

THE EVOLUTION OF THE GOVERNMENT'S PARTICIPATION IN AND
MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC SPHERE IN LATE-SEVENTEENTH AND
EARLY-EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND

A Thesis

Presented to

The Graduate Faculty of The University of Akron

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

Aaron VanHorn

December, 2014

THE EVOLUTION OF THE GOVERNMENT'S PARTICIPATION IN AND
MANAGEMENT OF THE PUBLIC SPHERE IN LATE-SEVENTEENTH AND
EARLY-EIGHTEENTH CENTURY ENGLAND

Aaron VanHorn

Thesis

Approved:

Accepted:

Advisor
Dr. Michael Graham

Dean of the College
Dr. Chand Midha

Co-Advisor
Dr. Michael Levin

Interim Dean of the Graduate School
Dr. Rex D. Ramsier

Department Chair
Dr. Martin Wainwright

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE POPISH PLOT AND THE EXCLUSION CRISIS	7
III. THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION	42
IV. THE SACHEVERELL “INCIDENT” AND ITS AFTERMATH	63
V. THE END OF THE WAR OF THE SPANISH SUCCESSION AND THE TREATY OF UTRECHT	86
VI. CONCLUSION	114
BIBLIOGRAPHY	122

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries saw England experience a dramatic shift.¹ This change took place across a variety of fields. Two areas of interest to this thesis that saw a transformation were the public sphere and print culture. The government's reaction to the changes occurring in these two theaters of the social landscape can be considered a third area of interest. Jürgen Habermas' theoretical concept of the "public sphere," an idea the German sociologist first put forward in 1962 in his influential book *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, has – since the book's translation into English in 1989 at least – become quite a popular analytical lens for examining the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries.² Habermas characterized the public sphere as a growing discursive space between the private realm of civil society – the family, household, and private business as oriented toward the public commodity market – and the domain of public authority – state and government officials, the court, and the king. Prior to this

¹ The actual range of dates this thesis examines in the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries is 1678 through 1713; the reasoning behind the choice to look at those particular years and the time between them is explained later in the introduction.

² Jürgen Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, trans. Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1991).

particular time period, he argued, such a space did not exist or only existed as the one-way street of “representative publicity,” wherein the lord or holder of power represented or displayed himself before his subjects to denote social status.³ Only with the expansion of trade capitalism – a critical precondition – did this begin to change. To this point, Habermas contended the public sphere’s emergence and subsequent transformation coincided with the development of bourgeois society and its desire for an arena of common concern that was governed by reason; such an arena would theoretically be based on inclusivity and a disregard for status and have the moral authority to challenge the monopoly over legitimate coercion that the king and his court had previously held.

Habermas saw the emergence of the public sphere in the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries as a phenomenon that took place across Europe. However, he claimed that its development in Britain preceded its rise on the continent. The years 1694-1695 were critical for him in this assertion, as a variety of events and non-events allowed the embryonic entity that he called the “literary public sphere” to enter the next phase of its transformation and become the “political public sphere.”⁴ In May of 1694 the first cabinet government, the so-called “First Whig Junto,” was appointed. On December 3 of the same year Parliament passed the Triennial Act that required general elections every three years. Both events increased the role of Parliament and by extension the role of the constituency while simultaneously lessening the degree of authority the monarch and the court exercised. Another key development transpired when a royal charter established the Bank of England on July 27, 1694 and an act of the

³ Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, 5-14.

⁴ Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, 58-59. Habermas mentioned “Three events occurring in 1694 and 1695 [that] mark the beginning of this development,” and he focused on “the founding of the Bank of England,” “the elimination of the institution of censorship,” and “the first cabinet government.” I mention an additional two that were closely linked to them.

Scottish Parliament established its equivalent less than a year later on July 17, 1695. The increase in capital this provided improved the capabilities of the bourgeoisie at the expense of the ruling class. Additionally, when in April of 1695 Parliament decided not to renew the Licensing Act, which after being renewed in 1693 had allowed the government to practice pre-publication censorship and implement consequences upon offensive works and individuals, the path was laid for rational-critical debate to thrive.⁵ As a social force for change in England and later Britain, particularly in regard to politics and the power structure, the public sphere cannot be ignored. Its underlying presence permeates this study.

