Randolph's instructions see Luttrell, Brief Relation I, 274 (entry for 14 August, 1683).

85 Wharton to Blathwayt, 15 September, 1684; BW VI; Randolph to Sir Nicholas Butlet, 29 March, 1688; BW I. For an account of the Massachusetts proceedings see Haffenden, 'Colonial Charters' I, 299-302, 305-307.
that Lord Baltimore, proprietor of Maryland, was pressing boundary claims against other colonies so forcefully. At a time when writs were 'of such force against Charters' his actions were most unwise. Three months later, the Attorney and Solicitor General had given their opinion that the Maryland charter was on many counts forfeit to the crown and the Governor of Virginia was being asked to furnish evidence with which to start proceedings. 'Prince Penn', claimed Blathwayt, was ready to resign his principality, the Duke was willing to surrender New York to the king and the proprietors of Carolina would soon follow. The charters of Connecticut and Rhode Island were also being investigated. 86

The death of Charles II put a temporary halt to these grand schemes. All over the empire, authority wavered as Governors watched anxiously for the ships bearing their instructions. Judges in Jamaica refused to sit in cases of life and death, and would only do so reluctantly in property cases; all waited for their new commissions. They were also waiting to see whether the Duke of Monmouth's rebellion would render their oaths to James superfluous. Better to do nothing than to perform acts which might later be construed illegal and furnish the courts with materials for years to come. 87

Monmouth defeated, the crown could resume its legal campaign. 88 But the situation had altered. James's religious policies and personal

86 Blathwayt to Effingham, 6 September, 1684, 9 December, 1684; BW XIV; Haffenden, 'Colonial Charters' I, 307.

87 Molesworth to Blathwayt, 29 August, 1685; CSFC 1685-1688, 339. Again the emphasis on the legal implications of actions is striking.

88 A definite statement was made condemning the principle of charter governments: see Haffenden, 'Colonial Charters' II, 454.
predilections made Baltimore and Penn secure in their proprietaries. To the north, proceedings were begun against the charters of Rhode Island and Connecticut, though they were impeded when Randolph found that, because of delays in England and the length of his voyage, the writs were out of date. 89 James may have had a greater interest in colonial administration than his brother, but the weakening of the Plantations Committee which was implicit in James's decision to take a more personal role in policy direction, and the change of personnel in that body when room was made for some Catholic members inexperienced in colonial affairs, had serious effects. The king's increasing preoccupation with his religious objectives and his apparent mental decline, combined with the changes in the chief legal officers, all served to erode the grand colonial design. 90 Nonetheless, Rhode Island and Connecticut submitted, and the proprietors of East New Jersey offered to surrender their right to the government, if not to the soil, in a petition on which the Treasury asked Blathwayt's opinion in 1688. Proceedings against the Bahamas and the Carolinas were still pending in the summer of that year. 91 But the attention of the monarch was by now directed more across the Channel than the Atlantic; and James's policy

---

89 See Webb, 'Imperial Fixer' I, 14-15. Randolph to Blathwayt, 29 May, 1686; BW I.

90 See Haffenden, 'Colonial Charters' II, esp. 457ff., and also Jones, Revolution of 1688, 253, 254. On James's problems with the bench from 1686 on, see Havighurst, 'James II and the Twelve Men in Scarlet', 534ff.

91 CTB VIII, 1685-1689, 1995. An Order-in-Council in May, 1686 had directed the Attorney General to proceed against the Carolinas, the Bahamas and Pennsylvania; see Haffenden II, 457. But Penn was safe when James tried to enlist the support of the nonconformists.
of circumventing rather than utilising the traditional machinery of
government, a contrast to his brother's methods, meant that local in-
terests and parties would not support him. The increased necessity
for 'good' judges was obvious and received continual emphasis in the
letters of the little band of truly loyal colonial officials. Matters
could not proceed 'regularly', wrote Randolph, until men from England
could be sent as judges, who would not be drawn to 'neglect or oppose
his Majesty's interests and Rights'. Such appointments would also increase
the number of officials directly dependent on London.

There did not seem, however, to be the leisure or the leadership
at Whitehall in the last two years of the reign to consider how vital
it was to combine careful choice and expansion of judicial and adminis-
trative personnel with legal process. The political reorganisation which
resulted from the annulment of the various charters was the Dominion of
New England, ultimately extended to include New York and the Jersies.
It was grandiose in conception but feeble in execution; though military
motives had been paramount in its formation, one wonders how 'terrible'
it really was to the French. It was certainly not terrible to the
inhabitants; within three years of assuming his enormous responsibili-
ties, Governor Andros was viewing life from a 'low, damp Room' in Boston

92 Sinner, 'Charles II and Local Government', 168, 290-1. Sinner
argues the case only for England but the application to the colonial
situation is obvious.

93 Randolph to Blathwayt, 31 March, 1687; BW I; for a similar request
see Andros to Blathwayt, 25 May, 1687; BW III.

94 See the description by Blathwayt in a letter to Randolph, 10 March,
1687/8; Teppan, Edward Randolph IV, 216.
gaol. The extent to which James's colonial schemes had parted company with reality had been made brutally clear. 95

In the 1660s, Charles II had been assured by his generals that in the last resort it is with an army, not with the lawyers, that the sovereign controls multitudes. 96 But controlling the multitudes with an army had been shown, in the seventies and eighties, to be impractical for reasons of finance and organisation and because of the almost hysterical political outbursts aroused by the mere threat of army action. Furthermore there is no evidence that such military control was a constituent government objective. The belief that it was, however, or the pretence of such a belief, helped shape the Revolution Settlement. The same Mutiny Act which at last gave proper legal status to military law simultaneously ensured parliamentary control over the army and the Declaration of Right made parliamentary consent necessary for the exercise of martial law. Even more significant the financial settlement of 1690, described by Clayton Roberts as temporary, inadequate and encumbered, set practical limits on the exercise of the royal military prerogative. 97

Yet if in some respects the end results of colonial policy in the

95 Randolph to Blathwayt, 25 October, 1689; BW I. Haffenden rightly emphasises the weaknesses of the structure; and see below, ch. 3.


eighties had been disappointing, there had also been some striking successes in the Stuart design of extending central power over the localities. The weapon of the law had been used by Charles with great subtlety and remarkable results; it was only the gross distortions of the policy under James which had such disastrous political consequences. The terms of the Revolution Settlement demonstrate the contemporary fear of legal absolutism, a perception founded on a much more solid reality than the fear of the misuse of the military prerogative. Particular clauses in the Bill of Rights dealt with specific grievances such as the dispensing power. The London charter was restored and no further quo warranto actions were planned. Though colonial charters were not restored and the crown was still anxious to pursue policies of imperial centralisation and colonial uniformity, any further resumption proceedings would have to be channelled, not through the royal judges, but through parliament. It was significant that, in a revolution noted more for its continuity than its purges, not one of the ten judges in office at the close of James's reign retained their posts or ever held office again. Moreover, seven of the judges were excluded from the Act of Indemnity, while many judicial decisions of 1681-8 were nullified or reversed. 98

It was the policy of administrative expansion and reform which proved to have the greatest staying power at the revolution. William was both willing to continue the bureaucrats of Charles and James in office and to protect them from the witch hunts of the Whigs. The wars

98 Havighurst, 'James II and the Twelve Men in Scarlet', 523; Cockburn, A History of English Assizes, 259. Legal weapons were not entirely laid aside, however; cf. the setting up of Admiralty courts in the colonies in the late nineteenth.
of the nineties provided a huge impetus to administrative growth, even as they deprived the government of the requisite leisure to exploit it. The accession of William and Mary by no means signalled the close of the campaign to extend state power, no more than it signalled the close of the career of William Blathwayt.
CHAPTER 3

BLATHWAYT AND THE GRAND PREROGATIVE DESIGN, 1668-1688

William Blathwayt in his own person seemed to summarize the main lines of policy development of the seventies and eighties. Secretary at War since 1683, part of his job was to supervise troop movements, including those to the colonies. As Secretary to the Committee of Trade from 1676, taking over from an exhausted Sir Robert Southwell, and clerk to the Privy Council from 1678, he was in a position to observe the major administrative developments of the period. Auditor General of the Plantations from 1680 on, he was henceforward regarded as the Treasury's expert on colonial finance; he also had important links to the Customs Commission. As the Earl of Conway's deputy in the Secretary of State's office, he had handled some of the organisation of the writs of quo warranto in England in the eighties, a task for which his legal training had given him excellent preparation.

Few individuals could have been in a better position to understand the military, administrative and legal developments of the time. Did Blathwayt also help to formulate policy, and on what lines? Blathwayt's vast correspondence in this period is notably lacking in any statement of his political philosophy, which is precisely what one would expect from a man who was to survive four reigns and one revolution. A comment on Harrington's Oceana scribbled on the bottom of a letter in

\[1\] Southwell was a member and asked permission for Blathwayt to handle the job during his period of ill health.
1675 is slender evidence on which to build. The most explicit public statement concerning his views on running the colonies is contained in his 'Reflections on a Paper concerning America', c.1685.

The paper on which Blathwayt was commenting has not survived, and its author is unknown, but Blathwayt's arguments are clear. On the question of land policy, he agreed that in Jamaica and elsewhere huge quantities of land had been taken up by individuals and that as the colonies became better peopled there must be insistence on the actual cultivation of large estates; this would also increase the royal revenues arising from quit rents. The Jamaican lands of the Earl of Carlisle and Sir Thomas Lynch ought to be made liable to quit rents or forfeited, especially since the proprietors were not 'needy persons'. All the plantations were worthy of the greatest royal care, for they enlarged the king's 'Empire and Revenue'; a clear statement, here, of the classic mercantilist argument that profit and power ought jointly to be considered.

To the author's (hardly novel) suggestion that good governors were necessary, Blathwayt could only agree, stressing that they were the more vital since the governor had nothing to support him 'but His Commission & authority', and great temptations awaited governors in areas so far from 'the Master's eye' where the Crown had so few officers of its own appointment.

In point six of his reply, Blathwayt discussed the author's suggestion of a Governor or Viceroy of the plantations who should reside in England. This would certainly give a title and some profit to a

---

2 Blathwayt to ?, 2 September, 1675; DJ799/C6, BG; 'Why the People of Oceana have blown up their king [is] that their kings did not first blown(sic) up them'.


person of that 'Eminent quality', noted Blathwayt sarcastically, but its practical utility was negligible. It would not advance the king's interest since the Viceroy would have a deputy, accountable only to his immediate superior and thus one stage further removed from the royal directions. Such a leasing out of government power was exactly what Blathwayt wished to avoid.

Trade and relations with the Spaniards were next discussed. It was, wrote Blathwayt, impossible for the king to acquire possession of Providence without great expense and a rupture with the Spaniards. Trade with the Spaniards could safely be carried on in Jamaica, provided that the privateers were totally destroyed. The privateers were supported not only by the French but also by English colonies such as the Bahamas, Carolina, Maryland and New England; Blathwayt hoped that the voiding of the charters of these colonies would largely remove this problem.

In point nine the author had clearly expressed a desire for the settlement of Tobago. The Secretary of the Plantations felt that England already possessed sufficient plantations to receive as many emigrants as would go there for many years, and did not wish to see the depopulation of any other islands for the sake of Tobago, 'besides ye hazard of His Ma'ies Custome'. It was, however, important that no other nation be permitted to settle Tobago, and that no other nation but the Spaniards be permitted to 'thrive or Plant in ye West Indies'.

The final sections of the document discussed New England. Blathwayt could not see the purpose of putting the king to any charge for New England, except for shipping and a 'small Honorary Guard' for the governor. If the people proved 'refractory', then, he judged, the power
of shipping would be much more effective than 1000 men in pay, which would cost the crown £20,000 p.a. and bring no 'profitable return' except the use of New England's men and ships as occasion demanded. The Secretary at War was hardly espousing militarist attitudes.

The nature of the empire according to Blathwayt had been spelled out clearly enough. It must hold its own against the French, but it was not to be particularly expansionist, for subjects not territory were the pressing need. It was not to exist for the benefit of a few wealthy proprietors; consolidation in the royal interest must be the rule. The authority of the crown must be made manifest through its governors and other officials, and the revenues of the crown must at all times be a primary concern. 3

Most historians have seen Blathwayt as very much the unquestioning instrument of the royal will. 4 Certainly his attitudes towards individuals tended to follow, rather than precede, expressed royal opinions. In the case of Lord Culpeper, he had played an important rôle in his removal from office in 1683 when royal disapproval of the Virginia governor was at its height, and reported unfavourably on all Culpeper's petitions. But in July, 1688, when Culpeper was praying for confirmation of his grant of the Northern Neck area of Virginia, and a slight alteration in its terms, Blathwayt in his report to the Treasury agreed with

3 'Reflections on a Paper concerning America', 1685, BL416, BH. For the full text of this document see below, Appendix.

4 See, for example, J.R. Western, Monarchy and Revolution, 92; J.H. Plumb, The Origins of Political Stability: England 1675-1725 (Boston, 1967), II. G.L. Beer, The Old Colonial System (New York, 1933), I, II allows Blathwayt a minor rôle in policy making, but not as significant as Sir George Downing's. Bieber, Lords of Trade, 45, claims Blathwayt was more interested in methods than policy.
every single argument that Culpeper put forward. Culpeper was in favour, his support for James vital at his juncture, and the outcome therefore inevitable. Blathwayt was too circumspect to press a case too strongly when the vagaries of royal favour seemed likely to interfere with policies of administrative centralisation. When coffee house rumours that Sir Edward Winter might replace him as governor of Jamaica reached Sir Thomas Lynch, Lynch wrote to Blathwayt, one of his patrons, that he realised that the Plantations Secretary was 'too much a Courtier' to appear act any Great Man' but perhaps Lords Clarendon and Rochester could support him.

Nonetheless, whenever possible Blathwayt pressed the imperial case. In 1679, he inveighed against a scheme for a Scots plantation in the West Indies, in part because it was to be 'a Propriety as absolute as that of Maryland'. It would certainly, he went on, be a greater plague to the King even than New England, and thus, it followed, no joy to Blathwayt either. When a proprietary grant was being made to William Penn in 1681, the annotation on the outside in Blathwayt's hand read 'This grant is not to passe without such restrictions as my Lords shall think fit' and copious marginal comments show the limitations that Blathwayt intended should be placed on 'Prince Penn'. Penn's graceful compliments to Blathwayt on his knowledge of American

---

5 See the striking account of the Culpeper dismissal in Webb, 'Imperial Fixer' I, 10-12 (which errs however in some details). On the petition reports see T64/88, 65-8, 155. The confirmation mentioned his father's 'faithful and continuous service to the Crowne and also his owne'; see Haffenden, 'Colonial Charters' I, 309.

6 Lynch to Blathwayt, 15 November, 1683; BW XXIV.
affairs had not in the least distracted the secretary of the planta-
tions from the major issues. 7

Blathwayt's patronage connections in this period help to clarify
his political stance. There was no doubt of his good Tory standing.
His correspondence with the Lieutenant Governor of Barbados, Edwyn Stede,
gives an indication of his animus against those of 'the Carolina and
Shaftesbury Cutt'. 8 His chief patron in the eighties was the monarch,
and he enjoyed excellent relations with the Earls of Clarendon, Roches-
ter and Nottingham. Godolphin thought highly of him also. There seems
to have been little in the way of a relationship with Sunderland, how-
ever, (except perhaps some ill feeling at the time of the Council clerk-
ship dispute), 9 or the extremist Roman Catholics who seemed to be the
monarch's chief advisors in the second half of James's reign. Blathwayt
showed no sign of wishing to convert to Catholicism. No doubt he shared
Lieutenant Governor Stede's disdain for the sudden converts such as Sir
Thomas Montgomery of Barbados who imported both a Roman Catholic priest
and a Jesuit to his estate on the island in an excess of Catholicizing
zeal. 10 Although he served as a key witness for the prosecution in the
trial of the seven bishops, it was not a role he relished.

Thus far the client. What of Blathwayt as patron? The influence

7Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 30 October, 1679; Portland MSS.
51; 'Draught of a Grant to Wm Penn', BW VII; Penn to Blathwayt, 30
July, 1683; BW VII.

8Stede to Blathwayt, 18 December, 1683, 3 June, 1687; BW XXXIII,
XXXII.

9See ch. 1, p. 24.

10Stede to Blathwayt, 16 August, 23 October, 1688, BW XXXII.
that he possessed sprang from the offices he occupied and his access to the monarch. The wheels of seventeenth century administration were set in motion only by constant petitioning; even (or perhaps one should more accurately say particularly) salary payments were only to be acquired by a prolonged campaign of letter writing and (if possible) personal interviews. 11 The organisation of such campaigns was best managed by experienced Whitehall bureaucrats. If a petition were to be presented at the Council Board, the friendship of the clerk in waiting was judged by one bureaucrat to be as valuable as three of the Council since he could give advice on wording and present the petition at a suitable time and in the proper tone of voice. Governor Dutton of Barbados, annoyed at receiving a mandamus to give a certain Binnes employment, was convinced that things would have gone very differently if Blathwayt or Secretary Jenkins had been at the Council when the Binnes petition was presented. 12

Help was to be gained by means official and unofficial, as agents of the colonies and other soon perceived. St. Kitt's man in London in the 1680s, Christopher Jeaffreson, advised the islanders 'to make this require Blathwayt their friend by some present, for he is in a station that enables him to be one...'. 13 Colony after colony concluded in the

---

11 The more novel the method of petitioning the better; in 1688 the Marquess of Powis brought the Prince of Wales to the King with a petition in his hand asking for the licensing of a larger number of hackney coaches, the proceeds to be applied to looking after foundlings. He was then only a few weeks old. 19 July, 1688: C.J.W. Ellis (ed.), Ellis Correspondence (London, 1829), II, 55.


13 J.C. Jeaffreson (ed.), A Young Squire of the Seventeenth Century (London, 1878), II, 12. Jeaffreson suggested £20 initially and more as occasion required, stressing that Blathwayt could repay if 'sevenfolds'; ibid., II, 14, 15. For a discussion of presents and their significance, and especially of their contribution to the building of Dyrham Park, see ch. 8.
eighties, as Blathwayt added the Auditor Generalship of the plantations, the Secretaryship at War and other offices to his existing posts, that providing suitable 'gratifications' to him and to his clerk, John Povey, was a worthwhile investment. 14 From minor officials to governors, all knew the advantages of 'a line of Information from the Plantation office' and an advocate to 'do them right' in Council and elsewhere. 15 As Edward Randolph, Surveyor General of the Customs, and Blathwayt's deputy auditor in New England, moaned at one of the frequent low points of his career, 'I have no freind but God & you to stand by me'. By 1700, the date of this complaint, Randolph had already enjoyed Blathwayt's patronage for close to twenty years. When Randolph could not afford to follow the court to Oxford in the spring of 1681 to press his case for employment, it was Blathwayt who acted for him, well knowing that Randolph must 'stick in ye Briars' if not given 'a favourable heave'. 16

To the governors Blathwayt could promise his 'good offices' at the Council of Trade, and make favourable reports on salary and other petitions referred to him by the Treasury. The utility of pluralism became apparent. When Governor Lynch of Jamaica was trying to get the income from fines and forfeitures in the island applied to government expenses, Blathwayt suggested the Jamaica agent, Littleton, could present a memo to the Treasury; then 'if it be referred to me as I believe it will', he could give a favourable opinion and the Lords would almost

14 See, for example, the cases of New Plymouth—note 18 below, and of Barbadoes; undated memorandum [1686 ?], BW XXXIII.

15 Dudley to Blathwayt, 20 September, 1685; BW IV; Lynch to Blathwayt, 16 February, 1681; CSPC 1681-5, no. 20; Bulkley to Blathwayt, 7 December, 1683; BW IV.

16 Randolph to Blathwayt, 23 November, 1700; BW II; Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 19 March, 1680/1; Portland MSS. 52.
certainly consent. 17 Of course a quid pro quo was expected; the grateful governor could make sure that Blathwayt's salary as Auditor General (all of it raised in the colonies) was actually paid, or make suitable contributions to the fauna, flora and fabric of Blathwayt's country house, Dyrham Park. With a bureaucracy of such slender size, a system of mutual aids was often the only way to effect any ends at all.

Sometimes groups of colonial politicians approached Blathwayt, hoping to have some particular line of policy implemented or grievances redressed. When New Plymouth won the Mounthope area, defeating the claims of Massachusetts and Rhode Island, leading colonists congratulated Blathwayt and Southwell on being 'our Remembrancers' to his Majesty and were soon working to engage their favour in the matter of the new patent. 18 (Possibly Blathwayt's usual animus against colonial charters was lulled by the smallness of the colony involved and the largeness of the fee.) When the proprietors of West New Jersey wished to complain to the King of various injustices they claimed to have suffered, they considered it 'most usuall and regular' to make their first approach via Blathwayt, who could then pass on their complaints to the Plantations Committee, whence they would reach the monarch. 19 Often differing factions within a colony competed to convince Blathwayt

17 Blathwayt to Lynch, 18 July, 1683; BW XXIV.

18 Winslow to Blathwayt, 2 July, 1680; Hinckley to Blathwayt, 8 December, 1680, 18 March, 1682/3; BW VI.

19 Jennings and Budd, on behalf of the proprietors of West New Jersey, to Blathwayt, 28 February, 1684/5; BW VII. For a Rhode Island example see the correspondence with governor Cranston and others, BW XI.
of the worthiness of their actions. While Governor Robinson of Bermuda expatriated to the Plantations Secretary on the problems he was having with his Council, the Council version of events, complaining of an autocratic governor, was also being sent to him.  

There could be little doubt regarding Blathwayt's influence in filling minor colonial posts. 'I know how much y', interest can p'vayle, wrote a correspondent (and prospective candidate) from Jamaica when the Provost Marshall's position fell vacant in 1684 on the death of Sir Thomas Lynch.  

Though the only posts directly in his gift were those on his office staff and the deputy auditorships in the royal plantations, sheer length of service and first class information services greatly enlarged his influence. As one hostile observer put it, 'this darke man, and his obscure Methods' could frequently accomplish what more direct solicitation could not.  

Superior information and speedy action could usually carry the day in minor patronage affairs, but this was not true of the more substantial gubernatorial appointments. Here Blathwayt was contending with patrons of much greater social weight and political authority, or sometimes with rival factions in the Plantations Committee. Something undoubtedly could be done. Cranfield of New Hampshire was helped to his governorship by Blathwayt; when he found that New Hampshire did not  

20 CSPC 1685-8, nos. 1216, 1811. For a similar kind of competition see CTB VIII, 1685-89, 53; '55. 'Value not Sir Thomas Lynch's way of writing home', warned his sacked Attorney General from Jamaica in March, 1685.  

21 Egleton to Blathwayt, 3 September, 1684; BW XXII. A day earlier another prospective candidate had written a letter in almost exactly the same terms: Beckford to Blathwayt, 2 September, 1684; BW XXII.  

22 Add. MSS. 38861, 74.
agree with his health, he moved to Barbados where Blathwayt subsequently made him his deputy auditor. The career soldier Francis Nicholson owed much to Blathwayt's early support: his Council membership in New England and his Lieutenant Governorship there had both been aided by Blathwayt. Sir Edmund Andros, governor of New York, 1674-81 and of the Dominion of New England, 1685-9, was also the recipient of Blathwayt's favour. He had been a correspondent since the 1660s when as Captain Andros of the Barbados regiment he was salvaging tin from a wreck in the Low Countries.

Once Blathwayt was Secretary at War, Andros, like every other army officer, was in constant communication with him since the Secretary at War's office served as a general clearing house for army administration: officers had to ask his permission to go on leave, for example. Even before Blathwayt bought the Secretaryship from Matthew Locke, there were signs that an ambitious incumbent could have a vital role in passing commissions, nominally a prerogative of the Secretary of State; Blathwayt did all he could to expand this power. Letters flooded in to the Secretary's office, soliciting such favours as the command of a regiment, an officer's post for a relative, or simply, as


25 For the Andros/Blathwayt relationship, see Webb, 'Imperial Fixer' I, 15-17, II, 399-402.

one officer, put it, 'the dispatch of several of my little affairs...'.

But Blathwayt's possession of the Secretaryship at War and his knowledge of the army officers does not necessarily mean that he supported a 'militarist' stance in imperial administration. He was no blind supporter of the military prerogative, as his attitude to Colonel Kirke in the aftermath of the Monmouth rebellion demonstrated, and he had enemies as well as friends among the military establishment: not every ambitious soldier had his backing. He approved of Andros (that advocate of assemblies as well as troops) because he thought him moderate, reliable and conscientious. He was not alone in his confidence. The Earl of Clarendon, too, expected great things from Andros in the eighties: 'I shall hope for a good account of New England, and much for the King's advantage, if Sir Edmund Andros goes thither.' The organisation of the area Andros was to govern owed much to Blathwayt. The decline of the Lords of Trade in the reign of James gave room for the rise of their secretary, and Edward Randolph for one was sure that Blathwayt was very influential in achieving the union of the northern colonies in 1687. He certainly helped Andros prevail in his struggle with Colonel Dongan, the governor of New York and another professional soldier, over their organisation and control. If it is curious, as Haffenden points out, that Blathwayt the administrator waxed so enthusiastic over a structure so fragile, perhaps it was that the impressive size of the new unit, and the

---

27 Add. MSS. 9724, 92; Add. MSS. 9728, 59, 63; Add. MSS. 9731; 8.


presence of his client as governor, blinded him temporarily to its administrative deficiencies. He retained complete faith in Andros' policies as governor. As he wrote to Sir Robert Southwell in 1688, it was to be hoped that Andros was so well rooted in the royal estimation that no efforts to replace him (and they were many) and to 'discredit the Cavaliers' could succeed.

Blathwayt favoured men who advanced the royal position in the plantations, who could uphold the prerogative without, however, alienating all local interests. Whether these men were soldiers, merchants or planters was not the major issue; indeed, given the circumstances of the time, most of them were likely at various stages of their careers to be all three. Dishonest and ineffective governors such as Dutton (Barbados, 1680–85) received short shrift. Personal motives also affected Blathwayt's judgement. Although Dutton had sent Blathwayt quantities of sugar to sweeten his chocolate and tea, put Blathwayt's cousin into the commission of the peace and promised to advance him in the militia, and attempted to mediate between Blathwayt's quarrelsome Povey uncles on the island; he made a basic error when he sent home a table of island expenses which entirely omitted any mention of the Auditor General or his deputy. He then suggested a Mr. Doughty as Blathwayt's deputy auditor; Blathwayt's carefully phrased reply explained that he would have thanked Dutton for giving the appointment

---


31 Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 19 June, 1688; Portland MSS. 53.
to such a good man, but he was still waiting for the accounts. Dutton was to sink yet lower in Blathwayt's opinion. After a leave in England, he returned to Barbados and started legal proceedings against Sir John Witham, Lieutenant Governor in his absence. But his mode of procedure was deemed improper, otherwise every succeeding governor might call his predecessors to account. Blathwayt was clearly backing Witham; a fact which Dutton glumly concluded was likely to contribute to his downfall.

Blathwayt shared the horror felt by those with even the most modest of administrative standards at the Duke of Albemarle's appointment as governor of Jamaica in 1686. The Duke, Blathwayt commented grimly to Southwell two years later, 'dances upon the High Rope and will soon break his own neck or destroy that Government.' The contrast with Albemarle's predecessors, Molesworth and Lynch, could hardly have been greater. The able Lynch, though his major patron appears to have been Shaftesbury, certainly met with Blathwayt's approval. Lynch showed every sign of assisting the new royal fiscal agents in his colony (and with them the new Auditor General) and although he attempted some intelligent exploitation of his powers through his policy against the Caribbean pirates, in general he acquiesced in that undercutting of the governor's position.

---

32 Blathwayt to Dutton, 24 August, 1681; BW XXX. Dutton to Blathwayt, 3 January, 1681/2; Blathwayt to Dutton; 24 November, 1681; Dutton to Blathwayt, 15 May, 1682; Blathwayt to Dutton, 6 August, 1682; William Povey to Blathwayt, 9 August, 1683; BW XXXI.

33 Blathwayt to Dutton, 20 January, 1684/5; BW XXX. Jacobsen, Blathwayt, 104.

34 Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 19 June, 1688; Portland MSS. 53.
which was the other side of the coin of imperial centralisation. 35

Governor Atkins of Barbados (1673-1680), Dutton's predecessor, who did not; and who greatly resented the loss of patronage implicit in innovations such as the Crown nomination of all members of his Council, found himself in receipt of a series of stinging rebukes from Blathwayt. 36 Perhaps Blathwayt remembered, too, that the first royal nomination to a West Indian council was that of his uncle, Richard Povey. The reasons for Atkins' recall, with which Blathwayt was clearly in agreement, were described in confidence by the secretary of the plantations for the Earl of Carlisle's benefit. The official reason was that Atkins had been governor for six years, quite long enough if the governor were not to be drawn inexorably to support local interests. But the real reasons were other. Atkins had fallen foul of Sunderland over the proceeds of some interloping ships seized at Barbados. He was in constant disagreement with the local population. The Royal Africa Company, whose governor, the Duke of York, 'always shew'd a concern for them', continually complained about him. The Plantations Committee was dissatisfied with 'his returns & manner of correspondence'. 37 On such combinations of private and public interests the ruin—and the advancement—of official careers depended.

35. Thornton, West India Policy, 148, 233-6. The powers that colonial governors could exercise at sea were narrowly interpreted at this time; thus Lynch's court martial of Captain Heywood of the Norwich was not upheld.

36. Blathwayt to Atkins, 20 March, 1678/9; and Blathwayt's hostile memorandum on Atkins' letter of 16 October, 1679; the governor wanted to be considered 'as it were Independant from the Government here'; BW XXXIX.

37. Thornton, West India Policy, 153; Blathwayt to the Earl of Carlisle, 9 July, 1680; BW XXII.
For Blathwayt the keynote was moderation. In 1681, when Sir John Witham proposed a scheme for continuing the Excise on liquors through the authority of the Barbados Governor and Council alone, without consulting the assembly, Blathwayt felt bound to protest on the grounds of the political inadvisability of such a move. 'I do not see', wrote the worried secretary of plantations, 'that it is legal or convenient to alarm the People with it, since that power which can make one Law may make more and so ad infinitum'.

Almost twenty years later, Blathwayt's client and colleague at the Board of Trade, George Stepney, expressed the same kind of worry when the Board report on the administration of Virginia was being drafted. It was not wise to appear 'too Eager'. Though abuses were 'certainly to be reform'd', wrote Stepney, 'I am for moderation in all things, for violent changes are dangerous & difficult, and ye attempt against all the officers of a Plantation will certainly draw a generall odium upon us'.

Policies of gradualism were the road to success: gradual elimination of abuses in patent offices, gradual encroachments by the royal legal prerogative.

Blathwayt applied the same care which made him ensure that his own patent as Auditor General was 'drawn up by the best hands in Eng(land)' to consideration of the legal and administrative state of the colonies. Blathwayt's admiration for the technical achievements of the French administrative system and his interest in the new science of

---

38 Blathwayt to Witham, 29 January, 1680/1; BW XXXV.
39 Stepney to Blathwayt, 14/24 June, 1698; SP 105/51.
40 Blathwayt to Powell, 12 March, 1680/1; BW XXVII.
political arithmetic—he was a friend of Sir William Petty—is undoubted. English envoys in France were requested to send over all types of information, from town plans to volumes of military ordinances, and Blathwayt himself had seen the French administration in action. Colonial correspondents such as Sir William Stapleton emphasised the presumed effects—well-paid and well-clothed soldiers—of French administrative methods. Again, Blathwayt supported gradual change; as he explained to Edward Randolph, 'matters of Power & Governmtn by new ways & forms' were 'not rashly to be proposed nor easily brought to pass'.

The pattern of Blathwayt's career until 1688 suggests several conclusions. The development of his connections as client shows the change from reliance on family pressure to the cultivation of important politicians, to a direct dependence on royal favour. Of course the three were not mutually exclusive; but the balance gradually altered until by the late eighties the 'interest' with the monarch was preponderant. It was this 'interest' which Blathwayt always emphasised to his correspondents; his insistence on its significance reveals his perception of the royal rôle in the English political system. The administration was the King's administration; the empire was the King's empire. It was this perception which helped give point to Blathwayt's

---

41 Plumb, Political Stability, 11; Jacobean, Blathwayt, 100, 103.

42 Blathwayt to Preston, 17 December, 1683; HMC VII, 368b; Blathwayt to Trumbull, 25 March, 1686; HMC Downshire I, 140.

43 Possibly the French administration did not reach the high standards supposed. 'It is the English perception of it that is the important point here.'

