

The Duke of Ormond: A Faithful Servant or a Selfish Schemer?

Richard Ireland

The English Civil War began as the result of a complex series of events, which took place throughout England, Ireland, and Scotland, leading up to the 1640s. Some of the most significant affairs that took place during the war surrounded the life of James Butler, the English earl of Ormond, who lived in Ireland. In 1641, a group of Irish peasants started an uprising demanding religious tolerance for Catholicism, which the English crown forbid, and the return of their land from English settlers, which had been seized from the peasants' ancestors during the reign of Elizabeth I. This revolt was not quickly suppressed, and, as a consequence, this led to a series of larger incidents that would ultimately have a huge impact on Butler's life in the years to follow.

As an earl, Ormond was responsible for maintaining control of events that occurred in Ireland. Therefore, Ormond's job required him to personally put an end to the Irish uprisings. If he could not suppress these revolts, then he was supposed to seek the English government for assistance. However, due to increasing hostilities between King Charles I and the English Parliament, an army could not be put together to take care of the situation. Consequently, the Irish uprising spread throughout the land. To make matters worse, parliament took up arms against the king because they believed that King Charles I did not treat the English populace fairly. This forced Ormond to choose his own side between the two parties. Ultimately, he chose to support King Charles I because Ormond believed that God had divinely elected him as king, and the earl believed it was his responsibility to remain faithful to God and those He put in place. Furthermore, even though James Butler, was ultimately defeated during the English Civil War in Ireland, Ormond's political actions, especially his readiness to employ opposing factions during the war, displayed that he was willing to go to great lengths in order to advance the

Royalist cause as a means to fulfill his steadfast duty to the English crown; therefore, opposing the idea that Ormond's actions were used to accomplish self serving interests.

Many historians have cast Ormond as a reference point to other important figures that lived in seventeenth century Ireland, but few of them have completed works that have focused specifically on his life. For example, Dr. Jerrold Casway mentions Ormond throughout his work on the Irish rebel Owen Roe O'Neill, but only goes into detail about Ormond's relationship with the Irish Confederate.<sup>1</sup> Similarly, Jane Ohlmeyer's work looks at details about Ormond's dealings and his relationship to the marquis of Antrim. However, Ohlmeyer, like Casway, did not focus her work specifically on Ormond himself, which leaves a lot to be learned.

Conversely, Thomas Carte's work, *The Life of James, Duke of Ormond*, is the place where the most information can be found on Ormond. Carte's work is a biography that took numerous primary documents and letters to construct a timeline on Ormond's life; however, it does not present a historical argument. Rather, Carte wrote an "impartial"<sup>2</sup> history of Ormond's life. In the same way, Winifred Lady Burghclere looked to create an abridged version of Carte's work. Therefore, she wrote *The Life of James First Duke of Ormond 1610-1688*, which summarized Carte's fifty-four folio volumes.<sup>3</sup>

There are, however, a few historians who have actually examined different aspects of Ormond's life and who have created proper historical arguments about him. For example, Raymond Gillespie focused his work on how Ormond perceived religion.<sup>4</sup> Gillespie concluded

---

<sup>1</sup> Jerrold Casway, "Owen Roe O'Neill: A Study of Gaelic Ireland's Struggle for Survival in the Seventeenth Century," PhD diss. (University of Maryland, College Park, 1972).

<sup>2</sup> Thomas Carte, *The Life of James, Duke of Ormond* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 185), xv.

<sup>3</sup> Winifred Lady Burghclere, *The Life of James First Duke of Ormond 1610-1688* (London: J. Murray, 1912).

that religion for Ormond was based on works and his duty to remain faithful to God and others, an idea that shall further be examined below. Moreover, the historian Patrick Little focused his work on Ormond's interactions with two conflicting groups during the war and looked specifically into the importance of these dealings.<sup>5</sup> With regards to both these historians, this essay shall take into account Gillespie's and Little's arguments, along with a thorough biographical analysis of Ormond's deeds, and combine them together to get a unique account of Ormond's actions throughout the English Civil War.

