

Charles Jenkinson -- The Grandfather of Conservatism

In spite of his political importance Charles Jenkinson, first Earl of Liverpool has been ignored by biographers, or even writers of PhD theses, except for one volume of papers covering a few early years of his career, published in 1949.¹ Since he was a significant political leader in the House of Commons from 1763, Secretary at War under Lord North and a major influence on his government, President of the Board of Trade for 18 years under Pitt and Addington, the catalyst by which Pittite "Independent Whigs" became Tories and the philosophical inspiration for his even more eminent son, this neglect is a disgrace to British historical scholarship. Truly the Whigs write history, the rebalancing of which must go a lot further than it yet has.

For a start, there is not even agreement about the date of Charles Jenkinson's birth, a disparity common among those born very poor or in the Dark Ages, but unexpected among the gentry in the 18th century's generally excellent record-keeping. The Dictionary of National Biography² and Wikipedia have him born in 1727, while the History of Parliament³ has him born in 1729. According to Ninetta Jucker's "The Jenkinson papers, 1760-1766," his baptismal certificate is dated 16th May, 1729, but included in the parish registry among Winchester's 1727 births.⁴ From his career, in which he went up to Charterhouse in 1740, to Oxford in 1746 and graduated in 1752, I conclude, contrary to Ms. Jucker's view, that 1729 is the more likely date. Indeed, Alumni Oxoniensis⁵ has him matriculating at University College on March 14, 1745/6,⁶ aged 16, which agrees with the 1729 date. Perhaps definitively, his coffin in Hawkesbury church says "Obiit 17 Dec. 1808, in the 80th year of his age."⁷

Charles Jenkinson was thus born at his mother's family home in Winchester, almost certainly on April 26, 1729, the eldest son of the Horse Guards officer Charles Jenkinson and Amarantha Cornwall (1702-85) daughter of Wolfran Cornwall (1658-1719), a Royal Navy captain, by then deceased. The Cornwalls/Cornwalls, a large family, were distantly descended from Henry III's brother Richard, Earl of Cornwall, and were doubly connected with Charles Jenkinson through his mother and his sister. Jenkinson's family was to include a younger brother John Jenkinson (1734-1805) himself MP for Corfe Castle, 1768-80, a brother Robert who died of fever in 1761 while undertaking military service in Hesse and a sister Elizabeth who in 1764 married her cousin Charles Wolfran Cornwall, a major political figure.⁸

Since Charles Jenkinson was the eldest son of a younger son, albeit one whose Army career later allowed him to rise to Lieutenant-Colonel of the Royal Horse Guards, there wasn't a lot of

¹ "The Jenkinson Papers, 1760-1766." Edited with an introduction by Ninetta S. Jucker, Macmillan, 1949.

² Dictionary of National Biography, micrographic edition, 1975 p 1074

³ The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1754-1790, ed. L. Namier, J. Brooke, 1964.

⁴ Jucker, op. cit., p v. note 1.

⁵ Alumni Oxoniensis, 1715-1886, Joseph Foster, 1888, Vol. 2 p 749.

⁶ Before 1752, besides being wrong by 11 days, the year was held to start on 25 March, so ignoring the 11 days, we would write the date of Jenkinson's matriculation as March 14, 1746.

⁷ Collins' Peerage of England, Vol v. 1812.

⁸ Charles Wolfran Cornwall (1735-89) MP for Grampound, Winchelsea and Rye, 1768-89. Speaker of the House of Commons, 1780-89.

money about. His childhood home Burford Lawn Lodge, in the village of Shipton-under-Wychwood, Oxfordshire, was no more than moderately substantial, while his mother, being the daughter of a naval captain, also did not bring much money to the family.⁹ However, with his Jenkinson cousins Baronets and MPs based at Walcot, four miles east of Shipton-under-Wychwood, and a healthy network of successful political figures around him in western Oxfordshire, Charles Jenkinson's family social position was assured, provided money could be found to keep it up.

Charles Jenkinson was born into a family and environment of numerous mid-level political connections, almost all of them Tory. His father took little part in politics, but the patron of his Army career was General the 3rd Earl of Peterborough,¹⁰ who although a Whig early on was by 1710 a Tory. However, the Colonel of the Royal Horse Guards during Charles Jenkinson's childhood, the 2nd Duke of Argyll,¹¹ was a staunch Whig, so Lieutenant-Colonel Jenkinson, if also a Tory, presumably dissembled in the Mess.

Charles Jenkinson's uncle Sir Robert Bankes Jenkinson, 4th baronet had been Tory MP for Oxfordshire 1717-27, succeeding his elder brother Robert, 3rd baronet. Robert Bankes was returned unopposed for the seat in 1722, having been listed to the Pretender as among the possible supporters of a Jacobite rebellion in the previous year, but then chose to retire at the 1727 election even though he was only 40 years old. The reason for his retirement may have been partly financial; the family was running into difficulties and was compelled to sell its seat at Walcot House to the 4th Duke of Marlborough in 1759.¹² However, Jenkinson's Jacobite tendencies were also well attested; indeed, in the dangerous days of 1745-46 he was a leader of the Jacobite wing of the Oxfordshire squirearchy, along with Henry Hyde, Lord Cornbury.¹³

Charles Jenkinson's cousin on his mother's side Velters Cornwall (1697-1768) was a long-serving Tory MP for Herefordshire from 1722 until 1768, serving alongside Jenkinson himself in his last years, being noted for his whimsical humour in attacking the predominantly Whig ministries of his time. His son-in law Sir George Cornwall (1748-1819) (born Amyand, but changing his name on marriage to Velters Cornwall's daughter) MP for Herefordshire 1774-1796 and 1802-07, succeeded to Velters' Herefordshire seat but not to his politics, voting in opposition to both North and Pitt (and thus, to Charles Jenkinson and his son) throughout his long parliamentary career.

However, after Velters Cornwall's death the Cornwall/Cornwall family continued playing a positive role in Jenkinson's career through his brother-in-law the future Speaker Charles Wolfran

⁹ In his will, Wolfran left Amarantha an equal share of a 99-year annuity of £200 per annum (C.G.S. Foljambe, 1st Earl of Liverpool (of the 1905 creation) and Compton Reade "The House of Cornwall," Jakeman and Carver, Hereford 1908 p 91)

¹⁰ Charles Mordaunt, 3rd Earl of Peterborough (1658-1735). Commander of the British forces in Spain, 1705-7, and aligned with the Tories for the Court of Inquiry thereafter. Colonel of the Blues, 1712-15.

¹¹ John Campbell (1680-1743), 2nd Duke of Argyll (Scotland) from 1703, 1st Duke of Greenwich (UK) from 1719, Lieutenant General, 1709, Field Marshal, 1735. Lord High Commissioner of Scotland, 1705-06, Lord Steward, 1718-25, Master-General of the Ordnance, 1725-40, 1741-42.

¹² Hawkesbury Local History Society website "Hawkesbury's Manor House." Sir Robert, fifth Baronet, was "having trouble in getting a country house" in 1766, Jucker op. cit. p 411.

¹³ "The Oxfordshire election of 1754" by R.J. Robson, Oxford University Press, 1949, p6

Cornwall, with whom Jenkinson collaborated quite closely. There were also two further cousins Frederick Cornwall (1706-88), MP for Montgomery Boroughs, 1771-74 and his son Frederick Cornwall (1752-83), MP for Leomister, 1776-80 and Ludlow, 1780-83, both undistinguished supporters of Lord North's government mentored to some extent by Jenkinson.

The other useful family connection for Charles Jenkinson was the Dashwoods, whose Catherine daughter of Sir Robert Dashwood (1662-1734) of Kirtlington Park (10 miles east of Walcot) had married the fourth Jenkinson baronet, Charles's uncle. Dashwood himself, the son of a City merchant, was MP for Banbury 1689-98 and Oxfordshire 1699-1701, sitting with the second Jenkinson baronet, while his grandson Sir James Dashwood (1715-1779) was a Tory MP for Oxfordshire 1740-54 and 1761-68, having been defeated at the 1754 election, of which more later.

In addition, Sir Robert Dashwood's first cousin Sir Francis Dashwood (1658-1724) was created Baronet of West Wycombe, Buckinghamshire, (about 30 miles east of Walcot). His son Sir Francis,¹⁴ the second West Wycombe baronet was to achieve both fame as the Earl of Bute's Chancellor of the Exchequer 1762-63, a senior colleague in Charles Jenkinson's early career, and notoriety as the founder of the Hellfire Club, an institution which the fastidious, intelligent and relatively impoverished Jenkinson appears not to have patronised.

Finally, Jenkinson's Bankes cousins controlled the constituency of Corfe Castle, which Charles Jenkinson's great great-grandmother had held for three years against the Parliamentarians. In the lives of Charles Jenkinson and his son the Bankes family produced four MPs: Henry Bankes (1700-76), a Newcastle Whig turning Tory after 1760, who just overlapped with Charles at as MP for Corfe Castle 1741-62, his son Henry (1756-1834) who was an MP for no less than 51 years from 1780 to 1831, voting highly eccentrically but generally in the Tory direction, and two Tory grandsons William John (1786-1855, MP 1810-12, 1823-26, 1829-34) and George (1787-1856, MP 1816-32, 1841-56). In addition, the Bankes family loaned a Corfe Castle parliamentary seat to Charles's brother John Jenkinson in 1768-80.

At Charles Jenkinson's birth, the politically most eminent family in the area were the Earls of Clarendon, based at Cornbury, adjacent to the Jenkinson baronets at Walcot and just 4 miles from Jenkinson's childhood home. The first Earl of Clarendon¹⁵ the great Lord Chancellor, the second Earl, Lord Privy Seal under James II, the first Earl of Rochester,¹⁶ a leading High Tory minister from Charles II's last years until the early years of Queen Anne, and the cross-dressing third Earl of Clarendon (1661-1723),¹⁷ Governor of New York, were all dead, and the family's

¹⁴ Francis Dashwood, 1708-81 2nd Baronet from 1724, 11th or 15th Baron le Despencer from 1763. MP for New Romney and Weymouth and Melcombe Regis, 1741-63. Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1762-63, Master of the Great Wardrobe, 1763-65, Joint Postmaster General, 1765-81. Founded Hellfire Club, 1755.

¹⁵ Edward Hyde (1609-74), 1st Baron Hyde from 1660, 1st Earl of Clarendon from 1661, MP for Shaftesbury, Wootton Bassett and Saltash, 1640-42, Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1643-46, 1660-61, Lord Chancellor, 1658-67. Author of "History of the Rebellion and Civil Wars in England" published 1702-04.

¹⁶ Laurence Hyde (1642-1711), 1st Earl of Rochester from 1682. MP for Newport, Oxford University, and Wootton Bassett, 1660-1681. First Lord of the Treasury, 1679-84, Lord President of the Council, 1684-85, Lord High Treasurer, 1685-86, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1700-03, Lord President of the Council, 1710-11.

¹⁷ The third Earl, then Lord Cornbury, is said to have opened the 1702 session of the New York Assembly, the first of Queen Anne's reign, dressed in a gown, with full headdress and fan; when reproached for this he responded: "You

political power was thus not what it had been (its two monarch cousins, Mary II and Anne, had also now passed on). However, the 4th Earl of Clarendon (1672-1753) was an active Tory in the House of Lords and his son Henry Hyde, Viscount Cornbury (1710-53) was MP for Oxford University from 1731 until he entered the Lords by Writ of Acceleration in 1751.

Regrettably Henry Hyde and his father the fourth Earl died within a year of each other, extinguishing the title, passing the estates out of the direct family (they were encumbered by large debts by this stage) and removing an important locus of Oxfordshire political power. Still, while he lasted, Henry Hyde was not only a Tory but a Jacobite, entering into negotiations with the French government in 1733 for the restoration of the Stuarts with French help and leading the Jacobite Oxfordshire squires in 1745-46 along with the fourth Jenkinson baronet. With the second Earl also having been a close friend of Charles Jenkinson's grandfather the second baronet, the families had a long-standing and close relationship, but the Clarendon influence died out before they could do much for Charles Jenkinson.

The biggest landowner in Oxfordshire, with Blenheim Palace 11 miles east of Shipton-under-Wychwood, was the dissolute and extravagant Charles Spencer, third Duke of Marlborough (1706-58). The first Duke of Marlborough had been politically close to neutral, but his Duchess Sarah (1660-1744) was a bigoted Whig whose Whiggery had lost her and by extension her husband the favour of Queen Anne. What's more the third Duke, who succeeded in 1733, was the second son of Charles Spencer, third Earl of Sunderland, a died-in-the-wool Whig who had vied with Sir Robert Walpole for political supremacy until his death in 1722. However, Charles Jenkinson visited Blenheim frequently in his youth, and was "much acquainted with Dr. Stevens, the Duchess's steward, who had accumulated a fortune of £70,000 in that service."¹⁸ While Marlborough was unlikely to further Charles Jenkinson's ambitions unless he became a Whig, in 1752 he precipitated the Oxfordshire election two years later in which Jenkinson was to play a notable part in the Whig interest.

More useful to Charles Jenkinson's prospects than the Earls of Clarendon, because more reconciled with the current regime, or the Dukes of Marlborough, because hereditarily friendly rather than opposed to the Jenkinsons, were the Harcourts of Stanton Harcourt, about 11 miles southeast of Shipton-under-Wychwood. Simon Harcourt¹⁹ succeeded his grandfather, who had been Queen Anne's last Lord Chancellor in the Tory government of 1710-14, as second Viscount Harcourt in 1727, then raised a regiment in 1745 for service against the Jacobite rebellion, receiving a Colonelship in the Army for doing so. In 1749 he was created Earl Harcourt, then in 1751 he gained an even more strategic position as Governor of the Prince of Wales, the future George III. The young John Jenkinson was the first to benefit from Harcourt patronage, becoming a pageboy to the King in 1748, in which he served four years, but Charles was to

are all very stupid people not to see the propriety of it all. I represent a woman, and in all respects I ought to represent her as faithfully as I can."

¹⁸ Anecdote told to Sylvester Douglas, first Baron Glenbervie (1743-1823). "The Diaries of Sylvester Douglas, ed. Francis Bickley, Constable, 1928 Vol. 1 p91, Oct. 27, 1796.

¹⁹ Simon Harcourt (1714-77), 2nd Viscount Harcourt from 1729, 1st Earl Harcourt from 1749, Governor to the Prince of Wales, 1751-60, Special Ambassador to Mecklenburg-Strelitz, 1761, Ambassador to Paris, 1768-72, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1772-77. Drowned in a well while rescuing his dog.

benefit more fully from Harcourt patronage, most especially Harcourt's connection with the Prince's tutor, John Stuart, third Earl of Bute.²⁰

Finally, Oxfordshire had also been home to a major intellectual fount of Jenkinson's Toryism, the Great Tew circle surrounding Lucius Cary second Viscount Falkland²¹ at his house of that name, 13 miles from Jenkinson's childhood home, and propagated to the late Stuart Tories through Clarendon. The Great Tew circle had been opposed to the absolutist rule of Charles I and the Earl of Strafford,²² and to the narrow quasi-Catholic Anglicanism of Archbishop William Laud²³ but like Clarendon himself it chose the King's side after the 1641 Grand Remonstrance and remained strongly committed both to the Church of England and to the King as personal leader of the country. In the early 18th century, this belief system sometimes led to Jacobitism, and Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke (1678-1751) refined it (in a somewhat more free-thinking direction) with his 1749 masterpiece "On the idea of a Patriot King."

Even after the Restoration and the Revolution of 1688 there was a certain amount of support for absolutism, for example from Sir Richard Bulstrode, who described the theory that Royal power derived from an underlying contract as "A Doctrine never heard before, even among the most barbarous Nations, it evidently appearing, that the Authority of Kings is immediately derived from God, and not conferred upon them as a Trust from the People."²⁴ However Charles Jenkinson's position in the 1760s through the 1780s as "King's Friend" supporting George III's position in the period's political squabbles was squarely within the Great Tew tradition and not as his enemies claimed absolutist.

We now arrive at a conundrum that is exceptionally important in deciphering Charles Jenkinson's life and of considerable importance in his son's early career: the confusion of party allegiances during this period. Sir Lewis Namier, in his magisterial "The structure of politics at the accession of George III"²⁵ sought to demonstrate by examining the 1761 election that political parties were of little relevance at that time. His conclusion had considerable validity for that election, the least contested of the 18th century, but it must be suspected that he selected his election carefully in order to make his point.

²⁰ John Stuart (1713-92) 3rd Earl of Bute from 1723, Tutor to George, Prince of Wales, 1755-60, Secretary of State for the Northern Department, 1761-62, Prime Minister, 1762-63.

²¹ Lucius Cary, (1610-43) 2nd Viscount Falkland (Scotland) from 1633. MP for Newport (Isle of Wight) 1640-42, Secretary of State, 1642-43, Lord Privy Seal, 1643. Killed at First Battle of Newbury, 1643.

²² Thomas Wentworth (1593-1641), 1st Viscount Wentworth from 1629, 1st Earl of Strafford from 1640 MP for Yorkshire and Pontefract, 1614-28. Lord Deputy of Ireland, 1633-40, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1640-41.

²³ William Laud (1573-1645), Dean of Gloucester, 1616-21, Bishop of St. David's, 1621-26, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1626-28, Bishop of London, 1628-33, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1633-45, First Lord of the Treasury, 1635-36.

²⁴ Sir Richard Bulstrode "Memoirs and Reflections upon the Reign and Government of King Charles 1st and King Charles the 2nd," Nathaniel Mist, 1721, p178. Bulstrode (1623-1711) (according to Alumni Cantabrigiensis; most references give an unlikely birth date of 1610/11, though some give a somewhat more plausible 1617) lived his beliefs to the extent of spending his last 20 years at St. Germain with the Old Pretender. Mist was the publisher of "Mist's Journal," the leading anti-Whig organ of the day. Bulstrode also wrote "To imagine it either lawful or practicable, to question and depose Kings, without a liberty of taking up arms against them, is a Contradiction that none will pretend to reconcile, who are not Lunatick, or deeply Hypochondriacal" p67

²⁵ Sir Lewis Namier "The structure of politics at the accession of George III" Macmillan, 1929

In 1754 or by 1774 (in 1768 party alignments were still fluid) he would not have been able to ignore the overwhelming evidence of strong party loyalties in many constituencies. Indeed, the 1754 Oxford Tories roaring choruses of "True Blue will Never Stain" or the 1774 Whigs carolling "Yankee Doodle" in sympathy with their American cousins would equally have thought Sir Lewis out to lunch.

Namier's followers, notably Ninetta Jucker, editor of the only extant volume of Charles Jenkinson's papers, label Harcourt a Whig, and assert that Jenkinson's early connections were Whig. Party allegiances were confusing to contemporaries also, even to the extent that William Pitt the younger, whose ministry from 1783 forms the first half of the Tory ascendancy of 1783-1830, was himself the son of the Whig Earl of Chatham and for the first few years of his ministry described himself as an Independent Whig. Indeed, Pitt supported measures of parliamentary reform, the Whig nostrum that purported to enlarge the franchise, both before and immediately after becoming prime minister.

The matter becomes clearer when you look at the politics of the 1730s and 1740s, the period when Chatham and Harcourt started their careers.²⁶ Both were in opposition to the long Whig ministry of Sir Robert Walpole until 1742, during which the Tories won a majority of votes at parliamentary elections, though the electoral system, with its "close" boroughs produced solid Whig parliamentary majorities. However, when Walpole fell and was replaced by a mixed ministry containing elements of the Walpole ministry and of its opposition but few Tories, it became clear that formal adherence to the Tory party was no way to build a political career under George II.

This became even clearer after the Jacobite rebellion of 1745, which finally wiped out any hope of restoring the Stuarts. Some Tories, like Henry Hyde, Viscount Cornbury gave up hope of a political career. Others like Harcourt and Lord Gower,²⁷ who had entered the government as a Tory in 1742, became Whigs in voting habit and, if members of the Commons, party affiliation, joining other Whigs like Pitt and Marlborough who had begun their careers in opposition to Walpole.²⁸ At the 1754 Oxfordshire election, which I shall deal with below, the still Tory Sir James Dashwood was opposed by Marlborough, Harcourt and Charles Jenkinson, the two latter from Tory families but now supporting the Whig interest.

After 1760, the Royal party preference was reversed. The Tory Bute had associated himself with the young George III and his mother and with the opposition to the Newcastle/Pitt ministry of 1757-62. Thus, his followers (of whom Jenkinson became one) and later the followers of Lord North and prosecutors of the American war, while reviled by loyal Whigs as "King's Friends," became associated with the remnants of the old Tory party and received Royal favour. Especially in the confused years before and after the American war, it was the natural Tory position to support the King and to support the kaleidoscopically succeeding ministries to the extent that they pleased the King and did not undertake radical policy innovations.

²⁶ Linda Colley "In defiance of Oligarchy: The Tory Party 1714-60" Cambridge University Press, 1982, is invaluable on the Tories of this period.

²⁷ John Leveson-Gower, first Earl Gower, 1694-1754, Lord Privy Seal, 1742-43, 1744-54.

²⁸ In a similar manner, in the 1790s young office-seeking statesmen with Whig connections, like George Canning and Robert, Viscount Castlereagh, supported and eventually joined the essentially Tory Pitt government.

Then after Charles Jenkinson joined Pitt's government in 1786, that government became Tory-dominated, gave up dreams of parliamentary reform, and over time became known simply as a Tory government. Ideology, which had been limited and quiescent since the demise of Jacobitism, reappeared with the French Revolution, Fox's support for it, Burke's polemics against it and the Portland Whigs' migration across the aisle to join Pitt in 1794. By this means, the late Stuart Tory party was linked with Liverpool's Tory (later Conservative) party, even though the connection suffered some vicissitudes from 1742 to 1786.

To historians of Namier's time, trained in Cartesian set theory and Aristotelian division of the universe into 'A' and 'Not-A', the party sets "Whig" and "Tory" may have appeared amorphous and parties indistinct. However, there should be no difficulty for modern readers acquainted with fuzzy logic, for whom the idea of fuzzy "Whig" and "Tory" party sets, to some extent overlapping, with different politicians having varying membership in each is perfectly natural. Party "sets" in the 17th and 18th centuries were fuzzy; they only became Cartesian in Gladstone's time, after the 1865 death of Lord Palmerston.