44 Blathwayt to Randolph, 20 August, 1680; RW I.
pluralism, a pluralism the more impressive in that all the positions held imposed real demands on the incumbent's time and energy: these were not decorative posts placed at the disposal of some Stuart favourite. Blathwayt and the other 'men of business' such as Pepys, Vernon and Lowndes (and even Blathwayt's rival Bridgeman) could bind together, the relatively small government departments and by reforming them fit them to serve the grand prerogative design: the metropolitan determination to bring the localities into a closer and more dependent relationship with the centre. The preference for legal and administrative methods over more expensive and politically contentious exertions of the military prerogative has already been discussed, but perhaps the consistency of the bureaucrats' approach needs to be emphasised. Disapproving of those fits of Stuart generosity (or spite) which could result in the setting up of new proprietary colonies or the sending of a Duke of Albemarle to Jamaica, worried about the increasing lack of political reality displayed by James II, Blathwayt and his colleagues plodded on, intent on their task of creating a powerful and unified state. The English plantations must, it was agreed, form an integral part of that state. 'Those Plantations', wrote Blathwayt in 1683, 'which heretofore were looked upon as desperate adventures are now become necessary and important members of the main body'. In 1688, it remained to be seen what the fate of that main body would be.

45 Crossed out there follows: 'and of little importance'. 'Reflections on a Paper concerning America', BL 416, BH.
PART II

THE FRAGMENTATION OF WILLIAM BLATHWAYT'S EMPIRE, 1688-1710
CHAPTER 4

SURVIVAL

'After a revolution', wrote the Marquess of Halifax in his Political Thoughts and Reflections, 'you see the same men in the Drawing Room and, within a week, the same flatterers'. ¹ Himself a frequenter of the drawing rooms of both James II and William III, he had reason to know. Certainly there was nothing to compare in 1688-9 with the massive changes in personnel which had occurred from 1649-60, nor, on a more minor level, with the dismissals which resulted from James II's closeting campaign in 1687. ² The post-revolutionary period, too, saw changes far greater in scope than those of 1688-9: in 1696, for example, in the aftermath of the assassination plot, or in 1702 on the accession of Anne. Continuity rather than change was the deliberately asserted theme of the Glorious Revolution and its propagandists. ³

It was surprising, however, to many contemporaries, and a source


of particular chagrin to the Whigs, that the changes of personnel in 1689 at all levels were not more thoroughgoing. Edward Randolph, languishing in Boston gaol as a result of the overthrow of the government of the Dominion of New England, reported to William Blathwayt in late 1689 that Mr. Mather was completely confident that Blathwayt, Sir Robert Southwell, the Earl of Danby and the Marquess of Halifax would all be removed from office shortly; Increase Mather was both a knowledgeable and successful lobbyist in London in 1689 and, although this particular opinion turned out to be a piece of wishful New England thinking, it exemplified a common view. The bitter parliamentary attack in December, 1689 on William’s use of King James’s servants and the accusation that he intended to employ a set of prerogative men illustrated Whig reasoning on the doubtful merits of political continuity. William Blathwayt, clerk of the Privy Council, Auditor General of the Plantations, and Secretary at War was one who emerged from this attack, as he had from those of the preceding twelve months, totally unscathed; confident enough, indeed, to petition for, and secure enough to get on very favourable terms, a house near the Horse Guards in which to carry on his War Office business. How and why did Blathwayt and men like him survive?

The leading authority on seventeenth century administrative history, G. E. Aylmer, distinguishes two bureaucratic types in this period; at one extreme there is the bureaucrat who stands or falls with his political masters — and in 1660 this meant exclusion from office for life.


5 CTB IX, 1689-1692, 352, 392, 683.
for five men who can be classed as administrators, while three others were actually attainted with the regicides); at the other, the bureaucrat as careerist, ready to serve any government prepared to employ him. The shift to the non-political bureaucrat was a gradual one. That same Earl of Nottingham who, in 1689, loftily claimed to adhere to 'Things, and Propositions, not men and Parties' joined the rest of the Tories in 1702 in insisting that it was absolutely necessary on the alteration of the ministry that changes be made in all 'subaltern employments'. Sunderland, Harley and Godolphin on occasion attempted to foster a tradition of bureaucratic immunity from the exigencies of party change; Godolphin, in 1695, when William III seemed to be considering some political dismissals from the Boards of Customs and Excise urged that it could not be for the King's service 'to make changes in the management of your revenue to gratify party or animosity...'. But the growth of that tradition was a slow one, and the process barely begun in 1689. Blathwayt himself seems poised uneasily between Aylmer's two bureaucratic types.

A great part of the explanation for the continuity of the Glorious Revolution must be sought in the character and attitudes of William III. Very soon after his arrival his reserve was commented on. As Lady Dartmouth tartly observed, there was no knowing who his favourites were so

---

6 Aylmer, The State's Servants, 340.

that it was difficult initially to know to whom one should make one's addresses. It soon became clear that William had no intention of becoming a Whig tool. From the start of the enterprise it proved difficult to prevent the Orange party from becoming a rope of sand and although the men who came over late to William were much laughed at ('thos as gos in now signifys Littell' wrote one observer on December 26th) there is scant evidence to suggest that going over early proved a guarantee of success. As a strong disciplinarian, William disapproved of those who had deserted James II before he left England. Halifax and Nottingham, who had both declined to sign the invitation to the Prince of Orange in 1688, found themselves his most trusted ministers in 1689. William Blathwayt, who was one of the witnesses to James II's will on November 17th and who had issued the order withdrawing the troops from Salisbury, had little to worry about on those counts. William III's pressure for an act of indemnity revealed the new ruler's determination not to hold grudges.

The illuminating Spencer House 'Journals', records of conversations between William and Halifax from December 1688 to March 1690, demonstrate how the King came to grips with the practical problems of governing.

---

8 Lady Dartmouth to Lord Dartmouth, 26 December, 1688; HMC Dartmouth I, 241; Dalrymple, Memoirs of Great Britain I, 225; Cary Gardiner to Sir Ralph Verney, 12 December, 1688; Lady Frances Vernod (ed.), Memoirs of the Verney Family (London, 1892-99), IV, 445.


10 Add. MSS. 28053, 357. The will is reproduced in J.S. Clarke, Life of James II (London, 1816), II, 647.
England. An anxiety not 'to bee governed' made him wary of those like Danby who 'did never speak of anything but to recommend men'. Frequently reiterated to Halifax was the theme that he must 'go upon the bottome of the trimmers' and the constant 'patching' of ministries was the theme of the early years of the reign. In effect the military man was trying to secure his base; the subtleties of English politics baffled William. Though it was something of an exaggeration to suggest, as did one commentator, that he was mindful of the soldiery and little else, Halifax soon came to realise that his interests were primarily continental. The English monarch, it appeared, had 'such a mind to France, that it would incline one to think, hee tooke England onely in his way'. Major administrative change was hardly likely in such circumstances, at least not initially and probably not deliberately.\(^\text{11}\)

Obviously there were a few Whig supporters who did have to be satisfied. One reason for William's resolve to keep the Admiralty and Treasury always in commission was to have a larger number of posts to fill, though the motive of keeping the direction of affairs in his own hands was probably more important.\(^\text{12}\) Known Catholics had to go; there were few enough of these, however, and in any case some of the men who had turned Catholic in '87 and '88 were equally willing to turn back. Sir Thomas Montgomery of Barbados, anxious to disavow his Jesuit connections, petitioned against his imprisonment by Lieutenant Governor Stede

\(^{11}\) Spencer House Journals (hereafter SHJ) in Foxcroft, Halifax II, 204, 210, 230, 242, 252.

\(^{12}\) SHJ 221; Dalrymple, Memoirs I, Past II, Book I, 6.
and the voiding of his patent on the grounds that no-one had actually asked him if he were a papist. 13

A few administrators were sacrificed to party fury; Pepys, Secretary of the Admiralty, was obviously a marked man: sent to the Tower in 1679 at the time of the Exclusion crisis, he was regarded as entirely a creature of James. Though still penning requests to Dartmouth and Blathwayt for information on troop movements in early 1689, he was dismissed in late February. 14 Henry Guy, Secretary of the Treasury and again, as a boon companion of Charles II and one of Sunderland's closest political associates, more than a simple administrator, was also dismissed. One could not, however, ignore such an influential, wealthy and knowledgeable man. On his way to Ireland in June, 1690, William stopped to dine with him and he was soon reinstated at the Treasury. 15 There were some casualties at more minor levels, too. Edward Sherborne was driven from his Ordnance Clerkship. Dr. Davenant was left off the new Excise Commission and Dudley North turned out of the Customs. In Davenant's case, however, financial considerations interposed. Because of William's perilous financial situation, he required the Excise Commissioners to

13 Montgomery to Blathwayt, 19 March, 1688/9; BW XXXI; see also the case of the Earl of Peterborough, who after turning Catholic in 1687 refused to dispose of his pew in St. Margaret's Westminster on the grounds that one never knew what might happen. W.E. Ruckley (ed.), Memoirs of Thomas, Earl of Ailesbury (London, 1890) I, 159.


make large capital advances before their commissions were renewed, thus excluding 'pure' administrators. Roger North's account of the changes in the Customs Commission, coloured, of course, by the fact that his brother was put out, is an interesting comment on the time-lag in revolutionary effects. For some time after the revolution, the Customs continued as before, 'for that collection was not to be disturbed till the main was safe'. But soon 'men of merit', as North sarcastically calls them, put in for posts, and the Customs 'was a jolly commission, that would serve five or six of them'.

February, 1689, was a crucial month for decisions about minor posts in the administration, both central and local; the immediate post-revolutionary dislocation was over and the decision to offer William and Mary the crown meant that many commissions were up for renewal. On the one hand there was a conscious decision, implemented by a proclamation on the 14th of that month, to continue in their places all Protestant sheriffs, J.P.s and revenue officials who had held office at the beginning of the previous December. On the other hand, as in the Customs Commission (and the Secretaryship of War, as we shall see) there were some signs, as Sir John Reresby noted, of more scruples in keeping in 'any but those that had either good principles or good friends'.

---


17 Luttrell, Brief Relation, I, 502; A. Browning (ed.), Memoirs of Sir John Reresby (Glasgow, 1936), 559-60, entry for 28 February, 1689.
This was positive action in contrary directions, dictated as much by insecurity as anything, but at least it was a contrast to the preceding uncertainty. And certainly Reresby, Luttrell and other commentators could find no massive purges to document.

The office-holder himself was not merely a pawn in the situation. The seventeenth century attitude to office was a great contributor to administrative conservatism, if not inertia. When a man had paid good money for an office, or his tenure was for life, it might be difficult to dislodge him and politically dangerous to do so. Office was regarded as a freehold. James II's changes in officials in 1687 and 1688 had not produced notably happy results. As the second Earl of Clarendon was informed by the Lord Chancellor in September, 1688, the King would yield in nothing and increasingly relied on the Virgin Mary 'to do all': it was manifest that the nation's leaders, both at the centre and in the localities, would be doing very little. 18 Pepys had wanted to retire from office in 1689, but the majority of officeholders definitely desired to stay in, 'as much', wrote Reresby, 'to prevent others coming in their steads as for any other reason'. The diary of Constantijn Huygens, William's Dutch secretary, lists many officials who called on him in early 1689, obviously with an eye to furthering their prospects by utilising the influence he was assumed to have with his master. Sir Thomas Ogle, who spoke to Huygens 'van continuatie die hij geern sonde gehad hebben van Governor

18 For an example of office treated as a freehold see Luttrell II, 224. The Lord Chancellor's remark was noted in The State Letters of Henry Hyde, Second Earl of Clarendon (Oxford, 1763), II, 69.
of Chelsey College' was entirely typical. Being put out might serve as a reference at St. Germain, but one might starve in the meantime and in any case one could always indulge in a little judicious correspondence with James and his connections. As late as 1698, the English diplomat Cresset noted the case of a fellow envoy whose papist relative 'hedged' for him at St. Germain, and would have secured the Tallys [i.e., his salary] on that side, if 't other had fail'd'.

William's health was known to be uncertain and Reresby in conversations with Halifax and Danby in February and March learned that some of the leaders of the new régime were of the opinion that it might not be too late for King James yet if he would quit his papists. Meanwhile it was obviously sensible to keep one's options open. Those with moral scruples could adopt the kind of reasoning used by the Earl of Ailesbury to justify the taking the oaths to William—'he had done all in his power in parliament to obstruct the naming of William as King, but once it was done then the King must protect the Kingdom and 'those that desire protection ought to take some oath'. For many officials there was no need for the 'garrison oath' rationalization since the problem either did not arise or could easily be evaded, at least until the assassination plot of 1696. An enquiry into Excise mismanagement

---

19 C. Huygens, *Journal van Constantijn Huygens, den zoon, van 21 October 1688 tot 2 September 1696* (Utrecht, 1876-7) I, 61. Ogle was successful: see the pay warrants at Add. MSS. 9755, 519.

20 Cresset to Ellis, 3 June, 1698; Add. MSS. 28901, 176v.

21 Reresby Memoirs 358, 564; Ailesbury Memoirs I, 237.
in 1697 revealed that, whether through deliberate policy or because of that inefficiency all seventeenth century administration was heir to, during the first five years after the revolution only one-fifth of the excise officials in the country had taken the prescribed oaths of allegiance and supremacy, and possibly the same was true in other departments. 22

In these circumstances survivors far outnumbered victims at all levels. Monographs on the various government departments emphasise the continuity of personnel: almost all the prominent bureaucrats of the nineties had begun their careers as servants of James II or his brother. 23 James Vernon, for example, Secretary of State 1697-1702, had been successively secretary to Monmouth and a clerk in Secretary of State's office, becoming Shrewsbury's secretary at the revolution. William Bridge- man, Blathwayt's rival for a clerkship in ordinary in the eighties, who before the revolution had served Arlington, Williamson, Sunderland and Middleton in secretarial posts, and like Blathwayt was a witness to James II's will, held posts in the Secretary of State's office and the Admiralty thereafter. William Lowndes, Guy's alter ego at the Treasury in the nineties, had begun his career in that department in 1679. Sir George Downing, though he disavowed the new government at the beginning of the

22 Hughes, Studies in Administration and Finance, 188.

revolution and quit his post as teller in the exchequer, took the oaths in 1693. 24

William Blathwayt's feelings on the crisis are difficult to ascertain. Prolific in the production of memoranda and other documents—in 1682 in a letter to his mentor Sir Robert Southwell he had likened his clerk Povey to a St. Christopher wading through the deeps of a never-failing stream of official correspondence 25—he was, perhaps through caution, curiously reticent in personal matters. Apparently his position under James remained secure to the end. He had not felt it necessary to change his religion, though it is interesting to note that James advised his heir that the Secretary at War should be Roman Catholic (though to balance this, the Secretary of the Admiralty ought to be Protestant). In 1686; Blathwayt was certain that there could be no difficulty in meeting his prospective father-in-law's insistence that any suitor for his daughter must be a good Protestant. 26 However, he was not especially devout. He had been put into the Commission of Peace in 1685 and was presumably able to answer satisfactorily questions concerning his attitude to the penal laws and tests. Blathwayt was not a particularly popular figure

24 For Vernon, see J.R. Jones, 'James II's Whig Collaborators', Historical Journal III (1960), 67; for Bridgeman, see M. Thomson, The Secretaries of State 1681-1782 (Oxford, 1932), 130; for Lowndes, see DNB XII, 210; for Downing, Luttrell III, 89.


26 Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 12 August, 1686; DL799/C8, BG. James's advice to his son is printed in full in Clarke, Life of James II, II, 619-642.
and it was alleged in August, 1688 that the War Office command for
officers to return to their posts was yet another of his money-making
devices (to get fees for leave to be absent). The absurdity of this
accusation soon became apparent as the invasion materialised, although
this was neither the first nor the last time that Blathwayt was attacked
for avarice. He was never, however, attacked for incompetence.

Although Blathwayt, as we have seen, had known William since the
seventies, only one piece of evidence can be found to suggest early
association with the Orange party during the crisis of 1688. The Duke of
Berwick, James's natural son, insisted that he had contributed to Lord
Cornbury's defection to the Prince, a defection which was a particular
blow to James. However, Berwick's Memoirs were written long after the
event and in a spirit of self-justification which strains credulity.

Whatever the stresses of November, 1688, Blathwayt worked on calmly,
paying his usual meticulous attention to both national and personal
affairs. He issued the orders for the retreat from Salisbury, witnessed
the King's will, and made a new settlement on his wife, Mary, all on the
same date, the 17th. After the retreat, when James removed to Windsor,
Blathwayt did not follow. He remained at his post when James left the
country.

---

27 On the commission of peace see HMC Leyborne-Popham, 265. For the
accusation of avarice see E.M. Thompson (ed.), Correspondence of the
Family of Hatton (London, 1878), i, 90.

28 A full discussion of the incident appears in G. Jacobšen, William
Blathwayt (New Haven, 1932), 234–6.

29 Blathwayt's father-in-law had recently died, hence the new settle-
ment. It is to be found at DL799/T4, BG.
As a pluralist, Blathwayt had to consider that each of his offices was at risk. In fact, however, only the Secretaryship at War proved precarious, not the Council Clerkship or the Auditor Generalship of the plantations. Clerkships of the Council, both Ordinary and Extraordinary, were offices held at pleasure, and the incumbents kissed hands, received a warrant of appointment and were sworn in Council just as the great officers of state. According to Luttrell, in January all the papers of state and the books of the secretaries' office at Whitehall were delivered to the Prince of Orange. Then in February Sir John Nicholas, Mr. Blathwayt, Charles Montague and Richard Coling were sworn clerks of the Privy Council, with Blathwayt moving up from most junior to second clerk. 30 Everything points to an intense conservatism in the Privy Council bureaucracy at this period. The disputes between Bridgeman and Blathwayt in 1686 and between Povey and the young Southwell in 1697 over the Ordinary Clerkship vacant on the death of Coling resulted in appointment on a strict seniority basis: in both cases the longest serving Clerk in Extraordinary got the post. Blathwayt took nineteen years to get to the top of the list of clerks. The Clerkships were lucrative enough, commanding salaries of £250 by 1679, with an additional £100, nominally for waiting on the Lords of Trade, and these salaries were probably more than doubled by fees. However, real work was involved; the incumbents were among the most notable minor officials of their day. These were not decorative posts suitable for rewarding adherents. 31

30 Luttrell, Brief Relation I, 498, 504.

31 The preceding discussion is largely based on Carter, 'English Privy Council', 493ff. See also ch. 8, p. 205.
Blathwayt was not challenged in his colonial responsibilities either, except by one or two disgruntled colonists and colonial officials. The committee of the Privy Council responsible for plantation affairs was reconstituted in February, with Blathwayt again serving as its secretary. Blathwayt's colonial clients must have been heartily relieved. On March 16th, 1689, Edwyn Stede wrote from Barbados to congratulate him on his 'good Circumstances' and on the employments in which Blathwayt was continued without fear of being removed...'. As the mad scramble for colonial offices commenced, Stede expressed the modest hope that he too might be continued in office, and retain the Lieutenant Governorship for a few more months. 32

No claimant aspired to the post of Auditor General of the plantations, a post tenable during good behaviour and therefore by definition more secure than one held at pleasure. As Blathwayt told his Virginia deputy in 1681, good behaviour was 'a term that Secures me from the ill will of the Govern or other officers of the Revenue...'. Lionel Copley, governor of Maryland, an erstwhile correspondent and client of Blathwayt when Lieutenant Governor of Hull, refused in 1692 to accept Blathwayt's 1680 patent as Auditor General on the grounds that it should have been renewed at the revolution. He also indulged in some drunken assertions that Blathwayt was a Jacobite. Blathwayt, however, insisted to Copley that there could be no doubt as to the validity of his patent and pointed out that his tenure was during good behaviour 'which

32 Add. MSS. 38861, 33v. Stede to Blathwayt, 16 March, 1689; BW XXXII. Stede was worried: his arch-enemy Sir Timothy Thornhill had suddenly discovered a relationship to the Earl of Nottingham, on which he hoped to capitalise.
is equal to life. Since the royal colonies contributed between them the sum of the Auditor General's salary, the reluctance of governors to recognise his authority was readily explained: there was only so much cash to go round and governors had their own way to make. From the point of view of the office hunter, the job of Auditor General was no great catch in the circumstances. Without an established network of colonial correspondents, some means of bringing pressure to bear and a certain amount of colonial goodwill, one's chances of being paid were negligible. Only Blathwayt came near to meeting these conditions. The hiatus in his entry book as Auditor General is explained by pressure of other business in the ferment of invasion and the foreign war which succeeded it rather than by any challenge to his colonial authority.

The Secretaryship at War was a different matter. By force of circumstance as well as through personal inclination, army affairs were bound to be a first priority for the new monarch and the Secretary at War had to be a prime mover in the reorganisation that was necessary.

The War Office books show that Blathwayt continued to issue orders after James left the country. The last letter of James's command was 8th December, 1688, and the next entry is for 16th January, 1688/9. But as he worked to deal with mutinous units, to send troops to the West Indies and to move companies to Guernsey and Jersey and elsewhere, he must have been aware that there were other applicants for his job and the constant access to the monarch which it entailed. Even as officers such

33 Blathwayt to Auditor Bacon, 17 October, 1681; BW XIII. Copley's comments are reported in Randolph to Blathwayt, 28 June, 1692; BW II. Blathwayt to Copley, 28 February, 1693; BW XVIII.

34 T64/88.

35 WO 4/1, 118.
as Governor Shakerley at Chester were relying on the Secretary at War to help them keep their garrison commands, Blathwayt's own position was in jeopardy. Lord Montagu, for example, would have liked to have been Secretary at War as well as Master of the Ordnance if a Secretaryship of State was not available. Dr. George Clarke, Judge-Advocate of the forces since 1681, was another aspirant, though he did not find an opportunity to press his claim until the following year. When he did, 'the favour of Lord Portland and methods which he [Blathwayt] used' helped keep him out.

The reference to the favour of Lord Portland indicates one necessity for longevity in office: the cultivation of an 'interest'. Blathwayt had known Portland for some years, and his calls on Constantijn Huygens in February of 1688 led Huygens to note in his diary that Blathwayt had formerly been secretary at the Hague to Sir William Temple, who had formed, so Blathwayt was told at the time, a very high opinion of his person and merits. This had been from 1668-1672; Blathwayt was doubtless reminding everyone of his earlier Dutch connections, which indeed he had never been so foolish as to drop; he had been in correspondence with William himself in the eighties.

---

36 Shakerley to Blathwayt, 13, 15, 24 December, 1688, 7, 14 January, 1688/9; Add. MSS. 38695, 103, 104, 112, 124, 128.

37 On Montagu's ambitions see the Devonshire House 'notebook' of Lord Halifax, quoted in Foxcroft, Halifax II, 106. For Clark see HMC Leyborne-Popham, 271.

38 Huygens, Journal I, 73, entry for 2 February, 1689. John Cooke to Blathwayt, 6 June, 1671; Add. MSS. 56240.

39 See ch. 1. None of this correspondence seems to have survived.
Curiously enough it was from these same days at the Hague that
the major threat to Blathwayt's tenure of the Secretaryship originated.
No man had gained greater stature as an envoy in the reign of Charles
II than Sir William Temple, the architect of the Triple Alliance. Uni-
versally respected as a man of integrity, well known to William as a
friend to the Dutch state, he was expected to hold high office in the
new régime. Very soon after his arrival in England William dined with
him at Sheen, but he could not persuade Temple from the retirement into
which he had withdrawn after seeing the collapse of the foreign policy
of which he had been a major advocate in the late sixties and early
seventies. Still, Temple continued to command an 'interest'; as late as
1693, the future Earl of Orrery confided to a friend that he intended
waiting on Temple to let him know about 'my pretensions...at court, where
I know his interest is very good'.

And Temple had a son, 'a young
gentleman of the finest accomplishments'.

This young man had a career to make. Huygens observed John Temple
several times in the prince's antechamber in early 1689, and the Earl of
Clarendon was watching him closely at court one evening in January when
he was having 'a very long whisper...in the window' with William, disc-
coursing from a paper which Clarendon could see was numbered in the
margin. This paper contained Temple's Irish project, a scheme to send

40 J. Nichols (ed.), The Miscellaneous Works of Bishop Atterbury
(London, 1789), 42.


42 Huygens, Journaal I, 84; Clarendon's diary entry for 4 January,
1689 is printed in The State Letters of Henry Hyde, Second Earl of
over Colonel Hamilton to Ireland to negotiate with James's adherent Tyrconnel and persuade him to capitulate. This was not considered a very realistic scheme by Temple's acquaintances; Hugh Speke, riding with him in the park one day, tried to persuade him that it was 'Perfect Nonsense' and that he would 'repent his concerning himself in Politicks, being a perfect Stranger therein...'. Repent he certainly did. On the strength of his scheme and as a mark of favour to his father, William had made John Temple Secretary at War in April, replacing Blathwayt. Totally inexperienced, he was very soon overwhelmed by the office and asked William to release him from it. William however spoke to him in a very kind and encouraging way and suggested that the ousted Blathwayt would assist him in the routine business. This Blathwayt was very happy to do. In fact, the business had never at any point left him; in March when Sir John Knatchbull wanted to get troops removed from Ashford it was to Blathwayt that he applied. In 1691 when giving evidence before the Commissioners of Public Accounts Blathwayt claimed that he 'came not to the administration of the Secretary at War until this king came to the crown', that during the interval between James leaving the country and William receiving the crown 'only some things past through his hands' and that

43. H. Speke, Memoirs of the Late Happy Revolution (Dublin, 1709), 116.

44. Luttrell, Brief Relation I, 521, entry for 12 April, 1689. A letter in the Ellis Correspondence refers to the new Secretary Temple on 16 April: Ellis to Hatton, Add. MSS. 29564, 13. f.17v of the same MS. (Strechay to Hatton, 18 April) names Sir William Temple in error.

45. Diary of Sir John Knatchbull, entry for 12 March, 1689; Add. MSS. 33923, 464. For Blathwayt's assistance to Temple see Hatton Correspondence I, 133.
Zulestein acted as Secretary at War at that time. To a later group of Commissioners in 1702 he claimed that Portland was acting Secretary with the assistance of Huygens. Blathwayt was skilled in the use of obstructionist tactics towards hostile enquiries, as these certainly were. The entry books give no evidence to support his statements; instead, there are a few letters signed by Churchill and Schomberg between April and May. What is likely is that Zulestein and the rest influenced policy while Blathwayt hung on to the papers. 46

So the work of the War Office continued during Temple's incumbency under Blathwayt's direction; in effect he was 'carrying' Temple just as he had carried Lord Conway, the Secretary of State, when he had served as his undersecretary from 1681-1683. By late April young Temple had made himself ill with the strain of the obviously doomed Irish project. Every contemporary history has an account of what followed. 47 He fell into a fever and then 'a phrenzie', was let blood, a few days later took 'a pint of sack with bread sops in it to help him to spirits to go about his business' but this cure failing, he hired a boat upon the Thames and committed suicide by drowning himself. 'My own imprudence in the Prince's service'; ran his suicide note, 'and the hurt I have done it, are the causes of my death. I wish him success in all his undertakings, and a

46 Harleian MSS. 6837, 135; Add. MSS. 36859, 123; WO 4/1, 129ff. Persuading seventeenth century officials—or their relatives—to give up their papers was in any case exceedingly difficult: cf. the case of Sir William Colt, envoy to Saxony, Add. MSS. 28901, 188.

better servant than I have proved. 48

With Temple's dramatic removal from the scene there was no reason why Blathwayt should not simply resume his duties in name as well as in fact. The gap in the War Office outletters had lasted only from April 6th to May 11th, and even that had been merely a formality. The bereaved father would hardly stand in his way; Sir William Temple had had a high regard for Blathwayt's abilities ever since the Earl of Arlington had prevailed on him to take the young man into his house and give him 'all the acquaintance with business which he is willing to make'. William, too, had formed a favourable opinion of Blathwayt, concluding that, though dull, he had 'a good method'. 49 Dullness was in fact a positive virtue in the eyes of one who mistrusted men of ideas and liked to turn even his Secretaries of State into mere clerks. As to his good method, William had had opportunity to observe it both in the Secretaryship at War and the Privy Council clerkship. Blathwayt had managed to expand his administrative empire at a crucial point: he had become secretary to the newly formed Privy Council committee for Irish affairs early in 1689. This committee enjoyed for several months such intense activity that the expert on Privy Council history for the period regards it as a makeshift cabinet. 50 As Blathwayt hastened to supply Marshal Schomberg with


50 Carter, 'English Privy Council', 58, 60.
directives about arms and to provide information about the amounts of money sent to Chester for dispatch to Ireland for troop payments, he was becoming increasingly indispensable.\textsuperscript{51} Hard work, meticulous attention to detail and careful record keeping had made him, too, an invaluable repository of information in a variety of fields. Like Sidney Codolphin, he was 'never in the way and never out of it'.\textsuperscript{52}

There was also to recommend him his knowledge of languages, a knowledge which William seems to have valued the more highly in others because of his own limitations: his written French, for example, was execrable. Blathwayt was an accomplished linguist. In 1678, at the time of the Popish plot, he was admitted to the Privy Council debates to assist in translating Coleman's correspondence and his name appears on a list dating from the late nineties of six members of the House of Commons whose knowledge of French would be adequate to enable them to act as negotiators in a treaty with France.\textsuperscript{53} His Dutch was excellent; he had acquired it while serving in Temple's household at the Hague where he was the only member who spoke it. The English envoys abroad were


\textsuperscript{52} Charles II's comment on Codolphin is quoted in DNB VIII, 43. For references to Blathwayt's experience see, for example, Add. MSS. 15572, 17.

\textsuperscript{53} See SHJ II, 202, 204 on the value William placed on linguistic ability. The standard of William's French is made obvious in N. Japikse (ed.). Correspondentie van Willem III en van Hans Willem Bentinck (The Hague, 1927-8), passim; for editorial comment see I, xiv. On the Coleman case see HMC House of Lords MSS., 1678-88, 10, 11, 14, 15. The list of the six M.P.s appears in Japikse II, 83; the other five were Trumbull, Williamson, Molesworth, Vernon and Goodrick.
aware of Blathwayt's facility in the language; during his employment as undersecretary to Lord Conway, they frequently sent him the originals of documents while translations went to his lordship. To a monarch whose interests were so determinedly European, Blathwayt's qualifications were obvious.

Two further challenges were to arise to Blathwayt's Secretaryship at War, one from parliament, the other from an individual. At the close of 1689, the Whigs mounted an all-out attack on William's servants, claiming that it was not fitting that so many of James's administrators should be employed. Bearing the chief brunt of the attack was Henry Shales, Commissary General to the army, who had held the same post under James and thus provides another example of this general continuity. The letters of Marshall Schomberg had indicated huge mismanagement in the Irish campaign and Shales was to be the sacrificial victim. As the debate on the affairs of Ireland proceeded, the attack widened to include other erstwhile servants of the previous monarch, Blathwayt among them. Was it fitting, asked Sir John Hawles, a prominent Whig, that Mr. Blathwayt should be in office to govern all the army? And was it not likely, asked another member, that men such as he were still in close (and treasonable) communication with James? A Privy Councillor had alleged that what the King said in his closet was sent to King James in brandy-

54 P.S. Lachs, The Diplomatic Corps under Charles II and James II (New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1965), 68. Skelton to Blathwayt, 6 June, 1682; Add. MSS, 27983, 209; Poley to Blathwayt, 4/14 June, 1682; Add. MSS. 37987, 78.
bottles...I name Mr. Blathwayte. 55

The whole power of the monarch to choose his own servants was now being brought into question. If William wished to maintain an important element of his prerogative, he could not afford to give way. He acted quickly, and seized the initiative by dismissing Shales (whose corruption was beyond doubt) while protecting his ministers by refusing to say who had recommended Shales to him and to make any further dismissals. Men like William Harbord, Paymaster of the army in Ireland and notorious for his dubious practices (he raised the art of false musters to its highest level by drawing the pay for an independent troop of cavalry which consisted of himself, two clerks whom he listed as officers and a standard he kept in his bedroom), survived. 56 So too did Blathwayt.

However, exposure to parliamentary attack made him more cautious than ever in his actions. Early in 1690 William decided that he must go in person to Ireland. It was natural that, as military secretary, Blathwayt should accompany him. This he resolutely refused to do: George Clarke, military Judge Advocate, saw this as his opportunity to step into the position. A letter from a well-wisher addressed to Clarke at his Oxford college urged him to lose no time but to come up to town and ask for the employment, suggesting that Clarke would be 'much more acceptable both to the King & Army, then y' predecessor'. 57 According


56 For Schomberg's comments on Harbord see Schomberg to William III, 26 December, 1689; Dalrymple, Memoirs of Great Britain II, 177.