The second area of interest to this paper that saw a transformation during the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries was print culture. Changes in print culture were closely linked to the emergence of the public sphere and served as key agents in its transformation into a political force. Critically, discussions previously confined to diaries, private correspondence, and intimate chat were more likely to occur in the open forum newspapers, pamphlets, and coffee-houses offered. With the shift in what was discussed in print publicly came a shift in interest level and consumption patterns. An increasing appetite for news and concentration on politics fueled an explosion of cheap print directed towards the masses – particularly in London. Contemporaries described the obsessive craving to read and hear news as an “itch” or a “disease,” while historian Joad Raymond labeled it as a “pathological interest.”⁶ Interest in news and politics naturally led to discussion of news and politics and resulted in rational argument,

⁵ Raymond Astbury, “The Renewal of the Licensing Act in 1693 and its Lapse in 1695,” *Oxford Journals* 5, no. 4 (1978): 296.

⁶ For “contemporaries” see L’Estrange quote from *Observer I* below. Joad Raymond, “The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century,” in *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain*, ed. Joad Raymond (London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 1999), 109.

criticism, and a powerful force capable of making political demands that justified itself via moral authority. This force was public opinion – the fourth estate!

Finally, the English, and later British, government's reaction to the emergence of the public sphere and the transformation of print culture plays a prominent role in this thesis. A point of order is necessary here. "Government" rather than "state" is used here because the extent to which the latter even existed in the late-seventeenth century is questionable and hotly debated. However, it is fair to use the former, as by this point ministers, Parliament, and various other officials assisted monarchs in England in the action or manner of controlling or regulating the nation. These groups helped the monarch form policy and enforce it. Some monarchs were more involved than others. The restoration era Stuarts Charles II and James II played larger roles in the governments of the 1670s and 1680s, relying less on their ministers, than Anne did during her reign (1702-1714). As a result, Charles and James were often the targets of opposition attacks while Anne's various ministers and cabinets bore the brunt of the opposition's criticism rather than the queen herself. Similarly, with the transfer of authority to others during Anne's reign came the onus to figure out what to do with the press. Overall, it is fair to say that even though the term "government" needs a fluid definition for this discussion, it is more suitable than the term "state."

Returning to the government's reaction to the emergence of the public sphere and the transformation of print culture, it is clear that changes and policy shifts here are directly related to the other two areas of interest. Appealing to the sympathies and sensibilities of the progressively more literate crowds on a day-to-day basis grew in importance for the government. The fantastic tools of print culture – be it newspapers,

pamphlets, or a variety of other media capable of influencing public opinion – were increasingly at the government’s disposal. Along with these tools came the legal devices used to regulate print and its proliferation in the public sphere. Some administrations and government officials recognized the increasingly important roles print and the public sphere would play in politics. Charles II’s press censor, Roger L’Estrange, famously commented in the first issue of his *Observer* in 1681 “Tis the Press that has made ‘um Mad, and the Press must set ‘um Right again. The Distemper is Epidemical; and there’s no way in the world, but by Printing, to convey the Remedy to the Disease.”⁷ Others were not as sure as L’Estrange. The evolution that occurred in government understanding, use, and control of print media as directed toward the public sphere was far from even. However, it is the contention of this study that a noticeable (and measurable) difference exists between the beginning and the end of the period.

To grasp this change and gauge how it happened over time this thesis will focus on four instructive events, or in some cases series of events, and the changing political and cultural contexts surrounding them to demonstrate the government’s evolving involvement in and management of the public sphere through print media during this period. The specific episodes of interest are the Popish Plot and subsequent Exclusion Crisis, the Glorious Revolution of 1688-1689, the Sacheverell “incident” and its aftermath, and the peace campaign that brought about the end of the War of the Spanish Succession and the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713. Each was chosen for particular reasons. All appear and are discussed frequently in the source base. In *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* Joad Raymond notices “significant peaks in [press] activity” during crisis years and asserts that “after 1641 press output was a gauge

⁷ Roger L’Estrange, *Observer*, April 13, 1681.

of political tension.”⁸ The avalanche of domestic print that occurred in the brief periods surrounding the Popish Plot and the Sacheverell incident was not previously or again matched for over half a century. The sheer amount and range of the Dutch print propaganda in 1688-1689 is also noteworthy for what it demonstrated to the English. Similarly, the peace campaign of 1710-1713, while more drawn out than the other events, was nonetheless formidable in quantity, scope, and organization. It was also a key example of how the government was able to effectively participate in and manage the public sphere via print. Additionally, two of the events occurred in the late-seventeenth century under the Restoration era Stuarts Charles II and James II, while the other two occurred in the early-eighteenth century during the reign of Queen Anne. The gap between these two pairs of episodes straddles Habermas’ key years for the emergence of the political public sphere, 1694-1695, and allows for a palpable sense of change over time. Below the narrative of each event is interwoven with the sources this paper is interested in analyzing both quantitatively and qualitatively in an effort to support or disprove the main assertion of this essay – that 1678 through 1713 represents a transition period in the public sphere, print culture, and government involvement in these spaces in England. More specifically, both the importance of the public sphere and of print expanded during this timeframe, and to achieve its goals and maintain political stability the government had to expand its participation in and management of these emergent spaces of power brokering – a task this thesis seeks to demonstrate that it successfully did.