James Butler, born on 19 October 1610, descended from one of the many Old English families that lived in Catholic Ireland. The Old English consisted of a group of people who settled in Ireland around the twelfth century. As time passed, they assimilated to Irish customs and practices, including adherence to Catholicism. By the sixteenth century the English crown controlled Ireland. During this time, Queen Elizabeth I sought to extend her influence over the Irish natives through the expansion of the Protestant faith. Since the Irish refused to denounce Catholicism, Elizabeth confiscated their land and gave it to the New English colonizers, who sought to convert the Irish natives, including the Old English, and establish English law throughout the land.<sup>6</sup> The main seizure of property occurred in the Irish provinces of Munster and Ulster. As Thomas Carte noted, the Irish "hated the English mortally for abolishing their old

---

<sup>4</sup> Raymond Gillespie, "The Religion of the first Duke of Ormond," in *The Dukes of Ormonde*, eds. Toby Barnard and Jane Fenlon (Woodbridge, Suffolk: The Boydell Press, 2000), 108. Hereafter cited as *TDO*.

<sup>5</sup> Patrick Little, "The Marquess of Ormond and the English Parliament, 1645-1647," in *TDO*.

<sup>6</sup> Patrick Collinson, "Elizabeth I (1533–1603)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; online edn, May 2008. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/8636> (accessed 17 Dec 2011]. Hereafter cited as *ODNB*.

barbarous customs, and turning them out of their ancestors possessions.”<sup>7</sup> They wished to live according to their own culture and not one that was forced upon them.

Although James Butler came from an Old English family who practiced Catholicism, he did not. This came as a result of the Protestant King James I’s influential hand upon the Butler family. In 1619, James Butler’s father died, which forced his mother to move the family back to England. In London, Butler attended school at Finchley, an institute that practiced Catholic traditions. The English king, James I, feared the influence Catholicism would have on Butler, so the monarch removed Butler from the care of his mother to that of the Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>8</sup> This one-on-one teaching led Butler to practice the Protestant faith on his own when he returned to Ireland in 1633. Upon his return, the Old English and the Irish saw Butler as a member of the New English, or a Protestant colonizer, even though the rest of his family in Ireland still practiced the Catholic faith.

Between the time when the New English settled in Ireland under the rule of Elizabeth I and when James Butler inherited his earldom from his father, many conflicts took place between the New English and the Irish. The year 1641 was no different. It was then that the Irish sought to combat English influence by starting uprisings in Dublin and Ulster. Ormond saw these uprisings as an opportunity to fulfill his duty to the English crown by expressing his devout loyalty as a means to maintain his honor. It can be argued that this unfaltering sense of duty arose from his religious beliefs. According to Gillespie, Ormond was a man who desired religious experience. This meant “faith worked out in a particular type of *social duty* rather than an individualistic religious code as a test of salvation... Duty involved not only responsibilities

---

<sup>7</sup> Carte, 314.

<sup>8</sup> Burghclere, 31.

to God... but also to others.”<sup>9</sup> Therefore, Ormond’s duty to the king was in direct relation to his duty to God. This line of thought sprang from the idea that “God would control the outcomes of actions,” however, “those actions needed to be honourable and in the line with ‘duty’.”<sup>10</sup> In Ormond’s mind, if he betrayed his allegiance to the king then he would also have betrayed his responsibility to God. God, Ormond believed, demanded complete faithfulness from his subjects; therefore, since God divinely elected the king, Ormond saw it as his responsibility to submit himself completely to the English monarch as a means of displaying his devotion to God. This devotion could be seen throughout the entirety of the civil war years.

Leading up to 1641 Ormond became close to the Lord Deputy of Ireland, Viscount Thomas Wentworth. However, this friendship was cut short when King Charles I recalled Wentworth to England during the Bishops War in 1639. As a result, the king appointed Ormond as the commander-in-chief of Ireland in Wentworth’s stead.<sup>11</sup> The viscount did not have the chance to reclaim the office because in 1641 parliament ordered his execution. Parliament believed that by getting rid of the king’s corruptible advisors, that the assembly would be able to have more influence on the king’s decisions, which would lead to more rights for the people. However, parliament quickly found out that they had misjudged this plan.

Even after parliament executed the king’s closest advisors, King Charles I did not relinquish his tight grip on the English people, who he believed should serve his every need. This was because he also believed in the principle of the divine right of monarchs, which, in his mind, meant that God specifically chose him to rule over the English people in any manner that seem fit. Consequently, the king demanded complete devotion from all his subjects and believed

---

<sup>9</sup> Gillespie, 108-109. Emphasis added.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 113.

<sup>11</sup> Toby Barnard, “Butler, James, first duke of Ormond (1610–1688),” in *ODNB*.

that his rule should not be questioned. The historian Christopher Durston claimed that such demands stemmed from King Charles I's insecurities. The king seemed to always need constant encouragement from those around him. He became upset when people did not adhere to his rule, so when parliament rejected Charles I's demand for money, among many other requests, "his worst fears about his personal worth were confirmed and he was left feeling hurt and betrayed."<sup>12</sup> As a result, a great divide occurred between the king and parliament. This placed King Charles I's followers on one-side and parliamentary supporters on the other. The split was also the consequence of some of the events that unfolded in Ireland.