57 Egerton MSS. 2618, 156.
to Clarke, Blathwayt wished him success in his application. This is a little surprising since Clarke's autobiography shows that there had been at least one point of friction between him and Blathwayt in the early eighties. Clarke found that there were few occasions for courts martial in England and his services were infrequently required; it was therefore all the more irritating when a complaint was made against the Governor of the Isle of Wight, Sir Robert Holmes, for false musters that Blathwayt out of friendship for Holmes attempted to circumvent a court martial by having 'what he called a council of war, where the Secretary of War was to be, and not the Judge Advocate'. At Windsor Clarke had the pleasure, and Blathwayt the mortification, to hear the King 'disapprove Mr. Blathwayt's project in pretty harsh terms...'. Presumably this did not make for good relations between the two. However, Clarke hurried to London, where he saw the King, who told him that he was Secretary at War and that he was to prepare for Ireland. But then problems arose. Before he returned to London from Kensington, Clarke heard the whisper in the Court as if Mr. Blathwayt was to continue in that employment'. The Duke of Ormonde, begged by Clarke to discuss the matter with the King (and possibly remembering Blathwayt's care for his business affairs in the seventies) could only report that William answered Blathwayt must continue while Clarke was in Ireland: 'but', wrote the disgruntled Clarke, 'he continued after my return and to the King's death'. Left in Ireland to assist Count Solms after the King's departure for England, Clarke remained there until the end of the Irish campaign and on his return was 'put off' with a commission of Secretary at War in the King's absence (i.e., deputy Secretary), which he held for ten years and constituted,
in his own words, 'all the King did for me as long as he lived'.

Clarke in the cloistered calm of All Souls had been deceiving himself if he thought that his much more limited experience and range of contacts could match Blathwayt's. Certain personal weaknesses too may have stood in the way of his advancement. Some years after the revolution, it was alleged that one 'who applyd himself more to the business' might supplant him as deputy to the Secretary at War and that the King 'had no opinion of George Clerk for his drinking too much'. Those in daily contact with William, as the Secretary at War was in his capacity of military secretary to the commander-in-chief, were not allowed vices of this sort. Though Blathwayt liked a little Montepulciano or Muscadine as well as the next man (as the foreign envoys with whom he corresponded knew very well) he was never indiscreet. However, perhaps in Clarke's case the bottle was a result not a cause of his disappointment.

Why had Blathwayt refused to go to Ireland? Exposure to the rigours of camp life and the physical dangers of campaigning was never to be to his taste; though he was to spend ten summers with William in Flanders, his unseemly haste in retreat after the battle of Landen illustrates his attitude to war. This lack of personal courage was unlikely to endear him to William; the King preferred his servants to be like

58 HMC Leyborne—Popham, 262ff.

59 Stepney to ?Vernon, October, 1694, reporting Blathwayt's comments: SP 105/55, unpaginated.

60 See, for example, Blackwell (consul at Leghorn) to Blathwayt, 13 April, 1693; Add. MSS. 21486, 126.

61 Blathwayt's behaviour after Landen is detailed in Huygens, _Journaal_, II, 264. And see ch. 5.
Huygens, who had ridden with him through a hail of bullets at the battle of Saint Denis.\textsuperscript{62} It is in Huygens' diary that the major reason for Blathwayt's reluctance to embark for Ireland is revealed.\textsuperscript{63} He indeed feared danger; but the danger he feared was 'geimputeerde misslagen' --imputed errors--which might ruin his family.\textsuperscript{63} He did not want to become another Shales. The Whig attack had been blunted but not defeated; there was still talk in 1691 of the employment of 'high prerogative' men, and according to Tindal the blame of employing these men 'was cast upon the Earl of Nottingham', who in this period was one of Blathwayt's chief patrons.\textsuperscript{64} William must have thought there was good cause for Blathwayt's fears.

Blathwayt had survived through a variety of circumstances. He had abilities which were needed: his languages, his administrative experience in a variety of fields, his accumulated expertise. Blathwayt had himself pointed out in 1686 that the nature of his offices was such that his tenure should be as firm as any. They were all 'places of pains or Experience and not like a White Staff to be carried by any or other places that may be as well executed by Deputy'.\textsuperscript{65} Blathwayt combined his abilities with an 'interest': his connections with Portland and


\textsuperscript{63}Huygens, \textit{Journal} I, 247, entry for 26 March, 1690.

\textsuperscript{64}Tindal's \textit{Continuation of Mr. Rapin's History}, (London, 1726), III, 189.

\textsuperscript{65}Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 28 September, 1686; DL799/C8, BG.
Nottingham, his acquaintance with Huygens and others from his days at the Hague and with William himself all contributed to his success. He had luck; the timely death of John Temple paved the way for the re-employment of that 'better servant' Temple wished for his master. His pattern of behaviour was circumspect; he had been willing to cooperate with his temporary successor and to display his continuing diligence in a situation where the administrative services of the country were being strained to their utmost. On a broader scale he was benefiting from William's determination to avoid witchhunts and from that part of the King's behaviour which seemed bent on turning all his ministers into clerks and some at least of his clerks into ministers.

To a degree which was alarming to contemporaries William's régime continued to have a somewhat temporary air about it well into the nineties. The history of the preceding fifty years must have given many people the feeling that allegiance to any monarch must be strictly on the basis of the Vicar of Bray. William's attempts at piecing together ministerial coalitions, increasingly hampered as they were by that growth and hardening of party demarcations which was a feature of the later years of the reign, have been documented elsewhere. These attempts, and the struggles that ensued, are undeniably important. But the changes at the lower levels of administration are equally significant. The modern distinction between a political programme and its implementation did not fully apply in the late seventeenth century, and this blurring makes the careers of lesser figures of more significance than they would

66 See, for example, H. Horwitz, Parliament, Policy and Politics in the Reign of William III (Manchester, 1977).
otherwise be. Henry Guy spoke no more than the truth when in 1692 he advised his monarch to look after the lower levels of the administration for the great men could look after themselves. 67

Insecurity as well as convenience dictated administrative continuity. The seventeenth century attitude to office and the terms on which office was held constituted a powerful deterrent to change. If, as Professor Plumb has stated, 1689 was a victory for the oligarchy, 68 nowhere was this more obvious than in the offices of Whitehall. Dismissals were few, the number of Dutch carpetbaggers (despite contemporary vitriol) comparatively small. It was not a case of applying a 'policy of thorough'.

Continuity of personnel, however, does not necessitate continuity of policy. As William Blathwayt commenced service with his third monarch it remained to be seen whether, in the matters domestic, foreign and imperial which were his concerns, it was the start of a new chapter or merely an addendum to the old.

---

67 Aylmer, King's Servants, 11; Kenyon, Sunderland, 249.

CHAPTER 5

THE PRICE OF VERSATILITY: OVEREXTENSION, 1689-1696

The preceding chapter has suggested that continuity of personnel was a major feature of the Glorious Revolution. In Lord Halifax's drawing rooms, as in the offices of Whitehall, much the same faces reappeared; the Blathways, Bridgeman's and Vernons toiled on at their official correspondence in the latter, while the presence of men such as the Earl of Sunderland in the former revealed the remarkable resilience of some politicians.¹

The objectives of the new monarch seemed not dissimilar in many fields to those of his predecessors. William III frequently disavowed any intention of governing like a Doge of Venice and made it clear that the royal prerogative was as important to him as it had been to his father-in-law. The choice of governors and other royal officials for the colonies seemed to indicate that, as Craven asserts, 'a reputation for upholding the royal prerogative in America constituted no disadvantage for those who sought preferment from the new government'; thus Nicholson, Andros and Randolph all resumed successful colonial careers once local colonial difficulties were over.²

Nevertheless, there were changes in policy after 1689, whether deliberately engineered or the product of circumstance. Recent analysis

of the revolutionary financial settlement has shown that, after 1690, parliament could ultimately enforce its will over the monarch because of its control over the purse in peace as in war.\(^3\) The frequency and duration of parliaments in the twenty-five years after the revolution (there were twelve elections between 1689 and 1715) was a marked contrast to the seventies and eighties; Blathwayt often emphasised to his correspondents the amount of time he was perforce spending in the House of Commons, acting as intermediary between the Board of Trade and the House, presenting bills, answering questions on the army estimates or giving evidence before the committees of a body which from time to time showed all the signs, as he observed in the tones of enraged officialdom, of 'running riot in everything, and I can't tell where they will stop'.\(^4\) No storm, Admiral Sir Cloudesley Shovel grimly commented, was as bad as one from the House of Commons.\(^5\) A further contrast to the eighties was the almost constant warfare of the reigns of William and Anne; at times the strains of war distorted an established policy, at times they elicited entirely new ones; in both cases they contributed to that fragmentation of policy which was possibly the most striking feature of the period, especially the nineties.\(^6\) For who made colonial policy? The

---


\(^4\) Blathwayt to Stepney, 3 November, 1696; Add. MSS. 9719, 102; Blathwayt to Stepney; 24 February, 1698/9; SP 105/52 (unpaginated).

\(^5\) Quoted in a letter from Vernon to Shrewsbury, 26 December, 1696; G.P.R. James (ed.), *Vernon Letters 1696-1708* (London, 1841) I, 146. Ironically, it was a storm from nature which proved Shovel's nemesis in 1707, when his ship was wrecked on the Scilly Isles: see Luttrell, *Brief Relation VI*, 228.

\(^6\) For a comment on the lack of a settled colonial policy in the early part of William and Mary's reign see Craven, 246.
monarch? William lacked the colonial interests of his father-in-law, the proprietor of New York, and tended to see the colonies as pawns in the conflict with France. He was interested enough in colonial revenues, however, as Blathwayt noted.\(^7\) The Committee of Trade, or, after 1696, the Board? The Committee met on average only forty times per annum from 1689-1696, less than in the 1675-1685 decade despite the greater demands of business; the Board, at least in its early years, made a more significant contribution to policy making; but perhaps, as Steele suggests, this was more a matter of the individual status of its personnel than of its institutional significance.\(^8\) Parliament? The House of Lords in particular played a crucial rôle in the late nineties, and the House of Commons had a great deal more to say (especially in the economic aspects of colonial policy), than it had had in the previous two reigns.\(^9\) The chief

\(^7\) Blathwayt's marginal note on a Treasury order to the governor of Virginia to remit some money from the quit rents, 7 September, 1695, reads: 'This shows the Jealous Eye his Majesty kept on his Right to Qt. Rents as even when abroad or [?] 'in Camp he issued all warr\(^8\) for payments out of them'. T64/88, 220. This interest befitted a monarch who kept the Treasury permanently in commission and attended its meetings when he was in England.


ministers and party leaders? William was notorious for keeping his formal advisers ignorant of policy developments; but the situation changed greatly under Anne, when Marlborough and Godolphin had for some years a virtual monopoly of colonial patronage and substantial influence on policy, too. Moreover, the gradual diminution of the court as a provider of office and the transfer of patronage to other hands helped cement the ties of party and turn the administrative initiatives of the eighties in a direction other than had been intended. Or did policy making lie with the semi-permanent civil servants such as Blathwayt? Does the fact that there were thirteen Commissions of the Treasury between 1689 and 1702, eleven Commissions of the Admiralty and ten Secretaries of State increase the influence of these 'men of business', demonstrate the royal dominance, or simply offer further proof of the fragmentation of policy? This chapter will consider the potential for military government after the revolution and examine Blathwayt's role in the years from 1689-96. The two chapters which follow will discuss the fate of the administrative and legal initiatives of the eighties and continue the analysis of Blathwayt's position until shortly after his dismissal from the Board of Trade in 1707.

At first glance it would appear that William III was much more likely to militarise England and her empire than his two predecessors.

---

The most significant military reform of the revolution, the Mutiny Act, was not entirely restrictive of monarchical power, for it meant that civil courts were no longer involved in the most serious military offences: royal authority was the gainer. 11 William's military experience was more extensive than that of Charles or James, his military abilities superior, and the size of his army throughout most of the nineties infinitely greater. 12 As the French ambassador told his ruler, the King of England had 'no solid foundation for the strengthening of his power in this country, except his army, of which he is the master...'. William himself indeed disavowed any intention of making himself absolute, arguing that since the crown was not to remain in his family and he had no children the motives for his actions were national, not personal and dynastic. 13 Nonetheless, it was hard to deny that the potential for military government existed and its implementation in the plantations, if not in England, was urged by some colonial administrators. Edward Randolph's views on the necessity of military persuasion of recalcitrant colonists were strengthened by the events of 1688/9 and his own imprisonment. Governor


12James had served in his youth under Louvois with some distinction, and with the English fleet, but his experience did not match William's nor his behaviour in the 1688 campaign inspire respect. For figures on army sizes see ch. 2 above.

Codrington of the Leeward Islands insisted that the differences which existed between England and the West Indian colonies meant that the latter 'should rather be treated as garrisons'. Although 'interest and esteem' among the people were all very well, what a Governor really needed was sufficient authority to act on all occasions. As he went on to explain, without that power a general was no more than the captain of a band of privateers. But Codrington's exasperation at the terms on which he was supposed to handle island militias, and his restricted powers of inflicting military discipline, met with no helpful response at Whitehall. Attempts to implement martial law in a crisis, as the President of the Jamaican Council, Sir Francis Watson, discovered in 1689, met with strong local objections. These objections, as Governor Kendall of Barbados found, could easily be translated into hostile lobbying in London; Blathwayt had to warn him to reconsider the Articles of War he published in 1692 because Sir Peter Colleton and one of the island agents took them to be 'arbitrary & against the liberty of y^e Subject'. It was difficult for any militaristic tendencies of the executive to prevail in such circumstances.

However, perhaps force of numbers might compensate. Undoubtedly troop presence in the colonies was substantially greater under William than in the previous two reigns, except perhaps in smaller and less significant colonies such as Bermuda. From that outpost Governor Richier

14 Codrington to the Lords of Trade and Plantations, 26 November, 1690; CSPC 1689-92, 1212.

15 Kelly to Blathwayt, 17 May, 5 June, 1689; BW XXII. Watson to Blathwayt, 6 June; 1689; BW XXVII. Blathwayt to Kendall, 20 December, 1692; BW XXXI.
insisted in 1693 that he would rather be a footman at Whitehall than continue Governor 'without a Sufficient number of Souldiers to maintain ye Authorities in my Comission'. His successor sent home the 313 matchlock muskets brought over by Richier and put in the storehouse; never taken out of the mats they arrived in, they were almost eaten out with rust. Elsewhere the picture looked a little more promising. The two New York companies were raised to four in 1694, at which time the colonial establishment also included a regiment in Barbados, a company in the Leewards and a company in Jamaica. Four companies (though of varying numbers) remained the establishment of New York for almost all of the period until 1707 and beyond, while the West Indies were variously reinforced as the exigencies of war strategy dictated. The Duke of Bolton's regiment was sent in 1690 to help Codrington retake St. Kitts, the Wheeler expedition was dispatched in 1693, Lillingston's regiment in 1695, a squadron (but no foot soldiers) with Admiral Nevill in 1697, and reinforcements in 1698. In addition, a company was sent to Newfoundland in 1697.

Plagued by the same administrative and health problems as their predecessors in the seventies and eighties, these troops achieved only a fraction of the aims with which they had been sent. Even Codrington, who had led the relief expedition, felt that the retaking of St. Kitts owed more to good luck than good management, and unfavourable comparisons to French military preparedness, a constant theme of governors' reports.

16 J. Richier to Blathwayt, 19 June, 1693; John Goddard to Blathwayt, 30 November, 1693; BW XXXVI.

17 CSPC 1696-7, 536; Add. MSS. 10123, 23 (establishment commencing 1 April, 1694).
in the earlier period, continued to figure largely in the complaints of their successors. Colonel Fletcher in New York pointed out that Frontenac got stores and men yearly but that he lacked these and money too. 18 A litany of complaints flowed from Fletcher's pen. The fort at Albany needed to be rebuilt, this time from stone; a whole regiment would hardly suffice to enable him to prosecute the war effectively; death and desertion had so weakened the companies that he had been forced to sign up men on a one-year basis, 'for no man here will be a soldier for life'. 19 One disgruntled officer of the four companies was convinced 'negar slaves' must fare better than soldiers who were faced with a high cost of living, execrable food, and irregular pay which even when it did arrive was reduced by 30% because of differences in exchange rates. 20

Military conditions in the West Indies were as dispiriting as those in New York. The aftermath of the Glorious Revolution was probably the most trying period, as military leaders struggled to raise the morale of mutinous and confused troops. As Major Edward Nott contemplated the 'ragged regiment' he was accompanying to the Leeward Islands in 1690, he could be pardoned for his perplexity over how 'fourteen belts, five swords and clothes proportionable' were to be distributed among four.

18 CSPC 1689-92, 1212. Fletcher to Blathwayt, 22 January, 1693/4, 22 August, 1696; BW VIII.

19 Fletcher to Blathwayt, 18 August, 1693, 22 January, 1693/4, 30 May, 1696; BW VIII. Blathwayt's deputy auditor explained to him that the assembly would contribute to the recruits for a year but at the end of it they intended to raise money to serve under their own officers and then the 'Established Companies of Granadaers will be very thin'. Van Cortlandt to Blathwayt, 21 March, 1696; BW IX. For a group of desertions in 1692 see Graham to Blathwayt, 20 June, 1692; BW X. The introduction of locals into the companies was bound to erode any notion of using imperial troops against the colonists themselves.

20 Sydenham to Blathwayt, 7 October, 1695; BW X.
companies. The Lieutenant Governor of St. Kitts used almost exactly the same words as Governor Stapleton ten years earlier when he complained of the unpaid and near naked condition of his soldiers. The West Indian climate sapped the strength of the troops even as the continuous bickering of the officers weakened their effectiveness. Lord Inchiquin found that the officers of the two regiments in Jamaica were so far from agreeing about places of command that it was easier (though less effective militarily) to make them independent companies; and indeed, as the Attorney General informed Blathwayt after Inchiquin's death, the numbers in the two regiments would not make up more than two good companies. When the island was reinforced in the mid-nineties by Lillingston's regiment, Governor Beeston felt that the only way to preserve the troops' health was to disperse them in the countryside, from where it was impossible either to muster them or to prevent large numbers from taking ship for Carolina. The colonel of the regiment himself left for England without leave, incurring thereby the grave displeasure of William III; the remnants of his regiment were inevitably reduced to a company; equally inevitably, this company was ordered disbanded at the end of the war. Since all the men already had civilian jobs, Beeston pronounced them perfectly satisfied, while the one surviving commissioned officer

21 Major Edward Nott to Blathwayt, 19 February, 1690; CSPC 1689-92, 768. Lieutenant Governor Hill and officers to the Lords of Trade and Plantations, 31 August, 1692; CSPC.1689-92, 2421.

22 Lyman Musgrave to Blathwayt, 31 January, 1691/2; BW XXVII. Unregimented companies of this sort were bound to be less effective agents of the central authority and the trend of the seventies and eighties had been to their suppression when possible: see the figures in J. Miller, 'Catholic Officers in the later Stuart Army', English Historical Review 88 (1973), 41.
was to go on half pay. 23

The major difference in the military presence in the colonies before and after the revolution, then, was quantitative and not qualitative. Yet this quantitative change placed huge demands on civil servants such as Blathwayt, especially when they were involved, too, in the organisation of the campaigns on the continent.

As we have seen from the preceding chapter, Blathwayt emerged from the revolution with his offices intact and his 'interest' at court seemingly unimpaired. Re-appointed to all his offices by the late spring of 1689, he shortly found himself with yet another; from 1692 until William's death he was acting Secretary of State when the King was on campaign, accompanying the King in that capacity as well as Secretary at War. Portland and Nottingham had helped him here; Nottingham himself, and future Secretaries of State, certainly had no ambition to run the gamut of war in Flanders. 24 The senior Secretary of State was also happy

23 Beeston to Blathwayt, 24 August, 1695; Blathwayt to Beeston, 21 April, 1696; Beeston to Blathwayt, 5 August, 1696, 24 August, 1699; BW XLI. For a similar pattern of troop erosion in the Leeward Islands see CSPC 1693-6, 1537 (Holt complains of his regiment's state, 1694); WO 26/9, 97-9 (Holt's regiment broken into Collingwood's, 1698); WO 26/10 (Codrington to disband the independent company in the Leewards and break it into the regiment going there from Ireland, 1701). Dispersion of the troops made for serious discipline problems; a few years after Beeston's recall, the Council of Trade recommended the building of barracks in Jamaica and other colonies where troops could be lodged 'under fitting regulations'. HMC House of Lords vol. VI, 1704-6, 102.

24 For a suggestion as to Portland's role in Blathwayt's career see HMC Leyborne-Popham, 271. The physical dangers of the campaigns were made more obvious to civilians when the deputy governor of the Bank of England, Michael Godfrey, visiting William in Flanders in 1695, was killed by a cannon ball; Luttrell, Brief Relation III, 503.
to get rid of some of the paperwork; he did not relish the constant correspondence with foreign envoys and others that his post necessitated and he had had ample opportunity to observe Blathwayt's efficiency when they both attended the Cabinet Council. As Blathwayt wrote, 'My Lord Nottingham settles the Minutes with me after every meeting so that no mistake can easily happen'.

It is difficult to be sure just how far constant access to William III advanced Blathwayt's standing. It was impossible for Blathwayt to boast, as he had of James, concerning the monarch's expressions of kindness to him, at least verbally. The taciturnity of the monarch was a byword; his Dutch secretary, Huygens, reported how difficult it was for both Nottingham and Shrewsbury to persuade him to speak to them even on the most pressing matters. Actions rather than words must help us to establish Blathwayt's position. When Blathwayt's papers and plate were captured by a Dunkirk privateer in 1692, the King ordered compensation from the Treasury for him very promptly and on a sufficiently liberal scale to provoke enduring envy. In 1692, in late 1693, and again in 1695,

25 Blathwayt to Southwell, 17 June, 1690; SOU/8, 135', SG. Stepney's opinion of Nottingham's interest and ability in foreign affairs was extremely disparaging: see Stepney to Prior, 11/21 December, 1692; SP 105/50. The memorandum prepared for Nottingham on the workings of the Secretary of State's office suggests that he was not entirely sure how to proceed in his new post; Add. MSS. 38861, 46-9.

26 C. Huygens, Journaal I, 429, entry for 9 May, 1691. Nottingham and Shrewsbury were the two Secretaries of State at this time.

27 See the comment of a fellow victim who received no compensation: Earl Rivers to Robert Harley, 5 December, 1710; HMC Portland, 641. The payments to Blathwayt are listed in CTR IX, 1689-92, 1602, 1616, 1658, 1734, 1736.
there were rumours that Blathwayt would be made a full Secretary of State; George Stepney opined in the last case that he 'seems to decline it, because without envy he is warmer as He is'. Power without responsibility was always more to Blathwayt's taste. 28

But it should not be thought that Blathwayt progressively consolidated his position with the monarch as the reign continued. 29 In 1693 after the battle of Landen he became the laughing stock of the camp and the object of royal disapproval for the speed of his retreat to Breda and an injudicious letter to Pensionary Heinsius referring to 'la défaite entière' of William III. While Blathwayt tried to explain in a letter to Stepney that he had somehow become 'separated' from the King since the army retreated in several directions, he was forced to admit that he was unlikely to be in any position to influence Stepney's next posting. 30 By the end of the year, Blathwayt seemed to have recovered much of his confidence and influence, but he was probably never quite as secure as his clients chose to suggest. Furthermore, not all important matters were allowed to pass through Blathwayt's hands; the King emphasised to the Duke of Shrewsbury on one occasion that there was a distinction between what he 'could trust to Blathwayt' and what he chose to write directly

28 Luttrell, Brief Relation II, 601 (entry for October, 1692); Stepney to Stratford, 20/30 December, 1693; SP 105/60; Stepney to Lexington, 13/23 February, 1694/5; Add. MSS. 46535, 11.

29 That is the impression given in Webb, 'Imperial Fixer' II, especially 380-81.

30 Blathwayt to Stepney, 3 August, 1693 MS; SP 105/59, 219; same to same, 2 October, 1693; SP 105/60. Huygens, Journaal II, 264 has an account of the Breda affair. And see S. Baxter, William III (London, 1966) 314. Blathwayt also expressed to Nottingham his feeling that this was not the right time to ask favours of the King; Add. MSS. 37992, 19.
to Shrewsbury. At varying times in the nineties, Portland and Albemarle
were providing clerical assistance to the monarch, in addition to Huy-
gens, the Dutch secretary. Despite these caveats, Blathwayt's position
was an important one, and his appointment to the new Board of Trade in
1696 seemed both logical and inevitable to contemporaries. 31 Although
leading politicians could aid him on occasion—Ranelagh, Godolphin and
Montagu, for example—his chief interest lay with the King. 32

Blathwayt was, of course, aware that certain colonial factions
remained hostile to his ideas of imperial centralisation and executive
discretion; as Randolph was quick to inform him, Mather and other New
Englanders were convinced that they would gain none of their objectives
while Blathwayt remained in office. 33 Nor was he immune to those feelings
of uncertainty about the new régime which plagued even the most ardent
supporters of William until at least the mid-nineties and which were
exacerbated in the immediate post-revolutionary period by William's de-
cision to lead the Irish campaign personally. As Blathwayt told his pat-
ron Southwell in 1690, Southwell might well lose his estate in Gloucester-

31 King to Shrewsbury, 23 July, 1696; W. Coxe (ed.), Private and
Original Correspondence of Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury (London,
1821), 127. On Blathwayt's position in the late nineties see Baxter,
326.

32 For Ranelagh's aid (mainly in Treasury affairs) see Add. MSS. 56242
and Add. MSS. 9735, 83. For Godolphin see Add. MSS. 9735, 54. Montagu
was termed by Blathwayt in a letter to Stepney 'our Patron'; SP 105/51
(18 February, 1697/8).

33 The removal of Danby and Halifax was also eagerly awaited. Ran-
dolph to Blathwayt, 10 January, 1689/90; BW I.
shire even as he was recovering his estate at Kinsale. 34 (Perhaps Blathwayt's decision to remain in England and to risk his monarch's displeasure by refusing to accompany him to Ireland had been a sound one).

In the early nineties, events seemed to outrun any possibility of their proper organisation. 35 Blathwayt identified a major problem when he pointed out during the midst of the Irish campaign that 'no body has a particular charge of generall matters so as to watch and pursue the dispatch of them in the severall places'. 36 It was not just the Irish campaign which suffered. The 'dilatory proceedings' in sending out the West Indies fleet in 1690 represented more than the usual reluctance of the troops when confronted with the prospect of colonial service; once that fleet had arrived at its destination, Colonel Kendall, governor of Barbados, was forced to threaten its immediate return, just as a French fleet was sailing within range, unless provision ships were sent from home and orders for him to draw bills on the Navy Commissioners. 37

The total financial collapse of the country seemed a distinct possibility until well into the decade (the major crisis came in spring, 1697), and fiscal problems continually hampered the implementation of policy. The Commissioners of Transportation constantly struggled to acquire sufficient tonnage for the ambitious schemes for 'descents' on France; as John Ellis reported to Blathwayt in early '93, they had re-

34 Blathwayt to Southwell, 17 July, 1690; SOU/1, 50, SC.

35 For instructive comments on post-revolutionary problems, see Webb, 'Imperial Fixer' II, 374ff.

36 Blathwayt to Southwell, 24 July, 1690; SOU/1, 70–1, SC.

37 Kendall to Blathwayt, 29 July, 1689/90, 26 June, 1690; BW XXXI.
ceived no orders for some weeks but were 'going on still, because we are not bid to stop, but going slowly for want of money to grease the wheels'.

To the hard-headed Godolphin, the cost of a 'descent' in the spring of 1692 and the problems in making such a descent useful or practicable, seemed almost as impossible 'as it would bee to Scale the moone.' When delays finally led to the cancellation of the attempt, it was difficult to discharge the transport ships: chiefly because there was no money to pay them.

Ten days earlier, Transport Commissioners Henley and Ellis had explained that Sir Edward Seymour had been at the Treasury asking why the hay and oats were rotting in the transport ships: but no orders had arrived about disposing of them. The Treasury was refusing to advance any cash to the Commissioners, blaming the descent, 'which is very comfortable newes to us, who are run into about 30000l debt on that score...'.

Fear of acting without proper authority when William was on the continent and strong interdepartmental rivalries were clearly vitiating policies.

---

38 Ellis to Blathwayt, 28 April, 1693; Add. MSS. 9729, 25-6. The problems of the Transport Commissioners can be followed in detail in the many volumes of the Ellis Correspondence in the British Library. See, for example, Henley to Ellis, 12 March, 1692/3; Add. MSS. 28878, 57. On the general fiscal problems of the nineties see P.G.M. Dickson, The Financial Revolution in England: A Study in the Development of Public Credit 1688-1756 (London, 1967), esp. 345ff.

39 Godolphin to Blathwayt, 5 May, 1693; BY 8.

40 Nottingham to Blathwayt, 25 July, 1693; Add. MSS. 24328, 13v.

41 Henley and Ellis to Blathwayt, 11 July, 1693, undated (summer, 1693); Add. MSS. 9729, 47, 59.
The problems assumed a different perspective in Flanders, however, Blathwayt, writing from Grammen, confessed he could not see 'at this distance' where all the obstacles lay that necessitated spending two whole months in shipping the troops intended for the (equally abortive) descent of 1692. Moreover, as Blathwayt complained to Nottingham, these troops had been sent without one farthing for their subsistence or contingencies, 'No great conquests are to be expected from such methods'. But Whitehall also had its complaints. The quality of some of the 'information' on which intelligent decisions were supposedly to be made is demonstrated by one particularly pathetic missive which reached Nottingham from Flanders in June of 1693. From the enclosed, wrote the harassed Secretary at War, the Secretary of State would 'probably' conclude that a detachment of eight ships had either gone to the East Indies, or to Canada, or had been sent to intercept the Bilboa fleet. This was all that Blathwayt could say, and probably all he knew, about the end result of the Wheeler/Foulkes expedition of 1692-3.

This expedition represented what was probably Blathwayt's most important contribution to policy-making in the nineties. While in the matter of the 'descents' he was largely acting as a superior clearing-

42 Blathwayt to Commissioners of Transportation, 5/15 September, 1692; Add. MSS. 28896, 299.

43 Blathwayt to Nottingham, 29 August/8 September, 1692; Add. MSS. 37991, 164.

44 Possibly the secretive William had a clearer vision of what was intended than his servants. Blathwayt to Nottingham, 19/29 June, 1693; Add. MSS. 37992, 14. This was a week after Blathwayt had passed on to Nottingham the King's displeasure at the taking of the New England packet boat, which had contained instructions to Governor Phips of Massachusetts about Wheeler's movements once he reached the mainland colonies. Add. MSS. 37992, 13.
house for information, here he was the major author of the scheme.
Blathwayt had drafted his 'Proposal for destroying the French Plantations in America' in 1691, recommending the sending of two regiments and a squadron of eight or more ships to the West Indies. 45 Throughout 1692 and 1693 he attempted to co-ordinate the details of the expedition with Nottingham. 46 Even as he apparently deferred to the senior Secretary of State, 47 he was answering Nottingham's request for direction on such matters as who should command the expedition, and what powers they should be given, with decisions which in all probability were as much his as the royal master's in whose name they were given. 48 Delay was inevitable as the letters passed from Flanders to Whitehall; the Queen, reluctant to assume any role in the direction of war policy, maintained however an informed interest and confided to her diary in September, 1692 the 'vexation' she felt in seeing 'the West India business linger so'. 49

45 CSPC 1689-92, 1560.
46 The expedition is discussed in great detail in Webb, 'Imperial Fixer' II, 381-394.
47 This deference may sometimes have been more formal than real but it helped protect Blathwayt's position even if it infuriated some. The English envoy to Turin, annoyed that his request for removal must first be discussed with Nottingham, complained that Blathwayt was acting as if both of them were in Lord Nottingham's service not the King's. 'How far my Lord Nottingham's advice in it may be necessary to you, I cannot tell, but it is not necessary to me...'. Edmund Poley to Blathwayt, 1 November NS 1691, BY 14.
48 Webb is most insistent on this point: he may well be correct, but there is little hard evidence. Blathwayt's experience in and knowledge of colonial affairs are well-known but so is William's reluctance to delegate command decisions.
The difficulties in co-ordinating the command of a colonial expedition were not new but they were never more clearly demonstrated. Sir Francis Wheeler was to have supreme naval command; as Governor Beeston of Jamaica pointed out later, Wheeler never got closer to that colony than three hundred leagues, and all Beeston's misgivings before he left for his government about his lack of authority over the King's ships had been justified. But Blathwayt had known of these problems years before: in 1691 he had noted for Governor Kendall's benefit in Barbados the jealous way in which the Admiralty guarded its power. Two years later Kendall was complaining to Rochester of the wrong done him by Wheeler's arrival with power to command in chief 'where I have been Captain-general for some years'.