In any case, contemporaries were quite clear in ascribing "Whig" and "Tory" labels to various parliaments and governments; for example in 1780 the Whig Horace Walpole described the 1774-80 parliament led by Lord North as "the most corrupt and most Tory Parliament that ever was."²⁹ In this case as in many other areas of human thought, the "advances" of the 20th century served mostly to obfuscate the intellectual clarity of the 18th.

Charles Jenkinson was educated at the grammar school in Burford, Oxon.,³⁰ then after 1740 at Charterhouse, in those days a distinctly less expensive establishment than Eton with strong military connections, attached to a military hospital and a home for gentlemen pensioners, located on the edge of the City of London. Six years later, he entered University College, Oxford, somewhat surprising at first glance, since both his father and his son were to matriculate at Christ Church. However, the anomaly is explained when we realize that Charles Jenkinson at first intended to study theology, in which University College at that time specialized (the oldest Oxford college, it had been founded in 1249).

Like Charterhouse compared to Eton, University College was distinctly less fashionable than Christ Church and offered many scholarships to impoverished students. The choice of University College rather than his father's Christ Church thus reflected Charles Jenkinson's modest circumstances and intellectual interests. It may also have reflected his family Toryism – Christ Church's politics tended to reflect the politics of the local Bishop³¹ (since it is also the seat of Oxford Cathedral) and in the 1740s the Bishop Thomas Secker was a strong Whig who had been brought up as a Dissenter. (In 1787, when Liverpool matriculated there, the Bishop of Oxford was once again Tory and so was Christ Church.)

²⁹ George III, Lord North and the People, 1779-80," Sir Herbert Butterfield, Bell, 1949, p323

³⁰ Universal Magazine, February 1809, p174.

³¹ Robson, op. cit., p74

Jenkinson's early interest in theology quickly broadened; the year after he went to Oxford he was admitted to Lincoln's Inn,³² and from that point studied law although he was never called to the Bar and never practised professionally. In an era when the aristocracy went to Oxford or Cambridge for a few terms and left without a degree but with a good network of contacts, Charles Jenkinson was a diligent and long-lasting student, whose Oxford career the Dictionary of National Biography describes as "distinguished."³³ He took his BA in 1749, his MA in 1752 and received a Doctorate in Civil Law in 1773, when he had already been a government minister for ten years (his cousin Sir Robert Jenkinson, fifth baronet also received a DCL, but at the age of 28 in 1749, without having achieved any special distinction -- he was the first Jenkinson baronet not to serve in the House of Commons). Taking Oxford's academic offerings seriously was thus a family tradition, and not simply a result of Charles Jenkinson's relative penury.

Jenkinson's father died in 1750, and Jenkinson inherited the family estate, such as it was. However, with a mother and three siblings to support, money was tight, so much so that he may have been forced to sell the family home since in an election list of February 1753 he was described as "no freeholder."³⁴ Financially, Jenkinson was thus compelled to live almost entirely on his wits.

Given his straitened financial circumstances, Charles Jenkinson's most obvious career choice was the Church. Through an uncle³⁵ Sir Jonathan Cope of Brewern, he was offered the living of Hanwell, to be taken up on Midsummer's Day 1754. In the interim, he devoted himself to journalism, an activity considerably less reputable in the 1750s than it is today, although already in his last year at Oxford he had published "Verses on the death of Frederick Prince of Wales" in a collection on that subject from the two universities. He is also known to have published several articles for the Monthly Review, surprisingly a Nonconformist magazine founded in 1749, the first to offer reviews.

Before the date for his ordination arrived, Charles Jenkinson pulled out, because he had become involved in politics under the sponsorship of Harcourt, already Governor to the Prince of Wales. This was by no means inevitable; Jenkinson was much poorer than the aristocratic sprigs who made up most of the ranks of 18th century politicians. Thus, he would need both ability and good luck to establish himself in politics, although through his family and their local friends he had quite good connections to leverage any opportunities that occurred. However, there is no question that for Charles Jenkinson, far more exciting than the prospect of a quiet country living was deep involvement in possibly the most notorious election campaign of the 18th Century, the Oxfordshire election of 1754.

In 1754 the Tories were in a substantial but shrinking minority of the electorate nationally, having been in a numerical majority earlier in the Whig ascendancy. However, the constituency

³² The Records of the Honorable Society of Lincoln's Inn, p433; July 6, 1747.

³³ Namier, Brooke op. cit.

³⁴ Robson, op. cit., p24

³⁵ Hay, op. cit. has Col. Jenkinson introduced to the Blues through the Whig General Sir John Cope, a distant cousin, but Cope was never an officer in the Blues and other sources have Col. Jenkinson introduced by the Tory Earl of Peterborough, its Colonel, 1712-15. Sir Jonathan Cope (1691-1765) Bt. 1714 was Tory MP for Banbury, 1713-22, listed to the Pretender as a potential supporter, 1721. Sir Jonathan Cope was Charles Jenkinson's uncle by Cope's marriage to his aunt Mary, daughter of the second Jenkinson baronet.

of Oxfordshire, returning two members had until 1754 remained staunchly Tory, with a strong Jacobite flavour, uncontested since the third Sir Robert Jenkinson, Charles's uncle, won it in 1710. By the 1750s it had become clear that Jacobitism was a lost cause and that Tories were condemning themselves to perpetual opposition, at least while George II remained King. Thus, in a favourable Whig year like 1754 Oxfordshire appeared winnable for the Whigs. Harcourt, ambitious and still not entirely trusted by the Whig leadership, saw his chance to win further favour (he had been granted an Earldom in 1749) by helping the Whig effort in his native county.

The Whigs had a highly plausible candidate in Sir Edward Turner,³⁶ with both the means and background to fight a strong race. A Balliol graduate, he had been known at Oxford for "distinguished scholarship and the regularity of his behaviour," was married to the Master of Balliol's niece and had from his own pocket financed a road between Ambrosden (his home) and Merton, Oxfordshire, which was reputed to have cost a guinea a yard.³⁷

Given Turner's ambitions and Marlborough's desire to build his parliamentary following, it was thus little surprise when the Duke in July 1752 decided to break the 42-year county electoral peace and support a Turner candidature for the Oxfordshire two-member seat. There was some difficulty finding a second Whig candidate, but by the following year Thomas, Viscount Parker,³⁸ the heir to the Earl of Macclesfield, had agreed to stand. Parker had disadvantages as a candidate; for one thing Macclesfield, an astronomer, had made himself thoroughly unpopular by sponsoring the 1752 change to the Gregorian calendar, thereby robbing the English people of eleven days.³⁹

On the Tory side, the Jenkinson in-law Sir James Dashwood had been MP since 1740, so far unopposed. His companion since 1743 Norreys Bertie however declined the expense of a contested election, instead recommending his relative Philip, 6th Viscount Wenman⁴⁰ (an Irish title, so ineligible to sit in the Lords) who had been MP for the city of Oxford since 1749.

On February 15, 1753, when the first Whig election meeting was held at the Bear Inn in Oxford, Jenkinson was recorded as present, along with Harcourt, Marlborough, Macclesfield, the candidates, six other peers and 23 "Esquires" (holders of Oxford Masters of Arts), even though Jenkinson was marked as not being a freeholder and therefore possessing no vote.⁴¹ At that point Jenkinson was still aiming for the Church and searching for a living, but he clearly saw the forthcoming Oxfordshire election as a means to distinguish himself and win favour with Harcourt, whose politics seem to have been not dissimilar to his own.

³⁶ Sir Edward Turner (1719-66) 2nd Baronet from 1735, MP for Great Bedwyn, Oxfordshire and Penryn, 1741-47, 1754-66.

³⁷ Lobel, Mary D. ed. Victoria County History, quoted Wikipedia "Sir Edward Turner."

³⁸ George Parker (1697-1764) 2nd Earl of Macclesfield from 1732, Whig MP for Wallingford, 1722-27, President of the Royal Society, 1752-64. Astronomer. Thomas Parker, 1723-95. Viscount Parker from 1732, 3rd Earl of Macclesfield from 1764, MP for Newcastle-under-Lyme, Oxfordshire and Rochester, 1747-64.

³⁹ The eleven-day difference between the Julian and more accurate Gregorian calendars was adjusted by making September 14 follow immediately on September 2, thus making those who paid rent quarterly fork out three months' rent in September for only 81 days' occupancy. However astronomically correct, it was rightly regarded as a rip-off.

⁴⁰ Philip Wenman, 1719-60, 6th Viscount Wenman from 1729. MP for Oxford, 1749-54.

⁴¹ Robson, op. cit., pp 23-24.

We do not know in detail the exact part Jenkinson played in what was to become probably the most expensive election of the 18th century, depicted by William Hogarth in his 1755 series of paintings "The Humours of an Election." He was active in writing and pamphleteering on the Whig side and is said to have written a successful election song, which made Turner grateful. "The Oxfordshire Contest," published at the time, gives a collection of election songs, mostly not very good ones for Dashwood and Wenman, but "The Ballad of Ballads" and "A New Song"⁴² are competent in the Turner/Parker interest, and one or both may have been a Jenkinson effort.

In any case, with election expenses totalling £20,000 (over £4 million in today's money) on the Tory side and doubtless an equivalent amount for the Whigs there was plenty of activity for Jenkinson to get involved in. Indeed, an Oxford newspaper Jackson's Oxford Journal was founded in May 1753, accepting anonymous contributions from supporters of both sides, and was to establish itself so well by this election that it survived until 1851.⁴³

In the event Dashwood and Wenman won the election, polling 2,033 for Wenman and 2,014 for Dashwood versus 1,919 for Parker and 1,890 for Turner⁴⁴ (it is odd that Dashwood and Turner, apparently the stronger candidates, each polled less than their confreres). This was not an example of oligarchy suppressing democracy, as Whig historians would have you believe; the non-voting population, in Oxford as elsewhere outside London, was in 1754 predominantly Tory and engaged in roughhouse mob activity at several points. However, Oxfordshire's High Sheriff was Whig, and so by a large majority was the House of Commons elected in 1754, which on April 24, 1755, having thrown out several hundred Tory votes and a considerable number of Whig votes, declared Parker and Turner elected.

It was not only a Pyrrhic victory for the Whigs, but a short-lived one. By the next election in 1761, George II had died, to be succeeded by a Tory sympathiser. (George III as a boy in 1754 had expressed support for Dashwood and remarked that Oxfordshire was "well satisfied with their present members.")⁴⁵ The 3rd Duke of Marlborough had died heavily in debt in 1758, and the 4th Duke, much less strongly Whig (he was Lord Privy Seal under George Grenville in 1763-65 and remained a strong supporter of George III) negotiated a compromise by which Oxfordshire was to elect a Whig and a Tory. Consequently, Sir James Dashwood returned triumphantly to the Tory seat, which he was to hold until 1768, being succeeded by Wenman's heir, while the other seat was held until 1790 by the fourth Duke of Marlborough's brother Lord Charles Spencer,⁴⁶ a Privy Councillor who also served in several Tory-dominated governments.

⁴² "The Oxfordshire Contest, or the whole controversy between the Old and New Interest" Printed for W. Owen, pp 29-30 and 48-9. "A New Song," possibly sung to "God Save the King," includes the verse "Harcourt with zealous care/Forms us a royal Heir/To love our laws/He with Fidelity/Will support Liberty/With Purse, with Heart and Glee/To gain our Cause."

⁴³ Robson, op. cit. p29.

⁴⁴ Robson, op. cit. p104

⁴⁵ Robson, op. cit. p20

⁴⁶ Lord Charles Spencer (1740-1820) MP for Oxfordshire, 1761-1790, 1796-1801. PC 1763, Lord of Admiralty, 1768-79, Treasurer of Chamber, 1769-82, Joint Vice Treasurer 1782-84, Joint Postmaster-General, 1801-06, Master of Mint, 1806.

Meanwhile both Turner and Parker remained good friends and patrons of Jenkinson, with his song possibly binding him to Turner in particular.⁴⁷ Both their politics after 1760 acquired a distinctly Tory flavour. Turner, elected for Penryn in 1761, supported Bute and opposed Rockingham, while Parker, elected for Rochester in 1761 and succeeding as third Earl of Macclesfield in 1764, supported both Bute and Grenville in the Commons and North and the younger Pitt in the Lords.

After the Oxfordshire election Jenkinson moved to London, relying on the Harcourt and possibly Turner patronage, writing for the newspapers as Harcourt's amanuensis, and cultivating his friendship with George Grenville⁴⁸ who he had already visited several times at his home Wotton in Buckinghamshire while he was at Oxford.⁴⁹ Sometime before 1756, through either Marlborough's introduction or Harcourt's,⁵⁰ he had become attached as an unpaid secretary to Robert Darcy, 4th Earl of Holderness,⁵¹ who in 1754 had become Secretary of State for the Northern Department in the Duke of Newcastle's⁵² Whig government.

Holderness was not an inspiring boss, being described later by Horace Walpole as a "solemn phantom." However, this appointment allowed Jenkinson to learn the intricacies of foreign policy; it also made his first bid for paid office credible. When George Grenville joined with his cousin William Pitt⁵³ and the 4th Duke of Devonshire⁵⁴ to form an administration in November 1756, Jenkinson wrote to Grenville with a recommendation from Harcourt for employment as an under-Secretary to Pitt in the new government.

That bid failed, but Jenkinson was also able to present Harcourt, Holderness and Grenville with his new 82-page pamphlet "Dissertation on the Establishment of a Natural and Constitutional Force in England independent of a Standing Army" which was subsequently published to

⁴⁷ The 1809 Annual Register obituary of Jenkinson claims that his election song was more important than his two early books in propelling him forward, gaining him Turner's patronage and through Turner an introduction to Bute. However, it claims the song was written in 1760, which makes no sense. It appears that Harcourt introduced Jenkinson to Holderness and Grenville introduced him to Bute. Given the flattery quoted in Note 50 above, the big shot won over by the song may have been Harcourt rather than Turner.

⁴⁸ George Grenville (1712-70) MP for Buckingham, 1741-70. Treasurer of the Navy, 1756-62, Secretary of State for the Northern Department, 1762, First Lord of the Admiralty, 1762-63. Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1763-65. Brother of William Grenville, 2nd Earl Temple (1711-79). Father of William Wyndham Grenville.

⁴⁹ Glenbervie, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1 p 296. According to Glenbervie's account, Jenkinson told him in 1802 that Grenville had introduced him to Bute.

⁵⁰ Hay, *op. cit.* p15, quoting Grenville papers says Marlborough; Glenbervie seems to indicate Harcourt.

⁵¹ Robert Darcy, (1718-78). 4th Earl of Holderness from 1722 Minister at Venice, 1744-46, at the Hague, 1749-51. Secretary of State for the Southern Department, 1751-54, 1757, Secretary of State for the Northern Department, 1754-61.

⁵² Thomas Pelham-Holles (1693-1768) 1st Duke of Newcastle from 1715, Lord Chamberlain, 1717-24, Secretary of State for the Southern Department, 1724-48, Secretary of State for the Northern Department, 1748-54, Prime Minister, 1754-56, 1757-62., Lord Privy Seal, 1765-66.

⁵³ William Pitt (1708-78) 1st Earl of Chatham from 1766, MP for Old Sarum, Seaford, Aldborough, Okehampton and Bath, 1735-66. Paymaster of the Forces, 1746-55, Secretary of State for the Southern Department, 1756-61, Prime Minister, 1766-68, Lord Privy Seal, 1766-68.

⁵⁴ William Cavendish, 1720-64, 4th Duke of Devonshire from 1755, MP for Derbyshire, 1741-51, Master of the Horse, 1751-55, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1755-57, Prime Minister, 1756-57, Lord Chamberlain, 1757-62.

considerable acclaim, since Britain was entering to the Seven Year War and invasion from France was regarded as a serious possibility.⁵⁵

Having failed to gain paid office in 1756, Jenkinson was to serve another four years under Holderness (who stayed in office when the Devonshire government fell, to be replaced by a Pitt/Newcastle coalition, with Grenville as Treasurer of the Navy, in July 1757) on an unpaid basis, until in 1760 he was awarded a pension of £250 per annum,⁵⁶ a worthwhile supplement to his limited income.

This was a period of considerable frustration, as he was several times from the latter months of 1758 promised by Holderness either a pension or an appointment as Under Secretary, neither of which became reality for some 16 months apparently owing to opposition from the Duke of Newcastle, the nominal prime minister and leader of the Old Corps Whigs.⁵⁷ His relations with Holderness remained cordial during this period, those with Grenville (who was moving away from Pitt and Newcastle and towards Bute) became closer, while his relationship with Newcastle, never close, chilled further.

During this period, he published in 1758 another book "Discourse on the conduct of Great Britain with respect to Neutral Nations" which was reprinted several times over the coming belligerent decades, so that his epitaph could claim at the time of his son's death 70 years later that it was "universally considered as a standard book on the important subject to which it relates."⁵⁸

Jenkinson's prospects were revolutionized in October 1760, with the death of George II and the advent of the Tory-friendly George III.⁵⁹ From this point nominal Whigs with Tory family backgrounds such as Harcourt, Turner and Jenkinson himself saw no further need to pretend to a Whiggery in which they did not believe. As the kaleidoscope of political affiliations sorted themselves out in the new reign, they began to associate with those like Bute who had maintained their nominal Tory affiliation and to disassociate themselves from those such as Newcastle and Pitt who remained Whig. The switch extended into the rarefied heights of Whiggery; Andrew Stone, Newcastle's close confidant and man of business, left Parliament in 1761 and refused to follow Newcastle into opposition.⁶⁰ Even by the end of Bute's administration in 1763, Jenkinson's Toryism and attachment to George III was strong and universally acknowledged.

⁵⁵ See Hogarth's December 1756 pair of engravings "The Invasion," a copy of which is in my possession.

⁵⁶ Namier, Brooke op. cit.

⁵⁷ November/December 1758 to March, 1760; Grenville papers Vol 1. pp 277 et. seq. The pension was entered into Newcastle's notes March 17, 1760, Jucker op. cit. p ix.

⁵⁸ Gentleman's Magazine, March 1829, p201.

⁵⁹ "George III and the Historians" Herbert Butterfield, Macmillan, 1957, discusses this transition in detail, though pointing out that its supporters claimed to be "above party" – thus assisting the transition of ex-"Whigs" like Jenkinson and Harcourt.

⁶⁰ Andrew Stone (1703-73) MP for Hastings, 1741-61. It was said (Namier/Brooke, op. cit.) that Andrew Stone did the Duke of Newcastle's business and Newcastle did his. Great-uncle and sponsor of Charles Arbuthnot, minister under Liverpool and husband of Harriet Arbuthnot, the diarist.

However “above party” the new reign claimed to be, its first years were a heady time for Tories. Even for those whose career was not rocket-launched by what was immediately recognized as a “change in regime” the combination of the Seven Years War’s successes and the new, young, British-born and Tory-friendly King was glorious indeed. Thomas Arne’s opera “Artaxerxes,” first performed in February 1762, got the mood right in its final chorus, applicable to George III as to the Persian King:

“Live to us, to Empire live,
Great Augustus, long may’st thou
From the subject world receive
Laurel wreathes t’adorn thy brow!”

The new reign's brighter prospects for Jenkinson opened when Grenville, while still Treasurer of the Navy, was promoted to the Cabinet in February 1761. Then the following month came Jenkinson's first official appointment, at the age of almost 32 (by which age his son would have become Foreign Secretary) when at Grenville's recommendation he was made Under-Secretary to Bute, who had succeeded Holderness as Secretary of State for the Northern Department. Jenkinson was overjoyed at his success and his new boss "I am absolutely in love with Lord Bute; his goodness shows itself to me more and more every day."⁶¹ Even when Bute retired from active politics and a close relationship with George III after 1763, Jenkinson's friendship with him was to remain intact, closer than he was to form with any other minister.⁶²

Jenkinson's favour with the new regime was further evidenced by his election on April 5, 1761 as MP for Cockermouth, a pocket borough controlled by Sir James Lowther⁶³ a tyrannical Tory borough-monger who was about to become Bute's son in law and later became the "Bad Earl" first Earl of Lonsdale. Through Lowther Jenkinson got to know John Robinson⁶⁴ the Lowthers' man of business in the North-West, who became a lifelong friend and the chief parliamentary manager for both North and (as mentor to George Rose)⁶⁵ for the younger Pitt in the crucial 1784 election.

Given Lowther's eccentricities and overbearing temper, this connection was later to cause Jenkinson problems, but service in some aristocrat's pocket borough was a standard political apprenticeship at that time. Indeed, both William Pitt the younger and Liverpool were to begin their political careers being elected for the Lowther borough of Appleby. (Liverpool was also elected for Rye, and chose the latter constituency, doubtless warned by his father's experience of the Bad Earl.)

The 1761 election was held when the new Tory King, strongly influenced by his tutor Bute and through him by Bolingbroke's "Patriot King," had succeeded two long-serving Whig monarchs.

⁶¹ The Grenville papers, Being the Correspondence of Richard Grenville Vol 1. p.359

⁶² Namier/Brooke, op. cit.

⁶³ James Lowther (1736-1802), 1st Earl of Lonsdale from 1784, MP for Cumberland, Westmorland, Cockermouth and Haslemere, 1757-84.

⁶⁴ John Robinson (1727-1802) MP for Westmorland and Harwich, 1764-1803. Secretary of the Treasury, 1770-82.

⁶⁵ George Rose (1744-1818) MP for Launceston, Lymington and Christchurch, 1784-1818. Senior Secretary to the Treasury, 1783-1801, Vice President of the Board of Trade 1804-06, 1807-12, Paymaster of the Forces, 1804-06, Treasurer of the Navy, 1807-1818.

Consequently, Tory and Whig loyalties were shaken up by the change. Careerist Tories who had pragmatically joined the Whigs in 1742-60 reverted to their earlier or ancestral loyalties. Long-term Whig Ministerialists like Newcastle went into opposition, although a few like Henry Fox, Lord Holland⁶⁶ remained glued to office under Bute and Grenville to keep their lucrative jobs. Anti-monarchists and radicals switched from Tory opposition to Whig radicalism, which germinated in these years.⁶⁷ The bench of bishops, almost all Whig by 1760, reverted gradually to its traditional Toryism as new bishops were appointed. Finally, quasi-independents like Pitt and the Grenvilles shifted their loyalties according to personal allegiances.