On 22 October 1641, the Catholic Irish revolted against English rule in their land. Casway claimed that this uprising was entrenched in hatreds that stemmed back to the reign of Queen Elizabeth I and her anti-Catholic laws.<sup>13</sup> The Irish revolted in Dublin and Ulster looking to regain complete religious tolerance and their property seized by the New English. The rebellion in Dublin ultimately failed because someone tipped off the English that the Irish planned to seize Dublin castle. However, in Ulster, Phelim O'Neil, a man whose family had been directly taken advantage of by the settlement of the New English, led a successful uprising.<sup>14</sup> The historian David Edwards claimed that the revolt in Dublin and southern Ireland "was an anti-Ormond uprising in which the rebels repudiated the Protestant earl... as much as the government he served."<sup>15</sup> This rebellion also acted as an ultimatum for the earl. He either had to give up his authority as Lord Deputy because he feared losing to the Irish, thus betraying

---

<sup>12</sup> Christopher Durston, *Charles I*, (New York: Routledge, 1998), 15.

<sup>13</sup> Casway, Abstract.

<sup>14</sup> Carte, 354.

<sup>15</sup> David Edwards, "The Poisoned Chalice: The Ormond inheritance, sectarian division and the emergence of James Butler, 1614-1642," in *TDO*, 56.

the king's cause, or he could choose to stand and fight against the rebels. Ultimately, Ormond chose to honor his allegiance to King Charles I and sought to put down the Catholic revolt.

These uprisings had a major effect on affairs in England. John Pym, a leading parliamentary voice against King Charles I's, used the revolts to his advantage. He claimed that the king could not be trusted with an army to suppress the rebellion. Parliamentary supporters feared that in creating such an army King Charles I might use it to start a war against the English Parliament. At this time, it seemed likely that a war might break out between the two groups because quarrelling among them escalated throughout the 1640s. Also during the uprisings, the Irish rebel leader Phelim O'Neil created a false commission stating that Charles I had authorized the rebels to re-seize land, which had been taken over by new English settlers during Elizabeth I's reign. This fake order made it seem as if the king supported the Irish Catholic cause more than the English settlers in Ireland. This put King Charles I in a bind. If the king did not seek to suppress the Irish rebels, parliament could assert that King Charles I betrayed the English living in Ireland to the hands of barbarians, thus highlighting the king's poor leadership. However, if the king did raise an army, as previously mentioned, parliament could maintain that King Charles I purposefully started the rebellion in order to use the rebels to fight parliamentary supporters. Consequently, parliament looked to establish its own fighting force because the king refused to hand over control of the army that he would eventually raise. These hostilities became an issue for Ormond in the years to follow.<sup>16</sup>

After receiving news of the Irish rebellion, Ormond left his estate in County Kilkenny and traveled to Dublin to lead the king's army. Since Ormond did not side with parliament during the uprisings, Charles I appointed Ormond Lieutenant General of Ireland. The newly

---

<sup>16</sup> British Civil Wars, Commonwealth and Protectorate, "1641: The Irish Uprising," David Plant, <http://www.british-civil-wars.co.uk/glossary/irish-uprising-1641.htm> (accessed November 18, 2011).

appointed lieutenant general went on to take the king's army against the Irish forces throughout the country. While Ormond remained relatively successful in the battles he waged, his efforts to suppress the rebels fell short. Consequently, the Irish seized Ormond's estate at Kilkenny and created the Confederate Catholic assembly, which represented the alliance of the Irish and the Old English, who both sought to regain their land and practice Catholicism freely.<sup>17</sup>

In the meantime, parliament looked to send its own army to Ireland, claiming the necessity to defend all Protestants loyal to the English Parliament living throughout the country. Rumors spread throughout England that during the uprising the Irish Catholics had brutally massacred numerous English Protestants; therefore, many parliamentarian supporters believed it was necessary to retaliate.<sup>18</sup> As a result, parliament passed a militia bill as a means to raise an army on their own terms without permission from the king. This bill led the parliamentarians to align themselves with the Scottish Covenanters, a group who already opposed King Charles I because he tried to compel them to abide by English religious practices. In 1643, The Solemn League and Covenant officially sealed the agreement between the English Parliament and the Scots. Now the Covenanters fought for parliament under the enticement that the Scots could hold onto any land they captured in Ireland.<sup>19</sup> Meanwhile, the king also sought any means of support he could get his hands on.