Colonel John Foulkes was given supreme command of the troops; again this was hardly pleasing to colonial governors. Blathwayt was forced to write placatingly to Colonel Codrington in the Leeward Islands that this arrangement did not, of course, spring from 'any distrust or prejudice to you'. Codrington's agents, when at a later date they

50 See Webb, 'Imperial Fixer' II, 386, 387.

51 Beeston to Blathwayt, 1 December, 1692; 27 July, 1693; BW XXI. Exactly the same problem occurred in 1695: Beeston found his authority to command all the forces on the island, the granting of which, Blathwayt assured him, was a special mark of royal favour, was largely vitiated by the Admiralty, who had 'soe Abridged it, y' I cannot Comand nor make Attacks, nor have anything to doe but in A Councill of Warre...'. Beeston to Povey, 1 September, 1695; BW XXI.

presented to the King a memorial of the Colonel's services, made much of his readiness to 'make that Condisention' in placing the thousand men he had raised under the command of Colonel Foulkes. In 1694, with the mistimed and mismanaged Wheeler-Foulkes expedition no more than an unpleasant (if costly) memory, Secretary of State Trenchard was hoping that Blathwayt, who had survived the débâcle though Nottingham had not, would return from the year's continental campaign in time to lend assistance in the drafting of instructions for the next season's Jamaica contingent, 'whereby the disputes may be prevented that arose in the last expedition'. This was no more than a fond hope. A decade later, Blathwayt summed up the wearisome lessons of over half a century of English experience in the West Indies: the misfortunes of the 1703 season were mainly caused by disagreements between the sea commander and the land general 'which has been the bane of all Expeditions from that agt. Hispaniola in Cromwell's time downwards to this last instance but the Influence of the Admty will always prevail to make it so'.

Blathwayt never had been in a position to take on the whole of the Admiralty, but arguably there had been less necessity for it under the pre-revolution Pepysian régime. There was much friction with the new Secretary, Phineas Bowles, in the immediate post-1688 period and no sign whatsoever that Blathwayt found allies at the Admiralty of the

53 Blathwayt to Codrington, 20 December, 1692; 'Memorial to the King of the services of Colonel Christopher Codrington, presented by his agents', 8 January, 1694 [?]; BW XXXVIII.

54 Trenchard to Blathwayt, 9 October, 1694; SOU/4, 365, SG.

55 Blathwayt to Stepney, 6 August, 1703; BY 21.
calibre of Henley and Ellis at the Transport Commission.  

The whole of the Transport Commission was in his debt when he managed to arrange for their tax reimbursement from the contingency money of the office. Even easy personal relationships could not solve every problem of organisation, as the era of the 'descents' revealed; without them, however, effective action was well-nigh impossible.

In theory, it was true, the Privy Council Committee for Trade and Plantations was in immediate authority over the Admiralty in the matter of detailed arrangements for colonial expeditions. Yet its letters and orders on such matters were few. The number of its meetings hardly matched what one would assume to have been its responsibilities between 1689 and 1696. In such circumstances, more power devolved on its diligent secretary, William Blathwayt. However, we have seen that he could not prevail over the Admiralty; by the end of 1693 he was probably grateful that he had not. 'We have cut down our Admirals after hanging', he commented wryly to one of the English envoys after the parliamentary attacks on the naval mismanagement of that year; at least he could feel that they had ruined themselves without his assistance (and thus, it

---

56 The Blathwayt correspondence of the eighties suggests that he was on amicable terms with Pepys. See also Blathwayt to Southwell, 20 January, 1680; Portland MSS. 52. For examples of problems with Bowles in 1690, see CSPC 1689–92, 681, 722.

57 Add. MSS. 9729, 138, 152. The Commissioners ingeniously claimed this could not serve as a precedent for others 'since we shall be sure to keep it private amongst ourselves'.


59 See note 8.
followed, without his being implicated). 60

Was Blathwayt able to exploit his colonial power effectively in other ways? His sources of information were as excellent as ever. In 1694 one of the Transport Commissioners, John Ellis, was told that the Secretaryship of Maryland (estimated to be worth £300 p.a.) was vacant. If Ellis wished to make a move it should be done that very night, urged his correspondent, 'otherwise Mr. Blathwayt may probably be too nimble for us both'. 61 Rare indeed was it for others to have information that the nimble Mr. Blathwayt did not. Many colonial governors were happy to 'spare' the Earl of Nottingham and other Secretaries of State the long letters they reserved for Blathwayt, and to continue to send to him the detailed documents which he might 'digest' for the benefit of the Committee of Trade. Digestion meant not just summary but explanation and justification. Simple statements of acts taken might be sent to the Committee, as when Governor Kendall of Barbados made a series of suspensions from the island's council, but the reasons and the documentation went straight to Blathwayt. 62 Clients continued loyal; Edward Randolph might not be certain 'how the Custom House will take it that I import to you papers properly to be addressed there', but he did it all the same. In a changing world Blathwayt appeared to be a constant; it was over a decade

60 On the naval problems of this period see Horwitz, Revolution Politicks, ch. 7.

61 Tucker to Ellis, 28 March, 1694; Add. MSS. 28878, 170.

62 CSPC 1689–92, 2552, 2599 (Phips to Nottingham, Kendall to the Lords of Trade and Plantations).
since Randolph had expressed the view that his 'small affaires...would fall to the ground' without Blathwayt's favour but he was clearly still of the same opinion. Blathwayt expressed incredulity to the less deferential Governor Copley of Maryland at the fact that Copley was demurring at Blathwayt's patent as Auditor General, and reminded him that the Collector and Receiver, to whom Blathwayt was also writing, would do well to remember that he had recommended them to their places, for which they could demonstrate their fitness 'by the performance of their duty specified in my Grant...'.

Colonial lobbyists had every reason to consider Blathwayt still worth the investment of a substantial 'gratification'. The utility of Blathwayt's several offices, acting in combination, was obvious. In 1695, Blathwayt as clerk of the Council signed the order referring the case of Robert Livingston, who was demanding payment for his services as agent to the Indians, and confirmation of all his former offices, to the Treasury. Then, in his capacity as Auditor General of Plantation Revenues, he drafted the requisite report. The Secretary at War was familiar with the military careers of dozens of officers who, in his capacity of

63 Randolph to Blathwayt, 14 March, 1692/3; BW II. Randolph to Sir Robert Southwell, 12 March, 1680/1; BH 227. For another example of Randolph's reliance on Blathwayt for vetting material see Randolph to Blathwayt, 15 October, 1688; BW I.

64 Blathwayt to Copley, 28 February, 1692/3; BW XVIII.

65 For example, Blathwayt received £300 from the Jamaica Council in 1691: Minutes of the Council of Jamaica, 20 October, 1691; CSPC 1689-92, 1848.

Secretary of Plantations, he might be asked to consider as potential colonial governors. The appointment of Francis Nicholson to Virginia in 1690 and to Maryland in 1692, and of Edmund Andros to Virginia in 1692, were all backed by Blathwayt. 'I kno very well yt your interest is great with ye King towards ye making a new governor', wrote Goddard from Bermuda in 1693 on hearing of the death of Copley in Maryland.  

In such ways the fragmentation of colonial policy might be countered.

The tone of the client-patron letter had to be somewhat hyperbolic regarding the patron's supposed influence and abilities. The fate of the Jamaica governorship in the years following 1689 helps demonstrate the dimensions of Blathwayt's influence. Jamaica was generally regarded as a posting where substantial profits were to be made; John Povey suggested to Sir Robert Southwell in 1686 that the bid by the appointee, the Duke of Albemarle, for a plantation in the island worth £15000 gave some indication of the value of the posting. In July, 1689, the Committee of Trade, over whose deliberations Blathwayt exerted substantial influence, recommended two candidates for the governorship, Lord Colchester and Colonel Molesworth, the latter being already deputy governor. In September Lord Halifax wrote in his journal of his interviews with the King that William would not hear of Lord Colchester but seemed most inclined to a third candidate, Lord Inchiquin, although a few weeks earlier he had not seemed willing to employ the second Earl of Inchiquin in any capacity. 'Query', wrote Halifax curtly, 'by what interest altered,

67 John Goddard to Blathwayt, 30 November, 1693; BW XXXVI.

68 Povey to Southwell, 24 April, 1686; Portland MSS. 60. Possibly the reputation of Jamaica was greater than the reality justified: see A.P. Thornton, West India Policy, 61, 150, n.2.
probably by the Queen'. 69 Inchiquin duly kissed hands for the post. By April of 1692, Inchiquin was dead and Secretary of State Nottingham was wishing that he knew someone suitable to succeed 'in yt very considerable Employment'. Others had noted the death, too. Governor Kendall of Barbados remarked to Blathwayt that it left the best government in the royal gift except Ireland to be disposed of. As Kendall's ambitions for the government of Jamaica became clearer, so too did his appreciation of Blathwayt's diligence and abilities. It was all in vain. From Brede Blathwayt replied to Nottingham's enquiries that the King wished the Cabinet Council or the Committee of Plantations to consider whether Colonel William Beeston might be suitable for Jamaica. Not surprisingly, the outcome was Beeston's appointment. The initiative had almost certainly come from Blathwayt; Beeston had been known to him since at least 1683, and when Lord President Carmarthen was thinking of a little flutter in the colonial trades Blathwayt could do no better than recommend he invest £1000 with Beeston, 'the most knowing and honest man I have been acquainted with belonging to the Plantations...'. 70 Probably too honest; when the Lieutenant Governor wished to proceed against the estate of the late Earl for a debt owing to the crown, Blathwayt had to warn him to go warily since the new Earl was related by marriage to Lord Portland. Bold moves by the Attorney

69 Persons recommended by the committee to be governors in the plantations, 19 July, 1689; CO 5/1, 11-25; Foxcroft, SHJ II, 233, 238.

70 Nottingham to Blathwayt, 22 April, 1692; Add. MSS. 37991, 55. Kendall to Blathwayt, 4 March, 1691/2, 3 November, 1692, 10 February, 1692/3; BW XXXI. Blathwayt to Nottingham, 2/12 May, 1692; Add. MSS. 37991, 57. Beeston was one of the Jamaican agents in the eighties; BW XXI. Blathwayt to the Lord President, 14 July, 1692; Add. MSS. 34351, 1.
General of Jamaica could only result in 'Clamorous Complaints'. Moderation was obviously still the key to Blathwayt's approach to colonial problems.

Even before he sailed, Beeston was asking for reassurances that he would not be condemned on any occasion without being heard, and he had hardly arrived when he heard rumours of his impending removal. Blathwayt managed to acquire the King's personal assurance this was not threatened, and by the summer of 1695 had secured him additional powers as commander-in-chief. Blathwayt returned a complaint against Beeston unseen by the King, claiming that the monarch had no leisure to read it while in Holland. There were many competitors for Beeston's position, including one of the influential Russell clan and the current Earl of Inchiquin. Inchiquin indeed was hoping that Blathwayt would take 'some opportunity of disposing the king towards sending me thither' while the King was on that side of the water, that is, in Flanders: all knew that Blathwayt's influence was greatest during the campaign season when his contact with William was constant and other influences on the monarch diminished. The candidate for the Russell faction for Jamaica had no

71 Blathwayt to Beeston, 5 January, 1692/3; Beeston to Blathwayt, 27 July, 1693; Blathwayt to Beeston, 24 April, 1694; BW XXI.

72 Blathwayt to Vernon, 9/19 November, 1697; Add. MSS. 37992, 189V. Blathwayt to Beeston, 21 March, 1696; BW XXI. Beeston did not rely solely on Blathwayt; his other major patron was the Lord President, now the Duke of Leeds, whose £1000 had presumably been well looked after.
chance on this occasion, and Blathwayt was too committed to Beeston in 1696 to help the third Earl of Inchiquin. Two years later, however, Blathwayt was playing a double game. Beeston remained convinced of his backing, but Inchiquin was charmed by Blathwayt's assurance that the King intended sending a new governor to Jamaica and that there might yet be a probability of Inchiquin's pretensions succeeding. Although Inchiquin was now convinced that he 'must no longer doubt ye good intentions', there is no evidence that Blathwayt in fact ever exerted himself on Inchiquin's behalf.

The very propinquity to the royal person which was such an indispensable element in the maintenance of Blathwayt's 'interest' reflected his seasonal removal from Whitehall and thus from some of the day-to-day colonial business. Towards the end of Blathwayt's first Flanders campaign with the King as acting Secretary of State, Beeston wrote to his patron to complain of the problems of a typical day in the labyrinth of Whitehall. First to the Treasury, where secretary William Lowndes told him to return at a later date since they had no information concerning money for Jamaica. Then to the Admiralty, as the Privy Council had ordered him. Beeston thought he was to discuss the question of Admiralty Courts for Prizes and his imminent embarkation for his command, but the Admiralty denied all knowledge of the matter and told him he would be sailing with the Barbados fleet just before Christmas, a delay of at

73 Inchiquin to Blathwayt, 5 August, 1696; Add. MSS. 9735, 66. Inchiquin made it clear that the Russells blamed Blathwayt for hindering their man. Blathwayt's relations with them had been poor for several years; see Admiral Russell's complaints against him to Shrewsbury in 1694; Coxe, Shrewsbury Correspondence, 215.

74 Inchiquin to Blathwayt, 13 September, 1698; BY 11.
least two months. No wonder Beeston feared he was going with 'a lame Authority' and longed for Blathwayt's return and his 'counsel and assistance'.

Delays in colonial business because of Blathwayt's absence in Flanders with King William were a tribute to his expertise and influence but they cannot have improved the running of an empire. John Povey, handling the routine correspondence and assuming Blathwayt's colonial responsibilities at the Council Board pro tem., did well enough and was certainly trustworthy (Blathwayt had agonised over this last point for months in 1681, emphasising that he would 'at least find one Security by it which I could not be assured of from every other hand') but he could not command his master's influence. Blathwayt's translation to a 'higher and different Sphere' was, Governor Kendall of Barbados concluded in 1694, the reason he had not received a letter for so long; it had also meant that several incidents had occurred in England to the island's disadvantage which, in Kendall's opinion, Blathwayt's presence would certainly have prevented. The 'Load of Business' to which the acting Secretary of State frequently made reference was palpable enough and nothing

---

75 Beeston to Blathwayt, 5 October, 1692; see also 24 October, 1692; BW XXI.

76 See, for example, J. Povey to H. Guy, 23 January, 1695; CSPC 1693-96, 1660. Important papers on the Virginia revenues and Virginia war stores had been set aside the previous June to await Blathwayt's return.

77 Blathwayt to Southwell, 21 May, 1681; see also Blathwayt to Southwell, 11 June, 1681: 'I can not deny that amongst all other considerations I would be safe myself'. Portland MSS. 52.

78 Kendall to Blathwayt, 5 November, 1694; BW XXXI.

79 See, for example, Blathwayt to Codrington, 24 April, 1694; BW XXXVIII.
less than its efficient discharge would satisfy a monarch who had first noticed Blathwayt for his 'good method'.

The nature of Blathwayt's business in spheres other than colonial also reflected his geographical location. While in England the Secretary at War helped mobilise the troops for colonial and continental expeditions, and lent aid to the garrison commanders in all manner of matters, including their relationship with the civilian authorities. Colonel Gibson at Portsmouth added to his list of requests for garrison supplies a plea for help at a Council hearing over his offer of Major General Tal- mash to the corporation as a candidate for burgess if a dissolution occurred. Blathwayt found, in fact, that he could operate in a small way as an electoral patron solely because of his influence over troop movements and quartering arrangements. Colonel Leveson in 1692 was convinced that if anything could get him elected in Newport it was Blath- wayt's help in arranging for his constituency to be free of responsibility for quartering troops.

When he was on campaign, military administration in England was dealt with by his ambitious deputy, George Clarke. But the diminution of patronage in one area was amply compensated for by its expansion in another, as the foreign envoys hastened to make their reports and requests to the acting Secretary of State. Even out of season it was unwise to neglect Blathwayt; as Monsieur d'Hervart reported from Switzerland one December, he would continue to write to him despite the fact that 'actuel- lment vous ne soyee plus dans le meme employ que vous exerces quand le Roy est en Campagne'—and added that in these days of frequent changes of

80 Gibson to Blathwayt, 13 October, 1691; Add. MSS. 29323, 9.
81 Leveson to Blathwayt, 5 December, 1692; Add. MSS. 9727, 84.
Secretaries of State he knew no one else with the requisite knowledge of the King's wishes. Rare was the English envoy who did not beg Blathwayt's aid in the difficult task of extracting money from the Treasury, especially ready money rather than the tallies which petitioners were frequently forced to accept. When Stepney heard that the King himself was backing one of his pay claims at the Treasury he commented, only half in jest, 'I hope he has some interest there'. Most envoys realised that, especially when the Secretary of State was in poor health or unwilling to burden himself with the details of foreign business, their fates were sealed on the continent, not in England. Although the occasional envoy resented receiving the advice that Stepney gave Cresset, consul in Hamburg, to correspond constantly with Blathwayt, as he 'cheifly directed foreign affairs', most were happy to pay the usual compliments and more to the acting secretary. And they reaped the usual type of

82 D'Hervart to Blathwayt, 2/12 December, 1693; Add. MSS. 9741, 74.

83 At the end of 1696 tallies were being discounted at the appalling rate of 45%: Prior to Powys, 7 December, 1696; NPC Bath, vol. III, Prior Papers, 95. For other envoy pleas for back pay see, for example, Add. MSS. 9808, 32 (Colt in Saxony, 1693), Add. MSS. 15572, 293 (Greg in Copenhagen, 1693).

84 Stepney to Robinson, 8 February, 1698/9; SP 105/52. At his death, Stepney left his estate to his two sisters, but it was estimated that most of it was in the Treasury, which owed him £7000; J. Addison to C. Cole, 16/27 September, 1707; Christian Cole, Historical and Political Memoirs, 1697-1708, (London, 1735), 481. Not everyone could emulate envoy Savile's accomplishments in the '80s: he got his money even before it was ordered at the Treasury, through 'his peculiar talent of drinking with Mr. Duncombe' (one of the Treasury Commissioners). R.W. Blencowe (ed.), Diary of the Times of Charles the Second by the Honourable Henry Sidney (London, 1843), 188.

85 Cresset to Ellis, 2 March, 1696/7; Add. MSS. 28899, 83. Same to same, 7 June, 1698; Add. MSS. 28901, 188-9.
reward: ambassador Skelton at Paris was delighted at the rate his sons advanced in the army; Dr. Robinson, envoy in Stockholm, was fulsome in the gratitude he expressed when his brother was made Secretary of Vir-
ginia. Long-serving diplomats such as Sutton, Prior and Stepney knew that the whole pattern of their careers was designed by Blathwayt. No-
thing was more pleasing to the ambitious diplomat than to learn that Blathwayt was making the best use of his letters 'for his Majesty's ser-
vice and yours'.

The Stepney case is particularly clearly documented. Stepney, un-
known to Blathwayt when he began writing to the acting Secretary of State from Berlin in 1692, had a lengthy discussion with him at the Hague two years later over career prospects. A Council clerkship would be attrac-
tive, but Stepney could not afford the purchase price. A clerkship in the Secretary of State's office was also a possibility, but lacked per-
manence since each new Secretary chose his own staff. Blathwayt seemed most inclined to try to fit Stepney on to his own staff in Flanders, some-
thing not entirely to the envoy's taste since he knew 'the Slavery in wh he keeps poor Cardonnell'. As Stepney put it to Cardonnell himself, 'I generally fall a sleep before 3 in the morning & you'd chuse to be his servant at a distance'. Ultimately, Stepney managed to achieve a seat.

---

86 Add. MSS. 38848, 101-2 (1688); Add. MSS. 35105, 16 (1693).
87 R.A. Sutton to Blathwayt, 15 January, 1698; Add. MSS. 46529, 3
88 For the beginning of the Stepney/Blathwayt correspondence see SP 105/50. Stepney reported the job discussion to Vernon in October, 1694; SP 105/55. Stepney to Cardonnell, 26 April/6 May, 1695; SP 105/55.
at the Board of Trade, at a salary of £1000 p.a., through a combination of Blathwayt's interest with those of Montagu and Vernon. This was not done, however, before Stepney had learned some of the perils of multiple patronage. He found that the more he begged Lord Portland to intercede on his behalf with the King, 'the less Mr. Blathwayt moved in my behalf'. 'Little Willy', as Lexington called Portland, had his own patronage empire.

Between 1689 and 1696, apart from the unfortunate aftermath of the battle of Landen, it appeared that Blathwayt had maintained and even strengthened his position. He had added to his pre-revolution responsibilities the post of acting Secretary of State, and his longevity in that post meant that his knowledge and experience were soon greater than those of the actual Secretaries. His patronage network flourished; he was able to have a decisive influence on some diplomatic postings and many minor colonial and army positions, and could make a strong contribution in the appointment of governors. He had had, in the Wheeler/Foulkes expedition, an opportunity to make policy not just to implement it.

89 The whole story is unravelled in Stepney's Letterbooks: see especially SP 105/53, 105/54, 105/55. The machinations are clearly described (though with minor errors of detail) in Webb, 'Imperial Fixer' II, 402-6.

90 Stepney to ? Montagu, 23 October/2 November, 1694; Lexington to Stepney, 4 May, 1695; SP 105/55.

91 In March, 1694, Luttrell reported a rumour that Secretary of State Trenchard would accompany the King to Flanders. This would, of course, have meant the end of Blathwayt's attendance. Brief Relation III, 279.
Yet this many-sided activity took its toll. The price of versatility, as G.E. Aylmer notes, is over-extension. One of the reasons for Blathwayt's failure to become Secretary of State to Charles II had probably been that he was regarded as sufficiently or even over-employed. That was before the explosion of business of the nineties. If public expenditure is used as an index of government activity, the figures speak for themselves. Dickson estimates that before 1688, England's public expenditure was under £2 million p.a., and that between 1689 and 1702 it was between £5 and £6 million p.a. Blathwayt fought the rising tide of paper manfully. However, as has been noted, there were some unfavourable omens. As government business grew, so too did the individual departments of state. Increased specialisation of functions no doubt meant increased need for co-ordinators, but such co-ordinators would be ministers rather than bureaucrats. Blathwayt had long been uneasily poised between the two. For Blathwayt the bureaucrat, an ever-greater effort was needed to master the details of his various offices, while on the other hand the very bureaucratic routines he himself had instituted meant that others could perform some of his functions equally well. Too timid (and probably too conscious of his social origins) to accept a full Secretaryship of State with its party and ministerial implications, Blathwayt was essentially following the ground rules for action which had worked so well for him in the 1680s. As the administrative and political impli-

92 G.E. Aylmer, The State's Servants (London, 1973), 226. Aylmer was commenting on the case of Henry Robinson, a member of the Accounts Committee of the 1650s.

93 For the incident in Charles's reign see ch. 1, P.G.M. Dickson, Financial Revolution in England, 46.
cations of the Glorious Revolution became more obvious in the mid and late nineties, as parliament began to take an increased interest in the colonies, in the war estimates and indeed in all aspects of administration, he would find (though possibly he did not understand) that this was not enough. Since 1693, he had been M.P. for Bath. If Blathwayt's position was to remain secure, parliamentary skills would have to be added to those of the bureaucrat.
CHAPTER 6

'NOT MUCH MINDED': 1696-1702

Early in 1697, George Stepney wrote in regretful tones to Blathwayt to claim that English reverses in the colonies were clear proof that things had not gone right in America 'since the helm was taken out of y' hands'. The claim was somewhat far-fetched, and Stepney anxious, at this critical stage in his career, to stand well with his patron; but it did reflect an important alteration in Blathwayt's position. The domineering Secretary of the old Plantations Committee was now simply a member of the new Board of Trade set up in 1696, and often an absentee one at that. Blathwayt confined himself in his colonial correspondence to a discreet announcement of the 'change there is in the Plantation Business' through the formation of the Board; his loyal clerk and kinsman Povey was assuring clients of the influence Blathwayt must have on it. But though the circumstances of the Board's formation might represent a victory for Blathwayt's monarch over a parliament that had wanted a body entirely of its own nomination, they hardly represented a victory

---

1 Stepney to Blathwayt, 1 February, 1697; SP 105/56, unpagedated.

2 Stepney was hoping to become a member of the new Board of Trade, or possibly to replace the secretary, Pophle.

3 For example, Blathwayt to Cranfield, 29 October, 1696; BW XII.

4 Povey to Nicholson, 4 July, 1696; Ellesmere MSS. 9625. As Povey noted, Blathwayt was the only member who knew anything of the matter Nicholson was interested in: and, the implication was, of many other matters.
for Blathwayt.⁵

One of the very first decisions about the Board, the nomination of the new Secretary, went against him. As Henley reported to him in Flanders, Lord Keeper Somers had blocked Povey from the post and succeeded in placing William Popple, a friend of Locke, in the secretaryship.⁶ The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Montagu, shared Blathwayt's opinion that Popple would have 'more business than he can go through with and wee every minute want the assistance of somebody that is conversant in the affairs of the Plantations'. Valiant attempts by Montagu and Blathwayt to set up a dual secretaryship with Povey as Popple's colleague, or to replace Popple by Stepney, came to nothing.⁷ As a disgruntled Stepney wrote to his patron, 'Mr. Popple (I find) will continue Mr. Popple'.⁸ Although Popple kept up a correspondence with Blathwayt,⁹ the Secretary was clearly the nominee of the Whigs and, moreover, possessed of several character defects according to his critics. He was too 'bold', in Montagu's view;

---


⁶Henley to Blathwayt, 3 July, 1696; Add. MSS. 9729, 140.

⁷Montagu to Blathwayt, 17/27 July, 1696; Add. MSS. 34355, 15; Povey to Nicholson, 4 July, 1696; Ellesmere MSS. 9625.

⁸Stepney to Blathwayt, 6/16 May, 1697; SP 105/57.

⁹See, for example, the series of letters in August, 1699; Popple to Blathwayt, 4, 11, 22 August; Add. MSS. 9747, 21, 19, 17.
after seven years of dealing with him, Blathwayt claimed he was 'duller and more obstinate than ever'.

Blathwayt's long-time clients, habituated to a dependence on him and still confident of his 'interest', continued to provide him with valuable information. For some months after the formation of the Board, Governor Beeston of Jamaica sent the public papers and accounts to Povey, although, as he admitted, 'I know nothing about the Lords of the Committee nor if hee bee Secretary to them'. The knowledge that Blathwayt had been named in the new Commission encouraged Beeston to use him, as ever, as his intermediary. Andros, too, brought down upon himself the displeasure of the other Board members by neglecting their requests for information and continuing to deal only with Blathwayt. As James Blair claimed in his Present State of Virginia, the finances of the colony remained a secret between the Governor, the Auditor and Mr. Blathwayt. Colonel Allen's assurances from New Hampshire that even the simplest country farmers there were aware of Blathwayt's influence at court were somewhat hyperbolic, but officials at all levels in the colonies continued to strike up a correspondence with Blathwayt in the latter half of William's reign. 'Altho' I am a stranger to you yet you can be soe to None', wrote Edward Parson from Montserrat. Robert Livingston, Secretary of Indian affairs in the colony of New York, was also anxious to inaugurate a

---

10 Add. MSS. 34355, 15; Blathwayt to Stepney, 1 June, 1703; BY 21.

11 Beeston to Blathwayt, 27 January, 18 March, 1697; BW XXI.

12 Board of Trade to Andros, 2 September, 1697; H.D. Farish (ed.), The Present State of Virginia, and the College (1964 reprint of Charlottesville, 1940 edition), 58.
correspondence if Blathwayt would find it useful. 13

There was still confidence in some quarters over Blathwayt's presumed patronage powers. When Colonel Basse was putting himself forward for a secretaryship in the Jersies, he felt confident of the outcome with Blathwayt for patron. 14 A fulsome letter from Governor Grey of Barbados in 1698 suggested that Blathwayt had given him aid in obtaining the post the previous year. 15 Joseph Dudley was another colonial official who had long wished to be reckoned 'on the file of your Dependents'; Blathwayt had helped Dudley to become head of Council to Slaughter, and a recommendation to a colonial governorship was the ultimate outcome. Dudley was appointed to Massachusetts in 1701, though not without the additional backing of Lord Cutts and a struggle against men like Vernon who considered him unsuitable. When Dudley's Tory imperialism provoked wrath among various New England interests, Blathwayt was among his chief defenders. 16

---

13 Allen to Blathwayt, 30 September, 1699; BW XII; Edward Parson to Blathwayt, 17 April, 1700; BW XXXIX; Robert Livingston to Blathwayt, 23 May, 1701; BH.


15 Grey to Blathwayt, 19 November, 1698; BW XXXI. As brother to Lord Tankerville, Grey had obvious access to influence.

16 Dudley to Blathwayt, 23 November, 1695; BW IV. Dudley had been cultivating his friendship with Blathwayt for at least a dozen years by the time of this letter. William Stoughton to Blathwayt, 14 November, 1694; BW V. Graham to Nicholson, 6 April, 1691; BW X. For Lord Cutts' backing see Trumbull to Blathwayt, 3 July, 1696; HMC Downshire, 677; Vernon to Shrewsbury, 9 June, 1698; Vernon Letters II, 101. On the Dudley/Blathwayt relationship see also Philip S. Haffenden, New England in the English Nation, 1689-1713 (Oxford, 1974), 188, 233.
Blathwayt's sources of information remained good, and several Secretaries of State in the second half of William's reign relied on him for knowledge of colonial affairs. Secretary Vernon had to admit that he knew little of the concerns of one of the island colonies, nor the pretender for a particular post; 'nothing ever falls in the Secretary's way to recommend to', he wrote petulantly a few months later, but the truth was rather that Vernon often lacked the requisite knowledge to play the patron successfully. Secretary Hedges was forced to confess that he would have been quite in the dark over foreign affairs if Blathwayt had not sent him frequent newsletters and copies of correspondence. \(^{17}\)

It is significant that when in 1699, as part of an economy drive, it was decided not to allow the printers' charge for supplying copies of printed acts, proclamations, votes, speeches etc. to various officials, Blathwayt was the only one mentioned by name, the rest being signified by position. Lord Chancellors, Secretaries of State and Lord Chief Justices might come and go, but it appeared that Blathwayt went on for ever. \(^{18}\)

Even in areas not directly connected with the positions he held, Blathwayt could exercise some unofficial pressure and gain friends in the process. When the post of custos rotulorum of Worcestershire fell vacant in 1699, Blathwayt's friend Ellis urged him to back the candidacy

\(^{17}\) Vernon to Blathwayt, 8 June, 1697; 2 August, 1698; Add. MSS. 34348, 47, 80; Hedges to Blathwayt, 9 September, 1701; SP 104/69, 122-3. Mark Thomson in The Secretaries of State, 1681-1782 (Oxford; 1932), 46 claims that Vernon had much more correspondence with colonial governors than other Secretaries of State of the period.

\(^{18}\) CPR XIV, 1699-1700, 17- Treasury minute for 20 October, 1699. There were ten Secretaries of State between 1689 and 1702.
of the Earl of Coventry and oblige an important noble family. 19 On other occasions Blathwayt dabbled in religious patronage; his help was solicited for an Irish bishopric and he promised one of his correspondents assistance in acquiring the Deanery of Durham. 20

Yet there were cracks in the façade. Many officials now preferred to cultivate other patrons. Governor Nicholson informed the President of the new Board of Trade, the Earl of Bridgewater, that he had no intention of following Povey's advice and corresponding with the Secretary of the Board (who would, Povey hoped, soon be himself), but would write direct. To a torrent of complaint from Nicholson about Povey and Blathwayt the fair-minded Bridgewater replied that it would be sensible to keep up a correspondence with Blathwayt 'tho you are to send your business to us'. 21 For 'us' some governors chose on occasion to read 'me', especially if personal matters were at stake; rather than delivering a memorial to Pople about the pay of the New York troops, Lord Bellmont preferred to raise the matter privately with Bridgewater and Tankerville, another Board member; and when asking for a salary increase he applied first to

19 In fact, three noble families because of the Coventry connections; Ellis to Blathwayt, 25 July, 1699; Add. MSS. 9734, 100.

20 Dean Smith to Blathwayt, 10 January, 1698/9; Add. MSS. 9734, 51; Blathwayt to Richard Hill, 28 March, 1699; Add. MSS. 56241. This Deanery was exceptionally lucrative, worth in excess of £1000 p.a. See also the case of the vacant bishopric of Raphoe in 1701; S.W. Singer (ed.), The Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon and of his brother Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester (London, 1828), II, 405.

21 Nicholson to Bridgewater, 30 March, 1697; Bridgewater to Nicholson, 2 August, 1697; Ellesmere MSS. 9722, 9733.
Bridgewater rather than the Board. Governor Codrington complained to Blathwayt that enemies were attempting to bring about his removal as governor of the Leeward islands by writing letters of accusation to Bridgewater.  

