

CHAPTER FIVE

THE CONSPIRACY AGAINST THE ENGLISH PEASANTRY

(Part II)

HISTORIANS from the time of Hume and Smollett, down to the period which ended with Macaulay, wrote of an England that concerned comparatively few people. The great mass of the inhabitants received scarcely any notice. Their sufferings were, in the main, ignored. On that account, the complaints that have been made by men of this generation against the recorders during the dynasties of the Hanoverians are shown to be well founded by the investigators who have brought to light the economic and political evils inflicted by Parliament upon the peasantry of England.

What better proof of this charge is at hand than Macaulay's description of England? He says:

The progress of this great change can nowhere be more clearly traced than in the Statute-book. The number of enclosure acts passed since King

George the Second came to the throne exceeds four thousand. The area enclosed under the authority of those acts exceeds, on a moderate calculation, ten thousand square miles. How many square miles, which were formerly uncultivated or ill cultivated, have, during the same period, been fenced and carefully tilled by the proprietors, without any application to the legislature, can only be conjectured. But it seems highly probable that a fourth part of England has been, in the course of little more than a century, *turned from a wild into a garden.*¹ (Italics mine)

This statement ignores every fact that bears upon the effect and consequences of enclosure. It produces an utterly false impression of the economic condition of the country, and there can be no excuse for his failure to deal with problems so momentous as expropriation of the peasantry and depopulation of the villages. His history was written about the middle of the last century, and he could then have obtained fairly full knowledge of the subject, if he had desired to use it.

The severe strictures passed upon historians by Voltaire and many other critics of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries are undoubtedly merited, but it is not often that the student turns his mind to works written by the unorthodox. The academic historians who instruct

him map out the course of his studies and nurse him along the well-beaten paths of conservative thought. This in no way refers to the special work given to a period, a person, or an event, which has become a by-product of history as it was understood and has now assumed a significance seldom appreciated by the former historians.

Schopenhauer, who has been considered a second-rate philosopher by a few of our modern instructors, is now shown, by some of the deepest students of our day, to be not only a man whose erudition was extraordinary but also one of the most profound thinkers of the nineteenth century.² To him history was far more than a mere record of kings and politicians, the intrigues of statesmen, the trafficking of diplomatists, and the stories of their wars; history to him was what it was to the Greeks—a vessel into which were poured the joy and sorrow of the life of the people. Small wonder, then, that Schopenhauer denounced history in shocking terms:

Besides this incompleteness of history there is the fact that Clio, the Muse of History, is as permeated with lies as a street-whore with syphilis. The new, or critical, historical research goes to considerable trouble indeed to cure her, but with its local remedies it can only deal with individual symptoms that

break out here and there—and not a little quackery, too, finds its way into the process, which makes matters worse than ever.³

The English wit who said, "Very nearly everything in history very nearly did not happen" must have made a profound study of the historians of our grandfathers' days. And probably he was familiar with Nietzsche's observation: "All historians relate things that have never existed save in the imagination."

Now I wish to assert here that there is history that may be accepted as true, in the main. Many interpretations may be put upon it; separate observers of the events recorded might give different pictures of what took place. This is all granted in any evidence given under oath. It varies according to the mind and character of the spectator. Nevertheless, a statesman lied, a murder was committed, a thief stole a purse, a man struck a child; any and every such actual happening will bear varied descriptions by different observers.

In this essay I wish to deal with the history of 150 years ignored by the academic recorders. And, strange to say, the men who wrote history in the early days of Victoria had the same opportunities to look into the documents that were

presented to those who set to work on this great matter after Victoria had been laid to rest.

Before I trace the last phase of "The Conspiracy Against the English Peasantry,"⁴ it is necessary for the reader to understand that England was at that time governed by very few men. In 1793 the Society of Friends of the People presented a petition to the House of Commons "in which it was stated that 157 members were sent to Parliament by 84 individuals, and 150 other members were returned by the recommendation of 70 powerful individuals." William Pitt must have recognized the ownership of parliamentary boroughs as property, for in 1785 he proposed to compensate the patrons of such "constituencies" when he wished to disenfranchise them. It has been said that of the 500-odd members representing counties, cities, and boroughs in England and Wales before the Reform Bill of 1832, at least four-fifths were landlords' men.