Just as the transition to Whig dominance had taken a generation, from 1714 to the mid-1740s, so the process of Tory revival wasn't complete until Burke discovered the horrors of the French Revolution and the Portland Whigs crossed the floor of the House of Commons in 1794. Thus, several governments were coalitions, like the Grenville government of 1763-65, the Chatham/Grafton government of 1766-70 and the Fox/North coalition of 1783. However, the political flux of 1761, like that of 1715, was a transitional, temporary phase.

The reshuffling of party loyalties in the 1760s had several unpleasant consequences. Among Whigs, the new dominance of Tories and their allies among Ministers appeared unnatural, so they developed a paranoia about Royal intervention, leading them to refer to Tory Ministerialists like Bute and Jenkinson as "King's Friends" and suggesting that their influence was unconstitutional. Governments were short-lived, as the Tories had considerable support in the country but few leaders of competence and Ministerial experience.

The American colonies, with limited loyalty to the Church of England, few natural Tories and strong Whig tendencies, started acting up and denouncing the "tyranny" of Tory rule – encouraged by breathtakingly irresponsible speeches by Pitt/Chatham and younger Whigs like Edmund Burke.⁶⁸ In the following decade, this was to produce a fatal ambivalence in the British reaction to the American drive for independence, with Whig generals like Sir William Howe⁶⁹ hamstringing effective military response.

Jenkinson was an ideal junior minister. He worked hard – a correspondent wrote to him in 1762 "I have wrote to Flexman to attend you any morning at eight o'clock, an hour at which I should not have directed any body to be waited on in London but a Minister, or a Minister's right hand."⁷⁰ He was no great orator, but a frequent debater; the History of Parliament says "his style

⁶⁶ Henry Fox (1705-74) 1st Baron Holland from 1763, MP for Hindon, Windsor and Dunwich, 1735-63. Secretary at War, 1746-55, Secretary of State for the Southern Department, 1755-56, Paymaster of the Forces, 1757-65, Leader of the House of Commons, 1755-56, 1762-63. As Paymaster General of the Forces he acquired a much-criticized fortune of perhaps £400,000.

⁶⁷ For example Sir William Meredith (1725-90) MP for Wigan, 1754-61, for Liverpool, 1761-80, who was reckoned a Tory, even a Jacobite in 1754, was marked as a Bute follower in 1761, became a Lord of the Admiralty in Rockingham's administration of 1765-66 and was a steady Whig/Radical vote thereafter, although he served in a Household post in 1774-77.

⁶⁸ Edmund Burke (1729-97) MP for Wendover, Malton and Bristol, 1765-94. Paymaster of the Forces, 1782, 1783-84. Author of "Reflections on the Revolution in France," 1790.

⁶⁹ William Howe, 1729-1814, KB 1776, 5th Viscount Howe from 1799, Whig MP for Nottingham, 1758-80. Colonel, 1762, Major General 1772, Commander in chief, America, 1775-8, Lieutenant General, 1777, General 1793.

⁷⁰ Jucker, op. cit. p67

was precise, formal and pedantic, and he relied on the strength of his reasoning to convince."⁷¹ From May 1762, when Bute succeeded as First Lord of the Treasury, Jenkinson became his private secretary and Treasurer of the Ordnance, the latter being arranged to give him an official salary.

The principal duties of both Bute's under-secretary and private secretary related to patronage, a vital function of 18th-century government. The period 1761-63 was an active one in this respect; Bute had the chance to fill offices with Tories, particularly after Pitt resigned in October 1761 and the great Whig magnate Newcastle was finally levered out of office in May 1762. Jenkinson was a loyal subordinate, preparing a list in 1762 of Newcastle supporters who should be replaced in major and minor offices throughout the country.

The problem was the quality of the potential replacements. While there were many ex-Whigs like Harcourt and Jenkinson himself whose official ability was admirable, Bute owed much loyalty to the long-standing Tories of the Cocoa Tree Club, many of whom proved to be incapable. Sir Francis Dashwood, of Hellfire Club fame was promoted right up the official hierarchy to Chancellor of the Exchequer in June 1762 (admittedly, not such a senior job as it subsequently became, but still a full Cabinet member, with major responsibilities when the First Lord was of modest financial literacy like Bute). He proved to have little financial knowledge, his budget speech was greeted with shouts of laughter, and his attempt to impose an excise of four shillings the hogshead on cider and perry was greeted with riots in the cider counties similar to those following Walpole's Excise Scheme of 1733.

Jenkinson appeared destined for very high office indeed while Bute ruled – he was the most conspicuous political talent Bute had found in his wholesale replacement of a half-century of Whiggery. Alas, Bute was a sensitive soul and found the onslaught of Press criticism intolerable -- the Press was largely government-subsidized and so after 50 years of Whig rule was almost universally Whig. As usual, the advent of an “outsider” leader of a different political persuasion sent the media into paroxysms of hatred -- in this case racist hatred, Bute being Scots. The worst offender was the North Briton, set up to attack Bute specifically by Richard Grenville, second Earl Temple,⁷² who had left office with his brother-in-law Pitt, and edited by John Wilkes.⁷³ Wilkes had been a close friend of Dashwood and alumnus of the Hellfire Club, succeeding Dashwood as Colonel of the Buckinghamshire Militia when Dashwood accepted office. He decided eccentrically that the best way to get a lucrative job from Bute was to attack him in print and be bought off, rather than filling the obvious market gap for Tory journalism.⁷⁴

Thus in April 1763 after less than a year in office, in spite of success in negotiating the Treaty of Paris and getting it through Parliament, Bute threw up his hand and retired, being replaced by George Grenville in an administration still dominated by the Tories. Dashwood retired also, to

⁷¹ Namier, Brooke, *op. cit.*

⁷² Richard Grenville-Temple (1711-79), 2nd Earl Temple from 1752. MP for Buckingham and Buckinghamshire, 1734-52. First Lord of the Admiralty, 1756-57, Lord Privy Seal, 1757-61. Brother of George Grenville, brother-in-law of Pitt/Chatham.

⁷³ John Wilkes (1725-97), MP for Aylesbury and Middlesex, 1757-64, 1768-69, 1774-90. Lord Mayor of London, 1774.

⁷⁴ The Wilkes/Dashwood relationship and Wilkes' sudden political change of sides and attack on his friends is set out in Eric Towers' "Dashwood – The Man and the Myth" *Crucible*, 1986.

the more appropriate post of Keeper of the Great Wardrobe and disappeared to the House of Lords as 15th or by modern standards 11th⁷⁵ Baron Le Despencer, a family title dating back to 1264 inherited through his mother that made him Premier Baron of England. Wilkes redoubled his efforts, attacking both Grenville and the King in No. 45 of the North Briton, which, together with a pornographic "Essay on Woman," resulted in him being expelled from the House of Commons and sentenced to a term in jail. Thereby Wilkes gained an entirely unmerited reputation as the people's friend and an apostle of democracy, a reputation he used unscrupulously in the Middlesex election controversy of 1768-69 and has kept with Whiggish and American historians ever since.

On Grenville's advent Jenkinson, with Bute's blessing, was promoted to one of the two Secretaries of the Treasury. His close and friendly relationship with Bute had brought him in frequent contact with the young King. Henceforth he was to be a Commons leader of the amorphous group known as King's Friends, who would support any Ministry favoured by the King and were attacked by Whigs and Radicals as sinister tools of Royal influence. During Grenville's administration he endeavoured to preserve good relations between Grenville and Bute, visiting Bute's house at Luton several times. As this became impossible his relationship with Grenville deteriorated while he remained close to Bute.

Jenkinson's influence at this point was demonstrated by a political intrigue of August 1763, when George III, who disliked Grenville's hectoring manner, opened negotiations with Pitt through the intermediation of Bute, who at this stage remained close to the King. The initial stage of negotiations went well, and Grenville believed he was about to be superseded, when Jenkinson met Bute and advised him against Pitt's return, since it would involve a Cabinet dominated by Whigs. Bute duly warned the King, who cross-examined Pitt and determined that was indeed Pitt's intention, then deciding to retain Grenville in power.⁷⁶ To appease Grenville, the King then drew away from Bute, whose influence declined. Indeed according to a story recounted by Charles Greville the diarist from Frederick, Duke of York, the King quarrelled with Bute in 1764 and never saw him again from then until his death in 1791.⁷⁷

Apart from Jenkinson's considerable influence with both Bute and George III, this shows his dislike of the mainstream Whigs and especially of Pitt, who reciprocated by damning Jenkinson as well as Grenville to his friends in the media (and by extension, with subsequent Whig historians). Jenkinson's own view of media attacks was expressed in a July 1764 letter to Grenville: "As to the paragraphs in the papers on this subject, they are to be slighted. If the enemy finds they give any uneasiness, there will be ten thousand times more, for they are easily invented and Lord Bute suffered much by being known to be sensible to them."⁷⁸

In the subsequent Ministerial reshuffle, Jenkinson was promoted to Senior Secretary (the equivalent to today's Chief Secretary of the Treasury, but in those days outside the Cabinet, which was much smaller than today's). As Senior Secretary, Jenkinson for the first time became

⁷⁵ There were three attainders in the fourteenth century, after each of which the barony was re-awarded.

⁷⁶ Grenville papers, Vol 2. pp 95-96 and 196-98.

⁷⁷ The Greville Memoirs, vol I page 84, account of an 1826 conversation with Frederick, Duke of York. The Duke was born in 1763, so his information would be partly second-hand.

⁷⁸ Grenville papers, Vol 2. P386.

intimately involved with the details of financial and economic policy. Here he was lucky; the economically literate Grenville had combined the office of Chancellor of the Exchequer with that of First Lord of the Treasury, but this meant that much detail work had to be delegated to the Secretaries. Indeed, having concerned himself primarily with patronage in his first years as a junior minister, Jenkinson now became involved in two events that still resonate 250 years later: the transition from commercial to territorial empire in India and the drafting of the 1765 Stamp Act, which was to provoke the first major breach with the American colonists.

To deal with these topics in their chronological order, Jenkinson played a significant role in the creation of the second British Empire in India, acquiring thereby an expertise that benefited his later career.⁷⁹ The crucial event in this creation had been the 1757 Battle of Plassey. Robert Clive,⁸⁰ the victor of Plassey remained as Governor of Bengal until 1760, then returned to London a military hero, with ideas for the expansion of British rule.

In the early 1760s there were three factions contending for power in the East India Company. The company's employees and associated traders wanted to expand the non-Company trading benefiting from the "firman" tax-free privileges that had been granted to the Company in 1717, while keeping local rulers feeble – their politics were radical Whig, like the Boston merchants of that period. At the top, the Company was effectively led by Laurence Sullivan⁸¹ in London and Henry Vansittart⁸² as Governor of Bengal (father of Liverpool's Chancellor of the Exchequer). The Company had been Whig during the half century of one-party Whig rule, but Sullivan and Vansittart were both generally Tory after 1762. The Company's top management wanted to retain the existing system, suppressing unofficial tax-free trading to protect the revenues of local rulers. Clive, on the other hand wanted to set up direct territorial rule by the Company in Bengal, collecting taxes to defray Company expenses and indirectly provide revenue for the British Exchequer, while preserving the East India Company monopoly and suppressing the greedy and disruptive independent traders.

Jenkinson became involved in the East India Company's affairs in the autumn of 1763, as he attempted with the government's loan agent Joseph Salvador⁸³ to fund the government in a London money market made unstable by the Company's financial difficulties. The situation became critical at the beginning of 1764, when news arrived that an alliance between the Nawab of Bengal and the Mughal Emperor Shah Alam II⁸⁴ had attacked the Company's forces, plunging India into war and making the Company's finances even more unsure. Clive's plans seemed the best way to produce a greater revenue, for both the Company and the government. Grenville's

⁷⁹ James M. Vaughn's "The Politics of Empire at the Accession of George III," Yale, 2019, is a new work that, albeit with unpleasant American polemic, throws considerable light on the London politics surrounding the 1757-65 process that established direct East India Company rule in Bengal.

⁸⁰ Robert Clive (1725-74), 1st Baron Clive (Ireland) from 1762. MP for Mitchell and Shrewsbury, 1754-55, 1761-74, switching from Newcastle to Grenville in 1764, then after Grenville's death in 1770 inclining to North. Commander in chief, India, 1756-60, 1765-67. Governor of Bengal, 1757-60, 1765-66.

⁸¹ Laurence Sullivan (1713-86), MP for Taunton and Ashburton, 1762-74, supporting Bute, Grenville and later North. East India Company Director, 1755-58, 1764-65, 1769-70, 1771-72, 1778-80, 1783-86. Deputy Chairman, 1763-64, 1772-73, 1780-81. Chairman, 1758-59, 1760-62, 1781-82.

⁸² Henry Vansittart (1732-70) MP for Reading, 1768-70. Governor of Bengal, 1760-64.

⁸³ Joseph Salvador (1716-86) FRS 1759. Merchant of Portuguese Jewish ancestry with East India Company connections. Succeeded Sampson Gideon as government's main loan agent on Gideon's death in 1762.

⁸⁴ Shah Alam II (1728-1806), Mughal Emperor, 1759-1806.

government accordingly decided to back Clive and his nominee Thomas Rous⁸⁵ for the East India Company chairmanship at the election in April 1764. (In the previous year, Bute's government had backed Sullivan against Clive's insurgent slate, because East India Company support was needed for the peace treaty with France.)

Jenkinson was active in the early months of 1764 in distributing East India stock in £500 lots (the amount needed to vote at the election of Directors) to reliable government supporters.⁸⁶ The election took place on April 11 and resulted in a tie between Sullivan's and Rous's supporters, but when on the following day Sullivan was unable to obtain the support of a majority of Directors he retired, leaving the Chairmanship to Rous. The next two months involved considerable struggle within the Company. At Grenville's instruction: "I need not tell you how much I wish Lord Clive's success in everything that is reasonable"⁸⁷ Jenkinson intervened on Clive's behalf, soliciting government-connected holders of East India stock. Finally, on June 5 Clive embarked for India, with full support from the Company, an accompanying Select Committee to enforce discipline on Company staff and local traders and a Knighthood of the Bath from George III, to demonstrate to officials in India and local dignitaries Clive's Royal support.

Before Clive arrived in India Major Hector Munro⁸⁸ with 7,000 men had defeated the Nawab's and Mughal's forces of 40,000 at the Battle of Buxar on October 23, 1764 restoring Company dominance in Bengal. The following year on August 12 Clive signed the Treaty of Allahabad with the Mughal Emperor Shah Alam II, obtaining the "diwani" tax collection rights for Bengal, Bihar and Odisha in return for an annual cash subsidy. Thereby the Company assumed administrative control of provinces with a population of 20 million people, three times that of Britain. From them the Company received a net tax revenue of about £1.6 million per annum after expenses, which it converted to exports of Indian cloth and other goods for sale in Europe, and silver to buy tea from China.

Turning to Jenkinson's other main involvement during these years, the Stamp Act, Britain had taken on an unprecedented amount of debt to fight the Seven Years War, an extra £70 million to raise the National Debt to around £140 million, and the budget was consequently tight. The cost of troops and other British administrators in the American colonies had been increased sharply by the war, by the increase in territories which it brought (including what is now Canada but also Florida) and by the expense of quelling Pontiac's Rebellion, an Indian uprising caused almost entirely by the depredations of the colonies' Western settlers.

According to a discussion between Grenville and agents for the colonies held in July 1764, whereas the "American Establishment" had cost £70,000 annually after the 1748 Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle, its annual cost had now increased to £350,000. Grenville accordingly resolved to

⁸⁵ Thomas Rous (-1771) Director, East India Company, 1745-48, 1750-53, 1754-58, 1760-62, 1764-67, Chairman, 1764-66.

⁸⁶ Correspondence between Salvador and Jenkinson on this subject are in Jucker, *op. cit.* pp 270-285

⁸⁷ Grenville to Jenkinson, April 29, 1764, and Jenkinson letter to Grenville, May 1, 1764, quoted Jucker *op. cit.* pp 290-92.

⁸⁸ Hector Munro (1726-1805) KB 1779. Major, 1759, Major General, 1782, General, 1798. MP for Inverness Burghs, 1768-1801

raise some of the additional cost, he estimated about £80,000-£100,000, through a Stamp Act.⁸⁹ However he emphasised to the colonial agents that he was entirely open to any other means of raising that amount which the colonists might prefer. He would even accept direct grants from the colonial assemblies if a means could be found to render them assured and equitably distributed between the colonies -- only four of the 13 colonies had contributed to the cost of suppressing Pontiac's Rebellion.

Stamp taxes were not new; they had been used since the time of William III and in England a moderate levy yielded an annual income of about £100,000. They did not bear especially heavily on the poor, or on any section of the population other than lawyers, who could pass the costs on to their clients, and they were relatively cheap to collect. Henry McCulloh, Clerk of the Crown for North Carolina, originally suggested a Stamp Tax to Charles Jenkinson in July 1763, writing "a stamp duty on vellum and paper in America, at sixpence, twelvecence and eighteenpence per sheet, would at moderate computation, amount to sixty thousand sterling per annum; or, if extended to the West Indies, would produce double that sum."⁹⁰

The idea seemed a good one, and Jenkinson appears to have proposed it to Grenville.⁹¹ Thus on September 8, 1763 Jenkinson called in Thomas Cruwys, the solicitor to the Stamp Office and instructed him to consult with McCulloh on a plan for a stamp law for America and the West Indies. Cruwys met McCulloh on September 14, and on September 22 the Treasury, led by Grenville instructed Jenkinson to instruct the Commissioners of the Stamp Duties to prepare such a bill. The Commissions in turn instructed Cruwys, who prepared a draft, under the supervision of Jenkinson.⁹²

Jenkinson meanwhile asked McCulloh to prepare a Memorandum setting out the customs collections from the various American ports, giving the collectors at each port, and the approximate amounts collected, from which we learn that Boston was the most important port, with New York and Charleston equal second, the collections at the latter ports being a mere £600 per annum.⁹³ The feeble yield of customs in North America was confirmed in November 1764, when Benjamin Hallowell, Collector of Customs at Boston informed Jenkinson that the entire trade from London in the six weeks from October 1, nine ships in all, had yielded the sum of only £189.⁹⁴

Grenville stopped Cruwys's work in March 1764, since it had been decided to pass a Sugar Act⁹⁵ and postpone the Stamp Act for that session, to gather further information. Then on July 2 Jenkinson wrote to Grenville: "In the last session of Parliament you assigned as a reason for not going on with a Stamp Act, that you waited only for further information on the subject. That having been said, should not Government appear to take some step for the purpose? I mentioned this to you soon after the Parliament was up. I remember your objections to it, but I think the

⁸⁹ Jucker, *op. cit.*, pp306-7, referring to an account of the meeting published in 1776 by Israel Mauduit, present at the meeting as Agent for Massachusetts.

⁹⁰ "A Prologue to Revolution: the political career of George Grenville" Allen S. Johnson, 1996, p179

⁹¹ In 1777, he was to claim responsibility for the idea to the House of Commons, Grenville papers Vol. 2, p373

⁹² *Ibid.*, p181.

⁹³ Jucker, *op. cit.* pp 229-230

⁹⁴ Jucker, *op. cit.* p 339.

⁹⁵ The Sugar Act of 1764.

information may be procured in a manner to obviate those objections, and without it we may perhaps be accused of neglect."⁹⁶

Jenkinson's own attitude to taxing the colonists was set out at length in a letter to Hallowell on January 12, 1765. "The people of the Colonies have done themselves much hurt by their resistance to the legislature of this kingdom in general; they have thrown thereby all serious men into the scale against them. The oeconomical spirit which has been introduced in consequence of the late law,⁹⁷ if it should continue, will do no hurt to the public in general, though it might in a small degree diminish the revenue; but I am convinced it will not last long. And as to the idea of people of the Colonies becoming manufacturers themselves, I see no reason to apprehend it at present. Whenever they can work cheaper than the manufacturers of this country, they will become so of course. That is not the case at present, nor is it likely to be so soon. The present act will not in any respect hasten this event for it lays no duty on British manufactures and consequently cannot raise the price of these."⁹⁸

He expanded on this theme in a letter six days later to R. Wolters,⁹⁹ "The several Laws that had been formerly passed on this subject (sugar/molasses duties), though they had always been esteemed of the utmost importance for the commercial interests of this country, had been executed for some time in a most negligent and shamefull manner. ... The increase of our Colonies is certainly what we wish but they must increase in such a manner as will keep them usefull to the mother country; and any regulations that are essential to this last object, tho' they may to a small degree prevent the increase of the Colonies, are founded on true policy and should be complied with."

Had Jenkinson been correct about "all serious men" in the British political class being in the scale against American obstreperousness, the Stamp Act might well have been held in place, the revenue problem would have been solved and the American malcontents would have been considerably set back. Alas, party politics and the intemperate language of Pitt and others were to give the colonists a very different impression. However, Jenkinson, as was to be usual, got the economics right – as Adam Smith was to point out a decade later, the colonies had the highest wage rates in the world, and so were indeed uncompetitive in manufacturing until Alexander Hamilton's high tariffs were imposed. Only with the opening of Francis Cabot Lowell's Boston Manufacturing Company in 1814 did the United States begin its move towards manufacturing supremacy.

The Stamp Act passed the House of Commons on March 22, 1765 with a majority of 205 to 49, with the highest rates of tax applying to attorney licenses, and the tax extending to land transactions, cards, dice, newspapers and pamphlets, but not books, and an effective date of November 1, 1765. To make the tax more acceptable to the colonies, Grenville appointed Americans to the principal stamp collecting posts, with generous salaries of £300 plus 8% of the amounts collected, while Jenkinson drafted a minute for Treasury approval by which all Stamp

⁹⁶ Grenville papers, Vol. 2. p 373.

⁹⁷ The Colonists had been boycotting British sugar and molasses imports in protest against the Sugar Act duties.

⁹⁸ Jucker, op. cit., p 346.

⁹⁹ The British Consul in Rotterdam and organizer of the British network of secret agents on the Continent, letter quoted Jucker, op. cit. p 347-8

Tax receipts were to remain within the colonies, being used to pay troops and defer other government expenses in America.

Alas, the new measure's chances were greatly lessened by the fall of Grenville's government, from a combination of Royal dislike of the domineering Grenville and the government's lack of parliamentary support. In July 1765 George III attempted to form through the intermediation of his uncle William, Duke of Cumberland¹⁰⁰ a government headed by Temple and including Pitt, but that failed when Temple refused to replace his brother George Grenville directly. Accordingly, George III bowed to the inevitable and invited through Cumberland the younger Whig Charles Watson-Wentworth, second Marquis of Rockingham¹⁰¹ to form a government.