Faction and fragmentation were inevitable results of the Board's formation. Although in its first few years individual members had a rôle in policy making, the Board's position in the institutional structure was inferior to the body it had replaced: The old body was a part of the Privy Council; the new was subordinate to it and subject to its supervision. Moreover, the Earl of Bridgewater for one was perfectly willing to acquiesce in this subordinate position. As his scribbled notes in answer to the House of Lords committee query on the powers of the Board indicate, he was convinced that 'our part is advise & not in the execution'.

Blathwayt's attitude to the Board varied between a desire to dominate it when he was present and amused contempt at its deliberations in his absence. During the campaigning season, the Board was dominated by

22 Bellomont to Bridgewater, 9 June, 1697, 12 November, 1698; Ellesmere MSS. 9706, 9756.
23 Codrington to Blathwayt, 27 September, 1697; BW XXXVIII.
25 Notes, 13 February, 1697; Ellesmere MSS. 9659.
26 During William III's reign Blathwayt was able to attend less than 50% of the meetings: Steele, Appendix A.
Locke; at least one connection of Blathwayt was approached by 'one who is a Philosopher, & his friends', to give his opinion on trade, one object clearly being to tease out information which could be construed in ways unfavourable to the Secretary at War. The policies of the Board were not always those which Blathwayt could approve and in any case it frequently lacked the requisite papers to formulate policy intelligently. Blathwayt claimed that at the setting up of the Board he had handed over 'more than sixty Volumes many of them methodis'd by myself or under my directions' but the later distribution of his papers indicates that not all the 'many Vol. of Collections and Entries and Bundles of Papers' had found their way to the storage room which he had insisted must be added to Sir Christopher Wren's proposals for accommodation for the new Board. The papers on the West Indies which the Board sent to the Ambassadors at the Congress of Ryswick were scornfully referred to by Blathwayt as 'wishewashes' and 'nothing to your purpose'. Since Blathwayt was constitutionally incapable of allowing Bridgewater and his colleagues to stumble on with things in their own way (on the question of the Lieutenant Governorship of New York he characteristically wrote that 'I assurd y Ldp: I would not meddle in it but...') it followed that

27 Henley to Blathwayt, 3 July, 1696; Add. MSS. 9729, 140.

28 Blathwayt to Commissioners of Public Accounts, 15 August, 1711; BH. Blathwayt to Vernon, 8/18 June, 1696; Add. MSS. 37992, 142. On the later distribution of Blathwayt's papers see Lester J. Cappon, 'The Blathwayt Papers of Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.', WMQ 3rd series IV (1947), 317-331, esp. 320-1.


30 There follows half a page of meddling. Blathwayt to Bridgewater, 2/12 August, 1697; Ellesmere MSS. 9735.
it would be useful if men of his own views could be made members of the Board. The appointment of Blathwayt's client Stepney, partly accomplished through Blathwayt's solicitations, would, it was hoped, keep the Board from 'Byass'd resolutions', a phrase which seemed to encompass the Board attacks on Andros in Virginia and its approval of Bellomont's zealous reform measures in New York. Blathwayt's twenty years experience in the plantation business had obviously disposed him both to protect old friends (Andros and Fletcher) and to continue to reject sweeping reform schemes. 31

The fate of Andros and Fletcher displayed the dimensions of Blathwayt's influence in this period. Benjamin Fletcher (governor of New York, 1691-7) had owed much to Blathwayt's support over the years. 'My Hart is full of Gratitude', enthused Fletcher in 1692 soon after he took up his command, and the gratitude proved well-founded; Blathwayt was successful in fighting off moves to oust Fletcher in 1695 and to join his government to the Massachusetts one of Lord Bellomont, even though the King was specifically warned by Shrewsbury of Blathwayt's 'partiality' to Fletcher. Yet he could not prevent Fletcher's recall in 1697, even if he could make some efforts towards his 'falling gently'; as Blathwayt was able to inform Shrewsbury, since the King had found no fault with Colonel Fletcher during his term of office, favourable phrases regarding 'taking care of him and otherwise employing him' would be allowed in the letters of revocation. But there were limits to the patron's support, Fletcher's thirty-five years of service under the crown seemed as nothing

31 Blathwayt to Stepney, 24 June, 31 May, 1698; SP 105/51; Blathwayt to Stepney, 30 December, 1698; SP 105/52. See also the comments on 'moderation' in Webb, 'Imperial Fines' II, 405-6.
compared with the interest that Lord Bellomont, who had replaced him in New York, could command with 'Persons in the cheife Stations and trust...'. By early '99, Fletcher no longer seemed so faultless. With Fletcher's case still dragging on at the Board of Trade, Blathwayt was admitting to a minor New York official that the ex-governor seemed to have favoured the pirates and committed several other irregularities. Those whom Blathwayt, in a letter to another worried governor, called the 'Angry Gentlemen' were simply too powerful for him at this point.

The advent of peace had lessened his influence, and Bellomont and his friends were soon spreading vicious-stories about his scheme to buy the proprietary rights to New Hampshire and his involvement with Fletcher's dubious land deals.

As for Andros, he 'fell gently', but fell he did; the Board of Trade investigation of his failings as governor and the disapproval of the Bishop of London saw to that. Povey's presence at the latter's investigation of Commissary Blair's complaints against Andros and Stepney's

---

32 Fletcher to Blathwayt, 10 September, 1692; BW VIII; Blathwayt to the Lords Justices, 8 April, 1695; Add. Mss. 37992, 101; Shrewsbury to the King, 16/26 July, 1695; Shrewsbury Letters, 94; Southwell to Blathwayt, 3 August, 1697; Add. Mss. 38015, 397; Blathwayt to Shrewsbury, 19/29 July, 1697; HMC Buccleuch, 500; Fletcher to Blathwayt, 5 August, 1698; Add. Mss. 9747, 5.


34 Bellomont to Vernon, 22 June, 1700; CSPC 1700, no. 582. Vernon certainly believed the New Hampshire story: see Vernon to Shrewsbury, 10 August, 1700; Vernon Letters III, 129. For an earlier accusation, this time of supporting governors who favoured pirates, see Shrewsbury to the King, 15/25 August, 1696; Shrewsbury Letters, 134-7.
presence at the Board hearings had not compensated for Blathwayt's absence. Indeed, Stepney's appointment to the Board did not have the effects Blathwayt intended. Stepney proved unwilling to 'drudge at ye duty' of Board attendance. When he promised to write to Lord Lexington about company in the Mall, the play and the music meeting, he assured him that '...these are the Plantations & Comerce that I design to cultivate...'. 35 Had Blathwayt known of his client's comments he might have been less insistent on Stepney's speedy return from his frequent diplomatic missions abroad. Bridgewater's translation to the Admiralty in 1699 rendered Stepney's attendance at the Board, in Blathwayt's view, even more necessary. 36

The move did, however, provide the Board with an ally in another department of government, even if that ally proved helpless when some Admiralty officials objected to Blathwayt's procedure over the issue of certain commissions. 37 In actual service, the naval commanders proved as unwilling to co-operate with colonial governors as they had in the past. In 1697, Governor Reeston of Jamaica found his efforts to feed and water the visiting fleet went unappreciated; all the naval officers

35 Stepney to Ellis, 5/15 September, 1699; SP 105/53. Stepney to Lexington, 25 June, 1697; SP 105/57.

36 Blathwayt to Stepney, 23 May, 1699; SP 105/53. Stepney's attendance record, apart from 1697 and 1700, is dismal: see Steele, Appendix A.

37 Bridgewater to Blathwayt, 11 July, 1699; BY 6. All Bridgewater could suggest was that Blathwayt should proceed as he thought fit since 'you know those matters better than I do'.
thought they had 'no Equall, nor that any Laws or Authority ought to restraine them...'. In 1699, the Rear Admiral of the fleet overstepped even his ample Admiralty directives and impressed from the inhabitants of Jamaica. 38

The Board's rôle vis à vis other departments of government was thus just as unhappy as its predecessor's. The Customs Commissioners, infuriated because Edward Randolph continued to keep Blathwayt and the Board as well informed as themselves, were frequently unco-operative, 39 and the Treasury was becoming more assertive with regard to its colonial responsibilities. Isaac Addington, Secretary of Massachusetts, summed up the colonial conclusion about the fragmenting effect of the formation of the Board when he wrote that the business of the plantations was 'somewhat altered upon the new Establishment from what it was heretofore, the whole not remaining in the care of one Office'. 40

38 Beeston to Blathwayt, 19 June, 1697, 2 August, 1699; BW XXI. Some inhabitants fled to the northern plantations to escape impressment.

39 Jacobep, William Blathwayt, 332–3; CSPC 1696–1697, 615; the Board complained that the Customs Commissioners were refusing to clear merchant ships for the West Indies, though the convoys were ready to escort them.

The official who had largely been that Office had other worries, too. In 1696, William III had triumphed against a House where the speeches were, in the opinion of one observer, comparable in violence to those of '41, but his Board rarely felt secure in its relationship to parliament. As Blathwayt told his fellow-member Stepney in 1699, that which sets us firm with the King does not always do it with the Parliament who will be glad of any occasion to undervalue us and then you know what follows so expensive a Commission'. The accounts of the 'Commission for Chimerical Affairs', as Jack Howe called it, were 'more liable to be found fault with than otherwise; in the 1701 session of parliament it was only 'J.H.'s' early retreat to Bath for his health that relieved the Board of Trade from danger.  

The existence of a direct link between the fragmentation of policy and the power of parliament was clearly described by Count Tallard in a despatch to his royal master, Louis XIV, in 1699. The events of that year's parliamentary session had severely weakened royal authority. In the interior of the kingdom, claimed Tallard, all things were at a stand: 'nothing is decided, since a certain time, but by Act of Parliament'. The persons appointed to execute these acts were virtually independent, and 'no-one knows to whom to apply on the slightest matter, and there is no-one in office who will regulate or decide, or sign anything whatever'.

---

41 J. Harvey to Mr. Mercier, 13 December, 1695; HMC Downshire, 597. On the anti-executive nature of parliament between 1695 and 1698, see J.F. Kenyon, Sunderland, 276.

42 Blathwayt to Stepney, 17/27 June, 1699; SF 105/53.

43 Blathwayt to Stepney, 18 February, 1697/8; SF 105/51; G.P.R. James (ed.), Vernon-Letters I, 481; Blathwayt to Stepney, 20 May, 13 June, 1701; BY 21.
(Echoes of the complaint Blathwayt had made in 1690).\textsuperscript{44} Tallard's proof involved an incident concerning the recently cashiered marine regiments. The officers, concerned about quartering problems, had applied to Mr. Blathwayt, in his capacity of Secretary at War. He referred them to the Admiralty, who sent them to Secretary of State Vernon, who referred them back to Mr. Blathwayt. Such were the administrative effects, in Tallard's view, of parliamentary meddling.\textsuperscript{45}

As Plumb states, the Revolution established parliament as a permanent and central feature of the body politic,\textsuperscript{46} and the implications of the changes became more obvious as time proceeded. A well-wisher warned Governor Nicholson of Virginia in 1702 that it was thought a 'high imputation' that he spoke 'so much of the Prerogative & so little of the law, & in truth the course must be steered now very evenly between Prerogative & Property...or our English Parliaments...will vent their indignation'. The violence and arbitrariness which Nicholson had acquired among the Moors when he served in the Tangier regiment might have been well enough approved in previous reigns, but 'the case is quite altered now & does more every day alter since the revolution': if Nicholson were accused of arbitrary behaviour then his former merits and the help of his friends would not, argued his correspondent, suffice to

\begin{itemize}
  \item See p. 126, ch. 5.
  \item Plumb, \textit{Political Stability}, 84.
\end{itemize}
save him.

The victory of parliamentary law over prerogative law could hardly be spelled out more clearly, and even the smallest colonial planter grasped its significance. The newly appointed Lieutenant Governor of Nevis was told by a local planter exactly what he could do with the King's orders for quartering soldiers since there appeared to be no act of parliament for that purpose. 'I have corrected him as far as I could', wrote the Lieutenant Governor lamely. 48

The judicial approach to the imposition of metropolitan power over the colonies was clearly of less significance than it had been in the seventies and eighties. A quo warranto against Rhode Island seemed a possibility in the late nineties, and Bellomont's detailed expose of the irregularities and misdemeanours of that colony led to further consultations of the Attorney and Solicitor General in 1700. 49 A judicial determination was also urged by the Board of Trade as the best solution to the thorny problem of whether Perth Amboy should have port privileges. 50 Colonial governors and other officials continued to urge the necessity of having judges sent from England, and instructions to conform to English law. The energetic Bellomont's complaints were taken up by the Board

---


48 Colonel Foze to Blathwayt, 1 May, 1700; CSPC 1700, 373.

49 CSPC 1697-8, 1071; CSPC 1700, 291.

50 CSPC 1699, 272.
of Trade, which agreed that if he were not assisted by two English
lawyers of known probity as Chief Justice and Attorney General, with
increased salaries, he could not continue his reforms. One of Bello-
mont's first actions on assuming the government of New Hampshire was
to displace all officers including the judges; New Hampshire's Lieu-
tenant Governor, Usher, annoyed at being displaced, insisted that the new
legal officers were men 'w ch are for Comon Wealth Govern m more than
Kingly'. The author of An Essay upon the Government of the English
Plantations (1701) made a detailed analysis of the defects of the colonial
legal system, and of the want of a 'Regular Settlement' to 'remove doubts
concerning the precise relationship between colonial and English law.

Nonetheless, judicial absolutism of the kind thought possible in
the early eighties had no future in King William's empire, nor did govern-
ment by administrative fiat. In 1679, when he took over Sir Robert
Southwell's responsibilities for plantation business, Blathwayt thanked
his predecessor for sending him his clerkly 'good Rules' for the plant-
tations. Twenty years later it was clear that, in the main, the 'good
Rules' would have to be established by parliament, not issued by the Privy

51 CSPC 1699, 1061; the legal officers were duly sent: CSPC 1701, 378.
Luttrell, Brief Relation IV, 657. Usher to Blathwayt, 25 February, 1699/1700; BW VI. Note also Blathwayt's report on the salary of the Virginian
Attorney General and suggestion of a £60 p.a. increase of the £40 p.a.
salary; T64/89, 69. The Order-in-Council giving effect to this recom-
dendation and the warrant for payment are at ff.70, 73.

52 Louis B. Wright (ed.), An Essay upon the Government of the English
The probable author was Robert Beverley.
Council or through royal proclamation. 53

The necessity constantly to weigh the parliamentary impact of his, and the Board's, actions, complicated Blathwayt's life enormously. The piracy question is an example. Although the Board of Trade in 1698 had suggested that a parliamentary act should be passed allowing speedy trial of pirates in any part of the empire, Blathwayt explained the compelling motives for sending pirates as criminals to England in a candid letter to one of his fellow Board members. He was worried that the piracy question might be brought up in parliament and the Board asked what they had done in the matter. The 'honour and safety' of the Board demanded legal centralisation, for would not every governor be 'willing enough to be turned out, when he has made his fortune by these pirates?' 54

It was parliament, too, which was the forum for debate and decision on the resumption of proprietary and charter governments: the days of large-scale procedure by writs of scire facias and quo warranto were over. Blathwayt still pressed for the administrative re-organisation of the empire, despite his efforts to ingratiate himself with Marlborough by finding him a suitable endowment of colonial land, and suggestions by ill-wishers that he was himself interested in acquiring the proprietary

53 Blathwayt to Southwell, 31 July, 1679; Portland MSS. 50. Blathwayt's letter to his patron concluded with the practical thought, gracefully expressed, that 'although one good example is of more force than many Rules yet I hope yours may produce many good Examples'.

54 CSPC 1697-8, 304; Blathwayt to Abraham Hill, 21 August, 1699; Abraham Hill, Familiar Letters (London, 1767), 160.
of New Hampshire. As the Board of Trade assured Bellomont in 1701 in its answers to his queries concerning the proprietary and charter colonies, 'the independency they thirst after is now so notorious' that a resumption bill had been introduced in the House of Lords. The failure of this bill, and the ones that followed it, also constituted failures for Blathwayt's view of empire.

Blathwayt's parliamentary performance was competent enough in his colonial capacity. According to Jacobsen, he served as the major spokesman for the Board of Trade in parliament, brought in most of the reports presented, and served on most of the parliamentary committees on trade and plantation matters. However, while committees were adroitly handled by this careful bureaucrat, open parliamentary debate was another matter. As Secretary at War, and one who had held the same post under James II, he found himself exposed to parliamentary attack from 1689 on. The inclination of the 1689 House of Commons for receiving complaints, noted by Dalrymple, was certainly matched by its successors. Blathwayt was attacked in 1689, in 1691, in 1692, and escaped it barely in 1694 when Henley reported to him that his enemies were spreading rumours that

55 For an example of Blathwayt's continued hostility to proprietary colonies see, for example, Blathwayt to Bridgewater, 18 October, 1697; Ellesmere MSS. 9741.


57 Jacobsen, 334.

58 Sir John Dalrymple, Memoirs of Great Britain and Ireland, II, 140.
Blathwayt was taking money out of England to be distributed to the Confederates, whose agent he was. 59 Fear of being 'called to acc't' in the Commons for his financial dealings always led Blathwayt to exercise immense caution.

In 1697 and 1698, the Secretary at War and his royal master were forced to witness what they regarded as the virtual disbandment of the army, its reduction by parliament to 10,000 men, a number which they considered totally inadequate for the security of the nation. 60 Blathwayt's mishandling of some of the disbandment details was described by James Vernon for the Duke of Shrewsbury's benefit: Blathwayt's announcement to the Commons that he would be ready with disbandment lists when he had orders for it led directly to Sir Christopher Musgrave's statement that 'they saw now where it stuck, and therefore moved for an address'. 61 Such mistakes did not improve Blathwayt's standing with his royal master. The 1701-2 session was another acrimonious one. Stepney's absence from England at a time like this was regarded by Blathwayt as the happiest.


60 Blathwayt to R. Hill, 3 August SN 1700, 24 December, 1697, 11 January, 1697/8; Add. MSS. 56241, unpaginated.

61 Vernon to Shrewsbury, 2 June, 1698; G.P.R. James (ed.), Vernon Letters 1696-1708 (London, 1841) II, 94. Shrewsbury was hostile to Blathwayt.
incident of Stepney's life. 'For my part I design to be as quiet as I can...'. 62 Attendance at the Commons in early 1702 Blathwayt judged excessively 'tiresome'; but he was not admitting the full seriousness of his position to Stepney. The parliamentary investigation of the accounts of Lord Ranelagh, Paymaster of the Army, brought Ranelagh's dismissal and very nearly led to Blathwayt's downfall as well.63 The preparations for the 1702 campaigning season on the continent at least provided some relief from parliament, but Blathwayt was demurring at another wearisome summer in camp and his 'looking but a little another way' was causing talk. He was doubtless still brooding, too, over the King's refusal to back his salary demands eight months previously and his failure at that time to make any advance in his 'private Interest', as he put it to Stepney. 64 The talk of a title in 1700 (Luttrell reported that Blathwayt might be created 'Lord of Bristol') had come to nothing, and William was not very sympathetic to Blathwayt's petitions for equipage allowance a few months later. 65

62 Blathwayt to Stepney, 4 October, 1701; BY 21.

63 Blathwayt to Stepney, 28 February, 1701/2; BY 21. Luttrell, Brief Relation V, 135, reported on 27 January the rumour of Blathwayt's dismissal. Blathwayt was fortunate that the House of Commons did not follow up a statement of Ranelagh which seriously incriminated the Secretary at War: John W. Fortescue, A History of the British Army (London, 1899-1930) I, 409.

64 Blathwayt to Stepney, 28 February, 1701/2, 13 June, 1701; BY 21.

65 Luttrell, Brief Relation IV, 718 (entry for 14 December, 1700). In time of peace the King felt Blathwayt should cut down on his equipage—see CRB XVI (1700-1701), 75.
The disbandment crises of the late nineties showed that parliament meant to and could prevail over any militaristic tendencies of the executive. The practical results are illustrated by the additional instructions issued to Ralph Gray, the new Governor of Barbados, which took away the clause which implied a power of exercising martial law on soldiers in pay even in peace time. The Board of Trade, in presenting its draft commission for the younger Codrington, suggested that instructions should be sent to all Governors in whose commissions the old clause appeared not to put it into execution. The general assemblies of the various plantations were to assume this particular power instead. 66

There were always strong fiscal considerations, too, to support army reduction and blunt the threat of militarism: in 1699, when the Treasury was considering the new establishment of the forces prepared by Ranelagh and Blathwayt, it demanded that a survey be taken of the cost of all garrisons when the Governors were paid out of the Exchequer and not on the establishment of the forces, the object being to reduce the number of garrisons. 67 Fiscal not military motives may even have dictated some officer appointments to governorships. In 1700 the Earl

66 CSPC 1699, 410, 271. The result of this policy in New York is instructive: the legislature passed an act which provided for civilian organised tribunals for military offences. See S.M. Pargellis, 'The Four Independent Companies of New York', in Essays in Colonial History Presented to Charles McLean Andrews by His Students (reprinted Freeport, 1966), 115. These were not just temporary Whiggish restraints: see L.W. Labaree, Royal Instructions to British Colonial Governors, 1670-1776 (New York, 1935), v, nos. 561, 562, 563.

67 CTB XIV (1698-99), 84.
of Jersey confided to Matthew Prior that there were too many officers unprovided for to have the government of Jersey given to any but a soldier.\(^{68}\)

With the Nine Years War over, there was less chance than ever of regular remittances to colonial troops. Blathwayt was forced to admit in 1698 that no money was available to pay the New York soldiers 'for want of funds that are not yet settled by the Parliament;' once this hurdle was overcome, the Lords of the Treasury refused to go ahead because the correct vouchers—attested copies of the public receipts of New York—had not yet been received. By the end of 1699 only forty men remained in the Governor's company and thirty in the Lieutenant Governor's.\(^{69}\) The government decision in the same month to reduce the four companies to a formal level of fifty from one hundred was simply an attempt to come to terms with reality. Fletcher's replacement as Governor, Lord Bellomont, blamed Blathwayt for a reduction which was contrary to the official recommendations of the Board of Trade.\(^{70}\) Though the decision was reversed eighteen months later as the peace began to look less secure,

\(^{68}\) Jersey to Prior, 27 September, 1700; HMC Bath, vol. III, Prior Papers, 419. The first British empire, like the second, could obviously serve as a system of outdoor relief for the unemployed upper classes.

\(^{69}\) Blathwayt to Cortlandt, 14 February, 1697/8, 12 March, 1699; Cortlandt to Blathwayt, 8 December, 1699; BW IX. L.H. Leder, Robert Livingston 1654-1728 and the Politics of Colonial New York (Chapel Hill, 1961), ch. III.

\(^{70}\) Bellomont to Council of Trade and Plantations, 26 July, 1700; CSPC 1700, 666. In view of Bellomont's general hostility to Blathwayt and Blathwayt's usual attitude to maintenance of military forces (see p. 164) the allegation is probably false.
the history of the four companies continued unhappy from both an administrative and a military point of view. There was never any question of autocratic governors using such troops against colonists; on the contrary, in 1700 it wasburghers who put down a military mutiny and the offenders were tried in a court presided over by the civilian Chief Justice and containing three members of the Council in addition to three military officers.

Part of the problem was that the colonies constituted a much less significant theatre of war than the continent for most military planners. Indeed, Blathwayt sometimes welcomed some minor French threat in an outpost of empire as a means of drawing attention to an area's existence: the presence of Monsieur de Nermond off St. Johns, Newfoundland, led him to remark that "I am glad this Occasion has made it appear how Valuable that Harbour is & how fitt in Some Manner to be fortifeyd..." But nagging Vernon and other Secretaries of State had limited effects. A peevish note entered some of Blathwayt's correspondence. If the French were allowed to settle near Potto Velo, or the 'Isle of Ash-Mississippi', he warned Vernon, English interests would be much threatened. 'I spoke of the first settlement some time ago, but was not much minded, no more than in the Business of Darien...'. Great as Blathwayt's knowledge was

71 For complaints see, for example, WO 26/11, 214-5; C1701, 996, 1085; HEC House of Lords vol. VII, 1706-1708, 223.

72 On this incident and on the manifest inadequacies of the companies in general, see Pargellis, passim.

73 Blathwayt to Vernon, 14/24 October, 1697; Add. MSS. 37992, 188.

74 Blathwayt to Vernon, 18/29 September, 1699; Add. MSS. 37992, 236. For another example of reminding Vernon of his colonial responsibilities see Add. MSS. 34348, 137 (1701). Blathwayt's lengthy report to Bridgewater on the Darien schema can be found in Ellesmere MSS. 9740.
in colonial affairs in particular and foreign affairs in general, particularly through his role of acting Secretary of State to William during the Flanders campaigns, there were large areas of policy-making from which he was totally excluded. He took no part in the important Portland-Boufflers negotiations which preceded the Peace of Ryswick and had no knowledge of the first Partition Treaty.\textsuperscript{75} George Stepney was surprised to find Blathwayt's name missing from the list of those who were to negotiate a Treaty of Commerce with France in 1699.\textsuperscript{76}

By 1700 a man who had been in the forefront of the latest administrative developments in the 1680s was beginning to look somewhat out of place, although this had hardly been predictable until well into the nineteenth. The miniature revolution in government which G.E. Aylmer discerns in late seventeenth century England had roots in the Civil War period and, more immediately, in the initiatives of the late seventies and eighties.\textsuperscript{77} After the events of 1688–9, the survival of men such as Blathwayt, Bridgeman and Vernon helped ensure that the new administrative methods would also continue, while the war demands of the nineties and beyond necessitated a greatly expanded executive.


\textsuperscript{76}Stepney to Vernon, 4/14 March, 1698/9; SP 105/52.

been 'no ways concern'd in Politicks a great while and do only chew the cud of what's past'. Although he was taking some part in the planning for Lord Peterborough's West Indian expedition, being one of Nottingham's 'secret committee' of cabinet ministers, service officers and officials, he was far from indispensable; the Secretary at War's out-letter books for 1702-3 show that when Blathwayt went to Bath to attend the Queen in August and September, all the war office work in support of the coming expedition went on in London under the chief clerk without him. Peterborough never sailed, and Blathwayt found himself with ever more leisure; so much, indeed, that, as he told Stepney in March of 1703, 'I have been turning over my Papers of my ten years function abroad'.

Little was likely to be gained from colonial, military initiatives for 1703, in Blathwayt's opinion. Policy in the southern plantations was 'not such as I wish or design';...Expect nothing very considerable from thence this year'. Floridian projects were 'no less abortive'. The general pessimism seemed justified, particularly when Codrington was driven back from Guadeloupe by the French. Meanwhile Blathwayt was spending increasing periods of time in the country, nearly two months

---

14 Blathwayt to Stepney, 7 October, 1702; BY 21.


16 See Blathwayt's 2 February, 1702/3 letter to Stepney, BY 21, on the reasons to which he attributed failure.

17 Blathwayt to Stepney, 26 March, 1703; BY 21.

18 Blathwayt to Stepney, 1 June, 6 August, 1703; BY 21.
and it is clear that, in the twenty years after the Revolution, Blathwayt in his capacity of Auditor General of Plantation Revenues had taken pains to oversee the terms on which offices were granted and to ensure both the royal income and his own. However, Blathwayt's long years in colonial service, while they allowed him an unrivalled knowledge of precedents (and a near-monopoly of the papers to sustain them) may also have served to blur his judgement when old friendships conflicted with administrative efficiency. In 1700, Governor Nicholson of Virginia complained that the offices of Receiver and Auditor of revenues in the colony needed to be separated and that the documents should be kept in the public buildings instead of at the house of the official in question, William Byrd. Blathwayt's report admitted the validity of Nicholson's arguments but protected Byrd by pointing out the expense of separate officials. Not until some months after the death of the elder Byrd did Lord Treasurer Godolphin effect the separation.

Another theme of imperial administrative reform in the eighties, the cutting down of the power of the governors, was also continued in this period; again, one should ask who benefitted from the change. A 1701 recommendation by the Board of Trade that governors be forbidden to accept presents and that an addition be made to their salaries was followed two years later by more precise directives on the same topic.

---

80 On Blathwayt's salary as Auditor, see ch. 8. For a detailed account of Blathwayt's work as Auditor in this period, see Jacobsen, ch. xi.

81 LAC 69, 132-3, 142-3; see also the account in Jacobsen, 369 n.33.

these were simply episodes in a lengthy campaign, but the perception of the problem at Whitehall is clear. The move was to be one more nail in the coffin of the governor's independence of central control, an independence which had frequently been abused by unscrupulous colonial governors; as late as 1701, according to Governor Codrington, there were still governors who came abroad to make their fortunes, to whom Acts of Trade and all their Lordships' instructions were 'verba et proeterie (sic) nihil'. However, the chances of lengthy survival in office for such governors were ever more slender as the home government became better informed about events in the colonies and as colonial pressure groups became more insistent. As the famous account of Virginia by Commissary Blair and friends pointed out, at the time when the King knew nobody in Virginia, it was thought that the governor was 'best fitted to give him right characters of men' to appoint to various posts; in their view this right of recommendation had been abused. By the date of the account, however, the scope for governors' patronage had been much narrowed.

Governor Besoton of Jamaica complained at length to Blathwayt in 1699 when he heard that some individuals in England were making recommendations for the Jamaica Council. He argued that the patent places and all offices were already filled in England so that the governor had no one to assist (by which he meant support) him but the Council; if

---

83 Codrington to Council of Trade and Plantations, 25 August, 1701; CSPC 1701, 784.

84 For the increasing volume of information about the colonies available to the English government from the 1670s on, see ch. 2.

members of that body too were put in through pressure in England from anyone who had an interest or who wanted to gratify some feeling against a governor, then life would become impossible. Governor Russell of Barbados felt similar (if more personal) annoyance about appointments in the island. On the death of the Receiver of the Casual Revenues, Edwyn Stede, Russell had hoped to obtain the post himself, especially since he had received assurances from Henry Guy at the Treasury that a previous governor, Colonel Kendall, had held the position. To Russell's chagrin, a resident of the island suddenly produced a commission from the Treasury; in Russell's opinion, people would think the governor's interest in England very slight if he could not acquire so small a thing. The growth of rival chains of interest connecting colonists with various (and often competing) individuals and departments of state at home was clearly demonstrated.

The feuds between governors and other royal officials, particularly revenue officials, also indicate an increased challenge to the governor's position, and often to Blathwayt's as he cast about for a means of ensuring that his salary was sent. These feuds seem to have been even more bitter and protracted than the ones of the eighties, as local factions scrambled to attach themselves to the combatants and through them to the networks of party interests at home. New York had an especially unhappy history in this respect. The feuds between Governor Bellomont and Graham,

86 Beeston to Blathwayt, 21 March, 1698/9; BW XXI.

87 Russell to Blathwayt, 22 July, 1696; BW XXXI.

at various times Attorney General and Recorder, and between Governor
Lord Cornbury and the Collector, Byerley, lasted for years. As the
Secretary of New York told Blathwayt at the end of a detailed exposition
damming both the Governor and the Schuyler faction for refusing to see
to Blathwayt’s salary and interfering with the fees due to revenue of-
ficials, 'In short we are sold, and with us the interest of the Crown'.
Increasing number of officials, however, were becoming available
to protect that royal interest. The Navigation Act of 1696 strengthened
the customs service in America and led to the appointment of naval offi-
cers who functioned under bond to the customs commissioners, and the
introduction of Admiralty Courts in the colonies involved the dispatch
of more royal officials. The Prize Office also had a great deal of busi-
ness during the wars of this period, though it proved difficult to pre-
vant commanders of ships of war from disposing of prizes themselves and
when cases did reach the Admiralty Courts there were problems with 'ex-
travagant charges'.