---

<sup>17</sup> Jane H. Olmeyer, *Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart Kingdoms* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 117.

<sup>18</sup> Tom Reilly, *Cromwell: An Honourable Enemy* (London: Brandon, 1999), 19-20.

<sup>19</sup> Pádraig Lenihan, *Confederate Catholics at War, 1641-49* (Cork, Ireland: Cork University Press, 2001), 74.

Since the threat of parliament loomed heavily over King Charles I and because Ormond was unable to squash the Irish uprising, the king asked the earl to make peace with the Irish Catholics on his behalf. Due to his allegiance, King Charles I also appointed Ormond as marquis and the Royalist Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. The king wanted Ormond to negotiate terms that would lead to a cessation in hostility between the king's troops and the Irish Catholics. The Irish Catholics asserted that the only way peace could be obtained was if the king granted them the land they captured in the previous two years of fighting and if they were given religious tolerance. However, Ormond knew that King Charles I would not agree to these demands, so he negotiated a Cessation of Arms in 1643, as a means of temporary appeasement. The conditions Ormond put forth allowed the Irish Catholic's to keep the land captured during the war and that King Charles I would consider complete tolerance toward the Catholic faith on a later date. In return, the Irish Catholics were to offer troops to aid the king's cause in England. For the time being, these terms seemed satisfactory enough for the Irish Catholics, so peace ensued.<sup>20</sup>

Parliament looked to take advantage of this treaty between King Charles I's forces and the Irish Catholics; consequently, parliament indicted Ormond for treason against England.<sup>21</sup> They also used this treaty as propaganda against the king and claimed that the king would rather support the barbaric Catholics over his own people. Parliamentarians went even further and asserted that King Charles I was deeply influenced by his Catholic wife, Henrietta Maria, and, while this was true, many English looked negatively upon the king for doing so. The real reason King Charles I sought peace with the Irish Catholics was because he needed as much support as possible to fight the war because he was losing. However, the troops Ormond negotiated for

---

<sup>20</sup> Lenihan, 74-75.

<sup>21</sup> Little, 84.

with the Confederates never arrived to aid the king in England; consequently, King Charles I looked for another means to garner more support.<sup>22</sup>

Since the terms of the arms cessation between the Irish Catholics and the Royalist in Ireland were only to last one year, King Charles I desired Ormond to reopen negotiations with the Confederate assembly before the year ended. However, the king felt that Ormond alone was insufficient for negotiating a peace with the Confederates even after the lord lieutenant had displayed devout loyalty. Consequently, King Charles I undercut Ormond's authority by sending the Catholic Royalist, Edward Somerset, the earl of Glamorgan, in early 1645 to make secret peace plans with the Confederates. Glamorgan's instructions were similar to Ormond's, but the king felt that Glamorgan's willingness to be more lenient to the Catholic cause would make him more suitable for the job. The major difference between Glamorgan's approach in dealing with the Confederacy to Ormond's was that Glamorgan was willing to grant the Catholics full religious tolerance in return for their aid; however, King Charles I did not know this was what Glamorgan had planned.<sup>23</sup>

Early in the negotiations, it seemed that Glamorgan would be successful in gaining the complete aid of the Confederate army. Unlike Ormond, Glamorgan looked to appease the Confederate assembly by granting them religious freedom to practice Catholicism without interference from Protestant clergy. In addition, he was going to allow the Catholics to keep all the Protestant churches captured during the war for their own use. In return, the Confederacy was to offer fighting men for the king's cause in England, but these negotiations were delayed until the end of 1645 by the Catholic nuncio's, Rinuccini, arrival in Ireland. Glamorgan's terms of peace did not appeal to the nuncio who desired even more religious tolerance. Consequently,

---

<sup>23</sup> Lenihan, 81.

the peace negotiations were delayed, and Glamorgan's dealings leaked into the public sphere. When Ormond found out that Glamorgan had been dealing behind his back, he had the earl arrested.<sup>24</sup>