With a purely Whig administration taking over, Jenkinson had to leave office (the suggestion by Jucker¹⁰² that he could have continued as a "civil servant" is nonsense for an office so senior and with Jenkinson a known and committed Tory). However, he was now well liked by the King, and so was happy, having no great estates, to be appointed Auditor of Accounts to the Princess Dowager (George III's mother Princess Augusta) for a stipend described as "far short of your late income" but nevertheless welcome. As he wrote to Grenville "The office conferred on me is very agreeable to me, as I owe it to no Minister whatsoever and as it leaves me unconnected and free to act that part which my honour and conscience dictates."¹⁰³

As Senior Secretary to the Treasury, Jenkinson had accumulated enough money to lease a house at North End, Middlesex (between Fulham and Hammersmith). Indeed, the opportunities for enrichment were considerable. This was before the 1780s movement for "economical reform" and political ethics were little different from the era fifty years earlier in which Robert Walpole and the 1st Duke of Chandos had both acquired major fortunes as Paymaster General of the Forces, as indeed did Henry Fox at this time. From his correspondence, we see Jenkinson as Senior Secretary of the Treasury being offered side-payments from time to time, in one case of as much as £1,000.¹⁰⁴

Since Grenville fell more than three months before the Stamp Act was due to come into effect on November 1, 1765 the American colonists knew the law was orphaned and had every incentive to make as much difficulty about its implementation as possible – which they duly did. By the New Year it was clear that the Act was at best expensive and difficult to enforce. Consequently, the Rockingham administration not only rejected in December 1765 a motion proposed by Grenville condemning American unrest but had no hesitation in proposing the Stamp Act's repeal, which duly passed the Commons by 276 votes to 168 on February 21, 1766. Jenkinson had moved an amendment to replace the word "repeal" with "explain and amend" but it was rejected.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁰ Prince William 1721-65. Third son of George II, Duke of Cumberland from 1726, Captain-General of the British Army, 1744-57.

¹⁰¹ Charles Watson-Wentworth 1730-82, 2nd Marquess of Rockingham from 1750, Prime Minister, 1765-66, 1782.

¹⁰² Jucker, *op. cit.*

¹⁰³ Additional Grenville papers 1763-65, ed. John R. Tomlinson, Manchester University Press, 1962 p309.

¹⁰⁴ Jucker, *op. cit.* p 200. The offer was made in November 1763 by Joseph Cawthorne, merchant, but Cawthorne was gazetted bankrupt in 1764, so it may not have one of Jenkinson's more lucrative opportunities.

¹⁰⁵ Rockingham to the King, Feb. 22, 1766. "The correspondence of George III, 1760-83," ed. Sir John Fortescue, Macmillan, 1927. Vol 1. p275.

More damaging even than repeal itself was the rhetoric used to justify it. Pitt in particular thundered: "I rejoice that America has resisted. Three millions of people, so dead to all feelings of liberty as voluntarily to submit to be slaves, would have been fit instruments to make slaves of the rest."¹⁰⁶ This was high-flown nonsense, and given Pitt's immense prestige in the American colonies, it served to inflame resistance to British rule still further, inspiring the rebels and depressing the loyalists. The American colonies were the lowest taxed society in the history of mankind, and among the best governed. One can accept the result of 1776, even regard it as having been almost inevitable, without making heroes of those who caused it or as Whig historians demonizing those like Charles Jenkinson who attempted to resist.

Once the Stamp Act had been repealed, it became clear that the Rockingham administration was a weak one, without Royal favour or access to the bountiful flows of Royal patronage, nor, without Pitt, any great support in the country, much of which remained strongly Tory. Thus, in July 1766 the King asked Pitt to form a government, sending him to the Lords as Earl of Chatham. Chatham's government, which was shared with Augustus Fitzroy, third Duke of Grafton,¹⁰⁷ who gradually took over full control owing to Chatham's recurring illness, was a coalition containing ministers of a wide variety of political persuasions, but initially few Tories.

However, in a reshuffle of November 1766, intending to strengthen the administration, even by importing friends of the despised Bute, Jenkinson was once again offered Ministerial office. Alas, as a friend of Bute and former sponsor of the Stamp Act his star was temporarily dimmed, and his relations with Chatham were cool at best. Thus, even though the new Chancellor of the Exchequer Charles Townshend¹⁰⁸ through Grafton asked for him as a Lord of the Treasury he returned merely as one of the Lords of the Admiralty.

Even this however was too much for Grenville, smarting from his ejection of the previous year, who wrote in his diary "Mr Grenville received a letter from Mr Jenkinson, acquainting him that he was going to kiss hands for one of the Lords of the Admiralty, to which Mr Grenville returned no answer, and forbade his porter ever to let him into his house again."¹⁰⁹ As Jenkinson remarked later, Grenville was "a sensible man, but of a dull and obstinate understanding; as obstinate but much less able and less informed than his son."¹¹⁰

Jenkinson's employment as Lord of the Admiralty lasted only a year, yet during it he was able to bring his Treasury experience to bear in working with the First Lord, the great Lord Hawke,¹¹¹ to

¹⁰⁶ House of Commons, January 14, 1766.

¹⁰⁷ Augustus Fitzroy, 1735-1811, 3rd Duke of Grafton from 1757. MP for Boroughbridge and Bury St. Edmunds, 1756-57. Secretary of State for the Northern Department, 1765-66, First Lord of the Treasury, 1766-70, Prime Minister, 1768-70, Lord Privy Seal, 1771-75, 1782-83.

¹⁰⁸ Charles Townshend, 1725-67. MP for Great Yarmouth, Saltash and Harwich, 1747-67. Paymaster of the Forces, 1765-66, Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1766-67. Younger brother of George Townshend and cousin of Thomas Townshend.

¹⁰⁹ Grenville papers Vol. 3. p393

¹¹⁰ Quoted Glenbervie, op. cit. Vol. 1, p 296. The son was William Wyndham Grenville.

¹¹¹ Edward Hawke, first baron Hawke (1705-81) Captain 1734, Rear Admiral 1747, Admiral 1757, Admiral of the Fleet 1768. First Lord of the Admiralty 1766-71. Victor of the battles of Cape Finisterre, 1747 and Quiberon Bay 1759 – the latter a triumph in difficult conditions arguably more important than Trafalgar, allowing the British to keep Canada.

draw up the Navy's first "Plan of Expense" – a coherent budget for expenditures that had previously been lacking in control.¹¹² Regrettably, the next First Lord, the 4th Earl of Sandwich,¹¹³ decided in 1771 that the Plan of Expense gave too much information and hence control to Parliament, but it was to form the basis for the system later imposed by the reforming Comptroller Charles Middleton.¹¹⁴

Jenkinson's other political ambition during these years was to become MP for Oxford University, where his own and his family connections remained considerable. Here however his Whig activities in 1754 and his connection with the current largely Whig ministry were anathema, with one don writing "we are in great danger of becoming a court borough."¹¹⁵ Hence at the general election of 1768 he placed third, with 198 votes against the 296 of the second elected candidate. Fortunately, unlike Oxfordshire, Oxford University was a relatively cheap constituency even in a contested election --and there was always Sir James Lowther's borough of Appleby (Robinson's home), for which Jenkinson had been elected on becoming a Lord of the Admiralty in January 1767.

In September 1767, Charles Townshend died, to be succeeded as Chancellor of the Exchequer by Jenkinson's next friend and patron, Frederick Lord North, like Jenkinson a former nominal Whig who had turned Tory after 1760.¹¹⁶ Thus by the time the Oxford University election was fought, Jenkinson had transferred jobs and become a Lord of the Treasury, where his expertise was more central than at the Admiralty. Lord of the Treasury was a less important job than Senior Secretary, but at £1,200 per annum the money was better.

Jenkinson's disappointment at losing in Oxford may have been tempered by the arrival in Parliament the same year of his younger brother John as MP for Corfe Castle, the family seat of their Bankes cousins. John had received help from Harcourt as a boy in becoming Page to the King, 1748-52 and through either Harcourt or his brother was to hold the Royal Household appointment of Gentleman Usher to Queen Charlotte from 1761 until his death in 1805. He also received some help from Charles in the 1760s in getting promoted to Captain in the Army.

However, by 1768, after 17 years in the Army and no sign of a new war, a seat in Parliament was more interesting. It still didn't help him gain Army promotion, so in 1773 he resigned from the Army to become second Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, appointed by Harcourt who had become Lord Lieutenant of Ireland in 1772 and was to remain there until his death in 1777. John

¹¹² "The command of the Ocean – a naval history of Britain, 1649-1815" N.A.M. Rodger, Norton 2004, pp 369-70.

¹¹³ John Montagu, 4th Earl of Sandwich (1718-92) First Lord of the Admiralty 1748-51, 1763, 1771-82. Secretary of State for the Northern Department 1763-65, 1770-71. Yes, he invented the sandwich.

¹¹⁴ Charles Middleton (1726-1813), 1st Baron Barham from 1805. Captain 1759, Rear Admiral 1787, Admiral 1795 Comptroller of the Navy 1778-1794, Lord of the Admiralty 1794, First Lord of the Admiralty 1805-06. Pittite MP for Rochester, 1784-90. Generally regarded as the main source of the Nelsonian Navy's administrative efficiency. Introduced abolitionists to William Wilberforce as potential sponsor of Slave Trade abolition bill.

¹¹⁵ Namier, Brooke, op. cit.

¹¹⁶ Frederick North (1732-92), Lord North from 1752, 2nd Earl of Guilford from 1790. MP for Banbury, 1754-90. Paymaster of the Forces, 1766-67, Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1767-82, First Lord of the Treasury, 1770-82, Home Secretary, 1783. While North's father's family had been Tories his mother came from the Whig Montagu family, and his stepbrother and close friend William Legge, second Earl of Dartmouth (1731-1801) was a Whig, although he served in North's ministry as Secretary of State for the Colonies 1772-75, resigning over American policy to become Lord Privy Seal 1775-82.

however never settled in Ireland, and in 1775 through Harcourt's favour was appointed joint secretary to the Lord Lieutenant in England, with a salary of £400.

While John was a faithful government and Tory vote for his 12-year parliamentary career, he never rose further and in 1780 he was forced to abandon his Corfe Castle seat to the young Henry Bankes. Still in 1778 he married Fanny (d. 1811), daughter of Rear Admiral John Barker (1706-76), and the four sons and a daughter that resulted from the marriage were presumably a consolation.

With his income substantial and stable, Jenkinson could now afford at the age of almost 40 to marry and start a family. His choice fell on Amelia Watts, the 18-year-old daughter of the deceased East India Company nabob William Watts. Even though Watts had other children, Amelia added substantially to Jenkinson's financial health, but alas, having produced Liverpool in June 1770 she died of the complications of childbirth the following month, at the age of only 19 after a marriage of only 17 months.

Jenkinson at the age of 41 was a rather old father, but not as old as Pitt, who produced a daughter at 46, an heir at 47 and the great William Pitt the younger at 50. Self-made 18th-century political careers, like Pitt's and Jenkinson's, took time to become lucrative.

From now until 1778, under first Grafton and then North, Jenkinson remained within government in a series of comfortably paid posts, partly as a token Tory and partly because George III found him easier to deal with than his prima-donna senior Ministers. His further rise was not hindered by his politics, which fitted well with North's, which although vacillating considerably more than the steady Jenkinson's, averaged out as moderate Tory. North's government after 1770 was another coalition of disparate forces but trended further towards Toryism over the years.

Politically, Jenkinson was a stauncher "Church and King" Tory than North; his staunchness extending to a reverence for the great William Laud, a figure not greatly admired in the Whiggish 18th century, with its veneration for the 1688 Revolution. "Candour must allow that Laud, with all his faults, was a very very great man,"¹¹⁷ he said in a Commons debate on the Thirty-Nine Articles on February 23, 1773. In the same speech, he described the period as "an age of Skepticism; under the notion of Religious Liberty the solemn truths of Religion itself are treated with contempt and sceptical infidelity abounds." Later in the speech he described Rousseau as "an ingenious madman." Jenkinson's reverence for the Church and traditional religion made him despised by Burke and Horace Walpole, and in later years gave him a difficult relationship with the freethinking Pitt.

However, Jenkinson's debating skill remained limited. His speech against Stamp Act repeal in 1766 was described as "ill-heard, from defect of voice." Then in 1770 Thomas Townshend¹¹⁸

¹¹⁷ London Chronicle, February 25-27, 1773, p194.

¹¹⁸ Thomas Townshend, 1733-1800. 1st Baron Sydney from 1783, 1st Viscount Sydney from 1790. MP for Whitchurch, 1754-83. Paymaster of the Forces, 1767-68, Secretary at War, 1782, Home Secretary, 1782-83, Leader of the House of Commons, 1782-83, Home Secretary, 1783-89. President of the Committee on Trade and Foreign

(from a Whig family and at that point a Rockingham Whig though he was later to join Pitt's government as Home Secretary and become Lord Sydney, founder of the eponymous penal settlement) declared him to have a "pompous manner... unbecoming in a gentleman risen from the situation he had done." To which Jenkinson riposted: "My rise is from a family as old as his own... I have risen by industry, by attention to duty, and by every honourable means I could devise."¹¹⁹

Industry, administrative ability and command of the minutiae of policy could largely compensate for Jenkinson's lack of family connections or debating pyrotechnics, but their boost was inevitably steady rather than spectacular. In addition, there was always an awkwardness about Jenkinson's movements, even though he believed himself graceful; much later the King was to tell an anecdote of how Lady Bute had said to him: "For God's sake Mr. Jenkinson, do not make those motions; they make you look like Lord Temple, which I cannot bear to see."¹²⁰ Still, haughty Whigs and subsequently Whig historians underrated the diffident Jenkinson, who as the son of a Guards Colonel and the heir-presumptive to a century-old baronetcy could not plausibly be described as naff.¹²¹

These years also saw Jenkinson quarrel with Lowther, who was moving into opposition to both Grafton and North, making his relationship with Jenkinson tense (and also that with Robinson, like Jenkinson a supporter of North and senior Treasury secretary from 1770). Lowther lost his own seat at Cumberland in 1768 and made demands on Jenkinson's seat at Appleby before settling for Cocker mouth as well as being otherwise difficult – as Jenkinson wrote "I have endeavoured to make him reasonable but in vain."¹²²

Thus, when the opportunity arose in 1772 to switch to the safe Treasury constituency of Harwich, now managed by Robinson, Jenkinson took it. In 1774, when Robinson wanted Harwich, Jenkinson switched to Hastings and in 1780 to Saltash; they were all government constituencies where he was safe so long as he was part of the administration. By the normal arrangement part of his earnings from government posts went to defray the election expenses of these government-controlled constituencies, but it appears that Jenkinson was given discounts.¹²³

Plantations, 1784-86, President of the Board of Control, 1784-90. Cousin of George Townshend and Charles Townshend

¹¹⁹ Oxford DNB. Jenkinson's assertion was not quite true; Sir Roger Townshend MP died in 1500, a generation before Anthony Jenkinson was born. The Townshend peerage (to which Thomas was a first cousin) however dates from 1661, the same year as the Jenkinson baronetcy. Charles' uncle the 4th Baronet had died in 1738, his cousin Sir Robert Jenkinson, 5th Baronet (1720-66) died in 1766; the Jenkinson baronetcy was now held by Sir Robert's younger brother Sir Banks Jenkinson, 6th Baronet (1721-90), who was to die in 1790, leaving the baronetcy to Charles.

¹²⁰ Conversation between George III and Glenbervie, Aug. 20, 1802. Glenbervie, *op. cit.* Vol I p 328.

¹²¹ See for example "The Younger Pitt: the Years of Acclaim", John Ehrman, Constable, 1969, p331 "he managed to give the disastrous impression that he was rather ill bred."

¹²² Namier, Brooke, *op. cit.*

¹²³ "Parliamentary papers of John Robinson, 1774-1784," ed. William T. Laprade, Royal Historical Society, 1922, p 25 North to Robinson, October 6, 1774 "Tell Gascoign that if we can bring in Jenkinson for less than £1,000 we will not require as much of him." The normal payment for a government seat at that election appears to have been £2,000. In 1784 (p 127) Jenkinson is listed as one of the "People who must be brought in at little expense" to support Pitt.

Jenkinson's relationships with both North and the King deepened over the years, so that by the middle 1770s he was a senior adviser to both. Nevertheless, the relative lack of references to him (and complete lack of direct correspondence from him) in George III's papers before 1775 indicates his position was less important than it had been under Bute and Grenville. When Burke alleged in 1771 that Jenkinson was a leading figure in a secret shadow government that was directing the "exterior government" of Lord North he was indulging in Whig paranoia, fuelled by the unexpected emergence of North's stable predominantly Tory government. (Burke also believed in Bute's continuing influence over the King, but as mentioned above, they appear not to have met after 1764.)

North, as well as being a better Parliamentary debater than Jenkinson, shared much of Jenkinson's expertise in economics and financial matters, although events were to prove him to be an unimaginative and vacillating leader when faced with unexpected difficulties. He was also bad at persuading people; Jenkinson wrote "One of his great errors is that he thinks that interest alone without any reasoning is the only motive on which men act."¹²⁴ Nevertheless he not Pitt was the first Prime Minister to read Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" and he granted Smith a Commissioner of Customs post worth £600 per annum in January 1778.¹²⁵

Jenkinson lost his modestly lucrative sinecure as Auditor of Accounts to the Princess Dowager when Princess Augusta died in 1772. However in the following year his gradually rising status was indicated, first by his appointment as Joint Vice-Treasurer of Ireland in January 1773¹²⁶ and then in the following month, by his elevation to the Privy Council, a more politically important body than it is today.¹²⁷ Vice-Treasurer of Ireland was more lucrative than a Lordship of the Treasury and gave him a business relationship with Harcourt, the Lord Lieutenant; it was also the office with which Pitt had begun his ministerial career in 1746.

Jenkinson's first active part in North's policymaking took advantage of his expertise in Indian affairs, as secretary of a secret committee set up by Parliament in December 1772 to report on the finances of the East India Company, which since the 1765 "diwani" had expanded its operating expenses even more than its revenues and was teetering close to bankruptcy. Jenkinson's committee discovered that the Company's liabilities totalled £9,219,114 while its assets in England totalled only £4,784,609; consequently, it was close to insolvency if not bankruptcy.¹²⁸

The government resolved to extend to the Company an additional £1,500,000 for working capital, but to restrict the Company's dividends to 6% until its debts were cleared, while the government would control the Company's major appointments, including a Governor General, to

¹²⁴ Quoted in Eric Robson "Lord North" History Today Vol. 2 issue 8, 1952.

¹²⁵ The Life of Adam Smith", Ian S. Ross, Oxford University Press, 1995 ch. 19. Smith at this time was a Rockingham Whig; he became effectively a Pittite in the late 1780s.

¹²⁶ North wanted the Lord of the Treasury post for the young Charles James Fox (1749-1806) in an attempt to attach him to the government; the attachment of the strongly Whig Fox proved short-lived.

¹²⁷ 32 Privy Councillors were appointed in the decade 1771-80 compared with 224 in the decade 2001-10; the number of Privy Councillors has thus kept pace with population but has greatly outstripped the 16% rise in the number of MPs.

¹²⁸ Alan Valentine "Lord North" University of Oklahoma Press, 1967, Vol I pp 281-290

rule India from Bengal. Against Whig opposition, the government's plan was passed by a strong vote of 131 to 21 on June 29, 1773.

At the same time as his East India success, Jenkinson played a key role in an event with a much less successful outcome (from the British viewpoint): the Boston Tea Party. On January 18, 1773 he and Robinson appear to have penned a Treasury memorandum outlining a plan whereby the East India Company's surplus of tea could be on-sold to the American colonies, attracting the three-penny tea duty but still undercutting the massive supplies of smuggled tea, mostly sourced from Holland.¹²⁹ Sponsored by North, this plan resulted in the Tea Act of 1773.

Assuming the Americans bought this cheaper tea, £900,000 could be raised for the Treasury and the smugglers could be severely knocked back. Unfortunately, while Jenkinson and Robinson contemplated the tea being sold through the regular London auctions and delivered piecemeal to the colonies, the East India Company decided to supply the tea directly in large consignments – producing the massive, politically prominent shipment that the Boston Tea Partiers could destroy on December 16, 1773.

Jenkinson had by this time become a valued advisor to North, evidenced by his participation in the major re-coinage scheme of 1774, described later in his 1805 "A Treatise on the Coins of the Realm: In a letter to the King."¹³⁰ Isaac Newton as Master of the Mint had set the ratio between the weights of gold and silver British coins in 1717, thereby effectively putting Britain on a gold standard (he had intended to create a bimetallic standard, but had set the Mint price of silver too high, making silver uncompetitive with gold). However, Newton had not reformed the coinage itself; the last such operation had been in 1696 under William III. Jenkinson had examined the outstanding coinage, and discovered it was substantially worn, especially the silver coinage, little of which had been produced since Newton's time.

Hence, he wrote to North proposing a full re-coinage of both gold and silver, with the Treasury bearing the cost differential between the bullion value and the nominal value of outstanding coins. He also proposed that gold coinage should cease to be legal tender if its weight was too much diminished. In the event, North ordered the re-coinage of the gold, but not the silver, which continued to depreciate in weight, and was accepted at face value at the Mint only up to £25, larger amounts being accepted only at their bullion value. Thus from 1774, Britain was legally as well as by market price arbitrage on a gold standard rather than a bimetallic standard. Over the period 1774-78, some £17 million of outstanding gold coins were taken in and re-coined, at a cost of some £750,000, excluding the cost which the public bore for gold coins more than 5% light.¹³¹

The next decade of British history, and of Jenkinson's life, were to be dominated by the British conflict with the American colonies. The political instability of the 1760s had exacerbated

¹²⁹ The origins of the Boston Tea Party, and Jenkinson's role therein, are covered in "An Empire on the Edge" Nick Bunker, Knopf, 2014, pp 156-7 for Jenkinson's role.

¹³⁰ "A Treatise on the Coins of the Realm: In a letter to the King" Charles Jenkinson, Earl of Liverpool Oxford University Press, 1805 The book was reprinted in 1880, with an introduction by two Bank of England officials and a dedication to Sir Stafford Northcote, Chancellor of the Exchequer.