Late in the seventeenth century an estimate was made of the cultivated land in England. King and Davenant⁵ found that it did not amount to much more than half the total area, and of this cultivated portion three-fifths was still farmed on the old common-field system. If this estimate is accepted, it means that, even after the enclosures of four hundred years (from the

time of Richard II), there still remained a wide area of land used by the peasantry. What happened in the next hundred years is faithfully recorded, and many of the state documents deal with the clamors and petitions which came from those whose land had been enclosed by force.

When "the value of coal as a means of producing mechanical force was revealed in the discovery by which Watt, in 1765, transformed the steam engine from a mere toy into the most wonderful instrument which human industry has ever had at its command,"⁶ the landlords of England set to work with a zeal unknown before to enclose "nearly every parcel of common, waste and swamp they could find." The procedure, however, was somewhat slow and, realizing their political power, they turned to the parliamentary machine as a means of speeding up the process—by making enclosure the law of the land.

A return printed in a report of a Commons Committee shows that enclosure by act of Parliament really began in 1719, but that, in the following thirty years, only 100 acts were passed. The same return gives the number for each year down to 1845. In all, some 4,122 acts were placed on the Statute Book.⁷ And during the periods when landlords thought more of coal

and less of farming, enclosure acts were turned out at a tremendous rate. Indeed, 1,700 were passed in the twenty years from 1800 to 1819.⁸ Side by side with this conspiracy to reduce the peasantry to the most iniquitous form of slavery, the landlords of England relieved themselves of the burdens of taxation which their land had formerly borne. In 1845, Richard Cobden said, in the House of Commons:

. . . For a period of 150 years after the Conquest, the whole of the revenue of the country was derived from the land. During the next 150 years it yielded nineteen-twentieths of the revenue—for the next century down to the reign of Richard III it was nine-tenths. During the next seventy years to the time of Mary it fell to about three-fourths. From this time to the end of the Commonwealth, land appeared to have yielded one-half of the revenue. Down to the reign of Anne it was one-fourth. In the reign of George III it was one-sixth. For the first thirty years of his reign the land yielded one-seventh of the revenue. From 1793 to 1816 (during the period of the Land Tax), land contributed one-ninth. From which time to the present [1845] one-twenty-fifth only of the revenue had been derived directly from land. Thus the land which anciently paid the whole of taxation, paid now only a fraction or one-twenty-fifth, notwithstanding the immense increase that had taken place in the value of the rentals. . . .

The imposition of excise duties in place of the former burdens of the fisc sent the landless, who had been cut adrift from their commons, with empty bellies in search of work in the towns. This war of the landlords against the peasants has never been exceeded in severity by any conquering state. The wars of the Persians and of the Romans came to an end and, during intervals of rest, although so many were condemned to slavery, care had to be taken of the conquered. There were periods in the history of all the classical empires when the subjugated people enjoyed some respite from the havoc of war. But the landlords' war in England was prosecuted century after century, generation after generation. There was no let-up to it. And it terminated in scenes of crowning horror and shame.

The estimated area of enclosures from 1702 to 1876 is 6,985,328 acres. In the return of 1843 are given the names of all commons that were enclosed after 1800, but the list is compiled of those which contain more than 5,000 acres, together with all commons, whatever their acreage, enclosed in Middlesex and Surrey between 1800 and 1843.⁹ It is only necessary to run one's finger down this list to note the coal areas that were swallowed up: over 53,000 acres in Lincoln-

shire; 48,000 in Cumberland; and tens of thousands in Yorkshire. The black country—all that area in the Midlands extending for miles north, south, east and west—shows even today the rapacity of the landlords.

Perhaps the reason why the historians scarcely touch upon this awful story is because those who imagined enclosure was necessary for the betterment of agriculture could point to an enormous increase in production, which followed the inventions of Watt, Arkwright, and Hargreaves. The prevailing opinion in high quarters seems to have been that the production of wealth, no matter how it was distributed, was the chief interest of man. Who received the wealth and how it was shared did not appear to be a problem that caused much misgiving, for the landlords and manufacturers thrive on the cheap worker of a congested labor market. The wheels of industry must spin, no matter what the human wreckage be, and there is record after record of the well-nigh brutal heartlessness on the part of the rulers, the bishops, the landlords, and the manufacturers of the early days of enclosure by statute.

