POLITICAL JOURNALISM, 1672-1714.

Ralph Britton

A Thesis submitted for the Degree of Ph.D.
Faculty of Humanities, University of Kent.

August, 1969.

C O N T E N T S

PART TWO. THE LAST FOUR YEARS OF QUEEN ANNE.

CHAPTER ONE. CHANGED CONDITIONS IN POLITICAL JOURNALISM... ... p.350.

A. Political Journalism, 1685-1710.

i) The Revolution of 1688.

ii) Controversy over Foreign Policy, 1697-1701.

iii) The Political Periodical.

B. Party Politics and the Press in the reign of Queen Anne.

CHAPTER TWO. THE ELECTION OF 1710 AND THE FIRST YEAR OF THE EXAMINER... ... ... p.383.

A. The impact of Sacheverell on the political situation.

B. Moderate support for Harley.

i) The *Examiner*.

ii) *Faults on Both Sides*.

iii) Defoe in 1710.

C. The Whig press.

D. Swift's *Examiner*.

CHAPTER THREE. PEACE OR WAR, 1711-1712... ... ... p.487.

A. The approach to a peace.

i) Early treatment of the war in the press.

ii) The new preliminaries.

B. Defoe on peace.

C. *The Conduct of the Allies.*

D. Marlborough's dismissal.

E. *Law is a Bottomless Pit.*

CHAPTER FOUR. THE SUCCESSION, 1713-1714... ... ... p.565.

A. The Whig attack.

i) The problem of the Succession.

ii) *A Short History of the Parliament.*

iii) Richard Steele.

B. The Succession in danger.

i) *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted.*

ii) Bishop Burnet.

iii) *Neck or Nothing.*

iv) *The Art of Restoring.*

v) *The Crisis.*

C. The Tory Reply.

i) *The Publick Spirit of the Whigs.*

ii) Defoe on the Succession.

iii) The Tory collapse.

D. Conclusion.

CONCLUSION ———— p.616.

APPENDIX A. (NUMBERS OF PAMPHLETS PUBLISHED). ———— p.622.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. ———— p B599.

PART TWO THE LAST FOUR YEARS OF QUEEN ANNE

CHAPTER ONE

CHANGED CONDITIONS IN POLITICAL JOURNALISM

The political journalism of the last four years of Queen Anne's reign demands a slightly different approach from the one I have used for the first section of this thesis. The main reasons for this are the close and regular role played by the press in party politics during these years, and the importance of the man of letters in journalism. To illustrate these points I have introduced this section with a summary of the press's role in politics from 1685 to 1710, and with an examination of the connections between politicians, men of letters and the press in the reign of Queen Anne. In my discussion of the actual political writings of 1710-1714 I have followed the exchanges between opposing writers, and the development of a party line, in greater detail than in the rest of the thesis. By means of a time chart, which I have not included, I have established roughly when many pamphlets were published in order to see how their authors responded to, and may have affected, political events. The numbers of newspapers, periodicals and pamphlets published at this time are estimated in Appendix A.

A. Political Journalism 1685-1710

(i) The Revolution of 1688

The Reign of James II passed with only one Parliament, which unwisely granted him a revenue sufficient for his peacetime needs. This gave opposition to him little chance to organise, and without party to protect it, the press could not operate on the scale it had done during the Exclusion Crisis. The Revolution of 1688 is less interesting to students of the press than might appear; it was a matter of underground conspiracy among the aristocracy rather than a rousing of public opinion. The trial of the seven bishops did not pass without comment, and press activity increased when royal control over London collapsed, but it was left to the writers of the unlicensed Whig newsletters to keep the gentry in touch with the movement against James.[1] William issued numerous proclamations, as did James, and paved his way with pamphlets from Gilbert Burnet and Robert Ferguson. The latter showed his feeling that the time of the saints had returned at last by breaking into a meeting house in Exeter and marching up to preach wearing his sword and clutching his Bible. Burnet had sketched out as early as 1687 a justification for resistance to James II's arbitrary policies. Several thousand copies were printed in Holland in

---

[1] Peter Fraser, The Intelligence of the Secretaries of State, (Cambridge, 1956), p.131-32.

1688 for distribution by the invading force.[1] On November 19, Burnet regretted the lack of a press in Exeter: "...the world is so mad that it believes nothing but what it sees in print."[2] After the invasion the press took part in the discussion of whether James had abdicated, and the problems of a new settlement of the crown, but there was no major press campaign to accompany the revolution.

The more liberal atmosphere of William's reign perhaps favoured free discussion, but did not sanction the repeal of the press legislation, which survived L'Estrange's enforced retirement to a literary career. The Jacobites kept up a steady trickle of pamphlets, helped by one of the most extraordinary changes of an age of uncertain loyalties. Ferguson, despite his generous reward of a sinecure of £500 a year, found the new government as unfavourable to radical measures as the old. Knowing that change could only be attempted by an organised group he acted accordingly; it was said that his "conversion" brought tears to the eyes of James II. The most important change brought by William was that of regular Parliaments, enacted in the Triennial Bill, which with the need of extra grants for war made the Commons constant

---

1 Ferguson's pamphlets were: A Representation of the dangers impending over Great Britain, (1687, 1689) and The Justification of The Prince of Orange his Descent, (1689). Burnet's contribution was, An Enquiry into the measures of submission to the Supreme Authority: and the grounds on which it may be Lawful or necessary for Subjects to defend their Religion, Lives and Liberties (1688)

2 H.C. Foxcroft and T.E.S. Clarke, A Life of Gilbert Burnet, (Cambridge 1907), p.253.

participants in government. With this came the rise of parties, each determined to control the government, as politicians began to grasp at power through management of the Commons as well as by the King's favour.[1] The necessity of a triennial appeal to public opinion ensured that the party leaders were careful to secure favourable representation in the press.

---

[1] There has recently been some controversy among historians over the justice of regarding the politics of the reigns of William and Anne as a conflict between two parties, a view universally subscribed to before the last war, and exemplified, for instance, by G.M.Trevelyan in England Under Queen Anne, 3 vols. (London, 1931-34). R.R.Walcott was largely responsible for changing this picture to one of at least seven family connections, in varying combinations, (English Politics in the Early Eighteenth Century, (Oxford, 1956). This position was challenged by J.H. Plumb in The Growth of Political Stability in England 1675-1725, (London, 1967) where he summarised his own attitude as follows: "Two simple but profoundly important facts eluded him. One was that the late seventeenth century witnessed the growth of a large political nation with voting rights. Secondly, more general elections and more contests at these elections, took place between 1689 and 1715 than for the rest of the eighteenth century. Indeed more general elections took place between 1688 and 1714 than at any comparable period in the history of Parliament, excluding medieval times. In the seventeenth century a political nation was in ferment, locked in a war for power, with ample opportunities for battle, and whatever their personal ambitions or intentions, politicians had to dominate a majority of that active voting political nation. This could only be done by the attitudes, ideas, and organization of party. Hence the huge output of political party literature, the parade of Dr. Sacheverell through the provinces, the concern of men in Norfolk for the fate of the Kentish petitioners, and so on..." (Introd. xiv-xv.) Fortunately the controversy can be regarded as concluded, thanks to the powerful and extensive examination of the subject by Geoffry Holmes in British Politics in the Age of Anne, (London, 1967). After insisting on the many qualifications with which the old view must be regarded, and on the experimental, unsettled existence of the parties under William, he concludes his introduction: "And yet, when all the qualifications have been made, we shall still find ourselves face to face time and again with one ineluctable truth: that without

Contd..

A stimulus was given to this by the lapse of the Press Act in 1695 - owing however to disagreements, between Lords and Commons, and a dislike of the Stationers' monopoly, rather than the spirit of freedom. Censorship as such vanished, but authors and printers were still liable to prosecution under the Common Law. The immediate effect was to encourage the appearance of newspapers dealing principally with foreign affairs; the more dangerous domestic news was still left to the news-letter. The newspapers catered for the immense appetite of the reading public for more than the bare official items that could be found in the *Gazette*, and they were often compiled by men with an extensive system of correspondents stretching over Europe. They tended to flourish in time of war, and the weaker ones expired with peace. Despite the number of papers that failed to survive, three lasted well into the eighteenth century, the *Flying Post*, the *Postboy*, and the *Postman*. In 1702 the first daily paper appeared, the *Daily Courant*, which lasted to 1735. Though these papers tended to be cautious in their political comments, and avoided party commitment, their spreading of news of foreign affairs was to play an important part in the next major controversy. In addition this expansion of the press gave it a commercial stature that made a return to the old system of Licensing

---

Note 2 contd. from p.353

'the detested names of Whig and Tory', and without the basic conflict of attitude, policy or principle which these names embodied, relatively few political situations of any importance in our period either possess or convey much real meaning." (p.9.) Holmes also supplies an excellent summary of the controversy of the historians.

impractical.

(ii) Controversy over Foreign Policy 1697-1701

The end of the licensing laws contributed to the size and vigour of the controversy over war and peace between the parties during the years 1697-1701, especially the last of those years. It centered on the problem of the Spanish succession, the likelihood of a Bourbon heir to the Spanish monarchy, and involved William's lifelong ambition to curb the power of France. I pass this period reluctantly, without space to give it detailed treatment; it is too similar to 1710-1714 in political content, and inferior in literary interest, though with the signal exception that it contains some of the best work of Defoe. Frank H. Ellis gives an excellent summary of what James Ralph called "the Paper-War in England", in his edition of The Contests and Dissentions Between the Nobles and Commons in Athens and Rome, etc.[1] The new Whig and Tory parties deliberately organised the press, and appear to have appointed unofficial managers to instruct their pamphleteers; Charles Davenant's maxim, "Opinion is the principle Support of Power", was generally accepted as true.[2] Ellis suggests that Robert Harley, speaker of the Tory Commons, was the manager of the Tory press, and John Somers of the Whigs'. As pamphleteers,

---

[1] (Oxford 1967). I depend on this for my account of the pamphlets of this period. The quotation from Ralph is from p.1.

[2] Essays upon the Balance of Power, (1701), p.31. Quoted Ellis, p.3.

Charles Davenant and John Toland were Harley's principal writers: for the Whigs Daniel Defoe stood out with twenty eight publications during these years. Jonathan Swift wrote his first political pamphlet in this controversy.

At this point it is worth mentioning the changes that had taken place among the parties. Under William their positions seemed reversed, the Whigs zealously guarding the prerogative, trying to secure William a standing army, and defending the Court and administration of the Junto. The Tories found themselves in the unaccustomed position of opposition to the Crown, which they had previously scarcely distinguished from rebellion. They adapted to the position by inheriting the "Country" view of politics; they decried placemen, gave grants with reluctance, opposed a large standing army, and defended the rights of the subject against royal prerogative. Under the influence of Seymour they linked with a small but able group of Whigs who did not fall into line with the Junto. These were known as "The Flying Squadron", or the "Old Whigs", as they claimed to represent pure Whig principle, and were led by Robert Harley and his kinsman Paul Foley. The united party was sometimes called the "New Country Party". This explains the presence of Harley as a Tory leader, and of his creature Toland, deist and fervent defender of Whig principle, among the Tory writers. Later this situation was to provide food for much ingenious argument from Swift and Defoe, both of whom were at the time to be found on the Junto side.

(iii) The Political Periodical

Political pamphlets were a regular feature of party politics in the reign of Queen Anne, though there was nothing to match the Exclusion Crisis or the controversy of 1701-2, until the trial of Dr. Sacheverell in 1710.[1] However the most important developments of political journalism in the earlier part of Anne's reign was the political periodical, a journal devoted to comment on domestic and foreign policy. The genre was inspired by L'Estrange's *Observator* and the first political periodical of Anne's reign borrowed his title to make this clear. The full title of the paper was the *Whig Observator*, which also emphasised the strong connection with party that was to characterise this type of paper. The *Observator*, as it was generally known, supported the Junto, and was written until 1707 by John Tutchin, a dissenter who had been involved in Monmouth's rebellion and had since turned to poetry and journalism; he died in 1707, possibly as a result of a beating given him by political enemies. He was succeeded by a Scotch Presbyterian, George Ridpath, who restarted the paper in 1709. Published twice a week, the *Observator* copied the form as well as the title of L'Estrange's paper, being a dialogue between two characters; it consisted solely of discussion and contained no news.

The Whigs were the first to realise the value of a regular paper for their party, but the government was not slow to follow. Robert

---

[1] See Appendix A for numbers of pamphlets published.

Harley, made Secretary of State in 1704, soon saw the need of a similar paper to support the policies of the administration. He had Defoe released from prison where Nottingham had committed him for his attack on the High Churchmen, The Shortest Way with the Dissenters. Harley, with the sensitivity to the press that he always showed, had recognised Defoe's ability as a writer and had thought of the possibility of employing him as early as 1702. He now encouraged Defoe to write the Review which came out first twice, then three times a week, and supported the ministry with Defoe's characteristic moderate approach. Though we may accept Defoe's frequent statements that he was not told what to write in his paper, and recognise the remarkable similarity between his views and Harley's, the Review took a clear stance behind the Ministry, making no secret of its position.

Each number of the Review consisted of a short essay on public affairs. Defoe rejected the dialogue method of L'Estrange and Tuchin, sensing correctly that despite its popularity in the late seventeenth century his readers could now stomach a direct address from the author. He was not averse from bringing his own personality into his paper, and, playing on his achievement in The Shortest Way with the Dissenters, from using his reputation to enhance its credibility in a manner faintly reminiscent of his puritan predecessors. He offered his readers solid argument and clear simple prose, comprehensible to the widest audience. It was a remarkable tribute to the power of the press that a member of the government should instigate a regular commentary on its own

proceedings, a far cry from even the Restoration. It is significant that the politician responsible, Harley, was a "new man" who had made his way by his prominence in the Commons, not by the favour of the Prince.

The third important periodical to appear was The _Rehearsal_, written by Charles Leslie, a prominent Non-juror and Jacobite. His avowed intention was to balance the efforts of the _Review_ and the _Observator_, both violently opposed to the High Churchman, especially to their extremist attitude to the problems of non-resistance and passive obedience. Leslie wrote as the champion of the "high flyers", supporting the Occasional Conformity Bills and keeping up a running controversy with the two rival papers. He took care to keep his non-juring and Jacobite opinions behind a decent veil of supporting the Church of England, but his paper came to an end in 1709 because prosecution for a pamphlet forced him to leave the country. At least one other periodical followed the example set by these papers but until 1710 they seem to be the ones of major importance. They demonstrated a new possibility in political journalism, a lesson not lost on both ministry and opposition in the last four years of Queen Anne.

B. _Party Politics and the Press in the reign of Queen Anne_

The political leaders who had seen the Exclusion Crisis and made their way to power in the reigns of William and Anne could hardly fail to recognise the importance of political journalism. A new development

was the value they placed on the good opinion of men of letters, whether they wrote party propaganda or not. Indeed the duty of the great man of this period to patronise men of letters became curiously intertwined with party politics, especially during the heated years of Harley's ministry of 1710-1714, when prominent literary figures belonged to party clubs and were encouraged to write and organise political journalism. The third Earl of Shaftesbury, the grandson of the leader of the first Whigs, described some advantages to be gained by courting men of letters:

> But supposing it were possible for the hero or statesman to be absolutely unconcerned for his memory, or what came after him, yet for the present merely, and during his own time, it must be of importance to him to stand fair with the men of letters and ingenuity, and to have the character and repute of being favourable to their art. Be the illustrious person ever so high or awful in his station, he must have descriptions made of him in verse and prose, under feigned or real appelations. If he be omitted in sounding ode or lofty epic, he must be sung at least in doggerel and plain ballad. The people will need have his effigies, though they see his person never so rarely; and if he refuses to sit to the good painter, there are others who, to oblige the public, will take the design in hand...
>
> Tis no small advantage, even in an absolute government, for a ministry to have the wit on their side, and engage the men of merit in this kind to be their well-wishers and friends. And in those states where ambitious leaders often contend for the supreme authority, 'tis a considerable advantage to the ill cause of such pretenders when they can obtain a name and interest with the men of letters. [1]

---

[1] Characteristics, (ed. 1809, Vol.I, p.181-2). Quoted from D.H. Stevens, Party Politics and English Journalism 1702-42.(Menasha, Wisconsin, 1916) p.133.

The man of letters could be most useful if he actually wrote for a party. At least some of the readers of the pamphlets of this period were expected to recognise and value literary ability, to be more likely to be convinced by the work of Swift than by that of writers nearer Grub Street. The political pamphlet was becoming more of a recognised genre in which literary ability played a part; criticism of opponents' style grew more common, and no pamphleteer could afford to give the impression of ignorance of what constituted a "good style". Pamphlets were valued as records of history; several collections of Whig pamphlets of the reigns of Charles II, James II, and William II had been published, and White Kennet, Dean of Peterborough, planned to issue a huge collection as the materials for a history of England. In 1715 an anonymous author attempted to write a history of pamphlets, giving as one of his reasons:

> THE Figure Pamphlets make in the World at present is so very considerable, that there seems a kind of necessity laid now-adays on most People to make their Court to them, or at least to have an Eye upon them, upon some account or other. Some in the first Ranks in Church and State are thought to have honour'd the Catalogue often with Homogeneal Productions, tho' not always with their names. [1]

As a genre of writing the political pamphlet had come of age.

---

[1] Icon Libellorum, or a Critical History of Pamphlets. By a Gentleman of the Inns of Court (1715), p.1.

Several politicians of Queen Anne's reign can be shown to have taken careful interest in organising the press, and to have been specially concerned to attract men of letters to their cause. Robert Harley was the most sensitive to the advantages to be gained by controlling the most effective writers. His part in managing the Tory press in 1700-1702 has already been mentioned. Though there is no satisfactory biography of Harley, his letters show that he remained in contact with a surprising number of writers. In 1704 when Harley was made Secretary of State, an office traditionally concerned with the press, John Tutchin, the author of the Observator, offered his services. Harley made use of this connection, as in the next month, a correspondent sent in a tale of Jacobites in Norwich "which may be useful to Mr. Observator". Harley at once took the matter up with the Bishop of Norwich.[1] Abel Boyer, an outstanding newswriter, who edited The Postboy from 1704-1709, offered Harley information and asked his countenance for a journal of the Duke of Marlborough's campaigns.[2] One of Harley's duties was to insert items of news from Marlborough that were not suitable for the official London Gazette into The Postman of Jean de Fonvive, a French protestant refugee.[3] Harley did not

---

[1] The Historical Manuscript Commission. Fifteenth Report; Appendix, Pt.IV. The Manuscripts of His Grace the Duke of Portland, Preserved at Welbeck Abbey, Vol.IV (London 1897), pp.86, 92 and 97-8.

[2] Ibid, Vol.IV, p.527-528.

[3] Historical Manuscripts Commission. Calandar of the Manuscripts of the Marquis of Bath, Preserved at Longleat, Wilts. Vol.I. (London 1904), p.81

restrict himself to official surveillance of the press. He encouraged John Toland to attack the extreme Tories in 1705 and supported him out of his own pocket for two years.[1] When Harley depended on High-Tory support for his ministry in 1710 he found it convenient to drop Toland, who was obnoxious to churchmen for his deism. Plaintive letters from Toland asked how he had offended, then grew colder as he obtained no success. His last letter is not dated, but was clearly written in 1712. In 1713 and 1714 Toland resumed his career as a pamphleteer on the opposite side to Harley and attacked him personally with great venom for favouring the Pretender.

Harley's relationship with Daniel Defoe has been thoroughly and carefully studied,[2] and I need only summarise their connection. Both in the _Review_, in pamphlets, and as a secret service agent Defoe was of great value to both Harley and Godolphin. He and Harley were both brought up as dissenters and both held political views of a moderation rare for their time. Harley, approachable and always receptive to suggestions, found Defoe a valuable adviser, as William III had, and Defoe cherished a personal attachment to him. Defoe's offer to leave the government service in 1708 when Harley was dismissed from his office shows that he regarded himself as a dependant of the minister.

---

[1] _Portland Papers_, Vol. IV, p.408-10.

[2] The best summing-up is by James Sutherland, _Defoe_ (London 1937)

His patron's advice to continue to work for Godolphin was sensible and Defoe was no doubt glad to take it, but in 1710 he readily proffered his service again to Harley. It appears that Defoe was paid adequately but hardly generously, for his very valuable services, which involved the expense of frequent travel and of maintaining a network of correspondents over England. D.H. Stevens estimates that he received about £400 a year in irregular payments.[1]

When Harley returned to power in 1710 there were other offers of service besides those of Defoe and Toland. Mrs. Manley, the author of the scandalous novel, The New Atalantis, which contained satirical portraits of the Whig leaders, sent him a sample of her work with a plea for employment;[2] Harley did not neglect the offer. Abel Boyer sent a pamphlet he had published supporting Harley's ministry with a request for Steele's place of Gazetteer, but was disappointed.[3] Harley probably also came to an arrangement with Steele, who lost his post of Gazetteer, but retained his place at the Stamp Office. One of Steele's letters mentions a call on Harley on October 9, 1710,[4]

---

[1] Party Politics and English Journalism, pp.55-58.

[2] Portland Papers, IV, 541.

[3] Ibid, IV, 615.

[4] The Correspondence of Richard Steele, ed. Rae Blanchard, (Oxford 1941) p.43.

and presumably John Gay guessed correctly that a bargain was reached whereby Steel agreed not to take an active part in opposition to the new ministry. The Tatler, which had angered the Tories by its occasional glances at them, was soon dropped in favour of the neutral Spectator. When, during his quarrel with Steele in 1713, Swift stressed his intercession with Harley on his friend's behalf, Steele replied with a confident denial that this had been useful, hinting at a private understanding with Harley.[1]

The tact and courtesy shown by Harley played an all important part in securing the services of Swift to manage part of the Tory press. How Harley did this is chronicled in the Journal to Stella. One must admire Harley's choice of Swift, and his recognition that he would have to be treated on different terms from other writers. In return Swift felt a personal allegiance to Harley that went deeper than the conventional attachment to the interest of a politician. Swift acted as a flexible middleman between the Tory leaders and the press, setting others to work and ensuring that the party was represented as its leaders wished. His letters and the Journal to Stella contain the details of his activity.

Henry St. John, created Viscount Bolingbroke in 1711, lieutenant, colleague and finally rival of Harley, was equally sensitive to the

---

[1] Ibid, pp.72, 73. Gay's suggestion is from The Present State of Wit, (1711), reprinted in An English Garner, ed. Edward Arber, I, (London 1903) 205.

power of the press. One Whig writer accused him of managing it for Harley as early as 1707.[1] In August 1710 Bolingbroke started the Examiner, and wrote some of the early numbers.[2] Opposition writers associated him rather than Harley with the paper; "Mr. Maynwaring never doubted but that Mr. St J---n was the main Promoter of that Paper, and that if Mr. H---y paid for it out of the Publick Purse, he not only contributed to it out of his private One, but also by his Assistance in Writing and Correcting."[3] As Secretary of State it was one of Bolingbroke's duties to watch the press, and he made determined attempts to hamper Whig journalists, culminating in the Stamp Tax. He tried to ensure that nothing detrimental to the ministry appeared in the Dutch papers.[4] Bolingbroke was particularly friendly with Swift, and gave him the factual material for The Conduct of the Allies.

The concern of Harley and Bolingbroke for publicity is well known, though its full extent is not always appreciated, but the part played by Arthur Maynwaring in managing the press for the opponents of

---

[1] The Impartial Secret History of Arlus Fortunatus and Odolphus, Ministers of State to the Empress of Grand-Insula (1710)

[2] See Stevens, Party Politics and English Journalism, pp.30ff, for a discussion of Bolingbroke's role as press manager.

[3] John Oldmixon, The Life and Posthumous Works of Arthur Maynwaring, Esq. (London, 1715), p.158.

[4] A Letter from Bolingbroke to John Drummond, October 13, 1710, Works, (London 1798), I, 6. Quoted Stevens, Party Politics and English Journalism, p.34.

Harley's ministry has never been generally recognised. Maynwaring had been a Jacobite early in life but had become attached to the interest of the Duke of Marlborough. The private secretary and personal friend of the Duchess of Marlborough, he also held the post of Auditor of the Imprest, and was a member of the Whig Kit Kat Club, a friend of Robert Walpole, and a recognised wit, poet and man of letters. Until his death in 1712 he seems to have acted a part not dissimilar to that of Swift, that of middleman between the Whig politicians and the pressmen.[1]

Maynwaring had written several pamphlets before 1710 for the Whigs, but he singled himself out in the autumn of that year by organising a reply to the Examiner. Maynwaring was responsible for the first reply to the paper, the Whig Examiner, written by Addison, whose name he kept secret from Oldmixon, who is uncertain whether or not Maynwaring wrote it himself. The Medley, which took the Whig Examiner's place, was written by Maynwaring and Oldmixon, and its publication superintended by the latter:

---

[1] Unfortunately Maynwaring's life has never been adequately investigated, and I have to depend on the evidence of John Oldmixon, a Whig pamphleteer who was, according to his own account, Maynwaring's principal lieutenant. He published a Life of Maynwaring (1715) A History of England (1730) and Memoirs of the Press (1740). Though Oldmixon is concerned to stress his own efforts for the Whig cause in order to obtain preferment, I see no reason why his evidence should not be trustworthy, especially as the politicians he appealed to in 1715 were in a position to know of Maynwaring's activities.

> ...I gave him a Meeting at White's Chocolate House, and he desiring me to take a Turn in the Garden began the Discourse of the Affair he had then in his Thoughts, by complaining mightily of the Villany and Insolence of the Examiner, saying, it did a World of Mischief. He told me he wish'd I would set up a Paper as an Antidote to that Poyson, and that he would assist me in it not only with his Advice but with his Pen. [1]

Steele, White Kennet, and others made occasional contributions. The paper became the voice of the Whig party as the Examiner was that of the Tories.

Neither Marlborough or Godolphin had Harley's interest in the press and both tended to underrate its power. Oldmixon reports Maynwaring's criticism of Godolphin, "He ever despis'd the Press, and never cou'd think a Nation capable of being influenc'd by the Mercenary Productions of a few Libellers till he felt the Effects of it, till his Merit was no longer a Defence to him, and his exalted Reputation was levell'd with Infamy, in the odious Comparisons made by the Examiner and his Brethren, of his Administration with his Successors."[2] As the change in the ministry had identified the interests of Marlborough and Godolphin and the Whig Junto, Maynwaring would have been a suitable spokesman for the whole range of opposition to the new ministers.

Rae Blanchard considers that Maynwaring was responsible for

---

1 Oldmixon, Life of Maynwaring, p.168.

2 Ibid, p.158.

influencing Steele to insert political papers into the Tatler.[1] Oldmixon claims Maynwaring wrote A State of the Thirty Five Millions (1711), a pamphlet that refutes the Tory charges of the financial mismanagement of Godolphin, and that in this work he had the assistance of Robert Walpole. This is confirmed by Horace Walpole, who mentions, with different and doubtless correct emphasis, that Maynwaring frequently revised Walpole's pamphlets.[2] Maynwaring had this particular pamphlet printed but the financial knowledge it shows bears the mark of Walpole's mind. The Four Letters to a Friend in North Britain (1710) are also claimed by Oldmixon for Maynwaring and by Horace Walpole for Walpole. Again it seems likely that the pamphlet was written by Walpole and given to Maynwaring to correct and publish.

Maynwaring acted in a similar capacity for Dr. Francis Hare, Marlborough's chaplain. He revised and published Hare's answer to The Conduct of the Allies, The Allies and the Late Ministry Defended against France and the late Friends of France (1711-12), and had his sermon on Bouchain, The Charge of God to Joshua (1711), printed in England.[3] Oldmixon connects Maynwaring with several other pieces, the

---

[1] The Correspondence of Richard Steele, ed. Blanchard, p.450, Note I.

[2] A Catalogue of the Royal and Noble Authors of England, ed. Thomas Parke (3rd ed., 5 vols; London, 1806), IV, 197.

[3] This and the following information are taken from Oldmixon's Life of Maynwaring, pp.203, 324.

most important being A Letter to a High Church Man (1711), an answer to a pamphlet of Defoe urging peace, and a reply to Swift's A Proposal for Correcting the English Tongue (1712), Maynwaring was the author of several pamphlets attacking Harley's ministry, including: The History of Dr. Sacheverell translated out of the Paris Gazette (1710); Hannibal and Hanno, (see p.552); The French King's Promise to the Pretender (1711); Reflections on a Quotation from the Review, and Remarks upon the Present Negotiations of Peace between Great Britain and France (1712).

Robert Walpole was a younger man than the Junto Lords, and had a great interest in the press; he was probably the Whig politician most alive to its possibilities. He could write unusually well himself. After Maynwaring's death in 1712 it is harder to find evidence of how the Whigs managed the press, but there is a suggestion that Walpole took over some of his duties. Walpole was a friend of Steele, the principal Whig journalist in 1713 and 1714, and defended him at his trial. In 1723 Stephen Whatley, a Whig journalist, wrote to Walpole reminding him of his services to the party:

> In the Close of the Late Reign, your Memorialist had the Happiness of being indulged with Access to your Honour, and was employ'd in the private Printing and Dispersing of several Papers wrote by the Best Pens against the Enemies of the Protestant Succession, particularly the Letter to the West Country Clothier, The Short History of the Parliament and others with which I will not now take up your time... [1]

---

[1] Stevens, Party Politics, p.29.

This may refer to a private press that Walpole was reputed to have concealed in his London house in 1713 because of the difficulty in getting his pamphlets printed. The letter suggests that Walpole was managing the Whig press for the general election of 1713, which is the subject of all the pamphlets mentioned. There is no doubt that the Tories attributed this function to him. An Examiner of 1714 purports to give the minutes of a meeting of a Whig club, clearly the Kit Kat, to organise party policy.[1] Mr. Hush (Bob Hush was Walpole's nickname) presents a report from the committee that deals with the press. The exact role played by Walpole in the Whig press is a subject that could stand further investigation.

The political clubs were less important than individual politicians in the party management of the press. The Kit Kat Club of the Whigs was composed of men of letters and politicians. It frequently distributed patronage to deserving writers, for a combination of Whig views and literary merit, but did not organise day to day journalism. It seems rather to have aimed at spreading Whig principles and ensuring the goodwill of men of letters after the advice of the third Earl of Shaftesbury. Addison, Steele, Congreve, Walsh and Vanbrugh were among the members, as well as Maynwaring and Walpole. Prior was dismissed on his going over to the Tories.

---

[1] Examiner, Feb.19, 1714.

The Brothers' Club, created by Bolingbroke with the aid of Swift, attempted to imitate the Kit Kat. Bolingbroke defined its function in a letter to the Earl of Orrery:

> We shall begin to meet in a small number, and that will be composed of some who have wit and learning to recommend them; of others who, from their own situations, or from their relations, have power and influence, and of others who, from accidental reasons, may properly be taken in. The first regulation proposed, and that must be inviolably kept, is decency. None of the extravagance of the kit kat, none of the drunkenness of the beef-steak is to be endured. The improvement of friendship, and the encouragement of letters, are to be the two great ends of our society. A number of valuable people will be kept in the same mind, and others will be made to converts to their opinions.
>
> Mr. Fenton, and those who, like him, have genius, will have a corporation of patrons to protect and advance them in the world. The folly of our party will be ridiculed and checked; the opposition of another will be better resisted; a multitude of other good uses will follow, which I am sure do not escape you and I hope in the winter to ballot for the honour of your company amongst us. [1]

The emphasis is on the patronage for literary merit and Tory views, to be given by a group from the same party, which replaces the individual patron. The Brothers' Club did distribute money and office to deserving writers, often through the medium of Swift. They did not organise the practical journalism supporting the ministry, which Harley, Bolingbroke and Swift did privately. However, they collected money to reward

---

[1] Bolingbroke, Works, I, 256. Quoted Stevens, Party Politics and English Journalism, p.34-35.

Mrs. Manley for her pamphlets[1] and presented twenty pounds to William Oldisworth,[2] the successor of Swift and Mrs. Manley as writer of the Examiner. Swift reports that his printer would frequently attend the club with any new piece he had just printed, as they enjoyed new ballads and political libels being read aloud. Both Whig and Tory clubs show the value placed by politicians on the good opinion of men of letters, and their efforts to draw them into sympathy with the party.

Swift's important position as friend of the Tory ministers allowed him to distribute money and office on his own initiative, as he did to Parnell and Harrison. He was partly motivated by the duty of furthering the cause of literature, and frequently boasted of the Whig writers he had aided, but his patronage came increasingly to have a party bias. D.H. Stevens gives an excellent account of this work of Swift in Party Politics and English Journalism 1702-1742.[3] He also has a carefully documented account of the way Addison carried out a similar duty for the Whigs, and describes the group of men of letters that met in Button's coffee house.[4] Addison's interest was not so much in day to day journalism, to which he only made a small

---

[1] Portland Papers, V, 453 and 454.

[2] Journal to Stella, ed. Harold Williams (2 vols; Oxford 1948), II, 637.

[3] Stevens, Party Politics and English Journalism, p.15-29.

[4] Ibid, p.30-46.

contribution in this period; this was taken care of by Maynwaring and Walpole. Addison attempted to attract as many literary figures of the time as he could to the Whig cause, sometimes using his reputation to help promote their work. The strength of the pull of party in this field can be seen in the competition between Addison and Swift to persuade Pope to associate himself with a party; the poet, in spite of his wish to remain indifferent, could not avoid having to choose the friendship of the Tories.

The career of Richard Steele shows how he was drawn into politics from his acknowledged position in the world of letters as writer of the Tatler and Spectator. In 1710 Steele had accepted Harley's compromise, though he could not resist coming to the defence of the Duke of Marlborough, whom he hero-worshipped. As was usual, The Englishman's Thanks to the Duke of Marlborough (1712), his work, was not signed. It was not until the summer of 1713, when concern for the succession raised animosity to its highest, that Steele resigned his post at the Stamp Office and decided to enter Parliament. His paper, the Guardian, sounded an increasingly strident note, and its successor, the Englishman, was an avowed political periodical. Steele made a telling impression as a pamphleteer with The Importance of Dunkirk Considered (1713), and The Crisis (1714), which were both signed with his own name. This gesture of commitment and defiance was designed to give unusual prestige to the pamphlets, especially as Steele was a member of Parliament at the time of their publication.

Steel was advised by Addison and backed by important Whig politicians in this striking entry into the field of political writing. Oldmixon wrote in The History of England that Steele, as Maynwaring, was directed by the leaders of the Whigs;[1] on June 20, 1713 Steele wrote to his wife to say a meeting with some Whig Lords had been postponed. The young Earl of Clare, his later patron, nominated him for the Borough of Stockbridge, and presumably offered him his protection. In the dedication to his Political Writings (1715), Steele addresses Clare as if this has been the case, "...it hath been Your Lordship's early Inclination to find out and encourage the Lovers of your Country, to comfort them under the Neglect of their Friends, and support them against the Resentment of their Enemies."[2] Steele was a friend of Lord Halifax, and had contact with many prominent Whigs, including Walpole, through membership of the Kit Kat Club. At his trial in March 1714, for treasonable libels in the Crisis and the Englishman, the Whig leaders treated the trial as a demonstration of party solidarity. Halifax advised Steele in his conduct, Walpole undertook his defence, and on March 5, 1714, Steele was able to report to his wife that he would not be a loser from the affair, "All I hear now is this morning from Ashurst that 3000 l. is to paid in to Mr. Warner for my Use, but when, and by

---

1 The History of England, during the reigns of King William and Queen Mary, Queen Anne, King George I. (London, 1735), p.525.

2 Correspondence of Richard Steele, ed. Blanchard, p.497.

what hand, I am still in the dark."[1]

The careers of Addison, Swift and Steele in this period show the value placed on the services of the man of letters by politicians, both for his influence with fellow writers and as a possible manager of the press and political journalist. The results of this on the quality of professional journalism will be seen in the following chapters. The news-writers and journalists who had to make a living from the patronage of parties showed some resentment at the invasion of their province by the man of letters. The literary figure tended to come from a better social class than the professional journalist, and had enjoyed a university education. He frequently had some kind of private income. The view that there was something suspicious about earning one's living from writing persisted into the eighteenth century and applied particularly to journalism. Though all writers on politics expected some reward,[2] the preferment Swift or Addison expected was a very different thing from the irregular cash payments to Defoe or Mrs. Manley. The accusation of writing for a party for payment was one of the standard insults of the controversialists; "The present

---

[1] Correspondence of Richard Steele, p.298.

[2] In addition to the rewards of party, one must not forget that in the absence of exact records, the flourishing state of the press (see Appendix A) is a sign that a considerable profit was being made commercially from political journalism. John Dunton estimated that De Fonvive drew an income of £600 a year from the Postman (The Life and Errors of John Dunton, Citizen of London, 2 vols; London, 1818, II, 428). The writers of newspapers and periodicals no doubt fared better than the pamphleteers.

Ministry are under no Necessity of employing prostitute Pens:"[1] wrote Swift. Addison, Swift or Steele could defend themselves from the accusation more effectively than the men whose families might want if ready money was not forthcoming.

Swift and Defoe form the most revealing contrast, their careers bringing out the social division between the man of letters and the professional journalist. Defoe depended on money supplied by Harley to keep his family and to meet the expenses of his political duties, and was fulsomely thankful when he received it. Swift returned indignantly a present of fifty pounds from the same man for the expenses of the _Examiner_ and demanded an apology.[2] An insult of this nature made him think of returning to Ireland. Swift refused to pocket the profits from the sale of his pamphlets, leaving them as patronage to the printer. It is not known how much Defoe profited from the sale of his work, but it is difficult to believe that he refused the money he needed so badly. Certainly he complained that pirated editions robbed him of the profits of his poem, _The True Born Englishman_ in 1700. Defoe, despite his pride in speaking to a section of the public who needed his instructions, repeatedly denied that he wrote for profit, and felt bitterly disappointed that he was not given some public office

---

1 _The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift_, gen. ed. Herbert Davis, (12 vols. Oxford 1939-1955). _The Examiner and Other Pieces Written in 1710-1711_ (1940) p.145 (May 3, 1711).

2 _Journal to Stella_, ed. Williams, I, 181-2, 191.

in recognition of his services in helping to bring about the Union of England and Scotland in 1706. The one exchange between the two writers shows Defoe's sensitiveness on this point of social station. In Examiner No.15, Swift contemptuously dismissed the author of the Review as a stupid illiterate scribbler. Defoe devoted several papers to his reply, justifying his lack of the traditional classical education by his knowledge of modern languages, and throughout insisting on his gentility.[1] His obvious pain and disturbance, quite different from his exchanges with Tutchin and Leslie, reveal how deeply Swift's casual remark had affected him. J.F. Ross in his comparison of the two men,[2] stresses the life-long antagonism with which Defoe regarded Swift; long after 1714 the memory remained of the contrast between his furtive visits to Harley and Swift's open friendship, and of the moderate payments he received compared with Swift's deanery.

The professional journalists' jealousy of the standing of the men of letters can be seen elsewhere. Oldmixon compared his reward to that of Steele, feeling that a latecomer to the struggle had taken all the glory. John Toland wrote to Harley in December 1711, plainly

---

[1] The Review

[2] Swift and Defoe, A Study in Relationship, (Berkley, California, 1941) pp.10-37.

revealing his jealousy of Swift and Prior.[1] Abel Boyer wryly compared his own attitude to journalism with Swift's pretensions in a comment on Swift's A Proposal for Correcting the English Tongue. After sneering at Harley's liking for Swift, Boyer concluded, addressing Lord Wharton, to whom he dedicated this volume of his yearly history of the reign; "As for Me, My Lord, Who could never reach such Sublime Notions, I content myself with relating Matters of Fact..."[2]

As well as providing the rewards of cash or office, parties were expected to protect their writers, particularly when in opposition. In 1713 George Ridpath, writer of the Flying Post, and his printer William Hart were prosecuted by the government; the Whigs made a collection for Ridpath of two guineas a head, making it a test of party loyalty.[3] With this money he fled to Holland, forfeiting his bail. Hart elected to stand trial, and was sentenced to the pillory; the Whigs organised a mob which fought a pitched battle to

---

1 Portland Papers, V, 127.

2 The History of the Reign of Queen Anne, Digested into Annals. Year the Tenth, X, (London, 1712). Dedication, vi. The dedication to the previous volume had complimented Harley on his success and moderation. Accused of inconstancy, Boyer addressed his eleventh volume to posterity rather than a potential patron.

3 The Wentworth Papers, 1705-1739, ed. J.J. Cartwright, (London, 1883) p.310.

protect him.[1] Harley sent Swift a hundred pounds to give to John Barber, who had printed The Public Spirit of the Whigs, when he was imprisoned by the House of Lords for refusing to name the author of the pamphlet.[2] Harley also secured the Queen's pardon for Defoe when, by deliberately misinterpreting his irony, the Whigs had him prosecuted for writing against the House of Hanover.

As a result of this protection it proved extremely difficult even for the government to deter the Whig pressmen. Swift vented his exasperation at Whig efficiency in the Journal to Stella, "They get out on bail and write on. We take them again, and get fresh bail; and so it goes round."[3] The ministry dared not imprison the writers wholesale, and nothing else would have silenced them. Successful prosecutions were infrequent as the flimsiest veil on a writer's meaning allowed him to escape. The usual means of dissuasion was arrest on the warrant of the Secretary of State. In the winter of 1711 Bolingbroke arrested fourteen printers and booksellers, but they were promptly bailed out and continued their work against the ministry. As a pamphlet had to bear the name of the publisher but not necessarily that of the author, the writer was even more difficult to punish.

---

[1] Abel Boyer, The Political State of Great Britain (a monthly digest), numbers of which for the last four years of the reign of Anne were published as Quadriennium Annae Postremum, or The Political State of Great Britain, Being the Four Last Years of the late Queen's Reign, (London, 1718, 1719), VI, 57-58.

[2] The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, ed. Harold Williams, (5 vols. Oxford, 1963-1965), II, 637.

[3] Journal to Stella, ed. Williams, II, 568-69 (October 28, 1712).

The only sentence of any severity was that of the Nonjuror Hilkish Bedford, who took the blame for writing The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted (1713), a study of English history with Jacobite leanings. Bedford was sentenced to three years' imprisonment; he had no party to defend him. It is a testimony to the Whigs that Bolingbroke's attempt to curb their press was financial, through the Stamp Tax. The press was too strong an industry and the parties too evenly balanced to allow any more direct attack.

In this survey of the connection of party with journalism, and of the men of letters drawn into political activity, it has been necessary to stress the organisation of the press by politicians. I should like to redress the balance by acknowledging the loose nature of such control, which did not unduly fetter the press. The political writer had freedom to choose the subject and style of his work to make it as attractive as possible to the reader, so that it would sell widely and bring him into the public eye. That he hoped for reward did not mean that he was told what to write; to a large extent it was his ability that was valued. The press was open to those who cared for neither Whig nor Tory; individuals could express their own views and condemn both parties. Nor did the fact that a writer received a reward from a party mean that he did not believe what he wrote. Swift voiced many of his deepest convictions writing for the Tories, and Defoe's occasional equivocation with his conscience was caused by

his political dilemma rather than desire of gain. Writers such as the eccentric John Dunton and John Asgill would have embarrassed anyone they chose to support. In general, the conditions favoured the better writers, who were recognized and encouraged. Party attracted a great variety of writers, including the chief literary figures of the time, by its lure of reward and enabled them to write with reasonable freedom. The existence of party was a major reason for the remarkable interest and quality of the political journalism of 1710-1714.

CHAPTER TWO

THE ELECTION OF 1710 AND THE FIRST YEAR OF THE EXAMINER

A. The impact of Sacheverell on the political situation

At the end of 1709, the ministry in power was nominally led by the Duke of Marlborough, keystone of the Grand Alliance against France, and his friend Sidney Godolphin, expert financial manager. Though these men had been considered Tories until the latter part of Anne's reign, they were not party leaders and felt themselves servants of the Queen, whose first duty was to carry on the war against France. In order to do this most effectively they had allied themselves with the Junto Whigs, who supported the utmost prosecution of the war, and were able to ensure the ministers regular majorities in the Commons. Reluctantly, Marlborough and Godolphin were forced to admit more of the Junto's candidates to high office, often having to put pressure on Anne to assent. In 1708, much against Anne's will, the two ministers had dispensed with the support of Robert Harley, depriving him of his office of Secretary of State, in response to Junto demands. This marked their final loss of Anne's favour; she distrusted the intentions of the Whigs towards her beloved Anglican Church, hated attempts to force her to act against her will, and had a personal liking for Harley, who never failed to treat her wishes with deference. Harley retained her confidence, and she was prepared to take the first opportunity to restore him to power.

Opposing the ministry in the Commons and, though hopelessly outvoted, hoping for a return to office, were two groups. First there were the high Tories, the "Church party" as they liked to call themselves, composed largely of country squires who still felt some of the enthusiasm for the Stuart dynasty that had marked parts of the reign of Charles II. They looked on Anne in an entirely different light from William III, referred to themselves sometimes as the "loyal party", recalling the days of the Civil War, and contained a strong streak of Jacobitism. Many had been brought up on the writings of L'Estrange, and they supported the Church of England with a vigour that verged on bigotry, and hated the dissenters. They respected the Lords Nottingham and Rochester, who had been Anne's first choice as ministers but had soon sacrificed her favour by their extremism. These Tories had promoted bills against the practice of occasional conformity as an attack on the ministers, Marlborough and Godolphin, who replaced these Lords, even trying to tack such a measure to the Land Tax: the suggestion that the Church needed further protection under her rule alienated Anne, who treated the Tories with circumspection.

The other group was the small personal following of Robert Harley, the remenants of the Old Whigs who did not follow the Junto; these became the moderate wing of the Tory party. We have seen Harley's part in leading the Tories in their attack on the Junto in the last years of William's reign. Harley had joined Marlborough and Godolphin in office

as a moderate after the dismissal of Nottingham and Rochester; the ministers found his ability and influence in the Commons invaluable. As Secretary of State he had been instrumental in securing the defeat of the Occasional Conformity Bills, thus losing the confidence of the high Tories. He had a reputation for balancing between the parties, and at his fall in 1708 he moved back towards the Tory opposition, creating a situation similar to the end of William's reign. Though never entirely trusted by the Tories, Harley's favour with Anne and political skill were indispensable to them if they were to return to power. Harley's following tended not to share the Tory feeling for the Church of England, and had no Jacobite leanings, but all had in common a strong dislike for the protracted and expensive war to which Marlborough and the Whigs had committed England. The war was expensive to the landed gentry, who paid the taxes for it, and they thought it had been mismanaged by neglecting Spain and the Navy in favour of land war in Flanders; both Harley and the Tories thought its objects had now been achieved, and that an honourable peace could be concluded.

On November 8, 1709, Dr. Henry Sacheverell preached his famous sermon on the text, "In Perils among False Brethren". He was already notorious as a high-flyer of little political weight, but impressive person and vehement delivery. An opponent later described the occasion:

> He came into the Pulpit like a Sybil to the Mouth of her Cave, or a Pythoness upon the Tripod; with such

> an Air of Fierceness and Rage, as it is not possible to express... I was surpriz'd at the Fiery Red that overspread his Face, (which I have since seen Fair and Effeminate enough) and the goggling Wildness of his Eyes: And I may truly say, He was, (if ever Man) transported with an Hellish Fury... 1

In language of extreme violence Sacheverell attacked the dissenters and those who supported them and declared the Church of England to be in danger, the traditional High Church and Tory war-cry. He reflected on Godolphin, under his nickname Volpone, and launched a barely concealed attack on the ministry. Here is a sample of his oratory, better suited to the pulpit than the press, which rapidly printed it.[2] It is the government's refusal to suppress the dissenting academies that is under fire:

> These FALSE BRETHREN in Our Government, [church government] do not Singly, and in Private spread their Poyson, but (what is lamentable to be spoken) are suffer'd to combine into Bodies, and Seminaries, wherein Atheism, Deism, Tritheism, Socinianism, with all the Hellish Principles of Fanaticism, Regicide, and Anarchy, are openly Profess'd, and Taught, to Corrupt and Debauch the Youth of the Nation, in all Parts of it, down to Posterity, to the Present Reproach, and Future Extirpation of Our Laws and Religion. Certainly the Toleration was never intended to Indulge, and Cherish such Monsters, and Vipers in our Bosom, that scatter Their Pestilence at Noon-day, and will Rend, Distract, and Confound, the firmest and Best settl'd Constitution in the World. 3

---

[1] William Bisset, The Modern Fanatic (1710), p.1-2.

[2] See Appendix A.

[3] The Perils of False Brethren in Church and State, (the printed version of the sermon) 1709, p.14-15.

The lower clergy were generally adherents of the "Church party" and extremist sermons were common, but Sacheverell had chosen the day set aside to celebrate the Glorious Revolution of William III for a sermon that asserted the principles of hereditary right of succession to the Crown, and the subject's duty of non-resistance. Preaching at St. Paul's to the Mayor and Alderman, Sacheverell asserted the subject's obligation to "...an Absolute and Unconditional Obedience to the Supream Power in all Things Lawful, and the utter Illegality of Resistance upon any Pretence whatsoever."[1] That he claimed that there had been no resistance in 1688 was small consolation for this open defiance of Whig political theory. In addition Sacheverell suggested that the theory of resistance was being promoted by those who wished to make the Queen a mere "Creature of their own Power."[2]

It is hard now to realise the intensity of emotion that the ideas of hereditary right and non-resistance could generate as late as 1710. They were a relic of the days of the royalist reaction in Charles II's reign, when non-resistance almost reached the status of an official doctrine of the Church of England. Such doctrines were to many Englishmen an expression of their emotional loyalty to the Crown, which had revived so markedly among the Tories under Anne. The sermon had been calculated to appeal to this latent feeling; Sacheverell

---

[1] Ibid, p.12.

[2] Ibid, p.18.

propounded the traditional identification of Church and State, which were so intermixed that a man who did not belong to the Church of England was a potential rebel. The prince ruled by divine right, and to resist him was a sin against God. Those who held these ideas most strongly were the Jacobites, but many Tories who agreed with the altered succession were hardly less attached to them. To the Whigs stress on such outmoded ideas meant covert support for the Pretender, the claimant with most hereditary right, and the Tory emotions surrounding the Church and prince were redolent of Jacobitism.

Sacheverell's sermon was immediately greeted with enthusiasm by the Tories and with indignation by the Whigs. The ministry decided to demonstrate their strength by an impeachment of Sacheverell, which would serve to vindicate the principle of Parliamentary limitation of the succession. In December Sacheverell was impeached, and in March he came up for trial. What the Whigs had miscalculated was the extraordinary popular support that Sacheverell excited. The London mob demonstrated its support by escorting him to trial and by burning Dissenters' meeting-houses. Politically the Tories gave Sacheverell their support during his trial, seeing an excellent opportunity to embarrass the ministry. Harley was at work among the Lords who were to judge Sacheverell, carrying the message that the Queen favoured leniency. Sacheverell was convicted but such a light sentence given him that his supporters treated it as a victory. His journey through the country to take up a new benefice became a royal progress. Addresses

were sent to Anne from all parts of England, composed and signed at the county quarter-sessions, declaring the addressors' support for her hereditary right, for non-resistance and for passive obedience.