⁸ Joad Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 166-167, 182, 185, 195. Five charts examining press output over various spans of time and in various locations, such as Scotland or London, support this claim and reveal the years around the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis as well as around the Glorious Revolution to be peaks in press activity.

CHAPTER II

THE POPISH PLOT AND THE EXCLUSION CRISIS

The first episode this study will analyze is a pair of two related events: the discovery of the supposed Popish Plot in August 1678 and the subsequent Exclusion Crisis of 1679-1681. Though historians agree it was fashioned from air, most contemporaries truly believed that there was a Catholic plot. Their belief and conversation about that belief in print made the Popish Plot the most intensely discussed single subject in England during the seventeenth century. No other event produced quite the abundance of printed documents meant for public consumption over such a short period. Consequently, the wealth of source material alone makes it excellent for examination, but more than that, the way in which the details of the Plot spread amongst the public, evolving as they were debated and contested in print, ensures that the Plot is of interest to this study. The Popish Plot is a perfect starting point because it demonstrates nascent attempts on behalf of the government to participate in and manage the public sphere through print. In particular, the attempts of Roger L'Estrange, the press censor, to use print to stifle the Plot by challenging the testimony and discrediting the character of its main protagonist – Titus Oates – represent an early governmental recognition of print's influence over the public sphere. However, others recognized the

power of print as well. This is critical to understanding the political connection between the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis. The opposition's use of the Plot to leverage public support for its political agenda via print is evident; the government's attempts to stop this are apparent as well. The relationship between opposition and government participants in this paper war is crucial in the Exclusion Crisis. Habermas submitted that "the innovation brought about by the opposition was the creation of public opinion."⁹ Its involvement in print and the public sphere seemed to prompt further engagement in these realms from a till then indifferent government.

Naturally, the various forms of print media, be it pamphlets, newspapers, broadsides, proclamations, etc..., are the window through which these attempted participations in and managements of the public sphere are best viewed and analyzed, so to begin with this essay will look at the two digital archives that hold the relevant primary source material. After exploring the source base this section will examine how the Plot's originator, Oates, brought his illusions before the government and how he managed to get various officials and members of cabinet to give them a degree of credence. An investigation of Oates himself will follow. Next the study will look at how the Plot became public knowledge. Then it will review the suspicious death of Edmund Berry Godfrey and what this meant for the Plot's credibility. It then will analyze the government's efforts to suppress the Plot in the public sphere, particularly the efforts of L'Estrange. An examination of L'Estrange's background and character will be useful here; this will precede the inspection of his specific efforts. The Exclusion Crisis is the second part of this episode. The timeframes of the Exclusion Crisis and the Popish Plot contain significant overlap, yet the two are distinctive enough that they will be examined

⁹ Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, 60.

separately. A look at how the Crisis is connected to the Plot, which in many ways served as the impetus for it, will pave the way for an analysis of the dance of prorogations, dissolutions, and calls for new elections that Charles II did with Parliament. Reviews of the various newspapers and pamphlets related to each government action – whether from the opposition or from loyal polemicists – will follow. Finally, I will evaluate all observations and deductions made throughout the body of the episode with an eye on the larger thesis in a brief conclusion.

This study relies on two major collections of primary source material. The first resource is the “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers” archive.¹⁰ The collection is a full-text, fully searchable digital archive originally collected by the Reverend Charles Burney (1757-1817). The archive comprises 1,521,918 documents from sources such as newspapers, newsbooks, Acts of Parliament, addresses, broadsides, pamphlets, and proclamations with titles predominantly from London, though titles from elsewhere in the British Isles and even the colonies are accessible as well. Although information like the circulation numbers and readership demographics of specific papers is lost to history, other information such as the lifetime of the papers, how often they were released, who published/printed them, where they were geographically, and even who the intended audience was is sometimes available with a little digging. For example, the *London Gazette* (2/1/1666 – 9/25/1792) was published as a single double-sided sheet bi-weekly for a general audience in London as the “official court” newspaper by Henry Muddiman (1629-1692) initially and following 1688 by Sir Richard Steele (1672-1729)