One of the most interesting accounts of the troubles which beset a man of kindly heart in trying to urge the statesmen of the day to do

something for the evicted and impoverished is given in the memoir of Lord Suffield. He had a scheme to make the peasants independent of the farmers, and he urged the government to purchase land that was then waste, and with the help of a public loan, compel parishes to place laborers upon it and to build cottages with a fixed allotment of land. Suffield writes of the difficulties he had in even trying to get the ear of some of the statesmen of that day. Grey was sympathetic but saw innumerable obstacles. Melbourne was opposed to any such relief, and Suffield tells us:

The fact is, with the exception of a few individuals, the subject is deemed by the world a bore: every one who touches on it is a bore, and nothing but the strongest conviction of its importance to the country would induce me to subject myself to the indifference that I daily experience when I venture to intrude the matter on the attention of legislators.¹⁰

And the sons of the men so ignominiously treated were to be taken to the Peninsula and, afterwards, pressed into the army to save the land of their birth from Bonaparte at Waterloo.

Those who wish to know something of the history of this scandalous conspiracy might turn to the pages of Sir Frederic Eden's *The State of the Poor*¹¹ and the Reverend Dr. Davies' *The Case*

of *Labourers in Husbandry*.¹² These two works by thorough investigators lay bare the facts of the conditions toward the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the next one.

Of the writers who supported enclosure for the purpose of bettering agriculture Arthur Young is the most important. In the case he presents are to be found the usual arguments of the supporters of the landlords. However, Young lived to rue the day he gave his efforts to the conspiracy, for he declared that "By nineteen out of twenty Inclosure Bills the poor are injured." In his paper, *An Inquiry into the Propriety of applying Wastes to the better Maintenance and Support of the Poor*, he reveals a sadness, a regret, which is most affecting, for he saw the consequences of taking the commons from the peasants.¹³

According to the *Return of Owners of Land* ordered to be made by the House of Lords, reported in the Official Debates of 19th February, 1872, it was found that the land of England and Wales (exclusive of London, of roads, Crown woods, wastes, commons, etc., and house and garden properties of less than 1 acre) amounted to 32,862,343 acres and was owned by 269,547 persons. This return has been submitted to careful analysis by many experts, and it has been found

that, if properties of less than 10 acres are omitted, there remain 32,383,664 acres owned by only 147,564 persons. Furthermore, an analysis reveals that as the inquiry was tabulated county by county, many landowners with estates in several counties were duplicated.¹⁴

The literature for and against the acts of the landlord is voluminous, and a bibliography of it would extend for pages. How the historians of that day missed it or how they were able to ignore it will never be explained. Those who protest against the omission in the historical volumes of that time have some reason for thinking it was purposely set aside because it would offend the high and mighty in the church and Parliament.

However, there was something in the spirit of the English peasant that the landlord had overlooked, and that was his courage to protest even in the blackest hour. He was English and knew his rights. Hence, the revolts that arose in so many parts of the country. The consequences of shifting him from the commons are writ large on the saddest pages of English history.

The story of the last revolt of the laborers may be found in the books of John and Barbara Hammond.¹⁵ These were the first works that dealt in a thorough manner with the documents,

the reports of the courts, and the proceedings in Parliament. The first disturbance arose in Kent. Riots took place and the ring-leaders were arrested. Rick-burning was reported in many districts. Threshing machines were smashed and collisions with the authorities often took place.

Then in Sussex an organized demand was made for a living wage. Disorders arose, and rioters were arrested. And so the revolts spread. Wiltshire and Somersetshire were affected. In other counties in the southwest of the country the spirit of revolt drove the maddened peasants to acts of violence. The alarm was so great that the Duke of Buckingham sent a letter to the Duke of Wellington in which he said:

Nothing can be worse than the state of this neighbourhood. I may say that this part of the country is wholly in the hands of the rebels. . . . Something decisive must instantly be done.¹⁶

In all these uprisings it was shown that wages had fallen to such a level that the necessaries of existence could not be procured. Laborers in some of the parishes were asking for eight or nine shillings a week. The riots startled the landlords and frightened the upper classes into acts of brutality. Even at that time these laborers were pictured as Huns and monsters. Other counties

had become affected; in Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire the revolt spread, and a daring riot was announced in Bedfordshire.