The reason Ormond arrested Glamorgan for treasonous claims dealt in the subtle differences in the terms both men offered the Catholic Confederates. What Glamorgan offered the Confederates that Ormond did not deal with granting Catholics equality with Protestants. Ormond refused to cross this line believing that toleration, not equality, was the only means acceptable to himself and the king. According to Burghclere, "this was the point on which King Charles I manifested no inclination to yield."<sup>25</sup> Granting Catholics equality spelled disaster for his reputation and the Protestant church in England. As a result, King Charles I denounced Glamorgan in 1646 when the monarch found that the earl overstepped his implied instructions, which did not involve granting Catholics equality. This denouncement later led Glamorgan to join the Confederates after he was released from prison.<sup>26</sup>

Although King Charles I undercut Ormond by sending Glamorgan to negotiate with the Catholic Irish, the lord lieutenant surprisingly remained faithful to the king. Like the Biblical figure Job, whose numerous possessions were destroyed and his family killed, but later received a reward for his suffering and faithfulness to God, Ormond viewed this incident as a trial that later would be rewarded for his steadfast devotion to King Charles I. However, some may argue that Ormond did not remain faithful to the king since the earl sought out peace conditions with parliament in the fall of 1645, when the king expected the marquis to come to terms with the

---

<sup>24</sup> Lenihan, 84-85.

<sup>25</sup> Burghclere, 268.

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 268-272.

Confederates. This action made it seem as if Ormond had betrayed his allegiance. However, as Patrick little pointed out, “Ormond’s dealing with the English Parliament were not disloyal, they merely reflected the reality of politics... Sooner or later, the king would have to strike a deal with parliament.”<sup>27</sup> Besides, no matter the outcome of the war very few people could imagine life without a monarch. Even the prominent parliamentarian Pym believed Charles I would maintain his position as king after the war ended, but with severely limited powers. Consequently, many people, especially a group called the constitutional Royalists, urged the king to seek peace with parliament throughout the 1640s.<sup>28</sup>

King Charles I was not a realistic man, so he never saw peace as an option. He desired to continue fighting against parliament until he obtained total victory or complete defeat. For example, when the king’s main force had been wiped out in the battle of Naseby during the summer of 1645, King Charles I kept pushing his allies to continue fighting. In Ormond’s mind, it seemed better to establish peace before the Irish Royalist were thrown in jail or executed for treason at the hands of parliament. Therefore, the marquis jumped at the best opportunity to gain security for the king’s supporters in Ireland, which, at this time, involved trying to persuade parliament to make peace.

In the end, the compromise between Ormond and parliament ultimately fell through. Inevitably, the lord lieutenant sought to establish security for Protestant Royalist in Ireland the only other way he knew possible, to reattempt an alliance with the Confederate Catholics under his own terms. This meant only offering tolerance and not complete freedom for Catholics to practice their religion. The speed at which an agreement needed to be reached was crucial

---

<sup>27</sup> Little, 98.

<sup>28</sup> See D. L. Smith, *Constitutional Royalism and the Search for Settlement, c. 1640-9* (Cambridge: Cambridge Publishing Company, 1994).

because victory for King Charles I looked unlikely without the support of an outside force. However, on 26 June 1646 Ormond received an unexpected letter from the king stating, “For many reasons too long for a letter, wee thinke fitt to require you to proceed noe further in treaty with the rebels, nor to engage us upon any conditions with them, after sight hereof.”<sup>29</sup> Conflicted by the circumstances, Ormond looked to remain faithful to the king’s orders even though, as Burghclere put it, the marquis “was convinced that to break off negotiations with the Confederates at that juncture was almost equivalent to signing his own death warrant, and that of the English garrison, it was, however, impossible for him to act in direct opposition to the Sovereign's orders.”<sup>30</sup> Reluctantly but obediently, Ormond looked to cancel any type of settlement with the Irish Catholics until an urgent message from the Prince of Wales, a Royalist ally, arrived on 4 July.

The messenger, George Digby, informed the marquis that the Scots allied with parliament had captured the king and forced him to write the letter that Ormond had received a few days earlier. Digby informed Ormond that the king “entrusted the control of affairs to the Queen [Henrietta Maria] and Prince [Charles II], enjoining them to disregard any orders, which might be wrung from him.”<sup>31</sup> He went on to explain that parliamentarian forces had taken the king’s Great Seal, and that anything with the king’s insignia had no authority. Therefore, Digby urged Ormond to continue negotiations with the Confederates with all deliberate speed.<sup>32</sup>

Ormond must have been relieved that he did not have to cut off negotiations with the Confederates. For he knew that he was responsible for more than his own life, but the lives of

---

<sup>29</sup> King Charles I to Ormond, June 1646, Burghclere, 303. In Carte, 392.