---

89 See, for example, Graham to Blathwayt, 30 October, 1700; BW X.
90 Clarke to Blathwayt, 12 (?) October, 1709; BW X.
91 T.C. Barrow, Trade and Empire: the British Customs Service in
92 For example, the Admiralty Court of Barbados charged £370 in fees
for condemning two prizes. Blathwayt could only suggest that tables
of fees be sent over both to the courts and the prize agents, and cir-
cular letters to all governors to keep a check on the situation. T64/89, 125-6, 127-9.
Colonial administrative policy reflected developments at home with uncanny accuracy. The new administrative methods of the seventies and eighties had survived the upheaval of the Revolution as had most of their initiators, and increasingly the expanded bureaucracy, especially the Treasury, the Admiralty and the Customs, pushed its way into positions of authority in the colonies. Such developments would, in the earlier period, certainly have redounded to the interest of the Crown; now that was not necessarily the case. The growth of party, both at home and in the colonies, accompanied by the demand for jobs for party adherents, ran counter to modernisation of the bureaucracy and undermined the standards of conduct which men such as Blathwayt had once tried to set. Blathwayt's own position was undercut by the formation of the Board of Trade, the increased role of Parliament, and the concomitant fragmentation of policy making. His jaundiced comments on two gubernatorial appointments in 1701 show a cynicism and world weariness lacking from his eager pronouncements of the eighties. Lord Cornbury's appointment to New York was likely to lead to just such a thorough-going purge of local officials (but this time on the other side) as Blathwayt had condemned under Bellomont: 'such is ye Vicissitude of Human Affairs especially where violence has prevail'd'. All this would happen, however, only if the spendthrift Cornbury could escape his English creditors; his pocket was 'a Sive and ever will be so'. Colonel Dudley, largely through Blathwayt's aid, had obtained Massachusetts: 'worth nothing but to a

93 Plumb, The Growth of Political Stability, 124. The established church, too, took part in the bureaucratic push.
Creolian', Blathwayt wrote in a fine display of metropolitan arrogance.\footnote{Blathwayt to Stepney, 21 June, 19 December, 1701; BY 21.}

The trends referred to were strengthened on the death of William. As Professor Plumb has observed, for most of Anne's reign the growth of the executive increased the instability of English politics and fed the rage of party.\footnote{Plumb, 127.} The transition to Newcastle's empire was already under way.
CHAPTER 7

A 'LOWER SPHERE': 1702-1710

In May, 1704, Blathwayt's cousin, Robert Gibbs, wrote from Barbados to solicit his relative's influence in obtaining any 'place of advantage' which might offer in the island. To sweeten his cousin's disposition, he had despatched one pot of 'preserved Tamerines', two of orange marmalade and 'one head of Sweetmeats whch Containes all or all-most of our Country ffruiites'. A month after Gibb's arrival in Barbados, his wife had given birth to a son; this child, to whom the governor himself stood godfather, rejoiced in the Christian name of Blathwayt. ¹ By May, 1704, however, these typical client manoeuvres were not so appropriate as they would have been ten, or even twenty, years earlier. Less than a month before, the putative patron had lost his post as Secretary at War, and his prestige and power had in fact been declining steadily since 1702.

Blathwayt's initial reaction to the death of King William was to insist that, although his circumstances were somewhat changed, all this meant was that he would be staying at home in the summers, 'which after ten years labor abroad should not be irksom to me'. ² Yet his relationship with the monarch was totally altered. Though he anxiously fitted out Dyrham Park in the hope of a royal visit (for Anne was frequently in Bath), he could make no headway with a monarch who set great store on

¹Gibbs to Blathwayt, 15 May, 1704; BH.
²Blathwayt to Stepney, 10 March, 1701/2; BY 21.
birth and social position. To have been a schoolfellow of Lord Dursley
was not enough. ³ Blathwayt boasted to Edward Southwell in the summer
of 1703 that when the court moved to Bath he would be the 'Sole Attend-
dant in Councill there'; but his 'interest' does not seem to have been
advanced by it. ⁴

Only a few days after the brave words to Stepney quoted above,
he was forced to admit that he was so far released from a foreign atten-
dance and even the thought of foreign affairs that he could hardly ima-
gine how his correspondence could be of any use to a diplomat. ⁵ In
reality, of course, he could hardly stop himself from thoughts of foreign
affairs; but those thoughts had little chance of being translated into
action. Some months before, he had tried to convince the Duke of Marl-
borough of his own views concerning West India policy; Blathwayt had
told the Duke, who passed through Loo in the summer of 1701 when the
Secretary at War was as usual in attendance on his monarch, that he would
rather see the Spanish West Indies under the House of Austria with a
freedom of trade than in English hands. ⁶ These policy suggestions had
no influence on the contents of the Austrian agreement which Marlborough

³ On the preparations at Dyrham see Luttrell, Brief Relation V, 197,
and ch. 8. Blathwayt to Dursley, 9 June, 1695 NS; Add. MSS. 38700, 127.
See also ch. I on social origins.

⁴ Blathwayt to Edward Southwell, 22 July, 1703; Add. MSS. 58221,
unpaginated.

⁵ Blathwayt to Stepney, 27 March, 1702; BY 21.

⁶ Blathwayt to Stepney, 8/19 August, 1701; BY 21.
negotiated. When Blathwayt sent Stepney an account of the 1701 Alliance Treaty (entirely without permission) he emphasised that the West India article was insisted on in England 'by those certainly that know little of these parts...'. In 1702, when Blathwayt heard that the Secretary of State had come over to his notion of the West Indies, he complained that despite this gratifying change, American affairs were still likely to be spoiled rather than mended while they were 'mismanaged as they have been which must needs be while they are misunderstood'.

Blathwayt specifically excluded the Council of Trade from this guilt: 'for they are but Journeymen'. It was ironic that, just when his freedom from campaign attendance enabled him to devote more time to Board of Trade business, the Board itself had become of less significance. The figures for Blathwayt's attendance at Board meetings went up; but his actual influence, like that of the Board, was steadily going down. In May, 1702, there were changes in the Board membership. Lord Lexington resigned and retired to Yorkshire on the grounds, Blathwayt reported, that, since he was no more than a Commissioner of Trade, his salary would not answer the cost of staying in town; Lord Stamford obtained leave to

---

7 Blathwayt to Stepney, 9 September, 13 September, 1701; BY 21. Blathwayt emphasised that if word of his indiscretion became public it would be 'to your prejudice & mine'. The evidence does not seem to square with Webb's argument that Marlborough championed 'an imperial program identical with that Blathwayt presented to him'. Webb, 'Imperial Fixer' II, 411.

8 Blathwayt to Stepney, 27 March, 1702; BY 21.

9 Steele, Politics of Colonial Policy, ch. V. On Blathwayt's attendance see Steele, Appendix A.
go into Holland for three months. Blathwayt hoped Stepney's place at
the Board was safe and was justified in his opinion when the new Com-
mission passed. However, little assistance or support for Blathwayt
in Board business was provided by Stepney, who attended merely six
meetings out of a possible number of over one thousand between 1702 and
1707. Blathwayt was increasingly isolated. When Popple (it was
thought) lay dying and the question of the Board Secretaryship came up
again, John Povey felt he had so few friends at the Board that the job
was not worth the having, and there is no evidence that Blathwayt pressed
for him to get it. (Popple in fact survived and, though ill, did not
resign from his position until 1707, when his son succeeded him).

There were changes, too, in the Secretaryships of State at Anne's
accession. Nottingham took office in May, and two of his kinsmen, Lords
Weymouth and Dartmouth, were appointed to the Board of Trade vacancies.
But the close collaboration between Nottingham and Blathwayt in imperial
expedition planning of ten years before was not renewed. Blathwayt did
not share Nottingham's views on English trade to the Spanish colonies,
nor approve of the Secretary of State's attempts to expand his colonial
patronage powers. In October, Blathwayt assured Stepney that he had

10 Blathwayt to Stepney, 22 May, 9 June, 1702; BY 21.
11 These figures are derived from Steele, Appendix A.
12 Povey to Southwell, 10 February, 1703/4; Portland MSS. 61.
13 On Nottingham's attitudes see Steele, 87-9; H. Horwitz, Revolution
Politics, ch. 9.
been 'no ways concern'd in Politicks a great while and do only chew the
cud of what's past'. Although he was taking some part in the planning
for Lord Peterborough's West Indian expedition, being one of Nottingham's
'secret committee' of cabinet ministers, service officers and officials,
he was far from indispensable; the Secretary at War's out-letter books
for 1702-3 show that when Blathwayt went to Bath to attend the Queen in
August and September, all the war office work in support of the coming
expedition went on in London under the chief clerk without him. Peter-
borough never sailed, and Blathwayt found himself with ever more leis-
ure; so much, indeed, that, as he told Stepney in March of 1703, 'I
have been turning over my Papers of my ten years function abroad'.

Little was likely to be gained from colonial military initiatives
for 1703, in Blathwayt's opinion. Policy in the southern plantations was
'not such as I wish or design'd...Expect nothing very considerable from
thence this year'. Floridan projects were 'no less abortive'. The
general pessimism seemed justified, particularly when Codrington was
driven back from Guadeloupe by the French. Meanwhile Blathwayt was
spending increasing periods of time in the country, nearly two months

14 Blathwayt to Stepney, 7 October, 1702; BY 21.

15 Ivor F. Burton, 'The Secretary at War and the Administration of the
Army during the War of the Spanish Succession' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis,
University of London, 1960), 159-161.

16 See Blathwayt's 2 February, 1702/3 letter to Stepney, BY 21, on the
reasons to which he attributed failure.

17 Blathwayt to Stepney, 26 March, 1703; BY 21.

18 Blathwayt to Stepney, 1 June, 6 August, 1703; BY 21.
together in the autumn of 1703, which, as he admitted, was a long time for a 'man of business', even if he did go to Court two or three times a week.  

Blathwayt had claimed to be writing far fewer business letters since Anne's accession, and the pattern of his surviving correspondence appears to confirm the statement.  

Anne could not fill William's position as commander-in-chief, so that much of the military direction passed to the royal favourite, Marlborough. Marlborough had his own military secretary, Adam Cardonnel; one provided by Blathwayt, but a man who soon realised that a successful future depended on total loyalty to his new master. Translated from his drudgery as Blathwayt's clerk in Flanders, he had reason to rejoice when the hundreds of correspondents who had provided the Secretary at War with that indispensable weapon of his domination, information, were instructed to address all their memorials to him.  

Blathwayt, deprived of his chief source materials, concentrated on mounting a rearguard action for the salary he claimed was due to him. The Lord Treasurer, Godolphin, possibly remembering over twenty years of friendly cooperation, was more impressed than the commander-in-chief.  

---

19 Blathwayt to Stepney, 15 October, 1703; BY 21.

20 See Blathwayt's comments on his letter writing, Blathwayt to Stepney, 2 February, 1702/3; BY 21. Although there are still Phillipps MSS. in private hands (portions of which appear at Sotheby's sales from time to time) it seems unlikely that these would modify the picture. See, too, the comments of Cappon on the Williamsburg MSS, WMQ 3rd series IV (1947), 320-1.

21 On the Cardonnel appointment see Blathwayt to Stepney, 1 May, 1702; BY 21. For the effects see, for example, Add. MSS, 21552, 54.

Blathwayt made efforts to cultivate Marlborough, being desirous, so he claimed, to 'become more usefull to y' Grace...'. But not even the suggestion of some timely assistance in procuring a substantial colonial land grant for the commander-in-chief had any effect.23

Marlborough insisted on the dominant role in the exercise of military patronage; that survivor of the Derien disaster Sam Vetch was mistaken when he thought that it was wholly in Blathwayt's power to procure him a commission to command a company in 1702. That power was diminishing.24 Less and less real business fell to the Secretary at War. Arrangements for the Portugal expedition clearly demonstrated the subordinate role of the war office, and the careful supervision by the Secretaries of State. The Secretary at War was increasingly dispensable, particularly this one. During William's reign, Blathwayt had carried out most of the financial responsibilities of his post during the winter while he was in England. In Anne's reign, however, comptrollers of army accounts were appointed, and the practice developed of administering pay through deputy paymasters and regimental agents under local regulations, thus edging out the Secretary at War.25

---

23 Blathwayt to Marlborough; 4 June, 29 September, 12 October, 1703; Add. MSS. 9722, 136, 146, 147. For the report by Blathwayt on a tract of land between Maryland and Virginia see Add. MSS. 21494, 60.

24 E.L. Snyder, 'Godolphin and Hatley: A Study of Their Partnership in Politics', Huntington Library Quarterly XXX (1967), 246. Vetch to Blathwayt, 25 May, 1702; BH. Vetch did not get the job: for details see G.M. Waller, Samuel Vetch, Colonial Enterprise (Chapel Hill, 1960), 70. However, Webb notes that Blathwayt was still handling company-grade appointments in the colonies as late as April, 1704; 'Imperial Fixer' II, 412, esp. note 136.

25 Burton, 'Secretary at War', 162, 46.
wayt himself for a comptrollership had no effect. Blathwayt cannot have been pleased when he found that the first comptroller was Jack Howe, that very 'J.H.' who had caused so much parliamentary misery for the Board of Trade members a short time before.  

The omens were bad, and in April of 1704 came dismissal. The new Secretary at War was Henry St. John, no civil servant but a rising politician. The passage of the 1704 recruiting act enormously increased the parliamentary responsibilities of the Secretary at War, as did the specialisation of estimates, and clearly St. John was much more likely to give a satisfactory parliamentary performance than Blathwayt. Moreover, Nottingham had resigned from office a month before and a purge of his associates was under way.  

Typically, Blathwayt made light of his dismissal to Stepney, assuring his friend that he had no reason to be very sorry for the loss, 'having finisht that long course without the least imputation deserving blame and continuing in my other places which will allow me sufficient leisure to enjoy the rest of my life which I could not well do before'. But his position depended so much on his successful exploitation of a multiplicity of posts that the repercussions were more serious than he claimed. It was no coincidence that he met with trouble in the 1705

---

26 DNB X, 90. And see ch. 6.

27 Burton, 'Secretary at War', 247.

28 Cardonnell and Stepney felt that Blathwayt contributed to his dismissal through jesting about the possibility; Jacobsen, Blathwayt 294-5; HMC Buccleuch II, 694.

29 Blathwayt to Stepney, 11 April, 1704; BY 21.
election, being forced to make frequent trips to Bath to fend off the opposition of the 'missionaries of the East India Company and Bank'. The election of Blathwayt and of Alexander Popham as members for Bath was challenged in the Commons by the usual allegations of 'indirect Practices'; not until early 1707 were Blathwayt and the now deceased Popham declared duly elected.\(^{30}\)

In that same year Blathwayt, who had long ago admitted that he was operating in a 'Lower Sphere' and did not enter into politics, either foreign or domestic, was dismissed from the Board of Trade.\(^{31}\) He had toiled conscientiously throughout Anne's reign at the details of Board affairs; he was certainly one of the two members referred to by Addison as 'doing all the Business' of it in the winter of 1706-7. But it was not enough. The rumour that '...Prior and Blathwayt do shake' turned out to be only too well-founded.\(^{32}\) Blathwayt had claimed he did not enter politics, but politics clearly affected him. Robert Cecil and John Pollexfen lost their Board places too; this was a political purge aimed at pacifying the Whigs.

There remained to Blathwayt his Auditor Generalship of Plantation Revenues and his clerkship of the Privy Council, but his powers in the first of these posts, too, had been eroded well before 1707. This was

---

\(^{30}\) Blathwayt to Stepney, 8 June, 1705; BY 21; The Journals of the House of Commons, 1547-1714 (London, 1803-52) XV, 12; 203, 255.

\(^{31}\) Blathwayt to Stepney, 20 November, 1706, 8 June, 1705; BY 21.

\(^{32}\) Joseph Addison to Stepney, 10 December, 17 December, 1706; Walter Graham (ed.), The Letters of Joseph Addison (Oxford, 1941), 65, 66.
largely a result of Godolphin's tenure of the Treasury (1722-10). Godolphin's methods were a clear contrast to those of the nineties, when the Treasury was in commission as William had resolved it always should be; and the Lord Treasurer's determined attack on financial problems, both internal and colonial, was, as P.G.M. Dickson shows, a visible reaction to the qualified chaos of the previous decade. Blathwayt had assured Joseph Dudley in 1702 that Godolphin's appointment as Treasurer was a matter of 'great Satisfaction to our freinds', but Godolphin's assertiveness in colonial affairs soon undermined Blathwayt's own position. The Lord Treasurer had known Blathwayt for many years, but it shortly became apparent that Godolphin would defer to no man's experience in plantation matters. The case of the payment of the Privy Council clerks in 1703 was a straw in the wind. As Blathwayt wryly pointed out to Edward Southwell, the Council clerks' arrears for plantation business were very slow in being settled because 'My Lord Treasurer thinks they do nothing for it and there are those that would have it believ'd so'.

For the first time in over twenty years, Blathwayt's accounts had to be checked before the Treasury; he in turn attempted to chivy his

---


34 Blathwayt to Dudley, 7 May, 1702; BW IV.


colonial correspondents. Those in arrears were threatened with legal process, from lowly deputy auditors up to the Lord Palatine of Carolina, Lord Granville. 37 Receivers of public revenue in the plantations were now required to give security both in the colony and in England for twice the value of their yearly receipts; the Auditor General's journal for 1705 is thick with the Treasurer's instructions on the matter. Godolphin himself saw fit to inform Governor Nott of Virginia that the younger Byrd was not to take over his father's posts in the colony as Receiver and Auditor until he had given security both in Virginia and in England for the very substantial sum of £6000. 38 For Jamaica the sum was £10000: when the Receiver General, Compere, petitioned against it, Blathwayt suggested that the security given in Jamaica could surely be extended to England, which, if it halved Compere's costs, seemed to vitiate the new rule and suggests a certain fretfulness on the part of the Auditor General over his superior's interference. 39

Clearly colonial revenues were now substantial enough to attract close Whitehall interest. Armed with precise information on revenues and the knowledge that transatlantic monetary transfers were becoming easier by the year, Godolphin had no intention of allowing the polite (and sometimes impolite) fudging over colonial revenues which had bedevilled metropolitan attempts at control in the seventies and eighties.

37 Blathwayt to Lord Granville, Blathwayt to Docminique.

38 T64/89, 124-5, 136-7, 145, 158 v.

39 T64/89, 159-60.
The whole of the Virginia quit rents had been set aside for 'extraordinary exigencies' in the colony by Charles II in 1684, largely at Blathwayt's instigation. Now Blathwayt had to stand by, and even assist, while large sums of money were transferred to the English exchequer. The balance in the hands of Receiver Byrd at his death, over £5700, was ordered sent in 1706, an additional £2000 in 1707, and a further £3000 in 1711.  

It was all very embarrassing when there was nothing left from which to finance the Walker expedition against Canada, but it certainly demonstrated Treasury insistence on fiscal centralisation. Godolphin's handling of the 4 1/2% export duty levied in Barbados and the Leewards gave similar proof: all the representations of the Board of Trade concerning the necessity of spending that royal revenue on island defence and other charges within these colonies went for nothing. The 4 1/2% yielded almost £80000 between 1702 and 1716, but a mere 10% of this had been of direct benefit to Barbados and the Leewards during Godolphin's tenure of the Treasury.

Blathwayt's choice of deputy auditors was carefully reviewed;

---

40 T64/89, 156-7, 192-3; T64/90, 59. Note, too, Blathwayt's answers to the Committee for Public Accounts in 1711 when he explained that the Virginia quit rents had been chiefly applied to the support of the government but that part had been 'sometimes remitted into Her Majesty's Exchequer here...'. T64/90, 51. See also Webb, 'Imperial Fixer' II, 414-5; Clark, Rise of the British Treasury, 28-9.

41 For a detailed discussion of the point see Steele, Politics of Colonial Policy, 94-8. It should not be thought, however, that the evidence must mean merciless exploitation of the colonies. It indicates control: but note Curtis Nettels' estimate that between 1708 and 1711, England spent £414000 on defence of the commerce and coasts of the mainland colonies alone. 'British Payments in the American Colonies, 1685-1715', EHR XLVII (1933), 244.
formal nomination as well as approval frequently came from the Lord Treasurer. Blathwayt's cousin Robert Gibbs, saved neither by the sweetmeats he had sent nor by his son's Christian name, lost his post as Blathwayt's deputy and as Receiver of the Casual Revenues of Barbados.\textsuperscript{42} Godolphin personally intervened in the financial morass that constituted New York under Lord Cornbury's rule, as the financial officials Fauçonier, Byerley and Clarke squabbled between themselves and with the governor over the tax returns.\textsuperscript{43} All knew that Blathwayt's dismissal from the Board of Trade must signify a diminished power to act on their behalf. In the very same letter in which the younger Byrd deprecated Blathwayt's departure from the Board he was forced to admit the 'irregular method' which the Virginia Council had employed in sending the Virginian accounts directly to the Lord Treasurer and not to Blathwayt.\textsuperscript{44}

Byrd suggested that the Board members would certainly find it necessary to ask Blathwayt's advice 'on several occasions'. Indeed they did; but something of Blathwayt's earlier strictures on Popple seemed now applicable to himself: if he was not growing duller, he was certainly more obstinate than ever. As he resentfully informed the Commissioners of Public Accounts in 1711, he could hardly be expected to supply

\textsuperscript{42} CTH XX, 1705-6, 362, 441, 585, 693. Blathwayt and Godolphin agreed on Gibbs' unfitness: see Blathwayt to Sir B. Granville, 25 February, 1705; Add. MSS. 38712, 75; Jacobsen, Blathwayt, 367-8; and see p. 177.

\textsuperscript{43} Deputy Auditor Clarke to Blathwayt, 12 (?) October, 1709; BW X. Virtually the whole of volume X of the Williamsburg Blathwayt Papers is devoted to correspondence on the financial problems of New York.

\textsuperscript{44} Byrd to Blathwayt, 12 November, 1707; BW XIII. Byrd managed to imply that this must have been the reason the accounts had miscarried.
complete information when, since his departure from the Board, he had been denied admission to the records 'though most of them of my own compiling'. (He did not, however, mention the vast numbers of documents which he had carried off with him to Dyrham).\footnote{Blathwayt to Commissioners of Public Accounts, 15 August, 1711; BH. For a detailed account of his work as Auditor from 1711-17, see Jacobsen, 394-400. Note, however, Clark's statement that while Oxford controlled the Treasury there was considerable neglect of crown colonial dues; 
Rise of the British Treasury, 25-6.}

Blathwayt had notably failed to be swept back to power and influence in the Tory landslide of 1710. On the contrary, he had lost his parliamentary seat. Since 1693 he had sat for Bath on the Duke of Beaufort's interest. The Duke was a near neighbour in Gloucestershire and the connection probably dates from Blathwayt's marriage to Mary Wynter in 1686; within three months of the wedding, Blathwayt was promising to send the Duke, on a regular basis, 'what considerable news might happen'. He was soon confident, too, that the Duke would make a favourable report in a lawsuit which appeared to be one of the less attractive aspects of the Wynter inheritance.\footnote{Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 3 March, 1686/7, 20 December, 1687; Portland MSS. 53.} For many years the Dukes of Beaufort were undemanding patrons; sending a few deer over to the estate at Badminton and doing some minor administrative favours proved a sufficient recommendation.\footnote{On Beaufort's electoral influence see SP 44/1, 84. An example of a favour is contained in D1799/C5, BG (14 March, 1695).} As for the closed corporation of Bath, it was usually a relatively simple matter to silence any 'Grumbletonians' among them by paying for a reasonable number of 'treats'.\footnote{cf. the 1702 election; D1799/E242, BG. In 1700 the vote for Blathwayt was unanimous; D1799/X9, BG.} Stepney suggested in 1705 that Blath-
wayt's interest in the seat was 'unalterable' and Blathwayt himself talked of his 'everlasting Title', although he added 'if that can signify much'. Even in 1705, however, as has been noted, there was trouble at the election.

In 1710 the second Duke of Beaufort was a young man of strong Tory sympathies and a supporter of Dr. Sacheverell. Believing that Blathwayt had voted against the Doctor in the impeachment proceedings, he opposed his election at Bath. The limits of Blathwayt's own interest there could now be clearly perceived. Though he told Beaufort that a 'false print' had misled him, and wrote to the corporation assuring them that he had no ambition to turn the choice of M.P.s in Bath over to the Freemen as rumour alleged, he could muster only twelve votes at the poll. To add insult to injury, the Duke of Beaufort's candidate was Colonel Codrington, a member of that very family to which Blathwayt had acted the patron for over twenty years. It was no use now to beg Lord Dartmouth to be remembered in any alterations at the Board of Trade, and small consolation some months later to hear that the Duchess of Beaufort

49 Stepney to Blathwayt, 29 April, 1705; Add. MSS. 34354, 26; Blathwayt to Hill, 26 December, 1693; Add. MSS. 56241.

50 Beaufort's visit and contribution of fifty guineas to Sacheverell is noted in HMC Downshire I, 886. Blathwayt's defence is found in HMC Dartmouth, 297. (But was he lying? cf. I. Burton et al., 'Political Parties in the reigns of William III and Anne: the Evidence of Division Lists', Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research Special Supplement nos. 4-8 (1968), 55.) For the letter to the corporation and the poll see DL799/X9, BG. Blathwayt's opponents gained 27 and 17 votes respectively.

51 Brydges MSS, 45, Huntington Library, copy consulted at the Institute for Historical Research, London.
was concerned that he was so 'ill-requited' for the kindness he had always shown her family. 52 He never regained the positions he had lost. All he could do was cultivate his garden at Dyrham, send his son to pay his respects at Hanover, and hope that the times would alter. 53

Whether the times altered or not, there was little likelihood that William Blathwayt would. His ideas had been established in the 1680s and changed little thereafter. The pattern of his actions as client and patron, the history of his attitudes to prerogative and parliament, all reveal a basic inflexibility of mind.

Blathwayt the client found before the revolution that advancement came through the cultivation of family patronage followed by that of the 'great men' of the day and finally and most significantly by that of the monarch. After the revolution he continued to reply on royal favour. William's character, particularly his reserved and suspicious nature, made this a dubious policy in some respects. Since Blathwayt did not possess the social position to recommend him to Anne, William's death proved disastrous. Moreover, it revealed the shaky underpinnings of Blathwayt's patronage position. He had not maintained sufficient connections among the 'great men'. The quality of his relationship with Nottingham was different in 1701 from that of the early nineties; the Wheeler-Foulkes expedition had seen to that. Godolphin's assertiveness as Lord Treasurer weakened the old friendship with the Auditor General of planta-

52 Somersett to Blathwayt, 12 June, 1712; DL799/C6, BG.

53 For the Hanover visit see Stowe MSS. 223, 421, 457.
tion revenues and Godolphin was blamed by Matthew Prior for the 1707 changes in the Board of Trade. 'As the wise Lord Godolphin told me when he turned me out for having served Him', wrote Prior sarcastically, 'Things change, and times change, and men change'. Prior learned his lesson, joined the extreme Tories and was made a Customs Commissioner in 1711. Blathwayt did not; he was unable or perhaps he did not try, to establish a strong relationship during Anne's reign with Godolphin or Marlborough, Harley or St. John. Holmes argues that by 1694 the placemen were taking their cue from the great party leaders rather than the crown but Blathwayt either could not see, or ignored, this development. He paid the price.

Blathwayt the patron displayed a similar continuity of attitude.
The supporters of the prerogative in the eighties, such as Andros and Randolph, received Blathwayt's backing in the nineties. All that could be done to exert metropolitan power should be done, but never at the expense of the total alienation of local opinion or through massive purges of local officials. Witham's suggestion of a Barbados excise on liquors imposed by the authority of Governor and council alone met no approval from Blathwayt in 1681; Bellomont's wholesale dismissals in New York in the nineties he similarly regarded as unwise. As a cautious man, and a man with a position to protect, he feared radical methods, but

54 Prior to Bolingbroke, 6/17 March, 1713/14; L.G. Wickham Legg, Matthew Prior (Cambridge, 1921), 133.

there can be no doubt of the primacy he accorded the royal prerogative in the workings of the political system. His letters in the eighties were redolent with the phrases of the 'high prerogative' man. The enlargement of the king's 'Empire & Revenue' were greatly aided by the limited rôle of parliament at that particular time; Blathwayt learned to despise and distrust its workings.

After the revolution, he shared William's dislike for parliament. The Dutch ruler's understanding of English parliamentary institutions was not enlarged by his Secretary at War, who indeed was not re-elected to parliament until 1693. The implications of the Glorious Revolution revealed themselves slowly; the pressures of war finance, and William's periodic absences from England, also had their constitutional effect as the nineties proceeded. Blathwayt's influence was not expanding throughout the nineties, pace Preston and Webb. The addition of yet another well-paid post to Blathwayt's pantheon of responsibilities in 1692 is misleading in its implications. Since Blathwayt had been stretched almost to the limit even of his formidable capacities in the 1680s, it followed that he could not possibly devote the requisite attention to all his posts in the decade which followed, a decade characterised by a veritable explosion of government business.

Moreover, the demands of several of those posts were altering. The disbandment crises of the late nineties showed the necessity of parliamentary skills in the Secretary at War. Increased scrutiny of the war estimates by the House of Commons drove home the lesson. The for-

56 BL416, BH. The word empire is used in the sense of authority, power and not in the sense of physical expansion of land held.
mation of the Board of Trade undermined the position of the secretary of the old plantations committee; though Blathwayt was a member of the new body he could not always dominate it and he well knew its limitations in policymaking and its liability to parliamentary attack. He could not be so effective in engineering parliamentary proceedings against colonial charters as he had been in the simpler days when matters could be channelled through the Attorney and Solicitor Generals and early submission to the royal legal prerogative was confidently expected by the Secretary of Plantations.

The integration of Blathwayt's offices which Webb sees as a main feature of his career was far more difficult to achieve in the nineties than it had been before the revolution. There were definite lacunae in the information Blathwayt was receiving from royal sources, as William's letters to Shrewsbury indicate. Although Preston considers Blathwayt's post as acting Secretary of State to have been the most significant of all his positions, it was in the field of foreign policy above all others that William demonstrated his desire to be the sole director of policy; clerkly tools such as Blathwayt were certainly not privy to all the royal diplomatic (and other) secrets. As Matthew Prior put it to the Earl of Jersey in 1699 after a visit to the royal encampment at Loo, 'The Elephant [Blathwayt] is always the same, jocular and ignorant, disguising his want of knowing what is doing by affecting to keep it secret'.

It was, naturally, some time before Blathwayt's correspondents

---

57 Wickham Legg, Matthew Prior, 315.
grasped the limitations of his position; even when they did, convention
demanded that their letters express confidence in Blathwayt's influence
with all the hyperbole that they could command. Nonetheless, it is
clear that Blathwayt was in decline well before William's death. It
has been sufficiently indicated that the reign of Anne offered little
comfort. A Tory resurgence did not mean a Blathwayt resurgence. The
empire of William Blathwayt, although it appeared to reach its greatest
extent after the revolution, in quality was more impressive in the 1680s.
The reformed and expanded royal administration of which Blathwayt had
been such an enthusiastic advocate, the legal absolutism for which he
had pressed, had come to very little. By the end of the first decade of
the eighteenth century, William Blathwayt seemed totally out of place.
He was not merely 'the Elephant'. He had become a mammoth.
PART III

THE REWARDS OF WILLIAM BLATHWAYT'S EMPIRE
CHAPTER 8
DYRHAM: THE MAKING OF A COUNTRY GENTLEMAN

During his travels about the kingdom in the early eighteenth century, Daniel Defoe noted in the county of Gloucestershire the existence of two imposing palaces. One was Badminton, the seat of the Dukes of Beaufort, traditionally Lords Lieutenant of the county and among the leading noble families of England. The other was Dyrham Park, residence of the Blathways, built by William Blathwayt in the 1690s on the site of an earlier house belonging to the Wynter family into which Blathwayt had married. Even today the size and splendour of Dyrham impress; to its architectural grandeur the King's own Comptroller of the Works and Surveyor General had contributed. In the early eighteenth century, when the house was surrounded by the elaborate gardens regarded by one of the leading authorities of the day as among the most beautiful in England, the effect must have been yet more striking. Visitors flocked to the area to view the 'Magnificence of the Seat', the 'beautiful Irregularity' of the setting and the fountains and cascade, the finest in the country.

---


2The east front was designed by William Talman; Wren's involvement is suggested in a letter from Talman: Talman to Wren, 12 September, 1699; Wren Society IV (1927) p. 60. See also M. Girouard, 'Dyrham Park, Gloucestershire', Country Life 15 February, 1962, 335-339, 22 February, 1962, 396-399; J.A. Kemworthy-Browne, 'The Building of Dyrham Park, Gloucestershire for William Blathwayt between 1692 and 1702', The Connoisseur March, 1962, 139-144.
after Chatsworth, according to one observer.  