The Sacheverell affair caused a sharp increase of pamphlets on politics in the year 1710; over two hundred dealt with the affair from a variety of angles.[1] Whig writers lost little time in attacking Sacheverell, whose archaic theories of non-resistance offered an easy target for the controversialist. Sacheverell's extremism, violence, and turgid rhetoric made him an embarrassing champion; Atterbury had to write the defence which he delivered to the Lords at the trial. Whig pamphleteers were delighted to accept Sacheverell as the figurehead of the whole Tory party, and then demolish both together. George Ridpath produced one of the earliest comprehensive attacks on these lines in 1709, The Peril of Being Zealously Affected but not Well. Ridpath defends the argument that the people, in their representative capacity, are the ultimate judges of right and wrong and that they have a right to resist royal authority if it oversteps its bounds. He stresses, as do most of the opponents of Sacheverell, that the High Churchmen are working in the interests of the Pretender and the views propagated by the Doctor

---

[1] See Appendix A.

can only result in his return. Sacheverell is called "this Orator and Amanuensis of the Jacobite mob"[1] and his faction are accused of falling in "with the Designe of those who are for a Popish Prince, and a French government."[2] Ridpath attempts to prove that passive obedience is not a doctrine of the Church, and ends with an attack on the High Church view of the relations between Church and State. Ridpath argues that the heart of Christianity lies in faith and conduct, and the organisation and ceremonies of a Church are immaterial and can be altered at will by the State. To the man who believed in a visible Church of Christ on earth, with its bishops enjoying apostolic succession, this stress on faith and conduct at the expense of the Church's authority was an attack on the privileged position of the Church of England.

Ridpath's pamphlet is carefully and seriously argued. A more typical example of the Whig writers' demolition of Sacheverell's sermon is The Cherubim with a Flaming Sword, that appear'd on the Fifth of November last, in the Cathedral of St. Paul. (1709). The author of this played continuously on the French, the Pretender and Popery, accusing Sacheverell and his adherents directly of Jacobitism, and associating them with such nonjurors as George Hicks and Charles Leslie. He treats the sermon as a blow against the civil government:

---

[1] The Peril of Being Zealously Affected but not Well, p.6.

[2] Ibid, p.15.

> They wou'd feign kindle a Civil War, and then send for the French and the Pretender to settle Church and State. This is the pious Knavery, and consecrated Villany of their Cabals and Invectives against the Government. They open loud in all places with Reasons for Non-resistance, and Passive-Obedience ('tis meant to the Pretender) at the same time they are privately consulting how they may resist and overthrow Chruch and State. [1]

The Jacobites already look forward to new fires at Smithfield, when their plotting has been successful. The Mayor of London is banteringly warned that he will be misunderstood if he continues to countenance the printing of the sermon.

Other writers preferred not to take Sacheverell so seriously. White Kennet, Dean of Peterborough, refused to deal with the arguments of the sermon, and concentrated on stylistic criticism. He shared the view of many Whigs that it was unwise to challenge the Church directly by the impeachment of a clergyman, which could raise more popular feeling against the government than for resistance. Kennet endeavoured to show Sacheverell as a fool rather than a dangerous plotter in A True Answer to Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon Before the Lord Mayor, Nov.5, 1709. In a Letter to one of the Aldermen, published in 1709. Kennet starts by admitting that he feels it would have been better if Sacheverell had never been answered, and his sermon allowed to be forgotten. However as it has excited so much comment, Kennet will try and put it in perspective. There is no argument in the sermon

---

[1] The Cherubim with a Flaming Sword, (1709), p.3.

to answer, "but a Jumble of Words and Periods, that made the Crackling of Thorns, Noise and Flame."[1] He will consider the sermon under several heads; the first is propriety of words and phrases:

> This Talent of putting Thoughts into plain and proper Expressions is now grown common among the very Tradesmen and the Women: They that have Sense can do it without being bred to Letters. The meanest Scribler is now asham'd of being tax'd with any Blunder. [2]

Under this head Kennet cites thoughtless use of figurative language, as in the expressions, "the Branch of the Foundation" and "hoisting the Toleration" which he coolly remarks would have been better applied to the Union flag.[3] Under "Good Sense", which is a slightly higher standard than propriety, Kennet points out that the phrase "profess'd Knaves and Hypocrites"[4] is absurd; there may possible be a professed knave, though this is unusual, but how can there be a professed hypocrite?

The sermon fails the test of "Natural and Easy Language" on account of the fustian and bombast of its style:

> See him a little angry with the Pride, Humours, Caprice, and qualmsick Stomachs, of obstinate, moody, wayward and schismatical Hypocrites and

---

1 A True Answer to Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon, p.3-4.

2 Ibid, p.4.

3 Ibid, p.5.

4 Ibid, p.6. To be fair to Sacheverell, in the edition of his sermon which I used (B.M.474.b.29) there was a comma after knaves.

> Enthusiasts, p.17. And if you can bear to come within another Discharge, hearken and have a Care, p.19. Consciences truly scrupulous, let them also move within their proper Sphere, and not grow Excentrick, and like Comets that burst their Orb, threaten the Ruin and Downfall of our Church and State. [1]

Kennet takes the view that the sermon is an archaic piece of controversy, and relates it to Martin Marprelate,[2] and, more pertinently, to the style of the preceding century.

> You have heard Your Grandfather speak of strong Lines. There be few of them now written, and those that are, be from the lowest Scholars in the English Tongue. There is a great deal of difference in a pleasant Rallery [Raillery] and a boistrous Rattling and Railing. [3]

Throughout his examination of the defects of Sacheverell's style Kennet preserves a tone of light ridicule, free from vituperation.

Few pamphleteers could emulate Kennet's appearance of unconcern; the Whig writers' tone of contempt often seems forced, and their confutation of High Church views shows that they considered Sacheverell had offered them a good handle for discrediting the Tories. The Rev. William Bisset attacked Sacheverell's personal character as well as

---

[1] Ibid, p.11-12.

[2] In a strange passage Kennet cites Anthony a Wood for his assertion that Marprelate never went so far as Sacheverell had in calling any bishop "a Perfidious Prelate," though he was "very foul mouth'd". (p.17).

[3] Ibid, p.12.

his ideas in The Modern Fanatic.[1] Bisset raked up some tales of Sacheverell getting drunk in his college days, of swearing, jilting a young girl, being rude to his uncle, and ill-treating his old mother. The triviality of these scandals, some of which Bisset admitted later he had not checked and were false, was only equalled by the violence with which Sacheverell was attacked as a true mirror of the high-flyers. A particularly outrageous incident was that of the Tory hero playing cards on a Sunday.

The attacks on Sacheverell were very confident considering that his impeachment was to play an important part in the fall of the ministry in a few months. Non-resistance and hereditary right were easily refuted, and the accusation of supporting the Pretender liberally used. The attempts to defend the Doctor reflect the embarrassment which he caused, in its cooler moments, the party that had espoused his cause. His undeniable popular backing depended on an appeal to old loyalties, which had nothing to do with argument; at the trial and in the press the Whigs had much the best of the case. Apart from copies of Sacheverell's sermon and his speeches at his trial, which helped

---

[1] The Modern Fanatic, Part One, (1710) provoked a controversy between Bisset and William King, wit and sometime editor of the London Gazette, who replied with A Vindication of Dr. Sacheverell, (1710) in which he ridiculed Bisset's method and evidence. The controversy became very entertaining when King treated it rather as Swift had done the Partridge Affair, and published a faked recantation of Bisset, and finally, to Bisset's growing wrath, answered Bisset's next contribution before he had written it. I think King is a much neglected humorist and controversialist.

to inflame popular feeling, there were far fewer defences of him than attacks. Some emanated from men as violent as Sacheverell himself. Dr. Sacheverell's Defence (1710) could have served as a model for Defoe's The Shortest Way with the Dissenters. Its writer claims that the dissenters cannot say that they are persecuted, because people can only be persecuted if they are penalised for practising the true religion, which is that of the Church of England. More interesting is the emergence of a more moderate defence of Sacheverell. At his trial his counsel Harcourt, later to be a member of Harley's ministry, had pleaded that passive obedience was due to the whole legislature rather than to the person of the King. This made it possible to defend passive obedience without reflecting on William III or the Revolution of 1688. A well thought-out and clearly argued pamphlet, An Answer to the Bishop of Oxford's Speech on the first Article of the Impeachment of Dr. Sacheverell, (1710) adopts this line. Its writer argued that the King and Parliament together possessed absolute power and the King had a right to complete obedience when using his executive power within the law. He allowed that armed resistance might be necessary in extreme cases, but was disastrous if advanced as a regular doctrine.

The numerous Tory addresses presented to Anne during the summer of 1710 received ample treatment in the press. Their tone was that of the High Churchmen and they voiced support for hereditary right, passive obedience, and non-resistance. They usually took care to mention

the Hanover succession to protect themselves from the accusation of Jacobitism. Anne received these addresses graciously and they had considerable publicity, collections of them being published. Whig writers did not let this open demonstration of hostility to the ministry pass unnoticed. John Oldmixon published A History of Addresses in which he tried to expose Jacobite plotting under the pretence of loyalty to the Queen. The most thorough confuter of the addresses was Benjamin Hoadly, better known for his part in the Bangorian controversy in the next reign, who had taken upon himself the position of champion of the Low Churchmen in the earlier part of Anne's reign. In 1718 a collection of twelve tracts was published claiming to be the work of Hoadly during the summer and autumn of 1710. Hoadly undoubtedly wrote some, if not all, of them and for convenience I shall consider them as his work.

Several of these tracts are devoted entirely to the addresses. In a parody of them, The True Genuine Tory Address, Hoadly attempts to expose the contradictions inherent in the addresses by stating them as paradoxes. Here he ridicules the frequent disavowal of resistance:

> We therefore cannot but esteem this the most proper time, to declare our Zeal to be awaken'd into the utmost Abhorrence of those Republican, Antimonarchical Principles, which alone preserved Your ROYAL PERSON, and secured to us the unspeakable Happiness of Your Government; and which alone can remove our Fears of

> returning again to Popery and Slavery, in time to come. [1]

In similar manner he reduces to absurdity the claim that the Revolution of 1688 had not violated the principle of non-resistance:

> ...we will effectually keep out the Pretender, and all the Popish Line, by constantly adhering to those principles of Unalienable Right and Unlimited Non-resistance, by which they were first excluded... [2]

In The Voice of the Addressors Hoadly criticises the contradictions of the addresses directly, again concentrating on the rift between what they say and what they actually mean. They are in the interest of the Pretender rather than Queen Anne. This pamphlet must have been published after it was clear that the old ministry were falling, as Hoadly suggests that the war effort will suffer if they lose power.

The daily and thrice-weekly newspapers were more occupied with foreign affairs than Sacheverell. They did not carry a leader and, with occasional exceptions, left direct comment on domestic politics to the periodicals. The Postboy however gave vigorous encouragement to the Tories. It carried in most of its summer issues a "loyal address" that mentioned hereditary right and passive-obedience, and gave rapturous accounts of Sacheverell's triumphant progress through England to his new benefice,presented by an admirer, after his sentence.

---

[1] A Collection of Several Papers Printed in the Year 1710, (London 1718) p.2.

[2] Ibid, p.5.

The political periodicals, The Observator and The Review, concentrated almost every issue on Sacheverell during the trial. Both at this time took a strong Whig line, defended the impeachment, confuted hereditary right and passive obedience, and violently condemned Sacheverell. The Observator was the least reasonable; if the observator hears of a riot, he announces sagely to Roger the countryman, his companion in the weekly dialogue, "These are new Proofs, Roger, that by Passive-Obedience, the faction mean nothing but Rebellion".[1] Continual reports come in from the country of what outrages the "Sacheverell mob" has perpetrated. His adherents have been debauching young girls in church doors and cock-fighting with birds named Burgess, a prominent Dissenter, and Sacheverell. Another sign that the Pretender is at the root of the tumults is the number of Papists engaged in nocturnal rambles in London. These stories are supplemented with discussions of hereditary right and passive obedience, and proofs that these doctrines mean that Queen Anne is a rebel. The standard Whig view is repeatedly hammered home. The opposition to the ministry is usually called "Sacheverell's faction"; for the Observator, it consists of disaffected clergy, nonjurors, Papists and men of "arbitrary principle" who support "Popery and Slavery". On April 19th, 1710, in An Enquiry into the causes of the late Rebellious tumults, and present ferments, and some of the late

---

[1] The Observator, No.19. Saturday, March 18. to Wednesday, March 22. 1710.

Addresses, it is put forward that many who took the oaths to William remained Jacobites and are now malignantly agitating for the "Old Cause". The *Observator* gives consistent warm support to the ministry throughout the dispute.

At this stage Defoe's *Review* was also engaged in confuting Sacheverell's principles and emphasising the logical consequences of his views. They must, if taken seriously, further the return of the Pretender. Defoe's readers are invited to choose between an arbitrary monarch or one limited by law. When the light sentence was passed, Defoe spent several numbers trying to prove that Sacheverell had been found guilty, that the sentence was serious, and the celebrations of the High Church party were misplaced.

B. Moderate support for Harley

(i) The Examiner

While the agitation over Sacheverell reached its height, Harley had concerted a plan of action with Anne to dislodge Godolphin and the Junto from office. The general discontent raised by Sacheverell, aggravated by successive bad harvests and the heavy taxes of a long war, ensured that there would be considerable support for a change of ministry. The dismissal of Sunderland on June 14, and Godolphin on August 8, 1710 marked the end of the Godolphin ministry, and Harley was made Chancellor of the Exchequer on August 10. His immediate problem was how to form a workable government. His High Tory allies had a well deserved reputation for destroying themselves by their

extremism when in positions of power. They had repeatedly threatened the toleration of Dissenters. The financiers of the City distrusted the Tories because of their bias towards landed interests as opposed to trade, and a rise in their fortunes tended to be marked by a fall in public credit. It was Harley's task to allay the anxieties that a change had created. He and his moderate followers had no sympathy with Sacheverell, and though they were prepared to use his popularity, they did not wish to be branded as as a ministry of extremists. Harley himself cherished ambitions of leading a coalition of moderates in a ministry that would not rely on either party, seeing himself rather as a servant of the Queen than a leader of the Tories.

While Harley negotiated with political leaders in August and September, trying to win over the support of the more moderate Whig lords for his government, Bolingbroke, his trusted lieutenant, had the job of providing a party line for their followers. The weekly periodical The _Examiner_ was the form he chose, and the first issue appeared on August 3, immediately before the dismissal of Godolphin, the sign that the position of the old ministers was irrecoverable. William King edited the first few months' issues. The first number was suspected to have been written by Bolingbroke himself. It starts with a declaration of purpose, to correct false wit, false learning, false politics and false divinity, by examining various pamphlets as they appear. A Whig broadsheet, _Mr. Pettecum's Letter_ is the first

of these; it purported to be a letter from Pettecum, an agent of Holstein, to a Dutch Deputy, M. Buys.[1] Pettecum voices the concern of the Allies at the events in England, and tells how the High Church agitation and the threatened change of ministry have encouraged the French plenipotentiaries to hinder, then break off negotiations for peace. The Frenchmen have confided to Pettecum that they trust the new ministry to give them better terms, and act generally in the interests of the Pretender. If the unctuous tone of these unlikely confidences did not arouse the readers suspicions about its authenticity, the naive horror and amazement of Pettecum marked the production as a Whig pamphlet.

The author of the first Examiner takes some care to prove that this tract is a Whig effort rather than a diplomatic document, and takes the opportunity to leave the vexatious subject of the Church.

---

[1] The only copy of this tract I could find was a reprint of it in Abel Boyer's Annals of Queen Anne for 1710 entitled, A Letter (suppos'd) from Monsieur Pet--m to Monsieur B--ys. (IX, 53). Its attribution poses an interesting problem. Addison, in a letter to Lord Wharton, suggested Walpole, (The Works of Joseph Addison, ed. Richard Hurd, 6 vols. London, 1811, V, 396). Horace Walpole in A Catalogue of Royal and Noble Authors, (IV, 197), lists the pamphlets of Robert Walpole; among them is A Letter from A Foreign Minister in England to M. Pettecum (1710). As this pamphlet justifies the change it can hardly be by Walpole; in addition Abel Boyer claimed he had written it (Quadriennium Annae Postremum I, 1). The most likely explanation is that Horace Walpole selected the wrong 'Pettecum's letter' knowing his uncle had written something of that name. This explains why A Letter from a Foreign Minister is under Walpole in the British Museum catalogue.

He tries to allay the suspicion that the change of ministry will mean a collapse of the war effort and surrender to France. Marlborough is treated with caution, praised lavishly for his patriotism, and reports that he will resign if his friends are removed from office are indignantly refuted on his behalf. The new ministers could not afford to risk a resignation from Marlborough while they were occupied with the problems of coming into power, and they did their best at first to conciliate him. The writer goes on to deny that a new Parliament should be any less patriotic than the old one. To placate allies, investors and bankers, an assurance is given that national credit will not suffer from the change. After this display of moderation, the writer permits himself an attack on the old ministers and the attitude, implicit in Mr. Pettecum's Letter, that fidelity is due to them rather than to the Queen. The appeal to Tory sentiment for Anne is skilfully made in a parody of the oath of allegiance, which is composed of phrases from the "Letter":

> I A.B. do swear, that I will be faithful to the CHIEF MINISTERS, and be their best Friend, and if such a happy and successful MINISTRY be disgrac'd, I will be assistant when the Spirit of the English Nation shall awaken, and pursue with Vengeance the Authors of such bold, desperate and destructive councils". [1]

The shifting of attention to the war and the deficiencies of the late ministers suited Harley far better than controversy on

---

[1] The Examiner, No.1, Aug. 3 1710.

non-resistance and attacks on dissent. The next number of the <u>Examiner</u> continued on the same lines by attacking a pamphlet of Hoadly's, <u>The French King's Thanks to the Tories of Great Britain</u> (1710), which was written in the form of a letter from Louis XIV to the Tories thanking them for helping his cause and that of the Pretender. In reply the Examiner accuses the Whigs of trying to create artificial fears of the new ministry. Did not the Whigs recognise the Pretender's legitimacy to strengthen their theory of resistance to arbitrary power and of the Parliamentary title to the crown? The Whigs are accused of trying to persuade Marlborough to resign and of sinking credit by selling government stock. In the third number the <u>Examiner</u> argues for the new Parliament which the Whigs hoped to avoid, thereby retaining their power in the Commons.

The editor and writers of the <u>Examiner</u> had an extremely difficult task. The popular momentum for a change had come from the High Church party and Sacheverell; the fall of Godolphin had resulted from Harley's relationship with the Queen. While the extreme Tory propaganda put into practice would have proved fatal to any ministry, government could not be carried on without the support of the Tories in the Commons. The <u>Examiner</u> had to build up a party programme that would bind the majority of the Tories into some kind of unity under Harley without making concessions to their extremism. This problem dogged the Tory ministry of 1710-1714 both in propaganda and in Parliamentary tactics, and finally caused its collapse.

Bolingbroke did his best to increase the reputation of the

Examiner; in August he wrote A Letter to the Examiner (the authorship was generally realised) to give something of his authority to the paper. In this letter Bolingbroke dealt with the war of the Spanish Succession and outlined a policy for the Examiner to follow. He adopts the Country attitude; Great Britain has taken too large a share of the cost of the war, and has not devoted sufficient attention to Spain itself, or to the navy. The war has been unnecessarily prolonged by challenging France at her strongest point, Flanders. He stresses the expense of the war with a new warmth: "Britain may expect to remain exhausted of Men and Money, to see her Trade divided amongst her Neighbours, her Revenues anticipated even to future Generations, and to have this only Glory left Her, that She has proved a Farm to the Bank, a Province to Holland, and a Jest to the whole World."[1] Such language together with the hint that the peace conference was broken off because of Whig rather than French intransigence, was a direct appeal to the growing disillusion with the war felt by the landed gentry paying the taxes for it.

Turning to domestic policy, Bolingbroke also stresses the insolence of the Whig ministers to Queen Anne, and their eagerness to reserve all offices for themselves. He touches on the attempt to remove Mrs. Masham, Harley's confidant, from her position as favourite

---

[1] Jonathan Swift. The Examiner, and Other Pieces Written in 1710-1711, (Oxford, 1940) ed. Herbert Davis, Appendix A, p.224.

of the Queen. The Sacheverell affair is briefly referred to as an example of the insolence of the Whigs in trying to restrict the royal prerogative. This has aroused the "Nobility, Gentry, Clergy and Commonality of Great Britain" in Anne's defence.[1] The plea that the old ministers are the only ones capable of handling European policy is rejected as a last desperate attempt of the Whigs to regain power, and the letter ends on a note of triumph.

The advice to concentrate on the war and the indignities offered to the Queen was sound, but the Examiner lacked continuity and coherence in its early days. According to Swift its authors included Bolingbroke, Atterbury, Prior, and Friend; but, despite this talent, the lack of a guiding hand is evident. Steele is heavily attacked in several papers for the Tatler's ventures into politics, and a poem of Dr. Garth praising Godolphin is ridiculed. More important than these slight papers, others showed a dangerous tendency towards High Church extremism. In number eight certain topical key-words and phrases are discussed. It is denied that the word, High Churchman, implies extremism; in the cause of right it is impossible to carry matters too high. Low Church is defined as anti-Church. There are three varieties of Churchmen; "True Churchmen", "False Churchmen" and "No Churchmen". The tone of this section is violent and reminiscent of Sacheverell. Even worse it

---

[1] Ibid, p.226.

hinted that there was no just cause for the rebellion against James II.

The most embarrassing paper was number thirteen, on the subject of non-resistance, which may have been written by Atterbury. When the Examiners were reprinted as an octavo volume in 1711, this paper was quietly dropped and the others renumbered.[1] In a clear and forceful style the author of this issue reasserted the extreme view of non-resistance without the customary qualifications or ambiguity used by more cautious exponents. Submission to God is the end of government, rather than the good of the people, and as the prince is the representative of God, obedience to him is a religious duty, however unjust he may be. The only exception is if the prince should try to take a subject's life, in which case he has a right to preserve himself but not to raise organised rebellion. Such a frank avowal of an extreme form of non-resistance gave Whig controversialists tolerable colour for accusations that the Tories favoured the Pretender; it was the very attitude that Harley wished to avoid.

(ii) Faults on Both Sides

In mid-September 1710, Anne dissolved Parliament prematurely and gave notice that there would be new elections in October. Harley had

---

[1] Herbert Davis, in his edition of The Examiner, and Other Pieces Written in 1710-1711 uses the later numbering, starting Swift's papers at No.13. I have followed Davis for the work of Swift, and the original numbering for the first thirteen issues of the Examiner.

decided that he could not obtain sufficient support from the existing House of Commons for his administration. This marked his failure to detach a significant proportion of Whigs from the Junto, but he retained many in high office and firmly refused to purge them generally from their places. Harley still cherished the idea of a moderate coalition of "Queen's servants" drawn from both parties. Many observers felt that he distrusted the Tories and was afraid that the enthusiasm raised by Sacheverell would sweep the high-flyers into Parliament; he did not hurry to change the key offices by which the Queen's patronage could be brought to bear at elections, and was accused by the extremists of hamstringing the Tory campaign. In September and October a number of pamphlets appeared that put forward the idea of a moderate coalition to the nation. They attacked the late ministry on other grounds than the impeachment of Sacheverell, and at this stage showed an attitude of reserve, if not hostility, to the High Churchmen. These pamphlets were felt to represent the personal feeling of Harley towards the elections and to mark out the broad basis for a government under his leadership.

By far the most important pamphlet was entitled Faults on Both Sides: Or, An Essay upon The Original Cause, Progress, and Mischievous Consequences of the Factions in this Nation. It appears to have made a big impression when it was published, probably in late September or early October; at least seven fulllength pamphlets were published in reply or pretended continuation of it, and it is referred to often

in the periodicals of the time.[1] It is worth examining in some detail. Faults on Both Sides was written in answer to Benjamin Hoadly's Thoughts of an Honest Tory, which purports to be from a Tory who feels ashamed of his party's support for Sacheverell, and thinks the late ministry honest men, gravely wronged by their dismissal. However Faults on Both Sides does not depend on Hoadly's pamphlet, which it quickly passes over; it is a serious and very perceptive essay on the state of the parties in England, written without humour or insult.

Faults on Both Sides opens with a summary of its main theme; its author addresses the "Honest Tory".

> SIR,/YOUR Thoughts and mine agree in so many things, that I could please my self to think that there were a Possibility of reconciling Whigs and Tories, if there were to be found among your Party Men of such Moderate Sentiment as you have exprest through your whole Letter; but,
>
> Timeo Danaoes, & Dona ferentes.
>
> your Concessions are so large in our Favour, that you give me Cause to suspect you have only assum'd the Name of a Tory, but are indeed a Crafty Whig at the bottom; however, I am willing to incline to the Charitable Side, and had rather submit to the Delusion, than omit so fair an Occasion to own my Belief, that there are honest Men in both Parties

---

[1] This pamphlet was attributed to Harley himself, (Oldmixon, ref. Clayton Roberts, Growth of Responsible Government, p.353-4, note 2) and to Simon Clements, a merchant and later secretary to the Earl of Peterborough (Onslow, Burnet's History of his own Times, ed. 1833, VI, 14 note). Contemporary speculation pointed to Harley, and in February 1711 Abel Boyer confidently ascribed it to Clements (Quadriennium Annae Postremum, I, 49) when he himself sympathised with Harley and had written similar moderate tracts. Peterborough was an eccentric Whig, considering himself deprived of military credit by the Junto, and was associated with Harley during and after the change.

> and to endeavour to convince the Honest Whigs as well as the Honest Tories that the Difference of their Opinions in relation to Religion and Civil Government is not so great as they are made to believe; and that they might easily be brought to agree in preserving the Publick Tranquility, if there were not designing Men in both Parties, who have each in their turns artfully contriv'd to keep open the Breach, and ventilate the Heats and Animosities of ignorant People; that by the Strength of their respective Factions they may be enabled to promote their own sinister Designs, which generally have been to engross the Places and the Profits of the Government into their own hands, to raise vast Estates to themselves by purloyning all they can from the Publick, and to establish such an Interest as may always support them from being call'd to account for their Mismanagements. [1]

The author sets out to prove this statement with a history of the parties, steering a judicious middle course. His unusually high standard of argument can be seen in his use of Harrington's theory that the balance of property moving away from the crown to the gentry was instrumental in causing the Civil War. Parliament was justified in trying to restrain Charles I from setting up an arbitrary monarchy, but the war threw power into the hands of ambitious men who sought to establish themselves by the evil action of executing the King. In reaction, in the reigns of Charles and James II, the Tories were misled into flattering regal power to a dangerous extent, aiding the designs of James, though not all realised what they were doing.

---

[1] Faults on Both Sides, p.3-4.

> ...I will not yet doubt but that many honest well-meaning Men, zealous for the Monarchy and the Church, were impos'd upon by the Leaders of that Party, (who were all the while playing their own game at Court preferments) and deluded into a groundless Jealousy that the Dissenters were aiming at the destruction of both. [1]

Shaftesbury's Whigs played the parts of true patriots in pressing Exclusion. Whigs and Tories joined in bringing over William III, but the author acknowledges that the Tories, having seen the error of their ways, must take the greater credit.

After the Glorious Revolution, party distinctions revived, but the new Whig party of the Junto rivalled the Tories in its corruption. The writer launches a heavy attack on the Whig ministry of William III, in which the basic charge is:

> ...they were no sooner got into Power, but their former zeal for the publick turn'd all into words and professions, when in deeds they greedily pursu'd their own private Interests and fell on the readiest ways to enrich themselves at the Nation's cost, prostituting their Principle to their profit. [2]

The writer brings up the old Country objections to the management of the war; that not enough attention was paid to the navy, that corruption was widespread, and that the new means of financing the war, by the creation of a National Debt, was unnecessary and wasteful in that it anticipated a large part of the future taxes. Worst of all, the Whigs supported extension of the royal prerogative and the

---

[1] Ibid, p.14.

[2] Ibid, p.17.

creation of a standing army against all Whig principles:

> If then, to allow them their most plausible Argument, it had been judg'd requisite to have kept up an Army for some time, I am sure that when I was first a _Whig_, we shou'd have accounted it abominable _Tor[y]ism_, to have entrusted the entire disposal of them to any King whatsoever, and that at least the Money rais'd to maintain them, should have been put under the Direction of Parliamentary Commissioners. [1]

The writer argues that at this time the names Whig and Tory were misleading, having become detached from their original meaning. Using the terms Court and Country, he paradoxically claims that by supporting the Court the Whigs had lost their principles and become Tories, whereas the Tories, playing the Country role, had become good Whigs. Only the difficulty of distinguishing between name and reality enabled the Junto to shelter behind a name that they did not deserve. At this point Harley and his "Flying Squadron", the Whigs who had linked with the Tory opposition to the Junto, are introduced as "Old Whigs", who have retained their purity of motive. They are to be praised for their part in checking the actions of the Junto, despite the abuse given them for their "desertion".

In Anne's reign the writer approves the conduct of Marlborough and Godolphin, nominal Tories, in defeating the plans of the high-flyers by securing the defeat of the Occasional Conformity Bills. All went well until the mismanagement of the war in Spain forced the

---

[1] _Ibid_, p.21.

ministers to rely on the strength of the Junto in the Commons. There follows a detailed account of the Junto tactics during a scandal in 1708 about the number of troops then in Spain, showing how they switched their influence first to put pressure on the ministers, then to relax it when their demands for office were met. The writer claims that the Junto were determined to monopolise all offices; it was pressure from them that secured Harley's dismissal, and they attempted to blacken him in the Gregg Affair.[1] Harley is praised for his firm adherence to Whig principle and his relations with the Tories justified; his influence has been to moderate their extremism. He is credited with persuading many not to vote for tacking the Occasional Conformity Bill to the Land Tax.

When the Junto and the ministers had come to terms with each other and were confident in their power to defeat any criticism, the situation worsened. The war was further mismanaged, and Queen Anne forced to place her wishes second to those of the Junto. The writer bitterly complains of the attempt to tyrannise over the Queen, touching on the moves to make her dismiss her dresser, Mrs. Masham, on account of her friendship to Harley. Arriving at the change of ministry, the writer asserts that the Queen has initiated it herself,

---

[1] Gregg was a clerk of Harley's who betrayed secrets to France. Though Harley discovered this, his lax security was exposed, and the Whigs did their best to suggest that he was implicated in Gregg's treachery, despite the clerk's steady denial of it on the scaffold.

to release herself from men grown too great to be subjects. The change has not been made from caprice, or because the Queen prefers Tories to Whigs, but

> ...from an inevitable necessity of giving some speedy cheque to the formidable Power of a few Men, who have given Indications too evident to be slighted, that they have entered into Confederacies, and taken Resolutions to govern both Queen and Nation; according to their own pleasure: And because the great Men of the Whig side have so deeply engag'd themselves with the Ministers in these dangerous Intrigues, and divers of them have rendred themselves too obnoxious to be longer confided in; it therefore became unavoidable to have recourse to such who have indeed rang'd themselves on the other side, but have seen the Error of extreams, and are willing to enter into healing and moderate measures: nor is there the least Reason to doubt, but that all those of the Whig Party who shall abandon the Designs of the Junto, and heartily concur (according to their own Principle) in the Promotion of the publick Good, will be as freely admitted to Employments, and as well regarded as ever; nothing being more desirous than a coalition of the honestest Men of both sides to balance the over-grown Power of the Ministers, and to manage the Affairs of the Government in such ways as may most conduce the ease and satisfaction of Her Majesty, and to the Welfare and Prosperity of the Nation. [1]

The Junto have shown the lengths to which they are prepared to go in their desperate attempts to frustrate the change of ministry. They have instigated protests from our Dutch allies and from the Bank to Anne; both have had the temerity to advise her not to change her ministers. Another instance is the rumour, helped by the Bank's protest,

---

[1] Ibid, p.36.

that England's finances will collapse through lack of confidence if the ministry is changed. The malice of the Junto is also responsible for a propaganda campaign of scandal, suggesting the blackest accusations against their successors; the dissenters will lose the privilege of occasional conformity and even a bare toleration. All Whigs will be purged from office, the high-flyers will resume power, eventually breaking the Revolution settlement and bringing in the Pretender, who will with his 'sponge' abolish the public debt. As the writer has cleverly separated Whig principles from the Junto, he is well placed to attack them without opening himself to such charges as the above. They are given a brief, contemptuous denial. There will be no purge of Whigs from office, and no further moves against dissenters. There is no evidence that the new ministers do not share the nation's loyalty to Hanover; all the answer needed to accusations of Jacobitism is, "Bellarmin thou lyest".[1] Though he has previously hinted in his discussion of the war in Spain that it had been prolonged unnecessarily, and fought in Flanders for the benefit of Marlborough, the writer is concerned to expose rumours that there will be a dishonourable peace. The war will be prosecuted until a good peace can be made, but without corruption and mismanagement. A long section is

---

[1] Ibid, p.45. A proverbial expression in contemporary pamphlets for a simple denial. I have not been able to find its origin, but it seems to refer to some controversy between a "parson" and Cardinal Bellarmine, Catholic apologist of the sixteenth century.

devoted to public credit, arguing that public credit depends on punctual fulfilment of government obligations rather than on particular ministers, and hints that Harley will have spectacular success in raising money needed immediately by the army.[1]

Having bitterly attacked the Junto, and calmed apprehensions of violent change, the writer returns to the theme of party.

> I will, Sir, own to you, That I have always espous'd the true Whig-Principle; that is, to be heartily affected to the Court and Ministry, when they act uprightly for the publick Good, and as heartily to oppose them when they do otherwise, and you'll see that I regard the thing itself so much more than the bare Name of it, which some Men have assum'd only to work their own ends, that I have as freely animadverted on the late Proceedings of some of my own Party as you have done upon yours... [2]

Then follows an attack on the high-flying Tories, and by clear implication Sacheverell, for "Nonsensical Addresses and Furious Insolent Sermons."[3] The stress they put on hereditary right and non-resistance is highly suspicious; they may even hope for a return of the Pretender in order to promote their "Ecclesiastical domination" of the state. Yet the view of non-resistance that the writer puts forward as 'Whig' is carefully phrased so that it would be acceptable to many Tories. He argues, as Sacheverell's counsel at his trial had done, that passive obedience is indeed owed to the prince when he acts according to law,

---

[1] This may be the result of inside information. See p.437.

[2] Ibid, p.46.

[3] Ibid, p.47.

and explains that the true Whigs will not countenance rebellion except after the clearest infringement of the constitution.

He argues that all Tories cannot be blamed for the excesses of the high-flyers:

> ...There are many Gentlemen among them, who tho' they may have a more than needful Concern for the Monarchy and the Establish'd Church, are yet zealous for the supporting Her Majesty's Title and the Hanover Succession, and do sincerely approve the Revolution-Principles, and abhor the Slavish Doctrine of Passive Obedience: And these do, in respect to Civil Government so nearly mean the same thing with the honest, well meaning, disinterested Whigs, that if these two sorts would but let fall their mutual Jealousies, and unite themselves in all those things that apparently concern the publick Good, the Nation might be so happy as to see a speedy end put to our Factious Divisions, and the designing Grandees on both Sides would find themselves left without Followers to shift for themselves. [1]

The quarrel of Whig and Tory over such vexatious subjects as the monarchy and Church is, among the moderates of both sides, largely irrelevant. Both agree on the essential, a limited monarchy, and differ only in emphasis. Accusations of republicanism by Tories, and absolutism by Whigs depart from political reality.

After this moderation the writer shows his own Whig principles in a discussion of religion. He separates the invisible Church of Christ, in which all believers in the basic truths of Christianity share, from the political Church established by the Christian magistrate.

---

[1] Ibid, p.48.

He asserts the importance of faith and charity over controversial subjects like Church government and ceremony, and comes out strongly against any participation of the Church in politics. This was aimed at the High Churchmen. Previously he has maintained that the Whigs are good Churchmen, and that the parties are political, not religious divisions. He deprecates contests over the outward forms of religion, and blames those "High-flying Clergy-men", wolves in sheep's clothing, who "fill their Sermons with Reviling, Slander and Invective, to stir up Men's minds to Wrath and Discord."[1] Though the object of this section appears to be to persuade Whigs and Tories that religion is no reason for division, such animosity is shown towards the High Churchmen that it is clear that the writer does not regard them as likely participants in the new ministry.

The pamphlet ends with a call to honest men of both parties to unite behind their Queen and the new ministers, and put an end to the rule of both the Junto and the High Tories:

> Thus, Sir, I have taken the Occasion of your Letter, to convince the honest Men on both sides, that they have been all along deceiv'd and cheated through the Opinion and Confidence they have had of their respective Parties, who have prov'd to us like a Whip-saw, which soever Extream is pull'd, the Nation is still miserably sawn between them. 'Tis time for us then to grow wiser, and for all such as sincerely desire the publick Good and Welfare of their Country, to bury their Animosities, and labour to reconcile their imaginary Differences,

---

1 Ibid, p.53.

> that they may no longer suffer themselves to be made use of as Tools, and to be play'd against one another by crafty and designing Men, who regard them no further than as they can make them subservient to their own purposes. It would be a great Happiness to the Nation, if in Cities and Corporations, both Sides would meet in a friendly manner to consult of their Elections for Representatives in Parliament, and unite in making choice of Men of the greatest Integrity and Probity, without any consideration of their Party... [1]

Faults on Both Sides is a very skilful performance, uniting a sensible view of Whig principle to the old dream of non-party government. For despite the existence of party, the early eighteenth century found it hard to accept that an organised opposition to the government should exist; it seemed a ruinous division still retaining some of its old association of treason. The pamphlet offered a sophisticated account of the events of the last twenty years, much of which the informed observer would have appreciated. That such a subtle version of the party struggles could be published shows how far off were the days of the rigid distinctions of the Exclusion Crisis. Faults on Both Sides could allay the fears of the change favouring the Pretender; no one could accuse its author of being a high-flyer. It provided an outlet for discontent with the Junto other than the danger to the Church of England, and resurrected the Country programme of financial economy, popular when European war was losing its glamour. It vindicated the reputation of Harley, prone to give ground for insults like

---

[1] Ibid, p.55.

his nickname, "Robin the Trickster" by his shifting between Whig and Tory, by showing that the political scene itself had shifted with him, paradoxically claiming for him a record of consistency. Its tone of informed commonsense helped to dispel the rumours of drastic changes, and represented the events of 1710 as natural and reasonable political moves. Its balanced fairness provided a convincing and reassuring basis for a new ministry, which the Sacheverell dispute certainly did not. Not least impressive to contemporaries was the pamphlet's confident assumption of knowing the desires both of Harley and Queen Anne, the strong hints that its author had inside knowledge of the principal actors in the fall of the old ministry.

The replies to Faults on Both Sides show that it must have puzzled many of its audience because of the way it refused to accept the usual party line, but the extremists showed no lack of confidence in dealing with it. The Medley, Maynwaring's and Oldmixon's periodical, declared that the pamphlet was an enemy to the old ministry. With its usual brusque vigour, the Medley tries to brush the new line aside, "So our Author has undone all that has been doing these six months, by damning the Hereditary, Jure Divino, the Unlimited Passive-Obedience, Non-Resistance, the Independency, and Addressing, which seems all that's contested for". It mentions our "Tory-Whig" and greets the remarks against the Church with delighted acceptance; "He's again flinging at the Priesthood." The middle way cannot be taken seriously; "And as to the Whigs ventilating Heats they'll have

a hard matter to clear themselves of his Charge, now the Tories give such substantial Proof of their Moderation."[1] The Medley treats the pamphlet as a Tory trick that defeats itself by its very absurdity.

Paradoxically, the writer of the eighth Examiner linked Faults on Both Sides no better than the Medley. He devoted this paper to defending the High Churchmen by examining the current catchwords and phrases of politics. One of these is "Faults on Both Sides," which gives the writer a chance to attack the pamphlet without mentioning it directly. He sees the new attitude to party as an attempt to confuse right and wrong principles:

> This is a most useful Expression to some Men: Here they have always a sure Refuge... But if there be Faults on both sides, yet are those Faults equal? And even if they are, what is that to the merits of the Cause. But this levelling of Persons and Things is an excellent way to make people talk like Children, to cast a Mist before their Eyes, confound their Judgments; and take away all Distinction between Truth and Falsehood. 2

He feels the pamphlet a threat to the orthodox Tory position.

The High Churchman had little sympathy for Harley's moderation. Dr. Joseph Trapp, another zealous Churchman in search of preferment, showed no hesitation in criticising Faults on Both Sides in a similar

---

1 The Medley, October 16 to October 23, No.4, 1710.

2 The Examiner, No.8, September 14 to September 21, 1710.

manner to the eighth Examiner. The title of his reply was Most Faults on One Side: or, the Shallow Politicks, Foolish Arguing, and Villanous Designs of the Author of a late Pamphlet, Entitul'd Faults on Both Sides. Trapp admits that this is a new brand of Whiggism indeed:

> His Performance is indeed an extraordinary one; it is such a motly, parti-colour'd, in-and-out Piece, that even this whimsical Age of Scribbling has not produc'd anything like it. The Truth is, the Whigs are got into a Net; and to wind themselves out of it, they are wriggling and twisting, and turning themselves into all Shapes... [1]

It is true that the pamphlet censures the Whigs:

> But then the Use he would make of this seemingly frank Acknowledgment, is to make it believ'd that he's Impartial in his Account of Things; in order to have his project more glibly swallow'd. And what is his Project? Truly, that wise one of a Coalition. [2]

Trapp replies to the pamphlet in detail with quotation and answer. He defends the loyal reaction of the Restoration; one can never be too loyal. The dissenters were not persecuted in Charles II's reign, but merely "not tolerated with absolute Impunity".[3] Later he hints at the possibility of a new Occasional Conformity Bill. Such remarks carried disquieting implications of what the new ministry

---

[1] Ibid, p.4-5.

[2] Ibid, p.4-5.

[3] Ibid, p.8.

should do. Trapp vindicates Harley from being a Whig, and prudently suggests that he should not be called by "either of the Cant-Names";[1] neither he nor Mrs. Masham are to be "complemented into Whiggism".[2] The faults of the parties are far from equal. The Whigs have thoroughly bad principles, of which the central one is confusion; they would not only destroy government in Church and State, but all distinction, "even that of Good and Evil, of Truth and Falsehood."[3] Their personal morality is no better: "...for all manner of Lewdness and Debauchery in Practice (as well as Infidelity in Profession) there never was such a Crew of Profligates under the Sun, as the present Set of Whigs."[4] On the other hand the Tories have excellent principles, and their only fault is not pressing their cause hard enough, but he hopes they will soon remedy this.

Trapp defends Sacheverell at length; he has given people "a right Notion of Persons and Principles".[5] He is given full credit for the change of ministry. Trapp also praises the addresses, though taking care to state that the Tories are for the Hanover Succession, and to disown the mob that wrecked meeting houses on Sacheverell's acquittal. He concludes with perhaps his most effective point, a defence of the High Churchmen's attitude to the Church itself, where he argues the case for the Church of England being more than a state controlled

---

[1] Ibid, p.15.

[2] Ibid, p.15.

[3] Ibid, p.23.

[4] Ibid, p.26.

[5] Ibid, p.28.

"political Church". Trapp claims that the distinction made between faith and Church organisation in Faults on Both Sides is merely a device to clear the way for an attack on the exclusive position of the Church in order to favour the dissenters. It would be interesting to know whether Trapp realised that Harley was the source of the work he attacked as insidious Whiggery. As both the Medley and the Observator insinuate Harley is its author well before Trapp's reply was published in December, he must have had some suspicion of it. Probably the High Churchmen were not averse from showing Harley that they meant to have the first place in any coalition. It may be significant that Trapp became one of Bolingbroke's adherents and that after the change of ministry Bolingbroke showed more sympathy with the extremer Tories.

Faults on Both Sides Part the Second (1710) continues the attack on the High Churchmen, only more violently, without the careful qualifications of the first part. There is some disagreement about whether it should be considered as a genuine continuation,[1] but I feel that this is unlikely because of its form, a series of examples of over-reaching Churchmen, including Laud and St. Thomas a Becket, and because the frank attack introduces an unbalanced note that the

---

[1] Sir Walter Scott, editor of the second edition of The Somers Tracts 13 vols.; London, 1809-1815) considers it a Whig pamphlet making use of the popularity of Faults on Both Sides, (XII, 103). Mary Ransome, in "The Press and the Election of 1710", Cambridge Historical Journal, VI, (1939) 209-222, takes it as a genuine continuation.

author of the original pamphlet was careful to avoid. Faults in the Fault Finder (1710) refutes the pamphlet's survey of the war and defends the financial management of it by Godolphin. The A Vindication of the Faults on Both Sides (1710) seems to have really been written by the author of the first part, and replies to the various attacks. The Medley irritated him:

> ...he is not a fair antagonist, he trafficks all in quotations without argument or conclusion; one knows not what he would be at, the spirit of his paper is all high Whig, and yet when I say what is commendable of the whigs, and censure the tories, he still cites both with an air of dislike ... he is admirable at his short turns of sheet wit, and has all manner of misrepresentation at command; in short t'is worth no serious man's while to trace him in his mazes... [1]

The Medley and Faults on Both Sides both lay claim to Whig principles while supporting the interests of opposing politicians; it is not surprising that accusations of misrepresentation and a critical view of party slogans played a large part in the controversy. The Vindication continues to discuss credit more fully, to argue about the war effort with the Fault Finder, and to attack Most Faults on One Side for its High Church extremism, insisting on an Erastian attitude to the Church. If Harley and the Tories were to work in concert, the Whig tone of Faults on Both Sides could hardly be retained in his press.

Abel Boyer, who had dealings with Harley when he was Secretary

---

[1] Somers Tracts, 2nd ed. XIII, 4.

of State, wrote two pamphlets justifying the new ministry at the time of the elections, and later asked for the editorship of the London Gazette on the strength of them.[1] Their titles were, An Essay towards the History of the last Minister and Parliament, containing Seasonable Reflections on Favourites, Ministers of State, Parties, Parliaments and Publick Credit, (1710) and A Letter from a Foreign Minister in England to Monsieur Pettecum: containing the true Reasons of the late Changes in the Ministry, and of the calling of a New Parliament, (1710). The latter was intended at least partly for a foreign audience, and was printed in Holland to calm the allies disquiet at the change.[2] They take almost the same line, but An Essay towards the History of the last Ministry and Parliament is longer and more detailed. It is very similar to Faults on Both Sides; Boyer aims to cool party heats and counteract the scaremongering of the Whigs. The main difference is a certain shift from the Whig tone of Faults on Both Sides towards the High Churchmen, who are recognised as about to play a major role in the new ministry. The late ministry is similarly indicted, though with a more vindictive tone and with more detailed charges:

> ...so in a Nation, to see a Set of Men engross all Places of Profit; enrich themselves with the

---

[1] See p.364. Boyer admitted authorship in Quadriennium Annae Postremum, I, 1.

[2] Boyer mentions this in the above-mentioned letter. There is a German translation in the British Museum Send-Schreiben eines auslandischen Ministers in Engeland an den Herrn P****, ...

> universal Spoils of the Publick; riot in Wealth; and raise sumptuous, I had almost said, *insulting Palaces,* whilst their Fellow-Subjects groan under heavy Burdens; cannot but raise the *Indignation* of a Free People, and produce *Murmurs* and *Discontent*
>
> ...
>
> But the People cannot behold, without a just Resentment, two, three, or more Persons exalted high above all the rest; who abuse the Prince's Favours, whose Ambition is not satisfied with any Honours, and whose Avarice is not satiated with multiplicity of profitable Places, nor with repeated Gifts and Grants; who keep an open Market of Civil and Military Employments; who by false Representations traduce all others, that they may engross the Prince to themselves; and who, in Return to his Kindness and Munificence, put continual *Slights* and *Affronts* upon him, and keep him in an inglorious Dependance on their Wills, in the Disposal of All. [1]

The Whigs and the ministers are accused of reviving the spirits of "a *baffled*, *inconsiderable*, and *expiring* ANTIMONARCHICAL PARTY",[2] in their impeachment of Sacheverell, a move by which they intended to confirm their tyrannous position by further curtailing royal authority. Boyer allots an important position to the affair; "Thus Dr. *Sacheverel's* Trial, though not the *true Cause*, was yet the *occasional Means* of the late Changes."[3] The trial exposed the Junto's contempt for royalty, and opened the eyes of both Queen and nation to their violence. The present ministry wisely used their consequent unpopularity to unseat them.

---

[1] *Somers Tracts*, first ed. (1748), II, 245.

[2] *Ibid*, p.249.

[3] *Ibid*, p.250.

Boyer does admit that Sacheverell himself was indiscreet, and even foolish, but he takes care not to antagonise the High Churchmen, praising their defence of the prerogative at the trial. He blames the addresses for extravagance, but vindicates the High Churchmen from charges of Jacobitism. They represent the landed interest, the body of the nation, who deserve some share in the management of the war they have paid for and can be depended upon to act responsibly when in positions of power. Boyer dismisses the scaremongering of the Whigs in the same way as Faults on Both Sides, devoting a long section to public credit. He reinforces his defence of the new ministry's moderation with a character of Harley, pointing out his consistent support for the protestant succession; his record gives no ground for the Whig allegations. He has proved that the Tories can be equally patriotic as the Whigs:

> From this short Account of Mr. Harley's Actions, and the Tenor of his whole Conduct, since the Revolution, it is no difficult Matter to judge of his Principles: And I am sure that all impartial Whigs will be apt to believe him to be on their Side. But then they ought, with the same Frankness and Partiality, to acknowledge, that since he has performed all the great Things before-mentioned in Company with the Tories, the latter are no such Enemies to our happy Constitution as they are represented by the hot Men of the Whig Party. [1]

Boyer gives a brief account of the other new ministers appointed, praising them all, even the Earl of Rochester, leader of the High

---

[1] Ibid, p.255.

Churchmen; Harley will vouch for the Tory Earl and there will be no fresh persecution of dissenters. A United ministry of moderate Tories and Old Whigs will see the war to an honourable peace, and Marlborough will be retained as general. Boyer is at pains to emphasise that the change is no mere substitution of parties.