¹⁰ “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *British Library*, Last modified February 17, 2013, Accessed June 9, 2013, http://ezproxy.uakron.edu:2097/bncn/start.do?prodId=BBCN&userGroupName=uakron_main&finalAuth=true.

and then Samuel Buckley respectively.¹¹ Fifty-six issues of the multivolume *Weekly Pacquet of Advice from Rome* were printed anonymously in London between December 03, 1678 and December 26, 1679 by its author, Henry Care (1646-1688), as a notoriously anti-Catholic publication.¹² The fascinatingly named *History of Popery* (12/16/1681 – 8/18/1682) was published in London in thirty-six issues; it was also edited and largely written by Henry Care and printed by A. Maxwell.¹³ *Domestick Intelligence or News Both from City and Country* (7/7/1679 – 1/16/1681) was originally printed Monday and Thursday and later Tuesday and Friday with the stated intention of “preventing false reports.”¹⁴ Fifty-nine issues survive in Burney’s collection. Two similarly named but short-lived papers also exist. Little is known about the seven issues of *Currant Intelligence or An Impartial Account of Transactions* (2/14/1680 – 4/9/1680).¹⁵ John How (fl. 1680-1709) published *Catholick Intelligence or Infallible News Both Domestick & Forreign* (4/1/1680 – 4/29/1680) as a satirical anti-Catholic newspaper, and Burney’s archive only contains five issues.¹⁶ Burney’s collection contains 100 issues of *Impartial Protestant Mercury Or Occurrences Foreign and Domestick* (12/30/1680 – 5/26/1682), another anti-Catholic London paper. The archive contains 189 issues of *The Loyal Protestant and True Domestick Intelligence* (4/9/1681 – 4/20/1683); one Nathaniel Thompson (d. 1687) edited it, and its stated purpose, like so many other papers, was to

¹¹ “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *London Gazette*, publication information.

¹² “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *Weekly Pacquet of Advice from Rome*, publication information. Also, Lois G. Schwoerer, “Care, Henry (1646/7–1688),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/4621>.

¹³ “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *History of Popery*, publication information.

¹⁴ “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *Domestick Intelligence or News Both from City and Country*, publication information.

¹⁵ “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *Currant Intelligence or An Impartial Account of Transactions*, publication information.

¹⁶ “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *Catholick Intelligence or Infallible News Both Domestick & Forreign*, publication information.

“prevent the many false, scandalous and seditious reports.”¹⁷ The seventy-two issue *True Domestick Intelligence or News Both from City and Country* (9/9/1679 – 5/11/1680) was another of these. Sir Roger L'Estrange's (1616-1704) famous *Observer in Dialogue* (4/13/1681 – 1/9/1684) with its 469 issues was yet another.¹⁸ Other newspapers with just a handful of issues that existed during this timeframe include the *English Gazette*, the *English Intelligencer*, the *Faithful Mercury*, the *Friendly Intelligence*, *Impartial London Intelligence or Occurences Foreign and Domestick*, the *True Protestant (Domestick) Intelligence or News Both from City and Country*, the *Weekly Discoverer*, and many more. An abundance of titles existed, but few for very long or with much consequence. Consequently, this archive is of slightly less value for examining the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis than it is for looking at the other events this paper is interested in because of the timeframe in question. Between August 1678 and January 1682 the archive holds a total of 2770 newspaper issues. This may seem like quite a few, but compared to 10229, which is the number of papers between August 1710 and March 1713 – a similar timeframe that covered the peace campaign leading up to the Treaty of Utrecht – there are far fewer to look at. A further breakdown reveals 525 issues of the total 2770 are of the *London Gazette*, with other papers like the *Observer in Dialogue* representing roughly a hundred issues here or there in this period and the rest of the number being made up of the short-lived papers with perhaps a handful of issues.

Burney's archive reveals even more interesting results when this period is keyword searched, though the database does have its limitations. Though “Popish Plot” only returns two results, and “Popish” only eleven, “Plot” returns 398. “Plotters” appears

¹⁷ “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *Loyal Protestant and True Domestick Intelligence*, publication information.