¹³¹ Journal of the Institute of Bankers, Vol. 5, December 1884, p582

problems, since the colonists, Whig-oriented especially in Puritan New England, were unsettled by the change from stable Whig governments to a kaleidoscope of governments, most with strong Tory elements. The Stamp Act fiasco, which encouraged the most radical colonists and downhearted loyalists, was only the most egregious example of this.

Had the younger Pitt or Liverpool been in power when political stability was restored after 1766, they might have tried the obvious potential solution, eliminating the "No Taxation without Representation" conundrum by granting the colonies modest representation in Parliament. The principle was there; Wales had been given representation in 1535 and Scotland in 1707, while Ireland had gained representation under the Protectorate and was to enjoy it after 1801. Indeed, Calais had been made a parliamentary constituency in 1372, and had sent MPs to the House of Commons from then until its loss in 1558.

Since nobody was suggesting the colonies should pay full British taxes their representation need not be pro rata to population. Two MPs for each colony, plus two each for the major cities of Boston, New York, Philadelphia and Charleston, for a total of 34, would have been generous for the next couple of generations. It would have added only modestly to net Whig strength in the 558-member House of Commons (Boston and New England in general would have been Whig, even Radical, but there were plenty of Tories down south). A "forty-shilling freeholder" franchise would even have addressed the problem of ex-slave representation, allowing blacks to vote if they owned sufficient property. There would have been logistical difficulties for American MPs in a Parliament across the Atlantic, but those were declining as transportation technology advanced.

It's an interesting counterfactual; in reality Jenkinson was too junior during these years to promote such a possibility (even if he had thought of it) while Grafton and North were both beleaguered and unimaginative. In the real world, conflict became inevitable after the Boston Tea Party, a deliberate provocation by Boston extremists, when North fell into the trap by passing the "Intolerable Acts" the following year. The Boston Port Act and the Massachusetts Government Act were the most intolerable, foolishly punitive against a colony in which the Tea Partiers were as yet nowhere near a majority. However, the Quebec Act, an item of far-sighted statesmanship which granted civil rights to the French Catholics in Quebec, provoked the unpleasant religious bigotry of New Englanders and further exacerbated the colonists' alienation.

As a newly minted Privy Councillor, Jenkinson was present as the junior member at the notorious meeting of 29 January, 1774 at which Alexander Wedderburn,¹³² then Solicitor-General, denounced the American delegate Benjamin Franklin, accusing him (correctly) of having stolen letters from Massachusetts Governor Thomas Hutchinson: "Into what companies will the fabricator of this iniquity hereafter go with an unembarrassed face, or with any semblance of the honest intrepidity of virtue? ... Having hitherto aspired after fame by his writings, he will henceforth esteem it a libel to be called a man of letters."¹³³

¹³² Alexander Wedderburn (1733-1805) 1st Baron Loughborough from 1780, 1st Earl of Rosslyn from 1801. MP for Ayr Burghs, Richmond, Bishop's Castle, 1761-69, 1770-74, 1778-80. Solicitor General, 1771-78, Attorney General, 1778-80, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, 1780-93, Lord Chancellor, 1793-1801.

¹³³ John, Lord Campbell "Lives of the Lord Chancellors, Murray, 1847, Vol. 6 p 108. Thomas Hutchinson (1711-80) is not so far as I know related to me.

The slippery Franklin, who was fired the following day from his position as Deputy Postmaster General of North America, resented Wedderburn's insults, and thereafter ceased to seek reconciliation between Britain and the colonies, becoming a full-fledged supporter of independence and exhibiting "severe resentment" against the unfortunate George III.¹³⁴ As for Wedderburn, he was to cap a career of dishonesty, ill-judgement and intemperance in 1801 by prevailing on George III not to allow Pitt to grant Catholic Emancipation to Ireland as he had half-promised, thus causing Pitt's resignation and contributing to the long-term failure of the Act of Union.

Jenkinson supported North's Intolerable Acts, but played little role in them, and even in May 1775 he was "in great expectation of a favourable turn in America."¹³⁵ His influence was still advisory rather than executive, but was valued highly as evidenced by his transfer in 1775 from the Vice Treasurership of Ireland to the lucrative Irish Treasury administrative office of Clerk of the Pells. This was granted to him for life and worth £2,347 per annum but expected to be more in war years. In this office he replaced Charles Fox,¹³⁶ now alienated from North's administration, and remained until his death in 1808. Whatever his future ministerial career, Jenkinson's finances were now secure.

Jenkinson's influence was now such that on January 5, 1775 Burke wrote to Rockingham: "I have great reason to suspect that Jenkinson governs everything. But it would be right to know this a little more clearly. A trusty person set at his door to follow him in his motions would give great lights. Surely it is so far from mean or trifling that nothing is more worthy of a general than to get good intelligence of the enemy's motions."¹³⁷ But Jenkinson himself laughed it off, writing to Harcourt in 1777: "The world are so obliging as to give me the credit of much more influence than I really have, and when I deny it I have seldom the good fortune to be believed. In the management of public affairs it is true that I sometimes have a share, I am always ready to give any assistance I am able, but I never intrude it, and to say the truth it is never called for but in emergencies when they cannot do without me."¹³⁸

The reality was that Jenkinson had won favour with the King during his period as Bute's private secretary and never lost it. As a "Church and King" Tory Jenkinson's approach to royal power was closer to that of 17th century Tories like Clarendon, Rochester and the Great Tew circle than it was to that of his Whig contemporaries. While George II and (until her death) his wife Queen Caroline had themselves been major political forces alongside Whig ministers, Whig tolerance

¹³⁴ "The Men who Lost America," Andrew Jackson O'Shaughnessey, Yale University Press, 2013, p17, quoting John Adams' autobiography. Franklin's resentment at Wedderburn's insults rankled to the extent of taking the coat he had worn in 1774 to France with him several years later, to wear it when signing the Treaty of Paris that confirmed American independence. ("The Diary and Correspondence of Charles Abbot, Baron Colchester" ed. Charles 2nd Baron Colchester, Murray, 1861, Vol I p 20.) Charles Abbot (1757-1829) 1st Baron Colchester from 1817, Tory MP for Helston, Heytesbury, Woodstock and Oxford University, 1795-1817. FRS, 1793. Chief Secretary for Ireland, 1801-02, Speaker of the House of Commons, 1802-17.

¹³⁵ Valentine, *op. cit.*, Vol.I p348.

¹³⁶ Charles James Fox, 1749-1806. MP for Midhurst, Malmesbury and Westminster, 1768-1806. Foreign Secretary and Leader of the House of Commons, 1782, 1783 and 1806. Second son of Henry Fox, 1st Lord Holland.

¹³⁷ Namier/Brooke, *op. cit.*

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*

for Royal influence was strained to the limit by George III's Tory preferences. The King played an active and at times dominant part in politics in the years to 1784, especially by providing backbone to North and mediating between his bickering Cabinet in the latter years of the American war from 1778 until North's fall. In terms of policy, Jenkinson's straightforward Tory beliefs matched the King's well, especially during the American war and the years immediately following.

As demonstrated in their correspondence, which reached its highest volume in 1778-82, Jenkinson was open to the King, with a fine line in knowledgeable and witty cynicism about other political players, but always signed his letters "From Your Majesty's DutyFull Subject." George III's relations with Bute were distant after 1764, while those with North were tinged with exasperation and those with Pitt with a wary formality. Other Royal favourites like Thurlow¹³⁹ ended by betraying their friendship. The King's relationship with Jenkinson lasted for 40 years, and was cordial throughout, while Jenkinson was in the true sense a "King's Friend," regarding that friendship as his first loyalty.

During Whig administrations such as those of Rockingham in 1765-66 and 1782 (and the 1783 Fox/North coalition, dominated by Fox) Jenkinson lay low and his influence was limited. During the mixed administrations of Grafton, Shelburne (1782-83) and the first few years of Pitt (1783-86) it was considerably greater, even though he held at most insignificant offices. Under North after 1773 it became greater still as North's indolence and indecisiveness became increasing problems, while Jenkinson was both firm and diligent, though he lacked North's command of the House of Commons. Inevitably, as he was consulted more by North, the King and others, his informal power increased, even though he did not join the Cabinet until 1791. From the middle 1770s until his retirement in 1804, Jenkinson was among the half dozen most important political figures in Britain.

On the American question, Jenkinson's advice was a blend of optimism and firmness. To North in 1777 (presumably before Saratoga) he wrote: "Nothing can be done with any prospect of success but to state to the Americans in plain and simple terms, the conditions on which alone you will allow them to reserve a share in their own government, and in the mean time to govern them by the powers vested in the Crown in the best and cheapest manner you can."¹⁴⁰

The North Cabinet was one of the most dysfunctional operations ever to oversee a major war. The Colonial Secretary Lord George Germain¹⁴¹ was given responsibility for military operations, having been a general during the Seven Years War – but a notably unsuccessful one, cashiered after the Battle of Minden for refusing to follow up a cavalry charge. His grasp of tactics was uncertain, his grasp of the vast distances involved in an American war even more so. Sandwich, like Jenkinson an ex-Whig turned Tory, was better as First Lord of the Admiralty, with

¹³⁹ Edward Thurlow (1731-1806), 1st Baron Thurlow from 1778. MP for Tamworth, 1765-78, Solicitor General, 1770-71, Attorney General 1771-78. Lord Chancellor 1778-83, 1783-92.

¹⁴⁰ Valentine, *op. cit.*, Vol. 1 p 422

¹⁴¹ Lord George Germain, 1716-85, 2nd son of 1st Duke of Dorset, 1st Viscount Sackville from 1782, MP (Ireland) for Portarlington, 1733-61, MP for Dover and East Grinstead, 1741-61, 1767-82. Colonel, 1747, Major General, 1755, Lieutenant General, 1758, Court Martial, 1760 for cowardice at Battle of Minden, 1759. Chief Secretary for Ireland, 1750-55, Colonial Secretary, 1775-82.

experience in naval administration dating back to 1748, but was perpetually at odds with Germain.

Senior Whig generals such as Lord Amherst¹⁴² refused to serve against the colonists, while the Whig General William Howe would only serve if his brother Admiral Richard, Lord Howe¹⁴³ was given the naval command and both were allowed to treat for peace with the colonists.

The result was that the campaign of 1776 was not followed up properly because General Howe treated for peace instead of finishing off the remnants of Washington's army after victories at Long Island and White Plains. Then in 1777 Germain sent General John Burgoyne¹⁴⁴ to march from Montreal down towards Albany, under the impression he would meet up with Howe, while Howe himself, who had originally proposed the advance on Albany, was allowed to go haring off in the opposite direction to loop round the Delmarva Peninsula by sea and capture Philadelphia. Burgoyne, a good general for whose appointment Jenkinson was said to have been a catalyst,¹⁴⁵ was thus outnumbered by the colonists' General Horatio Gates and forced to surrender at Saratoga.

Later in the war Whig admirals, notably Augustus, Lord Keppel¹⁴⁶ gave similar trouble. Keppel refused to serve against the Americans, then when given command of the Channel Fleet produced a notably feeble performance at the 1778 Battle of Ushant, after which he and his Tory Vice Admiral Sir Hugh Palliser¹⁴⁷ engaged in mutual courts martial, poisoning relations within the entire Navy. Fortunately, there were more Tory Admirals than Generals, and Rear Admiral Sir Samuel Hood¹⁴⁸ and above all Admiral Sir George Brydges Rodney¹⁴⁹ proved much more satisfactory, together making a reasonable peace possible by their 1782 victory over the French fleet at the Saintes.

¹⁴² Jeffrey Amherst, 1717-97, 1st Baron Amherst, from 1776, Colonel, 1756, Commander in Chief, North America, 1758-63, Captured Louisburg, 1758, Montreal, 1760. Major General, 1760, Lieutenant General, 1765, General, 1778, Commander in chief of the Forces, 1778-82, 1793-95. Field Marshal, 1796.

¹⁴³ Richard Howe, 1726-99, 4th Viscount Howe from 1758, 1st Earl Howe from 1788, MP for Dartmouth, 1757-82, Captain, 1746, Rear Admiral, 1770, Vice Admiral, 1776, Commander in chief, Mediterranean, 1770-74, Commander in chief, North American station, 1776-78, Admiral, 1782, Relieved Gibraltar, 1782, First Lord of the Admiralty, 1783-88, Glorious First of June, 1794, Admiral of the Fleet, 1796-99.

¹⁴⁴ John Burgoyne, 1722-92, MP for Midhurst and Preston, 1761-92. Major General, 1775. Lost Battle of Saratoga, 1777.

¹⁴⁵ O'Shaughnessey op. cit. p 132 Burgoyne was also the only Revolutionary War general who had supported the North government, although he befriended Fox and went into opposition on his return.

¹⁴⁶ Augustus Keppel (1725-86) 1st Viscount Keppel from 1782. MP for Chichester, Windsor and Surrey, 1755-82. Captain, 1744. Rear Admiral, 1762, Vice Admiral, 1770, Admiral, 1778, Commander of Channel Fleet, 1778-9, Battle of Ushant, 1778, First Lord of the Admiralty, 1782-3, 1783.

¹⁴⁷ Hugh Palliser, 1723-96, 1st Baronet from 1773, MP for Scarborough and Huntingdon, 1774-79, 1779-84. Captain, 1746, Governor of Newfoundland, 1764-68, Rear Admiral, 1775, Vice Admiral, 1778. Mutual Courts Martial with Keppel, 1779, Admiral, 1787. Patron of Captain James Cook.

¹⁴⁸ Samuel Hood, 1724-1816, 1st Baronet from 1778, 1st Viscount Hood from 1796. MP for Westminster and Reigate, 1784-96. Captain, 1756, Rear Admiral, 1780, Battle of the Saintes (with Rodney) 1782, Vice Admiral, 1787, Commander in chief, Mediterranean Fleet, 1793-94, Captured Toulon, 1793. Admiral, 1794.

¹⁴⁹ George Brydges Rodney, 1718-92, 1st Baron Rodney from 1782. MP for Saltash, Okehampton, Penryn, Northampton and Westminster, 1751-54, 1759-68, 1769-74, 1780-82. Captain, 1742, Rear Admiral, 1759, Vice Admiral, 1763, Admiral, 1778, Captured St. Eustatius, 1781, Battle of the Saintes, 1782,

North was plunged into depression by Saratoga, news of which reached England in November 1777 and was followed by the opportunistic entry of France and Spain into the war against Britain. From that point he wanted to relinquish office, and on balance was prepared to end the war, even at the cost of American independence. The King was not prepared to relinquish the American colonies but could find nobody but the bullyable North, with the unpopular Germain and Sandwich, to head a government committed to the war. After Saratoga most of the Rockingham Whigs were prepared to accept American independence while the aged Chatham, who wasn't, collapsed on the floor of the House of Lords in April 1778, even as North was preparing to hand over the government to him.

During this period North's government thus became even more dysfunctional, with the prime minister itching to resign while Germain and Sandwich were at loggerheads both with each other and with Parliament. In addition, Thurlow, Lord Chancellor from 1778, Wedderburn, Attorney General from 1778 and Lord Chief Justice with the title of Lord Loughborough from 1780 and William Eden¹⁵⁰ later Lord Auckland, Chief Secretary for Ireland from 1780, were all incorrigible schemers, prepared to break up the government without scruple if it advanced their position.

Thurlow and Wedderburn were to demonstrate their political flexibility by holding the Lord Chancellorship under Whigs -- Thurlow under Rockingham and Shelburne and Wedderburn under the Fox/North coalition (as leader of a commission) -- before succeeding each other as Lord Chancellors covering the whole of Pitt's first administration. Jenkinson disliked Wedderburn and Eden but was on tolerable terms with Thurlow, describing him to the King (who liked him) as "a more respectable character than the Others."¹⁵¹

Following Saratoga, as the King's role became central and indeed primary for the remainder of the war, Jenkinson's role also became critical, in providing both encouragement to both the King and the feeble North and administrative competence to make up for the senior ministers' lack thereof. In December 1778 his role was at last recognized by appointment as Secretary at War, responsible for military administration but still outside the Cabinet.

Indeed, both then and in February 1779 North recommended Jenkinson to the King as Chancellor of the Exchequer, replacing himself and on the latter occasion saying Jenkinson was "without exception, by much the fittest person in England to have the direction of the finances of this country."¹⁵² However the coalition projects that prompted North's proposal both came to nothing as the opposition would not serve with him. Also, in an interesting sidelight on the structure of 18th-century Cabinets, North indicated he would serve as First Lord of the Treasury without the Chancellorship for only one session, because after that time he would become "a cipher at his Board."

¹⁵⁰ William Eden (1745-1814), 1st Baron Auckland from 1793. MP for Woodstock and Heytesbury, 1774-93. Chief Secretary for Ireland, 1780-82, Ambassador to Spain, 1787-89, Ambassador to the Netherlands, 1789-90, Postmaster General, 1798-1804, President of the Board of Trade, 1806-07.

¹⁵¹ Correspondence of George III, op. cit. Vol. 4 p 460

¹⁵² Correspondence of George III, op. cit. Vol. 4, p 264.

Once France and Spain had entered the war (with Holland joining them in 1780) Britain's military situation was more desperate than it ever became during the Napoleonic Wars. The government was divided, and its feebleness made finance more difficult than in either the preceding Seven Years War or the Napoleonic wars that followed, when first Pitt and later Addington, Perceval and Liverpool kept the markets relatively calm by their command of government financing.

In addition, the military situation in 1779 and 1780 was truly perilous, with the Army fully committed in America and the Navy split between two functions: supporting an Army in hostile terrain and holding off the French and Spanish fleets. In retrospect, it is surprising the war went as well as it did. Certainly, the determination after Yorktown to abandon the attempt to retain the colonies was inevitable and allowed Britain to emerge with a reasonable peace, since it enabled the late Naval victories of the Saintes and Gibraltar (the latter by Admiral Howe after a Whig government had been formed under Rockingham).

Jenkinson's main task as Secretary at War was the complex one of military administration, at which he excelled through working harder than most contemporaries. His close relationship with the King was a great advantage, since the disgruntled Generals with whom he corresponded knew that he accurately represented the views of their nominal Commander-in-Chief. For example, a 1779 correspondence with Burgoyne included the stern reprimand from Jenkinson "His Majesty considers your letter to me as proof of your determination to persist in not obeying his orders."¹⁵³

Since the Secretary at War ran the War Office, but was not concerned with military strategy, it is natural to assume he was responsible for logistics for the 92,000 troops and attached civilian personnel (in 1780) serving in America, Canada and the West Indies. 18th century administrative arrangements being what they were, this was not the case.¹⁵⁴ While medical supplies, uniforms and camp equipment were supplied by the War Office, food and finance were the responsibility of the Treasury, reporting ultimately to Lord North, but more directly to the Secretaries of the Treasury, Grey Cooper¹⁵⁵ and Jenkinson's friend John Robinson.

Arms, ammunition, artillery and engineering were the responsibility of the Board of Ordnance, which reported to the Master-General of the Ordnance, George, 4th Viscount and 1st Marquess Townshend.¹⁵⁶ Finally, the Navy Board was responsible for transporting supplies to the various war theatres. With Germain responsible for military strategy and also taking an interest, the chain of responsibility for logistics was a mess.

¹⁵³ Annual Register, 1779, p308

¹⁵⁴ For the Army's wartime logistics problems, I am indebted to "Logistics and the failure of the British Army in America, 1775-1783," R. Arthur Bowler, Princeton University Press, 1975.

¹⁵⁵ Grey Cooper (1726-1801) MP for Rochester, Grampond, Saltash and Richmond, 1765-84, 1786-90. Secretary to the Treasury, 1765-82.

¹⁵⁶ George Townshend 1724-1807, 4th Viscount Townshend from 1764, 1st Marquess Townshend from 1787. MP for Norfolk, 1747-64. Colonel, 1758, Took command of the surrender of Quebec after Wolfe's death, 1759. Major General, 1761, Lieutenant General, 1770, General, 1782, Field Marshal, 1796. Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1767-72, Master General of the Ordnance, 1772-82, 1783-84. Elder brother of Charles Townshend and cousin of Thomas Townshend, Lord Sydney.

In the early years of the war, provisions had been bad, and shipping had been highly subject to American commerce raids, explaining much of the British Army's ineffectiveness during these years, when their numerical advantage was greatest (the problem wasn't just Howe's Whiggery). However, from the end of 1778, when Jenkinson at the War Office joined the effective Robinson at the Treasury, with whom his communication was excellent (for example ensuring that the Treasury knew how many men it had to feed in America, a problem earlier in the war) supply efficiency improved.

One change made in 1779 was to have supplies inspected by the Navy Board, who with a worldwide Navy and the effective Middleton as Controller had more expertise in spotting supply scams. Nevertheless, even after this time, French naval operations in the Channel could delay food convoys, for example in 1780, when a convoy expected in July/August did not arrive till November 13, preventing a possible combined operation with Admiral Rodney, whose fleet spent the 1780 hurricane season in North American waters to avoid West Indian hurricanes. However, provisioning for 1781 proceeded smoothly, and logistics bore no responsibility for Cornwallis¹⁵⁷ disaster at Yorktown. Much of this improvement was due to better communications, which Jenkinson was continually attempting to tighten, writing to Clinton in 1779 that he was unable to give "His Majesty and Parliament that accurate information respecting the troops in America which is from time to time expected and required from me."¹⁵⁸

In addition to his War Office duties, Jenkinson provided psychological uplift to both North and the King since he remained among the firmest supporters of the American war – Horace Walpole believed him to be "the most trusted man in all England by the King" and "in concert with Lord Mansfield, the suggester of all arbitrary measures."¹⁵⁹ The alignment with William Murray, first Earl of Mansfield¹⁶⁰ is an apposite one; Mansfield, since 1756 Lord Chief Justice, was like Jenkinson an ex-Whig Tory whose 1772 Somersett decision making slavery illegal in England and Wales took the opposite position on escaped slaves to the U.S. 1857 Dred Scott decision, and thereby set Britain on the road to slave emancipation.