<sup>30</sup> Burghclere, 303.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, 304.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*

the entire Royalist garrison in Ireland. If Ormond could not make peace with the Confederates, they would inevitably surround and slaughter Ormond's garrison. For this reason, it must be noted that while Ormond was conflicted about the king's orders, the marquis was still willing to carry them out even though his demise seemed like the most probable outcome. Ormond felt that his duty to the king was more vital than his own life because he saw his obedience as a way to protract the Royalist cause. Therefore, when he received news that the letter from King Charles I was written under duress, he promptly sought to make a deal with the Confederate leaders.

Finally, on 29 July 1646, Ormond and the Irish Catholics agreed upon a long-term peace. The conditions decided upon were similar to those that had been discussed previously. The Catholics were to receive some level of religious tolerance in return for an armed force that would fight for King Charles I. The reason why the Confederates accepted Ormond's propositions dealt with the uncertainty of the future. At the time, the Confederate army was successful in its campaign throughout Ireland, especially because of the leadership of Owen Roe O'Neill. Burghclere argued that this success heightened the possibility that parliament would dispatch more forces to Ireland.<sup>33</sup> For this reason, the political leaders of the Confederates saw an alliance with King Charles I as the best means to protect the Catholic cause. These men understood that if parliament decided to send a fighting force to Ireland that in the event of a Confederate loss, Catholic tolerance would not even enter the realm of possibilities. Therefore, it was better to side with the enemy, who offered the little support that it did toward Catholicism, than the enemy that offered nothing.

Almost as quickly as the Ormond Peace of 1646 was agreed upon, Rinuccini rejected it on the 12 August. Since the treaty did not allow Catholics to maintain control of the churches

---

<sup>33</sup> Burghclere, 305

captured during the war, the nuncio believed that the Confederates were being undercut by Ormond and could gain more freedoms elsewhere. Rinuccini threatened that anyone who wished to abide by the Ormond Peace would be excommunicated from the Catholic Church.

Consequently, the Confederates sided with Rinuccini over Ormond. This left the marquis at the same place he was in after negotiations with parliament fell through. However, Ormond's situation dramatically worsened when he was informed that Rinuccini sent the Confederate army to attack the English garrison at Dublin. At this point, the marquis started to run out of options.

Ormond looked to receive some aid in what looked like an inevitable confrontation with the Confederates, so he made it his initiative to once again pursue parliament for help in September 1646. Here, Ormond offered to surrender Dublin to parliament, in exchange for military aid and religious security for Irish Royalists and loyal Catholics.<sup>34</sup> Patrick Little also pointed out that Ormond made personal demands in this exchange for the reimbursement of his money that he had spent on the war and the preservation of his estate. Although these actions may seem self-centered and like a total betrayal to King Charles I, they were not.

If the Confederates successfully captured Dublin, then they obtained the key to controlling Ireland without any English authority. Therefore, it was better to inquire the aid of the English Parliament than forfeit complete control of Ireland to the Catholics. Ormond believed this to be in line with the king's thinking, so he told parliament that he would step down as the Royalist Lord Lieutenant if parliament would aid in stopping the Confederate takeover. However, Ormond claimed that he would not resign unless the king personally consented to the idea. "For w[i]thout that', Ormond told the king... 'I shal never quitt any station you have or

---

<sup>34</sup> Little, 90.

shall putt me in'.<sup>35</sup> In Ormond's mind, he needed to fulfill his social duty to Charles I even if it meant losing his life because only the king held the power to release Ormond from his responsibility as lord lieutenant.

While Ormond waited for the king's response, his efforts to establish peace with parliament became fruitless. Parliament undermined all of the marquis' propositions and refused to offer him anything close to what he originally bargained for. On 22 November the exchange with parliament came to an end. At this time, parliament also undercut Ormond by established their own Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Viscount Lisle, who they gave an army to take control of the situation at hand.<sup>36</sup> To get a clearer understanding of the state of affairs, this would have placed three main fighting forces in Ireland at the end of 1646: the Confederates under O'Neil, the English garrison under Ormond, and the parliamentary forces under Lisle. Since Ormond failed to negotiate with parliament, the marquis, once again, sought the aid of the Confederacy. However, when Ormond tried to meet up with the Confederate leaders, they refused to get together with him because of the nuncio's negative attitude toward the marquis.<sup>37</sup>

It must be reiterated that an alliance at this point with one side would have been more beneficial to the Royalist cause than none at all. For without an alliance, Ormond's garrison would likely be destroyed. On the one hand, Ormond viewed an alliance with the Irish Catholics as a pathway to possible Royalist victory down the road. On the other, an alliance with parliament would guarantee that the Catholics could not gain total control of Ireland, which the

---

<sup>35</sup> Ormond and Confederate Council to King Charles I, 26 September 1646. In Little, 91.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 93.