Soon the terrors of fearful penalties were hanging over several hundreds of laborers awaiting their trial. Then the matter was handed over to the judges of the English courts and a pitiless law disposed of them in such ways that the record falls like a dreadful shadow upon the fair name of English justice. The Winchester trials reveal that 101 prisoners had been capitally convicted. Hammond says:

. . . Of these 6 were left for execution. The remaining 95 were, with few exceptions, transported for life. Of the other prisoners tried, 36 were sentenced to transportation for various periods, 65 were imprisoned with hard labour, and 67 were acquitted. Not a single life had been taken by the rioters, not a single person wounded. . . .¹⁷

The correspondent of *The Times* (London) wrote to his paper a description of the conditions of the people outside the jail. He said:

The scenes of distress in and about the jail are most terrible. The number of men who are to be torn from their homes and connexions is so great that there is scarcely a hamlet in the county into which anguish and tribulation have not entered. Wives, sisters, mothers, children, beset the gates

daily, and the governor of the jail informs me that the scenes he is obliged to witness at the time of locking up the prison are truly heart-breaking.¹⁸

Winchester was merely a sample of what took place in other parts of England. One record of the men transported to Van Diemen's Land and to New South Wales shows that 457 men and boys suffered.¹⁹ There were, besides, about four hundred who were sentenced to imprisonment at home.

Hammond says that Marcus Clarke's great novel, *For the Term of His Natural Life*, is "one of the most vivid and terrible books ever written."²⁰ Certainly for barbaric horrors I know of none that compares with it. It tells the story of life in the Antipodean settlements, and Hammond describes it as follows:

. . . Not a single feature that can revolt and stupefy the imagination is wanting to the picture. Children of ten committing suicide, men murdering each other by compact as an escape from a hell they could no longer bear, prisoners receiving a death sentence with ecstasies of delight, punishments inflicted that are indistinguishable from torture, men stealing into the parched bush in groups, in the horrible hope that one or two of them might make their way to freedom by devouring their comrades—an atmosphere in which the last faint glimmer of self-respect and human feeling was extinguished by incessant

and degrading cruelty. Few books have been written in any language more terrible to read. Yet not a single incident or feature is imaginary: the whole picture is drawn from the cold facts of the official reports.²¹

When the rebellion was crushed, the peasantry—the very salt of England—lay prone, but their miseries were not at an end. To understand the full effect of enclosure, of taking the commons from these people and driving them into the towns, we must turn to the works that record the sufferings of the urban laborer, and there we shall find what it meant to the mass of the English people to be crowded into an already congested labor market.

Adam Smith came to the conclusion that "civil government, so far as it is instituted for the security of property, is, in reality, instituted for the defence of the rich against the poor, or of those who have some property against those who have none at all."²² A review of the debates in the House of Commons from the time of Anne to the close of the reigns of the Georges will reveal similar statements from many men of great repute in politics and literature. But there is scarcely anything worth noting to be found in the sermons, speeches, or books of the prelates of that day.

The bishops seemed to be landlords' men, and this is understandable if one will only realize how the "rotten borough" system gave perfect political power to the landed interest. Fox's description of the members of the House and their relationship to their patrons might be extended to the gentlemen who wore lawn sleeves in the Lords. Fox said:

When Gentlemen represent populous towns and cities, then it is a disputed point whether they ought to obey their voice or follow the dictates of their own conscience. But if they represent a noble lord or a noble duke then it becomes no longer a question of doubt, and he is not considered a man of honour who does not implicitly obey the orders of a single constituent.²³

Property was sacred; the troubles of human life a bore. Perhaps no more pertinent example of the attitude of mind of the ruling classes to the poor can be cited than that of Lord Chatham:

Knights of the Shire approach nearest to the constitutional representation of the country because they represent the soil.

Swift said it was absurd that men "who do not possess a foot of land in the country" should sit in Parliament for boroughs; and Bolingbroke described the landed gentry "as the true owners of our political vessel."²⁴

The depopulation of the villages, which ensued after enclosure by act of Parliament, has been treated by many authors of this generation. There are works that give the population of a village before and after enclosure. In the books of the Hammonds there is abundant evidence of the demolition which took place in the villages. It is unnecessary to go to the pamphlets that were written at that time by those who suffered and who witnessed the suffering. The bare facts as set down in the reports of the commissions are quite sufficient, and they are harrowing enough.