Finally, Jenkinson gave advice to both North and the King on the various possible Ministerial reshuffles – it was of course this last function that made him both powerful and disliked by the opposition. For example, as early as February 1779 he wrote to the King "I am persuaded that the three different Heads of Opposition are jealous of each other, and each contending to be treated with in preference to the other, and that the Resistance and Spirit which Your Majesty has shewn will bring them at last to your own Terms."¹⁶¹ He was straightforward in a later letter about the bickering Cabinet "It is evident also from hence what a spirit of Intrigue and Negociation

¹⁵⁷ Charles Cornwallis, 1st Marquis Cornwallis, KG (1738-1805). MP for Eye 1760-62, Earl Cornwallis from 1762, Lieutenant General, 1777, commanding forces in North America. Surrendered at Yorktown, October 19, 1781. Governor-General of India 1786-93, 1805. Marquess, 1792. Master of the Ordnance, 1794-98; Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1798-1801. Minister Plenipotentiary to France, 1801-02.

¹⁵⁸ Letter to Gen. Clinton, April 5, 1779, quoted Bowler, op. cit. p247

¹⁵⁹ Valentine, op.cit., Vol. 2 p 73

¹⁶⁰ William Murray (1705-93) 1st Baron Mansfield from 1756, 1st Earl of Mansfield from 1776. MP for Boroughbridge, 1742-56. Solicitor General, 1742-54, Attorney General, 1754-56, Lord Chief Justice, 1756-88.

¹⁶¹ Correspondence of George III, op. cit. Vol 4 p 281, February 14, 1779.

prevails among the Inferiour Instruments of Your Majesty's Government, which tends in fact more to disturb than to settle it, which is the Object they pretend to have in View."¹⁶²

Jenkinson was no mere civil servant; for one thing helping the King thwart the schemes of Thurlow and Wedderburn was an important part of his function, as was reporting to the King on his senior colleagues' backbone or lack thereof: "I think it right to apprise Your Majesty that Lord North held yesterday in the House of Commons much firmer language with respect to America than I have known him, and Lord G. Germaine spoke with much spirit and more like a Minister than usual, so that the Cause of Government wore a better face than it has done for some time."¹⁶³

The second half of 1779 and the first half of 1780 was an especially difficult period¹⁶⁴ – for one thing, a huge Franco-Spanish fleet spent the months of September and October 1779 cruising up and down the Channel threatening invasion, without much interference from the British fleet under the feeble Sir Charles Hardy.¹⁶⁵ The King in October 1779 sent Jenkinson his proposed terms for a deal with the Opposition, for Jenkinson's critique. Jenkinson responded: "it is right to be prepared --- owing to the strange conduct of some of Your Majesty's present Servants and the Hatreds and Dissensions that subsist between Part of Them."¹⁶⁶ Lengthy negotiations followed, mostly with Thurlow as intermediary, at Jenkinson's advice, but no new administration resulted, because the Rockingham Whigs wanted American independence, and the independent Whigs such as Grafton, Shelburne¹⁶⁷ and Charles Pratt, Lord Camden¹⁶⁸ would not enter a coalition without the Rockinghams.

At the start of 1780 Jenkinson advised the King on the settlement of Ireland, which had become highly disaffected under the feeble Lord Lieutenancy of John Hobart, 2nd Earl of Buckinghamshire,¹⁶⁹ who had succeeded after Harcourt's death in January 1777. Jenkinson drafted new regulations to allow free trade in Irish goods after Irish opposition had threatened to break out into open rebellion. Then Jenkinson proposed that Buckinghamshire be removed and replaced by a Commission, on which the friendlier of the Irish landowners could serve, thus granting Ireland partial self-government without abandoning the principle that British Acts of Parliament were binding on the country. In the event, North sent the young Frederick Howard,

¹⁶² Correspondence of George III, op. cit. Vol. 4 p 286, February 21, 1779

¹⁶³ Correspondence of George III, op. cit. Vol. 4 p 354, June 12, 1779

¹⁶⁴ This period is covered in detail in "George III, Lord North and the People" Sir Herbert Butterfield, G. Bell, 1949.

¹⁶⁵ Charles Hardy (1714-80). Knighted 1755. MP for Rochester and Plymouth, 1764-68, 1771-80. Captain, 1741, Rear Admiral 1756, Governor of New York, 1755-57, Admiral 1770. Commander of the Channel Fleet, 1779-80. Good Tory, but past his best as an Admiral in 1779-80.

¹⁶⁶ Correspondence of George III, op. cit. Vol. 4 pp 457 and 460, October 16, 1779

¹⁶⁷ William Petty-Fitzmaurice (1737-1805), 2nd Earl of Shelburne from 1761, 1st Marquess of Lansdowne from 1784, MP for Wycombe, 1760-61, MP(Ireland) for Kerry, 1761-62, Secretary of State for the Southern Department, 1766-68, Home Secretary, 1782, Prime Minister, 1782-83.

¹⁶⁸ Charles Pratt (1714-94), 1st Baron Camden from 1765, 1st Earl Camden from 1786, MP for Downton, 1757-61, Attorney General, 1757-62, Chief Justice of the Common Pleas, 1762-66, Lord Chancellor, 1766-70, Lord President of the Council, 1782-83, 1784-94.

¹⁶⁹ John Hobart (1723-93), 2nd Earl of Buckinghamshire from 1756, MP for Norwich, 1747-56, Ambassador to Russia, 1762-64, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1776-80.

5th Earl of Carlisle¹⁷⁰ who was able to quieten Irish agitation by allowing greater autonomy and setting up an Irish central bank.

The first half of 1780 was also notable for the beginnings of the Whig movement for Economical Reform, an idea originated by Edmund Burke and supported by a vast petitioning movement originating with the Yorkshire Association. The Yorkshire Association's activities led to the Parliamentary Reform movement of the early 1780s, which was to be supported by the young Pitt. In Parliament, they led to John Dunning's¹⁷¹ famous Parliamentary resolution of April 6, 1780 that the influence of the Crown "has increased, is increasing and ought to be diminished," which was carried against the government by 233 votes to 215. Jenkinson was active in organizing modest opposition in Yorkshire to the Yorkshire Association, as well as stirring up an exceptionally large turnout of normally inactive Government supporters to defeat by 254 votes to 203 Dunning's follow-up motion of April 24, preventing the prorogation of Parliament until Crown influence had been reduced.

On June 2, 1780 the Gordon Riots broke out, in which the half-mad Lord George Gordon¹⁷² stirred up the London mob against a supposed Catholic takeover. After an initial crowd of 50,000 petitioned against additional rights being given to Catholics, the mob raged out of control, smashing Catholic chapels, the Bank of England, Newgate Prison and the houses of particularly unpopular Ministers, including Mansfield. The Lord Mayor failed to read the Riot Act, but Jenkinson was quick to take precautions, telling the Guards at the Tower to hold themselves in readiness on June 5 and on the same day sending a special messenger to order a regiment of Dragoons to undertake a forced march from Canterbury to London.¹⁷³

In a letter on June 6 to the Northern Secretary of State, Lord Stormont,¹⁷⁴ who was acting as leader of the government in North's absence, Jenkinson criticized the Lord Mayor's dilatory behaviour: "It is the duty of the troops, my Lord, to act only under the authority and by direction of the Civil Magistrate... If, therefore, the Civil Magistrate, after having called upon them, is not ready to attend them, or abandons them before they return to their Quarters, or after they arrive at the places to which they have been ordered, he refuses to act, I leave it to your Lordship to judge in how defenceless and how disgraceful a situation the Military are left, and how much such a conduct as this tends even to encourage riots, and to bring matters to the last fatal extremity; and how much the Public Service as well as the Troops must suffer by it."¹⁷⁵

However, when on June 7 the Army was finally called out in force, following a Royal proclamation at a Privy Council meeting, it arrived in London the same day owing to Jenkinson's

¹⁷⁰ Frederick Howard (1748-1825), 5th Earl of Carlisle from 1758, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1780-82, Lord Privy Seal, 1783.

¹⁷¹ John Dunning (1731-83) 1st Baron Ashburton from 1782. Shelburneite-Whig MP for Calne, 1768-82. Solicitor General, 1768-70. Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, 1782-83. Married a sister of Sir Francis Baring.

¹⁷² Lord George Gordon (1751-93) MP for Ludgershall, 1774-80. Inspired and led anti-Catholic Gordon Riots of 1780.

¹⁷³ English Historical Documents Vol X., 1714-1783, ed D.B. Horn and Mary Ransome, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1969 p 278

¹⁷⁴ David Murray, (1727-96) 2nd Earl of Mansfield from 1793, known as Viscount Stormont, 1748-93, Secretary of State for the Northern Department, 1779-82, Lord President of the Council 1783, 1794-96.

¹⁷⁵ English Historical Documents Vol X., 1714-1783, pp 278-9.

prior preparations. The riots were then suppressed, albeit with over 250 deaths, with Gordon being captured on June 9.

The 1780 election took place shortly after the Gordon Riots had made the electorate nervous of radicalism and unrest and after the capture of Charleston had raised optimism about the war. Thus, with the opposition somewhat discredited and the government revived, the election saw few losses for North, albeit with massive electoral management by Robinson. It also saw a popular triumph by Rodney, who headed Fox by a substantial margin in the closely contested election at Westminster, where radicalism had been rife six months earlier (and unrest had flourished three months earlier). The government's election victory reflected continued strong majority popular support for its policy of quelling the American colonists, which did not at this stage seem entirely unrealistic.

A 1779 plan of action in George III's papers proposed that forces be concentrated on the middle colonies of New York, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, with a view to advancing slowly from the coast and suppressing opposition there without ever abandoning positions as Howe had done in Philadelphia (which betrayed local loyalists to rebel vengeance). After that was done the thinly populated South could be mopped up at leisure and the trade-dependent New England starved out through naval blockade.¹⁷⁶ The plan was probably too optimistic about loyalist strength in the middle colonies, but it offered a better chance of success than that adopted, which brought cheering but strategically irrelevant victories in the South, followed by disaster when Cornwallis' depleted remnants advanced into Virginia towards the main Continental Army.

No political realignment was possible after the election, because the opposition wanted peace at any price, even recognizing American independence, while the King and the government remained firm, with Jenkinson writing during the election campaign "I am fully sensible of the exhausted State of this Country, but if we cannot make Peace, we must continue to support the War, whatever the Burden may be. I wish for peace as much as any man and would give my vote for obtaining it on any reasonable or honourable conditions whatever."¹⁷⁷ To Jenkinson, American independence was neither reasonable nor honourable.

After the news of Yorktown arrived in November 1781 Germain naturally enough wanted to retire and both North and the King wanted Jenkinson to succeed him, but Jenkinson, seeing clearly enough by this stage that America was lost, declined the position, stating that "the Lord Advocate (Dundas)¹⁷⁸ is certainly fitter to deal with Lord North's indecisive manner than I am, who should in such a situation probably quarrel with him in a very short time, and thereby disturb Your Majesty's affairs."¹⁷⁹ He also advised the King not to let any major decision be taken with a single Cabinet minister, but be sure it was brought before the whole Cabinet – a sad commentary on the dissension within North's government. In the event, Dundas also turned

¹⁷⁶ Correspondence of George III, op. cit. Vol. 4 pp 542-549

¹⁷⁷ Letter to Philip Yorke, 2nd Earl of Hardwicke, a Rockingham Whig, October 9, 1780, quoted Valentine op. cit. Vol. 2 p 235.

¹⁷⁸ Henry Dundas (1741-1811) 1st Viscount Melville from 1802. Lord Advocate of Scotland 1775-83, Home Secretary 1791-94, Secretary for War and Colonies 1794-1801, First Lord of the Admiralty 1804-05.

¹⁷⁹ Correspondence of George III op. cit. Vol. 5 p338, January 22, 1782.

down the poisoned chalice, and it was given to the reliable elderly North supporter Welbore Ellis.¹⁸⁰

After it became obvious that North could no longer command a majority in the House of Commons, Jenkinson played an important role in the final attempts to create a new mixed ministry, still committed to the American war. However, after about a month of negotiations it became clear that this was impossible, and a Whig coalition between Rockingham and Shelburne was formed on a peace platform on March 27, 1782. George III seriously considered abdicating, and even drafted an abdication statement, but in the event he quickly found Shelburne at least surprisingly tolerable to work with.¹⁸¹

These years saw Jenkinson finally establish a private life. In 1780¹⁸² he took a long lease on Addiscombe Place, near Croydon in Surrey, a substantial country house built by the diarist John Evelyn's son-in-law William Draper around 1702. Evelyn's verdict on it: "the outside, to the coveing, being such excellent brickwork, bas'd with Portland Stone, with the pilasters, windows and within, that I pronounced it in all the points of good and solid architecture to be one of the very best gentleman's houses in Surrey, when finish'd."¹⁸³

Jenkinson lived in the house until his death in 1808; it was thus Liverpool's home for the latter part of his boyhood and early manhood. It brought Jenkinson some criticism; after the Window Tax was increased in 1784 he boarded up several of Addiscombe's windows, being pilloried by caricaturists for doing so.¹⁸⁴ Being only ten miles from Westminster the house was useful for political entertaining, of which Jenkinson did a lot; his long-term private secretary estimated in 1802 that Jenkinson's expenses had risen from around £5,000 early in the mid-1780s to £8,000 in 1802 even though his "mode of living" had rather diminished -- evidence of the virulent inflation in the early war years.¹⁸⁵

Indeed, the history of the military academy based in the house from 1809 to 1861 tells the story of a convivial dinner probably in 1785 with Pitt, who afterwards rode home (whether to Downing Street or to his house in Putney is not clear) and was shot at by a farmer in Wandsworth. This was commemorated in the 1784-5 Whig satire 'The Rolliad':

"Ah! Think what danger on debauch attends.
Let Pitt, once drunk, preach temp'rance to his friends
How, as he wandered darkling o'er the plain,
His reason drown'd in Jenkinson's champagne,

¹⁸⁰ Welbore Ellis (1713-1802) 1st Baron Mendip from 1794. MP for Cricklade, Weymouth and Melcombe Regis, Aylesbury and Petersfield, 1741-90, 1791-95. Secretary at War, 1762-65, Treasurer of the Navy, 1777-82, Secretary of State for the Colonies, 1782.

¹⁸¹ Shelburne adopted Jenkinson's "I remain Your Majesty's Most Duty Full Subject" salutation and variations thereof on his letters; nobody else appears to have done this and it may have been significant in his quick access to Royal favour.

¹⁸² Jenkinson's first letter to the King from Addiscombe is dated April 14, 1780. Correspondence of George III, op. cit. Vol. 5 p43

¹⁸³ Memoirs of John Evelyn Esq. FRS, ed W. Bray, Henry Colburn, 1827, Vol. 3, p400-1, July 11, 1703.

¹⁸⁴ See for example "The Shop Tax, Alexander Mackenzie, 1786. British Museum Collection.

¹⁸⁵ Glenbervie, op. cit. Vol. 1 p285.

A rustic's hand, but righteous fate withstood,
Had shed a Premier's for a robber's blood"¹⁸⁶

Jenkinson also expanded his private life during these years, marrying again on June 22, 1782, shortly after he had been relieved of official duties following the pressured last months of North's administration. His bride Catherine Bishopp Cope (1744-1827) was the widow of Sir Charles Cope, 2nd Baronet (1743-81), the grandson of Jenkinson's uncle and early patron Sir Jonathan Cope, with two daughters Catherine and Arabella by that marriage.

Catherine had been the youngest of the exceptionally beautiful daughters of Sir Cecil Bishopp, 6th Baronet (1700-78), from a Sussex Tory family, who had been MP for Penryn for 1727-34, had stood against Henry Pelham for Sussex in 1734 and was MP for Boroughbridge under Newcastle's recommendation from 1755-68. Bishopp broke with Newcastle in 1762, supported Bute and Grenville and opposed Rockingham, so his politics had aligned with Jenkinson's. Bishopp had married a sister of the famous Admiral Edward Boscawen, 1st Viscount Boscawen, giving Jenkinson another House of Lords connection.

Jenkinson's new wife was 15 years younger than her husband, but at 38 six years older than his first wife would have been. However, she bore him two children. Her daughter Charlotte Jenkinson (1783-1863) married in 1807 James Grimston (1775-1845), who succeeded his father as second Baron Verulam and a distant cousin as tenth Scottish Lord Forrester in 1808. Her second child was a son Charles Cecil Cope Jenkinson (1784-1851), Liverpool's half-brother, who eventually succeeded him as 3rd Earl of Liverpool.

The Rockingham/Shelburne coalition looked to be a stable albeit quarrelsome one, with strong Commons support, but the political world was turned upside down by Rockingham's sudden death on July 1, 1782. Six days later 150 supporters met at the house of Rockingham's nephew William, 4th Earl Fitzwilliam¹⁸⁷ and decided to withdraw support from the government, now led by Shelburne. Shelburne then formed a new administration, giving William Pitt¹⁸⁸ the younger his first big job as Chancellor of the Exchequer. Jenkinson did not join this administration though Shelburne had previously expressed enthusiasm for bringing him into the government,¹⁸⁹ but after checking with the King he gave it strong support in the Commons.

Royal optimism about the duration of Shelburne's government proved ill-founded. While with the King's support it could rely on the full support of the "King's Friends" like Jenkinson and thus a substantial number of Tories, it proved unable to rely on the support of North, who moved into opposition, and it faced opposition from most of the Whigs, now led by Fox. Accordingly, when the Peace Preliminaries negotiated by Shelburne and signed on January 17, 1783 were brought before the Commons, they were defeated by 207-190. The King was then faced with the

¹⁸⁶ "Addiscombe, its Heroes and Men of Note" Col. Henry M. Vibart, Constable, 1894 pp 9,15 quoting Rolliad, 1784-85.

¹⁸⁷ William Wentworth-Fitzwilliam (1748-1833) 4th Earl Fitzwilliam from 1756. Whig grandee. Nephew and heir of the 2nd Marquess of Rockingham, who d. 1782. Lord President of the Council, 1794, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1794-95, 1806, Minister without Portfolio, 1806-07. Lord Lieutenant of the West Riding of Yorkshire, 1798-1819

¹⁸⁸ William Pitt (1769-1806) MP for Appleby and Cambridge University, 1781-1806. Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1782-83, Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer, 1783-1801, 1804-06.

¹⁸⁹ Correspondence of George III, op. cit. Vol. 6 p 69, June 30, 1782.

hitherto unthinkable possibility of a Fox/North coalition, whose policy would be dictated by the much stronger Fox, while North provided voting fodder from the country gentlemen who remained loyal to him. (It must be remembered that Parliament was still that elected on a platform of loyalty to North's government in 1780.)

As for American independence, Jenkinson doubtless shared the view of the King, expressed when the draft peace terms arrived in England in November 1782: "Knavery seems to be so much the striking feature of its Inhabitants that it may not in the end be an evil that they become Aliens to this Kingdom."¹⁹⁰

Jenkinson was active in advising the King on alternatives to the Fox/North coalition, but again to no avail. Pitt, sounded on his willingness to serve as Prime Minister, turned down the office on the grounds he could not command a majority, while North refused to serve except with the Foxites. Gower,¹⁹¹ after attempting to recruit Pitt's older cousin Thomas Pitt¹⁹² as Home Secretary, was also forced to turn down the offer of the Premiership, in a ministry that would have included Jenkinson and Dundas. After more than a month of negotiations, with the King attempting every possible combination that would reduce the power of the Fox/North duo, the new administration was formed under the moderate Whig 3rd Duke of Portland on April 2.

The Fox/North coalition was a rickety affair, with many of the most capable political figures in opposition. Consequently, at the beginning of the new session Fox approached Pitt to join the new coalition, which Pitt declined.¹⁹³ However this indicated the ministry's weakness. Throughout the remainder of the 1783 session Pitt, Dundas and Jenkinson were active in their opposition to the administration; it was at this period that the decades-long relationship between the three was formed. Then in the autumn of 1783 a test case arose with Fox's India Bill altering the constitution of the East India Company and putting its management in the hands of seven commissioners to be nominated by the ministry. Giving Fox and North such powers was thought to lead to endless possibilities of corruption.

Jenkinson was one of Parliament's leading experts on Indian affairs, with experience dating back to 1764; he had also been a member together with Dundas of a secret committee set up by the Commons in 1781 to examine the causes of a major revolt in the Carnatic. Thus, Jenkinson and the wealthy East India Company Director Richard Atkinson¹⁹⁴ were the proponents of a plan to defeat Fox's Bill in the House of Lords and persuade Pitt to take over the government with Royal assistance. Jenkinson acted as information conduit to the King, assuring Robinson that "You may be assured that the King sees in the bill all the horrors that you and I do"¹⁹⁵ while Robinson, the

¹⁹⁰ Correspondence of George III, op. cit. Vol. 6 p 154, November 10, 1782; King to Shelburne.

¹⁹¹ Granville Leveson-Gower, 2nd Earl Gower (1721-1803) created 1st Marquess of Stafford, 1786. Lord Privy Seal, 1755-57, 1784-94; Lord President of the Council 1767-79, 1783-84.

¹⁹² Thomas Pitt (1737-93). 1st Baron Camelford from 1784. MP for Old Sarum and Okehampton, 1761-84. Independent, but more Tory than his cousin or his uncle.

¹⁹³ Correspondence of George III, op. cit. Vol. 6 p 466, November 15, 1783 Lord Temple to the King

¹⁹⁴ Richard Atkinson, 1738-85 MP for New Romney, 1784-84; died worth £300,000. The plan's germination is outlined in Robinson papers, op. cit. p xiii.

¹⁹⁵ Namier/Brooke, op. cit.

most astute electoral manager of his time, persuaded Pitt that he could hold his own in the House of Commons and win a subsequent election.¹⁹⁶

In consequence, after Temple¹⁹⁷ had told wavering peers from the King that "whoever voted for the India Bill was not only not his friend, but would be considered by him as an enemy" the India Bill was defeated in the House of Lords on December 17, 1783 by 95 votes to 76 and Portland resigned the following day.

Having been instrumental in its formation, Jenkinson expected office in Pitt's government, writing to Robinson in late December "I have not heard a word from Mr Pitt ... he has not even paid me this small mark of attention." To which Robinson responded "Fears and doubts make difficulties to your having office at this moment"¹⁹⁸ but on the other hand "Mr Pitt intends to write to you a very strong letter, expressing his opinion of you, his wish to show you every attention, ... and giving you assurances of his regard."¹⁹⁹ In fact, the reasons for Pitt's hesitancy are clear. He still thought of himself as a Whig, with appropriate Whig attitudes such as a hankering for parliamentary reform, a deep distrust of Royal power and a wish to avoid Tory dominance of his ministry. It didn't help that Pitt's revered father had strongly disliked Jenkinson.