<sup>37</sup> British Civil Wars, Commonwealth and Protectorate, David Plant, <http://www.british-civil-wars.co.uk/index.htm> (accessed November 18, 2011).

king would have detested. Therefore, when Ormond looked to employ one side over the other, he ultimately kept King Charles I's political position in mind.

Ormond understood he had some time before the Confederate army, which sat eight miles outside of Dublin, could act because he knew that they did not wish to wage war with winter looming so closely. Due to the pressing circumstances, the marquis looked back to parliament for peace. Ormond sent a letter to parliament on 6 February 1647 stating, "I am ready to leave ye sword, & all ye Places under my command, when, & to whom Parliam[en]t shall appoint".<sup>38</sup> Unlike before, Ormond was also careful to add that he no longer required the permission of the king to make peace because Charles I was being held captive by the Scots, and, as mentioned previously, any news from the king could not be trusted. The result of this peace offering, along with some personnel changes within parliament, which involved the departure of anti-Ormondist, was that parliament expressed that they would agree to Ormond's "propositions" only if he agreed to their additional "instructions".<sup>39</sup> Ultimately, Ormond agreed to these "instructions" and on 7 June, two thousand parliamentary troops arrived in Dublin to reinforce Ormond's men and save the city from destruction. Additionally, Irish Protestants were granted clemency, Ormond's personal estates and finances were secured, and Ormond had the ability to pardon men from being tried for treason against England. However, the terms stated that the marquis had to resign from his lieutenantancy. Consequently, Ormond retired to England where he hoped he could fight on the political front for King Charles I's cause, since Ormond could not return to his estate in Kilkenny where the Confederates still maintained control.

---

<sup>38</sup> Act of Ormond's Council, 5 February 1647. In Little, 94.

<sup>39</sup> Orders of Parliament, 22 February 1647, In Ibid., 95.

At the beginning of 1648, Ormond realized that it was pointless for him to stay in England because parliament no longer wished to continue peace negotiations with the king.<sup>40</sup> Consequently, Ormond went into exile in France where he looked to plan another campaign in Ireland. It was here that Ormond sought the support of King Charles I's French wife, Henrietta Maria. Ormond hoped that by garnering her support that France would be willing to supply men and equipment for a campaign in Ireland. The reason why France eventually agreed to Ormond's demands dealt with the idea that Ireland acted as the back door to gaining access to England in the event of a future conflict.<sup>41</sup> Therefore, France wished Ormond to seek out the support of the Irish Catholics in order to conquer the parliamentary force fighting in Ireland.

Although Ormond understood that France wished to take over Ireland for political reasons, he still agreed to receive French support knowing that any political issues could be dealt with later. He understood that the Royalist cause "now depended exclusively on [his] ability...to unite the divided factions in Ireland under the authority of the king," who was now the prisoner of parliament.<sup>42</sup> Even after losing the first civil war, King Charles I refused to meet parliament's demands because "he would not abandon the episcopacy entirely, and he adamantly refused to sacrifice his command of the armed forces, his choice of ministers and his veto over the legislation".<sup>43</sup> Consequently, Ormond sailed back to Ireland in the fall of 1648 in order to reopen negotiations with the Irish Confederates one last time.

---

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., 98.

<sup>41</sup> Paper I, presented by Crelly to parliamentary committee, December 1648. In Ohlmeyer, 207.

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., 214.

<sup>43</sup> Smith, 42. In Ibid., 207.

The difference between these negotiations and previous ones laid in Ormond's willingness to grant Catholic autonomy in Ireland.<sup>44</sup> At this point, Ormond saw that little hope remained for Charles I ever since the king had been incarcerated by parliament. The only option left was to gain Confederate support in order to defeat parliamentary forces in Ireland and eventually take on the New Model Army in England. Although the Confederates agreed to Ormond's terms on 17 January 1649, it was all but too late. On 30 January, parliament executed King Charles I declaring that he had committed treason by waging war against his own people. However, even after King Charles I's death, Ormond looked to remain faithful to the crown by continuing the fight in the name of Charles II.