> These few Hints and Instances shew, at the same Time, the main Scope of the late Changes: Which is not to cramp or streighten the Government, by turning out one Party, and taking in another; but rather to strengthen it, be enlarging its Foundation: It being the Queen's fix'd Design and Resolution, to encourage and reward all such, who with honest and virtuous Principles shall embrace and promote her Majesty's and the Nation's Service, without any regard to invidious Distinctions ... our rightful and lawful QUEEN has nothing more at Heart, than that the Names of Tory and Whig may be buried in Oblivion... [1]

A Letter from a Foreign Minister in England, (1710), is less hostile to the Whigs, but equally concerned to vindicate the High Churchmen for imputations that they support the Pretender or intend to cease the war effort and surrender to French demands. For his foreign audience Boyer propounds a slightly altered view of English parties. The main parties, Whig and Tory, both agree to a limited monarchy, and differ only in emphasis, and in their attitude to dissenters. On the wings of these central moderate parties are the Republicans and Jacobites, which names are used as terms of reproach for the Whig and Tory parties as a whole, in time of crisis. The

---

[1] Ibid, p.258.

great men, like Harley, do not belong to any parties, but use them to further their own plans. The foreign observers of the change should not believe the scandalous rumours spread about the new ministry by the "licentious and ignorant Scribblers"[1] of the Whigs, or credit the hot men of either party. Boyer predicts that the elections will be a victory for the Tories, and that they will dominate a new ministry, but assures his readers that English policy will be no less responsible as a result. He is assured by good authority that the Queen's speech to Parliament will recommend securing the Protestant succession, supporting public credit, and maintaining the toleration.

The last of the group of moderate pamphlets supporting Harley that I have found was published slightly after the election, when a large Tory majority was returned on the tide of emotion raised by Sacheverell. Country Tory members, inexperienced and full of zeal against the Whigs were swept into the House, and it became clear that any ministry would have to depend on their support. Harley was prepared to work with them, and William Bromley, the Speaker and an important organiser of the "Church party" was his personal friend. No more insults to Tory principle would be acceptable. The Secret History of Arlus and Odolphus, Ministers of State to the Empress of Grandinsula, (1710), is a thinly veiled history of the latter part of

---

[1] Ibid, p.275.

Anne's reign. Its writer starts by pointing out that in present political conditions it is impossible for a chief minister to survive without a party in the Commons, and a party may find it attractive to adopt him if he is high in the Queen's favour. Thus he may become tarred with attitudes that he does not subscribe to. That Harley refused to join in the Tory attack on Godolphin through the Occasional Conformity Bills shows that his present alliance with them is being misinterpreted in this manner.

After this rather embarrassed opening the writer moves to the more congenial subject of the war. He claims that the enmity of Marlborough, Godolphin and the Junto to Harley, that caused his fall in 1708, was caused by him advising Anne to look favourably on French offers of peace; his opponents wished to continue the war for their private interests. As far as I know this was a new slant on Harley's fall. The speeches of Godolphin, Sarah, Duchess of Marlborough and the Duke are given in a dialogue form, making a lively and colourful scene. A blustering attempt by Sunderland, the Junto representative, fails to impress Anne, and neither does Godolphin's threat to resign if the Queen continues to insult her general by listening to Harley's suggestions that he is against peace. Sarah is next to persuade the Queen in characteristic style:

> "Lawd! Madam, how can your Majesty let Things
> "run to these Extremities? You see how they
> "declare against him - You know I told you of
> "this, and are your Affairs now in a condition

"to disoblige such People? - You know, Madam, I
"never advis'd you wrong in my life. [1]

Last of the procession is Marlborough, who laments that unkind necessity has forced him to the point of resigning his command if Arlus is not dismissed. He expatiates on his indispensable position in the Grand Alliance, and the blow to trade and credit that his resignation will cause. With the utmost deference and regret he explains that it will be Anne's best course to dismiss him, as he will be useless if Arlus is retained to hamper him. When Anne, distressed by his concern, appeals to him as an old friend, he advises the dismissal of Harley and the point is at last gained.

This is one of the most severe attacks on the late ministry's behaviour to Anne. Marlborough and Godolphin had indeed been forced by Whig pressure for office to threaten resignation if Junto candidates were not given places, and this had sacrificed Anne's affection for them. Though this was not entirely their fault, the tactic offered a rich field for humour; Marlborough's courtesy and crafty deviousness being particularly well done. The writer moves over the usual sequence of incidents that this group of pamphlets take note of, the Gregg Affair, Marlborough's desire to be made general for life, the attempted removal of Mrs. Masham and the fall of the late ministry. His treatment of the Sacheverell Affair is the same as that of Boyer;

---

[1] The Secret History of Arlus and Odolphus, p.22. In my discussion I have decoded the fictitious names. Harley is Arlus; Marlborough, Fortunatus; Sarah, Hautifara; Godolphin, Odolphus.

the Whig impeachment insulted the Queen's prerogative, and provided popular momentum for the change. As this pamphlet was published slightly later than the others, its writer could hold up Harley's success in raising funds for the army and the retention of Marlborough as signs that fears of the change had been exaggerated. He ends with the wise profession that, at the present, the principle of obedience is safer than that of resistance. The desire to conciliate the Tories and turn their attention to the war, can be seen a trifle awkwardly combined with reluctance to join in their enthusiasm for the Church and hatred of dissent. It is significant that the reply, _The Impartial Secret History of Arlus, Fortunatus, and Udolphus_ (1710), stresses Sacheverell heavily, calling him Don Enerico Maniaco, and makes a point of the advantage to France and the Pretender, whose friends have been hard at work in the change of ministry.

The best summing up of this group of pamphlets is that of Francis Hare, Marlborough's chaplain and a dedicated defender of his master in the press. In a pamphlet published in December 1710, Hare picked on _A Letter from a Foreign Minister_, _The Secret History of Arlus and Odolphus_, _The Letter to the Examiner_, and _Faults on both Sides_ to show the range of Harley's propaganda. He even attributed _A Letter from a Foreign Minister_ to Harley himself. The object of this key piece Hare describes as "to please Friends, take off Enemies, amuse and quiet all, who are not acquainted with Affairs, nor enter

into Parties, but by the new Scheme might be apt to be alarm'd".[1] After admitting that there is much good sense in Faults on Both Sides, Hare pays tribute to the ingenuity of the group of pamphlets:

> Taking these Papers together, there is one thing in them, for which I mightily admire the able Architect, under whom they have all been form'd; and that is the Difference of Spirit one sees in them, according to the several sorts of Readers they are intended to impose on. One makes great Court to the Tories, another is to gain the Whigs, or divide them at least, others pretended mightily to Moderation; to catch the Men that have Honesty and Temper, and have not engag'd far in either Party; others seem chiefly design'd to impose on Foreigners; and make them believe, all we have been doing these six Months, is only a personal Business, that can have no Influence on the Publick... [2]

(iii) Defoe in 1710

Though Defoe did not write any of the pamphlets I have so far mentioned as putting forward Harley's attitude to the problem of government, he was eager to resume employment under his old patron. As the Review posed special problems of its own, I will deal with it separately from Defoe's pamphleteering for Harley. On July 17, immediately before Godolphin's fall, Defoe wrote to Harley, assuring him of his support for a policy of moderation: "I can Not but Think that Now is The Time to find Out and Improve Those blessed Mediums of This Nations Happyness, which lye between The wild Extremes of all

---

[1] The Management of the War, In a Letter to a Tory-Member, (1710), p.3.

[2] The Management of the War, In a Letter to a Tory-Member, (1710), p.3-4.

Partyies, and which I know you have long Wisht for."[1] Defoe ended by asking for advice so that he could be "More Able to Guide My Self to the publick advantage."[2] Defoe's position was that of a traditional but moderate Whig. In 1701 he had defended the Junto, but had been prepared to support Marlborough and Godolphin both when they were allied to Harley and to the Junto. He had a strong personal attachment to Harley, and a pressing need for employment, but he honestly believed in supporting any ministry providing it carried out moderate policies, and remained faithful to the protestant succession. He had no fear of Harley on this score and was prepared to swallow the alliance with the Tories. Defoe's pamphlets, as we shall see, often leant towards both Tory and Whig positions during 1710-1714. There are several reasons for this, the simplest being to sell them to both sides, either for profit, or to insinuate unusual ideas by disguising them in a party wrapping. Defoe gave this reason for some of his pamphlets that had a superficial appearance of Jacobitism. His most Whig-like pieces may be explained by a desire to speak out anonymously against Harley's Tory associates, for whom he had a constant and long standing disgust. The conflict between loyalty to Harley and a growing dislike of the concessions made to the Tories

---

[1] The Letters of Daniel Defoe, ed. George Harris Healey, (Oxford, 1955) p.270-271.

[2] Ibid, p.271.

created a tension in Defoe's work, which can be seen more clearly in his attitude to the peace in 1711, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

Defoe's first pamphlets for Harley were occasioned by the crisis over credit in the summer of 1710, which followed the protest by the directors of the Bank to Anne on the dismissal of Sunderland. The Whigs firmly believed that Godolphin was the only politician with sufficient financial skill to maintain public credit and secure the funds necessary for carrying on the war. Secure in his alliance with the Bank, which at first refused to lend money to Harley, Godolphin confidently expected that his successor would not be able to raise the next quarter's pay owing to the army in Flanders, and that the ministry would collapse. The Whig press insisted that credit could not survive the fall of a Whig ministry because of general lack of confidence in the Tories, and the suspicion of Jacobitism; the Pretender was expected to wipe out any public debts incurred in his absence if he returned to England as King. It was even suggested that Whig investors would withdraw their money and so break the government, which seemed to be confirmed when stocks fell rapidly on the change of ministry. Harley was concerned to allay doubts about the ministry's power to sustain the nation's finances; he had made his reputation partly in this field, and had no intention of scaring the financiers. John Carswell in his study, <u>The South Sea Bubble</u>[1] shows

---

[1] (London, 1960), p.40 et seq.

how Harley was in touch with a group of bankers and monied men who resented the monopoly given by the Whigs to the Bank of England. They provided immediate money, and later formed the nucleus of the South Sea Company. Later the Bank admitted defeat and offered a loan.

Defoe made the fullest and most interesting contribution to the controversy over credit in An Essay on Credit, which was thought to be by Harley himself.[1] Published in August it was one of the first instances of Harley's desire to moderate the fears of extreme Toryism, with its dislike of stockjobbers and monied men in general. Defoe's arguments, like the entire credit controversy, are too detailed and specialised to discuss here, but briefly he argued that there was no real reason for a loss of confidence, as credit depended on Queen and Parliament, and on punctual fulfilling of the government's obligations. Any attempt to break the government by withdrawing stocks is directly against business commonsense. Defoe ends by pronouncing the stockholder's creed:

> I know no persons or parties in my argument; this lord treasurer or another lord treasurer, or no lord treasurer, it is the same thing to me; a bank or no bank, it is all one; I will sell none of my tallies or annuities; I will discount no Exchequer bills. 2

---

1 The Letters of Daniel Defoe, p.277.

2 Somers Tracts, 2nd edition, XIII, 30.

Three editions and a Dutch translation appeared during 1710 to prove the popularity of this high-powered analysis.[1] Defoe followed it up in October with An Essay on Loans to complete the good work. The matter of credit was a vital issue for Harley, and the virtuosity of Defoe, one of the best informed men in England on matters of trade and finance, made him an ideal advocate for practical moderation. The writers of the slightly later group of pamphlets backing Harley frequently touch on credit, repeating Defoe's arguments.[2]

Not all Defoe's support for Harley was so straightforward as An Essay on Credit. A New Test of the Sence of the Nation: Being a Modest Comparison Between the Addresses to the Late King James, and those to Her Present Majesty was published at the time of the elections in 1710. In this pamphlet Defoe attacked the Tory addresses in Whig Manner but with a new emphasis, comparing them to those received by James II in favour of his absolutism. Defoe blames the

---

[1] The Letters of Daniel Defoe, p.277, note 1.

[2] The Tory extremists blamed the Whigs for trying to destroy the new ministry by sinking credit, even at the cost of the nation's ruin. One of their organs, the Moderator made a new use of Defoe's allegory of credit as a woman in the Review; on August 21, 1710 its heading read, The False Fits of Whiggish Credit Discovered, or an Account of the Turns and Returns, Comings and Goings, Visits and Departings of that subtle Pharisaical Lady called Whiggish Phanatical Credit. Swift picked up such accusations lightly in the Examiner (Nos. 25, 35, 37). In the Review Defoe praised the Whigs for not trying to sink credit. (February 13, 1711). Once the party points had been made, and Harley proved he could manage successfully, the controversy over credit died a natural death, though Defoe was to resuscitate it while writing of the Whig opposition to peace in 1711. It is too specialised a subject for me to treat adequately.

present addresses at least partly on "swearing Jacobites"[1] though he does not completely identify them with the Tories; this was to be a fruitful ambiguity for him during these years. Defoe lists the addresses to Anne on one side of the page, and those to James on the other. Most of those who addressed James so flatteringly did it as a "customary Piece of Extravagance," as the Revolution soon proved. The Tory gentry of 1710 are in the same case:

> Now after all that can be said, It must pass for the kindest Thing Men can suggest of these honest Gentlemen, who are so lavish of their Extravagant Expressions, viz. That they have NO MEANING... [2]

Defoe ridicules the contradictions and meaningless language of the addresses as Hoadly had done, showing their Jacobite implications, but he dissociates them completely from the ministry. The Queen wants moderate men elected to Parliament, not the high-flyers who wrote the addresses. On this point the interest of old and new ministry should be the same:

> Thus the Queen, the New Ministry, the Old Ministry, and indeed, all honest Men agree in this, that the Interest of the Freeholders of England at this Time, and indeed, at all Times, is to be represented by wise, sober, judicious Men, whose Zeal is temper'd, and guided by Knowledge, Wisdom and Love to their Country, whose

---

[1] The 'swearing Jacobite' is one who has taken the oath of allegiance falsely, in order to penetrate the state and work in the Pretender's interest; he is opposed to the nonjuror and the honest open Jacobite, and hated much more.

[2] A New Test of the Sence of the Nation, p.51.

> Moderation is distinguish'd upon known Occasions, as who are qualifi'd to cool, and restore our Native Country overwhelmed with Faction, and Furious Parties. [1]

If such men are elected all will go well, no matter who are ministers. The addresses portend ill to the party they pretend to support as well as the one they attack; "hot men" will ruin the nation and bring in the Pretender. The present ministry cannot possibly relish addresses that increase party animosity at this critical moment. Defoe ends his pamphlet with the curious statement that he "had not meddled with the Parties, only made a little merry with their Nonsence."[2]

This attitude parallels the line of Faults on Both Sides, and helps to present the new ministry as moderates while taking an even more pronounced Whig tone. Presumably Defoe saw it as an honest attempt to prevent the Tories sweeping the elections and preventing the possibility of a middle way. Some of the expressions of the last quotation are very similar to his letter of July 17, to Harley. Another of Defoe's pamphlets for the election sounded a different but familiar note, that of hatred of the terrors of popery; its title was A Word Against a New Election (1710).

> One would have thought, the Tyranny we so lately Groan'd under cou'd not be so Easily forgot that the Revolution might yet Stare in their Faces.

---

[1] A New Test of the Sence of the Nation, p.77-8.

[2] Ibid, p.91.

> The Gibbets, on which their Murthered Relations were put to Death are scarce taken down; the Spikes that Empail'd the Sculls and Quarters of the Nations Patriots, and the Martyrs of Liberty, are yet standing upon our Gates, both in England and Scotland. [1]

The Tory enthusiasm over Sacheverell, non-resistance and a new election is seen as thoroughly Jacobite, and the protestant Succession is in imminent danger.

> 'Tis for this, they are Treating, Caballing, forming Parties for a New Election, that if possible, they may bring Men into Parliament, that will Give up the Constitution, abandon Property, expose Religion, and prostitute the Virgin Liberties of this Nation, to the ravishing Lust of a Popish Pretender. [2]

At this point Defoe introduces the characteristic qualification that may have saved his conscience from any disquiet at writing for both sides. The Queen wants moderate men, not Sacheverellites, hereditary-right men and persecutors of dissenters. The people should elect those who support the Revolution, Hanover, the Union[3], toleration and the war. As he included himself and Harley in this class, the pamphlet could at a stretch of the imagination seem to be in his patron's interest, but there is no doubt that in England at least it would have been understood as solid support for the late ministry and the Junto candidates.

---

[1] A Word Against a New Election, p.4-5.

[2] Ibid, p.9.

[3] Defoe was in Scotland in early October on a mission for Harley. Could both the archaic tone and the references to Scotland mean that it was published there as well as in England?

Soon after the elections Defoe wrote a pamphlet that cashed in on the notoriety of Faults on Both Sides, though it was hardly a reply or a continuation. Its title was, A Supplement to The Faults on Both Sides: Containing the Compleat History of the Proceedings of a Party ever since the Revolution. In a Familiar Dialogue between Steddy and Turn-Round, Two Displac'd Officers of State. Steddy is a Whig who has loyally gone out with the Junto, Turn-Round another who has been won over by the new ministers and persuaded to stay in office, but has lost faith in their promises. Defoe depends on the reader knowing the moderate line:

> Turn-Round Indeed I did at first go in with them; they made their Pretences so specious, and talk'd so seemingly sincerely, that I really thought they would Act like Men of Temper and Moderation, and that they only sought to rectify some exorbitances, which, indeed, I was as Uneasie at as other People: But now I think I find what they drive at; that the Old Game is to be Reviv'd; that the Q--- is but to change her Rulers... [1]

Turn-Round had disliked the Junto, and favoured a middle way, the line of Faults on Both Sides, but now the new ministers are secure they have thrown off the mask and put high Tories into office. This has decided Turn-Round to resign.

This would appear to be clear enough in its rejection of the sincerity of the moderate compromise, but as the pamphlet progresses Defoe blurs this condemnation. Later on in the dialogue Turn-Round

---

[1] A Supplement to the Faults on Both Sides, p.4.

professes great sympathy for Harley, and blames the Whigs for disgracing him in 1708; they have brought their downfall upon themselves. He is sure Harley is no Jacobite, and several times expresses cautious optimism on Harley's ability to moderate or frustrate the high-flyers:

> I cannot believe he will be so abandon'd, or so weak in his Politicks, as well as so contrary to his General Practice, as to play the Tory; the World will allow he is no Fool, and we know he cannot act in his present Station but within the Circle of the Constitution; he has serv'd himself of them, and I do not blame him for that, but he always broke with them in Measures, and must of course do so again. [1]

Even Steddy is brought to admit that the new ministry have not yet acted badly, and that if they continue in the path of moderation he will give them his support. Defoe plays with the argument he persistently advanced in the *Review*, that any government must be a Whig government if it is to keep within the constitution, and when it does not its ministers are immediately liable to impeachment. At the height of generosity Turn-Round states that the Tories themselves find Sacheverell outrageous.

Yet Turn-Round and Steddy agree in censuring Harley's alliance with the Tories, and doubt whether such bigots can be restrained. They condemn the Tories self-destructive zeal, their desire to renew persecution of dissent, which is as strong in 1710 as it was in 1702.

---

[1] *Ibid*, p.53.

Both Tories and Jacobites are attacked, though Defoe is highly ambiguous about whether they are to be identified. There are "swearing Jacobites" in the Tory ranks, but Steddy, presumably referring to the whole party, vaguely admits that 'they' are not in the Pretender's interest though "they" are joined by those that are. At the end of the pamphlet vigorous support is given to the old ministry's conduct of the war, and Tory criticisms contemptuously refuted. If it is not carried on so well, or if a bad peace is made, it will soon be revealed who has "pursu'd the right Interest of Europe."[1]

In this pamphlet Defoe seems to have been unsure in his own mind about the situation. It contrasts oddly with the confident and business like tone of his letters to Harley. He took care to differ with both the Review and The Essay on Credit, presumably to disguise his identity. He also found space, a common trait in his pamphlets, for a few compliments to himself in the third person for service to the Whig cause, and rebuked the party for treating him so badly. He allows his reader to side with neither character in the dialogue; indeed both express varying opinions of the new ministry, and both agree that the issue of the change is still to be seen. The total effect of the dialogue is not to advocate strong action either way, but to wait and see whether the promises of moderation are fulfilled.

---

[1] A Supplement to the Faults on Both Sides, p.68.

Perhaps Defoe used Steddy and Turn-Round to express his own doubts, but the political purpose of the pamphlet can best be explained as an attempt to reach the Whigs and instil doubts about the blanket condemnation of the new ministry; Defoe was very careful not to damage Harley whatever tone he gave his writings. A Supplement to The Faults on Both Sides is a remarkable piece, quite unlike anything else published on the changes.

C. The Whig Press

The Whig writers did little new as the Godolphin ministry crumbled. Demoralised by the dismissal of one minister after another the Whigs failed to organise concerted resistance. The onslaught on Sacheverell and the Tory addresses, with the accompanying suggestions of France and the Pretender, was continued to cover the election. The Whig writers were geared to oppose the High Church Tories rather than the new moderate line that appeared immediately before the election; they preferred to ignore, or dismiss it as an attempt to confuse the issue. Benjamin Hoadly was the most active and important of the Whig pamphleteers, and throughout the summer and autumn he wrote against the change of ministry. Hoadly did not restrict himself to Sacheverell, but made the conduct of the war, so successful under Marlborough and Godolphin, one of his main points. He was the author of The French King's Thanks to the Tories of Great Britain (1710), which the early Examiner refuted, in which Louis thanks to the Tories for sabotaging

the allied war effort and denigrating Marlborough. Their recent success has saved France from an ignominious peace; the Pretender hopes to be over soon to reward them. His Thoughts of an Honest Tory has already been mentioned as provoking Faults on Both Sides. In this the "Honest Tory" fears the collapse of the war effort under the new ministry, dislikes the vague charges against their predecessors, and remarks that if the ministers really mean moderation then the way in which their supporters are whipping up enthusiasm for Sacheverell and the church is deceitful.

Hoadly's pamphlets are very similar in their attitude, though he varied his techniques. A Jacobite's Hopes reviv'd by our late Tumults and Addresses: Or, some necessary Remarks upon a new modest Pamphlet of Mr. Lesly's against the Government, entituled, The Good Old Cause, (1710) was occasioned by Charles Leslie treating the Sacheverell Affair as paving the way for the Pretender.[1] Armed with this material Hoadly asserts that the Jacobites unashamedly aid Sacheverell and the agitation of which he is the figurehead. He stops just short of calling the Tories Jacobites outright, though he is confident they are closely linked. Hoadly is prepared to reduce the issue to the succession:

---

[1] According to White Kennet, Leslie's pamphlet was published in June 1710 (The Wisdom of Looking Backwards, 1715, p.40-42). It did contain a hint in favour of the Pretender, but was largely an attack on Leslie's old enemy, Gilbert Burnet, bishop of Salisbury.

> Let there be no other Distinction heard of amongst us for the future, but of those who are for the Protestant Religion and the present Establishment, and those who mean a Popish Prince and a French Government.[1]

This apparent denial of party spirt is even less generous than those of Harley's supporters, for Hoadly is hardly prepared to admit that any of the new ministry were not in the interest of France. In another pamphlet, Serious Advice to the Good People of England (1710), he describes the Tories as the "tools" of the Jacobites, and warns his readers against the cry of danger to the Church.

In The Fears and Sentiments of All True Britains; with respect to National Credit, Interest, and Religion, (1710) Hoadly makes out a more comprehensive case against the change, stressing the danger to credit, urging that Marlborough had deserved better treatment than to have his authority, vital to the war effort, undermined, and harping on the Pretender. One pamphlet, A Letter of Advice to the Freeholders of England, concerning the Election of Members to serve in the Ensuing Parliament (1710), touches on the Tory professions of moderation. There are certainly honest men in both parties, but this is no guide to how to vote. Some Tories disown the extreme versions of passive obedience, but the party countenances unqualified extremes in the addresses and the enthusiasm they raise. The freeholders should vote

---

[1] A Collection of Several Papers, p.63.

for men who hold true Whig principles of preserving the nation's rights and liberties.

A weak point in the Whig case was the attitude of Queen Anne, who had an undisputed right to change her ministers if she so desired, and who had shown in the dismissals and the dissolution of Parliament that she disliked the late ministry. Hoadly cannot avoid exposing his party's lack of favour in The Election Dialogue (1710), despite his superficial praise of the Queen. She has dissolved Parliament and he is committed to the view that it ought to have been continued. Countering the argument that the Whigs will not allow Anne her due prerogative, he is reduced to arguing that she would still have been exercising it if she had not dissolved Parliament. The attempt to play up the success in the war cannot conceal that he has no answer to the Tories' claim that they have the Queen's favour. Equally weak is his reason why the dissenters support the Whigs, which is because they want the protestant succession, not because they hope to see the privileges of the Church eroded. When a Whig pamphleteer is reduced to explaining away dissenting support, one can assume that the cry of "The Church in Danger" is proving highly embarrassing.

Hoadly's energy seems to have been rare; I have only found two other important pamphlets which back the Godolphin ministry. A Letter from a Gentleman at St Germains, published in July or August, 1710, borders on forgery. It purports to be a letter from one of the Pretender's adherents to a friend in England, and advises the Jacobites

to take control by cementing an alliance with the High Churchmen, promising them stricter repression of dissent. The influence of the clergy on the common people is acknowledged; they are to initiate the campaign by preaching hereditary right and non-resistance. The <u>Letter</u> is obviously a Whig production, but it excited far more publicity and interest than the usual accusations of Jacobitism levelled at the Tories.

Robert Walpole was the author of the most important Whig pamphlet, <u>Four Letters from a Friend in North Britain</u>, which was published at the time of the elections; presumably he considered that the Whig press needed strengthening. In the first letter Walpole considers the actions of the High Churchmen from the beginning of Anne's reign, reminding his readers of their intolerable extremism when in office, and their vigorous attempts to curtail the toleration granted to dissent with Occasional Conformity Bills. Walpole reminds his readers of earlier attempts of the High Churchmen to regain power by declaiming that the Church was in danger. He then stresses the way that Sacheverell has been used by the opposition to the Godolphin ministry to whip up popular feeling against them. He claims that Jacobite malcontents, especially among the clergy, are conducting an organised campaign to bring back the Pretender. As there is no chance of a direct appeal on behalf of the Pretender succeeding, the first step is to have the lower clergy preach non-resistance and passive obedience.

The second letter gives an account of the trial, and how the cry, 'The Church in Danger', had been used to raise mob violence. The third exposes the way the Tories have manipulated popular enthusiasm for their own ends, and instances the numerous addresses to the Queen sent from all over England during the spring and summer of 1710. Walpole claims that these have been organised from London and do not represent true popular opinion:

> ... Addresses were put forwards round the Kingdom made up of the grossest Contradictions that were ever seen in print. But as before the Tryal, Instructions were given to their Clergy, what Doctrines they were to preach, in which their true Sense and Purpose was cover'd, as I have already shown: So now there was a Cue given, and Copies or Patterns of Addresses, were sent down to more dark and ignorant Parts of the Land, such as _Wales_, _Somersetshire_, _Oxfordshire, &c_. In which Addresses there was a secret meaning, different from that which was express'd, and the Poison of one Part was conceal'd under the seeming fair Professions of the other. But to Countries more enlightened, where they cou'd rely on the Zeal and Abilities of trusty Friends for performing so great a Service, they only transmitted some particular Heads to work upon, such as _Hereditary Right and the_ Hanover _Succession_ (two Topicks that stand mighty well together); _Primitive Appostolical Doctrines_, and _Indulgence to tender Consciences_: _Zeal for Passive-Obedience_, and _Detestation of Resistance_; _A great Rage against Deists, Socinians and Republicans_; and _a doating Fondness for a New_ Parliament. [1]

Walpole represents the call for a dissolution of Parliament as an attempt to dictate to the Queen, endeavouring to cover the weak point

---

[1] _Four Letters to a Friend in North Britain_ (1710) p.13-14.

of Anne's readiness to change the ministry. Neither Walpole nor Hoadly could prevent the Tories from representing themselves as true servants of the Queen and enlisting on their side the strong force of loyalty.

Walpole is on stronger ground in the last letter, in which he stresses that the French support the Tories, and brings the main arguments forward. These are the danger to the war effort, now so successful under Marlborough, and the blow to credit, if Godolphin is removed. Four Letters from a Friend in North Britain are dated, and supposedly written earlier in the summer, so that by the time they were published during the October elections, the validity of Walpole's prediction that even if the High Churchmen should form a government their inability to sustain credit would ruin them seems about to be justified by events. The argument is well handled, drawing in many details to form a comprehensive case against a change of ministry; Walpole disregards the new moderate line to concentrate on the traditional case against the Tories.

The Whig periodicals, the Review and the Observator, did not give the old ministry satisfactory backing after Godolphin had been dismissed. In the Review Defoe accomplished a curious volte-face in order to help Harley. Up to August Defoe had described the struggle between Whigs and Tories purely in terms of the Sacheverell affair; while Godolphin remained in power Defoe asserted that if "Sacheverell's faction" came into office it would be a national disaster. He vilified

his old enemies, the High Churchmen, insinuating they were crypto-Jacobites, and fully supported Godolphin against any changes, advancing the danger to credit and to the Grand Alliance as reasons. On August 10, Defoe skilfully continued an allegory of credit to cover Godolphin's fall. He warned the Tories that moderation would be necessary if credit was to be restored; they must take care not to associate with nonjurors and Jacobites. It is a surprising change to see Defoe differentiating between Tories and Jacobites in the Review. In the next issue he argues that an attempt to break the new ministry by withdrawing money from government funds and sinking credit is to sacrifice the nation to the resentments of party. The new ministry have not yet given any grounds for distrust and further tumults will only help the French war effort. By stressing the need to put the national interest above that of a party, Defoe cautiously aligns the Review with the new ministry without altogether dropping its Whig tone. Though he does not go so far as the moderate Tory line, and certainly does not attack the old ministry, Defoe depends on the Tory professions of moderation to support his argument that nothing harmful to the constitution need be expected from a change. One of his favourite themes is reminiscent of Faults on Both Sides and its claim that Harley and his followers acted on Whig principles. This is the argument that, because of the structure of our constitution, any government, once it comes into power, must be a Whig government. It must support the protestant succession because it is law, and to

further this it must continue the war. Defoe emphasizes that there is no choice but to do this as the alternative is treason. This covert support for Harley did not make the Review popular. In 1711 the Whig papers were stigmatizing Defoe as an opostate.

The Observator also failed to adopt a firm line on the dismissal of Godolphin. At the end of June the observator congratulates himself that there has been no further change since the dismissal of Sunderland. On August 12, Roger, the countryman, the observator's partner in the dialogue, is seized with a fit of the "hippo," presumably on hearing that Godolphin has also been dismissed. However, the paper concludes more cheerfully; the law will keep any ministry from harming the constitution. The Jacobites, "Sacheverell's faction" are not yet in power. This attitude apparently failed to satisfy extremer Whigs: on August 19, 1710, the observator defends himself from the charge of turning Tory. In particular, he has not condemned the Tory move to make the Elector of Hanover Generalissimo of the allied armies. In following issues he continues to attack passive obedience, "Sacheverell's faction," and the Jacobites but the tone of the paper is exactly the same as when Godolphin was in power. Perhaps in the interim period it was not clear whose support Harley would bid for.

On the news of the election, the observator knows better where he stands, and gives constant support to the Junto Whigs. Yet on October 14, the observator approves Faults on Both Sides in its

strictures of the High Churchmen, and praises Harley for aiming at a coalition of the honest men of both sides. The observator takes it as evidence that the court is against the high party. At the end of the paper he drinks to the converted Tories who follow Harley. Though this praise of Harley is not obviously ironic, there is at least a suspicion that the writer of the paper, George Ridpath, has chosen a discreet way of jeering at the new ministry. On November 4, the Observator launched an attack on the Examiner as a High Church paper, and continued to confute its views steadily. As it could be dangerous to attack the new ministry directly, Ridpath found it convenient to affect to believe that the Examiner had no connection with it. By this time the Observator appears to have settled into a stable attitude, but the summer of 1710 must have been confusing for the writer of a paper that depended on simple certitudes, a straight-forward opposition between good and bad.

During the summer and autumn of 1710 Steele gave the Whigs some light-hearted support in The Tatler. His references to politics were few, but they appear to have created great indignation on the Tory side, probably from a feeling that such a paper should not enter party politics. Steele wrote in a humorous vein which nevertheless concealed serious charges. In a letter from "Pasquin of Rome" his readers heard that the Pretender was postponing becoming a cardinal, "having, it is said, received Letters from Great Britain, wherein several Virtuosos of that Island have desired him to suspend his

Resolutions towards a Monastic Life, till the British Grammarians should publish their Explication of the words Indefeazable and Revolution."[1] The same paper, Tatler 187, contained references to Hannibal being thwarted by Hanno, with obvious pointers to Marlborough and Harley. In Tatler 190, a letter to the French king reproaches him with favouring Tories exclusively. Tatler 191, contained an unflattering portrait of Harley under the name of Polypragmon, and his ruses to gain power were satirised, two numbers later, in terms of the state in a letter from "Downs the prompter."[2] In the twelfth Examiner, perhaps the work of William King,[3] Steele was criticised for his style, his vanity, and his politics, in a kind of pseudo-literary criticism. Addison defended him in the Whig Examiner. Steele's political contributions may have helped to end the Tatler.[4]

D. Swift's Examiner

We have seen that the first thirteen issues of the Examiner had failed to give a coherent lead to supporters of a change of ministry. It tended towards High Church extremism, and made no concessions

---

[1] The Tatler, No. 187. June 20th 1710.

[2] Steele denied having written this number. (Preface to the Vol. IV of the Tatler, and Guardian, No.53) Rae Blanchard says it was attributed to his friend, Maynwaring. Steele's Correspondence, (Oxford, 1941, p.450).

[3] George A. Aitken, The Life of Richard Steele, (London, 1889) p.292.

[4] See pp.364-365

to the moderate compromise, which one issue covertly attacked. After the elections had returned a solid majority of Tories to the Commons, there was even more need of establishing a party platform that they could assent to, without reverting to the traditional war-cry against dissent. Harley had to carry the Tories with him, but he had come to power as a favourite of the Queen rather than as the acknowledged leader of a party. Thus the task of cementing his alliance with the Tories of the conventional pattern came into prominence after, rather than before his return to office.

It was fortunate for Harley that Swift had arrived in London in September, ostensibly to deal with the business of the Irish first fruits, but also looking for opportunities for advancing his career. Swift was disillusioned with the Whigs for not regarding his controversial efforts on their behalf with preferment, despite his well earned reputation as wit and pamphleteer, and realised that the main reason for this was his firm support for the Church of England, and refusal to countenance any mitigation of the Test Act excluding dissenters from positions in the state. Swift's position was one more common in Ireland than England, that of a High Church Whig. For though Swift accepted the Revolution of 1688 (what Anglo-Irishman would not have, when faced with a pro-Stuart Catholic majority of native Irish) and had associated himself with the Junto Whigs in 1701, he refused to agree to any weakening of the Church's temporal privileges. Sincere in his dislike of Roman Catholicism, Swift regarded the dissenters as a more immediate danger to the Church; of his Irish livings, one had

been among an overwhelmingly Presbyterian majority, the other in a Catholic area. Swift saw no discrepancy between his Whig principles and his Churchmanship; he considered himself a friend of Somers, Halifax, Addison and Steele, and professed to view the party conflict in England from the position of an impartial observer rather than a partisan. He had little in common with the true high-flyers like Sacheverell, or even Atterbury, with their Jacobite leanings and zeal for non-resistance. In The Sentiments of a Church of England Man, written in 1708, Swift had adopted a strict neutrality between the parties; his Churchman tended towards the Tory attitude in matters of religion, and to the Whig views on civil government. With this moderation Swift shared a common belief that party spirit blinded true judgement, and that party itself was an unfortunate development in English politics. In his Journal to Stella on arrival in England he first pretended complete indifference to the change of ministry, treating it with ironic detachment. This may seem strange in view of the party role he was to play for the next four years and maintain for the rest of his life, but one must remember that in 1710 the division between the parties had not yet hardened, and Swift's loyalties were only just becoming engaged; his search for the most effective polemic was to take him further towards a Tory position than he realised.

Harley lost little time in making flattering approaches to Swift, assuring him that he would be violating none of his principles as an

apologist for the new ministry;[1] Harley explained, "That their great difficulty lay in the want of some good pen, to keep up the spirit raised in the people, to assert the principles, and justify the proceedings of the new ministers."[2] Swift agreed to take over the Examiner. His usual position made him admirably suited for explaining the policies of the new ministry. His view of himself as an "Old Whig" in principle saved him from the dangers of Tory extremism, while his Churchmanship enabled him to find rapport with the mass of Tories. He regarded his change as one of allegiance to a set of persons rather than principles, and could thus allay any fears of a violent change of policy with complete good faith. The task that faced Swift in the Examiner was one of daunting magnitude, no less than to provide the Tory party in the Parliament and nation with a sense of party identity other than the emotions raised by the Sacheverell Affair, and satisfy them that the new ministry could be trusted. He could not risk offending them as Faults on Both Sides had done, and was ready to promote any measures that might strengthen the Church as long as they did not involve self-destructive violence. At the same time he had to counter the Whig propagandists' assertions that the new ministry was in the interest of the Pretender, and would rapidly hamstring the war effort. The war, though a much safer subject, raised

---

1, 2. Swift, Memoirs relating to that Change which happened in the Queen's Ministry. Reprin6ed in: Jonathan Swift. Political Tracts 1713-1719, ed. Herbert Davis and Irvin Ethrenpreis, (Oxford, 1953), p.123.

new problems; the Tory gentry were thoroughly tired of its expense, but baulked at the idea of abject surrender after the glorious successes of Marlborough.

Swift brought to the Examiner an acute judgement of the situation and the kind of literary ability to present his solution of the problems facing the new ministry in a lively and attractive way. Besides his "tolerable Style",[1] a model of clarity and readability, Swift could command a variety of literary devices to hold his readers. John Gay complimented him on his skilful presentation in The Present State of Wit:

> Though his subject will admit no great variety; he is continually placing it in so many different lights, and endeavouring to inculcate the same thing by so many beautiful changes of expression, that men who are concerned in no Party may read him with pleasure. [2]

These devices ranged from major items such as the "Bill of Roman Gratitude and British Ingratitude," and the "Letter to Crassus," to witty bantering and parody of the writers who opposed him. I have not the space to show the complete range of Swift's literary ability in the Examiner, but I shall discuss his general attitude to the change of ministry, and deal in detail with his most important single technique for creating a moderate Toryism, his discussion of party. This runs through the whole paper, and is an admirable illustration of how Swift

---

[1] The Examiner and Other Pieces Written in 1710-1711, ed. Herbert Davis, p.87.

[2] The Present State of Wit, An English Garner. ed. J. Churton Collins (London, 1963) Vol. I. p.204.

used his literary ability and his knowledge of the political situation together to persuade the reader.

Swift's first issue of the Examiner appeared on November 2, 1710, opening with a clear declaration of his overall purpose, offering to justify the change of ministry and allay the anxieties it had caused. The first paragraph introduces the theme of party:

> IT IS a Practice I have generally followed, to converse in equal Freedom with the deserving Men of both Parties; and it was never without some Contempt, that I have observed Persons wholly out of Employment, affect to do otherwise: I doubted whether any Man could owe so much to the side he was of, altho' he were retained by it; but without some great point of Interest either in Possession or Prospect, I thought it was the Mark of a low and narrow Spirit.
>
> It is hard, that for some Weeks past, I have been forced, in my own Defence, to follow a Proceeding that I have so much condemned in others. But several of my Acquaintance, among the declining Party, are grown so insufferably Peevish and Splenatick, profess such violent Apprehensions for the Publick, and represent the State of Things in such formidable Ideas, that I find myself disposed to share in their Afflictions, although I know them to be groundless and imaginary; or, which is worse, purely affected. To offer them Comfort one by one, would be not only an endless, but a disobliging Task. Some of them, I am convinced, would be less melancholy, if there were more Occasion. I shall therefore, instead of hearkning to further Complaints, employ some Part of this Paper for the future, in letting such Men see, that their natural or acquired Fears are ill-grounded, and their artificial ones as ill-intended. [1]

Swift adopts a tone of impartiality, of a reasonable man forced to protest at Whig scaremongering.

---

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.3.

After briefly mentioning Whig complaints that Marlborough has been disobliged by the change and that the Pretender's interest has been advanced, Swift devotes the rest of the paper to the subject of the war. He argues that the basic reason for change of ministers is that England is being ruined financially by the burden of the war, and that the late ministry had placed themselves in a position where their interest lay in continuing it indefinitely. Swift places heavy emphasis on the need for peace:

> UPON these Considerations alone, it was the most prudent Course imaginable in the QUEEN, to lay hold of the Disposition of the People for changing the Parliament and Ministry at this Juncture; and extricating her self, as soon as possible out of the Pupilage of those who found their Accounts only in perpetuating the War. Neither have we the least Reason to doubt, but the ensuing Parliament will assist her MAJESTY with the utmost Vigour, until her Enemies _again_ be brought to sue for Peace, and _again_ offer such Terms as will make it both honourable and lasting; only with this Difference, that the Ministry perhaps will not _again_ refuse them. [1]

The Sacheverell Affair is only hinted at in the remark on "the Disposition of the People for changing the Parliament and Ministry"; it is merely an opportunity for the Queen to exercise her prerogative rather than the cause of the change itself.

In his third issue Swift enlarges on the position of the _Examiner_ towards party, emphasising that it takes a middle way, and does not

---

[1] The _Examiner_, ed. Davis, p.8.

enter into "the Violences of either Party":

> WE live here under a limited Monarchy, and under the Doctrine and Discipline of an excellent Church: We are unhappily divided into two Parties, both which pretend a mighty Zeal for our Religion and Government, only they disagree about the Means. The Evils we must fence against are, on one side Fanaticism and Infidelity in Religion; and Anarchy, under the Name of a Commonwealth, in Government: On the other Side, Popery, Slavery, and the Pretender from France. Now to inform and direct us in our Sentiments, upon these weighty Points; here are on one Side two stupid illiterate Scribblers, both of them Fanaticks by Profession; I mean the Review and Observator. On the other Side we have an open Nonjuror, whose Character and Person, as well as good Learning and Sense, discovered upon other Subjects, do indeed deserve Respect and Esteem; but his Rehearsal, and the rest of his Political Papers, are yet more pernicious than those of the former two...
>
> It was this Reason, that moved me to take the Matter out of those rough, as well as those dirty Hands; to let the remote and uninstructed Part of the Nation see, that they have been misled on both Sides, by mad, ridiculous Extreams, at a wide Distance on each Side from the Truth; while the right Path is so broad and plain, as to be easily kept, if they were once put into it. [1]

Swift's tactic is not so simple as it might seem. He first postulates a division of two parties, Whigs and Tories, then two extremes in the periodical press, Defoe and Ridpath on one side, Leslie on the other. Yet he does not make the parallel between these two sets of extremes that his middle way would imply; he indentifies the Whigs with their press, but separates the Tories from the Jacobite and Nonjuror, so that

---

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.13-14.

they represent with the Examiner the middle way. Thus his plausible pretence of moderation does not preclude agreement with the new ministry.

The way in which the paper continues shows how Swift uses the middle way. He maintains, not unlike Faults on Both Sides, that party writers prevent honest men on both sides from coming together:

> For, let any one examine a reasonable honest Man of either Side, upon those Opinions in Religion and Government, which both Parties daily Buffet each other about; he shall hardly find one material Point in difference between them. I would be glad to ask a Question about two Great Men of the late Ministry, how they came to be Whigs? And by what figure of Speech, half a Dozen others, lately put into great Employments, can be called Tories? I doubt, whoever would suit the Definition to the Persons, must make it directly contrary to what we understood it at the Time of the Revolution. [1]

Here Swift uses the way that the parties altered during William's reign to throw doubt on the simple dualism of Whig and Tory; Marlborough and Godolphin had only become bracketed with the Junto Whigs since 1707, and Harley and his moderates had a good claim to their sometime name of Old Whigs. Swift's aim is to imply that the present change is one of persons, not substitution of Tory for Whig principle.

In this same issue Swift continues to look at two accusations made by the Whig journalists he has mentioned. The first is their attack on the war-cry of "The Church in Danger". On this point Swift

---

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.15.

shows how he differs from the line of Faults on Both Sides; being deliberately vague, he insinuates that the Church may well have been in danger, as Marlborough and Godolphin might have been forced by their Junto associates to repeal the Test Act. Swift avoids the subject of Sacheverell, so dear to the high-flyers, leaving it to the imagination of the reader whether he intends it to be included in the dangers to the Church. His second topic is the Pretender; he blames party spirit for the claim that the Tory stress on hereditary right favours the Pretender, and offers a careful defence of Anne's right being hereditary which does not impugn the Revolution settlement. On both these points Swift holds a delicate balance, countering the Whig propaganda points without alienating the High Churchmen, preserving throughout a tone of commonsense. One can see exactly how Swift's middle way and his critical examination of party help him to discount the standard Whig accusations of 1710, shrugging them off as the spleen of extremists.

Throughout his defence of the new ministry Swift kept harking back to his pretence of holding a middle position between the two parties, though he made no secret of being nearest to the Tories. He frequently denied that he was employed by the ministry, or supported them from any other reason than that of impartial judgement.[1] One

---

[1] This polite disavowal of employment was not intended to damage the paper's reputation for inside knowledge. John Gay wrote: "I presume I need not tell you that the Examiner carries much the more sail, as Contd...

paper opens: "I am satisfied, that no reasonable Man of either Party, can justly be offended at any Thing I said..."[1] In Examiner 18, Swift again asserts that he aims to convince those blinded by party:

> One principal End I designed by it, was to undeceive those well-meaning People, who have been drawn unaware into a wrong Sense of Things, either by the common Prejudices of Education and Company, the great personal Qualities of some Party-leaders, or the foul Misrepresentations that were constantly made of all who durst differ from them in the smallest Article. [2]

Swift showed no sympathy with Jacobites, and enjoyed demonstrating his moderation by bracketing them with "the Fanaticks" as parallel extremists. At the beginning of Examiner 19, Swift protests that the spirit of party has ruined objective assessment of the merit of political writing, which is judged by both sides alike purely on its party allegiance. He himself has been simultaneously attacked by his "enemies" for censuring the last ministry, and by his "friends" for not exposing more of their corruptions.[3] This situation is used again

---

Note 1 contd. from p.464

it is supposed to be written by the direction, and under the eye of some Great Persons who sit at the helm of affairs and is consequently looked on as a sort of Public Notice which way they are steering us." (The Present State of Wit, An English Garner, ed. Churton Collins, Vol. 1, p.205.)

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.58.

[2] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.31.

[3] Ibid, p.36.

in No.29 where Swift prints letters alleged to have come from a Whig, and from a Tory. The Whig accuses him of being a Jocobite, Jesuit, and Nonjuror for his praise of the present ministry and blame of the last, and threatens dire vengeance. The Tory is more polite, but is dissatisfied at the lack of detailed instances of the corruption and arrogance of the displaced ministers. Swift paradoxically takes credit for his leniency to them:

> THESE, Sir, are the Sentiments of a whole Party on one Side, and of considerable Numbers on the other: However, taking the Medium between these Extreams, I think to go on as I have hitherto done, although I am sensible my Paper would be more popular, if I did not lean too much to the favourable Side. [1]

The Whigs were hardly likely to thank Swift for his forbearance, but there was some truth in his claim, as can be seen by comparing the attacks in the Examiner with those of a real high-flyer, such as Joseph Trapp's _The Character and Principles of the Present Set of Whigs_.[2]

Yet Swift did not take this play of avoiding extremes to the

---

[1] _Ibid_, p.90.

[2] (1711). Here is an example. "At the same time they show their own Moderation by the most outrageous Railing, Cursing, Malice, Injustice and Oppression, by _drinking Damnation and Confusion_ to all who are not of their own Party, by distressing them in their Fortunes, or cutting off their _Noses_; by persecuting and tearing in pieces those that vote or make _Interest_ against 'em, buying up Debts on purpose to make the poor Debtors rot in Gaol, and beggaring and undoing whole Families, only because they would not be prevail'd upon to be as wicked as themselves." (p.10) The Whigs are: "a Wicked, Unreasonable, Rebellious, Antimonarchical, Antichristian Generation." (p.47-8)

extent of offending the mass of Tories and High Churchmen who read his paper. He accused the late ministry of prolonging the war for their own profit, of financial corruption, and of the attempt to monopolise all offices in the state. He excited Tory loyalty to Anne by asserting that the Whigs tyrannised over her and forced her into courses she hated by their continual threats of resignation; he brought up their attempt to make her dismiss Mrs. Masham, her dresser and favourite, because they suspected her of influencing the Queen. He stressed that Anne herself had changed her ministers, as her prerogative gave her every right to do, and that it was disloyal to question her decision. Swift made much of this argument which showed the Tories' respect for the constitution against Whig innovation. Swift vilified Thomas Wharton whom he had a great personal grudge against, and who was the particular enemy of the High Churchman on account of his alleged atheism and open patronage of the dissenters. He supported the Lower House of Convocation in its quarrel with the Whig bishiops, and defended the clergy vigorously from Whig criticism. He went even further to appease the less rational prejudices of the High Churchmen. Citing the Whigs' desire to repeal the Test Act, their moves to make it unnecessary for Fellows at Oxford and Cambridge to enter holy orders, and their patronage of individual freethinkers, Swift accuses them darkly of fostering "Atheism, Infidelity, Prophaneness, and Licentiousness," and professing principles destructive to our

religion and government.[1]

Swift achieved in the Examiner a mean between the aggression needed to satisfy the Tories and keep them reading his paper, and the moderation of Faults on Both Sides. Though he delighted the Tories with his insinuations that the Whigs represented unplumbed depths of evil, he often made reservations, such as that there were men among them who did not realise what their leaders really intended, and that these accusations did not include the whole party. More important, Swift steered the Tories away from their more dangerous pursuits; he confirmed that no move would be made to take away toleration of dissent, or even to attack occasional conformity, at the same time warning the dissenters to use it sparingly. He referred to Sacheverell only briefly, and then hardly with approval, taking care not to associate him with the new ministry. He told a story of a Whig lord who tried to persuade William to a similar impeachment:

> The King enquired the Character of the Man; *O Sir*, said my Lord, *the most violent, hot, positive Fellow in England; so extreamly wilful, that I believe he would be heartily glad to be a Martyr*. The King answered, *Is it so? Then I am resolved to disappoint him*; and would never hear more of the Matter; by which that hopeful Project unhappily miscarried. [2]

Swift played down passive obedience and hereditary right, and took care

---

[1] Examiners, 19, 21, 22, and 29. The quoted phrase is taken from No.21, Davis, III, p.49.