This is not the place to deal at length with the awful struggle which lasted for nearly half a century, waged by the men of the towns against the tyranny of Parliament, the exactions of the landlords, and the cruelties of the manufacturers. There were, of course, exceptions in these three classes who gave their sympathy to the poor and did what they could, against fearful odds, to have justice done to them. But the consequence and effect of enclosure by force and by statute made the so-called Industrial Revolution possible. Without a labor market of landless men, the machines of the inventors of the time would not have developed so rapidly, for few would have exchanged the security of using a common for the uncertainty of finding a job in a mill.

How short is the memory of the folk! How quickly their minds are turned to the distress of the moment. Education has seen to it that they shall not take a backward glance for the purpose of learning how these things came about. That, perhaps, is the saddest part of the tragedy; they forget and, forgetting, permit the system which injured their fathers to be perpetuated with untold suffering to their heirs. In the story of how the English peasantry was reduced to serfdom we may read of the heroism of a people who survived in spite of the tyrannies of their own kin and, while surviving, gave their best to the struggles fomented by their rulers against the wretched of other lands.

How any intelligent student can review the events recorded in the daily newspapers during the past thirty years and remain complacent as to the future of men in a world of chaos is beyond explanation; and, yet, there are millions in the great countries of the world who imagine that the hopes of the political idealists are about to be realized. But these imaginings are in direct opposition to every indication observed by the profoundest historians of this day. These sanguine individuals do not realize that there has been a re-diagnosis of the social diseases of the period. They either do not know or, if they do, they

deliberately ignore the fact that, as has been predicted by scholars so often during the past fifty years, the future was never so black.

Now the machine is shown to be the brutalizing terror that can destroy its makers. For this triumph of invention cheap labor had to be supplied by landless men—men without an alternative to entering the labor market. The circle comes full. Still, man was never yet bereft of hope. The light of a happier day some where, some when, over there, was never staunched, and there may be yet one more revival, a resurgence of that spirit which dispelled the gloom of the real Dark Age. It is possible that, underlying all this turmoil and suffering, a ferment is taking place that will cause a fundamental change. Men may come to see that the roots of tyranny thrive in the soil of ignorance. An awakening of the spirit should incline them to the belief that the tokens everywhere point clearly to the truth: that the endowment of man with a mind postulates that it is to be cultivated for the purpose of enjoying its goodly fruits. In that way only can ignorance be dispelled.

FOOTNOTES AND REFERENCES

Amer. Jour. Econ. Sociol., III, No. 4 (July, 1944), 525-38.

¹ Lord Macaulay, *The History of England* (New York: Harper & Brothers; 1st ed., 1848-55), I, 290-91.

² In turning again to "The World as Will," in *The Philosophy of Schopenhauer* (edited by Irwin Edman; New York: The Modern Library, 1928), sections 59-65, the student will find there, in the light that has been shed by scholars who have reconsidered the philosophers of the last century, not only a depth of thought in his analysis of eternal justice but a prophetic vision of the world condition as it exists today.

³ Quoted in Egon Friedell, *A Cultural History of the Modern Age*, Vol. III, chap. I, which contains one of the best short reviews of history to be found.

⁴ For *Part I* see *supra*, chap. IV. There are many references to this conspiracy in English history, but none so damning as that to be found in James E. Thorold Rogers' work, *Six Centuries of Work and Wages* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, no date). That which gives this reference great importance is the fact that Rogers was Drummond Professor of Political Economy at Oxford, and Professor of Statistics and Economic Science at King's College, London, and perhaps the most thorough investigator of labor conditions who worked in the nineteenth century. He says: "I contend that from 1563 to 1824, a conspiracy, concocted by the law and carried out by parties interested in its success, was entered into, to cheat the English workman of his wages, to tie him to the soil, to deprive him of hope, and to degrade him into irremediable poverty. . . . For more than two centuries and a half, the English law, and those who administered the law, were engaged in grinding the English workman down to the lowest pittance, in stamping out every expression or act which indicated any organized discontent, and in multiplying penalties upon him when he thought of his natural rights." (p. 398)

⁵ Gregory King, *Natural and Political Observations and Conclusions upon the State and Condition of England* (1696); reprinted by The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, with an introduction by George E. Barnett; and Charles Davenant, *Two Discourses on the Public Revenues and Trade of England* (1698); a complete edition of his writings was published in London, 1771, and The John Hopkins Press, Baltimore, has reprinted some of the smaller works.