¹⁸ “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *Observer in Dialogue*, publication information.

fourteen times. The originator and main communicator of the Plot, Titus “Oates,” reveals forty-nine hits when keyword searched. Fellow conspirator Israel “Tonge” returns two results. The examining magistrate, “Edmund Godfrey,” appears twice, but when “Godfrey” alone is searched the database returns fifty-five results. “Roger L'Estrange,” despite authoring newspapers during this timeframe, does not appear by name when keyword searched. Neither does “Exclusion Crisis” or “Exclusion,” but “Exclude” appears eight times. “Duke of York” returns sixteen results. More generic words like “Parliament” (305), “King” (899), “York” (57), “Charles” (79), “James” (83), etc... yield larger numbers of returns, and with some sorting may be useful as well. Together this type of data signals a certain level of discussion and relevance of the Plot, the individuals involved in it, and related topics and events within the printed material circulating in public sphere. Along with the numerical analysis of the newspapers above this type of data collection can lend quantitative support to any conclusions drawn about this period from the more direct investigation of the events and sources below. However, Burney’s collection is not the only source base of late-seventeenth century printed material to make use of.

The “Early English Books Online (EEBO)” digital archive is the second primary source collection that this paper draws upon.¹⁹ It contains images of essentially every known work printed in English in England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales and British North America between the first book printed in English by William Caxton in 1473 and 1700. An assortment of 125,000 titles drawn from Pollard & Redgrave's *Short-Title Catalogue (1475-1640)* and Wing's *Short-Title Catalogue (1641-1700)* and their revised editions, as

¹⁹ “Early English Books Online (EEBO),” *ProQuest* LLC, Last modified 2013, Accessed August 19, 2013, <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>.

well as the *Thomason Tracts (1640-1661)* collection and the *Early English Books Tract Supplement*, are available digitally in subject areas ranging from literature, history, philosophy, linguistics, theology, music, fine arts, education, mathematics, science, and more. The subject matter is not limited strictly to “books” in the traditional sense, and it includes broadsides, pamphlets, proclamations, letters, printed sermons, petitions, cases, and other public documents, auction catalogs, including prints and drawings, treatises, ballads, and more. Like Burney’s collection, EEBO’s database allows keyword searching. When “Popish Plot” is keyword searched in EEBO 149 hits in sixty-six records are returned for 1678. The year 1679 returned 648 hits in 270 records, 1680 produced 550 hits in 203 records, 1681 480 hits in 204 records, and 1682 152 hits in sixty-one records. A search of the entire database yielded a total of 2294 hits in 941 records; although some of these printed sources are duplicates or only mildly related, they confirm that the Popish Plot was clearly a subject of relevance and discussion in the public sphere. Correlating keyword searches of EEBO return large numbers of results as well. The progenitor of the Plot, “Titus Oates,” produced 252 hits in 124 records, and his governmental adversary, “Roger L'Estrange,” 461 hits in 271 records. “William Bedloe” shows fifty-four hits in twenty-eight records. Some results can be deceiving. Surprisingly, “Edmund Berry Godfrey” shows just five hits in three records. This may be a result of variant spellings, as “Edmondbury Godfrey” yields forty-six hits in twenty-four results and “Edmunbury Godfrey” an additional two hits in another record. Events or groups can be searched to show that they too were being discussed. “Exclusion” Crisis shows fifty-one hits in twenty-nine records for example. “Jesuit” returned 224 hits in 109 records. Although less likely to be necessarily related, keyword searching “Duke of

York” resulted in 262 hits in 142 records and “King Charles II” in 188 hits in ninety-six records. In combination these results demonstrate numerically that the Popish Plot and the people, events, and subjects connected to it appeared in print frequently – particularly during the main 1678 through 1681 time period. By extension they prove a certain level of relevance and discussion within the public sphere. However, to understand exactly how the government attempted to participate in and manage the public sphere through print both the narrative of the Plot and key individual sources have to be examined in more detail.

Sifting through the tangled, and often shifting, specifics of the Plot was not a simple charge for contemporaries and is not an easy task for historians today.²⁰ Still, the origins seem apparent. In August 1678 the rogue clergyman Titus Oates alleged that there was a Catholic conspiracy to massacre Protestants, including King Charles II and his brother James Duke of York, and with the assistance of French troops these plotters would reintroduce the Catholic faith to England. Since James was openly a Catholic and the king – in all likelihood a secret Catholic himself – could not have been friendlier with Catholics, it should have been obvious that the supposed Plot was pure fiction. However, the strange death of the examining magistrate Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey complicated the matter and brought to life the ever smoldering embers of anti-Catholicism. The Plot generated an incredible amount of discussion in print, ranging from wild speculation and further conspiracy theories to counter-arguments. The government took legal action. Numerous Catholics were accused, questioned, tried, and found guilty on witness

²⁰ For a general overview of the Popish Plot as well as a detailed look at its connection to print culture see Peter Hinds, *The Horrid Popish Plot’: Roger L’Estrange and the Circulation of Political Discourse in Late-Seventeenth-Century London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010). See also John Kenyon, *The Popish Plot* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1972) and Alan Marshall, *The Strange Death of Edmund Godfrey: Plots and Politics in Restoration London* (Stroud, U.K.: Sutton Publishing, 1999).

testimony alone. Twenty-two individuals were executed, because one man made up a story.