[2] The *Examiner*, ed. Davis, p.57.

to make clear his adherence to the Revolution settlement. Though he rebuked Marlborough severely, he did not demand his removal, but rather hoped he would not be so arrogant as to resign because his friends had lost office. The following quotation from the Queen's speech to the new Parliament shows Swift's hearty support for Harley's central moderation:

> I WOULD ask whether the QUEEN'S Speech doth not contain her Intentions, in every Particular relating to the Publick, that a good Subject, a Briton and a Protestant, can possibly have at Heart? To carry on the War in all its Parts, particularly in Spain, with the utmost Vigour, in order to procure a safe and honourable Peace for Us and our Allies; to find some Ways of paying the Debts on the Navy; to support and encourage the Church of England; to preserve the British Constitution according to the Union; to maintain the Indulgence [by Law] allowed to scrupulous Consciences; and, to employ none but such as are for the Protestant Succession in the House of Hanover. It is known enough, that Speeches on these Occasions are ever digested by the Advice of those who are in the chief Confidence; and consequently, that these are the Sentiments of her Majesty's Ministers, as well as her own; and we see, the two Houses have unanimously agreed with her in every Article. [1]

In the last twelve of his Examiners Swift devoted much space to a final discussion of party, where he picked up the suggestions he had made in earlier papers, as if to make a last, concentrated attack on the problem of where the new ministry stood in regard to party. Here he is at his most brilliant, as he employs his wit and literary ability

---

[1] Ibid, p.34.

to define and redefine the principles of Whig and Tory, attacking the Junto and defending the new ministry from the favourite accusation of Jacobitism. In Examiner 33, Swift touches on the question of misrepresentation in religion and politics; "A Whig forms an Image of a Tory, just after the Thing he most abhors; and that Image serveth to represent the whole Body." Declaring, "I am not sensible of any material Difference there is between those who call themselves the Old Whigs, and a great Majority of the present Tories",[1] Swift proceeds to defend the Tories from the Whig representation of passive obedience, which is responsible for them being branded as Jacobites.[2] His method is to give two versions of the doctrine of passive obedience; the first is how the Whigs charge it on the Tories:

---

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.111.

[2] There is evidence that Swift was particularly concerned at this development. Early in 1711 William Benson published a very popular pamphlet, A Letter to Sir J------ B------- (Jacob Banks, naturalised Swede, M.P. for Minehead, who had presented an address professing passive obedience to the Queen). Benson made an analogy that verged on allegory between the histories of England and Sweden, intended to show the disastrous consequences of passive obedience. Swift wrote to Peterborough on February 19, 1711: "I know not whether his quotation be fair, but the piece is shrewdly written: and in my opinion, not to be answered, otherwise than by disclaiming that sort of passive obedience which the Tories are charged with." (The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, I, 212). Swift continues with the same explanation as in Examiner 33, asserting that all reasonable men agree on the extent of obedience, irrespective of party. He mentioned Benson's pamphlet, in a different context, in Examiner 30 (March 8).

> THE Doctrine of Passive Obedience is to believe, that a King, even in a limited Monarchy holding his Power only from God, is only answerable to him. That, such a King is above all law; that the cruellest Tyrant must be submitted to in all Things; and if his Commands be ever so unlawful, you must neither fly nor resist, nor use any other Weapons than Prayers and Tears ... If a King of England should go through the Streets of London, in order to murder every Man he met, Passive Obedience commands them to submit ... His next Heir, although worse than what I have described although a Fool or a Madman, hath a Divine indefeasible Right to succeed him, which no law can disannul... But, whosoever sits on the Throne without this Title, although never so peaceably, and by Consent of former Kings and Parliaments, is an Usurper, while there is any where in the World another Person who hath a nearer Hereditary Right... [1]

Swift makes this summary extravagant to the point of comedy, then asserts that it is this version that Whig propaganda has tried to persuade the people that the present ministry and Parliament proceed by. To correct this he offers a second, moderate version, such as the vast majority of the present Tories and the Old Whigs would subscribe to. Passive obedience is due to the whole legislature, King, Lords, and Commons, not just the prince; under a Queen as excellent as Anne what question could there be about obedience? Though the Tories believe that the principle of hereditary right is best, they do not deny that it may be "defeasible by Act of Parliament."[2] Now Swift makes an unusual admission; if there are high-flyers, "warm and ignorant Men",

---

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.112-13.

[2] Ibid, p.114.

among the Tories, there are also revolutionaries among the Whigs, who hold that power resides in the people, and condone disobedience to the legislature itself. This comparison of the extremists of both parties, followed by a disavowal of the principles of Hicks, Dodwell and Leslie, all Nonjurors, implies the existence of honest men in the main body of the Whigs, a brief hint of his earlier theme of reconciliation. This greatly reinforces Swift's attempt to clear the Tories from charges of Jacobitism and separate them from their extremists.

The _Medley_, performing its function of watching the _Examiner_, thought this insidious justification of Tory moderation needed refuting, and consequently took up the point of misrepresentation.

> I Shou'd have been extremely taken with the _Examiner_ of the 22nd of _March_, if my Friend were not so unlucky that he can't help spoiling all he does, by some Falsity or other. One wou'd hope 'tis rather his Fate than his Inclination, since he then discover'd so good a Disposition to be one of our _Party_ ... But I wish he wou'd not have confounded things so; and that when he was order'd to declare himself a _Whig_, he wou'd have acted like one, been honest and spoke his mind and not have called _Revolution-Principles_ by a Tory Name! [1]

The author of the _Medley_ tries to reestablish the extreme version of passive obedience as he had the simple view of party against _Faults on Both Sides_. He compares Swift's argument with a pamphlet of James II's reign, _A Papist Misrepresented and Represented_, where the alleged

---

[1] The _Medley_ No.27, Monday, March 26. to Monday, April 2. 1711.

misrepresentation of the "bloody Papist" was proved to be the truth by the subsequent events of James's reign. Though Swift has called the Whig charge misrepresentation it may well be proved true by events; as evidence in its favour the Medley caries a large number of quotations from High Church divines, mostly of Charles II's reign, which enunciate the extreme view of passive obedience.

It has not been pointed out that Swift's protestations that he took no notice of his opponents papers have been too easily believed, He was too careful a controversialist not to familiarise himself with what he had to compete with, and the Medley, despite his sneers, was a competent paper which reiterated a Whig line for the party in a manner not unlike the Examiner's. His parody of a Whig paper, The Examiner Cross Examined,[1] is based closely on the Medley's style of controversy, and imitates its brusque, jocular tone. During the discussion of party in the Examiner there was a certain attention paid to the counter arguments put forward by the Medley, which clarify Swift's problems and his solutions to them. In Examiner 34, Swift, obviously inspired by the reference to A Papist Misrepresented and Represented, playfully considers that if the late ministry were to return to power, they would consider his satire on them panegyric:

> For, I appeal to any Man, whether I ever Charged
> that Party, or its Leaders, with one single Action
> or Design, which (if we may judge by their former

---

[1] Examiner, 22.

> Practices) they will not openly profess, be proud of, and score up for Merit, when they come again to the Head of Affairs? I said, they were Insolent to the QUEEN; Will they not value themselves upon That, as an Argument to prove them bold Assertors of the People's Liberty? I affirmed they were against a Peace; will they be angry with me for setting forth the Refinements of their Politicks, in pursuing the only Method left to preserve them in Power? I said, they had involved the Nation in Debts, and ingrossed much of its Money; they go beyond me, and boast they have got it _all_, and the _Credit_ too. I have urged the Probability of their intending great Alterations in Religion and Government: If they destroy both at their next Coming, will they not reckon my foretelling it, rather as a Panegyrick than an Affront? [1]

As well as reviving his indictment of the late ministry, this list of paradoxes wittily insinuates that Swift's accusations at least are highly reasonable. He enlarges on the theme, remembering that when a man was imprisoned in Charles II's reign for calling James Duke of York a Papist, James released him on his accession, regarding the charge as a compliment. So far from being accused of misrepresentation, the author of the Examiner will expect to be the favourite of the late ministry if they return. On the other hand, when he compliments the present ministry, his opponents think he is being satirical at their expense, as the principles of those they defend are so different.

John Oldmixon claimed to have written these numbers of the _Medley_ that comment on the _Examiner's_ discussion of party.[2] He clearly

---

[1] The _Examiner,_ ed. Davis, p.117.

[2] _Life of Maynwaring_, pp.193 and 196.

felt the moderate line of Swift to be a challenge, and in Medley 28, continued to refute Swift's version of passive obedience. This time he quoted from the Tory addresses of the summer of 1710 in order to show that the majority of the Tory party held the old, extreme view of passive obedience, and that Swift's moderate version was a red herring.

In Examiner 35, Swift again turns to "those two great Divisions of Whig and Tory, (which, some Way or other, take in the whole Kingdom) with the Principles they both profess, as well as those wherewith they reproach one another",[1] to determine which the Queen can most safely trust her government to. If both Whigs and Tories were true parties he would agree that a prince's best course would be to balance them, employing both as it suits him. However Swift is reluctant to consider the Whigs a true party, as they contain so many heterogeneous groups, all preferring different projects in Church and State.[2] For the moment he allows himself to consider them as a genuine party and

---

[1] The Examiner, p.121.

[2] Swift had distinguished between a party and a faction in Examiner 31. A true party has a genuine common interest which is part of the general interest of the nation; for instance the gentry of England, according to Swift the Tories, had a common interest in land. A faction is a collection of differing interests, united only for political strength, led by ambitious upstarts, who are prepared to call on the lowest of the people for support. In a sense Swift wants to have it both ways; his faction is both unprincipled, and ill-principled, delighting in all kinds of innovation in religion and politics.

promises to judge them only on the principles they admit to, and not to take into account "any that they pretend to deny".[1] He will summarise Whig and Tory principle on this fair basis, and let the reader judge which the Queen should favour.

The account of Whig principle is in its essentials free from injustice, centring on the subject's right to resist his prince and on complete toleration for the dissenters, including making them eligible for all office. Swift leaves out the black charges made by the high-flyers, but he subtly slants his summary, introducing a touch of unreasonable turbulence into his portrait of the Whigs:

> First, I conceive the _Whigs_ would grant, that they have naturally no great Veneration for _crowned Heads_; that they allow, the Person of the Prince may, upon many Occasions, be resisted by Arms; and that they do not condemn the War raised against King _Charles_ the First, or own it to be a Rebellion, although they would be thought to blame his Murder. They do not think the _Prerogative_ to be yet sufficiently limited, and have therefore taken Care (as a particular Mark of their Veneration for the illustrious House of _Hanover_) to clip it closer against the next Reign; which, consequently, they would be glad to see done in the present: Not to mention, that the Majority of them, if it were put to the Vote, would allow, that they prefer a Commonwealth before a Monarchy. [2]

Some of these "principles" the Whigs would certainly have disagreed with. Swift insinuates that they have no real love for Hanover, that they carry themselves arrogantly towards the Queen, and that they are

---

[1] _Ibid_, p.122-123.

[2] The _Examiner_, ed. Davis, p.123.

at heart republicans. He goes on to explain that such a domineering grasp for power makes the Whigs no less tyrannous to their fellow subjects than to their prince, as can be seen from the behaviour of the late ministry. The summary of Tory principle follows, stressing loyalty to the crown, care for the monarch's prerogative, and the subjects duty to obey "the lawful Authority of the Prince."[1] Swift is careful to avoid the unqualified denial of resistance so loved by the high-flyers. Swift's pretence of fair play is subordinated to his controversial purpose of discrediting the Whigs, but his admission of the prevalence of misrepresentation on both sides introduced a moderation and sophistication into the Tory position, making it easier to shrug off charges of Jacobitism.

The Medley did not reply to this paper, and Swift returned to extract further advantage from the discussion of party and misrepresentation in Examiner 39. He starts by drawing a parallel between Whig and Tory "Topicks of Reproach"[2]; while the Whigs are credited with designing to destroy the established Church and replace the monarchy with a commonwealth, the Tories are charged with intending to introduce Popery, arbitrary power and the Pretender. But Swift is not impartial in his treatment; he alleges that the Tory charges are founded on fact such as the Whigs' patronage of dissenters and freethinkers, and

---

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.125.

[2] Ibid, p.142.

justification of the rebellion against Charles I. He continues:

> WHAT Proofs they bring for our endeavouring to introduce Popery, Arbitrary Power, and the Pretender, I cannot readily tell, and would be glad to hear; however, those important Words having, by dextrous Management, been found of mighty Service to their Cause, although applied with little Colour, either of Reason or Justice; I have been considering whether they may not be adapted to more proper Objects. [1]

Swift proceeds to turn each of these accusations on the Whigs, using his ability to sustain a witty chain of absurd reasoning. The object of this exercise in paradox is to demonstrate the lack of foundation of the Whig propagandists' master charges; they are no truer applied to the Tories than to the Whigs. The device also gives Swift the opportunity to raise all his favourite insinuations against the Whigs in the process of the argument.

To the first point, Swift replies that the many sects fostered by the Whigs are most likely to bring in Popery by weakening the country for a foreign invader. He revives a story beloved by L'Estrange, that Jesuits were accustomed to disguise themselves as dissenters to spearhead the advance of Catholicism. Did not James attempt to bring in Popery through toleration for dissenters; if the Whigs except Papists from their toleration, they would give liberty to all free-thinkers, and is it not agreed by the learned that it is a short step from atheism to superstition. At this point Swift interjects a serious

---

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.143.

remark into the banter. He admits that with regard to arbitrary power some divines of Charles II's reign stressed the doctrine of passive obedience to a dangerous extent, but denies that this proves anything about the bulk of present Tory party, thus dismissing the *Medley's* collection of quotations.

Swift reverses the charge of arbitrary power by aligning the Whigs with the supporters of Cromwell, referring to their support for a standing army for William, and declaring that innovations always lead to tyranny, despite their authors' intentions. On the subject of the Pretender, Swift claims that by recognising the Pretender's legitimacy in the Sacheverell trial the Whigs have certainly favoured his cause with the common people, who may not appreciate the need to clarify Revolution principle. Then, returning to banter, Swift shows his facility in word-play and paradox in a controlled extravaganza of wit:

> A *Revolution-Principle*, as their Writings and Discourses have taught us to define it, is a Principle perpetually disposing Men to *Revolutions*: this is suitable to the famous saying of a great *Whig*, *That the more Revolutions the better*; which how odd a Maxim soever in Appearance, I take to be the true Characteristick of the Party.
>
> A DOG loves to turn round often; yet after certain *Revolutions*, he lies down to *Rest*: But Heads, under the Dominion of the *Moon*, are for perpetual *Changes*, and perpetual *Revolutions*: Besides, the *Whigs* owe all their Wealth to *Wars* and *Revolutions*; like the Girl at *Bartholomew-Fair*, who gets a Penny by turning round a hundred Times, with Swords in her Hands.
>
> TO conclude, the *Whigs*, have a natural Faculty of bringing in *Pretenders*, and will therefore probably

> endeavour to bring in the great One at last: How many Pretenders to Wit, Honour, Nobility, Politicks, have they brought in these last twenty Years? In short, they have been sometimes able to procure a Majority of Pretenders in Parliament; and wanted nothing to render the work compleat, except a Pretender at their Head. [1]

The brilliance of this raillery lies in the way it suggests the corrupt and hollow nature of the Whig party as Swift was determined to portray it, reducing, for instance, their glorious war to the level of a fairground trick. As I have mentioned, the very absurdity of the specious logic rubs off on the charges themselves, and removes them from the level of practical politics.

The *Medley*, 32, could not let this accusation go unanswered. Wilfully misunderstanding the point of Swift's tour-de-force, its author solemnly refutes the idea that the Whigs could further the Pretender's interest. The suggestion shows the depths to which the *Examiner* can sink. In the next issue the *Medley* again refers to *Examiner* 39, with the heading, " The Examiner turned Whig again ". Its author explains the moderation of the *Examiner's* Toryism, and the admission that some divines preached passive obedience to a dangerous extent, by claiming that the *Examiner* has been forced to back down because the "Church party" are not being indulged by the ministry. It was no mean triumph for Swift to have secured an admission from the

---

[1] The *Examiner*, ed. Davis, p.147.

Whig paper that the new ministry was not led by the high-flyers, even if the admission was made in the hopes of fomenting differences between the country Tories and their leadership. The Medley consistently refused to take the moderate compromise of Swift seriously, and fought to maintain the traditional Whig view of the Tories. Medley 34 laments that matters have come to an impasse in "our important controversy about Whig and Tory". Both sides have set out their position and the Medley has nothing more to add; at this the Medley loses interest, and changes its topic of discussion.

In almost his last Examiner Swift gave his final version of the situation of the parties.

> HAVING been forced in my Papers to use the Cant-words of Whig and Tory, which have so often varied their Significations, for twenty Years past; I think it necessary to say something of the several Changes those two Terms have undergone since that Period; and then to tell the Reader what I have always understood by each of them, since I undertook this Work. [1]

Swift enjoys the paradoxical situation of the parties in William's reign, pointing out how different their principles were then from in Charles II's time, or even the Revolution:

> To be against a Standing Army in Time of Peace, was all High-Church, Tory and Tantivy. To differ from a Majority of Bishops was the same. To raise the Prerogative above Law for serving a Turn, was Low-Church and Whig. The Opinion of the Majority in the House of Commons, especially of the Country-Party

---

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.162.

> or Landed Interest, was High-flying and rank Tory. To exalt the King's Supremacy beyond all Precedent, was Low-Church, Whiggish, and Moderate. To make the least Doubt of the pretended Prince being Supposititious, and a Tyler's Son, was, in their Phrase, Top and Top-gallant, and perfect Jacobitism. To resume the most exorbitant Grants that were ever given to a Set of profligate Favourites, and apply them to the Publick, was the very Quintescence of Toryism; notwithstanding those Grants were known to be acquired, by sacrificing the Honour and the Wealth of England. [1]

This passage harks back to the argument of Faults on Both Sides, that it was Harley and the Tory party that stood for true Whig principle in William's reign; it implies that the common view of the Tories is the result of Whig name-calling rather than historical fact. It is interesting that Swift had not felt this way at the time, when he had defended the Junto lords. He retells the alliance of Marlborough and Godolphin, traditional Tories, with the Junto; this cannot be explained by Whig or Tory principle, but is a combination held together by personal interest alone, as both profit by the war and by their monopolising grasp on power and office. This causes Swift to redefine what he means by Whig: "SINCE that Time, the Bulk of the Whigs appeareth rather to be linked to a certain Sett of Persons, than any certain Set of Principles: So that if I were to define a Member of that Party, I would say, he was one who believed in the late Ministry".[2] What he has

---

[1] Ibid, p.164.

[2] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.165.

objected to in the Whigs in the Examiner applies only to the late ministry and their adherents, and he even excepts those who mean well but have been deceived by the pretences of their leaders.

Having thus cleared the air, Swift offers another pair of summaries, of what Whig and Tory used to mean, before recent complications. These definitions are both truly restrained:

> Whoever formerly professed himself to approve the Revolution, to be against the Pretender, to justify the Succession in the House of Hanover, to think the British Monarchy not absolute, but limited by Laws, which the Executive Power could not dispense with; and to allow an Indulgence to scrupulous Consciences; such a Man was content to be called a Whig. On the other side, whoever asserted the QUEEN'S Hereditary Right; that the Persons of Princes were Sacred; their lawful Authority not to be resisted on any Pretence; nor even their Usurpations, without the most extream Necessity: That, Breaches in the Succession were highly dangerous; that, Schism was a great Evil, both in it self and its Consequences; that, the Ruin of the Church, would probably be attended with that of the State; that, no Power should be trusted with those who are not of the established Religion; such a Man was usually called a Tory. [1]

Swift argues that these views are not essentially contradictory, differing only in emphasis, whether danger is to be expected from the Pretender or from "other Enemies to the Constitution."[2] The majority of the kingdom who hold either of these views are brothers separated

---

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.166.

[2] Ibid, 166.

only by their fears, and Swift implies that nothing should prevent them joining together to defend the nation. The advantage of this is that while it is generous in its assessment of Whig principles, it effectively deprives the Junto Whigs and their party of any principles at all. It allows the Old Whigs to be linked with the Tories in Harley's new ministry, which represents, in Swift's eyes, the honest men of both parties, the bulk of the nation.

Swift's service to Harley and to the Tory party in writing the Examiner was considerable. Though he discarded the genuine middle way of Faults on Both Sides, he repeated many of the points made by its author about party in his paper. By combining them with the traditional Tory loyalties to Crown and Church Swift created a new identity for the Tory party. The manipulation of various definitions of party principle, and the show of avoiding party extremes were Swift's principal techniques for avoiding the unbalanced extremism of the high-flyers; he introduced a new sophistication into Tory thought, taking advantage of the recent confusion surrounding the party in recent years to disavow the Jacobite wing of the Tories, and reaffirm the assent of the latter to the Revolution settlement. It was a measure of Swift's success that he delighted the Tories at the same time as he headed them off from their most disastrous tendencies, and ensured that the attack on the late ministry took the form of criticism of the war, financial mismanagement, and monopolising high office, rather than a Church crusade. Swift allayed fears of a violent change of policy by

associating the Tories with the Old Whigs and vindicating their moderation; he gave them a claim to represent the honest men of both parties against a corrupt faction.

A writer of less literary ability than Swift could hardly have brought off this striking achievement, or handled a continuous discussion of party with such balance and control. A comparison with the simple certitudes of the writers of the Exclusion Crisis highlights Swift's artistic use of confusion surrounding party, the wit and persuasive force that gave his version of moderate Toryism such conviction. From his Examiner one can guess at a far more sophisticated readership, that could appreciate an intelligent approach to politics. Swift's tone of dispassionate discussion suited an age when political conflict had a more open place in the political system and lost some of the desperate tension of the previous century, though it had by no means attained Augustan calm. When he closed his contribution to the paper with a list of the new ministry's achievements, Swift could feel satisfied that his reputation as a controversialist had been enhanced, and that he had proved the man of letters' ability to contribute to political journalism: [1]

---

[1] The Tory majority in the 1710 elections destroyed what little hope there had been for a mixed ministry of Whigs and Tories. Most of Harley's moderate Whigs either dropped off or were forced out by the Tory clamour for places. Swift's moderate Toryism proved more robust, and helped throughout the four years to defend the ministry from accusations of Jacobitism. Some Reasons to Prove that no Person is obliged by his Principles as a Whig to

Contd...

AND now I conceive the main Design I had in writing these Papers, is fully executed. A great Majority of the Nation is at Length thoroughly convinced, that the QUEEN proceeded with the highest Wisdom, in changing her Ministry and Parliament. That, under a former Administration, the greatest Abuses of all Kinds were committed; and the most dangerous Attempts against the Constitution for some Time intended. The whole Kingdom finds the present Persons in Power, directly and openly pursuing the true Service of their QUEEN and Country; and to be such whom their most bitter Enemies cannot tax with Bribery, Covetousness, Ambition, Pride, Insolence, or any pernicious Principles in Religion or Government. [1]

Note 1 contd. from p.485.

Oppose Her Majesty or the Present Ministry (1712) shows Swift again arguing that adherence to a set of persons, rather than principles divided the parties. Much later, Bolingbroke was to use much of Swift's Toryism in his opposition to Walpole. As the parties hardened during 1711 the controversy about principles gave way to specific issues, the war and the succession being the most important.

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.171.

CHAPTER THREE

PEACE OR WAR, 1711-1712.

A. The Approach to a peace.

(i) Early treatment of the War in the press.

The most important question facing the new ministry of Harley was that of the war of the Spanish succession. Much of the discontent with the Godolphin ministry had risen from the cost of the war; in particular the landed gentry, who paid the taxes, felt they were being bled in order to benefit the "monied men" who had invested in the war. A tax on land paid the interest on money lent to the government to subsidise the war effort. Though Sacheverell had been the occasion of the fall of the Whigs the war played a more important part in causing their unpopularity. The war had been started under a Tory ministry, but it had lasted too long to please the Country members elected in 1710, and it had become associated with the Whigs when Marlborough and Godolphin had taken them into partnership. The Whigs supported the war partly to ingratiate themselves with the Elector of Hanover, the legal successor to the British crown, and because they genuinely feared that a revival of French power would endanger the protestant succession. In 1709 Louis XIV had shown signs of wanting to end the war, but the ministry demanded conditions that it was impossible for him to fulfil, and the war continued. Harley considered that too much money had been spent on the war and that its original object, containing French aggression, had been completed. Moreover,

peace was the only way in which he could satisfy the Tories and establish his ministry on a firm footing. Peace would also enable Marlborough to be removed from his powerful position of Captain General of the allied armies, which he might use to return his friends to office.

On his return to power Harley preserved a cautious attitude to the war. Marlborough was retained and supplies for the next campaign granted, but at the same time secret negotiations were initiated with France. Ministerial propaganda reflected this caution. The early issues of the *Examiner* had suggested that the war had been badly managed, but Marlborough was treated with respect and Whig charges that the change of ministry would help the French were indignantly denied. Bolingbroke's *Letter to the Examiner* went further, asserting that the continuation of the war on its present footing would mean England's ruin. St John acknowledged that the original aim of the war was in the national interest. He stressed the neglect of Spain and the West Indies, old grievances of the Tories, who resented both the expense of the campaigns in Flanders, and the prominence of Marlborough. *Faults on Both Sides* criticised the conduct of the war, in particular the neglect of Spain, but its author aimed to allay fears of a precipitate peace. He made vague professions of goodwill to Marlborough if he would serve under the new ministry.

A few pamphlets treated Marlborough more severely. *The Secret History of Arlus and Odolphus* contained a satiric portrait of the

general and revived the accusation that he was prolonging the war for his private profit. More surprisingly, the author of this pamphlet stated that Harley was disgraced because he favoured a policy of peace. Another attack carried the intriguing title, Reasons why a certain great G------l has not yet received the thanks of either of the two Houses of P---------nt. Its writer draws attention to the reluctance of the Tory Commons to give Marlborough his customary vote of thanks. He warns of the dangers of overweening generals, who put their own interests before those of their country. Marlborough's victories bring England no advantages, and he prolongs the war by avoiding a decisive battle, preferring to besiege towns, and by causing good offers of peace to be rejected. This pamphlet dates from very late in 1710,[1] as it cites an incident of December in which three officers were made to leave the army, accused of having drunk to the fall of the new ministry. This incident is used to point the dangers of an army that owes its allegiance to its general rather than its Queen.

Such boldness was unusual in 1710, and did not represent the policy of the ministry. Swift's Examiner came closer to this with its occasional oblique criticism of Marlborough. Harley and St John wished to make the Duke's position awkward, and to diminish his

---

[1] Boyer places it (Annals, IX, 284) in the last days of December, 1710, relating it to the efforts of Marlborough's friends to vote him his usual thanks.

popularity, rather than displace him from his command, where he was still needed until negotiations with France were settled. In his first paper, Examiner 13, Swifts states that the war will be prosecuted with vigour, but that the ministry will not again refuse reasonable terms of peace. In Examiner 16 Swift turns his attention to the accusation made in many of Hoadly's pamphlets that Marlborough has been treated with ingratitude. A bill of £994. 11. 10. for a Roman triumph is compared with the Duke's financial rewards, which are estimated at £540,000. On December 21, 1710, Swift deals with the incident of the three officers, taking the opportunity to remind his readers that Marlborough had asked to be made Captain General for life. Swift reflects on the danger of the intervention of the army in civil affairs, and advances two reasons why soldiers should desire it:

> To say the Truth, such formidable Sticklers can have but two Reasons for desiring to interfere in the Administration; the first is that of Caesar and Cromwell, of which, God forbid I should accuse or suspect any Body; since the second is pernicious enough, and that is, To preserve those in Power who are for perpetuating a War, rather than see others advanced, who, they are sure, will use all proper Means to promote a safe and honourable Peace. [1]

The personal character of Marlborough dominated the initial discussion of the war. Among the English politicians only Marlborough came near to heroic stature, and challenged comparison with the generals

---

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.44.

of Greece and Rome. Swift used the classical parallel to hit precisely the note the government wanted in the Examiner for February 27, 1711, in which he attacked Marlborough's notorious avarice under the guise of a Roman warning Crassus of the same vice. The dignified tone he adopted, and his careful refusal to dispute the true qualities of Crassus give the accusation a kind of impartiality that more vituperative writers quite fail to convey. In the hands of Swift the device has an imaginative life that differentiates it from simple allegory. The opening of the "Letter to Crassus" gives some indication of its tone of cool, impartial judgement:

To MARCUS CRASSUS, Health:

> IF you apply as you ought, what I now write, you will be more obliged to me than to all the World, hardly excepting your Parents, or your Country. I intend to tell you, without Disguise or Prejudice, the Opinion which the World hath entertained of you. And, to let you see I write this without any Sort of ill Will, you shall first hear the Sentiments they have to your Advantage. No Man disputes the Gracefulness of your Person; you are allowed to have a good and clear Understanding, cultivated by the Knowledge of Men and Manners, although not by Literature. You are no ill Orator in the Senate; and you are said to excel in the Art of bridling and subduing your Anger, and stifling or concealing your Resentments; you have been a most successful General, of long Experience, great Conduct, and much Personal Courage... [1]

Swift makes use of the distancing effect of the parallel to avoid the stock Tory portrait; no other attack allowed Marlborough these qualities, or appeared to show so little malice. Yet Swift uses this

---

[1] The Examiner, ed. Davis, p.83. The passage is in italics except for "Literature".

build-up to imply that it is Marlborough's avarice that has caused him to starve his soldiers and break off peace negotiations.

Marlborough did not lack defenders. By his victories, and his tireless political pressure, in Europe as well as England, he had identified himself with the cause of war. The pamphlets of Hoadly and Walpole at the 1710 election showed the Whigs were ready to accept the movement of controversy from Sacheverell to the war, and hoped that the new ministry would be discredited if they made peace on worse terms than those put forward at Gertrydenburg in 1709. The Observator and the Medley treated the accusations of the Examiner as malicious libel on a national hero. I have already mentioned that Francis Hare, Marlborough's chaplain, had published a lengthy defence of his patron which amounted to a complete discussion of the conduct of the war. Its title was The Management of the War and it consisted of four "letters" to a Tory Member of Parliament. The first of these was published in December 1710 and the last in March 1711. Hare had noted the insinuations about Marlborough in the propaganda surrounding the change of ministry, and anticipated the more comprehensive charges that they might give rise to. In turn Hare deals with the possibility of a good peace after the battle of Ramillies in 1706, the war in Spain, the choice of Flanders as the seat of the war, and the reasons for the failure of negotiations at Gertrydenburg in 1709. With detailed argument and discussion Hare tries to show that the war has been fought as well as was humanly possible, and that no offers of peace from France

have been genuine. Hare stresses the necessity of preventing Bourbon domination of Europe by taking Spain out of the hands of the French claimant, Philip of Bourbon, and hints that a dishonourable peace may be forthcoming under the new ministry. The pamphlet shows how closely the reputation of Marlborough is bound up with the larger issues of the war.

The question of whether Spain should be ruled by Philip or by Charles of Austria was the point on which previous peace negotiations had been wrecked. "No peace without Spain" had originally been a Tory war-cry designed to embarrass those who had placed the major war effort in Flanders. Later it had become the principal reason given by the Whigs for continuing the war; if France had control over Spain and the Indies, there would be no possibility of resisting our traditional rival either in war or in trade. On April 26, 1711 Swift in the Examiner boldly accuses the Whigs of using Spain as a pretext for prolonging the war indefinitely. He asks what must be done if it should be found impossible to recover Spain. As this seemed only too likely, Whig pamphleteers were quick to justify their party. The writer of Reflections on the Examiner's Scandalous Peace (1711) protests horror at the suggestion, and reiterates that the Spanish monarchy must be given entire to the House of Austria. An impressive array of quotations from the proceedings of Parliament are produced to prove that this has been the avowed object of the war from its beginning.

Several months later another pamphlet made the same point but

with a different emphasis, on England's trade. Entitled A Letter to a Member of the October Club, shewing that to yield Spain to the Duke of Anjou by a Peace would be the Ruin of Great Britain, it tries to prove that it is actually less expensive to fight on than to make a peace that surrenders Spain. Some amazing assertions are made and figures quoted to support this claim. France will charge a toll on trade in the Mediterranean; the East India Company will have to be closed down. No more Spanish wool will be imported, as France will not permit it; in fact England will have no more foreign trade at all. This writer estimates the loss of trade at three and a half million, which will put one sixth of the population out of work, and reduce all estates to one quarter of their present value. This will make peace exactly one million pounds per annum more expensive than war, and four millions per annum less profitable than recovering Spain for Charles. Ridiculous though these figures may seem, the pamphlet shows the lengths Whig writers would go to when opposing peace, even when there was no immediate prospect of it. This pamphlet is frequently referred to by other Whig writers in the controversy on peace as a useful warning of what may happen if Spain is abandoned.

(ii) The New Preliminaries

The controversy did not attain any scale until later in the year when the ministry communicated preliminary articles that they had negotiated secretly with the French to the allies. Until then there had been a lull in the press. In July the Examiner had been dropped

to placate Marlborough, and the _Medley_ followed it into retirement. It was not until Matthew Prior, returning from secret negotiations in France, early in August 1711, was arrested by a customs official by mistake that there was proof of dealings between the ministry and France. Swift published _A New Journey to Paris_ (1711) in order to cover the embarrassment of his friends. This pamphlet purports to be an account of Prior's journey written by his French valet, who hints at Prior obtaining large concessions for England. Swift succeeded in puzzling Londoners for a while, and in sounding public opinion about a peace, but the mischief had already been done; suspicions of secret negotiations became certainty.

Meanwhile Marlborough accomplished what was to be his last triumph, the surrender of Bouchain. Francis Hare celebrated it with a thanksgiving sermon, _The Charge of God to Joshua_, which was quickly printed in England. He called for a determined prosecution of the war to fulfil God's purposes. In addition Hare put the triumph to good use in a pamphlet, _Bouchain, in a Dialogue between the late Medley and Examiner_, (1711) that glorifies his patron's exploit. The _Examiner_ admits that he has libelled Marlborough, and joins in a laugh at the expense of the country gentry; they do not understand that it is necessary to continue the war to protect England's trade.

Swift had the difficult task of managing the Tory press. He was determined that every important Whig pamphlet to come out should be answered, either by himself or by his subordinates. Swift realised

that public opinion could well play a vital part when the ministry revealed the results of their nogotiations. France was England's traditional enemy, and those discontented with the war had no more compelling reason for its end than its cost. Though the country might be ready for peace, the energy of the Whigs could easily cause great embarrassment in Parliament. Secret negotiations had an air of treachery to England's allies that even the heavily taxed Tory squire might find unpalatable. Swift organised replies to Hare; on October 1, The Duke of M---------h's Vindication, in answer to Bouchain was advertised. It was written by Mrs Manley, with hints from Swift. Mrs Manley coolly dismisses the hero worship that surrounds Marlborough, ironically praising him for his loyalty to the Church in deserting his first patron, James I. She compares the wealthy Duke with the small gentry who really feel the weight of taxation. The Whig writers do not praise Marlborough for his own sake, but to further the fortunes of their party. To balance Hare's complaint of the libelling of Marlborough Mrs Manley points to the equally libellous attacks on Harley. Three days later another of Mrs Manley's pamphlets A Learned Comment on Dr. Hare's Sermon attacked The Charge of God to Joshua.

On September 27, the preliminary articles were signed. There were two sets, one secret detailing the advantages reserved for England, and one for communicating to the allies. On October 11, the Postboy, which had been discreetly sounding public opinion about peace since

August, announced that it hoped to be able to inform its readers in a few days of major advantages for trade that would be part of a peace settlement.[1] The newspapers were to play an important part in the struggle between the Whigs and their foreign allies and the government, being drawn in the ensuing months into more direct political action than they were accustomed to. When the ministers of the allies were given the preliminary articles, Count Gallas, the representative of Austria, forestalled the ministry by seeing that they reached the Daily Courant, where they appeared on October 13.

This premature release of the preliminaries was a gift to the Whig writers, as the articles most favourable to Britain were naturally in the secret agreement not revealed to the allies. Moreover, though the French agreed that the crowns of France and Spain should not be united, there was no provision for removing Spain from Philip. An undated Postscript to the Postboy was faked to take advantage of the situation; it carried ironic preliminaries that allowed the French to dominate Europe, and ended with an advertisement for a fictitious pamphlet, The Triumph of the Conquered. On October 16, the Postboy printed the preliminaries and tried to retrieve the situation by claiming there were additional terms that favoured England's trade. The Flying Post of the same date compared the new articles with those of

---

[1] For a detailed account of the Postboy's role see The Political State for September 1711.

1709 that preceded the negotiations at Gertrydenburg; these specified the removal of Philip from Spain and what was to be conceded to both Britain and her allies, and Ridpath made the most of the unflattering contrast. Abel Boyer wrote in his Political State: "It is hard to express how strangely the Generality of People, of Both Parties, and even some of the best Friends of the Present Ministry were surpris'd at the Publication of these Preliminaries, who look'd upon them as Captions, Insidious, and Insufficient to ground a Treaty on".[1]

An ingenious pamphlet took advantage of the predicament of the ministry to exploit the general consternation at the new articles. As early as October 16, A Vindication of the Present M------y, from the Clamours rais'd against them upon Occasion of the New Preliminaries", was published. Abel Boyer stated it to be, "so far from being an Apology, that it is rather a shrewd, Ingenious Satyr which runs upon a continued Ironical Supposition that the new Preliminaries are not genuine"[2] The opening sentences show the writer's tactic for increasing the embarrassment of the ministry:

> Among the many restless Endeavours of the Ruin'd Party to sink the Reputation of the Present M---y, there is none in which they discover their Good will to them more than in the Violence they shew in attacking the new Preliminaries; which, tho

---

[1] Quadriennium Annae Postremum, II, 580.

[2] Ibid, II, 649.

> they are such weak wretched things that they must fall of themselves, without any opposition made to them, yet these angry Men run upon them with all their might, and with the greatest Strength of Argument oppose Articles which no serious Man can think worthy of an Answer. A Man must have the meanest Opinion of the M---y, not to be sure such trifling Preliminaries can't be the Result of the Negotiations, which have been of late so much talk'd of; for an impartial Eye will discern in them at first sight most evident marks of their being spurious; and yet a certain Party take such pleasure in insulting the present M---y, that they set themselves against these Articles in great earnest, as if our All depended upon them, without the least enquiry, whether they are genuine or not. [1]

With great Zest the writer examines the shortcomings of the articles, pointing out their vague and evasive nature, contrasting them with the flattering hints of A New Journey to Paris. After lengthy discussion he concludes that the ministry can have nothing to do with them. Published almost equally rapidly was Remarks on the Preliminary Articles, a direct attack, which was advertised on October 19. It emphasised the main point of the Whigs, that Spain itself and the Indies were to be relinquished to Philip of Bourbon.

B. Defoe on Peace

The seriousness with which the ministers regarded the Whig press can be seen in Bolingbroke's attempt to discourage it at this vital moment. On October 23 he arrested fourteen printers, publishers and

---

[1] A Vindication of the Present M---y, p.3.

booksellers on his warrant as Secretary of State. They were quickly bailed out. Count Gallas was forbidden the court, then dismissed in disgrace. Such signs of firmness quite failed to restrain the press; in the next few months England saw perhaps the greatest output of political journalism of the Harley ministry, comparable to the last months of 1710. The interest of the Tory leaders, Harley and Bolingbroke, in the press ensured that they were well served. Swift was already working on the ministry's main weapon, The Conduct of the Allies, in close concert with Bolingbroke, but until that was published on November 27, the principal apologist for peace negotiations was Defoe.[1]

---

[1] Defoe's pamphlets during the crisis were as follows:

Reasons why this Nation Ought to put a Speedy End to this Expensive War. (6, 11, 13 October, 1711)

Armageddon. (October 30, 1711)

The Balance of Europe. (November 1, 1711)

An Essay at a Plain Exposition of that Difficult Phrase, A Good Peace. (November 27, 1711)

Reasons why a Party among us... are... against a Treaty of Peace. (November 29, December 8, 1711)

* A Defence of the Allies and the late Ministry: or Remarks on the Tories New Idol. (December 5, 1711).

The Felonius Treaty. (December, 1711)

An Essay on the History of Parties and Persecution in Britain. (December 22, 1711)

* No Queen or No General. (January 11, 1712).

The Conduct of Parties in England. (January 24, 1712).

Full titles of these pamphlets are given in the text. Their dates are taken from, William Lee, Daniel Defoe: His Life, and Recently

Contd...

He published at least ten pamphlets from October 1711 to January 1712, as well as writing the Review.

Defoe's personal attitude is hard to fathom, as the views expressed in his writings are far from identical. He admitted to writing only one of his pamphlets on the peace, and later denied categorically that he had written in its favour.[1] In An Appeal to Honour and Justice, published in 1715 Defoe defends the integrity of his political conduct during this period. He thought himself bound to serve the Queen's ministers unless he believed them to be absolute traitors. He has not vilified the old ministry, being satisfied it was working for the public good; Neither did he join in the Whigs' vindictive attacks on the new ministry, though he disliked many of its actions, notably its alliance with high-Tories and Jacobites. If he has been at fault it has been in allowing his obligations to Harley to restrain his criticisms of his patron's government. As for the peace, he disliked its terms, and openly said so in the Review, but did not consider them sufficiently bad to justify the Whig accusations that it proved the ministry to be in the interest of the

---

Note 1 contd. from p.500

Discovered Writings. Vol.I. (London, 1869) p.xxxvi, xxxvii, with the exception of those marked with an asterisk. A further pamphlet has been attributed to Defoe: A Further Search into the Conduct of the Allies (1712). It is reprinted in the Somers Tracts, Vol. 13 (London 1815), p.152. It seems to me very unlikely to be Defoe's work.

[1] An Appeal to Honour and Justice, reprinted in Daniel Defoe, ed. James T. Boulton, (London, 1965) p.177-178.

Pretender. He believed in partition, and had said so since William III's time, but once peace was made he thought best to urge England accept it rather than to use it to bring down the ministry. He was never told by the ministers to aid the Pretender, and saw no evidence that they were Jacobites.

Defoe dismisses the Whigs' accusations against him of Jacobitism as the inevitable reaction of the party-mad when confronted by moderation. He could not, while taking part in the rapidly changing political scene, both keep to the same principles and blindly serve one party. To indicate his independence he asserts that he was never paid for what he wrote, nor was his attitude dictated by Harley, who left him complete freedom to write as he liked. Defoe complains that all manner of pamphlets have been attributed to him without any evidence, and cites the Review as his only genuine pronouncement on the peace.[1]

This highly honourable picture of his activity does not agree with Defoe's letters to Harley, which show him both advising and probing the minister for ideas, suggesting lines of argument for Harley's approval, and asking for advice on how to conduct himself. In a letter of October 16, 1711 Defoe points out to Harley that he needs personal advice on what line to follow in such a time of crisis when his services are vitally necessary:

---

[1] This included An Essay at a Plain Exposition of that Difficult Phrase A Good Peace, which Defoe published openly as by the author of the Review.

> The present Case I beg of your Ldpp is Onely whether a warm Application to The Opening the peoples Eyes in The Affair of Peace, in which They are goeing Mad, will be Acceptable to your Ldpp, in which as my Own principle agrees and The Public Service Requires, So I Humbly Suggest your Ldpps Service also Very Much Consists. [1]

In a letter of November 30, Defoe tells how he has enraged the Whigs by defending "the just article of Peace",[2] meaning in the Review, as he instances the Observator's attack on him for doing so.

My object is not principally to determine Defoe's personal attitude to the peace and indeed to Harley's ministry in general,[2] but to follow the course of his pamphlets through this crisis, showing their variations and defining exactly what support he actually gave Harley in print. This is far more complicated than either his later justification or his letters to Harley might suggest; in neither did Defoe admit the full extent of his activity, or explain its diversity. His motives cannot be completely uncovered, but I suggest that this extraordinary run of pamphlets can be best explained by Defoe's conscience, his need to be able to justify to himself his different voices in order to maintain his own belief in the virtue he so pugnaciously

---

[1] The Letters of Daniel Defoe, ed. George Harris Healey, (Oxford, 1955) p.361.

[2] The Letters of Daniel Defoe, ed. George Harris Healey, (Oxford, 1955) p.362.

[3] The best account of Defoe's attitude is given by James Sutherland, Defoe, (Oxford, 1937) with whom I basically agree.

claimed before his readers.

Defoe's first pamphlet in support of the peace negotiations was published on October 6, before the Preliminary Articles were released. Its title was, Reasons Why this Nation Ought to put a Speedy End to this Expensive War: with a Brief Essay, at the probable Conditions on which the Peace Now Negotiating, may be Founded. Also An Enquiry into the Obligations Britain lies under to the Allies. The title suggests that the author has inside knowledge from the government, a front that Defoe keeps up throughout the pamphlet. It sold three editions in a week, and was recognised as the principal exponent of peace. Defoe starts with fulsome praise of peace:

> How have we above Twenty Years groan'd under a Long and a Bloody War? How often has our most remote Views of Peace gladden'd our Souls, and chear'd up our Spirits? [1]

From this he moves to the economic pressure of the war on the nation, including the slaughter of the latest "victories" in Flanders. His slightly overpitched emotional tone is much less common than that of sober reason which one tends to think typical of Defoe; it is a sign that he is making a special effort:

> When we look upon our victorious Army, and our Generals crown'd with Lawrels, and Garlands of Victory; (And how many such Battles as that near Mons, could we bear?) (how do those very Victories ruine us?) There we conquered the Marechal de Villars and gain'd the Honour of

---

[1] Reasons Why, p.3-4.

> the Field of Battle. But how lie the Bones of 22000 of the best and bravest Soldiers in Christendom sacrificed meerly to the Pique of Glory between the Haughty Generals, and to decide the mighty Contest between us and the French, who should possess the Hedges of Taniers, or be Masters of the little Coppice of Blareignes. [1]

Perhaps Defoe is trying to disguise his identity with such rhetoric. He continues to point out that besieging towns, the object of the last campaign, is also expensive. Six thousand soldiers fell at Bouchain. This is not to detract from the prowess of the General, but merely to show that there is no chance of rapid success.

In defence of peace Defoe declares that a regular, honourable treaty is proposed, and admits that England demanded far too much at Gertrydenburg. He hints that the Dutch helped to frustrate negotiations by their jealously of England. England cannot afford to take such a high-handed attitude again, as the military situation has stagnated. Opposition to peace can only come from those who misjudged French strength, or from:

> ...the selfish Principles in some of the Persons concern'd, who for Reasons of their own, were unwilling the War should End, and would choose rather to sacrifice their Country, and the Interest of the Queen, than make use of any Opportunity, how Advantageous soever, to make a Peace with the Enemy. [2]

---

[1] Ibid, p.6.

[2] Reasons Why, p.13.

This is as far as Defoe is prepared to go in condemning the opposition to peace. Unwilling to attack forthrightly the ministry he had served, Defoe is happier demonstrating how a peace will help British trade, in decline because of the war. To disguise himself, he admits he is no expert in trade. Dealing with the financing of the war, he does not complain of the method of raising loans, so hated by the country gentry, but congratulates the Review for advising the Whigs not to sink credit. If necessary the government could forgo the need for credit by stopping the interest on funds or by an excise, or by a rapid peace. The government are concerned for the poor in the case of a general excise, and it is only these whom the Whigs will hurt by a run on credit.

Touching on the delicate question of Spain, Defoe maintains that the demand for the whole Spanish monarchy was a late addition to our war aims, which were originally to crush the exorbitant power of France. This is now accomplished, and if Charles is given Spain as well as the Empire it will be Austria that will dominate Europe instead of the French. The only reason for "No peace without Spain" is a desire to prolong the war. Defoe only mentions this firm point very briefly before he deals with the charges that we are betraying our allies. He replies that we have as much right to treat initially as they do, and in London if necessary, hinting at the Dutch desire to monopolise negotiations. That we negotiate for a treaty does not mean that we will make a separate peace, or agree to dishonourable conditions.

Defoe stresses that no concessions have yet been made to justify Whig clamour. While the Whigs exclaim against the peace the allies themselves have made no protest; Defoe denies outright that they distrust England.

Here Defoe indulges in a little shadow boxing, a common tactic in these pamphlets. There is no evidence that Spain will be relinquished, but granting it for argument Defoe expostulates with the Review, which he affects to consider a staunch advocate for no peace without Spain.[1] He produces a series of excellent reasons why there is no danger in giving Spain to Philip, who will find that the different interests of Spain and France will force him apart from his family. A Treaty of Commerce may secure English trading rights; Defoe holds out the prospect of generous concessions to England. These may be more advantageous if obtained from Philip than from an Emperor who is also king of Spain. Finally he suggests two partitions, which alternatively give Spain and the Indies to Philip and to Charles, giving the Spanish possessions in Italy to the loser. It is time England acted on her own initiative; there is no need for her to tie herself to "the Humour and Caprice of any of our A------."[2]

This pamphlet gave excellent preparation for the peace terms, soothing the relinquishing of the Spanish monarchy with promises of

---

[1] See p.516-518. Defoe here killed two birds with one stone.

[2] Reasons Why, p.47.

trade concessions. Apart from a few seamy insinuations Defoe argued with moderation, defending negotiations on grounds that cast no blame on the late ministry. He agreed with the purpose of the war, and even to the demand of Spain before Charles became Emperor. He treated the allies with only mild rebukes. Defoe's attitude was defensive, especially his protests that no concessions had yet been made, and on the question of Dutch discontent with the negotiations. The rapid protests of the allies when the preliminaries were revealed soon turned this part of his argument against the ministry. Defoe's case, though cogent, put only economic pressure of a perfectly legitimate kind against the forthright attacks of the Whigs, and was badly damaged by the rapid movement of events.

Defoe published another pamphlet on October 30, after the new preliminaries had been fully absorbed by the press. His reaction to them can be seen in _Armageddon; or, the Necessity of Carrying on the War, If such a Peace cannot be obtained as may render Europe safe, and Trade secure_. This pamphlet is at the opposite pole from his previous one, as Defoe takes a Whig attitude as his starting point. The pamphlet is headed with biblical quotations against peace:

> What Peace? While the Whoredoms of thy Mother Jezabel and her Witchcrafts are so many?
>
> And Joram turned his hands and fled, and said to Ahaziah, There is Treachery, O Ahaziah.
> 2 Kings, 9.22, 23. [1]

---

[1] _Armageddon_, title page.

Again Defoe starts with praises of peace, which all England honestly desires. In particular he defends the Whigs from the foul misrepresentations of wanting to prolong the war:

> Are the Whigs of England People of desperate Fortunes, that went to make their Losses up out of the Publick? Are they seeking the Spoil of their Native Country? Or rather, are they of the Number of those who pay the greatest Share of the Expence? The Absurdity of supposing the Whigs are for a War as such, is so ridiculous, and so contrary to their Interest and Practise, that it would seem to want no Confutation but the Conscience of the Accusers. [1]

Peace would raise the value of the stocks and thus enrich the Whigs, as well as helping trade, their special interest.

However the Whigs have honest misgivings about this particular peace, though they do not go so far as to accuse the present ministry of any sinsister designs in prosecuting it. In view of the massive Whig outburst at the preliminaries this was an unconvincing lie. Defoe proceeds to reach new heights of unreality in his explanation of the crisis. There are several evil rumours about, the first of which is that our allies had previously not negotiated faithfully, and neglected England's interest. The second rumour is that the ministry wish to befriend France in order to strengthen themselves against the Whigs.[2] The third is that the peace negotiations have been

---

[1] Ibid, p.5-6.