After the king's death, parliament feared that Ireland would become the new "hub of Royalist activity."<sup>45</sup> Consequently, they sent the outspoken anti-Catholic, and successful military leader, Lord Lieutenant Oliver Cromwell, to squash any continuing resistance in Ireland, which included the newly formed alliance between Ormond and the Confederates.<sup>46</sup> Within three months Cromwell defeated four key allied strongholds. By 1652, the Cromwellian conquest of Ireland crushed all resistance, which also included the defeat of Ormond's army, and "succeeded in uniting Ireland under one ruler, something Ormond, the Scottish covenanters and the confederate armies had all failed to do."<sup>47</sup> As a result, Cromwell was appointed as Lord Protector of the Commonwealth of England, Ireland, and Scotland.

During Cromwell's invasion, Ormond lost most of his Confederate supporters because, again, the Catholic clergy rejected the marquis' authority and threatened to excommunicate

---

<sup>44</sup> Burghclere, 349.

<sup>45</sup> Ohlmeyer, 223.

<sup>46</sup> John Morrill, "Cromwell, Oliver (1599–1658)," in *ODNB*.

<sup>47</sup> Ohlmeyer, 230.

anyone who followed him. Furthermore, even though Cromwell defeated Ormond's army, the marquis survived and avoided capture; consequently, Ormond sought to leave Ireland fearing Confederate persecution or English arrest. However, Ormond refused to abandon his post without the permission of Charles II because if Ormond left on his own accord it would have meant betraying the Royalist cause. Therefore, after hearing back from Charles II in December 1650, Ormond joined the exiled monarch in France where the two became close friends. Even during exile Ormond looked for ways to display his loyalty to the crown. In January 1658, the marquis went on a secret mission to London where he sought to gather information that might help Charles II regain his title. However, Cromwell sent out spies looking for anyone trying to reinstate Charles II as king. These events almost led to Ormond's capture, so he returned to France.<sup>48</sup>

Later on in the same year interesting events began to play out in England. Oliver Cromwell died in September, so his son Richard succeeded him as Lord Protector. However Richard, unlike his father, lacked military experience and was not a skillful leader. Therefore, the New Model Army and parliament did not support his rule; consequently, they forced Richard to abdicate his position in 1659. This led to the dissolution of the English Protectorate, and after a period of confusion and unrest parliament decided the best move was to restore Charles II as king.<sup>49</sup>

Upon his restoration in May 1660, King Charles II appointed the marquis as duke of Ormond due to his unfaltering devotion to the crown. As duke, Ormond lived a distinguished career as a statesman where he would eventually return to Ireland in 1662 as lord lieutenant.

---

<sup>48</sup> Burghelere, 474-494.

<sup>49</sup> Paul Seaward, "Charles II (1630-1685)," in *ODNB*.

Ormond retained this position until 1677. Afterward, the duke retired to England where he eventually died on 21 July 1688, leaving behind him a legacy that was to be carried on by his grandson, also known as James Butler, who would become the second duke of Ormond.<sup>50</sup>

The foundation of the former duke of Ormond's legacy was grounded in his perception of religion. Ormond believed that remaining faithful to God and maintaining loyalty to others was the key to salvation. If it were not for the influence of King James I, then Ormond would have been raised Catholic instead of Protestant; consequently, the duke would have had a very different religious outlook and events in Ireland would have played out much differently. However, the religious practice Ormond actually followed led him to live a life in which he sought to express his devotion to others, especially the English ruler on the throne.

When the civil war started in 1641, Ormond upheld his duty to King Charles I. Throughout the entirety of the war, the duke could have betrayed the Royalist cause for his personal benefit, but he refused to do so. As mentioned previously, Ormond was not disloyal to the king when he sought to make peace with either parliament or the Irish confederates; rather, Ormond always looked to keep the king's best interest in mind. By employing both of the king's enemies throughout the war, Ormond wanted to solidify a Royalist presence in Ireland. Therefore, it seemed necessary to garner the support of one of these groups in order to ensure that this would happen. However, Ormond's cause ultimately met its doom when Cromwell wrecked havoc on the Royalist-Confederate alliance. Even so, this was not Ormond's end.

After his father's execution, Charles II realized how important it was to have steadfast followers like Ormond. Without men like the duke, Charles II would have struggled to retake the throne of England, but persistence and patience ultimately paid off. Charles II reclaimed the throne in 1660 with the help of Ormond, and, as a result, King Charles II reinstated Ormond as

---

<sup>50</sup> Barnard, in *ODNB*.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland and also rewarded the duke in other ways. If Ormond chose to serve his own interests during the war, which would have meant walking away from the Royalist cause, he would not have received the same benefits that the king bestowed upon him due to his unflinching devotion.