The 'proper, handsome person...very dextrous in business', with whom John Evelyn dined in 1687 had obviously succeeded in raising himself substantially above the 'very moderate circumstances' from which he had entered public affairs in 1668. Gossip alleged in 1695 that Blathwayt was building a house which 'my Ld Scarborow says he wont excuse him for 15000 for the finishing; the pictures, the library, the 'good rich beds' and other interior furnishings also constituted a substantial investment. Yet this self-effacing civil servant had by no means ruined his fortune in conspicuous consumption; his daughter brought to Edward Southwell in 1716 a dowry of £10,000; and for his second son, John, Blathwayt purchased 'a place or places' in the first Troop of Horse Guards. The careful inventories of his estate which Blathwayt made at regular intervals reveal a comfortable progression in affluence. In June, 1717, two months before his death, his notes indicate that he possessed lands in Gloucestershire worth almost £800 p.a., in Somerset worth £900 p.a., in Berkshire £600 p.a., and in addition houses in London worth £200 p.a. Moreover, this long-time inveigher against the pernicious trade of stockjobbing, who had once disdainfully referred to the opponents

---


5 Littleton to Hatton, 16 September, 1695; Add. MSS. 29578, 523; *Diary of Dudley Ryder*, 249.

6 HMC Egmont, Diary, 119; 'Draught of my Will', 10 September, 1716; DL799/F92, BC.
to his re-election at Bath as nothing but East India and bank men, had at the same date over £21000 invested in Bank of England, East India and South Sea stocks and various public securities such as Land Tax and Malt Tax tallies. A further £8000 was invested in mortgages; pay arrears, some of them dating back to the reign of William, constituted another £2200 (though by 1717 there was surely an element of wishful thinking in the inclusion of these in 'my Estate'). The sole acknowledged debts in Blathwayt's schedule were two annuities, worth less than £200 p.a. in total. 7

Virtually the whole of this substantial estate was to pass to Blathwayt's eldest son, William; predictably the will contained no charitable bequests. 8 It is not to be wondered at that the author of Ichnographia Rustica should express surprise that the 'happy Possessor' of the glories of Dyrham bore 'no higher Character than that of a private Gentleman'. 9 How had a man who claimed that he 'never pretended to any Estate' 10 managed to amass such a patrimony to hand on to his son? An analysis of Blathwayt's methods, both proper and improper, and the results

---

7 'Schedule of my Estate', 20 June, 1717; DL799/F92; Blathwayt to Stepney, 8 June, 1705; BY 21; 'Inventory of Mr. Blathwayt's Estate in the Publick Funds, Stocks taken the 26 June, 1716'; DL799/A100, BG. The largest individual holding was £6000 in bank stock.

8 The only benefaction of Blathwayt I have been able to trace was a small contribution to Chelsea Hospital: G. Jacobsen, William Blathwayt (New Haven, 1932), 65. The last £4000 of Blathwayt's daughter's dowry was to be paid at his death. The manor of Egham (£600 p.a.) went to the younger son, John, plus a cash payment of £1000. £30 went to his sister Elizabeth to buy her mourning.

9 Switzer, Ichnographia Rustica 113.

10 Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 28 September, 1686; DL799/C8, BG.
of his exertions, is the subject of this chapter.

Marriage, public service and the law are regarded by Lawrence Stone as the three main methods of self-advancement in this period, with the colonies becoming a fourth major avenue in the eighteenth century. Blathwayt employed three of these four.\footnote{L. Stone, 'Social Mobility in England, 1500-1700', \textit{Past and Present} 33 (1966), 34-5. Though Blathwayt had legal training it was not a major factor in his advancement.} Marriage was a traditional path to the improvement of one's estate: the case of the wealthy widow of Edward Palmer, who, Roger North assures us, 'had no less than five younger brothers sat down before her at one time', was surely not un-typical.\footnote{Roger North, \textit{Lives of the Norths} (London, 1826) I, 157. North's brother was another suitor to the lady. For a fascinating discussion of the rôle of marriage in the making of family fortunes see L. Stone, \textit{Family and Fortune: Studies in Aristocratic Finance in the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries} (Oxford, 1973).} In 1686 Blathwayt's cousin Clark informed him that there was a Mr. Wynter in Gloucestershire with a daughter, Mary, of 'about thirty', heiress to her father's £1000 p.a. and £10000 in ready money.\footnote{Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 6 July, 1686 (Dyrham Park).} Though Blathwayt disclaimed any wish for 'a contest or a Smithfield bargain' there were elements of the meat market in what transpired. His patron Sir Robert Southwell, his own estate at King's Weston most conveniently located close to the Wynter acres, acted as chief confidante and advisor. The suitor soon claimed to be more interested in the person of the lady than the size of her estate, but his negotiating care never
There was, for example, the matter of the house at Dyram; it would have to be completely rebuilt, though the 'old Gentleman' must not be told for fear of hurting his feelings. There would have to be plate, furniture, a coach: though he was not a man for 'parade', Blathwayt claimed, appearances must be kept up. The possibility that the Wynter estate might be involved in a major lawsuit was also a factor to be taken into account by a careful suitor, particularly one whose own father had left his affairs 'extremely embroil'd and impaired' through legal proceedings. So anxious indeed was Blathwayt to remind Southwell that Mary Wynter's inheritance was a thing of the future and necessarily uncertain that he felt obliged to state categorically that this was not a marriage likely to make his fortune. Rumour always exaggerated the expectations of heiresses, he complained. However, we should remember that Blathwayt was capable of gamesmanship of a very high order. The precise cash value of the Wynter alliance is a little difficult to assess but one of the main negotiators was fond of talking of 'the sound of

---

14. The Dahl painting at Dyram shows a grave and handsome lady. In 1686 she was thirty six, an age which Blathwayt at first thought 'uninviting'. Five years and five pregnancies later she was dead. As far as is known, this was Blathwayt's first serious thought of marriage since 1675, when he had proposed to and been refused by a cousin, Betty InKén (Jenkin?). Blathwayt to Frances Vivian (his stepsister), 31 May, 1675; DL799/C5, BG.

15. Blathwayt to Southwell, 12 October, 1686; DL799/C8, BG; Blathwayt to Southwell, 25 September, 1686 (Dyram Park); Blathwayt to Southwell, 30 September, 7 October, 1686; DL799/C8, BG.

£27000' as the long term prospect. It must surely have been a matter of some satisfaction for the putative bridegroom when the agreements were drawn. In November, 1686, he returned from a visit to Dyrham with 'a pattern...for the Wedding Ring'; the marriage took place in December.

For his part, to balance the Wynter fortune, Blathwayt had had to estimate his own estate and income prospects. This involved a shrewd assessment of the real worth of his various posts, and their significance in the bureaucratic structure. By now in his late thirties, Blathwayt was unencumbered by debts and by relatives to provide for, though he stressed that he wanted always to have it in his power to oblige his numerous connections if he so desired. The income from Blathwayt's positions, he claimed, was over £2000 p.a. (his own estimate accorded well with that of Evelyn), and the positions were such, all 'places of pains or Experience', that the continuation of the income seemed reasonably assured. Salary from the Plantation Office Blathwayt put at £750, with other things such as house rents £100 p.a. Perquisites amounted to £1200 p.a., 'besides other contingencies'. The Secretaryship at War brought £730 p.a., with fees and perquisites as much. Five hundred pounds of his salary, boasted Blathwayt, was during good behaviour, and therefore in his own estimation virtually unshakable. At least £3000 p.a.

17 Comment of Mr. Edwards, quoted in Blathwayt to Southwell, 28 September, 1686; DL799/C8. In 1694 Narcissus Luttrell claimed that the lady with the 'greatest fortune in England' had £5000 p.a. in land and £50000 in money; Brief Relation III, 340.

18 Blathwayt to Southwell, 16 November, 1686; DL799/C8.

19 Blathwayt to Southwell, 23 September, 7 October, 1686; DL799/C8.
was now admitted to by Blathwayt, who tended to vary the figures he gave depending on their prospective use. After almost twenty years in the public service he had also accumulated various investments, including some London houses renting at a combined value of £250 p.a. and a holding of £3400 in bonds and notes on Mr. Duncombe and others. 20

No wonder one colonial governor referred enviously to Blathwayt's 'advantageous p'rentts.' 21 Clearly the posts held were far more lucrative than their nominal value suggests, though even this was substantial enough to provoke attack: in 1692 an anti-executive House of Commons discharged 'tout leur bile', according to the Brandenburg envoy, against Blathwayt and his salary as Secretary at War. 22 Perquisites and the 'other contingencies' so blandly referred to by Blathwayt in his letter

20 Blathwayt to Southwell, 27 July, 28 September, 1686; DL799/C8. On the latter date Blathwayt drew up a schedule of his estate: see DL799/ A100, BQ. Duncombe was a leading London financier: see Dictionary of National Biography (Oxford, 1949-50) VI, 175-177. For a detailed discussion of Blathwayt's salaries see Jacobsen, Blathwayt ch. XIII.

21 Sir John Witham to Blathwayt, 12 November, 1683; BW XXXV. In the same letter Witham hoped that Blathwayt would accept a present of a 'good diamond ring': obviously Blathwayt's preferments were advantageous in more ways than one. And see below, pp. 210ff.

22 Report of Friedrich Bönnet to the Court of Brandenburg, 9/19 December, 1692; the reports are printed in L. von Ranke, A History of England principally in the Seventeenth Century (Oxford, 1875) VI, 144-274. I.P. Burton, 'The Secretary at War and the Administration of the Army during the War of the Spanish Succession' (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1960) indicates that Blathwayt received £1 a day as a staff officer on the establishment of the guards and garrisons and a further £1000 p.a. paid out of the poundage. See also Clifford Walton, History of the British Standing Army, 1660-1700 (London, 1894), 641. The fees associated with this post were substantial and even their gradual pruning did not make Blathwayt the loser; for example, the discontinuance of the fee on pay warrants 'led to a compensatory allowance of £1 per day: CTB VIII, 1685-1689, 1253 (12 March, 1687), and see also p.25.
to Southwell in 1686 were, it is interesting to note, higher than any of his individual salaries. It was surely not the desire for the modest £250 p.a. of a clerk in ordinary that was reflected in the purchase price of £1500 or £2000 which Blathwayt told his friend Stepney would be needed in 1694 if Stepney wished to join him in attendance at the Council Board. It was the profit of £500 or £600 p.a. which led to the intense competition for the Council clerkships and acrimonious disputes such as the Povey/Southwell crisis of 1697.23

Blathwayt's remaining salary at the time of his marriage was from his post as Auditor of Plantation Revenues; the £500 p.a. (which increased as other colonies came directly under royal rule) was raised in the plantations and thus subject to the exigencies of local factional fights, the efficiency or otherwise of his deputies, the co-operation of the governors and the problems of transatlantic money transfers. Acquiring bills of exchange at favourable rates was clearly a problem for the deputy auditors and the governors. Some bills came back protested; perhaps Governor Fletcher of New York really was much grieved that Blathwayt 'should meet that Disappointment' in 1694 but it is impossible not to suspect that some colonial officials were only too delighted over any...

23 Stepney to ? Montagu, November, 1694; SP 105/55. In 1686 Blathwayt estimated the value of Sir Philip Lloyd's Council clerkship at £2500; Blathwayt to Southwell, 7 October, 1686; D1799/C8, RG. For a detailed discussion of the salaries of Council clerks (which included an extra £100 for waiting on the Committee of Trade and Plantations; though Blathwayt got £250 after 1685 for his special plantation responsibilities, see CTB VIII, 1685-89, 155) see Jennifer J. Carter, 'The Administrative Work of the English Privy Council, 1679-1714', 532ff. (unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of London, 1958). The young Southwell, son of Blathwayt's old friend, was incensed when Blathwayt offered to sell him his own clerkship since Blathwayt had not paid for the post originally.
delays in payment. 24 Faction-ridden New York, particularly after the friendly Fletcher was replaced by Lord Bellomont, was not a happy hunting ground for the Auditor's salary. The events of 1699 illustrate the problems. Blathwayt's deputy, Stephen Van Cortlandt, had delayed for months sending the Auditor's salary, claiming first that he did not know in what mode to send it, whether in produce of the country or bills, and then that no good bills of exchange could be obtained. In any case Van Cortlandt had been victualling the New York companies for three years and lending money to the officers; he intended to take Blathwayt's salary from the money due for this but Governor Bellomont would not hand over a bill until he was absolutely certain his agent in England had received the money due to the troops. It was difficult to break this vicious circle especially since Van Cortlandt died most inopportune with the matter unresolved and his accounts in total disarray. 25 New York salary problems continued under Bellomont's successors. Blathwayt's deputy while Cornbury was governor claimed always to be looking for a 'more seasonable occasion to Exert the authority of your Commission ...'. Under Lord Lovelace's administration the same deputy was instructed

24 Fletcher to Blathwayt, 22 January, 1693/4; BW VIII. Brooke to Blathwayt, 28 March, 1694; BW XI. Brocke was reluctant to pay 36% exchange on Blathwayt's salary. For similar problems in Barbados in the eighties see Stede to Blathwayt, 6 February, 1684/5; BW XXXIII, and in the qineties, Thomas to Blathwayt, 4 March, 1697/8, Blathwayt to Thomas, 18 July, 1698; BW XXXIV.

25 Van Cortlandt to Blathwayt, 3 April, 16 October, 8 December, 1699; Blathwayt to Van Cortlandt, 2 (?) January, 1699/1700; Gertrude Van Cortlandt to Blathwayt, 22 February, 16 October, 1700; BW IX. For other New York salary problems see Randolph to Blathwayt, 16 August, 1692, Brooke to Blathwayt, 7 March, 1692/3, Randolph to Blathwayt, 12 September, 1698; BW II; Graham to Blathwayt, 8 (? ) February, 1692/3; BW X.
to settle for £100 or thereabouts rather than fight for the full amount.\(^26\)

Massachusetts and New Hampshire were similarly unreliable areas as far as the Auditor's fees (and indeed most other salaries) were concerned. Lieutenant Governor Stoughton's 'deep sense' of the 'great disingenuity' of the assembly in objecting to the item in the account relating to Blathwayt's salary matched by Lieutenant Governor Usher's rejected admission that "Sallarys for any Commissioned or appointed by the King will not be Swallowed."\(^27\) Matters were better managed in Virginia where the friendly Byrds both received and audited the royal revenues for almost the whole period of Blathwayt's career, and in Barbados and the Leewards until the end of the century. In 1711, however, Blathwayt claimed in reports to the Commissioners of Public Accounts that his salary as Auditor was £2000 in arrears and that he had received no accounts from the Leeward Islands since 1701 because of French invasions, the death of the Receiver and 'other unfortunate accidents'. Surely Blathwayt must have lacked the certainty about payment that he displayed concerning his Auditor's arrears in 1686,\(^28\) when he listed what was due among his 'certain Debts'. At that time Blathwayt was a man on the rise; by 1711, stripped of the Secretaryship at War, his seat at the Board of Trade and

\(^{26}\) Clarke to Blathwayt, 12 (?) October, 1709; BW X; Blathwayt to Clarke (during the Lovelace administration), BW XXXIX. Clarke was also to do his best to get the £100 appointed by the assembly of the Jerseys for Blathwayt's salary.

\(^{27}\) Stoughton to Blathwayt, 14 November, 1694; BW V; Usher to Blathwayt, 27 July, 1695; BW VI.

\(^{28}\) Drafts, Blathwayt to Commissioners of Public Accounts, ? September, 1711; BH. D1799/A100, BG.
the electoral patronage of the Duke of Beaufort, he was a man on the
defensive. The reassurances that one friend of Blathwayt had had to
give that Blathwayt's patent as Auditor was in no way affected by his loss
of other positions, particularly his dismissal from the Board of Trade,
showed the sensitivity of colonial weather to the breezes at Whitehall
and portended ever-increasing difficulties in finding 'good' bills of
exchange and conveyances by which to send them. 29

At home, too, regularity of salary payments depended very much
on one's standing at the time and the precise manner in which payment was
to be made. All shared the heartfelt desire of the Earl of Conway that
their salaries and pensions should be assigned on 'some Fond', thus ob-
viating the need for quarterly solicitation. 30 The eighties and most of
the nineties proved an excellent financial period for Blathwayt, pre-
cisely reflecting the state of his career. By 1690 he was in a position
actually to lend money to the government; 31 in 1692 his appointment as
acting Secretary of State in attendance on William III during the cam-
paigning season brought him a substantial salary addition especially as
he was to get it without any of the multifarious 'deductions' which
seventeenth century salaries were heir to; after 1694 it was equal in
amount to the salary of the other Secretaries of State. There were also

29 Samuel Barwick to Blathwayt, 17 June, 1707; BY 3.

30 Conway to Blathwayt, 22 May, 1683; Add. MSS. 37990, 50. Note, too,
Blathwayt's letter to Lowndes in 1701 concerning the fund his salary
was to be assigned to; Add. MSS. 38706, 60.

31 CTR IX, 1689-1692, 645.
special grants in this period which illustrate Blathwayt's access to royal and Treasury influence: generous allowances for horses and carriages for serving the King abroad, £1000 for the loss of his equipage in 1692 (paid with gratifying promptness); payment for attending the King to Scotland in 1699, grants of housing in London and manors elsewhere. Appointment to the new Board of Trade in 1696 meant a salary of £1000 p.a., though arguably the position was less secure than Blathwayt's old post as Secretary to the Privy Council's Committee of Plantations.

It was the coming of peace, in some ways a relief for a most un-warlike Secretary of War who had hardly relished the rigours of campaigning, which was to crimp Blathwayt's financial style. William III, ever-alert to possible economies, noted that his servant could hardly expect to make such an equipage as in time of war and there was no room now to satisfy this payment out of 'contingencies'. The death of William was a more serious setback and meant that there were others who needed to be satisfied that Blathwayt was entitled to various payments; parts of his petition for £2105 p.a. in 1703 were left for consideration until Marlborough arrived. Marlborough was far from convinced by Blathwayt's demands,

---

32 CTB X, 1693-1696, 566, 86; CTB LX, 1689-1692, 1602, 1616, 1658, 1734, 1746, 352, 392, 647, 683; CTB X, 1693-1696, 276; CTB XV, 1699-1700, 428. The prompt payment of the equipage money was in part due to the assistance of Ranelagh, who hoped for a quid pro quo in Blathwayt's help in forwarding an Irish financial scheme of his, and of Godolphin: see Add. MSS. 9735, 83, 85, 87, 50.

33 CTB XVI, 1700-1701, 75.
though Blathwayt had done his best to cultivate his patronage.  

Thus far the emphasis has largely been on official salaries and fees. What of Blathwayt's 'other contingencies'? To estimate their amount in kind and cash, and their propriety, is difficult. The frank notes of Edward Southwell, son of Blathwayt's old patron, contain indications of how the discreet bureaucrat was expected to conduct himself. Clearly, wrote Southwell, few men would refuse a reward for doing right, 'but that the reward makes it look as wrong'. Courtiers did not live in a 'Slippery place in order to consume, but to make a fortune and if they live high, they expect proportionable Gratifications...'. Southwell's future father-in-law did not live 'high' (the man who boasted that he was one of the four men in England to have the privilege of free postage was careful with his money) but he certainly expected his 'gratifications', as the papers of Christopher Jeaffreson, agent for the Leeward Islands in the 1680s, attest. While Jeaffreson struggled to obtain supplies and men for St. Kitts, he was forced to learn the ways of Whitehall the hard way. His editor and descendant portrays Jeaffreson as caught in the toils of a civil servant, Blathwayt, who was 'more fortunate

---

34 CTB XVIII, 1703, 40; on Marlborough-Blathwayt relations see ch. 7. Note too Blathwayt's explicit instructions to his friend Stepney in 1702: '...it is absolutely necessary for you to maintain a close correspondence with my Lord Marlborough...y' reasons I need not tell you ...'. 10 March, 1702, BY 21.

35 'Method of Petitions'; Add. MSS. 38861, 127, 128.

36 Blathwayt to Southwell, 27 July, 1686; D1799/C8, BG. The others were the Secretaries of State and the Secretary of the Admiralty.
than scrupulous. However, modern historians tend not to share this attitude of condemnation. The reigning expert on earlier seventeenth century administration points out that tips were not bribes; particular studies of, for example, the Ordnance office suggest the importance of seeing the matter in a proper contemporary context. Private financial bargains of all types were clearly a necessity in a society where so much of the power of the government was perforce leased out to individual enterprise. Nonetheless, there were certainly standards of propriety in this society. On one matter Blathwayt was absolutely clear: the care that must be taken when royal monies were involved. As he informed Governor Lynch of Jamaica in 1684, the sums due to the King should be sent via Guy and not him, since he desired 'never to handle money'. (Perhaps if Guy had exercised similar discretion he could have avoided the Tower in 1695). This punctilious approach was maintained in succeeding reigns; in 1699 Blathwayt informed Richard Hill, Paymaster of the Forces in Flanders, that a great lord had said he was cavilling when

37 J.C. Jeaffreson (ed.), A Young Squire of the Seventeenth Century (London, 1878), 313. On the agent's insistence on the importance of seeing Blathwayt see, for example, 14, 15, 106-7. See also Webb, 'Imperial Filler' 1, 6.

38 G.E. Aylmer, The King's Servants (London, revised edition, 1974), 179; for a more general discussion of the problem see ibid, chs. 4, 6. H.C. Tomlinson, 'Place and Profit: An Examination of the Ordnance Office, 1660-1714', Transactions of the Royal Historical Society, 5th series XXV (1975), 55-75. See also Joel Hurstfield, 'Political Corruption in Modern England: The Historian's Problem', History 52 (1967), 16-34. The avarice of Pepys, who was frequently accused of neglecting 'all where money chinks not' is well known: but this has not prevented him from being regarded as a first-rate civil servant; G.J.W.A. Ellis (ed.), Ellis Correspondence (London, 1829), 1, 93.
he insisted respite warrants required a counter signature but 'I have known my Trade too long...'.\textsuperscript{39} It would take a great deal more than this to catch Blathwayt out, and his colonial correspondents were generally quick enough to pick up any hints about anonymity in matters of special payments. When Crisp sent ten guineas from St. Kitts acknowledging help in business at court he did not name Blathwayt in the bill so that 'noe notice might be taken to whome ye money goes'. The £1500 voted by the Barbados assembly to carry on the solicitation of the colony's affairs in 1695 was destined for Blathwayt and his clerk Povey but private directions were given to the agents and care taken that 'no publick mention is made of your name therein...'.\textsuperscript{40} But while Blathwayt might jocularly suggest to that indefatigable servant of the crown Edward Randolph that perhaps some 'accident' with pirate goods might help Randolph make his fortune, he obviously recognised the existence of certain principles which must guide the behaviour of the conscientious bureaucrat.

In a brief and unusually frank memorandum in the mid-eighties, Blathwayt noted that Barbados had very liberal intentions towards him but the occasion was such that he must refuse the present for 'either I shall not be able to do them good in what they propose or his Majesty's Duty will be seemingly lessened which may on that acc't be construed to my preju-

\textsuperscript{39} Blathwayt to Lynch, 3 March, 1683/4; BW XXIV; Blathwayt to Hill, October, 1700; Add. MSS. 56241, unpaginated.

\textsuperscript{40} Crisp to Blathwayt, 20 July, 1681; BW XXXIX; Cranfield to Blathwayt, 27 February, 1695; BW XII.
dice'. As John Povey pointed out to Governor Nicholson in 1696, the very fact that he had failed to become Secretary of the new Board of Trade meant that he could serve Maryland with 'more partiality to the Country than while I lay under the Engagements of the office'. There were rules, then: the problem lies in identifying them. The evidence suggests, too, that they changed over time, with somewhat stricter guidelines being imposed under King William. The most overt offers of cash payments to Blathwayt for help in acquiring offices, for example, all seem to date from the eighties; even then it is impossible to say whether they were taken up.

The notion that the public good must prevail over private profit was one which was slow to develop but it certainly motivated some of Blathwayt's actions. When Sir John Witham suggested from Barbados that

41 Blathwayt to Randolph, 10 March, 1687/8; Toppan, Edward Randolph IV, 218; Randolph, typically, wished any irregularities he might commit licensed: he asked Blathwayt to help him become deputy to Sir Robert Holmes, who had procured a commission to put down pirates in the West Indies, with the right for three years to seize and keep all their goods. Randolph to Blathwayt, 19 October, 1688; BW I. Undated memorandum (probably January, 1686); BW XXXIII.

42 Povey to Nicholson, 4 July, 1696; Ellesmere MSS. 9625.

43 See 'Memorandum to write to the Plantations: 1697. Maryland. For the Councill and Assembly'. The marginal comment on the notification of an assembly vote for 14 July, 1696 for fifty guineas to Mr. Blathwayt and fifty pounds to Mr. Povey when two acts for religion and schools should be confirmed is 'This is supposed to be out of doors now'. BW VIII.

44 See, for example, the suggestion of the Secretary of Jamaica that the provost marshall's patent could be acquired by Blathwayt and then disposed of for £1000 or £1200; Egleton to Blathwayt, 3 September, 1684; BW XXII. It is also possible that Blathwayt was judged less capable of delivering the offices in the later period.
the Secretary of the Plantations Council might find it worth his while to get a grant under the Privy Seal to manage the King's share of the income from the interloping trade for two or three years, he was sternly informed that Blathwayt had made use of the information Witham had provided not 'to procure to myself any such Grant but to prevent others doing it'.

The opportunities for Blathwayt to invest in colonial enterprises were, of course, legion. His family connections in the West Indies were such that as early as 1677 he could comment on the number of his interests in Barbados. The variety of his colonial correspondents meant that he was deluged with schemes, all of whose authors claimed that they would answer the very highest expectations, if well managed. From Barbados William Chapman asserted he had made a 'discovery' of something worth over £100,000 'concealed' from the crown: one third of the sum was expected by the discoverers for their pains, out of which Blathwayt should have half if he would present this to the King. Writing from the same colony, Colonel Stede made several propositions: Blathwayt could realise substantial profits on licences for the Scots trade if direct trading in Scots servants and goods were allowed; he could invest in naval bonds, many thousands of which, dating back to 1660, were cluttering up

45 Witham to Blathwayt, 30 July, 1680, Blathwayt to Witham, 29 January, 1680/81: the Dowager Countess of Bristol had apparently done very well out of her grant of His Majesty's share of all the interlopers taken by Captain Delaval in the Constant Warwick; BW XXXV.

46 Blathwayt to Sir Jonathan Atkins, 27 May, 1677; BW XXIX. There was also Povey property in Jamaica: see Blathwayt to Lynch, 20 January, 1682/3; BW XXIII.
the Naval Office in Barbados; he could send over a cargo of rebels in
the aftermath of the Monmouth rebellion and perhaps clear £1000: 'iff
you will be an adventurer I will be your factor...'. 47 Governor Lynch
of Jamaica suggested a partnership in a Cocoa walk, to which Blathwayt
replied that he would be happy to be a freeholder of Jamaica if it would
'cause no clamor'; he and Sir Charles Littleton were prepared to invest
£250 apiece in the cocoa scheme. 48 Though the project eventually fell
through, Blathwayt was still considering Jamaican investment in the
1690s when he recommended the trading expertise of Colonel Beeston to
the Lord President, Carmarthen, and offered to participate in a joint
venture. 49 An ambitious Bermudan scheme for whale fishing in which
again a colonial governor, Richier, tried to involve Blathwayt, failed
when the problems and charges of getting the necessary grant became
clear. 50 Richier's successor, Goddard, sent over to England the papers
of a complex land inheritance case which might, he assured Blathwayt,

47 Chapman to Blathwayt, 28 July, 1687; BW XXII; Stede to Blathwayt,
25 January, 1682/3, 15 June, 1683; BW XXXIV; Stede to Blathwayt, 12
March, 1685/6; BW XXXIII.

48 Lynch to Blathwayt, 22 July, 1682; Blathwayt to Lynch, 1 November,
1682, 20 January, 1682/3; BW XXIII. Lynch to Blathwayt, 26 April, 1683.
In a letter of 30 June, 1683, Blathwayt noted it would be best to use
his cousin's name, Richard Povey, if land was taken up for him; see
Lynch to Blathwayt, 15 November, 1683; BW XXIV.

49 Blathwayt to the Lord President, 14 July, 1692; Add. MSS. 34351, l.
Lynch's successor, Moleworth, promised Blathwayt £100 p.a. and a share
of any profits he made in the Spanish negro trade in return for Blath-
wayt acting as an 'able Pilot' for him in court affairs; Moleworth to
Blathwayt, 2 September, 1684; BW XXV.

50 Richier to Blathwayt, 12 May, 1691, 22 January, 1691/2; BW XXXVI.
put '3 or 400 pound in your pocket as well as my own'...'. In the very same packet the over-anxious governor enclosed details of an adjacent island which might surely be begged as a grant from the King 'in your name and mine'.

The mainland colonies provided a variety of investment opportunities too: ambitious land schemes from Edward Cranfield and Joseph Dudley, a beaver trading scheme from Phipps, a silver mining possibility in Massachusetts, and a mining scheme in South Carolina where the Earls of Pembroke and Bridgewater were also involved. Profits from these schemes proved in many cases entirely chimerical (as were some of the mines). It is impossible, too, to know how far Blathwayt committed himself; his schedules of investments certainly make no reference to them but this does not preclude the existence of Povey front-men. There cannot have been any major infringement of the rules of contemporary practice, or Blathwayt would have joined Guy in the Tower or suffered full investigation at the time of the Ranelagh enquiry. A whole series of Commissioners of Public Accounts proved unable to discover any serious fiscal infractions. Bellomont's accusations about Blathwayt's involv-

51 Goddard to Blathwayt, 1693 (received February, 1694); BW XXXVI.

ment in shady New Hampshire land deals are dismissed by his biographer as the product of spite. 53

The acquisition of the necessary cash is only one element in the translation of London bureaucrat into Gloucestershire country gentleman. Dyrham Park had to be built and furnished in suitably tasteful fashion. The personal supervision which Blathwayt gave to this task in the nineteen-ties is incredible when one considers the number and weight of his official responsibilities and his physical absence, in the winter in London, in the summer in Loo or wherever the year's campaign dictated. From Dyrham came a constant stream of reports from bailiffs, gardeners and chief workmen. To Dyrham went even more voluminous instructions: no wonder the construction supervisor was told to write on large sheets of paper leaving a margin for the answer. All this long-distance nagging about such matters as the 'quickening' need by the workmen, the necessity of finishing stonework for the fountain before rains and frost set in, the importance of looking 'narrowly' at the weekly payments, is summed up in one sentence scribbled at the end of a letter in 1698: 'All my mem: dms to be observed & everything to be carried on with vigor'. 54

The vigour was not quite enough, apparently, to enable the house

53 See the defence of Blathwayt in Jacobsen, Blathwayt, 463. See also the accusation of Nicholson that Blathwayt took bribes: Nicholson to Bridgewater, 30 March, 1697; Ellesmere MSS. 9722.

54 Watkins to Blathwayt, 28 July, 30 July, 1698; Blathwayt to Watkins, 19 July, 1699 (?): D1799/E239, BG.
to be sufficiently finished to lodge Queen Anne on her visit to Bath in 1702. Instead the second Duke of Beaufort entertained the Queen with great splendour at Badminton. However, Blathwayt boasted to Stepney that he had the 'Second order' of the Court staying with him: the Lord Treasurer, Somerset, and his Duchess, Lady Marlborough, Lord Rochester and other nobles. 55 All the foreign envoys were received at Dyrham too, and could admire what in some cases they had helped in minor ways to achieve.

Perhaps the admiration was not so universal as Blathwayt would have liked to think. In the early stages of the rebuilding of Dyrham Park, Lord Scarborough waspishly suggested that Blathwayt's money was not being well spent. 56 This may have been a criticism of the architectural style; according to the reigning expert on English country house architecture, Blathwayt's lack of imagination and originality was fully mirrored in his house. The first step in the remodelling of the Tudor manor house of the Wynters was the superimposing of a new façade, one room thick, on to the west front; this was done under the supervision of the French Huguenot architect, Hauduroy, between 1692 and 1694, and it was the result of this work, presumably, to which Lord Scarborough objected. The great hall was rebuilt and at each end of the central block

55 Blathwayt to Stepney, 6 November, 1702; BY 21. It is possible, of course, that Anne simply preferred to stay elsewhere and Blathwayt was making excuses: Luttrell had reported in July that Blathwayt was 'fitting up at Bath for reception of her majestie...'. Brief Relation V, 197.

56 Littleton to Hatton, 16 September, 1695; Add. MSS. 29578, 523V. Webb suggests the criticism may have owed something to the fact that both Littleton and Scarborough were building mansions themselves. 'Imperial Fixer' I, 9.
was placed a projecting wing. Foreign influences can be discerned in the façade; Italian in the straight double stairway to the terrace, French in such details as the window arrangement, the closed terrace, and the courtyard with its central balcony to Blathwayt's private apartment. Whether these were the result of Blathwayt's own travels on the continent in the seventies and again in the nineties or of opinions held by the virtually unknown Hauduroy (whose main attraction for Blathwayt may have been his cheapness) it is difficult to say. A modern critic pronounces the result 'insipid but pleasant'.