[2] This I have not met with in contemporary pamphlets. The usual accusation is that the ministry are making peace to put the Pretender and his French backers in a stronger position.

treacherously conducted by the ministry, and is intended to incite the Whigs to complain against them. All these rumours are the work of "a wicked High-flying party" of Jacobites, who wish to slander the ministry and misrepresent them as in the French interest. The same Jacobites are responsible for insinuating that the Whigs wish to prolong the war, thus hoping to embroil the parties to an extent that will weaken England for the Pretender. Defoe propounds this view of the situation as being that of a true moderate who can see the mistakes of the party-mad. It is so obviously untrue that one wonders what can have made Defoe put it forward; any Jacobites would have been delighted at the prospect of peace, and reluctant to endanger it by inciting the Whigs.

Defoe continues his favourite tactic of discounting the extremists of both sides. It is equally untrue to state that the Whigs want to break the government over the peace or that the government wish to crush the Whigs with French help. Such reports are "Wicked Insinuations made use of on both Sides".[1] All in England wish for an honourable peace, and all England will be prepared to fight on if it is not obtained. Having satisfactorily vindicated all parties concerned Defoe turns to the negotiations at Gertrydenburg. This time he blames the French for breaking them off, and endorses the old ministry's demand that Philip should be forced out of Spain, by Louis XIV himself if

---

[1] Armageddon, p.11.

necessary. The present ministry will not give up Spain either:

> ...our Ministry ... cannot be supposed to be making any clandestine Treaty, either without the Consent of our Confederates, or for giving up Spain to the French: Because they are under mutual Obligations with the Confederates to the contrary; which no Man can have so little Honour for the Character of the Persons concern'd in the Government, as to believe they will break in upon. [1]

Praise of the honour and good faith of the ministry follows; besides, they know that they can be impeached if they negotiate a separate peace. This kind of vindication, similar to the irony of A Vindication of the Present M------y was likely to be more embarrassing than helpful. Defoe prudently emphasises a separate peace; technically he could have claimed that there was no giving up Spain by a separate peace as the ministry had communicated terms to the allies and were awaiting their response. This neglected the fact that the issue was not that of a complete separate peace treaty, but of prior agreement between the English and the French.

Considering that the preliminaries had already consigned the Spanish monarchy to Philip, Defoe's protestations on this score were less than helpful. To confirm his support for no peace without Spain he answers his own objection, made in his previous pamphlets, that if the French and Spanish crowns remain separate, giving Philip Spain will not be against the Grand Alliance. Spain cannot be left in the

---

[1] Ibid, p.17-18.

hands of any Bourbon as no promise of Separation will be honoured. With such arguments "confuted and knocked on the Head", Defoe produces an Address of both Houses of November 1707 for no peace without Spain. Again and again he claims the Whigs and the ministry agree on seeking a good peace, a peace that will not give Spain to a Bourbon.[1]

At this point comes one of the many qualifications that blur Defoe's clearest statements in these pamphlets. While affirming the justice of the demand for the whole Spanish monarchy for Charles, he slips in that if the Queen and Parliament could be satisfied of Louis XIV's sincerity in promising to keep the two crowns separate, or had "other conditions", they might change their minds over this point. According to Defoe, flatly against the preliminaries published, Louis had agreed that the Spanish monarchy should not remain in the hands of the house of Bourbon.[2] This could be examined further at a treaty, where agreement might or might not be reached. Thus support is quietly given for commencing a formal treaty.

As if to offset this switch Defoe declares for another campaign, defends the allies, and attacks the Postboy, which had no right to suggest that the Spanish monarchy would be given up, and aimed to foment discord for the advantage of the Jacobites. Two newsmen are

---

[1] Armegeddon, p.24.

[2] Defoe interprets the recognition of France that the crowns of Spain and France should not be united in this manner.

under arrest for describing the negotiations as clandestine.[1] This proves the government's sincerity, which such libellers attempt to impugn. Again Defoe denies that there has been a separate peace, and as a parting shot blames all discontent on the high-flyers; if the ministry do not realise that these men are their enemies they have only themselves to blame.

I have summarised Armageddon at length because it shows how Defoe's balancing between the parties could lose touch with political reality. Unlike Swift, he was not kept well informed of government activity, but left to find his own way. His ingenious explanation of the crisis satisfied only his desire to blame neither ministry or Whigs; his confusion and inconsistency must have puzzled his readers. At a time when hostility was hardening the parties Armageddon helped neither Whigs or ministers; Abel Boyer, who opposed the peace, pronounced it was written by "a trimming Voluntier with better Intention, than Solidity of Argument, or Clearness of Expression."[2] This indicates Defoe's position better than saying that he wrote for both sides at once. If he had wanted to write a thorough Whig pamphlet he could easily have been far more effective on that side than in Armageddon; part of his difficulty was that he was determined not to damage Harley.

---

[1] This presumably refers to Bolingbroke's arrests. As far as I know no-one was actually charged.

[2] Quadrennium Annae Postremum, II, 591

One can only speculate on his intentions. He may have wanted to express his reservations about the new preliminaries and the suggestion that his old employers had prolonged the war. He always hated the high-flyers and Jacobites, and his denunciations of them during Harley's ministry helped persuade his readers, and possibly himself, that he had not changed his principles. They proved very convenient scapegoats to disguise a straight party conflict. Alternatively he may have been trying to insinuate the pamphlet among the Whigs and moderate their hostility to the ministry. Defoe probably believed Armageddon really was designed to cool party heat, but it was hardly likely to succeed. It does however help explain Defoe's consistent reluctance to press the case for peace as far as Swift was soon to do.

Defoe's next pamphlet was published on November 1, two days after Armageddon. Its title was, The Balance of Europe: or, An Enquiry into the Respective Dangers of giving the Spanish Monarchy to the Emperour as well as to King Philip. In it Defoe returns to moderate support of the peace, again suggesting partition as a solution to military deadlock. He concentrates on how the election of Charles to the Empire has completely altered the situation in Europe, and caused all allies to reconsider gaining Spain for him and wonder whether Philip's accession might be more in the general interest, by creating a safer balance of power in Europe. In this situation it is unity that is wanted, at home and in the Grand Alliance; Defoe thinks that

accusing the peacemakers of being in the French interest is untrue and unpatriotic. Those concerned with the public good,

> ...would do well to reflect, whether the present Humour, which too much prevails among us, of opposing the General Peace, because of their Prejudices at the Party concern'd in making it, is not a thing of such ruinous consequence, as may in the end prevent our having any Peace at all, or at least disable us from obtaining so good Conditions as at this time may be obtain'd. [1]

Representing the arguments against peace in turn very fairly Defoe punches holes in them, at his best when putting forward a straightforward case. Against the danger of a Bourbon king of Spain he poses the question of how we can get Spain away from him with no chance of quick success in Flanders? If the Gertrydenburg negotiations could have obtained better terms, why were they not accepted? That we have negotiated in secret is not dishonest, as we have communicated the results to our allies. Austrian greatness can be equally dangerous as French; here Defoe takes a look at the Hapsburgs' tendency to persecute protestant subjects, as in Bohemia. In fighting for Charles we may be only creating a new war to reduce him. On matters of trade he differs from <u>A Letter to a Member of the October Club</u>; it is the interest of Spanish trade that will make Philip a Spaniard, and estrange him from Louis. With an air of complete conviction Defoe outlines the trade of Spain, proving her need to trade

---

[1] <u>The Ballance of Europe</u>, p.11-12.

it is the interest of Spanish trade that will make Philip a Spaniard, and estrange him from Louis. With an air of complete conviction Defoe outlines the trade of Spain, proving her need to trade with England and Holland, and the inability of France to absorb the goods normally exported to them. What is needed is for France to give security for Spanish independence, to keep out of the West Indies, and to arrange for free trade; if this is done we need worry no more about giving Spain and the Indies to Philip.

This is a very able and assured pamphlet, showing Defoe's supreme knowledge of trade, and written with all his ability to argue clearly in hard-hitting prose. It breathed an air of reason against the alarmist fears of the Whigs. Yet even here Defoe is still apologetic, and protests that nothing of what the Whigs fear has actually happened; Spain has not yet been relinquished. As his own pamphlet advised the very step they were against, this could hardly have been very reassuring to them.

These pamphlets were anonymous, but in the Review Defoe had the problem of reconciling his support for the Godolphin ministry with his refusal to come out against the peace negotiations in progress. As early as April 20, 1711, Defoe mentions the disadvantages of Charles being both Emperor and King of Spain. On July 5, he assures his readers that no peace will be safe without taking Spain from France. On October 11, he faces the challenge of a Whig broadsheet (probably Maynwaring's Reflections on a Quotation from the Review):

> The first Thing therefore I now desire of him, is, That he would please to give his Thoughts a new Turn, and endeavour to prove, according to the present Language of the Times, That it is impossible to have a good Peace, without giving Spain to France. This is a pretty new Maxim in Politicks, and fit to be illustrated by so able a Pen. [1]

In answer to this ingenious attempt to make him avow his support for the ministry Defoe is forced to quibble. In the Review of October 13 he produces a distinction between the country of Spain and the Spanish monarchy, which includes all Spanish possessions. His previous statements that there could be no peace while Philip held the Spanish monarchy are thus still valid; there is no question of giving all of it to Philip. The country of Spain is another matter; a good peace may be possible without demanding Spain for Charles: "for it would be a hard Case that should have no safe Peace, without keeping what we cannot get" It is our trading rights with the Spanish dominions that are important to us, not who rules the country; compensation can be given in other areas.

Defoe found this distinction very useful in the Review in the next few months, as it enabled him to advance partition which left Spain in the hands of Philip with some show of consistency with his earlier position. However he did not explain the distinction in his previous statements that Spain must be taken from the Bourbons, and

---

[1] The Review for October 11, 1711, quotes this passage.

and Maynwaring had turned a harsh spotlight on Defoe's alignment of the Review to aid Harley. During the following weeks Defoe gives qualified support for negotiation with France, arguing that Spain and France are unlikely to form a close alliance even if they are ruled by members of the same family, and the difficulty of conquering Spain in the first place. He emphasises in a rather hand to mouth way that there is no actual peace treaty in sight, merely proposals for negotiation. Defoe was right in arguing that the question of who ruled Spain was not the most important issue of a peace, but his attempt to consider a peace on its own merits was unfortunately compromised by his earlier demands for Spain. The parties were more interested in the effect that peace would have on their own conflict than in the structure of European power; in particular "No peace without Spain" was too convenient for the Whigs to forego. Defoe makes great play of refusing to imitate the violence of either party; he is not so eager for peace as the Tories, nor so ready to blame the ministry as the Whigs. He firmly states that he will vilify neither the late nor the present ministry, as he has no reason to believe either have neglected the national interest. On December 13, Defoe takes the attitude that some solution of the problems of peace and war will appear to satisfy everyone, but he has no particular reason to justify this optimistic prediction.

An Essay at a Plain Exposition of that Difficult Phrase, A Good Peace can be considered with the Review, as it was the only pamphlet

which Defoe admitted he had written. It was published in November, advertised as by the author of the Review, and contained a similar guarded approval of the negotiation on the basis of relinquishing Spain, without committing Defoe to any particular terms of peace. In his Introduction he makes it clear how carefully he undertakes his task:

> The Subject I have here undertaken is so Nice, and a plain treating of it so Difficult, so Dangerous, and especially in me so liable to the Censures and Prejudices on both Sides, that it has been with some Hesitation that I go about it.
>
> Not that I am so Solicitous of whom I please or displease, in my handling this Nice Affair; for he that is so, can never speak with an impartial Freedom; a Liberty absolutely necessary to the clear stating Things of doubtful Acceptation, and a Liberty which when I cease to preserve to my self, I shall cease to write at all.
>
> It is very hard with me in this Case, more than with any other Author; in that, whereas others are wary in what they Write for fear of displeasing the Government, and irritating Men in Power; my Difficulty is a Clamour raised by them, who without Arrogance I may say, cannot Confute me, pretending that I am too Careful to please Men in Power, in which, as my Lord Rochester said of his Whore, I have the Scandal without the Joy, the Reproach without the Profit of the Change... [1]

This pamphlet and the Review show how Defoe's open support for the ministry in their moves to secure peace was qualified. Valuable though his moderate arguments were for allaying fears of what a peace might bring, they failed to give an aggressive line for the Tories to

---

[1] An Essay at a Plain Exposition of that Difficult Phrase, A Good Peace, p.3-4.

follow. He offered little defence against the charge that by conducting secret negotiations and emerging with startling preliminaries England was betraying her allies. The quibbling over Spain and the Spanish monarchy and the evident unhappiness of Defoe over the preliminaries could hardly have been very heartening for the Tories, if indeed they read the Review. On the other hand the Whigs were not placated by his moderation or his unwillingness to censure the late ministry, and they saw his refusal to join in the attack on the preliminaries as convincing evidence of his betrayal of the Whig cause. In the Observator George Ridpath enjoyed the opportunity of denouncing Defoe as an apostate. Ridpath had taken a stand on the issue of Spain being given to Charles; on November 24, and December 1, he compared the Review of September 1, which stated that Spain should not be left in Bourbon hands, with Defoe's subsequent distinction between Spain and the Spanish monarchy. Upon Defoe protesting vigorously that he was maligned by Ridpath's accusation that he was helping the cause of the Pretender by writing for peace, Ridpath badly stated that if he did not want to be considered a Jacobite, then he should not write like one.

The Whig reply to Defoe's first pamphlet on the peace, A Letter to a High-Churchman, in Answer to a Pamphlet, Intituled, Reasons why this Nation should put a Speedy end to this Expensive War, (1711) is representative of the Whig writers' remarkably consistent attitude to

any justification of peace negotiations or the preliminaries.[1] Its author appeals to the Tories as Englishmen to oppose this peace, and treats any advocate of a peace that relinquishes Spain as a covert supporter of France and the Pretender. Despite his pretence of being the government's spokesman the author of Reasons Why this Nation Ought to put a Speedy End to this Expensive War is a pro-French Jacobite who has prepared the way for The Postboy's false preliminaries in a concerted effort to blacken the government. This line is similar to that taken by A Vindication of the Present M-------y, a quick dissociation of the government and the preliminaries, followed by a violent attack on the latter. The author of Reasons Why insults the Dutch and maligns the Whigs unjustly for not contributing to the funds when they have done so generously. This writer insists that the whole Spanish monarchy must be taken from Philip. Louis can never be trusted and no French security for trade will be worth the taking. Spain will be under French control; he mentions A Letter to a Member of the October Club to show how the death of our trade will follow. He compares the new preliminaries with the Gertrydenburg ones of 1709 ; they must be rejected and the war fought on. Especially interesting is the way this writer identifies the case for continuing the war with Marlborough, using him as a figurehead for the war policy. Another approach is exemplified by A History of the Peace with France and War

---

[1] Oldmixon connected Maynwaring with this pamphlet. See p. 369-370.

with Holland, (1711) which examines the history of the Dutch War of 1672 to establish that the Dutch are our traditional friends and the French our enemies. Altogether the Whigs mounted a large and energetic campaign which promised to dominate public opinion.[1]

Under this kins of condemnation (A Letter to a High-Churchman was published on November 13, 1711) Defoe's attitude to those who opposed peace hardened in his next pamphlet, Reasons why a Party among us, and also among the Confederates, are obstinately bent against a Treaty of Peace with the French at this Time. By the Author of Reasons for putting a Speedy End to this expensive War. This was published on November 29, two days after The Conduct of the Allies, but as it can hardly have been affected by it I shall consider it with Defoe's other pre-Conduct efforts. Defoe's admission that it was by the same author as his previous most outspoken pamphlet showed he was prepared to take a firm line. Defoe starts by summarising the main objections to the preliminaries, which he calls "propositions" to emphasise their unofficial character. These objections and the demand for continuation of the war have been the message of an extensive press campaign for public opinion, so that, according to Defoe: "From

---

[1] A Selection of pamphlets on the war can be found in the Bibliography. One was the last contribution to politics from Robert Ferguson, "The Plotter". (An Account of the obligations the States of Holland have to Great Britain, 1711).

hense it is Evident already, that even the Mouths of the Poor and Ignorant Ploughmen and Servants are filled with such Speeches as these ..."[1]

It is time to tell the people that these reasons against peace are "the meer Varnish and Outside, put on, like Apothecary's Leaf Gold, to cover and make shining to the Eye, the Bitter Pill which is inclosed within."[2] Behind these plausible pretences is simple party hostility. The Whigs will have no peace unless they are in office to gain the credit for it. The men who oppose peace are the same as opposed the change of ministry in 1710, when the war was cited as a reason for keeping the old ministers, and the charge of favouring the Pretender was first broadcast. Defoe enlarges on the Whig attempt to stop the government obtaining funds through the Bank, and its consequent failure. He accuses them of trying to break credit, and blame its fall on the new ministry. The same people attacked the South Sea project of the summer of 1711, hoping to bring down the ministry in its failure.[3] Defoe makes a very detailed case out of the Whig financial manoeuvres which cannot be followed here; his point is to

---

[1] Reasons Why a Party among us, ---- are ---- against a Treaty of Peace, p.6.

[2] Ibid, p.7.

[3] Defoe had written a pamphlet in support of Harley's scheme in September 1711, An Essay on the South Sea Trade.

demonstrate that the opposition the government will made ready use of any means at hand to bring it down.

Moving to the peace, Defoe states the problem it posed the government:

> The Sound of Peace, was not to the People so agreeable and desirable; but the Epethets of Good, Safe, Lasting, Honourable, were always wanting to make the Harmony, to make the Words Sonorous, and please the Ears; and it was no difficult thing to affect the Minds of the Commons with the Notion of Being Betray'd by a Party of Designs set on Foot to give us up to the Enemy; of French Money among our publick Ministers, Bribing and Working to sell their Country, and give up to France the Fruits of so many Years of Fighting. [1]

Defoe comments on the ease with which the 'common people' absorb such rumours with a vivid image not unlike that of L'Estrange: "...the Minds of the Common People are a Train of Wildfire, which touch'd but at one Angle, instantly takes Fire, and the Flames run to the extreamest Parts."[2] Despite such scaremongering of the Whig press Defoe still stops short of saying that the late ministry were opposed to peace as such:

> It is hard Saying that some lay to the charge of the Late Managers; That they were unwilling to Peace in its General Acceptation, having Schemes of Advantages to others unknown, which were upon the Length of the War depending, and which in Treaties, Accomodation &c. must terminate and have end: But having nothing to do with that Black Part in this place, it is omitted

---

[1] Reasons Why, etc., p.23.

[2] Ibid, p.23.

> purposely, choosing rather the Middle Way of clear Truth... [1]

The supporters of the late ministry, whom Defoe prudently calls "they" throughout this pamphlet, are not prepared to countenance even a conference for treating, which they themselves opened in 1709, and which does not necessitate agreement. They fear that peace will establish the ministry firmly and so do not hesitate to put their party interest before that of the nation in opposing new negotiations. Defoe clings to the argument that the Confederates are not so much against peace as is reported of them by the Whigs, and if they object to peace on private grounds this is no impediment, as the Grand Alliance was made to take care of common aims only. Charles of Austria in particular is mildly rebuked for his greed for Spain as well as the Empire. This as far as Defoe is prepared to go to answer the criticism that England has betrayed her allies.

The pamphlet is concluded with a reply to answers to _Reasons Why this Nation Ought to put a Speedy End to this Expensive War_, which Defoe resolutely defends. His opponents merely insult and misrepresent him as in the French interest because they cannot answer his arguments. He is particularly angry at the charge that he has been offensive to Marlborough; all he has said is that the war could last for years longer, which is a simple fact and no reflection on the Captain General.

---

[1] _Reasons Why_, etc., p.34.

Omitting the extravagant praises that Marlborough's adherents regard as obligatory is no insult either. Defoe ends with five points to prove that treating loses nothing, as preparations for war can continue through the winter, and may gain much; how do the Whigs know so certainly that a good peace is impossible?

Defoe had rendered invaluable service to the ministry with his series of pamphlets, supporting the peace negotiations almost single-handed. His work was aimed at moderate opinion and contained good sense to allay the extravagant fears raised and fostered by the Whig press campaign. Defoe's pamphlets may have satisfied some moderates, but they could make little impression on the Whigs, delighted by their success in embarrassing the ministry. Neither did they offer an aggressive enough line to rally the Tories behind the ministry, and made few concessions to their prejudices. Defoe baulked at reproducing the Tory counterpart of the Whig party spirit; even in his latest pamphlet he refused to accuse the old ministry and the Whigs of anything worse than putting party before national interest. His plea that he found it impossible to go to the lengths of the extremists of either party is in this respect fully justified by this series of pamphlets. Further, he tended to be apologetic and on the denfensive when referring to the matter of the secret negotiations and the preliminaries, preferring not to consider the latter at their face value. Unlike Swift, he was not informed of what was really happening behind the scenes, and he may well have been genuinely shocked at the terms.

Defoe failed to answer convincingly the obvious dissatisfaction of the allies at the way negotiations had been conducted and major concessions made before they were informed. Defoe was embarrassed by the terms, and a more agressive writer was badly needed by the ministry.

C. The Conduct of the Allies

Harley and Bolingbroke realised that when Parliament finally met they were likely to be faced with a crisis, especially in the Lords where the Whigs were organising a vote against the peace. They had managed to convince Nottingham of the dangers of peace, and he traded his support for the bizarre promise that the Whigs would agree to him introducing a bill against occasional conformity. Nottingham was a sincere High Churchman, who had fallen out with Harley after not being given office on the change. Worst of all for the ministry, he was greatly respected by the Tories and his opinion might well be taken seriously. His desertion was almost bound to secure a vote against peace in the Lords, where the parties were delicately balanced. There were widespread doubts, even among the Tories, at the underhand way the negotiations had been carried on, and the apparent disregard of our allies. A patriotic stance by the Whigs might carry some wavering Tories with them. The ministry's major effort to turn the tide, Swift's The Conduct of the Allies and the Late Ministry in Beginning and Carrying on the Present War, was published on November 27.

Bolingbroke had provided Swift with secret government papers to supply the material for grave charges against the allies, and helped with its composition. Dr. Johnson remarked that the "facts" gave the Conduct of the Allies its success. The detailed information of how the allies had failed to pay their share in the war, and thrown more of the burden on Britain, was indeed explosive material, but Swift's literary ability and genius as a controversialist can be seen in the way that he used them.

The pamphlet opens with some general maxims about the reasons for making war, which establish an atmosphere of prudence and common-sense. These maxims are not without guile, as they insinuate the arguments that are to come in an unexceptionable way. For instance, take the following paragraph:

> BUT, if an Ally, who is not so immediately concerned in the good or ill Fortune of the War, be so generous, as to contribute more than the Principal Party, and even more in proportion to his Abilities, he ought at least to have his Share in what is conquered from the Enemy: Or, if his Romantick Disposition transports him so far, as to expect little or nothing of this, he might however hope, that the Principals would make it up in Dignity and Respect; and he would surely think it monstrous to find them intermedling in his Domestick Affairs, prescribing what Servants he should keep or dismiss, pressing him perpetually with the most unreasonable Demands, and at every turn threatning to break the Alliance, if he will not comply. [1]

---

[1] Jonathan Swift, Political Tracts, 1711-1713, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford, 1951) p.9.

By disguising what is really a comment on the actual situation as a general principle, Swift is able to evoke the required response of indignation without substantiating his accusations. The ironic stress on "Romantick" and "transports" is part of Swift's deflation of the patriotic emotions his opponents were trying to raise. He assumes that the only reason for fighting is profit, and considers the Civil War and the Dutch wars in the light of the financial damage they did the nation. Though Swift is not prepared to bring his case into the open for some time, he gives hints of what is to come: "Beside, our Victories were then of some Use as well as Glory; for we were so prudent to Fight, and so happy to Conquer, only for our selves."[1]

After this introduction Swift makes his first major point, which effectually changes the character of the controversy so far vented in the press. To the defensive attitude of Defoe, the Whig pamphleteers could reply that England had been fighting to take Spain from Philip of Anjou, and that to desist after such an unprecedented series of victories proved partiality to the Bourbons, and hence the Pretender.[2] Swift attacks the very basis of the Whig case, why England entered the

---

[1] Jonathan Swift, Political Tracts, 1711-1713, ed. Herbert Davis (Oxford 1951) p.10.

[2] Defoe had very briefly stated that "No Peace without Spain" was a late addition to the war aims (see p.506) but he had not elaborated the point, and he was far from suggesting that England should not have entered the war when and how she did.

the war in the first place. Quoting from the English and Dutch Declarations of War, he argues that England from the first accepted too large a share of the war, engaging herself as a principal instead of merely as an auxiliary to the Dutch and Germans. Our only particular quarrel with France was Louis XIV recognising the Pretender on the death of James II. Swift also points out that both England and Holland recognised Philip. Summing up arguments for and against war, Swift suggests that considering the ill success of the war under William III and the debts it had left to the nation, it might have been wiser not to have entered the war at all, and counted on the different interests of Spain and France to prevent the union of the two crowns. Even Godolphin originally opposed the war, and only consented when the succession of Anne offered him the opportunity to dominate the government.

Swift delivers this novel condemnation of the terms on which Britain entered the war with an affectation of casual ease. Irvin Ehrenpreis has mentioned that Swift has been given insufficient credit by literary critics for The Conduct of the Allies because of the absence of the "Swiftian" techniques of indirection.[1] In this pamphlet such devices are rejected for a manner of apparently simple exposition of fact, so as not to dissipate any of the pressure of the demand for action, or minimise Swift's insistent bitterness. As we shall find,

---

[1] Swift the man, his works, and the age. Vol. II. Dr. Swift (London, 1967), p.406-7.

Swift's artistry can be seen in the structure of the work, but his individual tone is just as strong as in his more spectacular works; in its quiet way the prose of The Conduct of the Allies, with its dignity and steady, unremitting bite, is as remarkable an achievement as that of A Modest Proposal. This can hardly be shown in brief quotation, but here is the comment on Britain's entry into the war:

> These and the like Arguments prevailed; and so, without offering at any other Remedy, without taking time to consider the Consequences, or to reflect on our own Condition, we hastily engaged in a War which hath cost us sixty Millions; and after repeated, as well as unexpected Success in Arms, hath put us and our Posterity in a worse Condition, not only than any of our Allies, but even our conquered Enemies themselves. [1]

The surprising juxtaposition of success and poverty, the comparison between victor and vanquished in the latter's favour, is deceptively simple, yet makes a powerful appeal to the readers' emotions. For his most important pamphlet Swift preferred to depend on such effects as did not interrupt his argument or call for special attention on the part of the reader.

Swift turns to the war itself, stating the purpose of the pamphlet:

> THE part we have acted in the Conduct of this whole War, with reference to our Allies abroad, and to a prevailing Faction at home, is what I shall now particularly examin; where I presume it will appear, by plain Matters of Fact, that no Nation

---

[1] Political Tracts, 1711-1713, ed. Davis, p.15.

> was ever so long or so scandalously abused by the Folly, the Temerity, the Corruption, the Ambition of its domestick Enemies; or treated with so much Insolence, Injustice and Ingratitude by its foreign Friends. [1]

Swift recognises that there was good reason to support the Dutch against Louis, but all that was needed was a small auxiliary force. Yet even after we had engaged as principals, we had no need to finance the war on credit, thus placing a huge debt on the nation. Swift makes the analogy of a man pawning his land to pay for an expense that is greater than his revenue; as his debt increases, so does his inability to pay it. This was quite false, but it appealed strongly to the country gentry who were, like Swift, unversed in the advantages of capitalist finance. Swift brings up the usual Tory complaints about the handling of the war. The navy has been neglected, and the West Indies left unraided because of the jealousy of the Dutch and the supineness of the administration. Land war is most suitable to the talents of the Captain General, so all our efforts have been concentrated in heavily fortified Flanders. Spain has been shamefully neglected, and the extraordinary achievements of Peterborough dissipated by not being followed up.

Apart from small touches, like this hint that Marlborough has caused the neglect of Spain and the sea, and Godolphin's original reluctance to back the war, Swift offers no explanation for the apparent

---

[1] Ibid, p.15.

lack of concern for England's interest. With his worst accusations not yet made, he now brings his secret information to bear, to prove that the allies have evaded more and more of their treaty obligations and thrown the burden of the war on England. Swift manipulates a long list of allies' failures to supply troops or money they had agreed to, to build up a picture of the British government's complacency that borders on lunacy. He shows subsidies paid for non-existent Portuguese regiments, and the profits from the recoinage of an English subsidy calmly pocketed by Charles of Austria. The allies are treated with consistent hostility; they have also prevented England from securing any gains herself, especially from gaining advantageous trading concessions in the West Indies. The allies have the benefit of all Marlborough's conquests in Flanders and Germany, yet refuse to compensate Britain for the cost, or allow her corresponding advantages. The Barrier Treaty of 1709 gives the Dutch a vast new territory for commercial expansion, by which they will threaten English trade, particularly the wool trade; the only profit for Britain is a barren guarantee of our succession. The allies' reluctance to provide troops and cash has ruined several promising military operations, including the attempt on Toulon, and Marlborough's plan of 1711 for maintaining troops in action during the winter. Nevertheless Britain has continued to offer the allies more and more money, taking their shares on her shoulders, accepting insults from those directly dependent on her generosity.

It is impossible to list the detailed sets of figures that Swift produces, but it is hardly fair to describe even these as mere statement of fact. Though the facts were largely true and most of them secret, he shows considerable art in putting them in the worst possible light. Here Swift puts an absurd construction on the treaty with Portugal, described with bitter comedy:

> BY two other Articles (beside the Honour of being Convoys and Guards in ordinary to the Portuguese Ships and Coasts) we are to guess the Enemies Thoughts, and to take the King of Portugal's Word, whenever he has a Fancy that he shall be invaded: We are also to furnish him with a Strength superior to what the Enemy intends to invade any of his Dominions with, let that be what it will: And, 'till we know what the Enemy's Forces are, His Portuguese Majesty is sole Judge what Strength is superior, and what will be able to prevent an Invasion; and may send our Fleets, whenever he pleases, upon his Errands, to some of the furthest Parts of the World, or keep them attending upon his own Coasts till he thinks fit to dismiss them. These Fleets must likewise be subject, in all things, not only to the King, but to his Viceroys, Admirals and Governours, in any of his foreign Dominions, when he is in a Humour to apprehend an Invasion; which, I believe, is an Indignity that was never offered before, except to a Conquered Nation. [1]

In return for this and twelve thousand troops, Portugal is to assist England if she is invaded, but before this Portugal must be furnished with the same number of troops as she would have been if invaded herself; in addition she will provide ten men of war, which will however only serve on Portuguese coasts. Swift does not mention that the treaty is

---

[1] Political Tracts, 1711-1713, ed. Davis, p.25.

favourable because Portugal had to be detached from France, or that Portugal did attempt to invade Spain in return. Similarly he neglects the vast efforts made by Holland in the war, or, the Empire's genuine lack of strength.

This information is so placed to clinch Swift's argument that the war has been a kind of madness, which he portrays with the power that irrationality always excited in him. At last he can introduce the question which this lengthy build up forces the reader to ask himself:

> BUT if all this be true: If, according to what I have affirmed, we began this War contrary to Reason: If, as the other Party themselves, upon all Occasions, acknowledge, the Success we have had was more than we could reasonably expect: If, after all our Success, we have not made that use of it, which in Reason we ought to have done: If we have made weak and foolish Bargains with our Allies, suffered them tamely to break every Article, even in those Bargains to our Disadvantage, and allowed them to treat us with Insolence and Contempt, at the very Instant when We were gaining Towns, Provinces and Kingdoms for them, at the Price of our Ruin, and without any Prospect of Interest to our selves: If we have consumed all our Strength in attacking the Enemy on the strongest side, where (as the old Duke of Schomberg expressed it) to engage with France, was to take a Bull by the Horns; and left wholly unattempted, that part of the War, which could only enable us to continue or to end it. If all this, I say, be our Case, it is a very obvious Question to ask, by what Motives, or what Management, we are thus become the Dupes and Bubbles of Europe? [1]

---

[1] Political Tracts, 1711-1713, ed. Davis, p.39-40.

The answer is ready. The war has been fought for the sake of the general and ministry, not for the prince and people. The war was started to advance the interest of Marlborough and Godolphin, who as general and Treasurer, with the Duchess Sarah as Anne's favourite, took the opportunity to control the whole of England. They allied themselves with the monied men, always ready to profit from war by lending money to finance it. When the ministers were attacked by the "Church Party" they bought the support of the Whigs, darlings of the monied men, to strengthen themselves in Parliament. Taken into office, the Whigs proceeded to "cry down the Landed Interest, and worry the Church"[1] The allies traded their support to the ministers in return for a blind eye being turned to their duplicity, and England taking the principal share of the expense. The Dutch found it easier to make large presents of money to Marlborough than to provide the complement of men they had promised. The support of Whigs and the allies, who now protest if there is any threat of Marlborough being removed as they formerly did over Godolphin, has kept the ministers in power for so long. This unholy alliance of interest has constituted a vicious circle, dependent on the war:

> All which we were forced to submit to, because the General was <u>made easie</u>; because the Monied Men at home were fond of the War; because the <u>Whigs</u> were not yet firmly settled; and because that exorbitant degree of Power, which was built upon a supposed Necessity of employing particular Persons, would go off in a Peace. [2]

---

[1] <u>Political Tracts, 1711-1713</u>, ed. Davis, p.42-43.

[2] <u>Ibid</u>, p.42-43.

Swift praises Anne for her firmness and courage in extricating herself from such a formidable combination. This account of the war has a comprehensive quality in the hands of Swift, who draws many facts into a pattern which offers a convincing explanation for them all.

Swift is now in a position to deal with the demand that no peace should be made unless Spain is taken from Philip. This was a troublesome point for the Tories, as they had always wanted greater efforts made there, and were responsible for the emphasis on it. Swift disclaims party interest, in this appeal to the reader: "Therefore I shall not apply my self to any of those, [who profit by the war] but to all others indifferently, whether Whig or Tory, whose private Interest is best answered by the Welfare of their Country."[1] Swift argues that "No peace without Spain" is a new demand, distinct from the original reasons for the war, and translates the eighth article of the Grand Alliance, hitherto unpublished, to prove it.[2] The true reason was to secure that France and Spain would not be united under the same king. The Whigs and ministers adopted the slogan in order to frustrate hopes of peace, knowing that it was totally

---

[1] Political Tracts, 1711-1713, ed. Davis, p.45.

[2] Ehrenpreis asserts that Swift's version is a mistranslation, (Swift, II, 495) though he agrees that the Grand Alliance was formed without the intention of fighting to put a Hapsburg on the Spanish throne, but merely to keep the French and Spanish crowns separate, (Ibid, p.499.)

impractical. The Emperor readily agreed, and the Dutch, less enthusiastic, were paid off by the Barrier Treaty. This done the French offers of peace at Gertrydenburg in 1709 could be rejected, despite their acceptability, with some show of reason. The demand for Spain is merely a pretext for prolonging the war; not even the accession of the Archduke Charles to the Empire, and the prospect of Hapsburg control of Spain and Germany has shaken the resolution to fight on.

Throughout the pamphlet Swift has stressed the expense of the war to the nation. Now he paints an even more alarming picture. He plays on the Tory feeling that the landed interest was being sacrificed to the monied men, as the Land Tax paid for the interest on government loans. He enlarges on the national debt, claiming that it will cripple later generations. Here is an example of Swift's ability to manipulate figures to give an impression of conviction to the credulous reader, as he did later in the Drapier's Letters.

> NOW, to give the most ignorant Reader some Idea of our present Circumstances, without troubling him or myself with Computations in form: Every body knows, that our Land and Malt Tax amount annually to about Two Millions and an half. All other Branches of the Revenue are mortgaged to pay Interest, for what we have already borrowed. The yearly Charge of the War is usually about Six Millions; to make up which Sum, we are forced to take up, on the Credit of new Funds, about Three Millions and an half. This last Year the computed Charge of the War came to above a Million more, than all the Funds the Parliament could contrive would pay Interest for; and so we have been forced to divide a Deficiency of Twelve hundred thousand Pounds among the several

> Branches of our Expence. This is a Demonstration, that if the War lasts another Campaign, it will be impossible to find Funds for supplying it, without mortgaging the Malt Tax, or by some other Method equally desperate. [1]

Even if there is an immediate peace Swift estimates the national debt will be a quarter of the value of the whole island, "if it were to be Sold."[2] How he makes this estimate, Swift wisely conceals, and prudently admits that he has not the skill to calculate how long such a debt will take to pay off. It will necessitate the war taxes being retained for paying off the principal, the interest, and providing for the ordinary expenses of government. Such alarmist fears, based on a primitive idea of finance, were calculated to strike terror into the country gentry on the Tory benches.

Up to now Swift's language has been very restrained; there have been no open emotional appeals, no insult and no violence. He has preserved a surface tone of cold reason. On the public debts, he shows how easily this can be adapted to express considerable bitterness.

> IT will no doubt, be a mighty Comfort to our Grandchildren, when they see a few Rags hang up in Westminster-Hall, which cost an hundred Millions, whereof they are paying the Arrears, and boasting, as Beggars do, that their Grandfathers were Rich and Great. [3]

It is only after he has thoroughly prepared his readers that Swift allows

---

[1] Political Tracts, 1711-1713, ed. Davis, p.54.

[2] Ibid, p.54.

[3] Political Tracts, 1711-1713, ed. Davis, p.55-56.

himself to speak out in this characteristic manner, deriding the glory of the war effort. It is only now that he advocates the peace which his arguments have implied. The black picture of the part that the allies have played removes the principal objection to England forcing the pace of a general peace by secret negotiation; it is time to call a halt to being gulled. A good peace is still possible, if worse than that offered in 1709, the more blame on the late ministry for not accepting the previous offers. If England does not take the initiative, the Dutch may well forestall her and obtain special concessions for themselves. The allies have made sufficient gains already: "...they now tell us, it is our War; so that in common Justice, it ought to be our Peace."[1] Now Swift can afford to answer the question of the Whig pamphleteers in a novel way:

> BUT the common Question is, If we must now Surrender Spain, what have we been Fighting for all this while, The Answer is ready; We have been Fighting for the Ruin of the Publick Interest, and the Advancement of a Private. We have been fighting to raise the Wealth and Grandeur of a particular Family; to enrich Usurers and Stock-jobbers; and to cultivate the pernicious Designs of a Faction, by destroying the Landed Interest. The Nation begins now to think these Blessings are not worth Fighting for any longer, and therefore desires a Peace. [2]

By changing the grounds of the controversy, Swift had rendered the Whig slogan irrelevant.

---

[1] Political Tracts, 1711-1713, ed. Davis, p.57.

[2] Ibid, p.58-59.

From this strong position Swift proceeds to divest Marlborough's victories of their use and glory with another rare burst of indignation, in order to silence pleas for another campaign. At the rate of the last, France will be able to last for years, surrendering a town a campaign:

> WHEN our Armies take a Town in Flanders, the Dutch are immediately put into Possession, and we at home make Bonfires. I have sometimes pitied the deluded People, to see them squandring away their Fewel to so little purpose. For Example, What is it to Us that Bouchain is taken, about which the Warlike Politicians of the Coffee-House make such a Clutter? What though the Garrison surrendered Prisoners of War, and in sight of the Enemy? We are not now in a Condition to be fed with Points of Honour. What Advantage have We, but that of spending three or four Millions more to get another Town for the States, which may open them a new Country for Contributions, and encrease the Perquisites of the General? [1]

Again there is a savage pressure in the irony of warlike success juxtaposed to national disaster. This is the culmination of Swift's attack on military glory, and practically the end of the pamphlet. The remainder is a warning that the northern war may again break out and put new pressure on the allies, a dismissal of Whig propaganda, and final praise of the present ministers for their attempt to make peace, even if Spain is relinquished.

The Conduct of the Allies is one of the finest political pamphlets in our language, and shows what Swift could achieve with a minimum of

---

[1] Political Tracts, 1711-1713, ed. Davis, p.60-61.

technical devices. The structure of the pamphlet carries the receptive reader with its arguments, preparing him to accept the brief outbursts of anger at the end. Swift puts continual pressure on his reader to assent to what is said, though veiling the appeal to the emotions beneath a surface of ironic restraint and rational argument. Swift, one must remember, was preaching to the converted. He used his "facts" to give the Tory members a chance to release their pent up dislike of the war, and their prejudices against its conduct and financing, with some appearance of reasonableness and justice. They had never forgiven Marlborough and Godolphin for their desertion of the "Church party" in the earlier part of the reign, and the events of 1710 had not appeased their vindictiveness. _The Conduct of the Allies_ stepped up the attack on the late ministry, being much more violent against them than the urbane _Examiner_. It had the advantage of combining familiar material with brand-new evidence, of giving a supremely artistic expression to half-formed suspicions and emotions clamouring for expression. Swift's judgement of the political scene, as well as his controversial ability must share the credit for its extraordinary popularity.

The impact of _The Conduct of the Allies_ surprised even its author. Four editions were printed in a week, and the mood of the Tories rapidly changed from despondency to enthusiastic support for peace. The wording of the pamphlet was used in the votes of censure passed on the allies in the Commons, and it overshadowed the remainder

of the controversy.[1] The Whigs agreed that the pamphlet had retrieved a difficult situation for Harley. Gilbert Burnet paid a reluctant tribute to it in his history.[2] Robert Walpole described its effect in a later pamphlet:

> This Matter then was to be managed a little more tenderly, and the Commons were to be taught a new Lesson; In order to this a _Pamphlet called The Conduct of the Allies, &c._ was Published, and a great deal of Industry used, to make this the _Political Creed of the Party_, which all the _Orthodox Friends of France_ embrac'd very readily; and in this was to be found the whole Scheme of the Proceedings of that Session; This Masterpiece, fill'd with falsities, and misrepresentations, was no sooner dispers'd and canvass'd in the World, but it produced the desired effect, affording Arguments for Artful and Ill-designing Instruments, to pervert and prejudice the Minds of weak and deluded People, and firing others, who had no leisure of opportunity to be better inform'd with Resentment and Indignation against the _Allies_, who, they had been made to believe, had dealt so unfaithfully with us... [3]

---

[1] Swift can be said to have made a few small tactical errors only. An innocent reference to changing the succession was immediately interpreted as being a hint in favour of the Pretender, though only by grotesque distortion. Swift corrected this in his 4th edition. In fact he took care not to justify the peace on any terms but its inherent good sense, and showed no favouritism to France. He played down the Whigs' designs on the Church of England. Less happy was his slighting reference to petty German princes who failed to make up their quota of troops for the Emperor, but hired them direct to Britain. This rather irrelevant dig at Hanover, among others, encouraged in a very minor way the Tory anger at the Elector's intervention in English politics on the side of Marlborough and the Whigs.

[2] _A History of his own Time_, (London 1818) 4 vols. Vol. IV, p.277-8. He described it as written "with much art, but with no regard to truth".

[3] _A Short History of the Parliament_ 1713, p.4-5.

Bolingbroke's readiness to hand out information to the public was amply rewarded. It was followed by success in Parliament; though the alliance between Lord Nottingham and the Whigs secured a vote against the peace in the Lords, Harley was in a strong enough position to crush the opposition by the creation of twelve new peers. Marlborough suffered for his countenance of moves against peace, being rapidly charged with peculation and dismissed from his post.

The Conduct of the Allies and the opening of Parliament caused an intensification of controversy in the press. Defoe became notably more agressive in the Review, and on December 18, attacked the Emperor Charles with spirit for his greed for power and his refusal to fulfil his commitments. A second series of the Examiner, started on December 5, under the aegis of Swift but written by William Oldisworth, took its tone directly from The Conduct of the Allies. The Observator was quick to brand the pamphlet as Jacobite, in the issue of December 8. The allies found means of expressing their attitude to the war in the English press. On November 30, the Daily Courant reprinted the petition of the Council of State at the Hague to the States General, which advised continuing the war. On December 4 the Protestant Postboy carried the Emperor's letter to the Electors, to which the Postboy responded with the Queen's circular letter to the foreign ministers of the allies. Most important, a manifesto from the Elector of Hanover appeared in the Daily Courant, on December 5, showing his disapproval of the preliminaries and echoing the Whig arguments against them. The

Whigs thus had evidence of their solidarity with the heir to the throne. On December 12, the Daily Courant continued the series with a letter from the Emperor to the States General.

There were many replies to The Conduct of the Allies of which the most important was Francis Hare's The Allies and the Late Ministry Defended against France and the Friends of France, which was published in four parts, the first advertised on December 8. Hare repeats the views of earlier Whig pamphlets, offering a long justification of Marlborough and Godolphin which I will not discuss in detail. He and Swift hardly seem to be discussing the same events, so different are their accounts. Hare claims that the growth of France had to be checked, and that Spain should still be taken from her. He reacts with suitable amazement to his antagonist, whose object is "to persuade us out of our senses, to change all the notions we have had of things for these twenty years or more, and to give up contentedly all the fruits of a most successful war in a mean inglorious peace".[1] Hare can do little to shake Swift's evidence of the allies contributions to the war, though he produces extenuating circumstances. He makes a strong effort to equate the peace with the Pretender:

> The Revolution will run in my thoughts while I am upon this argument, for I can't but fear, that the same faction, that are in so much haste to overturn the grand alliance, mean no less than

---

[1] The Allies and the Late Ministry Defended against France and the Friends of France, 1711-1712, part I (1711), Somers Tracts (2nd ed) XIII, 121.

> to destroy the Revolution; and whether they do directly mean it or not, there is so close a connection between the two, that the confounding of one, will, in all human probability, draw after it the subversion of the other. [1]

To oppose the picture of a corrupt alliance between Marlborough and Godolphin, the Whigs, and the allies, Hare creates that of a war in the national interest, conducted by a patriotic government; this has been undermined by Jacobites and sympathisers with France, who have used a campaign of vilification to gain their ends. As specific evidence of the Jacobitism of _The Conduct_ Hare deliberately misinterprets an innocent reference of Swift to Parliament's power to change the succession, which Hare claims is a hint to the Pretender's supporters that he may yet legally succeed. Other Whig pamphlets in reply to _The Conduct_ take the same line as Hare, some modelling themselves on his pamphlet.

Defoe provided the notable exception to this by answering _The Conduct of the Allies_ himself, in _A Defence of the Allies and the Late Ministry: or, Remarks on the Tories New Idol_. Unless one is to assume him wholly mercenary in pursuit of sales, he must have found the attack on the late ministry and on the very grounds of the war he had for years defended too repugnant to remain silent. Personal animosity to Swift may have played a part in his reply. He starts by accusing the author of _The Conduct of the Allies_ of substituting rhetoric

---

[1] _Ibid_, p.137.

for reason in a lively comparison:

> This I take to be the Case of a New Pamphlet, which is just now come out among us, and which, as it enters the Stage like a Gladiator at the Bear-garden, with a great Flourish, Brandishing its Weapons, carrying a fine Feather in its Hat, the Shirt and Hair tied up with Ribbands, a bright Weapon in its Hand in Terrorem, and the like; so it comes ushered in by the Shouts and Huzza's of the Rabble, who, according to Custom, always attend it. [1]

Defoe defends the allies and the late ministry, shifting his ground from moderate Tory to very moderate Whig. The Dutch have made great efforts to maintain their quotas. As for the other allies, some are indeed slack and mercenary, but they are none the less necessary, and the only way their defects could be penalised would have damaged the war effort.

Defoe takes the same attitude to peace as in his previous Whiggish pamphlet, Armageddon, doing his best to exculpate the present ministry. The present ministry wants a peace conference, where French offers can be accepted, or rejected on their merits, not peace at all costs. The ministers are badly misrepresented by The Conduct of the Allies, which is in the French and Jacobite interest. This argument, considering there could only have been one source from which the secret material could have come, is on a par with that of Armageddon for unreality, and could only make political sense if taken ironically;

---

[1] A Defence of the Allies and the Late Ministry, p.2.

Defoe advances it in earnest:

> The Numbers of People in this Nation are many, who are as willing as possible, consisting with Honour and Justice, to bring this War to a Happy Peace, who yet abhor the Thoughts of abandoning our Allies, or complying with base or mean Conditions from France, and to urge either of these would arm all the Reason, Honour, Sence, and Virtue, of the Nation against the Ministry. [1]

In Defoe's comforting view both Whigs and ministers are acting in the national interest, and only the Jacobites are to blame.

In December Defoe published two other pamphlets. The Felonius Treaty was a defence of William III's treaties of partition, obliquely aiding the move for a peace on other terms than Spain being given to Charles, which Defoe expressly argued against. This was the other pamphlet relating to the peace that he acknowledged, stating in its title "By the Author of the Review". The other[2] was concerned with the bargain between the hated Nottingham, who had had Defoe prosecuted in 1702 for The Shortest Way with the Dissenters, and the Whigs for a bill against occasional conformity, which duly passed the houses. Defoe was genuinely distressed and disgusted at this treachery to the dissenters; of those who had foiled the bills earlier in Anne's reign, he alone protested. Less honestly, he used the incident to escape from his embarrassment at Whig charges of treachery to the allies.

---

[1] A Defence of the Allies and the Late Ministry, p.46.

[2] An Essay on the History of Parties and Persecution in Britain. (December 22, 1711)

In the Review of January 3, 1712 he wrote:

> Never open your Mouths after this about Publick Faith, the Honour of Treaties, Justice to Allies, and standing fast to Confederacies, and the like; whoever may complain of these Things, it is not for those I am speaking of, to open their Mouths about it now-. [1]

D. Marlborough's dismissal.

After the vote for peace negotiations had been passed the controversy switched to the subject of Marlborough, now highlighted by his dismissal for supporting war in the Lords, and accused of peculation. The fall of such an important figure provoked a new crop of parallels from the classics as both defenders and attackers created an archaic picture of military greatness. On December 6, before his fall The Protestant Postboy had delivered a long eulogy of Marlborough in the form of a leader to its news. Its writer rebuts the accusations of The Conduct of the Allies; defence of the man and of the policy he stands for coalesce as Marlborough's credit is used to reflect on the government's peace policy:

> There are Calumnies that never pierce this Heroe's Soul: He is entrench'd with solid Vertue, and impregnable against these Feeble Arrows. He is sensible, that this has been the Fate of the Greatest Men in all Ages. Ingratitude has been the Harvest they have Reap'd from all their Toils; and that the most illustrious Actions have been sully'd by the Pestilential Breath of a few Discontented

---

[1] The Review, January 3, 1712.

> People; and the Noblest Ends Disappointed by
> unnatural Projects at Home. [1]

Defence of Marlborough was a subject that lent itself easily to extravagance.