In *'The Horrid Popish Plot': Roger L'Estrange and the Circulation of Political Discourse in Late-Seventeenth-Century London* Peter Hinds contends that Oates “invented” the Popish Plot in July-August 1678 as a “way back into at least some part of London society.”²¹ The controversial Oates, who had previously converted to Catholicism and even travelled abroad for the Jesuits, returned to England in June and contacted his former acquaintance and fellow conspiracy theorist Israel Tonge near the end of July or the beginning of August to inform him that he had details of a Catholic plot.²² The fervently anti-Catholic Tonge was receptive, but Oates was reluctant to divulge too much for fear of reprisal from his former Jesuit associates. Oates gave Tonge a lengthy written account of the Plot on August 11, and upon reading it the latter immediately concluded that the king should be notified. Tonge used Christopher Kirby as an intermediary between himself and the king, who first learned of the Plot via Kirby on August 13, 1678.²³ Charles was skeptical upon meeting Kirby and Tonge and hearing the details, but the next day he referred the matter to the lord treasurer, Thomas Osborne Earl of Danby. Danby was also unconvinced, and he pressed Tonge for more evidence before taking any action. Tonge suggested further evidence might appear in the form of intercepted letters to the Duke of York’s Jesuit confessor, Father Thomas Bedingfield, and sure enough, Bedingfield did receive some suspicious letters that he turned over to

²¹ Hinds, *'The Horrid Popish Plot'*, 72.

²² For biographical details about these individuals see “Oxford Dictionary of National Biographies” *Oxford University Press*. Last modified May, 2013. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/public/index.html>, “Oates, Titus” and “Tonge, Israel.” For Oates’ biography see Jane Lane, *Titus Oates* (London: Andrew Dakers Limited, 1949).

²³ No ODNB article exists for Christopher Kirby, however Tonge’s article explains that he was a chemist and a former assistant in Charles’ scientific experiments, thus explaining how he was able to approach the king whilst he walked in St. James’ Park on August 13 and gain some degree of acceptance.

the government on September 1. Additionally, Tonge requested that Oates's allegations be sworn before a justice of the peace. Magistrate Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey met and heard Oates's statement on September 6; Godfrey took a second sworn deposition from Oates on September 28. The Privy Council met September 28-30 to hear the testimony of witnesses and accused Catholics and evaluate the information – including the five “Windsor Letters.”

At this point very few knew of Oates, Tonge, the Letters, or the supposed Popish Plot. Nothing at all related to the Plot appears in Burney's newspaper collection at this time. However, Hinds points out that “details did escape the Privy Council and it is worthwhile” to understand “how they did so” and why “they were received so readily by so many, despite their sometimes extraordinary nature.”²⁴ Hinds cites the words of Henry Coventry, the secretary of state for the northern department, to substantiate this assertion. Although Coventry himself was initially skeptical concerning the testimony of Oates, he saw that “it hath given occasion to so many inquiries and awakened so many men and discourses” that he did not believe it could “pass” without becoming public knowledge and incurring a response. An October 9 newsletter from someone in London to one Sir Francis Radcliffe contains a number of important details from the Privy Council's September 28-30 meeting, and although much of the information reported in it is confused or inaccurate, enough of it is true to confirm that the Plot was being leaked to the public at this time. Additionally, cases of misreported information like this newsletter could and did become cases of invention, as swirling gossip and rumor were the only real sources of information in early-October. Exaggerated allegations generated public fear and, according to John Kenyon in *The Popish Plot*, even “nationwide panic,” “mass

²⁴ Hinds, *The Horrid Popish Plot*, 81.

hysteria,” and “frenzy.”²⁵ While it might be hard to imagine Londoners swallowing the often unrealistic claims associated with the Plot whole, it should be noted that the public was primed with feelings of anti-Catholicism and suspicions of Catholic subversion from over a hundred years of history. In fact, this type of seemingly irrational public response occurred in previous supposed Catholic conspiracies or Catholic related catastrophes during the late-sixteenth and seventeenth centuries such as the 1605 Gunpowder Plot or the 1666 Great Fire of London and marks deep cultural concerns with the issue.