The opposition Whigs however saw Jenkinson as the immensely powerful puppet-master behind their expulsion from office -- Pitt's subsequent smashing election victory, with Robinson's help, in March 1784 was held to be due to Royal influence rather than to the continued strength of Toryism and dislike of Foxite Whiggery in the country as a whole. The Whigs retreated into satire, but their "Rolliad" of 1784-85 made it quite clear that "Mr. Jenkinson [is] confessedly greater than Mr. Atkinson, or any other man, except One, in the kingdom"²⁰⁰ Indeed, Jenkinson is the major character in the lengthy satire, other than Pitt himself, for example:

PITT.

In early youth misled by Honour's rules,
That fancied Deity of dreaming fools;
I simply thought, forgive the rash mistake,
That Kings should govern for their People's sake:
But Reverend JENKY soon these thoughts supprest,
And drove the glittering phantom from my breast;
JENKY! that sage, whom mighty George declares,
Next SCHWELLENBURGEN, great on the back stairs:
'Twas JENKINSON—ye Deacons, catch the sound!
Ye Treasury scribes, the sacred name rebound!
Ye pages, sing it—echo it, ye Peers!

¹⁹⁶ Robinson papers, op. cit. p xiv-xv. Robinson predicted 149 certain votes plus 116 hopeful before a dissolution, with 231 against and 74 doubtful. After a dissolution he predicted 253 pro plus 116 hopeful in a new Parliament versus 123 plus 66 doubtful for the opposition – in both cases remarkably close to the actual results.

¹⁹⁷ George Nugent Temple-Grenville, from 1779 3rd Earl Temple and from 1784 first Marquis of Buckingham (1753-1813). Son of Jenkinson's old boss George Grenville, nephew of the 2nd Earl Temple and elder brother of William Wyndham Grenville. Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, 1782-83 and 1787-89.

¹⁹⁸ Oxford Dictionary of National Biography.

¹⁹⁹ Namier/Brooke, op. cit.

²⁰⁰ Rolliad VIII p68 It's not now clear whether the One is Pitt or the King; probably the latter is my guess.

And ye who best repeat, Right Reverend Seers!
Whose pious tongues no wavering fancies sway,
But like the needle ever point one way.²⁰¹

During his years out of power from 1782-6, as well as revolutionising his personal life, Jenkinson completed his second major policy tome: "A collection of all the Treaties of Peace, Alliance and Commerce between Great Britain and Other Powers from the Treaty signed at Munster in 1648 to the Treaties signed at Paris in 1783" which was published by Debrett²⁰² in three volumes in 1785. Jenkinson included his previous "Discourse on the conduct of Great Britain with respect to Neutral Nations" in this compilation, thus ensuring considerable additional attention for a treatise written before he had become well-known. The collection continued to be cited into the 20th century, and was another strong indication to contemporaries of Jenkinson's powers of industry and scholarship (for 21st Century readers: yes I KNOW that today he could have copied the whole thing off Wikipedia, but you couldn't do that in 1785)!

We think of Pitt as a Tory prime minister running a government with an unparalleled collection of talent, mostly his protégés -- Grenville, Canning, Castlereagh, Eldon, Perceval,²⁰³ Addington,²⁰⁴ Liverpool and the non-Cabinet Wilberforce²⁰⁵ – but also including substantial ex-Whig and other talent attracted to his abilities – Portland, Windham,²⁰⁶ Spencer,²⁰⁷ Cornwallis, Camden, Dundas, Gower. However, for his early years neither memory is correct.

First, Pitt initially remained a Whig; his 1785 attempt at Parliamentary Reform and his 1788-95 attempt to impeach the former Governor-General of Bengal Warren Hastings were supported by leftist Whigs like Fox and Burke (who only converted after the French Revolution) and were thoroughly Whig acts in the Rockingham tradition.

Jenkinson opposed parliamentary reform; during the reform agitation of 1784 he remarked "I am afraid of some Convulsion and of something near a Change in the Constitution."²⁰⁸ However on the Hastings impeachment Jenkinson voted with Pitt in the crucial Benares division of June 13, 1786; one of his protégés of the 1770s, the judge Sir Robert Chambers,²⁰⁹ had been an opponent

²⁰¹ Rolliad, *The Statesmen: An Ecologue* lines 47-60. Presumably "Reverend" refers to Jenkinson's early ambitions.

²⁰² John Debrett (1753-1822). "The New Peerage" had first appeared in 1769 from a bookseller John Almon, whose business was taken over by Debrett in 1780.

²⁰³ Spencer Perceval, 1762-1812. Attorney-General, 1802-06, Chancellor of the Exchequer 1807-12, Prime Minister 1809-12

²⁰⁴ Henry Addington (1757-1844) 1st Viscount Sidmouth from 1805, MP for Devizes, 1784-1805, Speaker of the House of Commons, 1789-1801, Prime Minister and Chancellor of the Exchequer 1801-04, Lord President of the Council, 1805, 1806-7 and 1812 Lord Privy Seal, 1806, Home Secretary, 1812-22

²⁰⁵ William Wilberforce, 1759-1833. MP, 1780-1825. Leader in the Abolition movement of the Slave Trade, 1807 and Slavery, 1833. Close friend of Pitt.

²⁰⁶ William Windham, 1750-1810. Chief Secretary for Ireland, 1783, Secretary at War, 1794-1801, Secretary of State for War and Colonies, 1806-07

²⁰⁷ George Spencer, 2nd Earl Spencer, 1758-1834. Lord Privy Seal, 1794, First Lord of the Admiralty, 1794-1801, Home Secretary, 1806-07

²⁰⁸ "The Association: British Extraparliamentary Political Organization, 1769-1793" E.C. Black, Oxford University Press, 1963, p117n

²⁰⁹ Letter from Sir Robert Chambers (1737-1803) to Jenkinson, February 22, 1779, quoted Thomas M. Curley, "Sir Robert Chambers: Law, Literature and Empire in the Age of Johnson" Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1998 p201.

of Hastings in India – also this was just before Jenkinson entered the ministry, so he was doubtless keen to stay in Pitt's good books.

Second, until 1789 Pitt's government was distinctly short of ability; neither Sydney nor Carmarthen²¹⁰ were up to their jobs as Secretaries of State, while Thurlow as Lord Chancellor was a mediocre intriguer and only Howe at the admiralty, Gower as Lord Privy Seal and Camden as Lord President of the Council were top-notch talents (Jenkinson did not join the Cabinet until 1791).

Pitt remained a Whig in one respect throughout his ministry, his attitude to Royal power. George III had stretched his prerogative to the maximum in the shenanigans surrounding Pitt's advent to power and the election that followed. However, whereas in North's time the King had been the dominant political power, with the strong-willed Pitt, brought up by Chatham to be suspicious of Royal influence, he was never able to impose himself to the same extent. Advancing age and periodic bouts of porphyria further weakened his influence, so even after Pitt's death he was much closer to the 19th century Bagehotian²¹¹ ideal constitutional monarch than to the near-Stuart predominance of his earlier years.

Thus, Jenkinson's intermediation between King and Ministers, so vital in the last years of North's government, was no longer either possible or necessary under Pitt. Jenkinson, being no fool, realized this, and that his approach needed to be modified to succeed in the new political world. Along with Thurlow while he lasted and after 1801 Eldon, Jenkinson nevertheless continued to represent the Royal point of view within the governments of Pitt and his successors.

His son Liverpool did not take the expansive Bolingbrokean view of Royal power that his father had, and in any case as Prime Minister was dealing with the idle and dissolute George IV rather than the diligent and capable George III. In this respect, but in few others, father and son differed; their difference was largely due to the changes wrought by Pitt's lengthy, successful and dominant administration.

Pitt's goodwill towards Jenkinson was shown soon after his election victory in March 1784 when he made Jenkinson a member of the Board of Trade. (This increasingly useful body had been abolished two years earlier in the Rockingham Whigs' half-baked "Economical Reform" campaign and was now reconstituted and over the next few years enlarged.) While there, Jenkinson played a key role in drawing up Orders in Council preventing American shippers from trading with the West Indies, restrictions which remained in force until 1788 and were generally against the views of the free-trading Pitt.

Jenkinson gave a slightly qualified support to Pitt's government: "I support the present Government, because it is what my Sovereign has chosen, and it Deliver'd him from the hands of

Chambers was another graduate of University College, Oxford, and had been involved in Jenkinson's 1768 campaign for the Oxford University seat.

²¹⁰ Francis Godolphin Osborne, 5th Duke of Leeds from 1789, courtesy Marquess of Carmarthen, MP for Eye and Helston, 1774-75, Foreign Secretary, 1783-91.

²¹¹ Walter Bagehot (1826-77). Editor, *The Economist*, 1861-77. His "The English Constitution" (1867) is considered the standard work on the subject; it defines the monarchy as "dignified" rather than "efficient." George III was both!

Men he did not like. But I cannot... place implicit Confidence in them till I have seen more of their Behaviour."²¹² After all, one of Pitt's first political initiatives was to attempt a measure of parliamentary reform, which even at this early stage Jenkinson regarded as dangerous. On the other hand, Pitt's 1784 India Bill was based on a draft drawn up by Jenkinson and Dundas while members of the Secret Committee in 1781 although in the event it was Dundas rather than Jenkinson who led the bill's passage in the Commons.

Jenkinson's confidence in Pitt's government gradually grew, and his relationship with Pitt gradually deepened, as he fed him copious quantities of champagne (*see supra*). Jenkinson indeed told Robinson in December 1784 that he "did not choose to give up the game as yet entirely" although at 55 he was 30 years older than the new prime minister. Conversely Pitt gradually became more secure in his position, and more comfortable both with Jenkinson and with the idea of giving him ministerial office. He consulted Jenkinson when drawing up his measures to regulate Irish trade in 1785,²¹³ although at the end of the year there was still considerable Cabinet opposition to including Jenkinson in the government. Grafton, generally a supporter of Pitt but not in the Cabinet, wrote to the Lord President Camden in December 1785 concerning a rumour of a peerage and Cabinet membership for Jenkinson: "Your Lordship would, I am confident, if no other friend interposed to keep the minister from a step which would ruin his credit with the nation and make him soon feel that he was playing only a second part to *others*. Surely it can never be."²¹⁴

In fact, it was to be, quite quickly. On January 8, 1786 Pitt wrote to Jenkinson "I have had the honour of laying before the King your request to be advanced to the rank of peerage, and I have His Majesty's commands to acquaint you that whenever any new creations take place you may depend on being included in the number. Allow me to add that the sense of the advantages which the Government receives on many occasions from your abilities and knowledge, and particularly in the very important Department you are so good as to execute, makes it impossible for me not to take a warm interest in any object which you have at heart."²¹⁵

From here on Jenkinson must have known it was only a matter of time. In March 1786 on Pitt's behalf he began drawing up legislation which became the Navigation Act of 1786. Then on August 21 he was created Lord Hawkesbury, after the family's Gloucestershire estate (which he was to inherit in 1790²¹⁶ from Sir Banks Jenkinson, 6th baronet, together with the further lucrative sinecure of Collector of the Customs Inwards for the Port of London).²¹⁷ Two days

²¹² Quoted Ehrman, *op.cit.*, p331. Letter to J. Home, November 16, 1784.

²¹³ "Posthumous Memoirs of his own time" Sir Nathaniel Wraxall, Carey, Lea and Blanchard, Philadelphia 1836, p145 says "On Jenkinson he (Pitt) principally, and almost exclusively relied" but Wraxall, although nominally a supporter of both North and Pitt, was an intellectual lightweight and a strong proponent of the "hidden power" theory of Jenkinson's career so is not reliable.

²¹⁴ Namier/Brooke, *op. cit.*

²¹⁵ quoted "The Later Correspondence of George III" ed. A. Aspinall, Cambridge University Press, 1962, Vol. I p 238

²¹⁶ Sources are agreed that Sir Banks died on 21st or 22nd July, but as with Charles Jenkinson's birth date, there is disagreement as to the year – the DNB (which has Charles born in 1727) has him dying in 1789. However, I am again sticking with the Hawkesbury Church tombstone, which says 1790.

²¹⁷ It's not clear how Sir Banks obtained this valuable sinecure, worth over £1,000 per year, though one source suggests Bute had arranged for the King to award it to him, with reversion to Charles Jenkinson, as part of the arrangements for Charles Jenkinson becoming Bute's private secretary in 1762. It would have been a small part of

later, he became President of the reconstructed Board of Trade with Pitt's trusty (at this stage) William Grenville, fourth son of his old boss and bugbear George, as his Vice-President. Finally, in the following month he became Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster (which added income but few duties) albeit still without a seat in the Cabinet.

Jenkinson's conjunction with Pitt's government had been anathema to old Whigs like Grafton and Camden, because it represented a further confirmation of the government's gradual move in a Tory direction. From 1786 on, except for the Hastings impeachment, to which Pitt had become committed in the Benares debate of June 1786, there were no more Whig follies and policy became increasingly aligned with Tory sentiment. With the Whigs Howe, Sydney, Carmarthen and Camden leaving the government successively in 1788-94, either by resignation or death, the government became increasingly Tory in personnel. Jenkinson's advent to the government in 1786 and to the Cabinet in 1791 both embodied this trend and emphasised it.

Whig historians have often regarded Pitt's government as divided between the noble Whig reformism of 1783-92 and the gloomy Tory reaction after war broke out. In reality, Pitt was an Independent Whig only until around the time of Jenkinson's accession to his government, and a Tory or indeed Conservative²¹⁸ thereafter, with the 1789 Regency Crisis hardening his position. A major indicator of this change was Pitt's refusal from 1787 to support repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, a leading demand of Nonconformists and most Foxite Whigs, which failed repeatedly in the House of Commons, the first time by 176 votes to 98 on March 28, 1787. Since Pitt was one of the most dominant of prime ministers, at least before 1801, his government mostly reflected his own political position, but Jenkinson's entry to it both changed the government's political balance and reflected the maturing Toryism in Pitt's own political beliefs.

The Navigation Act of 1786 exemplified Jenkinson's approach to economics, which differed in certain important respects from that of Pitt and the 19th century Whigs/Liberals yet was close to that of his son Liverpool. Pitt and his close colleague William Grenville had both read Adam Smith's "Wealth of Nations" when they were teenagers, shortly after it came out in 1776 and were heavily influenced by its novel ideas. Jenkinson, like his former boss North, came on Smith's work in middle life -- he was 47 when it was published. Consequently, he remained sceptical of extreme free trade claims, seeing unilateral free trade, giving away valuable positions without adequate recompense, as unlikely to further British interests.

This is a very important distinction indeed between the Whig and Conservative versions of free market economics. While Pitt himself remained partly though not wholly Whig in the economic sphere, in this respect Liverpool largely followed his father, even though, being much younger, he grew up reading Smith.

The central question addressed by the Navigation Act was that of the United States' post-independence commercial relations with Britain. Before 1776, by far the most important British

the general redirection of sinecures to Tories in that year. In any case, the Economical Reformers of the early 1780s had wanted to abolish the post, but Jenkinson soon put a stop to that.

²¹⁸ I am here using "Conservative" according to its original 1830 definition: alignment with the Liverpool government's policies and principles. Pitt was not the founder of Conservatism, but he was an important precursor to it.

trade was the "triangular trade" between the American colonies, the West Indies and Britain, whereby the colonies and West Indies took British goods, the colonies supplied raw materials and slaves to the West Indies and the West Indies supplied sugar to both trading partners, all three legs of the trade being carried in British ships. After the war the West Indian planters wanted the restrictions on carrying removed, so that American ships could supply them with cheap U.S. raw materials.

Free trade theory agreed with the plantation interests but Jenkinson didn't, believing that the restriction to British carriers built up the British shipbuilding industries and the supply of seamen, both vital in war -- in this he was to be proved right within a decade. As he told the Commons "If proper means could be devised to secure the navigation trade to Great Britain, though we had lost a dominion, we might almost be said to have gained an empire."²¹⁹

Accordingly, within a month of being instructed, his speed demonstrating his experience and capacity for hard work, he had prepared a new Navigation Act which tightened up the original Cromwellian Navigation Acts and excluded U.S. shipping from British colonial trade. (The likelihood of effective U.S. retaliation was limited, because the U.S. was still governed by the Articles of Confederation, with each state formulating its trade policy separately.) The Bill was passed in July 1786, with unanimous consent for its final reading -- as Jenkinson said later, it was the only important measure to pass unanimously in the course of fifty years.

Jenkinson was busy for the next few years as attempted trade treaties with France, Holland, Spain, Russia, Prussia and Portugal were the main foreign policy initiatives of Pitt's government. Since Carmarthen, the Foreign Secretary, was uninterested in either trade or detail, most of the work fell to Jenkinson, although negotiation of the most successful agreement (for the few years until revolution broke out), that with France was carried out by his old colleague from North days William Eden, who was to join him in the Lords as Baron Auckland in 1793. Jenkinson kept a firm hand on negotiations, protecting British interests and making sure that rules for the carrying trade remained strongly leaning in Britain's direction.

The Spanish treaty proved especially difficult – and then ran into further difficulty in 1790 when Britain and Spain clashed over the British settlement at Nootka Sound, near Vancouver. As for the Dutch treaty, Pitt, Grenville and Eden attempted to negotiate it without Jenkinson's involvement, but were so unable to agree among themselves that preliminaries were not agreed until 1791, by which time Jenkinson was in the Cabinet, and raised deal-killing objections to its concessions to Dutch shipping rights.

Jenkinson's primary objective during these years remained to settle trade with the new United States on a satisfactory basis. To this end, in 1791 he published a report to the Privy Council on Anglo-U.S. trade. This relaxed the restrictions against shipping Anglo-U.S. trade in American vessels, although it kept the provision that U.S. exports into the West Indies and Canada must be shipped in British vessels. Still, the relaxation of Anglo-U.S. trade was a substantial concession by Jenkinson, who favoured the shipping interest, partly for naval reasons. The paper also applied the same tariff preferences to U.S. raw materials as to Canadian and West Indian raw

²¹⁹ Jenkinson to House of Commons, April 11, 1786, quoted Ehrman, op. cit. p339

materials and exempted all U.S. goods from the preferential aliens' duty applied to European goods.

The paper then examined Anglo-U.S. trade in detail and set out areas where the U.S. must be pressed to make reciprocal concessions, since according to its calculations, the U.S. imposed substantially higher tariffs on British goods than Britain did on U.S. goods. Regrettably the protectionist albeit pro-British Alexander Hamilton would make this problem worse by the Report on Manufactures followed by the Tariff of 1792. As so often during the 19th century, British moves towards free trade were met in its trading partners by further bursts of protectionism. Still the paper showed that Jenkinson was ultimately a believer in freer trade and had fully absorbed the novel doctrines of Adam Smith, even if he didn't agree with all of them.

Jenkinson's first five years as President of the Board of Trade were ones of gradually increasing influence within Pitt's government. As the Whig grandees retired one by one, opposition to Jenkinson died away and the government moved towards his political position. It also strengthened – Grenville, Home Secretary from 1789 and Foreign Secretary from 1791 and Dundas, Home Secretary from 1791 were both much more efficient than their predecessors while Pitt's brother Chatham,²²⁰ at the Admiralty from 1788, was far more committed to the government's general direction than Howe had been.

The Regency Crisis of 1789 strengthened Jenkinson's position further -- he remained loyal to Pitt and the King during the latter's illness while Thurlow, the King's other "trustee" in the Cabinet, intrigued with Fox and the Prince of Wales to bring in a Regency prematurely. Then in July 1789 the French Revolution broke out, with Jenkinson receiving on-the-spot bulletins from Liverpool, who witnessed the storming of the Bastille on July 14 and wrote to his father about it the following day.

In November 1790 Burke published "Reflections on the Revolution in France." Burke had spent much of his literary energies in the preceding three decades railing about Jenkinson as leader of the supposedly sinister "King's Friends," describing them in his 1770 "Thoughts on the Present Discontents" as "selling their conjunct iniquity at the highest rate."²²¹ Thus Burke's "Reflections" extolling the benefits of monarchy and the dangers of republicanism essentially amounted to an admission that Jenkinson with his "Great Tew" Toryism had been right all along. Together with the negative turn the French Revolution took over the next few years, Burke's conversion strengthened Jenkinson's position further, reducing anti-Royalism to a relatively small Radical rump and making niggling Whiggery look irrelevant.

Finally, in 1791 Jenkinson was admitted to the Cabinet, a position he might well have achieved two decades earlier. Even then he had to fight for it; Grenville's elevation to the House of Lords in 1790 reduced Jenkinson's position as the government's main man of business in that body.

²²⁰ John Pitt (1756-1835), 2nd Earl of Chatham from 1778, Colonel, 1793, Major General, 1795, General, 1812. Commander of the Walcheren Expedition, 1809, First Lord of the Admiralty, 1788-94, Lord Privy Seal, 1794-98, Lord President of the Council, 1796-1801, Master General of the Ordnance, 1801-06, 1807-10.

²²¹ Edmund Burke "Thoughts on the Cause of the Present Discontents" Dodsley, 1770, p46.

Thus, Pitt's eventual offer to him of a position in the Cabinet was slightly insulting in that instead of an automatic upgrade Pitt offered it only as a consolation for his diminished Lords position.²²²

Burke broke with Fox in May 1791 and over the next few years the great bulk of moderate Whigs moved gradually towards coalition with Pitt's Ministry. When this finally happened in December 1794, increasing the Cabinet from 10 to 13, it brought several former opponents in cabinet with Jenkinson. However, it also reunited him with some former colleagues from North's days. Loughborough (the former Wedderburn) with whom his relations were cool, had replaced the friendlier if devious Thurlow as Lord Chancellor in January 1793. However, Dundas, who had joined the Cabinet as Home Secretary in 1791 and now moved to the new but in the circumstances critical office of Secretary for War (Colonies were added to the office in 1801) and Mansfield (the former Stormont) who became Lord President in December 1794 were both old friends and allies.

Perceiving their hostility to its increasingly radical government, France declared war on Austria and Prussia in April 1792. Later in the year French supplicants from Martinique and Guadeloupe, disassociating themselves from the Jacobin French government, approached Jenkinson for protection. However, it was only at the end of 1792 that it became clear that France would execute Louis XVI, which drew the normally pacific George III into belligerence, to be joined by Jenkinson as a supporter of monarchy in general and George III in particular. Since the Portland Whigs were also belligerent, when Louis XVI was executed in January 1793 war became inevitable, although in the event France struck first, declaring war on Britain on February 1, 1793. With the country again at war, both Jenkinson's 1757 work on the need for a militia and his 1758 work on the rights of neutral nations were republished in expanded editions, drawing considerably more notice this time around as the work of a Cabinet minister.