After Marlborough had been accused of peculation, on December 23, the Daily Courant carried his justification against the charges, which was also published in the form of a pamphlet. His dismissal gave a new lease of life to the controversy, in which the political periodicals came to the fore. In the Examiner Oldisworth tried to destroy Marlborough's popularity, repeating in issue after issue the the charge that he had taken bribes from a contractor who provided bread for the army. Oldisworth represented this in the blackest possible manner, stating that English soldiers were given inferior bread, paid high prices or even starved because of their general's avarice. Oldisworth makes the basest insinuations:

> Impartial and Fierce; thus Our Hero kills Dead,
> His Foes with his Arms, his Friends with his Bread. [2]

On March 27, 1712 he tells the story of a common soldier who has been condemned to be hanged for stealing bread. As if this was not enough, the soldier is said to have complained that if Marlborough had not stolen his own bread, he would not have needed to steal at all.

George Ridpath devoted most of the January issues of the

---

[1] The Protestant Postboy, December 6, 1711.

[2] The Examiner, April 17, to 24, 1712.

Observator to the defence of the Whig hero. The paper's heading for January 5, read, A Grecian Story told by the Observator to Roger and Joan in the Chimney-Corner about the ungrateful treatment that Aristides, the noble Grecian Patriot and General met with from his Country, notwithstanding his many victories. Following issues defended Marlborough by name.

Defoe delayed writing of the subject in the Review until January 22, when he claimed that letters had been written to him trying to draw him out and if possible embroil him with the ministry. Defoe refused to voice the harsher accusations of the Tories, arguing that the charges of peculation were unnecessary, as the Queen had every right to remove a general from his post. The true reason for his dismissal is the way the Whigs have insisted that Marlborough was indispensable in order to enhance his opposition to a peace:

> ...when People cry up any Man so high, as to tell their Sovereign she cannot act without them, it often works Mischief to the Person himself by making it necessary to the Government to convince them of the Mistake.

In this case Defoe's middle position enabled him to give the most balanced account of Marlborough's fall.[1]

---

[1] In a letter to Harley of January 10, 1712, Defoe wrote: "God That Directs your Ldpp I hope in all Things, has Moved you No doubt to Take This Most Necessary step of Deposeing The Idol Man, who Coveted to Set himself up as The head of a Party, and by whom They pretended to Make Themselves Formidable. All wise men Own the Necessity, and Applaud The Wisdome of This step, . . ." (The Letters of Daniel Defoe, ed. Healey, p.366.

The case of Marlborough was well covered by the pamphleteers. The writer of a short tract, Marcus Manlius Capitolinus, compared the general to another hero who had saved his country only to betray it. Arthur Maynwaring had a pamphlet, Hannibal and Hanno, privately printed and circulated among friends. Oldmixon later remarked on Maynwaring's fondness for the historical parallel, and the care he took to choose those that truly corresponded with contemporary events.[1] This pamphlet tells a simple version of the story of Hannibal, meticulously taken from the works of Livy and Sir Walter Raleigh. Maynwaring makes no attempt to distort the version of Livy to make it resemble the case of Marlborough more closely. Hanno is paralleled with Harley, on account of the way they both worked to end their respective wars and recall the famous generals. That Hanno hated Hannibal on dynastic grounds, their families being enemies of long standing, also suits the parallel, as Harley's ambition to ennoble his family was common knowledge. Maynwaring's fidelity to his sources can be judged from this speech of Hanno against sending Hannibal to the army, which is set against the Livy:

---

[1] Life of Arthur Maynwaring, p.184. Rae Blanchard refers to this pamphlet (Correspondence of Richard Steele, p.450) as if it dated from 1710, and indeed Oldmixon discusses it with 1710 material. This is coincidence, as the pamphlet includes a parallel between Asdrubal and the Bishop of Bristol (appointed plenipotentiary in November 1711) as peace negotiators, and refers to Marlborough's fall (January, 1712). As Maynwaring died in 1712, this dates the pamphlet.

> Of which Ambition, Hanno directly accus'd Hannibal, saying, That he made War upon War, that so he might live compass'd with Legions; as knowing no other way to make himself a king. [1]

> Iuvenem flagrantem cupidine regni viamque unam ad id cernentem si ex bellis bella serendo succinctus armis legionibusque vivat, velut materiam igni praebentes ad exercitus misistis. [2]

The exact translation lets the resemblance with the Tory outcry when Marlborough asked to be made general for life, speak for itself. Maynwaring's confidence in the validity of the historical parallel endows Marlborough's plight with some of the grandeur that Livy allows Hannibal.

On the opposite side, William King in Ruffinus could not resist the temptation to alter his sources obviously to suit his purpose. King tells the story of a late Roman favourite and general of Theodosius, who apparently controlled the empire with violent rapacity and utter disregard for justice. This is most unlike the situation of Marlborough, but King inserts small details to parallel modern events likely to please the Tory reader. There is a reference to General Webb's victory at Wynenddael, which the Tories accused Marlborough of trying to stifle report of, to the Barrier Treaty, and to the Whig bishops. King ends with the brutal murder of Ruffinus, just as he is plotting the death

---

[1] Ibid, p.150.

[2] Ab Urbe Condita, ed. Loeb, V, (London, 1929), 26.

of the young Emperor Arcadius. He gives as a maxim: "From this single instance it would be easy to demonstrate, that a Favourite Ministry is fundamentally destructive of good government, and equally pernicious to the Prince, and to the People."[1] This cannot be taken seriously; King's object is to attack Marlborough and the Whigs with all the violence and insult possible, and the parallel is only a framework for doing so.

Marlborough inspired one writer to an even more fanciful parallel. In Oliver's Pocket Looking Glass, New Fram'd and Clean'd, To give a clear view of the Great Modern Colossus, the writer suggests an analogy between Marlborough and Cromwell. He enjoys recalling the less glorious actions of the Whig hero, such as his rise to power through his sister being James II's mistress, and his own liason with Charles II's mistress, Charlotte Villiers, "Harlotta Villeria." Taking a high moral tone, this writer spares no calumny:

> For no manner of Reliance can be had on, no certain Trust can ever be put in a Man, so base in Soul, as to Purchase false Honour with true, and poorly submit part with the whole Reputation of his Family, to feed his Avarice with Riches, his Ambition with Titles, thus ignominiously bought. Is it possible for Honour to debase itself lower than by such mean and vile Condescentions? Can anything more express a degenerate sordid Spirit than selling the Virtue of a Sister to buy a Place at Court? [2]

---

[1] The Original Works of William King, LL.D. 3 vols. ed. John Nichols, (London, 1776) II, 291.

[2] Oliver's Pocket Looking Glass, p.24-25.

Marlborough is reproached with his betrayal of James II, and with corresponding with St. Germains afterward. With flagrant malice the writer belittles his military skill and hints he has tried to become a dictator through the power of his army.

The excitement generated by the fall of Marlborough brought Steele back into the field of political journalism with The Englishman's Thanks to the Duke of M-------h. This extravagant eulogy may well be both an attempt to avoid recognition and a reflection of Steele's own hero-wroship. He protests violently at the disgrace that the innocent hero has suffered, and assures him that the honest Englishmen recognise the slander on his character for what it is. Steele's language is hyperbolical:

> Your Actions have exalted You to be the Chief of Your Species; and a continued Chain of Successes resulting from Wise Counsels, have denominated You the First of Mankind in the Age which was Bless'd with your Birth...
>
> It is as impossible to do You Dishonour, as to recall Yesterday: Your Character is indelible in the Book of Fame; And tho' after a few Turbulent Years, it will be said of Us the rest of Manking, They were: it will be to the End of Time said, MARLBOROUGH Is. [1]

Steele does not scruple to make an analogy between Marlborough and Christ.

Defoe was the only writer to contribute a major pamphlet on Marlborough's fall; its title was No Queen, or, No General: An

---

[1] Tracts and Pamphlets by Richard Steele, ed. Rae Blanchard, (Baltimore 1944, reprinted New York, 1967) p.69-70.

Argument proving the Necessity Her Majesty was in, as well for the Safety of Her Person as of her Authority, to Displace the D--- of M---borough. In the opening pages Defoe goes surprisingly far towards the Tory picture of Marlborough. With ironic generosity he catalogues the charges that he is not going to make, thus introducing some of the worst insinuations:

> I'le forbear to lessen his Glorious Character by reckoning the Number of the Slain, or counting up the Cost of the Towns we have recovered.
>
> I'le forbear entring into the Affair of Treaties, and enquiring why a good Peace was not long ago obtain'd; I'le drop the Discourse of who might, or might not, have procured a lasting Peace after the Victory of Ramillies, or who comes under the Scandal of Her Majesties Censure, (viz.) of Delighting in War... I'le, in meer Complaisance to that Heroe, wave the Charge of insufferable Avarice, and refer the Deficiencies of Accounts, the Misapplying the Publick Moneys, the Diverting proper Payments, the Taking great Sums for Pasports, Quarters, Forage, &c in Flanders, and unaccounted for, to the Examination of the Parliament Commissioners of Accounts, &c. whose Peculiar that is, and before whom these Things now lye in the Regular Method of Examination. [1]

Defoe even touches, very unfairly for him, on Marlborough's desertion of James II.

After this Defoe becomes more moderate, and his main argument closely resembles that of the Review. The Whigs are themselves to blame for the fall of the man they are now praising. He has been amply rewarded, and it has been the Queen's favour that has made him

---

[1] No Queen, or, No General, p.2-3.

what he is. Defoe recalls the time when it was the Whigs who were attacking Marlborough in the press, and making use of similar slanders now voiced by the Tories. The Junto now glorify him for their own ends, not because they really have any feeling for him; parties sometimes adopt great men to gain the lustre of their popularity. No government can tolerate an office-holder being used against them, and allow claims that he is indispensable to be made with impunity.

The pamphlet then swings to attack the Junto in a similar way to _Reasons Why a Party ... are against a Peace_, and defends the peace negotiations yet again. Defoe treats the _Hanover Memorial_ with caution; it may be forged, but if it is not it is extremely unwise of the Elector to slander the Queen in a party paper, which will not endear him to the nation. The "Hellish Compact" of the bill against dissent is another instance of the Junto's ruthless self interest, which parallels their adoption of Marlborough. Defoe ends by repeating that the Junto have left the government no alternative but to dismiss Marlborough; we will show the French that we can fight without him if necessary.

This is the last pamphlet by Defoe of this period that I shall deal with in detail. He repeated this attack on the Junto in _The Conduct of Parties in England, more especially of those Whigs, who now appear against the new Ministry and a Treaty of Peace_, published on January 24, 1712. In this pamphlet Defoe runs over the history of the Junto from 1706, proving them "a Set of Men, who so plainly pursue their Private

Interest at the Hazard of their Country, and the Ruin of their Friends."[1] Though the attitude is the same, this is the most forthright of this series of pamphlets, showing Defoe reacting to the Tory victory; much of his new enthusiasm seems to stem from the betrayal of the dissenters. Defoe's contribution to controversy during these crucial months is interesting for what it reveals of his character and methods; he was ready to vary the emphasis of his middle way so as to give it a Whig instead of a Tory flavour, but he would not go to the extremes of either party or damage those he felt loyalty to. Though he defended the moves for peace very competently, with moderation and good sense, it is easy to see why he was so much less effective than Swift for the particular need of the moment, and how his divided loyalties occasionally ruined the polemic power of his pamphlets. For Defoe, as for Harley, this was a difficult time; both saw the Tory majority going further than they might have liked, while the Whigs would accept no compromise. During the following year Defoe was to go further in support of his patron, defending the "restraining orders" forbidding Ormonde to fight, and proving the necessity, though he insisted that it was only an academic question, of fighting Holland and Germany if they refused to make peace and succeeded in defeating France on their own.[2]

---

[1] The Conduct of the Parties in England, p.42.

[2] Reasons against Fighting, 1712 (June 7) The Justice and Necessity of a War with Holland, 1712.

E. Law is a Bottomless Pit.

The controversy over the peace dragged on through 1712 and 1713, but its climax had passed by February, 1712 after the dismissal of Marlborough and the vote for peace. John Arbuthnot added a light-hearted coda to the affair during the spring and summer of 1712 with which I should like to end the treatment of the peace. His story of John Bull, Law is a Bottomless Pit, published in five parts, is one of the outstanding pamphlets of the period. This genre, the low allegory, had been used constantly to comment on political events, but no-one of this period made such charming and inventive use of it as Arbuthnot.[1] He makes humorous pretence of writing a history, and declares his debt to both classical and modern historians, including very pertinently, John Bunyan. Under the guise of Sir Humphrey Polesworth, historiographer to John Bull, he claims to have compiled his work from a trunkful of Journals of all John Bull's transactions.

Arbuthnot chose to write the Tory justification of the Treaty of Utrecht in the form of a story of a tradesman's lawsuit with his neighbour. The analogy between law and war proves a fund of humour and of serious criticism of the policy of the Godolphin ministry in fighting the war of the Spanish succession. John Bull (England) is a linen-draper, who sues Lewis Baboon (Louis XIV) for depriving him of

---

[1] A recent example had been, A True and Faithful Account of the Last Distemper and Death of Tom Whig, (1710). Swift's Tale of a Tub and Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress must share some credit for influencing Arbuthnot. Low allegory can easily shade into mock heroic or the animal fable.

the custom of Lord Strut (the King of Spain) by putting forward Philip Baboon (Philip of Anjou) as the new Lord Strut. Together with Nic Frog (Holland) and other smaller tradesmen, John attempts to enstate Esquire South (Charles of Austria) in a long and costly lawsuit. One advantage of the reduction of the great names of Europe to litigious tradesmen is to emphasise that a lot of money is being spent to little advantage. As tradesmen the characters naturally consider their profit and loss, and the glory of the war disappears when it is seen as a lawsuit. Arbuthnot establishes an atmosphere of hard bargaining and the dangers of bankruptcy. It is John's folly that he begins to despise his occupation of linen draper and pride himself on his legal skill. Marlborough loses his stature in the character of Hocus, an exceptionally cunning lawyer. Arbuthnot makes good use of the length and costliness of lawsuits, from which only the lawyers themselves make a profit. John Bull finds that he is being cheated by his companions in the suit, especially by Nic Frog. The allegory is too long and detailed to be described completely here. It contains sections on Scotland, on passive obedience, and on the Church, where Arbuthnot graciously admits his debt to Swift by borrowing the character of Jack from A Tale of a Tub to personify the dissenters. The tale ends triumphantly when John Bull accepts the offer of Lewis Baboon to end the suit, evades the tricks of Nic Frog to keep him in it, and retires with Ecclesdown Castle (Dunkirk) as security for a reasonable settlement.

What has made Arbuthnot's main character survive as the personification of England is his ability to create a character and tell a story in a lively way. He refused to let the allegory override the tale of a set of tradesmen quarrelling. His narrative exists in its own right, not merely as the vehicle for a scathing attack on the war of the Spanish succession. The language of his characters is full of comic life. The plea for one more campaign to smash France appears as "One Term more, and old Lewis goes to pot!"[1] The following extract is from the meeting at the Salutation tavern (the Congress of Utrecht), where Nic. Frog tries to hinder a settlement:

> Shall I serve Philip Baboon with Broadcloth, and accept of the Composition that he offers, with Liberty of his Parks and Fish-ponds? Then Nic. roar'd like a Bull, O,o,o! John Bull.] If thou wilt not let me have them, wilt thou take them they self? Then Nic. grinn'd, cackl'd and laugh'd, till he was like to kill himself, and seem'd to be so pleas'd that he fell a frisking and dancing about the Room. John Bull.] Shall I leave all this Matter to thy Management, Nic. and go about my Business? Then Nic. got up a Glass and drank to John, shaking him by the Hand till he had like to have shook his Shoulder out of Joint. John Bull.] I understand thee, Nic.; but I shall make thee speak before I go. Then Nic. put his Finger in his Cheek, and made it cry Buck; which is as much as to say I care not a Farthing for thee. John Bull.] I have done, Nic.; If thou wilt not speak, Ill make my own Terms with old Lewis here. Then Nic. loll'd out his Tongue and turn'd up his Bum to him: which was as much as to say, KISS---. 2

---

[1] Miscellanies, Vol. II, (1727) p.65.

[2] Ibid, p.131.

Arbuthnot avoids giving extravagant praise to the Tories. A member of the Scriblerus group and a close friend of Swift, he was familiar with devious methods of praising and blaming. In addition, he was a political moderate, whose humour got the better of his animosity. The Duke of Savoy, the favourite ally of the Tories, is called "Lying Ned the Chimney-sweeper."[1] Even Harley, Arbuthnot's personal friend and the hero of the piece, appears as a comic figure, Sir Roger Bold. Arbuthnot describes Sir Roger walking trhough the streets in a leather coat to protect him from water squirted at him by his enemies, and keeping off John Bull's duns with his long pole (the Treasurer's staff). This is from a passage dealing with Sir Roger's ways of side-tracking importunate duns:

> It would have done your Heart good to have seen him charge thro' an army of Lawyers, Attorneys, Clerks, and Tradesmen; sometimes with Sword in Hand, at other nuzling like an Eel in the Mud. When a Fellow stuck like a Bur that there was no shaking him off, he us'd to be mighty inquisitive about the Health of his Uncles and Aunts in the Country; he would call them all by their Names, for he knew every Body, and could talk to them in their own way. The extremely Impertinent, he would send away to see some strange Sight, as the Dragon at Hockley the Hole, or bid him call the 30th of next February. 2

No character is allowed to have any dignity, though all are treated with unfailing good humour. John Bull himself is the Englishman as

---

[1] Ibid, p.9.

[2] Ibid, p.110-111.

he likes to see himself, impulsive, goodnatured and, though he knows his trade, too ready to believe what he is told, which makes him vulnerable to deceitful friends. A blunt honest man, he cannot remain fooled for long. It is worth pointing out that Arbuthnot's version of John Bull is far more critical than later adaptations of it. I have not space to mention the many strokes of wit which abound in Law is a Bottomless Pit, such as the sorites of false reasoning from Don Diego (Nottingham on the necessity to fight on), or the vindication of the indispensable duty of cuckoldom (resistance). In all the pamphlet is a fine example of political satire that holds the reader's attention by the vitality of its narrative as well as by the interaction between that narrative and the actual events it reflects on.

The controversy over the peace of Utrecht could not be said to have ended until long after the conclusion of the treaty in 1713. Their conduct of the negotiations was one of the chief articles of the impeachment of the Tory ministers and was the main ground of the attacks in the press that led to it. Peace was the great issue of the period, and its accomplishment the most important action of Harley and Bolingbroke; even as late as the Jew Bill of 1755 the Commons, warming to old and nearly extinct loyalties, could engage in a heated discussion of the merits of the treaty. The Tories gained the immediate victory, with The Conduct of the Allies playing an unusually large part in their struggle for public opinion with the Whigs. Yet in the long run the

peace alienated the Elector of Hanover, ensured the Tories exclusion from power on his accession, and brought about their extinction as an active political party. The Whig tactic of equating the peace with the Pretender, unsuccessful at the time, was to pay dividends in their press campaigns of 1713 and 1714 when the treaty was used to brand the Tory ministers as Jacobites.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE SUCCESSION, 1713-1714.

A. The Whig attack.

(i) The Problem of the Succession.

The question of the succession was the main reason for the climax of party hostility towards the end of Anne's reign. The Queen's health was uncertain; she almost died from a severe illness in the Christmas of 1713-1714. The legal successor was the Elector of Hanover, but there was little enthusiasm for him in the country, and many Tories still cherished feelings of loyalty to the Stuart claimant, the Pretender. Harley had played an important part in supporting the protestant succession in his earlier career, but any favour he might have had with the Elector had been destroyed by the peace of Utrecht. The Elector was in contact with the Whig politicians and with Marlborough, and it was clear that his arrival would mean the departure of the Tory politicians from power. Harley made vague approaches to the Pretender, but refused to commit himself; this was part of his precautions against a Jacobite revival. Bolingbroke, who was making himself the leader of the extremer Tories and trying to wrest control of the ministry from Harley, made more purposeful advances, but the Pretender's refusal to change his Roman Catholic faith halted negotiations. The legal succession did not appear inevitable to other politicians; Marlborough made prudent presents of money to the Pretender, though he offered a much

larger loan to the Elector in the event of his having to enforce his right by invasion.

The Whigs gave wholehearted support to the Hanover succession both for its own sake and because they saw it as bringing a return of their power. The controversy between the parties in the press was dominated by their attempt to spread the idea that the succession was in danger from the Tory ministry. The Whigs had a simple and compelling case, which had been behind their propaganda at the change of ministry in 1710 and in the debate over the peace. They claimed that each move of Harley's ministry had been planned to make the path of the Pretender to the English throne easier. The peace, with its concessions to France, formed the cornerstone of their arguments, and was carefully emphasised as proof of the ministry's inclinations. Until late in 1713 these accusations had little effect as the ministry carried public opinion with them. What gave the initiative to the Whigs was the reluctance of the extremer Tories to submit to Harley's moderate leadership. They gradually forced his moderate Whigs out of office, calling for a Tory monopoly of places to make their party indisputably secure. Bolingbroke made a bid for leadership offering a more aggressive policy so that many Tories were torn between their desire to follow him and their knowledge that only Harley's friendship with the Queen and his skilful management of Parliament had kept them in power. The position was complicated by Harley's evident decline, and his inability to control the situation. His addiction to mystery

grew, as did his drunkenness, and he became more concerned to undermine and destroy his rival than to lead a party. As the Tory leaders' quarrel grew into open enmity and conflict, they formed no clear reply to the Whig pressure in Parliament and the press.

I shall follow the course of Whig propaganda and Tory reply from the end of 1713 until its climax in the following year and the death of Queen Anne. The stereotyped similarity of the arguments of both sides makes the succession controversy the least interesting of those of the last four years of the Queen. The new champion of the Whigs, Richard Steele, was a competent and readable pamphleteer, but he lacked the genius for controversy of Swift or Defoe. His real excellence lay in the periodical essay, and his periodicals were his most impressive contribution to the Whig cause. The case he had to argue gave him little room for manoeuvre. The Tory writers were on the defensive; Swift resorted to satire rather than argument in reply to Steele, and Defoe was left sadly isolated from a receptive audience by the hardening of party spirit. The same accusations and refutations are made again and again in connection with each notable event in politics, and the techniques of the various writers are more interesting than their arguments. Consequently I shall deal with the succession controversy as a coda to end this study of the political journalism of Anne's reign, and not treat it in such detail as the two previous episodes.

(ii) A Short History of the Parliament

The first defeat of the ministry came in June, 1713, when the

commercial treaty that had been part of Bolingbroke's peace negotiations with France, was rejected by the Commons. The articles objected to proposed a mutual removal of tariffs to promote trade. The reasons for its defeat were many. One was the opposition of protectionist commercial interests which affected a number of Tories with interests in trade; another was the determination of extremist Tories to teach Harley that he could not hold his position without their support.[1] Bolingbroke himself felt that Harley had not fought hard enough for the measure in order to discredit him. The Whig opposition conducted a press campaign of pamphlets and addresses that stigmatised the treaty as an attempt to ruin England's trade and increase the power of France. The ministry replied by trying to prove the advantages of the treaty, their chief spokesman being Defoe in the _Mercator_, a periodical created especially for the occasion. Though the press and public opinion played a most important part in the rejection of this Treaty, I will not discuss the political journalism on the subject in detail, as it involves economic issues far wider than the political conflict I am tracing.

The Whigs used their unique success, a Commons vote against government policy, in their propaganda for the elections in the autumn of 1713. As Whig journalism is remarkably single-minded at this time, one pamphlet will suffice to show its force, _A Short History of the_

---

[1] Clayton Roberts, _Growth of Responsible Goverment_, p.369.

Parliament, written by Walpole, then managing the press for the Junto. The pamphlet is prefaced by an ironic dedication to Harley comparing his achievements with Marlborough's generalship on the battlefield:

> In commemorating the three last Winter Campaigns in Parliament, which though not exposed to much Danger, must be allow'd to require some Conduct and Generalship, at whose Feet could I think of laying this Treatise, but at your Lordships, and to mention your Name would be to suppose that the Fame and Reputation which you have acquir'd by retrieving the Affairs of the French King was not as well known to all the World as the mistaken Glory of the Duke of Marlborough in distressing him...

Walpole ends the dedication with a list of compliments that summarise the points of the Whig attack:

> To these [the Commons] and your Lordship, the Honour is due of all that the following Sheets contain; To your Lordship's great Truth and Sincerity, is owing the present indefeasible Security of the Protestant Succession the House of HANOVER, and the prefect Friendship between her Majesty and that Illustrious House. To your Lordship's Zeal, for the Establish'd Religion, and Aversion to Fanaticism, is Owing the safety of our Church: To the Love of your Country, and your deep skill in foreign Affairs, is owing the Glory of the Peace, and the Ballance of Power in Europe; To your great wisdom, we owe the Extension of our Trade; and to your Vigilance, the Demolition of Dunkirk; In short, to your Lordship's Dexterity and Munificence, we Owe what was done in one House, and to your Eloquence, Perspicuity, and Twelve Peers, whatever was done in the other. [1]

In the body of the pamphlet Walpole hits at the source of Tory

---

[1] A Short History of the Parliament; p.2. Dedication.

power, directly accusing the Commons of corruption and of ruining the nation by their partiality to France. Their boasted loyalty to the Queen means little:

> They have prided themselves in the Titles of Dutiful and Loyal, a Character that no future Parliament will ever want, that will be ready always to comply with, and support the Projects of an enterprizing Ministry. [1]

Walpole uses his thorough knowledge of the Commons in adopting the country line in opposing a ministry in power, inveighing against office-holders being allowed to sit in Parliament, where they help manage the Commons. The attack on placemen was dear to the hearts of all country members and to some extent cut across the division of Whig and Tory; Walpole does indeed allow that there are many "honest" Tories who have not understood that what their leaders intend will end in their country's ruin.

Walpole traces the progress of the peace negotiations and the parallel attack on the conduct of the Godolphin ministry in some detail, treating both as part of an organised plan of action. The charges of peculation against Marlborough, the censure of Townsend for his part in making the Barrier Treaty, and Walpole's expulsion from the House have been intended to blacken the Whigs in the eyes of the people and open the way for a complete reversal of previous policy. With his experience of finance Walpole is able to refute with contemptuous

---

[1] A Short History of the Parliament, p.7.

conviction the charges of mismanagement brought against Godolphin for allowing the national debt to accumulate. He shows that the present government has raised as many taxes as its allegedly corrupt and wasteful predecessor. The last step of the ministry, which has caused even the servile Tory Commons to revolt, has been the Treaty of Commerce. He touches on Dunkirk, which remains undemolished despite this having been one of the conditions of the peace. The logical and final move of the campaign will be the return of the Pretender; Walpole calls for the election of new members to avert this calamity, exhorting the freeholders not to choose again those, "Who for the Characters of Loyal and Dutiful have sacrificed their Country to the Power of France; which can end in nothing but bringing in the Pretender, Popery, and Slavery."[1] A Short History of the Parliament is a very competent pamphlet; Walpole's achievement is to have knitted the events of 1710 to 1713 into a pattern which throws doubt on the ministry's intentions to support the protestant succession.

(iii) Richard Steele

The Whigs made some gains in these elections but these were not sufficient to defeat the ministry; the court interest and gratitude for the peace still outweighed the doubts over the Treaty of Commerce. However the contention over Dunkirk continued from August 1713 through the election and gave a fillip to the Whig programme. This was marked

---

[1] A Short History of Parliament, p.24.

by the appointment of Steele to the position of official champion of the Whig party. Since the death of Maynwaring and exile of Ridpath the Whigs badly needed a high-level pamphleteer to counter the ministry's talent. Steele had come out openly for the Whigs as early as April 28 1713, when he had defended Nottingham's daughter in the Guardian from an attack of the Examiner. On May 12, he had signed his own name beneath a defence of Marlborough in the same paper. The Whig plan was to have Steele elected to Parliament, so that he could use his status as a Member as well as his reputation as a writer, very high after the success of the Tatler and Spectator, to stiffen the Whig press. Accordingly he resigned his office and pension and was in due course elected member for Stockbridge, a borough notorious for its proneness to bribery.

Before his election Steele had published a Guardian, that of August 7, on the subject of Dunkirk. It was signed "English Tory". In the Treaty of Utrecht both the fortifications and the harbour of Dunkirk, home of French privateers and invasion base for England, were to be demolished, but the French showed great reluctance to start the work. Steele decided to elevate this into a proof of the ministry's dangerous lenity towards France. He quotes from a memorial to the Queen from a certain M. Tugghe, a French deputy of Dunkirk, who pleaded that the harbour, but not the fortifications of Dunkirk should be preserved so that the people might not lose their livelihood. Tugghe pointed out that this would assist English trade with the Low-Countries,

a clever appeal to our trade rivalry with the Dutch. Steele attacks this petition in his Guardian as an attempt to preserve the port which most menaces England, being a threat to England's trade and a possible base for the Pretender's return to his crown. The keynote of the paper is the resolution that quickly became famous, "That the British Nation expect the immediate Demolition of Dunkirk."[1]

The point was well chosen; the Tories could do little about French intransigence, and were far from happy about the situation themselves. The Whigs were in a position where if Dunkirk was demolished they might attribute it to their own efforts, and if it was not, cite this as evidence of the ministry's love of France. Tory replies to Steele took equally unimpressive lines, vilification of Steele's character and assertions that he questioned the royal prerogative of making peace and war. A pamphlet was quickly published entitled The Honour and Prerogative of the Queen's Majesty Vindicated and Defended against the unexampled Insolence of the Author of the Guardian; In a Letter from a Country Whig to Mr. Steele.[2] The author of this piece represents any comment on the matter of Dunkirk as an insult to the Queen, and is particularly horrified by the word "expect". Here is

---

1 Tracts and Pamphlets by Richard Steele, ed. Rae Blanchard (Baltimore, 1944) pp.96,97.

2 Defoe has been suggested as the author: Irvin Ehrenpreis, Swift the Man, his Works, and the Age, Vol. II, Dr. Swift, (London 1967) p.686. In the Dictionary of National Biography it is given to Mrs. Manley.

an example of his manner:

> See how the Villain threats the best of Sovereigns, the best Mistress to him, whose Bread he has eaten, and who has kept him from a Goal! Read it again, say they: Put it into English, said a Neighbour of mine to me, come make the best of it! then he reads the abominable Language as follows:
>
> The British Nation EXPECT, &c...
>
> Just thus an Imperious Planter at Barbadoes speaks to a Negro Slave, Look you, Sirrah, I expect this Sugar to be ground, and look to it that it be done forthwith. 'Tis enough to tell you I EXPECT it, or else &c. and then he holds up his Stick at him, Take what follows. [1]

The Examiner took a similar attitude, concentrating on Steele's alleged ingratitude to the Queen.

Steele demolished these replies in a full-length pamphlet published in late September 1713, The Importance of Dunkirk Consider'd: In Defence of the Guardian of August the 7th. In a Letter to the Bailiff of Stockbridge. By Mr. Steele. This ran through three editions in a week. Much of this pamphlet was quotation, of Tugghe's memorial, of his own Guardian, and of the writers attacking him. In his own contribution Steele argued very soundly for the right to criticise the actions of the Queen's ministers without being held to reflect on the Queen. The question of ministerial responsibility had been hammered out since the Restoration and the maxim, "The King can do no wrong" had

---

[1] Tracts and pamphlets, pp.98, 99. This is taken from Steele's own quotation of his opponents. The whole passage is in italics except the underlined words.

been accepted by both parties. Steele showed convincingly that the time when the royal prerogative could shelter a minister had passed, and hinted that the concern for the Queen's honour hid sinister intentions.

> If the word Prerogative comes to be used to frighten Men from speaking what they lawfully may upon publick Occurrences, it may come to Pass hereafter that it may be a Refuge to indiscreet Ministers, and they may in time to come protect their Miscarriages under that aweful Word. [1]

In this pamphlet Steele made a new departure in the political journalism of this period. He signed it with his own name and devoted a large section to defending his motives, bringing his prestige as a Member of Parliament to support his assertions.[2] The courage of this gesture should not be underestimated; it laid Steele open to a barrage of vicious personalities and finally caused his expulsion from the House. No-one was prepared to follow his example on the Tory side, least of all Swift, and only Asgill and Burnet on the Whig one; neither of these acknowledged such front line journalism as Steele's. Steele explained the motives that persuaded him to enter active politics, owning his disgust at the vilification of "such Instruments of Glory and

---

[1] Tracts and Pamphlets, p.113.

[2] Steele wrote later that anonymous accusations savoured of calumny, "but when any Man with his Name asserted Things were amiss, it would behove the Persons concerned to prove it Calumny, or suffer under it; And I was willing to ripen the Question of the Succession upon my own Head." (Tracts and Pamphlets, p.285).

The moral advice of the Tatler and Spectator fit heavily into this pamphlet, without the graceful touch so often shown in the periodicals.

Steele had anticipated that "prostituted Pens"[1] would in reply attack his character, though he perhaps did not realise the extent to which his complacency and play with his identity invited satire. One of the most abusive pamphlets was The Character of Richard St---le by Toby, Abel's Kinsman, which avoided argument altogether. This is a fair example of its temper:

> You may blame me, perhaps, for reminding our Author of his Debts, and I should justly think myself blameable, if they were not the Effects of his Luxury, his Vanity and Ambition, and not of Accident or Misfortune. I could easily excuse and pity a Man for being poor, but not when by his Vices he labours to undo himself. Not when he endeavours to make a Figure, or become a Senator, at the Expence of his Creditors... Where is his Charity and Benevolence to Mankind, who is squandering away a handsome Competency among the Illegitimate, who is running into everybody's Debt, and paying no body? [2]

Outside of suggestions in the Examiner, which repaid Steele in similar coin, that Dunkirk might be a good bargaining counter against the Dutch, the Tory writers had little to say in reply; Steele had scored a notable success. It fell to his one-time friend, Swift who had returned from his installation as Dean of St. Patrick's to try and

---

[1] Ibid, p.122.

[2] The Miscellaneous Works of Dr. William Wagstaffe, (2nd Ed. London, 1726), pp.139, 140. Toby was the nephew of Abel Roper, the editor of the Postboy. It is doubtful if Wagstaffe had much to do with the pamphlets later published under his name.

Honour to our Country as the Illustrious Duke of Marlborough, such wise and faithful Managers as the late Earl of Godolphin, such Pious, Disinterested, Generous, and Self-denying Patriots as the Bishops."[1] Steele's praise of his own disinterested virtue is both naive, inflated and in his denial of any personal profit being in view, not entirely honest. There is no doubt that his protestations reflect his generous and emotional character, prone to fix on the most attractive side of his actions. Answering the charge that he must have "secret Views or Supports"[2] Steele replies:

> I answer, that I indeed have particular Views, and tho' I may be ridiculous for saying it, I hope I am animated in my Conduct, by a Grace which is as little practised as understood, and that is Charity. ...Great Qualifications are not Praises to the Possessor, but from the Application of them; and all that is justly Commendable among Men, is to Love and Serve them as much as it is in your Power, with a Contempt of all Advantages to your self (above the Conveniencies of Life) but as they tend to the Service of the Publick ... Riches and Honour can administer to the Heart no Pleasure, like what an Honest Man feels when he is contending for the Interests of his Country, and the Civil Rights of his Fellow-Subjects, without which the Being of Man grows Brute, and he can never under it give to Heav'n that Worship which is called a Reasonable Sacrifice, nor support towards his Fellow-Creatures that worthy Disposition, which we call disinterested Friendship. The highest pleasure of the Human Soul consists in this Charity, and there is no way of making it so diffusive, as by contending for Liberty. [3]

---

[1] Tracts and Pamphlets, p.110.

[2] Tracts and Pamphlets, p.120.

[3] Ibid, p.120-121.

nullify his pamphlet. Swift and Steele had quarrelled in the spring of 1713 over a reference to Swift as an "infidel" that Steele had inserted in the Guardian. What seemed to Steele a conventional disparaging comment on an opponent was to Swift a personal insult.[1] Personal and party animosity had full play in The Importance of the Guardian Considered; in a Second Letter to the Bailiff of Stockbridge, By a Friend of Mr. Steele, published on November 2, 1713. Swift ostentatiously refused to discuss the question of Dunkirk at all in his Preface:

> MR. Steele in his Letter to the Bailiff of Stockbridge has given us leave to treat him as we think fit, as he is our Brother-Scribler; but not to attack him as an honest Man. That is to say, he allows us to be his Criticks, but not his Answerers; and he is altogether in the right, for there is in his Letter much to be Criticised, and little to be Answered. [2]

Swift indulges in sustained ridicule of Steele and his pamphlet, giving particular attention to Steele's justification of his conduct and motives. Certainly Steele's sacrifice of his places acquits him of eating the Queen's bread while he insults her; "the bread was eaten at least a Week before he would offer to insult his Prince: So that the Folly of the Examiner's objecting Ingratitude to him upon this

---

[1] A detailed account of this is given in B.A. Goldgar, The Curse of the Party, (Lincoln Nebraska, 1961).

[2] Jonathan Swift, Political Tracts 1713-1719, ed. Herbert Davis and Irvin Ehrenpreis, (Oxford, 1953), p.4.

Article, is manifest to all the World."[1] Swift can think of other reasons besides serving his country that have induced Steele to become a Member of Parliament. In numbering the motives Swift ridicules Steele's aliases and his elegantly varied list of points in reply to Tugghe:

> First, The Guardian apprehended it impossible, that the Ministry would let him keep his Place much longer, after the Part he had acted for above two Years past. Secondly, Mr. Ironside said publickly, that he was ashamed to be obliged any longer to a Person (meaning Lord Treasurer) whom he had used so ill: For it seems, a Man ought not to use his Benefactors ill above two Years and a half. Thirdly, the Sieur Steele appeals for Protection to you, Mr. Bailiff, from others of your Denomination, who would have carried him some where else, if you had not removed him by your Habeas Corpus to St. Stephen's Chapel. Fourthly, Mr. English Tory found, by calculating the Life of a Ministry, that it hath lasted above three Years, and is near expiring; he resolved therefore to strip off the very Garments spotted with the Flesh, and be wholly regenerate against the Return of his old Masters. [2]

Steele must not be surprised that the world finds his sudden reformation strange. Is "so very quick a Sanctification, and carried to so prodigious a Height"[3] really the explanation for Steele giving up his places? As a final scathing comment Swift suggests yet another reason for Steele's

---

[1] Ibid, p.11.

[2] Jonathan Swift, Political Tracts 1713-1719, ed. Herbert Davis and Irvin Ehrenpreis, (Oxford, 1953), p.12-13.

[3] Ibid, p.21.

new disinterest, "he hath resumed his old Pursuits after the Philosopher's Stone, towards which it is held by all Adepts for a most essential Ingredient, that a Man must seek it meerly for the Glory of God, and without the least Desire of being rich."[1]

When Swift does arrive at the point in question, the responsibility of ministers for policy and whether they can cite the prerogative to excuse their actions, he is obviously unhappy, and tries to confuse the issue. Finally he affirms that they are responsible to Parliament and must justify their proceedings if called upon to do so.[2] However ministers are called upon to answer Parliament, not Mr. Steele. If Swift had the best of the wit on his side he also had the worst of the argument; he had not touched Dunkirk and had granted the question of the prerogative.

While the election campaign and the controversy on Dunkirk were in full swing, Steele started a new periodical, the Englishman, on October 6, as a sequel to the Guardian but this time avowedly political in emphasis. In the preface to the second series, written in July 1715, Steele stated the paper's object.

> The Former Volume of the Englishman was written with a direct Intention to destroy the Credit; and

---

[1] Ibid, p.21-22.

[2] The question of the political responsibility of the Crown, the ministry and the Commons as argued by Swift and Steele is discussed in Clayton Roberts, The Growth of Responsible Government, pp.373, 374.

> frustrate the Designs of Wicked Men, at that Time in Power.
>
> To insinuate that there are evil Purposes in the Ministers of one's Countrey, is, in it self, a seditious and unwarrentable Practice; but the apparent Tendency of the Proceedings in the late Times justified the Disrespect with which the Officers of the State were then treated. [1]

In 1713 Steele was not prepared to speak out as boldly as this. The Englishman is practical day to day journalism, and moves from one topic to the next as had Swift's Examiner. It is extremely competent, varying entertainment with politics, and it shows Steele's ability to write on politics with the easy, well-bred tone of his earlier periodicals. The Englishman gives support to the Whigs in the London elections (No.3): disposes of passive obedience (No.5): makes sly insinuations against the ministers (Nos.10 and 24): brings up the subject of Dunkirk again (No.17) and defends Marlborough (No.36). Steele also used the Englishman to reply to the Examiner; his paper soon had the standing of the voice of the Whig party.

Steele's attitude to party in the Englishman reflects the purposes of the Whig opposition. Aiding them in the Commons were the group of Tories led by Lord Nottingham, working often with the Whigs, who also hoped to gain the votes of the "Whimsicals" or "Hanover Tories" led by Sir Thomas Hamner, if suitable issues arose. Both of these groups being High Churchmen, the Whigs had no use for the crude anti-Sacheverell type

---

[1] The Englishman, ed. Rae Blanchard (Oxford 1955), p.252.

attack on the Churchmen, so often issuing from the pen of a deist or dissenter. Steele is wary about party; "The Distinctions of Whig and Tory are Snares to catch the Unwary on both Sides."[1] He is prepared to submerge all party quarrels, so he says, in order to Concentrate on the all-important issue of the succession. He quotes with approval from a sermon of the Bishop of Clogher:

> The Consideration of the Dangers we have so lately escaped, and Possibility that we may fall into the same again, should methinks alarm us all into Union; and 'twere passionately to be wished (to use some of the Last Words of our great Deliverer) That there were no other Distinction among us, but of those who are hearty and zealous for the Protestant Religion and present Establishment in Church and State, and those who are for Popery and a French Government. [2]

The willingness to forget party appears generous, but is really a device for further estranging the different sections of the Tories. It represents the Whigs and their allies as fighting for the national interest, as Steele refuses to recognise that any of the Tory ministry sincerely support the protestant succession.

This profession of disregard for party has a parallel in the Tory moderation of 1710-1711 propounded by Swift in the Examiner. In the Englishman of October 15, 1713, Steele makes the identical point that Swift did over hereditary and Parliamentary right:

---

[1] The Englishman, ed. Rae Blanchard (Oxford 1955), p.76.

[2] The Englishman, ed. Rae Blanchard (Oxford 1955), p.62.

> But the unhappy Animosities which have reigned amongst us, have made each Side reduce it self to an Absurdity from the Violence in opposing each other. While the one urges a Parliamentary Title, his Warmth betrays him into Expressions disrespectful to the Sovereignty; while his Opponent expresses his Indignation at Principles too near the Sentiments of Commonwealth's Men, with carrying too far the Terms of Hereditary and Indefeasible; let them both agree that the Queen is vested in all the Rights inherent to the Crown of England; and in Default of Her Issue, the same Titles devolved upon the House of Hanover. [1]

What could be more conciliatory to the Churchmen who stood in defence of hereditary right? In sharp contrast to much of the Whig press of 1710 Steele treats the Church of England with the utmost respect, though reserving his finest compliments for the moderate clergy. One of his "correspondents" remarks: "I have with a great deal of Pleasure observed, that in the Course of your Writings, (If I guess right who you are) the Clergy of the Church of England are your peculiar Favourites."[2] Another correspondent is called "Constant Churchman". Steele gives no ground for the common Tory gibe that the Whigs ridicule the clergy, insisting that the laity should treat them with courtesy and consideration.

On questions of Church policy, Steele attacked the extreme version of passive obedience, and opposed the claims of High Churchmen for more temporal power. Nevertheless he made quite sure it was

---

[1] Ibid, p.26.

[2] The Englishman, ed. Rae Blanchard, p.88 (November 21, 1713).

understood that he criticised the few hot-heads who coveted power or had Jacobite inclinations from a position inside the Church. He defended the Church's position, and made it clear that he sought no diminution of its rights and privileges, particularly those secured by the Test Act. The way in which Steele built on this ostentatious concern for the Church to weaken the ministry can be seen in the Englishman, 34, where the author, revisiting Oxford, talks with a High Church acquaintance:

> ...our Discourse fell insensibly on our present Party-Disputes and unhappy Divisions: I must tell you freely, Sir, (says the good Man) that your Papers are not read among us with that general Applause those of your Predecessors met with: For my own part, I know your Character too well, from my friend NESTOR, to doubt of your most hearty and unfeigned Affection for the Church of England. But you are not to wonder if we of this Place especially, who are so thoroughly convinced of the Excellency of her Constitution, are so alarmed at the least Appearance of any Design against her. If cunning men can so manage this good Disposition in us to make us approve of some Measures before we see in what they will end, you must at least allow that our very Errors arise from a noble Cause. However, if I am not much mistaken, the University will for the Future see with her own Eyes, judge of Persons without the Prejudices of Parties, and give her Voice to Merit, wherever she sees it. [1]

In his attempt to call in question the alleged danger to the Church which the Tory party proposed to avert, Steele treats the Churchman of Oxford, home of high-flyers, with the utmost delicacy. The Whigs had learnt the perils of a policy that would oppose them to the Church from

---

[1] The Englishman, ed. Rae Blanchard, p.138.

the Sacheverell trial; Steele preferred to stress the protestant succession against Popery and slavery, appealing to the time honoured patriotism of the Reformation.

B. The Succession in danger

(i) The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted

Suspicion of the ministry was fostered by a surprising development of the controversy on the succession. William Harbin, a Nonjuror and Jacobite of the scholarly rather than polemic type, published a folio volume on the history of England entitled The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted, in October 1713. It was written in reply to William Higden's View of the English Constitution, published in 1709, which argued that the crown of England legally belonged to the de facto monarch, irrespective of birthright. Though Harbin's work had obvious political implications it formed part of a scholarly controversy over the constitution of England in Saxon and Norman times.[1] Harbin did not appear to realise quite what explosive material he was giving to the Whigs who used his erudite volume to demonstrate that the Tory ministry allowed Jacobite works to be published unchecked. Unfortunately for the ministry it had been advertised in the Postboy, and by some oversight, in the London Gazette; worse still, some of it was based on manuscripts in Harley's library. It was little use Harley

---

[1] David C. Douglas, English Scholars, (London, 1939) Chapter VI, pp.119-138.

protesting quite honestly that he allowed all scholars to use his library without restraint; the Whigs realised they held a winner. Reply after reply attacked the motive and historical accuracy of Harbin. White Kennet, Abel Boyer, John Asgil and Steele, in the *Englishman*, were among the principal answerers. Eventually the ministry were forced to prosecute Hilikiah Bedford, another Nonjuror, who had given the book to the press, in order to demonstrate their innocence; he received a three year sentence.

(ii) Bishop Burnet

Others besides Steele joined in the attempt to persuade the public that the succession was in danger. Bishop Burnet, now an old man, published an introduction to the third volume of his *History of the Reformation* in which he expatiated on the imminent danger of the return of Popery to England. It appeared separately as a pamphlet on September 26, 1713, and was the last of a series of pieces in which Burnet had praised the late ministry and vented his suspicions of the Tories. Burnet saw Popery as he had done in 1688, and painted an inflated and archaic picture of its terrors, offering freely to seal his faith with his blood and burn on the rekindled fires of Smithfield:

> God be thanked there are many among us that stand upon the *Watch Tower*, and that give faithful Warning; that stand in the *Breach*, and make themselves *a Wall for their Church and Country*; *that cry to God Day and Night, and lie in the Dust mourning before him*, to avert those Judgements that seem to hasten towards us; They search into the Mystery of Iniquity that is working among us, and acquaint themselves with all

That Mass of Corruption that is in Popery. 1

The exasperated Tories could do little but dismiss the Whig hero as a man living in the past, afflicted by the spectres of a deluded imagination. The author of one reply suggested humorously that Burnet had no need to fear the fires of Smithfield, as his ability to draw subtle distinctions between principle and practice, exemplified by his words to James II on passive obedience, was "a political Insurance against Fire."[2] John Dunton and George Ridpath were the Bishop's fellow-watchmen against popery. As for dying for the doctrines he has preached for fifty years, Burnet can hardly do this, as he has preached one set of doctrines for the first twenty five years and another for the last.[3]

Swift followed a similar line in A Preface to the B----p of S---m's Introduction, where he treats Burnet as an ally of Steele, the latest representative of the Whig effort to create imaginary fears, Indeed both writers placed a similar emphasis on emotional protestations of personal sincerity that Swift found offensive. He relegates

---

1 An Introduction to the Third Volume of the History of the Reformation of the Church of England, (2nd ed. 1714), p.71.

2 Speculum Sarisburianum, in remarks on some passages in a pamphlet entituled, An Introduction. etc. (1713), p.33.Burnet had publicised his assurance to James II that subjects would find ways of evading the strict tenets of passive obedience. Of course, he had soon taken this step himself.

3 Ibid, p.77. This refers to Burnet's original preaching of passive obedience in its extreme form, in the Restoration's revival of loyalty. His early sermons were reprinted to remind him of this.

Burnet firmly to the last century; though he expected some support for Steele to appear, he owns himself surprised:

> But I will confess, my Suspicions did not carry me so far, as to conjecture, that this venerable Champion would be in such mightyHaste to come into the Field, and serve in the Quality of an Enfant-perdu, armed only with a Pocket Pistol, before his great Blunderbuss could be got ready, his old rusty Breast-Plate scoured, and his cracked Head-Piece mended. [1]

The Bishop is subjected to Swift's most scathing contempt and ridicule; it is even suggested that what he really wants for his portentous introduction is a half guinea subscription for the third volume. To the charge that there is indifference to the dangers of Popery Swift replies in his most Augustan mood:

> AMONG other Instances produced by him of the dismal Condition we are in, he offers one which could not easily be guessed. It is this, That the little factious Pamphlets written about the End of King Charles II Reign, lie dead in Shops, are looked on as waste Paper, and turned to Pasteboard. How many are there of his Lordship's Writings which could otherwise never have been of any real Service to the Publick? Has he indeed so mean an Opinion of our Taste, to send us at this Time of Day into all the Corners of Holborn, Duck-Lane, and Moorfields, in quest after the factious Trash published in those days by Julian Johnson, Hickeringil, Dr. Oates, and himself? [2]

Swift also replies in detail to Burnet's strictures on the clergy, roused to anger at his implication that the lower clergy are on the point of bringing in Popery because they hanker after the possessions

---

[1] Davis, IV, p.57-58. The title page carried, "By Gregory Misosarum."