With this atmosphere in mind, the critical event that took the Plot to a new level and gave it some much needed credence was the suspected murder of the investigating magistrate Godfrey. He went missing on Saturday October 12, and was found dead five days later on Wednesday October 17 with strangulation marks on his neck and his own sword pushed through his chest.²⁶ Of two potential causes of death, murder and suicide, murder seemed the more likely at the time, and this led most to believe that Catholics had killed him to keep whatever he knew about the Plot silent.²⁷ Various printed sources soon developed his reputation as a “Protestant martyr.” This is supported in the fact that over 1000 individuals, many of them gentry, attended his funeral on Thursday October 31.²⁸ The House of Commons created a committee in late-October to investigate Godfrey’s death, and the government published two proclamations, on the 20 and 24 of October respectively, offering a reward and a royal pardon in exchange for information regarding Godfrey’s death. The first appeared in the October 20 issue of the *London Gazette* and declares “His Majesty has been pleased to command His Royal Proclamation

²⁵ Kenyon, *The Popish Plot*, 11-12, 95, 252, 274.

²⁶ Alan Marshall, *The Strange Death of Edmund Godfrey*, 146 and Hinds, ‘*The Horrid Popish Plot*’, 86-87.

²⁷ Nicholas Cooper and Zachary Skillard performed an autopsy on Godfrey’s body and ruled strangulation was the cause of death – though L’Estrange and others would later dispute this.

²⁸ Hinds, ‘*The Horrid Popish Plot*’, 238-239.

to be Published, For the Discovery of the Murtherers of Sir Edmundbury Godfrey.”²⁹

Any possible alternatives to murder are stifled in the words “Murthered in a “Barbarous and Inhumane manner.” Thus the printing of this royal proclamation, which was meant to untangle one of the complications of the Plot, served only to conflate it further. The second proclamation appeared in the October 24 issue of the *London Gazette* and added a royal pardon to the offer of a “£500 reward” mentioned in the first. This too, as we will see below, added rather than resolved issues.

However, there was no official governmental publication relating to the Plot at all until Parliament assembled on Monday October 21, 1678. The October 21 through October 24 issue of the *London Gazette* begins with the report that “This day the Parliament... met at Westminster... His Majesty made a most Gracious Speech to the Two Houses, on the Subject of their Meeting; After which the Lord Chancellor more fully declared His Majesties Mind to them.”³⁰ It goes on to explain that the two houses immediately entered into “debate of the Matters before them.” Examining the king’s speech to Parliament reveals that the “matters” being debated at the time were in fact the Plot. In his opening address to both houses Charles said “I have been informed of a design upon my Person, by the Jesuites... and of others too who have been tampering in a high degree with Foreigners, and contriving how to introduce Popery amongst us.”³¹ Hinds tells us that this speech was “printed immediately, distributed all over the country, and subsequently reprinted in Edinburgh and Dublin.”³² Naturally, with the discovery of the death of Edmund Berry Godfrey just four days previously, the king’s revelation came

²⁹ *London Gazette*, October 17, 1678 – October 21, 1678.

³⁰ *London Gazette*, October 21, 1678 – October 24, 1678.

³¹ Charles II, *His Majesties most Gracious Speech together with the Lord Chancellors, to Both Houses of Parliament, On Monday the 21 of October, 1678* (Dublin, Benjamin Tooke, 1678), 3.

³² Hinds, ‘*The Horrid Popish Plot*’, 142.

at a time when tensions were high. The earliest mention of the Plot in the documents collected in EEBO's archive appears in two copies of a tract titled *Charles R. Whereas His Majesty hath received information, that some persons who can discover the manner and circumstances of the murder of Sir Edmund-Bury*; this proclamation was given "at Whitehall this twenty fourth day of October... By His Majesties Command" by "Henry Coventry" and "Printed by John Bill, Christopher Barker, Thomas Newcomb, and Henry Hills, Printers to the Kings most Excellent Majesty, 1678."³³ The first mention of the Plot itself in Burney's collection of newspapers comes in the October 28 through October 31 issue of the *London Gazette*. It contains a royal proclamation delivered from Whitehall on October 29 that declares "That there is Information given of a Horrible Design against His [Majesty's] Sacred Life; And being very sensible of the fatal Consequence of such an Attempt, and of the Dangers of the Subversion of the Protestant Religion, and Government of this Realm... His Majesty... Commands a General and Publick Fast."³⁴ By the end of October the Plot had become such a pressing concern that it seemed appropriate enough to "implore the mercy and protection" of an almighty God – as well as to rally the public behind the government as it attempted to close ranks against the supposed Plot and its agents. Further statements from the government related to the Plot were printed and either republished or announced in the *London Gazette* in November and December. In all, nineteen of these proclamations, orders of council, and royal speeches were published between October 20 and December 21, 1678. These are evidence of the government's efforts to influence the public sphere through print.