Jenkinson's most important responsibility in the early years of the war was to relieve the dearths which affected agriculture during these years, causing rising prices and a sharp decline in working-class living standards. After advice on the current year's crop from Sir Joseph Banks,²²³ Jenkinson led a vigorous program of government grain imports to attack these dearths, importing 300,000 quarters in 1795 and greater amounts in later years. In this he was opposed by the more literal-minded younger Whiggish ministerial readers of Adam Smith, who believed government should not intervene in this way – an attitude that was to have tragic results fifty years later in the failure of Russell's government to use such imports adequately to address the Irish Potato Famine. As for Pitt, as the years went by his views moved closer to Jenkinson's, although the two introverts never quite bonded. In a 1799 letter to Canning (admittedly, a known mocker of the elder Jenkinson) Pitt wrote "I am obliged to set out for Addiscombe to hear a lecture on Corn."²²⁴

Jenkinson also attempted to modify the Jay Treaty of 1794, whose principal negotiators were John Jay²²⁵ for the United States and Grenville for Britain. Jenkinson's main objection was to the clause which gave American ships of less than 70 tons access to the West Indian ports; as he

²²² He complained about it in a letter to Liverpool, quoted in "The Life and Administration of Robert Banks Jenkinson, second Earl of Liverpool", Charles Duke Yonge, Macmillan, 1868 Vol. I p15

²²³ Sir Joseph Banks, 1st Baronet, 1743-1820, naturalist, President of the Royal Society, 1778-1820.

²²⁴ Ehrman "The Younger Pitt: the consuming struggle" Constable, 1996 p 292 note 6

²²⁵ John Jay (1745-1829) Chief Justice of the United States, 1789-95.

wrote, the great question was: "whether this country shall give up the principal advantages which it derives from her Sugar Islands, and allow a competition from which the United States will in a short time become Masters in effect."²²⁶ Alas, the strategic need to preserve the mild U.S. tilt towards Britain at this stage in the Revolutionary Wars was too strong for Pitt and Grenville, and Jenkinson lost his point.

Jenkinson enjoyed his tenure as President of the Board of Trade; one vignette from around this time said that while Pitt, when meeting merchants, would spend time convincing them his measures were right, Jenkinson "entertains them with telling them what he knows of their business, instead of hearing what they have to tell him."²²⁷ Thus his ten years at the Board of Trade, which might have resulted in a promotion in a 1796 reshuffle to the more senior if less "efficient" office of Lord Privy Seal which he would probably not have enjoyed,²²⁸ were instead marked by a promotion in the peerage to an Earldom. Pitt had valued Jenkinson's work, and his status as a diligent expert in a subject which most politicians found too dull and technical, so when in late 1795 Jenkinson hinted that a step in the peerage might be desirable, it was less than a year before the King granted the request – Jenkinson received his elevation on May 25, 1796, just before the general election of that year. This time, the Cabinet seem to have welcomed Jenkinson's promotion; there was none of the backbiting that had accompanied his entry into the Lords ten years earlier.

When you examine the pattern of 18th Century peerage promotions, Jenkinson's transition from commoner to Earldom in two steps, without ever having occupied one of the great offices of state, is exceptional. It indicates that both his career's longevity and his friendly relationship with the King were powerful additional factors in his favour. In any case, Jenkinson's life priorities were clearly expressed by his taking the name of Liverpool, a city with which he had no personal or family connection, but which was notable as one of the country's foremost trading ports. By a special Royal dispensation, he was allowed to quarter the arms of the City of Liverpool with those of his own family.

Jenkinson's friendship with the King had its downside; in May 1797 he was made a Trustee of the fund set up to maintain Caroline Princess of Wales after her separation from the future George IV. Given Caroline's character, this was no sinecure, but Jenkinson's problems in this respect paled before those faced by his son in 1820.

On February 26, 1797, in an atmosphere of crisis following an abortive French invasion of Wales, the Bank of England stopped redeeming its bills for gold, thus going off the gold standard. From that point, as well as notes for five pounds and higher denominations, it began to issue one- and two- pound notes, a practice which it was to continue until 1819. This was a problem for public confidence, since the two best-known recent examples of paper currency

²²⁶ Jenkinson to Grenville, August 29, 1794, quoted Ehrman op. cit. Vol. 2 p513.

²²⁷ "The Diary and Correspondence of Charles Abbot, Baron Colchester" ed. Charles 2nd Baron Colchester, Murray, 1861, Vol I p 45

²²⁸ According to Glenbervie, Lady Liverpool (Jenkinson's second wife) was opposed, saying to Lady Chatham, wife of the previous Lord Privy Seal: "No, they may make a fool of your husband, but they can't of mine. He is a man of business." Glenbervie, op. cit. Vol. 1, p95.

were the French Revolutionary "assignats" which had lost 99.5% of their value in 1789-96 and the American "continentals" which had lost 97.5% of their value in 1775-81.

As Chairman of the Committee on Trade, and with his involvement in the 1774 re-coinage, Jenkinson was the obvious person to take charge. To relieve the huge volume of counterfeit coinage circulating, as well as trade tokens in small denominations, he decided to issue a large volume of copper coinage, which would relieve a prolonged shortage of small denomination coin. Since copper from Welsh mines was readily available, the new coinage would have a bullion value close to its nominal value, unlike previously issued copper coinage in "token" form. This would ensure that public confidence in the currency was maintained and inflation avoided even though high-value payments would be in paper only.

Matthew Boulton,²²⁹ the master of the new steam powered technology and owner of the Soho mint, had been in discussion with Jenkinson since 1787, and wrote to him on the subject as early as 1789: "In the course of my journeys, I observe that I receive upon an average two-thirds counterfeit halfpence for change at toll-gates, etc. and I believe the evil is daily increasing, as the spurious money is carried into circulation by the lowest class of manufacturers, who pay with it the principal part of the wages of the poor people they employ. They purchase from the subterraneous coiners 36 shillings'-worth of copper (in nominal value) for 20 shillings, so that the profit derived from the cheating is very large."²³⁰

Jenkinson was already a strong proponent of mechanical milling of coins for "machines, which act with a given force, can work with more truth and accuracy than the arm of man."²³¹ Furthermore, Boulton and Watt was already coining rupees for the East India Company with steam presses at the rate of 30,000 per hour.²³² Accordingly, on March 3, 1797, just five days after the Bank stopped payment, Jenkinson summoned Boulton to London and by a proclamation of July 26, 1797 instructed him to strike with his steam presses 500 tons worth of new penny and two-penny pieces in copper. The pieces would weigh one ounce and two ounces, around the bullion equivalent of their value, also allowing them to be used as weights as well as coinage. As Jenkinson wrote to Boulton: "This Coin will certainly be very bulky and heavy, but I doubt much, whether this would be any Objection, to that Description of People, for whom the Coin is principally intended."²³³

Technologically, the minting was cutting-edge, straining the Soho Mint's capacity. "Presses broke, dies shattered, bottlenecks were created, and harried workmen were deafened by the noise... The rumbling of the overhead wheel, making a dozen revolutions per minute, added to the cacophony as iron curves and rollers banged against each other, air pumps hissed and

²²⁹ Matthew Boulton (1728-1809) ironmaster and partner with James Watt (1736-1819) in the development of steam-powered manufacturing.

²³⁰ Samuel Smiles "Lives of Boulton and Watt" John Murray, 1865, quoted Wikipedia.

²³¹ Jenkinson, "A Treatise on the Coins of the Realm" 1805 p227

²³² "The Diary and Correspondence of Charles Abbot, Baron Colchester" ed. Charles 2nd Baron Colchester, Murray, 1861, Vol I p 87.

²³³ Jenkinson to Boulton, March 3, 1797, quoted George Selgin "Good Money: Birmingham Button Makers, the Royal Mint, and the Beginnings of Modern Coinage, 1775-1821," The Independent Institute, 2008, p162.

sputtered, and dies smashed images of Britannia and the King into pieces of metal."²³⁴ The result was some 10 million of the "cartwheel" penny and two-penny pieces, numismatically important, hard to counterfeit, and indeed beautiful, with the design stamped into the metal rather than raised from it. It was the nearest British coinage has come to the gigantic stone coinage of the island of Yap!

By coining copper coins at their bullion value and putting no limit on their tender, Jenkinson had effectively put working-class Britain temporarily onto a copper standard. Alas, the price of copper kept increasing, so after a modest further issue in 1799, the next issue of pennies in 1806 were lighter.

At the same time as Jenkinson increased the supply of genuine copper coinage, he reduced counterfeiting with the Counterfeiting Coin Act of 1797, passed on July 19, which extended the treason provisions of the 1741 legislation to copper coinage, and added a provision against counterfeiting the gold or silver coins of foreign countries.

As well as the paper currency for large denominations, new silver coinage was felt necessary for medium ones, since silver coins' weight had depreciated by 5%-38% over the century since the last major silver re-coinage in 1696. Thus, Jenkinson was on February 7, 1798 made Chairman of a new Select Committee to take into consideration the Coins of the United Kingdom.

Jenkinson's committee took its work seriously, to the extent of making Liverpool Master of the Mint on February 14, 1799 at the age of only 28 to assist his father in carrying through a re-coinage and reforming the Mint. However, the economic position in 1799-1800 was so severe that re-coinage necessarily took a back seat. In the event, the Committee's report was written up by Jenkinson after his retirement in his 1805 volume "A Treatise on the Coins of the Realm: In a letter to the King." The reform of the Mint itself, through the efforts of both Jenkinsons, was implemented over a period of years, finally moving the institution out of its mediaeval office in the Tower, for example.

The coinage work was not lost. In 1816 Liverpool, now prime minister, carried through his father's re-coinage almost without altering a detail, passing the Coinage Act and producing the new coinage, including the gold sovereign rather than the 18th-century guinea, as well as silver crowns, half crowns and shillings, that was introduced on February 13, 1817 and was to last until World War I. The Act also put restrictions on issuing paper notes and on limiting the legal tender of coins other than gold, as recommended by Jenkinson, which were to form the effective basis of the 1819-1914 Gold Standard.

Jenkinson's literary talents took a polemical turn in the interest of government, with his publication of the 32-page pamphlet "State of the country in the autumn of 1798"²³⁵ – presumably intended to counteract such morale-destroying productions as Thomas Malthus' "Essay on the Principle of Population" published earlier that year. Intended to bolster public support at a difficult time, it culminates with the stirring sentiment, referring to the continental

²³⁴ Doty, Richard "The Soho Mint and the Industrialization of Money" British Numismatic Society, 1998, quoted in Selgin, op. cit. p166

²³⁵ "State of the Country in the Autumn of 1798" J. Wright, 1798.

allies: "We have done our part and shall, I trust, continue to do it – let them, even now, do theirs and THE WORLD IS SAVED."²³⁶

In 1800 the food dearth of 1795-6 reappeared in heightened form, the worst of the war. Jenkinson addressed the economic issue acerbically in an October 11, 1800 letter to Dundas. It began by remarking "There has not been a single member of (the Committee on Trade) at the office since the last prorogation except on one occasion" – this had been a problem throughout Jenkinson's Chairmanship of the Committee; members absented themselves after the Parliamentary session ended so that decisions could not be taken.

The letter then went on "If I could obtain a meeting and the majority should agree to any measure, I am not sure that the minority would attend in Parliament and vote for it, so much are people wedded to favourite abstract notions on this subject." Jenkinson then described how in the previous session Liverpool, then a junior minister, had proposed and carried "a Bill calculated to do some little good in this business, and very little injury to anyone" after which Jenkinson himself pushed it through the Lords against opposition by several members of the government.²³⁷

"In time of distress" he remarked to Sir Joseph Banks around this time "the Seller becomes Master of the Market" and it then becomes absurd to rest one's confidence in Adam Smith, who "has Pushed his Principles to an extravagant Length, and in some respects, has erred."²³⁸ The starving Irish of 1845-49 would have agreed with him. Indeed Jenkinson saw in 1800 a danger of serious trouble "There will be Insurrections of a very serious nature, and... different Bodies of Yeomanry may possibly fight each other... those of the Cities and great manufacturing Towns, who are adverse to the farmers and fight those of the Country, who will be disposed to defend them."²³⁹ The extreme dangers to public order of 1795 and 1800 reminded Jenkinson of the 1780 Gordon Riots and remained a warning to Jenkinson's son in the apparently similar circumstances of 1816-20.

By 1800 Pitt's dominance over the government was beginning to lessen. The supremacy established by sheer ability over a mediocre Cabinet in the mid-1780s was maintained through success in the early 1790s, and even increased through the lack of serious Parliamentary opposition after the conjunction with the Portland Whigs in 1794. However, by 1800, just as Jenkinson himself was growing old and rheumatic – and beginning to sublimate his political ambitions in the career of his son Liverpool -- so Pitt's absolute dominance was lessening due to a succession of difficult years and his own physical weaknesses and increasing addiction to the bottle. It didn't help that from 1793 much of the decision-making was on military subjects, of which Pitt was "very ignorant" as Jenkinson remarked in 1794, himself having learned military logistics and planning the hard way as Secretary at War in 1778-82.

Jenkinson's own military knowledge was called into play in October 1800, when at a Cabinet evenly split on the question of an expedition to Egypt versus one to the West Indies, Pitt called

²³⁶ "State of the Country" p24

²³⁷ English Historical Documents, Vol. XI, 1783-1832, ed. A. Aspinall and E.A. Smith, Oxford University Press, 1959, No. 222 pp 280-1

²³⁸ Quoted Ehrman Vol. III, p290.

²³⁹ October 11, 1800 letter to Dundas, quoted Ehrman Vol. III, p 295

on Jenkinson to give his opinion, which swung the meeting in favour of the Egypt expedition. As Pitt, Jenkinson and Dundas all believed, and as events were to prove,²⁴⁰ the Egypt expedition was more likely to produce an early military success, essential to catalyse the peace talks which they supported and the belligerent Grenville opposed.

Thus, Pitt's fall in 1801 after the King had refused to grant a measure of Catholic Emancipation, as Pitt believed necessary to make the Act of Union with Ireland function properly, was more or less inevitable when it came. Jenkinson himself opposed Catholic Emancipation, on the grounds that from his experience with working class anti-Catholicism as Secretary at War during the Gordon Riots, a full emancipation of Catholics, admitting them to Parliament, would lead to "the most dangerous excesses" especially at a time of corn dearth and general unrest.²⁴¹ However by this time his rheumatism was beginning to play up, and he was absent from the crucial Cabinet meeting in February 1801.

Loughborough then performed his second notable disservice to British long-term interests, telling the King about the Cabinet discussions and poisoning his mind against Emancipation as contrary to his Coronation oath, after which the die was cast. Pitt was devastated, bursting into tears at his last audience with the King (which had been delayed because of a recurrence of the King's illness) but a new government was inevitable, and Henry Addington, then Speaker of the House of Commons, opposed to Catholic Emancipation and otherwise solidly Tory, was chosen by the King to lead it.

As an opponent of Catholic Emancipation and a vastly experienced Minister with special expertise, Jenkinson was naturally kept on in the new government. More remarkably, his political influence assisted in the promotion of Liverpool, then aged 30 with only junior Ministerial experience, to the post of Foreign Secretary. With Grenville and Dundas in opposition because they favoured Catholic Emancipation, and Portland remaining Home Secretary, the choice of top talent was meagre, and Liverpool was a good House of Commons speaker, critical for governments of the period with most of their most senior members in the Lords. He was also supported by the outgoing Prime Minister William Pitt, but this first giant promotion owed much to his father's remaining clout and both men's friendship with the King.

For the next three years, Jenkinson and his son were to sit in Cabinet together, forming two ninths of that still small body. That was not a unique occurrence in British history but nonetheless uncommon (I have found a total of only four other examples).²⁴² However Jenkinson was by now a sick man, at 71 old by the standards of the day, confined to his house for much of

²⁴⁰ Lieutenant-General Sir Ralph Abercromby (1734-1801) defeated the remnants of Napoleon's Egypt expedition at the Battle of Alexandria in March 1801.

²⁴¹ Glenbervie, *op. cit.* Vol. 1 p 157.

²⁴² Brothers were common enough; the Walpoles, the Pelhams, George Grenville/Temple and Pitt/Chatham, and there were examples of father/son-in-law (Marlborough/Sunderland, for example) but the last previous occasion of father/son that I could find was the first and second Earls of Nottingham, who overlapped for a year in 1681-2 as Lord Chancellor and First Lord of the Admiralty. The first subsequent example I could find were the 14th/15th Earls of Derby, the latter of whom served in his father's last two Cabinets in 1858-9 and 1866-68. Other subsequent examples were Joseph and Austen Chamberlain in 1902-3 as Colonial Secretary and Postmaster-General and Ramsay and Malcolm Macdonald in 1935-7 as Lord President of the Council and Colonial, then Dominion Secretary.

the time with rheumatism. Thus, while he continued to work diligently at ongoing responsibilities such as currency reform, his influence was necessarily reduced. Even while ill he kept a keen watch over the interests of British trade, as evidenced by his deputy, Sylvester Douglas, Lord Glenbervie, whose diaries referred to herein contain numerous anecdotes about Jenkinson, but nothing about trade, a subject in which Glenbervie like most politicians of that period took little interest. He also advised his inexperienced son on tricky diplomatic questions, especially in dealing with the duplicitous French emissaries from Bonaparte.²⁴³

Jenkinson finally resigned his lucrative office as Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster in 1803, when Addington needed it for a Ministerial reshuffle. Liverpool joined him in the Lords in November 1803, but Jenkinson vacated office entirely (except for his sinecures) in May 1804, when the Addington ministry fell.

Jenkinson's last years were quiet ones, doubtless cheered by his son's continued success. After publishing "Coins of the Realm" in 1805 his health did not allow much further activity. However, he remained mentally alert, describing the fall of the Grenville ministry in 1807 as "a political suicide – if it had not happened now you can be assured it would have happened in the next six months" and blocking his daughter Charlotte's marriage to James Grimston on account of the inadequate proposed settlement.²⁴⁴

One final horrid (but typical of the period) accident disturbed Jenkinson when in December 1808 his wife Catherine's dress caught fire and burned her badly. She was to survive until 1827, but alas he didn't, dying a week later, on December 17, 1808 at his house in Hertford Street, Mayfair. He was buried at Hawkesbury on December 30, with a dozen of the peerage forming a funeral procession for the departure to Gloucestershire and Liverpool and his half-brother Charles meeting the cortege at Hawkesbury.

In contrast to his son, Jenkinson did well financially out of his political career. According to the Annual Register, he left Liverpool about £15,000 per annum (the equivalent of about £3.5 million per annum today) of which only £3,500 per annum was in land (presumably mostly the Jenkinson family estates) plus £700 per annum to his wife, plus £1,000 per annum to Charles Cope Jenkinson and £700 per annum to his daughter.²⁴⁵

Jenkinson's outlook differed materially from his son's in two respects. First, there was the matter of personal finance. Jenkinson grew up in a political world in which sinecures abounded and in which as Henry Fox showed, it was thought only mildly gamey to accumulate a vast fortune through holding political office. By Liverpool's time, after the Whig "Economical Reform" movement of the 1780s and the further reforms instituted by Pitt and by Liverpool himself, sinecures were much scarcer, corruption was much less and political life was correspondingly less lucrative. The consequence was that in the 19th century there were in politics far more sons of nouveau riche money like Peel and Gladstone and far fewer sprigs of impoverished gentry like

²⁴³ See e.g. Glenbervie Vol. 1, p341

²⁴⁴ Letter to Auckland, April 4, 1807. "The Journal and Correspondence of William, Lord Auckland." Ed. Robert Eden, 3rd Baron Auckland Bentley, 1861-2. Vol ii. pp 307-9

²⁴⁵ Annual Register, 1809, p569

Jenkinson than a hundred years earlier. Jenkinson was fortunate in that he accumulated most of his sinecures under the earlier system and was never forced to give them up.

Second, Jenkinson's "Church and King" Toryism, descending from the Great Tew tradition and from the Toryism of Bolingbroke, envisaged the King as an active and positive force in politics, even taking over ultimate control in periods like 1778-82 when the politicians were weak. After 1784, with the Whiggish (in this respect) and determined Pitt in power, this position was no longer possible, and George III's decline and George IV's idleness and ineptitude firmly cemented the modern fully constitutional monarchy in place. Doubtless had Liverpool been dealing with the young and able George III, he would have adapted. However, though a favourite of George III through his father, Liverpool's relationship with George IV as Prince Regent and King throughout his Premiership was more distant, with no question of effective Royal control except on issues immediately affecting the Royal household or prerogative.

Nevertheless, Jenkinson's career was crucial to Liverpool's in two respects. First, and most obviously, he gave Liverpool a huge boost towards success. Whereas Jenkinson was 32 before getting even the most junior official post, Liverpool was Foreign Secretary at 30, and this was largely his father's doing. A better speaker than his father and with better "people skills" Liverpool was able to carry on the family business of politics even more successfully, to fifteen years as prime minister. But even with Jenkinson's wealth and Earldom behind him, Liverpool might not have made it that far without his father's energetic promotion of his early career.

Second, Jenkinson's Toryism, rooted as it was in that of early 18th-century Oxfordshire, was in most respects also the core of Liverpool's belief system. Unlike Pitt, Liverpool had no traces of Whiggism; he showed no early sympathy with the French Revolution or for Parliamentary Reform. Jenkinson's forty years at the centre of politics, with a primarily economic focus, also gave him a basis of deep economic knowledge and understanding which he was to pass on to Liverpool, integrating the new economics of Smith (and in Liverpool's case Malthus and Ricardo) without becoming slave to its more unrealistic doctrines. As I shall show, Liverpool was by far the most economically sophisticated prime minister of the 19th century; much of this sophistication derived from his father.

Jenkinson was the most important influence on his son, who became Britain's Greatest Prime Minister. But he also deserves enormous respect for his own career of forty years of influential public service at the highest level. Far more than the Radicals and low-lives currently being painstakingly rescued from the ash-heap of oblivion, he deserves the profound attention of historians.