[2] Ibid, p.62.

the Church enjoyed before the Reformation. It is hard for a rich bishop to feel the needs of a poor vicar, who may be equally willing to be burned at Smithfield as Burnet. "He hath been poring so long upon Fox's Book of Martyrs, that he imagines himself living in the reign of Queen Mary, and is resolved to set up for a Knight-Errant against Popery".[1] Swift laughs at the readiness of Burnet to die for the cause, and icily points out that his fear that the dangers of Popery are forgotten are groundless:

> WITH due Submission to the profound Sagacity of this Prelate, who can smell Popery at five hundred Miles Distance, better than Fanaticism just under his Nose; I take Leave to tell him, that this Reproof to his Friends for want of Zeal and Clamour against Popery, Slavery, and the Pretender, is what they have not deserved. [2]

(iii) Neck or Nothing

Both replies to Burnet mention John Dunton in connection with him; Swift was later to compare Dunton with Steele and Ridpath as a Whig rabble rouser in The Publick Spirit of the Whigs. Dunton, eccentric bookseller and journalist, had been one of the leaders of Shaftesbury's apprentices in the heated days of the Popish Plot. He had been producing light entertainment in periodical form, but the crisis over the succession brought him back to politics. At about the same time as Burnet's Introduction and the start of the Englishman,

---

[1] Davis, IV, p.80.

[2] Ibid, p.74.

Dunton spoke out more fully than either in Neck or Nothing: In a Letter to the Right Honourable the Lord -----; Being a Supplement to the Short History of Parliament; Written by his Grace, John, Duke of ------. The pamphlet lived up to the promise of its title. Dunton soon quotes from another of his works, The Court Spy, in which Harley is labelled, "the greatest Enemy to your Native Country on this side Hell and the Gallows."[1] With no concealment he attacks the ministers, calling both Harley and Bolingbroke, **"LEUD, DRUNKEN HARRY"**,[2] traitors outright. Like Burnet, happily back in the days of the Plot, Dunton sees himself, "venturing my Life and Fortune, in crying Fire, Fire, Fire, to a Frenchify'd Nation, that's fast asleep in the midst of Flames."[3]

Dunton promises to set the ministers' "Neck Adventures (or secret T-----n)" in a true light. In a wild, uncontrolled style and with a fantastic wit all of his own, he discovers some unexpected sins of Harley:

> 'Tis' generally affirm'd ... that he hath been privately given to those Sins of the Flesh which little (or vulgar) People call Wh---g. I mean, my Lord, that Conjugal Perjury has not been too bitter a Pill for O---- corrupt swallow ... his keeping a Miss at the Nations Expence ... is one of those Sixty Articles of which his IMPEACHMENT consists... [4]

---

[1] Neck or Nothing, p.4-5.

[2] Ibid, p.5.

[3] Ibid, p.5.

[4] Ibid, p.24.

Dunton has to admit this seems unlikely (Harley was known to be an exemplary family man) but reflects that a man who can aid the Pretender is capable of any depravity. As for "Leud Harry" his pleasures are drunkenness and whoredom, and what is more he has danced naked before some unspecified gathering. Dunton asserts that Bolingbroke is a strong candidate for Dunton's Philosophical Madhouse, a book which will prove all the nation mad, with the exception of the Queen and the late ministry. Bolingbroke would do well to read Dunton's Hazard of a Deathbed Repentance as an aid to salvation. In addition Dunton offers to prove that a fool cannot be a Whig, and that there are only six Tories in the kingdom who are not knaves or fools. He ends the pamphlet with tales of a Jacobite conspiracy, supported by letters, all obviously written by himself. Neck or Nothing gained much notoriety for its outspokenness, but is hard to see how anyone could have taken it seriously; Swift enjoyed using it to mock the more sober writers. Defoe wrote to Harley that six thousand had been printed and many sent to Scotland, describing it as "A Continued Rhapsody of Scandal and Raillery".[1]

(iv) The Art of Restoring

The beginning of 1714 saw an intensification of the attacks on the ministry. John Toland had tired of pleading with his old patron for employment and determined to restrain his anger with Harley no

---

[1] Letters of Daniel Defoe, ed. Healey, p.438.

longer. In January 1714 he published The Art of Restoring; or the Piety and Probity of General Monk, in bringing about the last RESTORATION, envinced from his own authentic letters; with a just account of SIR ROGER,[1] who runs the parallel as far as he can; in a letter to a Minister of State at the court of Vienna. Toland had the knowledge to draw a more lifelike picture of Harley than Dunton, and claims that he is out solely to further his own fortunes and for this reason is prepared to humour Jacobite supporters, whom he may intend to drop later. Toland draws a detailed picture of Harley's love of mystification and ambiguity, elaborating on his powers of deception. His promises to maintain the protestant succession mean little to

> ...a man that never spoke a Syllable of direct Truth in this Life, that never made a Promise without a double meaning. Tho his Head is naturally muddy, yet the confusion and ambition of his expressions proceeds as much from Design as from Nature, that he may be bound by nothing; and so, as it may suit his Convenience, be able to slip his Neck out of the Collar, as to all obligations. As for his Promises, therefore and his Protestations, they are sure to be deciev'd who are weak enough to trust to 'em; and so may all of you be as sure, to whom he writes his long canting Letters, of which, when his turn is serv'd, he'll make no manner of account, but sneer and laugh in your faces, insulting you after his bantering way, for being so easily made his Property. [2]

---

[1] This refers to the name given Harley in Arbuthnot's Law is a Bottomless Pit, — Sir Roger Bold.

[2] The Art of Restoring, p.11.

Allowing for Toland's personal grudge against Harley this agrees with other descriptions. Toland fears that the love of power has seduced Harley to prepare the way for the Pretender, and compares him with General Monk in his careful dissimulation of his plans to bring back the Stuart family; Monk's subterfuges are documented from his letters to show how he refused to commit himself to any one course of action. Considering the situation of 1714 this was an ingenious and acute explanation of the first minister's strange conduct; it was more convincing to accuse Harley of humouring Hanoverians and Jacobites at once than to say he was a Jacobite on principle. The danger of such conduct in the face of a disputed succession was obvious. Even some of Harley's own supporters felt that he should resign and dissociate himself from the Jacobite wing of the party.

(v) The Crisis

On January 19, 1714, Steele made the next move in the Whig campaign, publishing *The Crisis: or, a Discourse representing, from the most authentic Records, the just Causes of the late happy Revolution: and the several Settlements of the Crowns of England and Scotland on Her Majesty; and on the Demise of her Majesty without Issue, upon the Most Illustrious Princess Sophia, Electress and Dutchess Dowager of Hanover and the Heirs of her Body being Protestants; ... With some seasonable Remarks on the danger of a Popish Successor*. This pamphlet had been compiled with the help of William Moore, a lawyer friend, and

corrected by such notables as Addison, Lechmere and Hoadly.[1] It was published by subscription, heavily supported by the leaders of the Whigs, and even by Bothmar, the representative of the Elector of Hanover.[2]

The Crisis is dedicated, not without irony, to the clergy of of the Church of England:

> Give me Leave, who have in all my Words and Actions, from my Youth upwards, maintained an inviolable Respect to you and your Order, to observe to you, that all the Dissatisfactions which have been raised in the Minds of the People, owe their Rise to the Cunning of artful Men, who have introduced the Mention of you and your Interest, (which are sacred to all good Men) to cover and sanctify their own Practices upon the Affections of the People, for Ends very different from the Promotion of Religion and Virtue. Give me Leave also to take Notice, That these Suggestions have been favoured by some few unwary Men in Holy Orders, who have made the Constitution of their own Country a very little Part of their Study, and yet made Obedience and Government the frequent Subjects of their Discourses. [3]

As in the Englishman, Steele wishes to avoid giving any appearance of threatening the privileged position of the Church of England, and insinuates the Whig fear of the lower clergy's extremism without letting slip the mask of respect. The clergy have immense influence; Steele is confident it will be used on the side of the constitution. He reminds the clergy that they have sworn an oath to maintain the succession

---

[1] Mr. Steele's Apology, 1714. Tracts and Pamphlets, p.286.

[2] Ehrenpreis, Swift, Vol. II, p.697.

[3] Tracts and Pamphlets, p.129-130.

in the House of Hanover, and insinuates that unscrupulous politicians are using their zeal for the Church as a screen for bringing back the Pretender, and with him Popery. It is quite clear that he intends the ministry to be understood.

The main body of the pamphlet consists of a recital of all the Acts of Parliament which confirmed the Revolution settlement and the Hanover succession. Ehrenpreis has remarked: "As a controversialist Steele was chronically addicted to padding and was undersupplied with thought. Declamation, not analysis, was his strength."[1] The declamation follows the quotations; Steele praises Marlborough fulsomely for his successful conduct of the war, and laments that his fall and the subsequent peace which has left France so powerful in Europe that she will be able to impose the Pretender on Britain. At home this danger is neglected and Jacobite propaganda is rife. Steele cites a sheet entitled _Queries Relative to the Birth and Birthright of a Certain Person_ (1712), and the works of Harbin and Swift:[2] "The Author of the Conduct of the Allies has dared to drop Insinuations about altering the Succession; and a late Treasonable Book, on the Subject of _Hereditary Right_, has published the Will of King _Henry_ the Eighth, which

---

[1] _Swift_, Vol. II, p.699.

[2] The _Queries_ were the work of George Hickes. In fact there seems to have been a pitifully small amount of Jacobite propaganda in comparison with the party efforts, but what there was naturally received disproportionate attention. There were a few pamphlets in 1712, and a new crop later in 1714, including some by Charles Leslie.

seems to be intended as a Pattern for the like Occasion."[1] Steele revives tales of massacres of protestants to warn England what must be expected from the Pretender. The Hanover succession is the only bar to these horrors, and its supporters can rely on having the laws and the vast majority of the people on their side. Steele hints broadly who the friends to the Pretender are; they cannot move a step further without moving into the open as confessed traitors:

> When the People were in a ferment, when Faction ran high, with irresistible Prepossessions against every thing in its former Channel, sanguine Men might conceive Hopes of leading them their own way. But the Building erected upon that Quicksand, the Favour of the Multitude, will sink, and be swallowed up by that treacherous Ground on which the Foundation was laid. [2]

Rising to new heights, Steele appeals for action to save the country from her desperate plight: "Whatever may befall the Glory and Wealth of Great Britain, let us struggle to the last Drop of our Blood for its Religion and Liberty."[3] This alarmist pamphlet ends with an assurance of God's support for the Hanover succession.

A month later, on February 15 1714, Steele closed the *Englishman* with an issue in the form of a quarto pamphlet, in which he defended himself generally against his critics, particularly the *Examiner*, which had kept up a steady attack on him. The earlier part gives a list of

---

[1] *Tracts and Pamphlets*, p.176.

[2] *Tracts and Pamphlets*, p.180.

[3] *Ibid*, p.180.

Whig grievances, a short discussion of the pamphlets written on Dunkirk, and a long denunciation of the Examiner's charges that the Whigs had, on the illness of the Queen, circulated rumours of the Pretender's return in order to cause a fall in stocks and precipitate a crisis.

The conclusion of this work, a letter to an unnamed courtier acquaintance at Windsor (could Steele mean Swift?) marks a new departure in Steele's signed journalism. Here he openly jeers at Harley and Bolingbroke's Toryism, calling them "new converts" in derision of their Presbyterian background. The moderate Toryism, the alliance of Tories and Old Whigs that Swift had propounded in 1710 in the _Examiner_, is held up as a laughing-stock. The ministers are neither honest Whigs or Tories, and pursue only their own interest: "Thus from the good Skill of the new Converts, and the Indulgence which the Clergy are pleased to give them as Babes of Grace, both Parties occasionally play'd off, and their Noddles knocked against each other, when either pretends to be sawcy."[1] Steele is trying to exploit the divisions of the Tory party; he remarks that the ministers have been only too pleased to vilify good Churchmen who have disagreed with them, hinting at Nottingham. The High Churchmen have been deliberately kept out of preferments, and even now do not hold the vital offices. Steel throws discretion to the winds in his insults:

---

[1] _Tracts and Pamphlets_, p.210.

> YOU must know the new Converts are to me the very pleasantest Fellows that ever this Nation produced. Tho' there is no such thing professed in our Church as a downright Indulgence in any written Form, yet all thinking Men agree they have a plenary Indulgence virtually given, received, and understood, by which they may in any thing that does not impeach or waste the Power of the Church, promise and disappoint, say and unsay, swear and forswear, lie and betray, (besides gratifying the natural Demands of the Flesh and Blood by way of Whoring and Drinking) without the least Damage to their Sanctity, or reputation as Lay-Brothers. [1]

Steele suggests that the person he addresses is prepared to sacrifice his sovereign and his people by favouring the new converts. He gives three demands, which must be met to satisfy him; that Dunkirk should be demolished; that the Pretender should be removed from Lorraine; and that the Elector of Hanover should signify his satisfaction with the attitude of the English government. Steele had the advantage of knowing that the last two, at least, were outside the ministry's control.

C. The Tory Reply

(i) The Publick Spirit of the Whigs

Events were moving Steele's and the Whig's way, but Swift made a last attempt to disable both of Steele's pamphlets in The Publick Spirit of the Whigs: Set forth in their Generous Encouragement of the Author of the Crisis: with some Observations on the Seasonableness,

---

[1] Ibid, p.210-211.

Candor, Erudition, and Style of that Treatise, published on February 23, 1714. With the Tory party split and without a positive programme, all he could do was to voice his contempt for Steele, defend the peace, and accuse the Whigs of raising totally ungrounded fears about succession. He compares Steele with mock seriousness to the exiled Ridpath and to Dunton, allowing Neck or Nothing "to be the shrewdest Piece, and written with the most Spirit of any which hath appeared from that Side since the Change of the Ministry."[1] Swift admires the generosity of the Whigs in subscribing for The Crisis, employing a fund-raising method normally only used for expensive major works; its reputed popularity is a credit to party fervour rather than people's desire to read Steele's extracts.

Steele has learnt from Burnet the art of insinuation, of making grave accusations under a pretence of warning those accused. He too insults the clergy with his epistle to them, taxing them with inflaming the people against the Whigs under the pretence of the Church's danger. Does not Steele exert himself to inflame the people against the present ministry? Swift will have none of Steele's politeness, and exposes his technique with some of his most scathing irony:

> I WILL upon Occasion, strip some of his Insinuations from their Generality and Solecisms, and drag them into the Light. This Dedication to the Clergy is full of them, because here he endeavours to mold up his Rancor and Civility together; by which

---

[1] Political Tracts, p.32. 1713-19.

> Constraint, he is obliged to shorten his Paragraphs, and to place them in such a Light, that they obscure one another. Supposing therefore that I have scraped off his good Manners, in order to come at his Meaning which lies under; he tells the Clergy, that the Favour of the QUEEN and her Ministers, is but a Colour of Zeal towards them: That, the People were deluded by a groundless Cry of the Church's Danger at Sacheverell's Tryal; that the Clergy, as they are Men of Sense and Honour, ought to preach this Truth to their several Congregations; and let them know, that the true Design of the present Men in Power in that and all their Proceedings since, in Favour of the Church, was to bring in Popery, France and the Pretender, and to enslave all Europe, contrary to the Laws of our Country, the Power of the Legislature, the Faith of Nations, and the Honour of God. [1]

Swift's method is to expose Steele's meaning so that it can be quickly dismissed, and to concentrate on why such charges are made, portraying *The Crisis* as deliberate and dishonest scaremongering.

Swift deals with the last *Englishman's* satire of the new converts in a few words; that the ministers are Churchmen after a dissenting education is to their credit rather than disgraceful. He knew better than Steele the divisions in the party and the disastrous ambiguous manner of Harley, that frequently exasperated the faithful Dean. Steele had hit a vital spot, which Swift did not dare discuss until *Some Free Thoughts upon the Present State of Affairs*, when the situation was too bad to conceal. Swift concentrated on ridicule of *The Crisis*, savaging its style and content with repeated quotation and comment. It is a credit to Swift's creative power that he can make this often

---

[1] *Political Tracts*, p.39.

dull method fascinating, building up his own picture of the Whig party and their methods as he banters and answers his opponent. His unfortunate mistake was to allow himself to express his contempt for the Scots lords who had not backed the ministry. This he did with such violence that he gave the Whigs a handle by which to condemn the pamphlet later in the Lords.

Swift defends the peace in his usual manner, and does his best with Dunkirk, promising it will soon be completely demolished. France is far from dominating Europe as Steele has asserted, and can impose nothing on Britain. As for Jacobite pamphlets, Swift points out that the Nonjuror responsible for publishing _The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted_ is already "starving and rotting among Thieves and Pickpockets, in the common Room of a stinking Jail."[1] As in his reply to Burnet, Swift allows his sympathy for the Nonjurors as persons to show in defiance of the Whig attack on them. Such touches show Swift's personal anger beneath the show of lofty contempt. On the subject of the succession, he calls Steele himself to witness that a vast majority of the nation are in favour of Hanover, and that many laws bind the country to their right;

> This is a _Security_ indeed, a _Security_ adequate at least to the Importance of the _Thing_; and yet, according to the Whig-Scheme, as delivered to us by Mr. _Steele_, and his Coadjutators, is altogether insufficient; and the Succession will be defeated,

---

[1] _Political Tracts_, p.65.

> the Pretender brought in, and Popery established among us, without the farther Assistance of this Writer and his Faction.
>
> And what Securities have our Adversaries substituted in the Place of these? A Club of Politicians, where Jenny Man presides; A Crisis written by Mr. Steele; a confederacy of knavish Stock-Jobbers to ruin Credit; a Report of the QUEEN's Death; an Effigies of the Pretender run twice through the Body by a valiant Peer: A Speech by the Author of the Crisis: And to sum up all, an unlimited Freedom of reviling her Majesty, and those she employs. [1]

As for Steele's three final points in the last Englishman Swift claims the first two will soon be satisfied. The last affords him an opportunity of representing Steele as saying that the Queen lies in her assurances that she enjoys a perfect understanding with Hanover; with the last question of whether one capable of such monstrous ingratitude can be a "human creature" Swift ends the pamphlet. In The Publick Spirit of the Whigs ridicule to some extent takes the place of argument. The situation had gone beyond the point where Swift could have stemmed the tide, and he was forced on the defensive, unable to push any positive programme. Behind the superb pretence of unconcern one can sense his anger and disillusion.

(ii) Defoe on the Succession

The rising tension of the succession controversy brought more bitterness to the writings of both parties. At no time in the last four years of Queen Anne's reign had hostility been more pronounced;

---

[1] Political Tracts, p.66.

both sides believed implicitly in the justice of their attitudes; many Whigs felt certain there was a conspiracy to bring in the Pretender, while such Tories as Swift, firmly for Hanover, could not help regarding such suspicions of the ministry as unprincipled scaremongering. The quarrel of Swift and Steele shows how party feeling could destroy friendship; it seemed so significant of the time that other writers made it a subject of discussion.[1] Defoe was the only major political writer who at least partly retained his sense of perspective and refused to join the zealots of either party.

Defoe was still firmly attached to the interest of Harley, but like his patron he found himself isolated more and more from the high Tories. Defoe had always taken an absolute and enthusiastic stand for the Hanover succession; this was one subject he never equivocated over. In the latter part of 1713 he attacked the Jacobites in two pamphlets.[2] His reward was to be prosecuted, outrageously, for writing in favour of the Pretender on the strength of the pamphlets' ironic technique. Not even the most blatant irony, such as the blessings of wooden shoes that the Pretender was to bring the English, could save Defoe from the malice of a private prosecution and a Whig judge. Harley was obliged to have Defoe given a free pardon by the Queen. The Whigs

---

[1] See Goldgar, Curse of Party.

[2] Reasons Against the House of Hanover. What if the Pretender should come. Defoe explained the ironic titles as intended to attract genuine Jacobites. (An Appeal to Honour and Justice, Boulton, op.cit. pp.179-183).

rejoiced at having demonstrated that Defoe had ministerial backing for all his boasted independence, and even cited his pardon as an instance of the ministry's favour to Jacobites. This accusation was made in a pamphlet entitled, Judas Discovered and Catch'd at last, or Daniel Defoe in Lobbs Pound (1713).

Late in 1713 Defoe had tried to remodel his moderate line of argument to aid Harley against the Whig emphasis on the Pretender. In Whigs turn'd Tories, and Hanoverian Tories, from their Avow'd Principles, prov'd Whigs: Or, Each Side in the Other Mistaken. Being A plain Proof, that each Party deny that Charge which the other bring against them: And that neither Side will disown those principles, which the other profess, Defoe conducted a lengthy discussion of party and principles. Following the path of Swift and the moderate Tories of 1710 Defoe sets out to prove that both parties really hold the same principles. He draws the picture of a Tory who supports Hanover, and follows it with a Whig version of a Tory, who, naturally, is a Jacobite. He divides the Tory party into Jacobite Tories and Hanover Tories, who are in the vast majority: "I am Morally sure, more than five Parts in Six of all those Protestants call'd Tories are Intentionally against the Pretender."[1] His Whig is a Churchman and no republican, holding identical views as the Hanover Tory but with a different emphasis. Party conflict is thus a result of misunderstanding, and is fomented by

---

[1] Whigs turn'd Tories, p.22.

the Jacobites, who pretend to agree with the Tories, but really intend to destroy the "honest" ones if they obtain power. It is these people who foment both the fear of the danger of the Church and that of the ministry being Jacobite. This strange mixture of insight and unreality was no more appealing in 1713 than it had been in 1711.

Early in 1714 Defoe made another attempt to moderate party heats, A View of the Real Danger of the Protestant Succession. Here Defoe admits that the peace has occasioned the present distrust of the ministry, and argues that now the Treaty has been published this distrust can be seen to be unjustified. He offers to show by an impartial examination of the provisions concerning the succession that no more could have been done to secure to the House of Hanover. The fortifications of Dunkirk have been demolished, and Louis has been forced to disown the Pretender and dismiss him from France. Defoe argues carefully that there are no other securities that France could have given; the Jacobites themselves are disappointed at the peace. Discontent over these provisions has been artificially whipped up even before they were known, and should evaporate now they can be seen. Defoe argues that the emphasis on French security for not aiding the Pretender is misplaced; it is on the attitude of the British themselves that the succession really depends. It is well known that Louis XIV cannot be trusted, but if the British do now want the Pretender no country has the power to impose him on them. Paradoxically those who evidence the Treaty as helping the Pretender actually

weaken the succession by belittling our own all important role in deciding it. This sober and reasonable attempt to examine the peace and the succession fairly on their own merits also attracted neither Whigs nor Tories.

Defoe tried yet again in more aggressive mood, in <u>A Letter to the Whigs, Expostulating with them upon Their Present Conduct: Wherein, the Grounds and Reasons of the Present Alarm about the Pretender are Enquir'd into, Examin'd, and Impartially Stated</u>. Defoe intends this letter for the "Hot Whigs", "Those Whigs who being violently Embark'd in the present Party Heats, between New and Old Ministry, carry on the Breach to that Irreconcilable Dreadful Height which we now see it is brought to."[1] These Whigs want the complete destruction of the ministers. Defoe laments that to play moderator in such a clash is inviting trouble, but he feels compelled to point out that by this violence the Whigs justify any measures taken against them, and hazard their country in the conflict. All the Whigs hold against the present ministers, despite their scaremongering, is that they have supplanted the previous ministry. As for libels, both sides are guilty, but hardly equally:

> Has any thing, that ever the opposite Party either Said or Printed, upon the whole Body of the Late Ministry, come up to the Language you give the Present Ministry in your common Discourse? Have any of the Libels and Pamphlets, Printed by either

---

[1] <u>A Letter to the Whigs</u>, p.3.

> the *Examiner*, or even Abel himself, come up to the Ambassadresses Speech, *Neck or Nothing*, and the multitude of insolencies in the *Flying Post* upon the present Ministry; and not only so, but even the Person and Actions of the Queen herself. [1]

It comes badly to the Whigs to blame the Tories for what they practise themselves.

Defoe calls upon the Whigs to produce hard evidence of the ministry's alleged treachery, and is confident they cannot do so; the *Englishman* has not cited one tyrannous act to justify his insinuations. Defoe reminds his readers that the ministers are only responsible for the legality, not the expediency of what they do, so that the mere opinion that the peace is a bad one, in the face of Parliamentary approval of it, is no evidence of their guilt. What the Whigs really hope for is popular clamour, in order to embarrass the government. They are trying hard to whip up fears of the succession that they cannot possibly believe themselves: "What sometimes you say on that Head, is so disconcerted, and so Irrational, as well as unjust, that it is impossible but it must shock you."[2] Defoe continues:

> Hitherto this is founded only in Clamour, and it is well known to your selves, that this Clamour, is not Artfully Raised, is Artfully Spread just like that of the Queen's death, to Alarm the People,

---

[1] *Ibid*, p.13. *The Ambassadress's* Speech was a short poem vilifying the peace, which Ridpath fled to Holland rather than face trial over in April, 1713.

[2] *A Letter to the Whigs*, p.32.

> Terrify them with Apprehensions, and Awaken
> them to Tumult and Sedition. [1]

The successor himself may possibly not like the Whigs' attempt to monopolise the credit for his succession, alienate half at least of his subjects from him and use him in their domestic broils.

This gallant effort on Defoe's part is earnest and forcefully argued, though a trifle over-lachrymose in the complaints of the Whigs' duplicity. Defoe's pose of the honest man distressed by party hostility had truth in it, but is perhaps too aggressively thrust forward in this pamphlet; like Steele's professions of disinterest, it encourages questioning. Defoe's ideas on the situation were acute and full of commonsense, but he could make little impact against each party's determination to monopolise power and destroy the other. Defoe's version of events was remodelled in his "White Staff" pamphlets published after the Queen's death to vindicate Harley and blame Bolingbroke for leading the extremists towards Jacobitism and challenging the first minister. Until this Defoe seems to have confined his attention to specific issues like the Schism Bill.

(iii) The Tory Collapse

The Whigs were determined to bring all the Tory ministers down together, and had no intention of allowing blame to be placed on Bolingbroke alone. Harley had belatedly moved towards Hanover, securing

---

[1] Ibid, p.33.

votes of money to pay Hanoverian troops, informing the Elector of Marlborough's commerce with the Pretender and trying to negotiate with the Whigs. There was a faint possibility that the able Harley might escape from the sinking ministry. The writer of The Grand Mystery Laid Open (1714) dismissed the rift between the two ministers as merely politic, or at the most a disagreement about the way the Pretender should be brought in. Swift, torn between allegiance to the person of Harley and policies of Bolingbroke, admitted the failure of his attempts to reconcile them and retired to Letcombe to avoid the painful spectacle. He realised the futility of controversy while the Tory leaders devoted more attention to their struggle with each other than to the Whigs. His last pamphlet, Some Free Thoughts on the Present State of Affairs, advised his friends to close the breach, demonstrate their firm support for Hanover, and move the Tory party into all places of power. The pamphlet was never published, coming into the hands of Bolingbroke, who held it up on account of some strictures on his behaviour to Harley. Swift was irritated by this, and the incident helped his final decision not to throw his weight in with Bolingbroke; he offered to visit Harley in the country on his dismissal. On June 16, he jested bitterly to Arbuthnot on the situation; "Your Ministry is fourscore and ten years old, and all you can endeavour at is an Euthanasia."[1]

---

[1] Correspondence of Jonathan Swift, ed. Williams, II, p.36.

The Whigs enjoyed success after success in Parliament and in the press. Steele, dismissed from the Commons for his pamphlets in March but high in Whig favour, satirised Harley and his relations in a highly personal and vindictive manner in his new periodical, the Lover. On April, 22 he brought out another new political paper, the Reader, to reply to the Examiner and to publicise the Whig Parliamentary programme. It was published under the influence of Walpole and Stanhope,[1] and lasted for nine numbers. In Parliament the principal success was a move to invite the Elector of Hanover's son to take his seat in the House of Lords as Duke of Cambridge. Queen Anne hated the thought of a Hanoverian resident in England and would obviously not consent. The object of the exercise was to force the ministers to support the measure and alienate the Queen, or temporise and incur the suspicion of favouring the Pretender. The Whigs made the most of the ministry's embarrassment; Toland celebrated the occasion with The Reasons and Necessity of the Duke of Cambridge's coming to and residing in Great Britain. A Jacobite pamphlet from Charles Leslie helped the Whigs to foment what was fast becoming a general feeling of disquiet.[2]

At this point the internal quarrel of the Tory leaders complicated the situation. Bolingbroke was fast gaining influence over

---

[1] Richard Steele's Periodical Journalism 1714-16. ed. Rae Blanchard, (Oxford 1959) Preface, p.xvii-xviii.

[2] Mr. Lesley's Letter to a Member of Parliament (1714)

Queen Anne, and he had secured the services of Abigail Masham from his rival. He pursued the policy of filling all places he could, in the state and,, more important, the army, with Tory sympathisers whose loyalty he could rely on. Some were Jacobites, which did nothing to restore confidence. In an effort to reunite all Tories behind himself and undermine Harley Bolingbroke chose to introduce a Schism Bill, which prohibited the dissenting academies, which the high-flyers had long wanted to destroy. This revived just the extremism that Harley had so carefully avoided, and threatened to destroy organised dissent. Even Swift's Churchmanship did not extend to approve the measure,[1] and Nottingham to his credit stood out against it. Bolingbroke hoped that Harley's dislike of the Bill would ruin him with the Tories, but the minister, with visible discontent restrained himself to moderating the bill. The measure passed at the cost of alienating moderate opinion, including the Elector, who was a Lutheran. Propaganda both for and against the Bill gave it wide publicity; both Defoe and Steele wrote pamphlets opposing it.

Only after Parliament had been adjourned did Bolingbroke dare have his rival removed, having a healthy respect for his command of the Houses. Harley, who had retaliated for the Schism Bill by revealing details of Bolingbroke's corrupt management of government funds, made further damaging and specific allegations, forshadowing his later

---

[1] Swift's Correspondence, ed. Williams, II, 83.

clever shifting of all guilt on his partner. Two days after Harley's dismissal Queen Anne died. The machinery for installing the Elector, oiled by Shrewsbury and the Whig privy councillors, worked smoothly. Bolingbroke had not planned for bringing in the Pretender and the Queen's death robbed him of the opportunity to try the fortune of a new election of Parliamentary session. He and Harley were soon impeached, and his departure for France beforehand helped to persuade the nation of his guilt. Harley, with the phlegmatic courage that was one of his characteristics, decided to stand trial and was eventually acquitted, but was effectively removed from politics. The Whigs established their supremacy firmly on the basis of their earlier propaganda, a burst of pamphleteering greeting the new reign. Despite its hold on the country the Tory party of Harley and Bolingbroke never returned to power.

D. Conclusion

Several characteristics that I noted in the political journalism of the Exclusion Crisis can be found further developed in that of the last four years of Queen Anne. The connection between party and the press had become closer and more regular, so that even more than before the writer's role was to explain and justify party policy. The importance of the press to politicians and the rewards they were prepared to give for useful service, attracted varied and talented writers to political journalism. The result of this, and of the regular supply

of news and comment was an increase in the standard of argument. Most writers preserved a manner of detachment, and were prepared to argue their views at a surprisingly high level. The audience of Parliament men, gentry, freeholders and London merchants and tradesmen, was politically aware and well-informed, and demanded a more subtle and critical journalism than in the heated days of Exclusion.

The uncertainty surrounding party itself gave the cleverest controversialists room for manoeuvre. While the existence of two parties in Anne's reign could hardly be denied, no political theory recognised this as anything other than a disaster. Each party claimed it represented almost the whole nation, and that the other was a mere faction, maintained to satisfy the self interest of a few groups. This situation rendered conflicting claims of misrepresentation only less important than in the Exclusion Crisis. The danger to the Church was balanced by the fear of the Pretender in many Tory and Whig pamphlets respectively. However these simple attitudes were frequently criticised and more subtle views of the nation's politics put in their place, as in Faults on Both Sides. Martin Price throws an interesting light on this point:

> Traditional loyalties were still powerful and could be invoked to win men to a cause. But they were claimed by opposing sides and used as sanctions for hostile interests. The conflicts of the age were at least in part a competition for these sanctions. As a result there arose a profoundly critical view of the uses to which sanctifying terms were put. [1]

---

[1] Swift's Rhetorical Art, (New Haven, 1953), p.l.

One of the finest examples of a critical examination of sanctifying terms is Swift's discussion of party in the Examiner, but the technique is widespread in the controversy of 1710-1714. One writer went so far as to assert; "...most Controversies are merely about Words."[1]

Another major development continued from the Exclusion Crisis was the growth of a simple, easily comprehensible style, which in 1710-1714 can be found in the work of the vast majority of writers. The prevalence of criticism of style and grammar shows the importance attached to correctness. The prose of the man of letters was the accepted mode in pamphleteering as in letters, and general practice came commendably near the ideal. Defoe's direct and natural prose, developed from that of his puritan predecessors to new economy and control, is now recognised as at least the equal of that of Steele, who enjoyed a literary prestige denied to Defoe. However the most striking exponent of the Augustan virtues of clarity and order was Swift, whose style can contain the most brilliant effects without losing its surface ease and simplicity.

The men of letters made an all-important contribution to political journalism in 1710-1714. Swift used his literary and controversial ability to take advantage of the uncertain situation of party that I have mentioned and create a moderate Toryism to unite Harley's supporters. He also showed in The Conduct of the Allies what

---

[1] The Mischief of Prejudice, (1710), p.5.

art could be concealed in an apparently straightforward argument. Defoe attempted to provide a moderate justification of Harley's ministry from a more Whig viewpoint, though his credibility was sometimes strained by trying to reconcile divided Loyalties. At his best his clarity, zest for argument and his ability to give an impression of a true moderate between the extremists, made his pamphlets outstanding. Steele revived an old precedent by using his own name to give credit to his work, though his naive self-glorification detracts from the courage of his gesture. In the *Englishman* he created a moderate Whig position that owed much to the example of Swift and Defoe.

The men of letters also participated with distinction in a revival of satire and irony in political controversy. Swift was important here, with his love of the persona and the literary device. Arbuthnot, Steele, Addison and William King all contributed to the revival. I have discussed some of their efforts, but have preferred to concentrate on the central productions of political journalism rather than attempt a comprehensive treatment of its satiric techniques.

It was due to the participation of the men of letters that the years 1710-1714 can be said to have marked the zenith of a brief period when literature and political journalism can hardly be separated.

CONCLUSION

As I have written a conclusion to each chapter, I shall be brief here. Initially the urge to discuss politics publicly came from those seeking reformation of the Church; only the organisation of the Elizabethan Presbyterians could support a press campaign. Martin Marprelate gave a new slant to puritan pamphleteering by using his considerable literary talents to obtain notice for himself and for the Presbyterian position, creating an extraordinary, dramatic character who indulged in infectious satire of the bishops. Martin Marprelate's writings were "popular" in a way very few had been before him, and the spontaneity of his humour gave his views new attractiveness. In his attempt to reach a widespread audience by catching and holding their interest, Marprelate was the precursor of a great age of political journalism.

In the unprecedented expansion of political writing of the Civil War, the Leveller pamphleteers made perhaps the most striking use of the press, appealing to their readers to identify with them and join their party in working for reform. Lilburne pioneered a way of discussing political issues in terms of his own life and personality, making his clashes with authority test cases for the people's rights, and recounting them in his pamphlets. His sure knowledge of his audience,

his ability to recreate his experiences in print and above all the appearance of energetic, dedicated commitment that he gave, made him one of the best known figures of the Civil War. Walwyn also made character the centre of his argument, though in a manner entirely different from Lilburne's. Walwyn personified the calm, tolerance and reason that he urged on his readers, and he preferred to invite them to choose between this and the portrait he painted of his opponents' personality rather than to argue in the abstract. Overton continued the satiric tradition of Marprelate, also creating a fictional personality which generated its own drama to secure attention. Overton was a more sophisticated writer than Lilburne, sometimes writing under his own name, but equally at ease as Marpriest or as the spokesman of the Commons of England. Overton's irony, bite and control make him a worthy successor to Marprelate.

Milton's early pamphlets against the bishops were even more stamped with an individual personality, more highly coloured and more powerfully written than those of the Levellers, but they made little impact on the political scene; Milton had not the Levellers' feeling for their audience, and his work remained largely personal in its relevance. Later, when he wrote for the Commonwealth government, he modified his style and attitude to suit the task in hand. His later pamphlets, however, did not cease to carry the liveliest impression of his character, and the pressure that he could infuse into an argument through his ordered structure and verbal power was unequalled.

After the Restoration the press became an adjunct of party in the Parliament, and the pamphleteering of the Exclusion Crisis is important more from the point of view of the development of the press than for its intrinsic quality. The work of the Exclusion writers has a superficial sophistication that paradoxically co-exists with its often crude emotional content. Marprelate, the Levellers and Milton all had a religious earnestness, which they might have called "conscience"; the heat and violence of the Exclusion writers cannot compensate for their lack of this quality. They were competent rather than brilliant; Ferguson possessed the ability to present an argument persuasively; L'Estrange could enliven his work with dialogue and create characters to enact satirically his political message, and he had a gift for the colloquial phrase. L'Estrange often wrote in his own person and played on his reputation for cavalier loyalty, but did so without the imagination of the Levellers; indeed the monotony of his reference to the Civil War does much to mar the real liveliness of his writing.

In the last four years of Queen Anne the press had become a regular part of political life, the concern of major Whig and Tory politicians. This was the great age of the man of letters in pamphleteering, and its most striking product was Swift, who showed his controversial ability in satire and straightforward argument. He did not admit to his work, but it always gave the impression of having been written by a strong and individual personality, sometimes amounting

to a persona, as in the Examiner; this helped give his writing its unusual bite and pressure. Defoe was at his best in straightforward argument, which he handled with great confidence, breadth of reasoning and control. He could maintain the movement of his argument while discussing all possible points for and against it, which suited his avowed character of an impartial man surrounded by partisans, prepared to answer their fury with cool reason. In the Review he took this character under his own name, but in his pamphlets he found freedom for his defence of Harley in anonymity, building an impression of a moderate afresh in each work. Sometimes the tone in which Defoe presented himself has something in common with that of the puritans of the Civil War, though in a muted and cautious form, reminiscent of Lilburne's agressive self-demonstration and Walwyn's rationality. In this period Steele made the most deliberate use of his own name, status and motives, enlarging on his virtue with the ostentation of a man of sentiment. His competence serves to highlight his lack of the zest for argument that made Swift and Defoe his superiors as pamphleteers. All three, and especially Defoe, had a thorough knowledge of the political situation and used this to make more subtle and intelligent appeals to their readers than the writers of the Exclusion Crisis.

Throughout the period I have covered, a simple and readable prose style was used in pamphlets intended to reach a wide audience. During Elizabeth I's reigh this was not the style of the literary wits,

who favoured more ornate prose. During the seventeenth century, aided by the journalism of the Civil War, in many cases extremely direct and close to the rhythms of speech, a simpler prose style spread until, in a more controlled and polished version, it became the accepted style of the educated classes. When in the early eighteenth century the men of letters turned political journalists, their ideal of ease and clarity was admirably suited to their new purpose, and their prose was accepted as a model for political writing.

I hope that a picture of the qualities of a good pamphleteer has emerged from my discussion of such a varied selection of writers. The best pamphleteers had a solid grasp of the political situation they had to deal with, and strong views of their own to convey to their readers. After this, perhaps the most important quality was the ability to convey an impression of individual personality, of a voice speaking with urgency and compulsion. I have quoted Irvin Ehrenpreis in this context; "What Swift possessed, I think, was a dramatic immediacy, a force of presence, a voice addressing us particularly ... Swift seems to be talking directly from his own self to that of each separate reader."[1] This personality can be the writer's own, as in the case of Lilburne, or a literary creation, as in that of Martin Marprelate. Swift could create different personae for his different purposes as well as using his natural sardonic manner.

---

[1] Swift, II, 500.

Another quality that the best pamphleteers combined with this insistence of tone was a zest for controversy, an ability to present an argument in the most persuasive manner, so as to compel the neutral reader to accept it. This can be seen in the work of many of the writers I have mentioned, particularly Defoe, Swift and Milton, who could on occasion endow an argument with a dynamic thrust that makes their pamphlets stand out from those of all other writers I have dealt with.

The contribution of the men of letters to political journalism was one of quality rather than of kind; they had to adapt their talents to exploit fully the possibilities of the medium. They often possessed the two qualities I have just mentioned in the highest degree, and were prominent in the field of political satire, another important aspect of pamphleteering. Martin Marprelate was the initiator of the serious use of ridicule in political writing, and the line ran through Nash, Overton, L'Estrange and Marvell to Swift and the Augustan wits. This I have dealt with in passing, but it deserves a separate and major treatment.

I hope that this thesis has shown that, to be properly appreciated, the political journalism of this period demands consideration as a genre in its own right, and any assessment of its literary quality must take fully into account the aims and circumstances in which it was written.

APPENDIX A

In the early chapters of this thesis it has been easy to incorporate the very limited information about the number of pamphlets published into the text and footnotes. For the reign of Queen Anne many more facts are available, and I should like to establish a rough idea of the number of newspapers, periodicals and pamphlets then published. Most figures concern the two former categories. In 1704 an informer to the Treasury gave this account of the number of copies of each issue of the most prominent papers. Apart from the one daily and the twice weekly Review and Observator, all were published three times a week. The following table has been simplified to show average figures for one issue of each paper.

Paper	Copies	Paper	Copies
Daily Courant	800	London Post	400
English Post	400	London Gazette	6,000
Flying Post	400	Observator	1,000
Post Boy	3,000	Postman	3,800
Review	400	(and 4000 on Saturdays)	

The total weekly circulation is estimated at 43,800.[1] Apart from the periodicals, all these papers concentrated on foreign news and contained no comment, though occasionally they would favour a party by the selection,

---

[1] James Sutherland, "The Circulation of Newspapers and Literary Periodicals 1700-1730," The Library, Fourth Series, XV (1934-35), 111.

slanting or even faking of news. The high figure of the London Gazette is partly due to its official character, partly to the number given away, up to a thousand; in June 1710 8,500 copies of each issue were being printed, and about 5,500 of these sold.[1] The Review had only just started, and must have increased its circulation later.

The last four years of Anne's reign saw an increase in the numbers of different papers published, though there are few figures for the numbers of each issue. In 1711 Defoe put the total weekly circulation at 200,000, but he must have exaggerated;[2] W.L. Payne suggests about half this figure.[3] In the case of all these figures it should be remembered that more people read the papers than could afford to buy them; the coffee houses took in a large selection for their customers, and Addison calculated that twenty people might read one copy of the Spectator.[4] In 1710 two important political periodicals were published, the Examiner[5] and the Medley. A third, the Moderator, lasted only for fifty numbers. The year 1712, saw at least three more such papers, two new Medleys and the Plaindealer, none of

---

[1] James Sutherland, "The Circulation of Newspapers and Literary Periodicals 1700-1730", The Library, Fourth Series, XV (1934-35), 113.

[2] Preface to the Seventh Volume of the Review.

[3] William Lytton Payne, Mr. Review, Daniel Defoe as Author of the Review (New York, 1947) p.43.

[4] The Spectator, Vol. I, No.10. (March 12, 1711).

[5] Michael Foot guesses at 5,000 copies an issue for the Examiner, (The Pen and the Sword, London, 1967, p.155.)

which survived the Stamp Tax. While the newspapers were not greatly affected by this, the periodicals were drastically reduced, the Observator being discontinued as well as the three already mentioned. The Spectator, according to Steele still sold 1,600 or so copies daily, despite its doubled price.[1] The Review reduced its size and the frequency of its issues. Despite the tax, the Mercator and the British Merchant were published in 1713, and Steele produced his succession of political and semi-political periodicals in the same and the following year. In 1714 there were also published the Patriot, the Monitor and the High German Doctor.

The pamphlet controversies of the last four years are frequently mentioned, but there has been only one determined effort to catalogue them, that of W.T. Morgan in his Bibliography of British History, 1700-1715.[2] Considering the difficulty it is remarkable how complete and accurate his list is. Morgan has been forced to omit many of the slighter items such as broadsides and poems on account of sheer numbers. Some of these, the more ephemeral productions of political journalism, have not been discovered and catalogued. Swift's casual reference "every day a ballad comes out",[3] suggests their number and the little

---

[1] Spectator No.555, ref. Sutherland, "Circulation of Newspapers, p.121.

[2] 5 vols. Bloomington, Indiana, 1934-42.

[3] Swift, Journal to Stella, ed. Williams, II, 394 (October 24, 1711).

importance attached to them. On the other hand, the serious and frequently lengthy pamphlets that form the bulk of Morgan's catalogue have survived remarkably well. I have only rarely found one advertised or referred to in contemporary papers that he does not list.

Morgan's exact number of pamphlets during each year from 1700 to 1709 is as follows:

Year	Number	Year	Number
1700	498	1705	481
1701	514	1706	437
1702	580	1707	491
1703	442	1708	460
1704	521	1709	450

The years from 1710 to 1716 show very different totals:

Year	Number	Year	Number
1710	770	1713	680
1711	670	1714	750
1712	680	1715	650
1716	490		

These figures indicate the sudden rise in the quantity of pamphlets in 1710. However, Morgan's figures must be broken down before an idea of the scale of purely political pamphleteering can be reached. Several hundred of his entries for each year deal with subjects unconnected with politics, some few are poems, and he admits to some unavoidable duplication. My own attempt to extract from these figures the prose works on politics, which include sermons and religious pamphlets with a strong political overtone follows:

1708	100	1712	270
1709	110	1713	190
1710	320	1714	212
1711	280	1715	190

These figures are a rough indication of the number of pamphlets published in any given year, They do establish that there was a sharp rise in the number of pamphlets written on politics in 1710 which continued for at least the next four years. Abel Boyer's casual estimates made in 1713 was probably a shrewd one, "It is now above five Years since you left the Town; in which time I must inform you, that the Number of Pamphlets and of flying Papers is become double to what it was when you first betook your self to your Retirement."[1]

Morgan provides information about the numbers of pamphlets published on particular topics in this period. In 1710 one hundred and twenty pamphlets were written on the subject of Sacheverell, an amount confirmed by a bibliography of the Sacheverell affair by S. Madan. One hundred and twenty pamphlets dealt with the change of ministry in the same year. In 1711 seventy six were published on the subject of peace and war, and one hundred and twenty on the same topic in 1712. The Treaty of Commerce in 1713 engages twenty three, and the controversy over Dunkirk in the winter of 1713-1714 thirty eight. In 1714 there are thirty two pamphlets on the problem of the Succession.

---

1 _A Letter from a Gentleman in Town, in Answer to his friend in the Country, concerning the Author of the Examiner. Quadriennium Annae Postrenum_, VI, 251. (_Political State_, November, 1713).

Again, these figures are intended as a guide rather than definite information. Pamphlets on particular subjects are likely to be counted in tens and the total number produced in a year in hundreds. Some of these pamphlets are well over a hundred pages long, many consisted of six sheets making up to forty eight pages, and few fall below twenty pages, so that these figures represent a considerable amount of print for the presses to produce and the readers to digest. In times of crisis London, at any rate, could be sure of an up-to-date and liberal commentary on events. On March 10, 1712, Swift remarked, "The Commons are very slow in bringing in their Bill to limit the Press, and the Pamphleteers make good use of their Time for there come out 3 or 4 every day"[1]

We have also a few references to the number of copies of the most important pamphlets of 1710-1714; though they may not be reliable, they give some indication of a substantial increase over previous periods. Though Defoe's poem The True Born Englishman belongs to the reign of William III and is outside my subject, it is worth mentioning for its astonishing success. In four years nine editions were printed on good paper, and twelve editions were pirated, totalling 80,000 copies.[2] Sacheverell's notorious sermon, The Perils of False Brethren

---

[1] Journal to Stella, ed. Williams, II, 510.

[2] Walter Wilson, Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel Defoe, (3 vols.; London, 1830) I, 346.

in Church and State, sold 40,000 copies in a few days,[1] and a lengthy reply by William Bisset, The Modern Fanatick, went through twelve editions in four years. A Letter to Sir J---- B----, a Whig pamphlet by William Benson, sold 60,000 copies.[2] Swift's The Conduct of the Allies at the high price of a shilling sold 11,000 copies in one month. Boosted by artificial means, 40,000 copies of Steele's The Crisis were reputed to have been distributed.[3] An edition of a pamphlet might number two to three thousand copies. Many pamphlets reached a second edition, a fair number reached their third and fourth, but it was left to the select few to attain double figures. When we consider these figures, we must remember that the total population of England in 1700 was about five and a half million and that of the metropolitan area of London 674,000.[4]

---

[1] Burnet, History of his Own Time, (ed. London, 1818) IV, 288.

[2] Oldmixon, History of England, p.477.

[3] Jack the Courtier's Answer to Dick the Englishman's Close of the Paper so called (1714) p.4. Quoted, George Atherton Aitken, The Life of Richard Steele, (2 vols.; London, 1889) II, 6 note 2.

[4] G.M. Trevelyan, England Under Queen Anne. (3 vols.; London, 1930-4) I, 75.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

To prevent unecessary bulk in the primary material of the following bibliography I have not attempted a fully comprehensive list of the pamphlets I used as background material, especially for the years 1710-12. For the same reason I have not listed separately pamphlets included in the collections at the head of the primary material. When a pamphlet in a collection has been referred to in the text, I have mentioned the fact in a footnote. I have treated pamphlets included in an author's collected works similarly.

With regard to problems of authorship, I have discussed the most important of these in the text. Most pamphlets were published anonymously or under pseudonyms, so to avoid confusion I have listed all pamphlets under their generally accepted authors regardless of whether the title-pages carry a name. Where there is real doubt I have used square brackets round the authors name and followed it with a question mark. If I have considered an attribution quite worthless I have catalogued the pamphlet in question under anonymous.

The length of most pamphlet titles has made it practical to list them in abbreviated form. London was the place of publication of all pamphlets unless it is stated otherwise; I have only stated London in the case of those published after 1715.

A SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliographies

A Bibliography of British History, 1700-1715. comp. William Thomas Morgan. 5 vols. Bloomington, Indiana, 1934-1942.

A Bibliography of Dr. Henry Sacheverell. comp. Falconer Madan. Oxford, 1884.

British Museum General Catalogue of Printed Books. Photolithographic edition to 1955. London, 1965-1966. Ten year Supplement, 1956-1965. London, 1968-

The Cambridge Bibliography of English Literature. Gen. ed. F.W. Bateson. 4 vols. Vols. I and II. Cambridge, 1940.

Catalogue of the Pamphlets, Books, Newspapers and Manuscripts relating to the Civil War, the Commonwealth and Restoration collected by George Thomason 1640-1661. comp. G.K. Fortescue. 2 vols. London, 1908.

A Census of British Newspapers and Periodicals, 1620-1800. comp. Ronald Salmon Crane and Frederick Benjamin Kaye. Chapel Hill, 1927.

The Dictionary of National Biography. gen. ed. Sir Leslie Stephen and Sir Sidney Lee. 1885-1907. 22 vols. reprinted Oxford, 1959-60.

Short-Title Catalogue of Books Printed in England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales and British America, and of English Books Printed in Other Countries. comp. Donald Wing. 3 vols. New York, 1945-1951.

Studies of British Newspapers and Periodicals to 1800. A Bibliography. comp. N.K. Weed and R.P. Bond. Chapel Hill, 1946.

Primary Material

Collections

The Acts and Monuments of John Foxe. ed. George Townsend. 8 vols. London, 1843-1849.

British Pamphleteers. Vol. I. ed. George Orwell and Reginald Reynolds. London 1948.