⁶ J. R. Green, *A Short History*, p. 792.

⁷ Frederick Clifford, *A History of Private Bill Legislation* (2 vols.; London: Butterworths, 1885), I, Appendix B, No. I, p. 493.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*, I, Appendix B, No. II, p. 495.

¹⁰ R. M. Bacon, *Memoir of Lord Suffield* (1838), as quoted by J. L. and Barbara Hammond in *The Village Labourer* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1911), p. 323.

¹¹ Three volumes, London, 1797.

¹² Published in 1795. The author was Rector of Barkham in Berkshire, and a graduate of Jesus College, Oxford. One of Davies' contemporaries called his work "incomparable."

¹³ This paper was written in 1801, shortly after the Speenhamland system had been inflicted upon the villages. Arthur Young, in traveling around the country, noticed the effect of the increase in the poor rates. He observed that in the parishes where the cottagers had been allowed to hold a tiny piece of land, they refused to accept benefits under the Poor Law. Further investigation led Young to the conclusion that the effects of enclosure had been deplorable in destroying the incentive to industry and self respect. This conversion was shared by Sir John Sinclair. For further details, the reader might be interested in consulting J. L. and Barbara Hammond, *The Village Labourer*, pp. 82-85.

¹⁴ One of the most searching examinations of this *Return* will be found in Graham Peace's *The Great Robbery*. He shows clearly that slightly more than 2,000 persons owned half the agricultural land of England. For another illuminating description of the effects of enclosure, the reader is referred to Dr. Gilbert Slater, *The English Peasantry and the Enclosure of Common Fields*; also by the same author, *The Land: The Report of the Land Enquiry Committee* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1913).

¹⁵ *The Skilled Labourer, 1760-1832* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1919); *The Town Labourer, 1760-1832* (2nd ed.; London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1917); and *The Village Labourer, 1760-1832* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1911).

¹⁶ *The Village Labourer*, chap. XI, *passim*. This letter was written on November 22, 1830 (p. 258).

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 288.

¹⁸ Dated January 7, 1831, *cit.* in *The Village Labourer*, p. 289.

¹⁹ The story of the transportation is told by W. H. Hudson in *A Shepherd's Life*, p. 247, and quoted in *The Village Labourer*, p. 308.

²⁰ *The Village Labourer*, p. 205. Lord Rosebery said of Marcus Clarke's novel: "It has all the ghastliness of truth," and *Chambers's Cyclopaedia of English Literature* (London: W. & R. Chambers, Limited, 1914) III, 729 states: "The terrible realism hardly goes beyond the facts."

²¹ See *Report from Select Committee on Secondary Punishments, 1831* (Parliamentary Paper) and *Report from Select Committee on Transportation, 1838*.

²² *The Wealth of Nations* (one-volume ed.; The Modern Library; New York: Random House, Inc., 1937), Bk. V, chap. I, Pt. II, p. 674. Cf. Adam Smith's

Lectures on Justice, Police, Revenue and Arms, delivered in the University of Glasgow; reported by a student in 1763, and edited with an Introduction and Notes by Edwin Cannan (Professor of Political Economy in the University of London), 1896, p. 15. "Till there be property there can be no government, the very end of which is to secure wealth and to defend the rich from the poor." Cf. also John Locke *Two Treatises of Government* (Everyman's Library; New York: E. P. Dutton & Co.; London: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1924), Bk. II, chap. VII, sec. 94, pp. 163-64: "Government has no other end but the preservation of property."

²³ House of Commons, May 26, 1797, on Grey's motion for Parliamentary Reform, *cit.* in *The Village Labourer*, pp. 13-14.

²⁴ *Chatham's Correspondence*, Vol. III, p. 406; Swift's *Essay on Public Absurdities*; and Bolingbroke's *Patriot King*.