None of Blathwayt's surviving correspondence gives any hint of a strong interest in the theory of architecture. An inventory of Blathwayt's books, taken just before the rebuilding of Dyrham commenced, shows that his library contained nothing on house or garden design. This does not necessarily mean, however, that he was unknowledgeable. No-one brought up in the household of Thomas Povey could have been immune to aesthetic considerations. The diaries of Evelyn and Pepys both indicate Povey's reputation as a man of taste and discrimination. Blathwayt must have admired that taste, for he bought 93 pictures and c.500 books from his uncle in 1693 for £500, presumably to embellish his newly decorated rooms at Dyrham. Hoogstraeten's 'View down a Corridor', probably the 'piece of perspective' so admired at Povey's house by Pepys, was doubtless acquired at this time.


However, as Mark Girouard suggests, originality was not Blathwayt's forte and the later building at Dyrham, the Stables (1698) and the East Front (1698-1702) amply bears this out. The sheer scale of the East Front, the work of William Talman, Comptroller of the Royal Works, must impress; but some critics have found its nobility clumsy and its modelling dull: a half-hearted echo of Chatsworth, which Talman had also designed. The French style of J-H Mansart can be seen in the ground floor and Italian influences are also present. Perhaps the fine hand of one of the English envoys in Italy, Sir Lambert Blackwell, may be discerned in the Genoese effect of the façade; he had certainly provided plans for an Orangery, though the final result owed as much to Versailles as to any Italian palace.

The architecture of Dyrham Park looked back to and summarised the themes of the seventeenth century and represented the culmination of the first phase of English baroque; it did not foreshadow the eighteenth. As Kenworthy-Browne observes, there was no novelty to the façade, no hint of the adventurous ideas of Vanbrugh (who, it is interesting to note, was soon to redesign King's Weston for the son of Blathwayt's old friend Sir Robert Southwell), or of Hawksmoor. By the time the Blathwayt crest, a great stone eagle carved by John Harvey of Bath, was haugt

into place over the East Front in July, 1703, Dyrham, like its owner, was already somewhat old-fashioned. Blathwayt's influence and income were beginning to lessen; although even after the loss of two of his major offices in 1704 and 1707 he had no perceptible financial problems, the failure to attempt any proper architectural linkage between the rather disparate West and East Fronts may suggest a need for greater care than when building commenced. However, gossip alleged that Blathwayt was 'amply recompened for his losse' in 1704. Problems, if they existed, must have been very minor. Talman, unlike Hauduroy, did not come cheap (he was dismissed by the third Earl of Carlisle when the Earl refused to pay the prices he demanded for his Castle Howard designs) and the 'immense cost' of the whole Dyrham undertaking was well-known in the eighteenth century.

The interiors at Dyrham, too, though termed 'restrained' by one commentator, were hardly the result of penny-pinching. The new rooms in the Talman east wing were finished in 1703 and 1704. The walls of the new entrance hall were covered, in the Dutch style, with embossed

---

60 For a description of the East Front see Guide, 26-7; this points out that the façade shows the influence of Rubens's Palazzi di Genova, a heavily consulted work published in 1622. On Vanbrugh's designs for King's Weston see Downes, 82.

61 Girouard, 'Dyrham Park, Gloucestershire' II, 398.

62 Levens MSS. 28, Westmoreland Record Office (copies consulted at Institute for Historical Research, London).


64 Downes, 65.
leather, acquired by Blathwayt at the Hague at c.5s. a skin. The sheer volume of gilding at Dyrham also bespeaks a taste for rich effects.\textsuperscript{65} The preference for a Dutch style was natural enough for Blathwayt in view of his early service at the Hague; but doubtless, too, he was imitating court taste closely. His impressive collection of Delft urns and pyramids (there are more than forty Delft pieces at Dyrham) certainly owed much to the fashion for Delft ware set by Queen Mary.\textsuperscript{66}

The arrangement of the rooms suggested the use to which Blathwayt hoped they might be put; the series of 'apartments' noted by John Povey in 1700 was 'more for State than use except upon Extraordinary occasion'.\textsuperscript{67} The object was obviously entertainment on the grand scale. Also for 'Extraordinary occasion' was the Dyrham State Bed, made for the house c.1700. The very existence of such an object reveals the extent of Blathwayt's social aspirations, for such beds were meant to symbolise a family's standing and hospitality. There was no 'restraint' in design or materials here. The main fabric used was crimson velvet, with panelling in olive green; yellow silk appliqués and scrolls of gold galloon enriched the

\textsuperscript{65} Guide, 19; J. Fowler and J. Cornforth, \textit{English Decoration in the Eighteenth Century} (London, 1974), 130, 183, 185. As Fowler and Cornforth severely note, 'Gilding is and always was a great extravagance'.


\textsuperscript{67} John Povey to Thomas Povey, 5 December, 1700; D1799/E240, BG. On the use of 'apartments' on the French model, see Fowler and Cornforth, ch. 2.
valances. The design was clearly based on the work of Daniel Marot, who had been chief designer to William and Mary in Holland and a collection of whose work was published in 1702. Alas for Blathwayt. The baroque elaboration of this State Bed was already beginning to be regarded as somewhat coarse; Marot's main influence preceded the publication of his designs, which by that time were regarded as rather out of date, particularly by the time of the second edition in 1712. Queen Anne, as has been noted, never did sleep there, and it is fascinating to note that the designs for the bed she ordered at Windsor in 1714 show a sober silhouette, a marked contrast to the Dyrham design. Once again Dyrham, like its owner, seemed to be looking backwards to the seventeenth century.

What of the grounds? The main influences in garden design in this period were foreign: Italian influence in the making of elaborate waterworks, French in the vast scale that was aspired to, Dutch in the intricate, sometimes fussy arrangement of flowerbeds and clipped ever-

---

68 Fowler and Cornforth, 84, 89. The colour was significant; crimson was the convention for parade rooms: Fowler and Cornforth, 203. The costs involved in this kind of work are illuminating. An inventory of Charles I's possessions in 1651 lists Raphael cartoons at £300 each and two State Beds at £500 and £1000 respectively. The trimmings and curtains for the Houghton State Bed in 1732 cost £1200.

69 On Marot, who had fled France in 1685 and who worked in England from 1694-6, see Fowler and Cornforth, 41, 83; also A. Lane, 'Daniel Marot: Designer of Delft Vases and of Gardens at Hampton Court', The Connoisseur CXXIII, no. 511 (March, 1949), 19-24. Marot was also responsible for the shape and decoration of many of the Delft pieces at Dyrham: see Archer, 'Delft at Dyrham', 17.

70 Fowler and Cornforth, 91.
greens. All three can be discerned in varying degrees at Dyrham; none could be achieved without very substantial outlay. Gardening on the elaborate and formal scale deemed necessary in the seventeenth century ruined many a gentleman. The very large proportion of total design expenses which went towards the grounds of an estate is noteworthy; upkeep would be similarly expensive. The breakdown of costs for Castle Howard, designed by Vanbrugh for the third Earl of Carlisle in 1699, was £35,000 for the house, and c.£24,000 for the grounds and outworks.

The complexity of the Dyrham waterworks, alluded to at the beginning of this chapter, was carefully described by Blathwayt’s clerk Povey in 1700: ‘...at the Entrance of the Avenue on the left hand you see five Bountifull Fountains and Cascade Basins, down the Hill on the other hand you see a Cataract of about 15 foot and another of ab’t six falling into two fish ponds that hange one after the other. Having past thru the house into the gardens you see on the Right Hand three fountains one above another with a Good Body & Height of Water and before you on the top of a Hill ab’t 20 foot high and under is a large Cataract of Water descending the whole hill and coming und’ground to the Parterre, rising again in a very large Fountain to a very Great Height from thence proceeding to a Cascade of three large basins of a stone fall from thence

---


72Hunt and Willis, 18; Downes, English Baroque Architecture, 12. The 'great expence' of the 'curious water-workes' at Dyrham was noted by Samuel Rudder in his New History of Gloucestershire (Cirencester, 1779), 427.
to four more & thence by Three large Basins falls into a large oval from whence it runs into the Canal and passes underground to the Cataract and ponds seen in the Avenue..."  

French influences were also strong. Bigland claimed that the 'Pleasure Grounds' were designed by Le Nôtre; the personal involvement of Louis XIV's court gardener, who died in 1700, is highly unlikely. But it is known that George London, the English court gardener who did advise at Dyrham, had visited France in 1698 and brought back a series of designs for parterres and avenues. Some of these may well have been incorporated at Dyrham.  

'Every caprice of the Dutch style', continued Bigland, abounded at Dyrham: the regularity of the arrangement which can be observed in Kip's engraving of the gardens to some extent bears this out, but the attention to 'Dutch taste' cannot have been overpowering, for Stephen Switzer, that advocate of 'La (sic) Grand Manier' in gardening, approved heartily of the effects achieved at Dyrham. Whether it was the practical method of heating the Orangery ('several Stoves underneath at convenient Distances for Firing'), the arrangement of the parterres, or

---

73 John Povey to Thomas Povey, D1799/E240, BG.


the Neptune fountain and the canals, Switzer was all praise. Was Blathwayt at last in the van of fashion? Switzer recommended an 'extended garden' in the baroque mould, far removed from those 'crimping diminutive and wretched Performances we every day meet with...'. There was certainly nothing diminutive about Dyrham, and the geographical location, if it provided problems for the house (met by 'large and most exquisite contriv'd Drains') provided, too, a challenge in the surrounding hills to the gardener's art; from those hills, an 'infinite Variety of beautiful Prospects' could be obtained. But Blathwayt had not chosen the location, he had merely inherited it; the 'bringing in the countryside' later to characterise the English landscape garden was in his case more a matter of chance than purpose. The 'new' designs of the theorists such as Switzer and Batty Langley, though they claimed to reject the old formality, in practice seem very little different from previous ones. Although it is a little unfair to state, as does the Dyrham Guide, that 'almost instantly the Dyrham garden would have become little more than a curiosity', it is true that, despite Switzer's praises, it was not at bottom truly original.

76 Hussey, English Gardens and Landscape, 33. Switzer's description of the Dyrham garden is to be found in Ichnographia Rustica (London, 1742) III, 114-127.

77 Ichnographia Rustica III, 114; Hussey, English Gardens and Landscape, 40, 41. For other comments on the strange contrast between theory and practice see J.D. Hunt, The Figure in the Landscape: Poetry, Painting and Gardening during the Eighteenth Century (Baltimore, 1976), 36.

Hussey and Hunt both suggest the connection between landscape painting and gardens and the growing impact by 1700 of the work of those who painted Italian scenes of nature such as Poussin and Rosa, but Blathwayt's collection of paintings (much of it acquired from his uncle, Thomas Povey) again reflects conventional seventeenth century taste: Dutch still life, portraits by well-known court painters such as Lely and Dahl, the Hoogstraeten perspective already alluded to. There was no material here for imaginative connections between powerful scenes of nature and garden landscaping.  

It was men such as Pope and Addison who actually used the new gardening ideas. The spirit of Dyrham was far removed from that of Twickenham; the proprietor of the one quoted the same kind of Virgilian and Horatian phrases as the other on the joys of solitude and gardening but it is hard to believe that this was more than conventional in the case of Blathwayt, the pluralist office-holder and producer of prodigious numbers of official letters and memoranda, and that he actually relished his retirement when he got it; surely he conformed more to the 'cloistered coxcombs' described in an earlier period by the Earl of Rochester, who 'retire to think, cause they have ought to do'.  

He was not cast in the same mould as his former superior at the Hague, Sir William Temple, who had gone into voluntary (and final) retirement in 1681, and who indeed had then written an essay on gardening

---

79 Such connections are suggested in Hunt, The Figure in the Landscape, 39ff; C. Hussey, The Picturesque: Studies in a Point of View (London, 1927), ch. V.

80 Quoted in Hunt, Figure in the Landscape, 9.
which Blathwayt perhaps had read. 81

'As is the Gardener, so is the Garden', wrote Thomas Fuller sententiously in 1732. 82 One might extend the thought. Blathwayt's house and furnishings, as well as his garden, reflect the man, a man of affluence and of certain social pretensions, a man of informed if highly conventional and somewhat old-fashioned taste. He had claimed not to be a man of 'parade' in 1686, but only two months after his marriage he admitted that 'our Finery is taken notice of at Dirham', justifying the £2000 spent by claiming it was necessary to his position, 83 and surely a certain amount of 'parade' informs Dyrham Park. It was ironic that, by the time a suitable setting had been constructed, Blathwayt's career and influence were already past their peak.

More direct and less speculative evidence is to be found on the manner in which Blathwayt procured the materials for Dyrham. He had written a bad-tempered query on one of the innumerable lists of work to be done at the house: 'Qu. Who is to find the Stuff for all these Particulars and if by me where is ye stuff to be found?' 84 The question

81 'Upon the Gardens of Epicurus or Of Gardening in the Year 1685' (published 1692). This essay appears in full in S.H. Monk (ed.), Five Miscellaneous Essays by Sir William Temple (Ann Arbor, 1963), 1-36.

82 Quoted in Hunt and Willis (eds.), The Genius of the Place, 2.

83 Blathwayt to Sir Robert Southwell, 1 February 1686/7; Portland MSS. 53.

84 'Mr. Shepard's Acco. of Work to be done wth the prices', DL799/ E235, BG.
was surely rhetorical; few men in England were in a better position to acquire the necessary materials, and nothing could better illustrate the workings of the Anglo-American and European communities than the furnishing of Dyrham Park. While colonial governors might complain of never hearing from Whitehall and finding it impossible to procure shipping to take home their reports, the same constraints seem not to have operated at the more informal levels of the imperial community. On the contrary, the shipping lanes were crammed with the paraphernalia of innumerable patron/client relationships. Enemy action and natural disasters disposed of some tributes, it is true: 'French rogues', it was presumed, wore the furs destined by Governor Nicholson for James Vernon in 1696 while rats ate all the plants in one shipment directed by the same governor to the head of the Board of Trade, the Earl of Bridgewater; the disappointed Earl could not even drink Nicholson's health in the two bottles of peach water he sent since 'it was so strong we could not touch it'. But most offerings fared better, and indeed the losses simply served to spur on the anxious clients to ever greater efforts.

The English envoys at the European courts, in constant touch with Blathwayt in his capacity of acting Secretary of State, contributed equally with colonial officials to the stocking of Dyrham. Deal boards were shipped over from Scandinavia by envoys Gregg and Robinson, and

---

85 It was, of course, only too convenient to make such complaints; see I.K. Steele, "Most Theories and the English Atlantic, 1675-1740", Historical Papers, Canadian Historical Association, 1978, esp. 25-6.

86 Vernon to Nicholson, 10 January, 1695/6; Ellêsmere MSS. 9621; Bridgewater to Nicholson, [undated]1698 Ellêsmere MSS. 9754a.
coach horses and deer for the park from north Germany. The latest Italian house designs were sent by Sir Lambert Blackwell from Florence: the Orangery in particular owed much to this source, while a famous sculptor from Carrara was consulted about the Blathwayt tomb. Marble blocks and paving stones were loaded onto English men-of-war since merchantmen charged such extravagant freights; nothing was too good for so 'worthy...a Padrone'. Italy was an excellent source too for the plants with which to furnish Dyrham's gardens; Blathwayt soon claimed enough gardening expertise to advise Governor Codrington of the Leeward Islands on his English estate at Doddington.

The vitality of the imperial community was materially demonstrated by the physical transplantation of colonial flora and fauna to the English estates of the wealthy and well-connected. Even before his marriage and his acquisition of a Gloucestershire estate, Blathwayt was in receipt of various colonial tributes: juniper boards from Jamaica, cedar and black

---

87 Robinson to Blathwayt, Stockholm, 7 September, 1701; Gregg to Blathwayt, Copenhagen, 22 October, 1701; D1799/E241, GRO. Aldersey to Blathwayt, 20 February, 12 June, 1705; Add. MSS. 21552, 57-8, 60. Sanson to Blathwayt, 27 October, 1701; Add. MSS. 9734, 106. Cresset to Blathwayt, 11 November, 1698; Add. MSS. 23617, 78. By December, 1709 there were sixty brace of deer in the park: D1799/E45, BG.

88 Blackwell to Blathwayt, 31 August, 1700; Add. MSS. 9734, 104; Blackwell to Blathwayt, 10, 17 June, 2 September, 1698, 16 June, 1703; BY 4. See also Kirke to Blathwayt, 29 January, 24 June, 1696; BY 11.

89 He suggested fruit trees against the brick walls: Blathwayt to Codrington, 10 February, 1702/3; Add. MSS. 38709, 32. Blackwell to Blathwayt, 23 January, 1696; BY 4. A box of trees and plants worth £528 was sent from Genoa by Consul Kirke: February, 1696, BY 11.
walnuts from Virginia; once the acquisition was known, and Blathwayt's plans for a new house, the trickle turned into a flood. Edward Randolph, that eager agent of a centralising monarchy, was no less the enthusiastic procurer of acorns, chestnuts, planes, walnut plank, pine boards and cedar for the Secretary of Plantations; and he was well-fitted by his travels throughout the colonies and his frequent Atlantic voyages to give first-hand reports to his patron and advise him of any special plants native to the colonies which might 'grow in your parke'. Both 'necessaries and curiosities' could be provided for the gardens at Dyrham, and Blathwayt's access to the advice of the King's gardener, London, meant that Randolph was given full instructions on how to arrange the shipments. As usual a little official encouragement was of great assistance in obtaining favourable freight rates: getting some Virginian masters liberty to sail when others were stopped by embargo was bound to 'oblige them to take your plank aboard - upon very easy terms'. Careful co-ordination with Robert Henley, Blathwayt's friend at the Transport Office, helped Randolph ensure a smooth passage for Blathwayt's timber and safe delivery to Bristol: Henley and Povey were overseeing operations at Dyrham throughout the campaign seasons in the nineties while

90 Powell to Blathwayt, 9 October, 1682; BW XXVII. Blathwayt to Effingham, 9 December, 1684, Effingham to Blathwayt, 6 February, 1685; BW XIV. Spencer to Blathwayt, 23 June, 1684; BW XVI.

91 Randolph to Blathwayt, 23 November, 1687, 29 March, 1688 (the novelty mentioned here was the plane tree); BW I. Randolph to Blathwayt, 21 April, 28 June, 1692; BW II. Blathwayt to Nicholson, 5 January, 1692; BW XV. Carolina, Maryland and Virginia were the major sources of Randolph's shipments.
the Secretary at War was absent on the continent with the King. It was indeed a pity that schemes for 'descent' on the continent in the early nineties, or colonial expeditions such as the Wheeler-Foulkes fiasco of 1693, did not manifest that degree of interdepartmental co-operation which was so amply demonstrated in miniature by the furnishing of Dyrham.

Of course not every packet of seeds or shipment of plank which arrived for Blathwayt was designed for his own use; it was sometimes convenient to have him act as a clearing house for mutual acquaintances such as Sir Robert Southwell, or William Lowdes at the Treasury. The two live rattle snakes in a cage which William Byrd enclosed in a box of Virginia nuts and seeds would, Byrd thought, be 'very Acceptable to Several Gentlemen of the Royall Society', but failing this they were to be left, as so very many things were, to Blathwayt's disposal. 93

Every colonial official knew the importance of contributing to 'the beauty of your paradise at Dirham'. Bermuda was 'scoured from end to end for cedar by one anxious judge; unable to get the breadth of plank his patron required he despairingly resolved to send back a large oval table which Blathwayt could alter to his needs. Bermudan governors Goddard and

---

92 Randolph to Blathwayt, 13 July, 28 July, 1692; BW II. Henley to Blathwayt, 28 May, 1693; Add. MSS. 9729, 27-8. Commissioners of Transportation to Blathwayt, 27 June, 1693; SOU/2, SG. Fovey and Henley both went down to the house to interview possible workmen and to keep a general eye on progress: see, in particular, the detailed report of Henley to Blathwayt, 18 August, 1694; Add. MSS. 9734, 21-22.

93 Byrd to Blathwayt, 30 November, 1693; BW XIII; for a listing of the contents of this box see D1799/E234, SG.
Day were also involved in the cedar hunt: as Goddard placatingly wrote, 'I would not have you resent that I have not sent you any Cedar...'.

On the state of the wainscoting at Dyrham, or so at least it was believed, depended the regular payment of many a colonial civil servant. Governor Nicholson of Virginia might privately discharge his bile against Blathwayt in a series of complaining letters to the Earl of Bridgewater, but only four years later he was suggesting the dispatch of some black walnut for a summer house at the end of 'y extraordinary Pile, and noble upper Terras walk: and I am very ambitious of having the Stairs varnished & sent you...'. The Virginia plants and seeds sent by Blathwayt's long-time client Edmund Andros perhaps revealed a more sincere desire to be of service.

The state of the Dyrham cellar was a further reflection of Blathwayt's position at the centre of an extensive communications network. The origins of the seven bottles of Barbados water and the eight pints of usquebagh which formed a part of the inventory in 1703 are not difficult to find, and over the years madeira from Bermuda, Italian wines from Livorno, Genoa and Florence, Flemish and Spanish vintages all found

---

94 Nicholson to Blathwayt, 30 March, 1697; BW XV. Judge Horesnells to Blathwayt, 19 January, 29 January, 19 March, 1688. Horesnells's efforts were clearly appreciated: see Blathwayt's favourable report on his salary petition in 1691; CTR IX, 1689-1692, 1101, 1112. Goddard to Blathwayt, 30 November, 1693, 6 May, 1695; Day to Blathwayt, 4 May, 1699; BW XXXVI.

95 Nicholson to Blathwayt, 2 December, 1701; BW XV.

96 Andros to Blathwayt, 20 July, 1694; BW III. The voluminous contents of a chest and barrel sent by Andros in 1694 are itemized in D1799/X5, RG.
a place in Blathwayt's cellar. 97 Most arrived in better condition than Lord Lexington's Tockay, all spoiled for 'want of care in y^e carriage and direction', as Blathwayt severely noted. 98 Matthew Prior's observation that Blathwayt's appetite for Lacrimae Christi and White Florence made him a much better correspondent with the English envoys at the Italian courts than the one in Paris was, as he admitted, ill-natured (it was far more likely, as Vernon sternly reminded him, that the letters designed for Prior had been intercepted at the French post houses and carried to Versailles); but it certainly indicated Blathwayt's interest in a good wine. 99

Indeed, every conceivable interest of the Secretary of Plantations was catered to by his eager correspondents. The list of presents is as varied as it is lengthy. Corelli and Scarlatti sonatas, panther skins, pickled herring, preserved ginger, a Bermudan piglet, a silk hammock, beavers for a hat, rare books: nothing seemed to be lacking to the

97 'The present state of y^e cellar', 25 September, 1703; DL799/A323, BG. See, for example, Clarke to Blathwayt, 2 September, 1698; BY 7; Blackwell to Blathwayt, 23 January, 1695/6, 29 April, 1698; BY 4; Kirke to Blathwayt, 24 June, 1696; BY 11; Rycart to Blathwayt, 15/25 September, 1699; Add. MSS. 21490, 59; Methuen to Blathwayt, 11 December, 1698; Add. MSS. 34335, 83; Goddard to Blathwayt, 1693, BW XXXVI. On Henley's assistance in stocking the cellar see Henley to Ellis, 17 September, 1692; Add. MSS. 28877, 365.

98 Blathwayt to Lexington, 6 September, 1695; Add. MSS. 46528, 156.

99 Prior to Vernon, 27 August, 1698; Vernon to Prior, 22 August/1 September, 1698; HMC Bath, vol. III, Prior Papers, 257, 260.
'happy Possessor' of Dyrham. 100

As early as 1693, Blathwayt had felt that he was turning himself into a country gentleman through his election to the House of Commons for a constituency close to Dyrham Park. 101 In 1701, he was made a deputy lieutenant for Gloucestershire and Somerset. 102 Yet retirement to the country, when it came, was forced not voluntary; though he put a brave face on his dismissal as Secretary at War in 1704, claiming that it would give him 'sufficient leisure to enjoy the rest of my life which I could not well do before', in 1710, three years after his dismissal from the Board of Trade, he was begging to be remembered in any alterations at that Board. 103 It did not suit his temperament when the most significant problems to occupy his attention were matters such as the presumption of the vicar of Dyrham (preferred to the living by Blathwayt) in allowing cattle to be fed in that part of the churchyard which lay under Blathwayt's very windows. 104 Ill-health compounded disappointment.

100 Blackwell to Blathwayt, 31 May, 1700; Add. MSS. 34356, 2; Randolph to Blathwayt, 28 March, 1693; BW II; Carr. to Blathwayt, 28 February, 11 July, 1681; Add. MSS. 37981, 6, 55; Witham to Blathwayt, 29 December, 1679; BW XXXV; Goddard to Blathwayt, 1693, BW XXXVI; Nicholson to Blathwayt, 11 June, 1700; BW XIII; Spencer to Blathwayt, 9 April, 1682; BW XVI.

101 Blathwayt to Richard Hill, 8 December, 1693; Add. MSS. 56241, unpaginated.

102 Draft biography of Blathwayt, History of Parliament Trust, Institute of Historical Research.

103 Blathwayt to Stepney, 11 April, 1704; BY 21; Blathwayt to Dartmouth, 14 August, 1710; HMC Dartmouth, 297.

104 Blathwayt to ?, undated, 71710, D1799/C167, BG.
even as it provided further excuse for lingering in the country.\footnote{Palsy. My Case'. DL799/E316, BG.}

Nonetheless William Blathwayt, with his coat of arms and palatial residence, had achieved much more than the modest competence which he had always claimed to be the summit of his ambition.\footnote{The coat of arms is described by Samuel Rudder in A New History of Gloucestershire (1799), 429: 'Or, 2 bends ingraeld sable'. Consul Broughton in Venice noted additions to it in 1695, but there is no evidence to suggest what these might have been: Broughton to Blathwayt, 8 April, 1695; BY 6. Though Blathwayt displayed and used arms there was no official recording at the College of Arms establishing his right. Perhaps in so meticulous a character this suggests, not oversight, but the social climber's fear of the outcome. The armorial position of the family was not regularised until 1910 (see College of Arms Records: Grants LXXX.121). A full description of the arms granted at that date (very slightly altered from the seventeenth century ones) is in C. Fox-Davies, Armorial Families 7th edition (London, 1929), 172. I am grateful for help on these points to Dr. Conrad Swan, York Herald of Arms.}

If, with Professor Trevor-Roper, we regard house building as a useful criterion for the distribution of wealth within the peerage and gentry,\footnote{Quoted in G.F. Aylmer, The State's Servants: the Civil Service of the English Republic, 1649-1660 (London, 1973), 280.}

then the late seventeenth and early eighteenth century, adjudged one of the great periods of English house building, was one of prosperity indeed. Blathwayt's patron, the Earl of Nottingham, built Burley-on-the-Hill between 1694 and 1708; his counterpart at the Treasury, William Lowndes, erected Winslow Hall between 1699 and 1702.\footnote{H.J. Habakkuk, 'Daniel Finch, Second Earl of Nottingham, his house and estate', in J.H. Plumb, (ed.). Studies in Social History (London, 1955), 141, 151, 173, 175. Winslow Hall is attributed to Wren.}

In Winslow Hall and Dyrham Park, and in the reconstructed King's Weston of Blathwayt's son-in-law, Edward Southwell, were the outward and visible signs of the growth of the
seventeenth century bureaucracy and the rewards of government service. 109

The results of William Blathwayt's empire were obvious to all.

109 On the changes in the landed gentry and the growing influence of London money in the localities see H.J. Habakkuk, "English Landownership 1680-1740", Economic History Review X (1939-40), 2-17. Habakkuk's conclusions are based on work done on the landed estates of Northamptonshire and Bedfordshire.
APPENDIX

'REFLECTIONS ON A PAPER CONCERNING AMERICA'\(^1\) (c.1685)

1. The taking up great Quantities of Land by single persons in Jamaica is true in fact and was allowed of from the first settlement of Jamaica by an Instruction that directs The Govern’ to forbear (if he shall so think fitt) the taking advantage of any penalty or forfeitures ag’ any Planter for not planting their Lands according to y’ times limited, until The Govern’ shall have represented the state of that matter, which S’ P. Howard is also directed to do upon his arrivall in order to receive His Ma’ pleasure thereupon. But it is no less true that Former Govern’ being interested in great quantities of Lands have neglected to make this representation which becomes every day more necessary as The Island is better peopled. This will also encrease His Ma’ Revenue arising from y’ Quitrents.

2. It would be well that more places than Port Antonio were setted & fortified which cannot be done on a sudden or without great expence. However The Lands of y’ Esq of Carlisle and of S’ T. Lynch ought to be made lyable to y’ Quitrents or the foreitures the rather as The Proprieters are not needly persons & have therefore no excuse for not manuring their Lands.

3. All His Ma’ Plantations as well as Jamaica (as Jamaica indeed in an eminent degree) are worthy of His Ma’s care as They enlarge His Empire & Revenue very considerabily and Those Plantations which heretofore were looked upon as desperate adventures are now become necessary and important members of the main body, and deserve as good Govern’ as is proposed which is the more requisite as He is The Representative of His Ma’ at so great distance and has nothing else to support him but His Commission & authority.

4. As It ought to be the chief care of the Govern’ to provide such places for The king’s ships & Stores, He may receive an Instruction to that purpose.

5. S’ Thomas Lynch & other Govern’ had such an Instruction but nothing can more improve The Plantations than liberty of conscience.

\(^{1}\)BL416, Blathwayt Papers, Huntington Library.
6. The constituting such a Govern or ViceRoy as is proposed to reside in England will afford a Title & some profit to a Person of that Eminent quality but how it can advance His Ma's interest in this or any other Plantation does not appear since The Dep will hold himself only accountable to His immediate superior and be at a further distance from His Ma's directions. No man is better known in the West Indies than Coll. Codrington having distinguished himself by affecting popularity in y assemblies but it is conceived His Ma's has very many Subjects in those parts as well as in England no less capable than He is of serving His Ma: he is represented to be.

7. This Island of Providence as well as Tortugas now settled by ye French did formerly belong to ye English but were several years past abandon'd by Them Nor can His Ma's now repossess himself of Providence without great expense and a rupture with ye Spaniards who are so jealous of New Settlements in their neighborhood which They take to be contrary to ye Treaty of Madrid made in ye year 1670. However all these conveniences and advantages proposed by a Trade with the Spaniards may be in some degree and more safely as well as with less jealousies carried on in Jamaica to which end orders are already given but cannot be well effected without a total destruction of the Privateers which do not only disturb ye Spaniards but debauch The English both Traders & Planters.

8. It is true that The Privateers find great success at Jamaica by Provisions and Supplies of men which is not always with ye knowledge or by ye countenance of The Govern. Thos Privateers are likewise encouraged & supported by ye French at Petit Graves Tortugas & Hispaniola and by ye English Proprieties as ye Bahama Islands, Carolina Maryland New England etc: which by the Surrender of Their Charters may be in a great manner prevented. The Spaniards have fortified some Places in ye West Indies but it remains nevertheless in His Ma: Power to be Master of ye greatest and best parts of Their Dominion in America but it cannot easily made appear how it can be for His Ma: Service [to] weaken or disturb the Spaniards in America. They being already Subservient in ye course of Trade to ye English Nation who reap the profit of their hazards & labour, without any expence to ye Crown.

The French may indeed do us and our Trade great prejudice by an Encrease of their Power there.

9. Tobago being the most Windward of all The Charibby Islands is by its situation as well as fruitfulness very considerable but His Ma's has already Plantations enough to receive as many of His Subjects or Forreigners as may goe thither for many years to come. Nor is it practicable to depopulate any other Islands for ye sake of Tobago besides ye hazard of His Ma: Customs but it is indeed of very great consequence that no other nation be permittted to settle in Tobago.

The sending of Good Govern to ye Plantations is much insisted on with great reason for where His Ma's has so few Officers of His
own appointment They ought to be the more carefull of Their Duty and at so great a distance from y' Master's Eye, Great Temptations happen whereby His Ma. service does often suffer.

10. If the Spirit of Rum could be improved, as is proposed, it would be of very great profit to His Ma. & His Plantations.

11. If any other useful Products besides Sugar were encouraged It would be very beneficially and especially Those of The East Indies.

12. It is certainly His Ma. Interest to hinder any other Nation but ye Spaniards to thrive or Plant in ye West Indies especially in such places where They may be able to annoy either us or them.

13. This Company is not yet settled and the Spaniards seldom take so good measures.

**New England**

What is said of New England is very true and worthy of His Ma. consideration. It cannot be to any purpose that His Ma. be at any charge (except for Shipping & a small Honorary Guard for The Govern) for if the People be refractory The Power of Shipping will be much more effectual than 1000 men in Pay which cannot cost less than 20000 P. an. for w. th His Ma. can expect no profitable returns from New England besides ye use of their men & ships upon occasion.

Some of ye other Colonies of New England will be taken immediately under His Ma. Govern: and the others will soon submitt.

**Virginia**

Strict orders are already given for building of Towns. It is not easy to comprehend how New discoveries can be of advantage to His Ma. who wants more subjects than Land in America.
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