The Harleian Miscellany: a Collection of Scarce, Curious and Entertaining Pamphlets and Tracts... found in the late Earl of Oxford's Library. 8 vols. London, 1744-1746.

Leveller Manifestoes. ed. Don M. Wolfe. New York, 1944.

The Leveller Tracts, 1647-1653. ed. William Haller and Godfrey Davies. New York, 1944.

A Parte of a Register, Containinge Sundrie Memorable Matters, Written by Divers Godly and Learned in our Time, which Stande for and desire the Reformation of our Church. n.p. 1592.

Puritan Manifestoes. ed. W.H. Frere and C.E. Douglas. London, 1907.

The Somers Tracts. First edition, 12 vols. London, 1748-1752. Second edition, ed. Sir Walter Scott. 13 vols. London, 1809-1815.

State Tracts: in Two Parts. The First Part being a Collection of Several Treatises relating to the Government, Privately Printed in the reign of King Charles II; the Second Part consisting of a farther Collection of several Choice Treatises relating to the Government, from .. 1660-1689. London, 1693.

State Trials. Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials, 33 vols. London, 1809-1826. Vols. 6-10.

Tracts on Liberty in the Puritan Revolution, 1638-1647. ed. William Haller. 3 vols. New York, 1934.

Authors.

Addison, Joseph. The Works of Joseph Addison, ed. Richard Hurd, Bishop of Worcester. 6 vols. London, 1811. The Letters of Joseph Addison. ed. Walter Graham. Oxford, 1941.

Anon. An Account of the bloody Massacre in Ireland, acted by the Instigation of the Jesuits, Friars and Priests. 1678.

-- Ananias and Saphira discover'd. Or the true intent of a Pamphlet Called Omnia Comesta a Belo. 1679.

-- An Answer to a Foolish Pamphlet Entituled a Swarme of Sectaries and Schismaticks... Put forth by John Taylor the Water-Poet. 1641.

-- Mr. Asg--l's Congratulatory Letter to the L---d B---p of S---m, upon the excellent modern preface just publish'd by his L----p. 1713.

-- A Brief Relation of certain special and most materiall passages, and speeches in the Starre-Chamber, .. at the censure of Dr. Bastwick, Mr. Burton and Mr. Prynne. 1637.

-- Canterburies Dream: in which the Apparition of Cardinall Wolsey did present himselfe unto him on the fourteenth of May last past. 1641.

-- The Case of Protestant Dissenters, of Late Prosecuted; on old Statutes made against Papists and Popish Recusants. 1680.

-- The Charge of a Tory Plot Maintain'd in a Dialogue Between the Observator, Heraclitus and an Inferior Clergy-man. 1682.

-- The Debates in the House of Commons assembled at Oxford. 1681.

-- The Devil in his Dumps: or a sad Complaint of Malignant Spirits, at the settling of Peace and Truth. In a late Conventicle held neer the Tower for the better Influence of John Lilburns Counsels. 1647.

-- A Dialogue between the Pope and a Phanatick, Concerning Affairs in England. 1680.

-- A Dialogue between Tom and Dick, over a Dish of Coffee Concerning Matters of Religion and Government. 1680.

-- A Dialogue. Wherein is Plainly Laide Open, the tyrannicall dealing of L. Bishopps against God's children. 1589.

-- Englands Concern in the Case of His R.H. 1680.

-- The Enigmatical Court .... being the characters of those men whose actions are a mystery. 1714.

-- The Fable of the Eagle and the Robin. 1709.

-- The Fable of the Housewife and her Cock. 1712.

-- The Fable of the Lyon and the Fox. 1712.

-- Faults in the Fault Finder. 1710.

-- The Grand Mystery Laid open, by dividing of Protestants to weaken the Hanover Succession. 1714.

-- Grimalkin, or, the Rebel-Cat; A Novell. 1681.

-- Hannibal not at our Gates, or an Enquiry into the Grounds of our present Fears of Popery and the Pretender, in a Dialogue between my Lord Panick and George Steady Esq. 1714.

-- A History of the Peace, from the Arrival of M. Mesnager, September 18th, 1711, to the Return of the Earl of Strafford from Utrecht May 15th, 1712. 1712.

-- A History of the Peace with France and War with Holland. 1711.

-- The History of Prince Mirabels Infancy Rise and Disgrace. Three Pts. 1712.

-- Honest Hodge and Ralph Holding a sober Discourse, in Answer to a late Scandalous and Pernicious Pamphlet, Called, A dialogue Between the Pope and a Phanatick. 1680.

-- A Hue and Cry after R.L. [Roger L'Estrange]. 1680.

-- Icon Libellorum: or, A Critical History of Pamphlets. 1715.

-- An Impartial Account of the Nature and Tendency of the Late Addresses. In a Letter to a Gentleman in the Country. 1681.

-- The Impartial Secret History of Arlus Fortunatus and Odolphus, Ministers of State to the Empress of Grand-Insula. 1710.

-- The Instructive Library. .. By a Friend of the Author of the Tale of a Tub. 1710.

-- The Interest of the Three Kingdoms, With Respect to the Business of the Black Box, and all the other Pretentions of his Grace the Duke of Monmouth. 1680.

-- A Letter from a Gentleman in the City, To One in the Country; Concerning the Bill for Disabling the Duke of York to Inherit the Imperial Crown of this Realm. 1680.

-- A Letter from a Gentleman at St. Germains. 1710.

-- A Letter sent to an honourable Gentleman in way of satisfaction, concerning some slanderous reports lately raised against the Bishops. 1641.

-- A Letter to a Member of the October Club, shewing that to yield Spain to the Duke of Anjou would be the ruin of Great Britain. 1711.

-- A Letter to a West-Country Clothier and Free-holder, concerning Parliament's rejecting the French Treaty of Commerce. 1713.

-- The Loyalty of the Last Long Parliament. 1681.

-- Marcus Manlius Capitolinus. 1712.

-- Memoirs of the Chevalier de St. George. 1712.

-- Memoires of the Life of Anthony Late Earl of Shaftesbury. 1683.

-- A New Bull-Bayting: or, A Match Play'd at the Town Bull of Ely. 1649.

-- New News From Tory-Land and Tantivy-shire. 1682.

-- Observations on the State of the Nation. 1711.

-- Olivers Pocket Looking Glass New Framed and Cleaned to give a clear view of the great modern Colossus. 1711.

-- The Perquisite Monger. 1712.

-- The Principles and Practice of the Present Set of Whigs Defended. By the Censor of Great Britain. 1713.

-- The Priviledges of the Citizens of London: Contained in the Charters, Granted to them by the several Kings of this Realm, and confirmed by sundry Parliaments. 1682.

-- Reasons why a certain great G-----l has not yet received the thanks of either of the two Houses of P------nt. 1710.

-- Reflections on the Examiner's Scandalous Peace. 1711.

-- A Relation of Two Free Conferences Between Father L'Chese and Four Considerable Jesuits. 1680.

-- The Secret History of Arlus and Odolphus, Ministers of State to the Empress of Grand-Insula. 1710.

-- Seldom Comes a Better. 1710.

-- A Serious Epistle to Hodge. 1680.

-- A Sober Discourse of the Honest Cavalier with the Popish Couranter. 1680.

-- Some Memoirs: or a Sober Essay for a Just Vindication of the Right Honourable the Earl of Shatesbury. 1681.

-- Some Remarks by way of answer to A Letter to Sir J--- B---. 1711.

-- Speculum Sarisburianum, in Remarks on Some Passages in a Pamphlet, Entitul'd An Introduction to the Third Volume of the History of the Reformation. 1714.

-- A Tory Plot. 1682.

-- A True and Faithful Account of the Last Distemper and Death of Tom Whig Esq.. who departed this life on the 22nd September 1710. 1710.

-- Truth and Honesty in Plain English, or, A Brief Survey of some of those Libels and Pamphlets Printed and Published since the Dissolution of the last Parliament. 1679.

-- A Vindication of the present M-------y from the Clamours rais'd against them, upon Occasion of the New Preliminaries. 1711.

Arbuthnot, John. The Art of Political Lying. 1712. In Political Pamphlets. ed. A.F. Pollard. London, 1897.

-- Law is a Bottomless Pit. 4 parts. 1712. In An English Garner, ed. Edward Arber. Later Stuart Tracts. ed. George A. Aithen, Westminster 1903.

Asgill, John. Mr. Asgill's Defence upon his Expulsion from the House of Commons in 1707. 1712.

-- The Assertion is, that the title of the House of Hanover to the British Monarchy, is a title of Hereditary Right and Divine Institution. 1710.

-- The Pretender's Declaration Abstracted from Two Anonymous Pamphlets, The one Entituled Jus Sacrum and the other Memoirs of the Chevalier de St. George. 1713.

-- The Succession of the House of Hanover Vindicated, against the Pretender's second Declaration in folio, intituled, The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted. 1714.

Bale, John, Bishop of Ossory. Select Works of John Bale, D.D. Bishop of Ossory. ed. Henry Christmas. Cambridge, 1849.

Bastwick, John. The Letany of John Bastwick, Doctor of Physike. 1637.

-- The Just Defence of John Bastwick, .. Against the Calumnies of John Lilburne. 1645.

Benson, William. A Letter to Sir J---- B---. 1711.

Bisset, William. The Modern Fanatic. pt.1 and 2, 1710, pt.3, 1714.

Blount, Charles. An Appeal from the Country to the City. For the Preservation of His Majesties Person, Liberty, Property, and the Protestant Religion. 1679.

Bolingbroke, Henry St. John, Viscount. The Letters and Correspondence, public and private, of Lord Bolingbroke, ed. Gilbert Parke. 7 vols. London, 1754-1798.

Boyer, Abel. The History of the Reign of Queen Anne Digested into Annals. 11 vols. 1703-1713.

-- Quadriennium Annae Postremum; or, The Political State of Great Britain, Being the Four Last Years of the late Queen's Reign. 8 vols. Second edition, 1719.

Bridges, John, Dean of Sarum. A Defence of the Government Established in the Churche of Englande for ecclesiastical matters. 1587.

Buckley, Samuel ed. The Daily Caveat. 1702-1735.

Burnet, Gilbert, Bishop of Salisbury. History of his own Times. ed. 4 vols. London, 1818. 6 vols. London, 1883.

-- An Introduction to the third volume of the History of the Reformation of the Church of England. 1713.

-- The New Preface and Additional Chapter to the Third Edition of the Pastoral Care. 1713.

Burnet, Thomas. Ancient Precedents and Modern Facts, or, Our Ancestors as wise as we. 1712.

-- A Character of the Present M----y and P----t. In a Letter to a Member of the March Club. 1712.

-- A certain Information of a certain Discourse that happen'd at a certain Gentleman's House, in a certain County, written by a certain Person then present, to a certain Friend now in London. 1713.

-- Essays Divine, Moral and Political, by the Author of a Tale of a Tub. 1714.

-- A Letter to the People. 1712.

-- Some New Proofs, by which it appears, that the Pretender is truly James III. 1712.

Care, Henry. Animadversions on A Late Paper Entituled, A Letter to a Dissenter, upon occasion of his Majesties late Gracious Declaration of Indulgence. 1687.

-- English Liberties: Or the Free-Born Subject's Inheritance. 1680.

-- A Word in Season: being a Parallel between the intended Bloody Massacre of the People of the Jews, in the Reign of King Ahasuerus, and the Hellish Powder Plot in the Reign of King James. 1679.

Carlyle, Thomas, ed. Oliver Cromwell's Letter and Speeches. Third ed. 4 vols. London, 1850.

[Charles I, King of England?] Eikon Basilike: the portraiture of his Majesty in his solitudes and sufferings. ed. P.A. Knachel. Ithaca, New York, 1966.

[Clements, Simon?] Faults on Both Sides: Or, An Essay upon the Original Cause, Progress, and Mischievous Consequences of the Faction in this Nation. 1710.

Convocation. A Representation of the present State of Religion, with regard to the late excessive Growth of Infidelity, Heresy and Profaness. Drawn up by the Upper House of Convocation. 1711.

Cooper, Thomas, Bishop of Winchester. An Admonition to the People of England. 1589. ed. Edward Arber, London, 1882.

Cowper, William, First Earl. The Private Diary of William, First Earl Cowper. ed. E.C. Hawtrey. London, 1833.

Davenant, Charles. Sir Thomas Double at Court. 1710.

-- The True Picture of a Modern Whig. In a Dialogue between Whiglove and Double. 1701.

Defoe, Daniel. Daniel Defoe, a selection of tracts. ed. James T. Boulton. London, 1965.

-- Armageddon, or the Necessity of carrying on the war, if such a peace cannot be obtained as may render Europe safe, and trade secure. 1711.

-- Atalantis Major. 1711.

-- The Ballance of Europe; or, an Enquiry into the respective dangers of giving the Spanish Monarchy to the Emperour as well as King Philip, with the consequences that may be expected from either. 1711.

-- The Conduct of Parties in England, More especially of those Whigs who now appear against the New Ministry, and a Treaty of Peace in England. 1712.

-- A Defence of the Allies and the Late Ministry, or Remarks on the Tories New Idol. 1711.

-- Eleven Opinions about Mr. H-----y; with observations. 1711.

-- An Essay at a Plain Exposition of that Difficult Phrase a Good Peace. 1711.

-- The Justice and Necessity of a War with Holland, in case the Dutch do not come into Her Majesty's Measures, stated and examined. 1712.

-- A Letter to the Whigs, Expostulating with them on Their Present Conduct. 1714.

-- A New Test of the Sence of the Nation; Being a Modest Comparison Between the Addresses to the late King James, and those to her present Majesty. 1710.

-- No Queen, or, No General. 1712.

-- Reasons against the Succession of the House of Hanover. 1713.

-- Reasons why this Nation Ought to put a Speedy End to this Expensive War. 1711.

-- Reasons why a Party among us, and also among the Confederates, are obstinately bent against a Treaty of Peace with the French at this time. 1711.

-- The Review. 1704-1713. ed. W.L. Payne. New York, 1948.

-- Rogues on Both Sides. 1711.

-- The Secret History of the White Staff. 1714.

-- The Secret History of the October Club; from its original to this time. 1711.

-- A Supplement to The Faults on Both Sides: Containing the Compleat History of the Proceedings of a Party ever since the Revolution. 1710.

-- A View of the Real Danger of the Protestant Succession. 1714.

-- Whigs turn'd Tories and Hanover Tories, from their Avow'd Principles, prov'd Whigs; Or Each Side in the Other Mistaken. 1713.

-- A Word Against a New Election. 1710.

Digges, Dudley. The Unlawfulnesse of Subjects taking up Armes. 1644.

Dunton, John. The Life and Errors of John Dunton, Citizen of London. 2 vols. reprinted London, 1818.

-- Neck or Nothing. 1713.

Edwards, Thomas. Gangraena: Or a Catalogue and Discovery of many of the Errours, Heresies, Blasphemies, and Pernicious Practice of the Sectaries of this time. 1646.

Ewald, William Bragg, ed. The Newsmen of Queen Anne. Oxford, 1956.

Fenner, Dudley. A Defence of the godlie Ministers, against the slaunders of D. Bridges. Middelburg?, 1587.

Ferguson, Robert. An Account of the Obligations the States of Holland have to Great Britain. 1711.

-- A Letter to a Person of Honour concerning the King's disavowing the having been married to the D. of M.'s Mother. 1680.

-- A Just and Modest Vindication of the proceedings of the Two Last Parliaments. 1681.

-- No Protestant Plot. 1681. Second Part, 1682. Third Part, 1682.

Fonvive, Jean de, ed. The Postman. 1695-1730.

Frost, Walter and Canne, John. *The Discoverer*. 1649.

[Fulke, William?] *A Briefe and plaine declaration, concerning the desires of all those faithful Ministers, that have and do seeke for the Discipline and reformation of the Church of Englande*. 1584. (usually known as *A Learned Discourse of Ecclesiastical Government*).

Gay, John. *The Present State of Wit. 1711. An English Garner. Critical Essays and Literary Fragments*. Westminster, 1903.

Gilby, Anthony. *A Pleasant Dialogue Betweene a Souldier of Barwicke, and an English Chaplaine*. 1581.

Goodwin, John. *Cretensis: or A Briefe Answer to an ulcerous Treatise, lately published by Mr. Thomas Edwards*. 1646.

Goodwin, Thomas. (and others) *An Apologetical Narration*. 1643.

Halifax, George Saville First Marquess of. *The Complete Works of George Saville, First Marquess of Halifax*. ed. Walter Raleigh. Oxford, 1912.

Hall, Joseph, Bishop of Norwich. *A Defence of the Humble Remonstrance Against the frivolous and false exceptions of Smectymnuus*. 1641.

-- *An Humble Remonstrance to the High Court of Parliament, By a dutiful Sonne of the Church*. 1640.

-- *A Short Answer to the Tedious Vindication of Smectymnuus*. 1641.

Harbin, George. *The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted*. 1713.

Hare, Francis. *The Allies and the Late Ministry defended against France and the present friends of France*. 1711.

-- *Bouchain, in a dialogue between the late Medley and Examiner*. 1711.

-- *The Management of the War. In Four letters to a Tory Member*. 1710-1711.

Harris, Benjamin, ed. *The Protestant Postboy*. 1711-

-- pub., with introduction, *The Triumph of Justice Over Unjust Judges*. 1681.

Harvey, Richard. Plaine Percevall the Peace-Maker of England. 1590.

Hawles, Sir John. The Englishman's Right. A Dialogue betweene a Barrister at Law and a Jury-man. 1680.

Hickes, George. Queries to Civil, Canon and Common Lawyers. 1712.

Hoadly, Benjamin. A Collection of Several Papers Printed in the Year 1710. 1718.

Hooke, Nathaniel. An Account of the conduct of the Dowager Duchess of Marlborough from her first coming to court to the year 1710. 1710.

Hooker, Richard. Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. 5 vols. ed. Everyman, London, 1907.

Hornby, Charles. A Caveat against the Whigs. 4 pts. 1710-1713.

Kennet, White. A letter to the Lord Bishop of Carlisle concerning one of his predecessors Bishop Merks: on occasion of a new volume for the Pretender intituled The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England Asserted. 1713.

-- A Memorial to Protestants on the 5th November. In a Letter to a Peer of Great Britain. 1713.

-- A true Answer to Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon before the Lord Mayor ... In a letter to one of the Aldermen. 1709.

-- A Visit to St. Saviours Southwark, With Advice to Dr. Sacheverell's Preachers there. By a Divine of the Church of England. 1710.

-- The Wisdom of Looking Backward, to Judge the Better of One Side and T'Other by the Speeches, Writings, Actions and Matters of Fact on Both Sides, for the Four Years Last Past. 1715.

King, William. The Original Works of William King. ed. John Nichols. 3 vols. London, 1776.

LeMoine, Pierre. trans. Of the Art Both of Writing and Judging of History. 1695.

Leslie, Charles. The Case of the Regale and the Pontificate. 1701.

-- The Finishing Stroke. 1711.

-- The Good Old Cause. 1710.

-- A Letter from Mr. Leslie to a Member of Parliament. 1714.

-- The Rehearsal. 1704-1709.

L'Estrange, Sir Roger. The Accompt Clear'd: In Answer to A Libel, Intiluled, A True Account From Chichester, concerning the Death of Habin the Informer. 1682.

-- An Account of the Growth of Knavery, Under the Pretended Fears of Arbitrary Government and Popery. 1678.

-- An Answer to The Appeal from the Country to the City. 1681.

-- An Answer to a Letter to a Dissenter. 1687.

-- An Apology for the Protestants. 1681. (trans. by L'Estrange with introduction).

-- The Case Put, Concerning the Succession of His Royal Highness the Duke of York. 1679.

-- The Casuist Uncas'd, In a Dialogue between Richard and Baxter. 1680.

-- The Character of a Papist in Masquerade. 1681.

-- Citt and Bumpkin. In a Dialogue over A Pot of Ale. Concerning Matters of Religion and Government. 1680.

-- Citt and Bumpkin. Or, A Learned Discourse upon Swearing and Lying, and other Laudable Qualities tending to a Thorow Reformation. The Second Part. 1680.

-- Considerations and Proposals In Order to the Regulation of the Press. 1663.

-- Discovery upon Discovery, In Defence of Doctor Oates against B.W.'s Libellous Vindication of him, in his Additional Discovery. 1680.

-- The Dissenters Sayings, In Requital for L'Estrange's Sayings, Published in Their Own Words, For the Information of the People. 1681.

-- Dissenters Sayings, The Second Part. 1681.

-- The Freeborn Subject: Or, The Englishmans Birthright. 1679.

-- A Further Discovery of the Plot: Dedicated to Dr. Titus Oates. 1680.

-- The Holy Cheat. 1682.

-- The Lawyer Outlaw'd; Or a Brief Answer to Mr. Hunts defence of the Charter. 1683.

-- L'Estrange His Appeal Humbly Submitted to the King's most Excellent Majesty and the Three Estates Assembled in Parliament. 1680.

-- L'Estrange's Case In a Civil Dialogue Betwixt Zekiel and Ephraim. 1680.

-- L'Estrange's Narrative of the Plot. Set Forth for the Edification of his Majesties Liege-People. 1680.

-- L'Estrange No Papist. 1681.

-- A Memento. Treating of the Rise, Progress, and Remedies of Seditions. 1682 (Titlepage states that this was first printed in 1642, an obvious error for 1662).

-- A Modest Plea for the Caveat, and the Author of it. 1661.

-- Notes Upon Stephen College. 1681.

-- Presbytery Display'd, 1681. (ed. L'Estrange in 1663 with an introduction).

-- The Reformation Reformed. 1681.

-- The Reformed Catholique: Or, the True Protestant. 4 second ed. 1679.

-- The Relapsed Apostate. 1681. (Reissue of a pamphlet of 1661).

-- A Reply to the Reasons of the Oxford-Clergy against Addressing. 1687.

-- A Reply to the Second Part of the Character of a Popish Successor. 1681.

-- A Seasonable Memorial in some Historical Notes upon the Liberties of the Presse and Pulpit. 1680.

-- The Shammer Shammed. 1681.

-- A Short Answer to a Whole Litter of Libellers. 1680.

-- A Short View of some Remarkable Transactions. 1660.

-- State Divinity: Or A Supplement to the Relaps'd Apostate. 1661.

-- Toleration Discuss'd; In Two Dialogues. 3rd ed. 1681. (reissue of pamphlet of 1663).

-- Truth and Loyalty Vindicated, From the Reproaches and Clamours of Mr. Edward Bagshaw. 1662.

-- Tyranny and Popery Lording it Over the Consciences, Lives, Liberties, and Estates Both of King and People. 1681.

-- A Whip A Whipp for the Schismaticall Animadverter Upon The Bishop of Worcester's Letter. 1662.

-- A Word Concerning Libels and Libellers. 1681.

Lilburne, John. An Anatomy of the Lords Tyranny. 1646.

-- An Answer to Nine Arguments. 1645.

-- The Copie of a Letter from lieutenant collonell J. Lilburne to a friend. 1645, dated August 9.

-- A Declaration of Lieutenant-Colonel John Lilburne to the Free-born People of England. 1652.

-- A Discourse Betwixt Lieutenant Colonel John Lilburne Close Prisoner in the Tower of London, and Mr. Hugh Peters. 1649.

-- The Free-Mans Freedom Vindicated, A true Relation of the cause and manner of Lieut. Col. John Lilburns present imprisonment in Newgate. 1646.

-- An Impeachment of High Treason Against Oliver Cromwell. 1649.

-- Innocency and Truth Justified. 1646.

-- Jonahs Cry out of the Wales Belly. 1647.

-- The Jugglers Discovered. 1647.

-- The Just Mans Justification. 1646.

-- The Lawes Funerall. 1648.

-- Londons Liberty In Chains Discovered. 1646.

-- The Oppressed Mans Oppressions declared. 1647.

-- The Peoples Prerogative and Priviledges, asserted and vindicated by Law and Reason. 1648.

-- Plaine Truth Without Feare, or Flattery. 1647.

-- The Poore Mans Cry. 1639.

-- Rash Oaths Unwarrantable: And the Breaking of them as inexcusable. 1647.

-- The Reasons of Lieu.-Col. Lilburnes sending his Letter to Mr. Prinn, humbly presented to the Hon. Committee of Examinations. 1645.

-- The Resolved Mans Resolution. 1647.

-- A Whip for the present House of Lords, Or The Levellers Levelled. 1648.

-- The Young-mens and the Apprentices Outcry: Or An Inquisition after the lost Fundamentall Lawes and Liberties of England. 1649.

Lord, George de Forest. gen. ed. Poems on Affairs of State Augustan Satirical Verse, 1660-1714. 4 vols to date. New Haven, 1963-68.

Lyly, John. The Complete Works of John Lyly. ed. R. Warwick Bond. 3 vols. Oxford, 1902. reprinted 1967.

Manley, Mary de la Rivere. The Adventures of Rivella. 1714.

-- The Duke of M-----h's Vindication, in answer to Bouchain. 1711.

-- A Modest Enquiry into the reasons of the Joy expressed by a certain sett of people upon a report of Her Majesties death. 1714.

-- Secret Memoirs of several persons of quality from the New Atalantis. 1709.

Marprelate, Martin. pseud. The Marprelate Tracts. ed. William Pierce. London, 1911.

/Marten, Henry/? Vox Plebis, or, the Peoples' Outcry Against Oppression, Injustice, and Tyranny. 1646.

Marvell, Andrew. The Complete Works in verse and prose, of Andrew Marvell, M.P. ed. A.B. Grosart. 4 vols. London, 1872-5.

Maynwaring, Arthur. The History of Dr. Sacheverell translated from the Paris Gazette. 1711.

-- The Life and Postumous Works of Arthur Maynwaring. ed. John Oldmixon. 1715.

Milton, John. The Complete Prose Works of John Milton. gen. ed. Don M. Wolfe. Vols I-IV extant. New Haven, 1953-1966.

-- The Sonnets of John Milton, ed. J.S. Smart. Oxford, 1921, reprinted 1966.

Ministers. A Letter of the Ministers of the City of London, Presented the first of January 1645 to the Reverend Assembly of Divines. 1645.

Moderator, The. May 22, -November 10, 1710.

Nashe, Thomas. The Works of Thomas Nashe. ed. R.B. McKerrow, reprinted with corrections and notes by F.P. Wilson. 5 vols. Oxford, 1958.

-- The Complete Works of Thomas Nashe. ed. A.B. Grosart. 6 vols. London 1883-5.

Nedham, Marchmont. The Case of the Kingdom Stated According to the Proper Interest of severall Parties Ingaged. 1647.

-- A Paquet of Advices and Animadversions Sent from London to the Men of Shaftesbury. 1676.

Ockley, Simon. An Imitation of the New Way of Writing, introduced by the learned Mr. Asgill. 1712.

Oldmixon, John. The History of England, during the reigns of King William and Queen Mary, Queen Anne, King George I. London, 1735.

-- The Life and History of Belisarius and a Parallel between him and a Modern Heroe. 1713.

-- Memoirs of the Press, historical and political, for thirty years past, from 1710-1740. London, 1742.

-- The Medley. ed. Oldmixon. 1710-1711.

Overton, Richard. An Alarum to the House of Lords: Against their insolent Usurpation of Common Liberties and Rights of this Nation. 1646.

-- An Arrow Against all Tyrants and Tyranny, shot from the Prison of Newgate into the Prerogative Bowels of the Arbitrary House of Lords. 1646.

-- The Baiting of the Great Bull of Hashan Unfolded. 1649.

-- A Defiance Against all Arbitrary Usurpations. 1646.

-- Divine Observations Upon the London Ministers Letter against Toleration. 1645.

-- Eighteen Reasons Propounded to the Soldiers of the Army, Why they ought to continu/e/ the several Adjutators of their respective Regiments. 1647.

-- England's Misere and Remedie. In a Judicious Letter from an Utter Barrister to his special Friend. 1645.

-- Martins Eccho: or a Remonstrance, From His Holinesse reverend Young Martin Mar-priest. 1645.

-- The Nativity of Sir John Presbyter. 1645.

-- The out-cryes of Oppressed Commons. (with Lilburne) 1647.

-- Overton's Defyance of the Act of Pardon: or, The Copy of a Letter to the Citizens usually meeting at the Whale-Bone. 1649.

-- A Pearle in a Dounghill, Or, Lieu. Col. John Lilburne in Newgate. 1646.

-- Regall Tyrannie Discovered. (with Lilburne?) 1647.

-- A Sacred Decretall, or Hue and Cry, From his superlative Holinesse, Sir Symon Synod, for the Apprehension of Reverend Young Martin Mar-priest. 1645.

-- An Unhappie Game at Scotch and English. 1646.

Penn, William. Good Advice to the Church of England, Roman Catholic and Protestant Dissenter. 1687.

Penry, John. The Notebook of John Penry 1593. ed. Albert Peel. London, 1944.

-- Three Treatises Concerning Wales. ed. David Williams. Cardiff, 1960.

Prynne, William. The Antipathie of the English Lordly Prelacie Both to Regale Monarchy, and Civil Unitie. 1641.

-- A Breife Memento to the Present UnParliamentary Junto. 1649.

-- A Fresh Discovery of some Prodigious New Wardring-Blazing Stars, and Firebrands, Stiling Themselves New-Lights, Firing our Church and State into New Combustions. 1645.

-- A Gagge for Long-Hair'd Rattle-Heads who revile all civill Round-heads. 1646.

-- Independency Examined, Unmasked, Refuted. 1644.

-- The Levellers Levelled to the very Ground. 1648.

-- The Lyar Confounded or A Brief Relation of John Lilburnes miserably-mistated-Case. 1645.

-- Mola Asinaria: Or, The Unresonable and Insupportable Burthen Now press'd upon the Shoulders of this groaning Nation. 1659.

-- A New Discovery of the Prelates Tyranny. 1641.

-- Newes From Ipswich. 1636.

-- The Popish Royal Favourite. 1643.

-- Romes Master-Peece. 1643.

-- A Seasonable Legal and Historical Vindication and Chronolagicall Collection of the good Old Fundamental Liberties, Franchises, Rights, Laws of all English Freemen. 1657.

-- The Substance of a Speech Made in the H. of C. by Wil. Prynn... on Munday the Fourth of December, 1648. 1649.

-- Truth Triumphing over Falshood, Antiquity over Novelty. 1st part. 1645.

-- Twelve Serious Questions touching Church Government. 1644.

-- A Vindication of the Imprisoned and Secluded Members of the House of Commons, From the Aspersions cast upon them, and the Majority of the House, in a paper lately printed and published: Intituled An Humble Answer of the General Council of the Army ... To the Demands of the Honourable House of Commons. 1649.

Ridpath, George. ed. The Flying Post. 1695-1731.

-- The Observator. 1702-1712. (Ridpath, 1709-12).

-- The Peril of being Zealously Affected, but not well. 1710.

Roper Abel. The Postboy. 1695-1728. (Roper ed.

Sacheverell, Henry. The Answer of Henry Sacheverell, D.D. to the Articles of Impeachment. 1710.

-- The Communication of Sin. A Sermon Preach'd at The Assizes held at Derby, August 15th 1709. 1709.

-- The Perils of False Brethren, both in Church and State. 1710.

Sewell, George. An Introduction to the Life and Writings of G---t Lord Bishop of S---m. Being a Third Letter to his Lordship Occasioned by his Introduction to the Third Volume of the History of the Reformation. 1714.

Shepherd, Simon. Animadversions upon John Lilburnes Two Last Bookes. 1646.

Smectymnuus, pseud. Thomas Young, and others. An Answer to a Book Entitled An Humble Remonstrance. 1641.

-- A Vindication of the Answer to the Humble Remonstrance. 1641.

Smalridge, George. The Thoughts of a Country Gentleman upon the reading of Dr. Sacheverell's Tryal. 1710.

Smith, Francis. An Account of the Injurious Proceedings of Sir George Jeffreys Knt. Late Recorder of London, Against Francis Smith, Bookseller. 1680.

Steele, Richard.

-- The Correspondence of Richard Steele. ed. Rae Blanchard. London, 1941.

-- The Englishman. ed. Rae Blanchard. Oxford, 1955.

-- Periodical Journalism 1714-16. ed. Rae Blanchard. Oxford, 1959.

-- The Tatler, 1710.

-- Tracts and Pamphlets. ed. Rae Blanchard. Baltimore, 1944.

Swift, Jonathan. The Correspondence of Jonathan Swift. ed. Harold Williams. 5 vols. Oxford, 1963-1965.

-- A Discourse of the Contests and Dissentions Between the Nobles and Commons in Athens and Rome. ed. Frank H. Ellis. Oxford, 1967.

-- Journal To Stella. ed. Harold Williams. 2 vols. Oxford, 1948.

-- The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift. gen. ed. Herbert Davis. 12 vols. Oxford, 1939-1955.

-- The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift D.D. ed. Temple Scott. 12 vols. London, 1897-1908.

Temple, Sir William. An Introduction to a History of England. 1695.

Taylor, John. A Swarme of Sectaries and Schismaticques. 1641.

Throckmorton, Job. The Defence of Job Throckmorton against the slaunders of Maister Sutcliffe. Middelburg? 1594.

Toland, John. The Art of Restoring; or the Piety and Probity of General Monk, in bringing about the last Restoration, evinced from his own authentic Letters. 1714.

-- Dunkirk or Dover, 1713.

Trapp, Joseph. The Character and Principles of the Present Set of Whigs. 1711.

-- Most Faults on One Side, or the Shallow Politics, Foolish Arguing, and Villanous Designs of the Author of a late Pamphlet Entitled Faults on Both Sides. 1710.

Travers, Walter. A Defence of the Ecclesiastical Discipline ordayned of God to be used in his Church. Middelburg? 1588.

Turner, William. The huntyng and fyndying out of the Romish Fox. 1543.

Udall, John. A Demonstration of the truth of that Discipline which Christe hath prescribed in his worde for the government of his Church, in all times and places, until the ende of the worlde. 1588, reprinted, ed. Edward Arber. The English Scholar's Library, Old Series No.9. London, 1880.

-- The State of the Churche of Englande, laide open in a conference betweene Diotrephes a Bishop, Tertullus a Papist, Demetrius an usureer, Panocheus an In-Keeper, and Paule a Preacher of the work of God. 1588. Reprinted, ed. Edward Arber. The English Scholar's Library, Old Series No.5. London, 1880.

[Wagstaffe, William, D.D.?] The Miscellaneous works of Dr. William Wagstaffe from 1710-1715. 2nd ed. London, 1726. (It is unlikely that all of this collection was written by Wagstaffe.)

Walpole, Sir Robert. The Debts of the Nation Stated. 1711.

-- Four Letters to a Friend in North Britain, upon the publishing of the tryal of Dr. Sacheverell. 1710.

-- A Short History of the Parliament. 1713.

-- A State of the Five and Thirty Millions. mention'd in the Report of a Committee of the House of Commons. 1711.

-- Mr. Walpole's Case. 1712.

Walwyn, William. An Antidote Against Master Edwards His Old and New Poyson. 1646.

-- The Fountain of Slaunder Discovered. 1649.

-- Gold Tried in the Fire, or, The burnt Petitions revived. 1647.

-- Juries justified; Or, A word of Correction to Mr. Henry Robinson: For His seven Objections against the Trial of Causes, by Juries of Twelve men. 1651.

-- The Just Man in Bonds, Or, Lieut. Col. John Lilburne close Prisoner in Newgate, by order of the House of Lords. 1646.

-- A Parable, or Consultation of Physitians upon Master Edwards. 1646.

[--?] Some Considerations. Being a necessary discourse.. concerning the unseasonable difference between the Protestant and the Puritan. 1642.

-- A Word in Season: to All Sorts of Wel minded people in this miserably distracted and distempered Nation. 1646.

-- A Word More to Mr. Thomas Edwards. 1646.

Wentworth, Thomas. Earl of Strafford. The Wentworth Papers 1705-1739. ed. Cartwright. London, 1883.

Wildman, John. Putney Projects, Or the Old Serpent in a New Forme. 1647.

Winstanley, Gerrard. The Works of Gerrard Winstanley. ed. George H. Sabine. New York, 1965.

Secondary Material.

Adamson, J.W. "The Extent of Literacy in England in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries: Notes and Conjectures", The Library, 4th Series, X, (1929-30), 163-193.

Aiken, W.A. and Henning, B.D. ed. Conflict in Stuart England. Essays in Honour of Wallace Notestein. London, 1960.

Aitken, George Atherton. The Life and Works of John Arbuthnot. Oxford, 1892.

-- The Life of Richard Steele. 2 vols. London, 1889.

Allen, J.W. English Political Thought, 1603-60. Vol.I. London, 1938.

Allen, Robert Joseph. The Clubs of Augustan London. Cambridge, Mass., 1933.

Andrews, Alexander. A History of British Journalism, from the foundation of the Newspaper Press in England, to the repeal of the Stamp Act in 1855. London, 1895.

Arber, Edward. An Introductory Scetch to the Marprelate Controversy. London, 1898.

Ashley, Maurice. John Wildman, Plotter and Postmaster. London, 1947.

Babbage, Stuart Barton. Puritanism and Richard Bancroft. London, 1962.

Beljame, Alexandre. Men of Letters and the English Public in the Eighteenth Century 1660-1744. ed. Bonamy Dobree. trans. E.O. Lorimer.

Beattie, Lester. M. John Arbuthnot, Mathematician and Satirist. Cambridge, Mass., 1935.

Beeching, Henry Charles. Francis Atterbury. London, 1909.

Bennet, G.V. White Kennet. London, 1957.

Bindoff, Stanley Thomas, Hurstfield, J. and Williams, C.H. ed. Elizabethan Government and Society. Essays presented to Sir John Neale. London, 1961.

Bourne, Henry Richard Fox. English Newspapers. 2 vols. London, 1887.

Boulton, James T. Language and Politics in the Age of Wilkes and Burke. (London, 1963).

Brailsford, Henry Noel. The Levellers and the English Revolution. ed. Christopher Hill. London, 1961.

-- The Political Activities of the Baptists and Fifth Monarchy Men in England During the Inferregnum. New York, 1911.

Brown, Louise Fargo. The First Earl of Shaftesbury. New York, 1933.

Burrage, C. The Early English Dissenters in the Light of Recent Research. Cambridge, 1912.

-- The Old Cause, London, 1954.

Carswell, John. The South Sea Bubble. London, 1960.

Churchill, The Right Honourable Sir Winston S. Marlborough His Life and Times. 4 vols. London, 1933.

Clarendon, Edward Hyde Earl of. The History of the Rebellion and Civil War in England. 7 vols. Oxford, 1849.

Clark, Sir George. The Later Stuarts. 1660-1714. Oxford, 1934.

Cole, G.D.H. Politics and Literature. London 1929.

Collinson, Patrick. The Elizabethan Puritan Movement. London, 1967.

Cook, Richard I. Jonathan Swift as a Tory Pamphleteer. Seattle and London, 1967.

Dickens, A.G. The English Reformation. London, 1964.

Dottin, Paul. The Life and Strange and Surprising Adventures of Daniel Defoe. trans. Louise Ragan. London, 1930.

Douglas, D.C. English Scholars 1660-1730. London, 1939.

Ehrenpreis, Irvin. Swift the Man, his Works and the Age. 2 vols to date. London, 1962.

Feiling, Sir Keith Grahame. A History of the Tory Party 1660-1714. Oxford, 1950.

Ferguson, James. Robert Ferguson the Plotter. Edinburgh, 1887.

Figgis, J. Neville. The Divine Right of Kings. Cambridge, 1914.

Foot, Michael. The Pen and the Sword. London, 1967.

Foxcroft, H.C. and Clarke, T.E.S. A Life of Gilbert Burnet, Cambridge, 1907.

Frank, Joseph. The Beginnings of the English Newspaper 1620-1660. Cambridge, Mass., 1961.

-- The Levellers. A History of the Writings of Three Seventeenth Century Social Democrats: John Lilburne, Richard Overton, William Walwyn. Camb. Mass., 1955.

Fraser, Peter. The Intelligence of the Secretaries of State and their Monopoly of Licensed News 1660-1688. Cambridge, 1956.

Furley, O.W. "The Whig Exclusionists: Pamphlet Literature in the Exclusion Campaign 1678-1681." Cambridge Historical Journal, (1957).

Gilman, Elwyn Wilbur. Milton's Rhetoric: Studies in His Defence of Liberty. Missouri, Columbia, 1939.

Goldgar, Bertram Alvin. The Curse of Party. Swift's relations with Addison and Steele. Lincoln, Nebraska, 1961.

Gooch, G.P. English Democratic Ideas in the Seventeenth Century. First published 1898, revised H.J. Laski, 1927.

Gordon, Ian A. The Movement of English Prose. London, 1966.

Gregg, Pauline. Freeborn John. A Biography of John Lilburne. London, 1961.

Haley, K.D.H. The First Earl of Shaftesbury. Oxford, 1968.

-- William of Orange and the English Opposition. 1672-4. Oxford, 1953.

Haller, William. Liberty and Reformation in the Puritan Revolution. New York, 1955.

-- The Rise of Puritanism. New York, 1938.

Hanson, Lawrence William. Government and Press 1695-1763. London, 1936.

Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare's Audience. New York, 1961.

Hart, Jeffrey. Viscount Bolingbroke, Tory Humanist. London, 1965.

Hearnshaw, F.J.C. ed. The Social and Political Ideas of Some English Thinkers of the Augustan Age. A.D. 1650-1750. London, 1928.

Henderson, G.D. Presbyterianism. Aberdeen, 1954.

Hibbard, G.R. Thomas Nashe. London, 1962.

Hill, Christopher. Puritanism and Revolution. London, 1958.

-- Society and Puritanism in Pre-Revolutionary England. London, 1964.

Holmes, Geoffry. British Politics in the Age of Anne. London, 1967.

Jackman, Sydney Wayne. Man of Mercury, an appreciation of the mind of Henry St. John, Viscount Bolingbroke. London, 1965.

Jones, James, Rees. The First Whigs. The Politics of the Exclusion Crisis, 1678-1683. London, 1961.

Kemp, Betty. King and Commons 1660-1832. London, 1957.

Kinloch, T.F. The Life and Works of Joseph Hall. New York, 1955.

Kirby, Ethyn Williams. William Prynne. A Study in Puritanism. Cambridge, Mass., 1931.

Kitchen, George. Sir Roger L'Estrange. London, 1913.

-- A Survey of Burlesque and Parody in English. London, 1931.

Knappen, Marshal Moon. Tudor Puritanism. A chapter in the History of Idealism. Chicago, 1939.

Knox, Norman. The Word Irony and its Contexts. 1500-1755. Durham, North Carolina, 1961.

Knox, S.J. Walter Travers. Paragon of Elizabethan Puritanism. London, 1962.

Lamont, William. Marginal Prynne. 1600-1669. London, 1963.

Laprade, William, Thomas. "The Power of the English Press in the Eighteenth Century," South Atlantic Quarterly, XXVII, (1928).

-- Public Opinion and Politics in Eighteenth Century England to the Fall of Walpole. New York, 1936.

Laski, Harold Joseph. Political Thought in England from Locke to Bentham. London, 1920.

Laslett, Peter. The World we have Lost. London, 1965.

Leadham, I.S. The Political History of England 1702-1760. London, 1909.

Lecky, The Rt. Hon. Wiliam Edward Hartpole. A History of England in the Eighteenth Century. 5 vols. London 1892.

Lee, William, Daniel Defoe: His Life, and Recently Discovered Writings (3 vols; London, 1869).

Legouis, Pierre. Andrew Marvell. Revised version Oxford, 1965.

Leishman, J.B. The Art of Marvell's Poetry. London, 1964.

Leslie, Robert Joshua. The Life and Writings of Charles Leslie, M.A., Nonjuring Divine. London, 1885.

MacDonald, Hugh. "Banter in English Controversial Prose after the Restoration," Essays and Studies of Members of the English Language Association, XXXII, (1946), 21-29.

MacFarlane, John. "The Paper Duties of 1699-1712. Pamphlets and the Pamphlet Duty of 1712," The Library, I.

Madden, Robert Francis Joseph. Bishop Gilbert Burnet as a Man of Letters. unpublished Phd. Thesis, University of London, 1963.

McGinn, Donald J. The Admonition Controversy. New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1949.

-- John Penry and the Marprelate Controversy. New Brunswick, New Jersey, 1966.

-- "Nashe's Share in the Marprelate Controversy," P.M.L.A. LIX, (1944), 952-81.

Macpherson, C.B. The Political Theory of Possessive Individualism. Hobbes to Locke. Oxford, 1962.

Maskell, William. A History of the Martin Marprelate Controversy in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. London, 1845.

Miller, E.H. The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England. Cambridge, Mass., 1959.

Montgomery, H.R. Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Sir Richard Steele. 2 vols. Edinburgh 1865.

Morgan, William Thomas. English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne, 1702-1710. London, 1920.

-- "The Election of 1710" Political Science Quarterly, XXVI, (1922).

Morley, Iris. A Thousand Lives. An Account of the English Revolutionary Movement, 1660-1685. London, 1954.

Muddiman, Joseph George. The King's Journalist 1659-1689. London, 1923.

-- A History of English Journalism to the founding of the Gazette. (under the pseud. J.B. Williams) London, 1908.

Neale, J.E. Queen Elizabeth's Parliaments. 2 vols. London, 1934.

Nicholson, T.C. and Turberville, A.S. Charles Talbot, Duke of Shrewsbury. Cambridge, 1960.

Ogg, David. England in the Reign of Charles II. 2 vols. Oxford, 1956.

-- England in the Reigns of James II and William III. Oxford, 1955.

Overton, J.H. The Nonjurors, their Lives, Principles and Writings. London, 1902.

Owst, Gerald Robert. Preaching in Medieval England; an introduction to sermon manuscripts of the period c. 1350-1450. Cambridge, 1926.

Payne, William Lytton. Mr. Review. Daniel Defoe as Author of the Review. New York, 1947.

Pearl, Valerie. London and the Outbreak of the Puritan Revolution. Oxford, 1961.

Pearson, A.F.S. Scott. Thomas Cartwright and Elizabethan Puritanism, 1553-1603. New York, 1925.

Pease, T.C. The Leveller Movement. (Washington 1916, reprinted Gloucester Mass., 1965.)

Perry, Thomas W. Public Opinion, Propaganda and Politics in eighteenth century England: a Study of the Jew Bill of 1753. Cambridge, Mass., 1962.

Petegorsky, David W. Left Wing Democracy in the English Civil War. London, 1940.

Pierce, William. A Historical Introduction to the Marprelate Tracts. London, 1908.

Pinkus, Philip. Grub St. stripped bare. London, 1968.

Plant, Marjorie. The English Book Trade. An Economic History of the Making and Sale of Books. London, 1939.

Plomer, H.R. "Secret Printing During the Civil War," The Library, 2nd. Series, V, (1904) 374-403.

Plumb, J.H. The Growth of Political Stability in England. 1675-1725. London, 1967.

-- Sir Robert Walpole. The Making of a Statesman. London, 1956.

-- Sir Robert Walpole. The King's Minister. London, 1960.

-- Men and Places. London, 1963.

Pollock, Sir John. The Popish Plot. A Study in the History of the Reign of Charles II. London, 1903.

Price, Martin. Swift's Rhetorical Art. New Haven, 1953.

Ransome, M.E. "The Press and the Election of 1710", Cambridge Historical Journal, VI, (1939) 209-222.

Roberts, Clayton. The Growth of Responsible Government in Stuart England. Cambridge, 1966.

Robinson, Edward Forbes. The Early History of the Coffee Houses in England. London, 1893.

Rogers, P.G. The Fifth Monarchy Men. London, 1966.

Ronalds, F.S. The Attempted Whig Revolution of 1678. Urbana, Illinois, 1937.

Roscoe, Edward Stanley. Robert Harley, Earl of Oxford. London, 1902.

Ross, John F. Swift and Defoe, a Study in Relationship. Berkley and Los Angeles, 1941.

Schenk, W. The Concern for Social Justice in the Puritan Revolution. London, 1948.

Scudi, Abbie Turner. The Sacheverell Affair. New York, 1939.

Siebert, Federick Seaton. Freedom of the Press in England 1476-1776. The Rise and Decline of Government Controls. Urbana Illinois, 1952.

Stanhope, Philip Henry, Fifth Earl. History of England Comprising the Reign of Queen Anne until the Peace of Utrecht. 2 vols. London, 1870.

Stephen, Leslie. English Literature and Society in the Eighteenth Century. London, 1904.

Stevens, D.H. Party Politics and English Journalism 1702-42. Menasha, Wisconsin, 1916.

Sutherland, James R. "The Circulation of Newspapers and Literary Periodicals 1700-1730," The Library, 2nd. Series XV, (1934-35), 110-128.

-- On English Prose. Toronto, 1957.

-- Defoe. London, 1937.

Sykes, Norman. Church and State in the XVIIIth Century. Cambridge, 1934.

-- Old Priest and New Presbyter. Cambridge, 1956.

Taylor, P.A.M. ed. The Origins of the English Civil War. Boston, 1960.

Trevelyan, George Macaulay. England Under Queen Anne. 3 vols. London, 1930-1934.

-- England Under the Stuarts. London, 1904.

Trevor-Roper, Hugh R. Religion, the Reformation and Social Change, and other essays. London, 1967.

Walcott, Robert. English Politics in the Early Eighteenth Century. Oxford, 1956.

Wallace, John M. Destiny his Choice: The Loyalism of Andrew Marvell. Cambridge, 1968.

Walpole, Horace Earl of Orford. A Catalogue of the Royal and Noble Authors of England. Third ed. corrected and enlarged by Thomas Park. 5 vols. London, 1806.

Wedgewood, C.V. Poetry and Politics under the Stuarts, Cambridge, 1960.

Welsford, Enid. The Fool, His Social and Literary History. London, 1935.

Wickham-Legg, L.G. Matthew Prior. Cambridge, 1921.

Whitcombe, D.T. Charles II and the Cavalier House of Commons. 1663-74. New York, 1966.

Williams, Kathleen H. Jonathan Swift and the Age of Compromise. Laurence, Kansas, 1959.

Williamson, George. The Senecan Amble. Chicago, 1951.

Wilson, John Dover. "Shakespeare's Fluellen," The Library, Third Series, III, (1912), 113-151, 241-276.

Wilson, Walter. Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel Defoe. 3 vols. London, 1830.

Ward, A.W. and Waller, A.R. gen. eds. The Cambridge History of English Literature. 15 vols. Cambridge, 1907-27. Vols. III, VIII and IX. (1909, and 1932.)

Wolfe, Don M. Milton in the Puritan Revolution. 1941, reprinted, London, 1963.

Woodhouse, A.S.P. ed. Puritanism and Liberty. Being the Army Debates from the Clarke Manuscripts. London, 1938.

Wright, Louis B. Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England. North Carolina, 1935.

Zagorin, Perez. A History of Political Thought in the English Revolution. London, 1954.