³³ EEBO, England and Wales. Sovereign (1660-1685: Charles II), *Charles R. Whereas His Majesty hath received information, that some persons who can discover the manner and circumstances of the murder of Sir Edmund-Bury*.

³⁴ *London Gazette*, October 28, 1678 – October 31, 1678.

Habermas offered this as the explanation for the flurry of government press releases as well, saying “Already in the 1670s the government had found itself compelled to issue proclamations that confronted the dangers bred by the coffee-house discussions” – where the “coffee-house discussions” are an obvious reference to the public sphere.³⁵ The fact that these proclamations were influential in raising the level of public hysteria – though this was unintentional – demonstrates the impact of print. However, these attempts represent the old, top-down, one-way-street of state hegemony over the public sphere. They do not demonstrate participation in or true management of this growing zone of political power.

All the royal proclamations, requests for information, and enticements regarding the Plot finally showed some returns in the last months of 1678. A man with no connection to Oates, William Bedloe, contacted the secretary of state on October 30 and applied for the £500 reward. Bedloe was examined before the Privy Council on November 7. He and another rogue, Miles Prance, accepted the pardon, became ‘King’s Witnesses,’ and eventually went on to testify on February 10, 1679 before the King’s Bench that Robert Green, Lawrence Hill, and Henry Berry were Godfrey’s murderers.³⁶ With the testimony of Bedloe and Prance as well as that of Oates the government could finally take legal action. Late-1678 and early-1679 saw numerous Catholics accused, questioned, tried, and found guilty on witness testimony alone. Several individuals were executed. The first was William Staley; he was tried and found guilty of High Treason

³⁵ Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, 59.

³⁶ Alan Marshall, “Bedloe, William (1650–1680),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Jan. 2008, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/1940> and “Prance, Miles (*fl.* 1678–1688),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/22697>. The term “rogue” is appropriate based on biographical information and the fact that even the ODNB database classifies these men with the terms “informer” and “perjurer.” The three accused men – Robert Green, Lawrence Hill, and Henry Berry – do not have biography articles, but they are discussed in those of Bedloe and Prance.

on November 21. The November 26 issue of the *London Gazette* reports that “This day Mr. William Staley was drawn upon the Sledge from Newgate to Tyburne, and there Hanged and Quartered, according to the Sentence past upon him at the King’s Bench Bar.”³⁷ The same issue reports that “Edward Coleman was on Friday last arraigned.” Oates gave evidence at the trial of Coleman on November 27. He too was found guilty of High Treason and executed on December 3. The three men of the “Jesuit’s Provincial” – Thomas Whitebread, William Ireland, and John Fenwick – as well as the two Oates accused of trying to assassinate the king in St. James’ Park – Thomas Pickering and John Grove – were tried and found guilty on December 17; all were later executed. Robert Green, Lawrence Hill, and Henry Berry were among the martyrs; all three men claimed to be innocent, yet all three were convicted and hanged in February 1679.³⁸ The last of the Plot’s killings occurred in June 1679 when three other accused Jesuits – William Harcourt, John Gavan, and Anthony Turner – were tried and found guilty on June 13 and executed June 20. All these proceedings were announced in the *London Gazette*, so they were clearly public knowledge. In combination with the various printed proclamations from the king throughout the autumn of 1678 and spring of 1679, these announcements advertised to the Plot-crazed public that the government was taking legal action. While this was one form of managing the public sphere via print, it was not really involvement and participation so much as placation.

Few in the government unequivocally bought into the Popish Plot upon hearing the constantly changing details and taking the contradictory statements. As mentioned above, the king, his brother, the lord treasurer, and the secretary of state all doubted the

³⁷ *London Gazette*, November 25, 1678 – November, 28, 1678.

³⁸ Green and Hill were executed on February 21, 1679 and Berry on February 28, 1679.

reality of the Plot. However, none was more skeptical than Roger L'Estrange, the press censor.³⁹ L'Estrange is a critical figure in this study because his actions represent the only significant attempt on behalf of the government or one of its apparatuses to both become involved in and to attempt to influence the public sphere through print during the Plot and subsequent Exclusion Crisis. L'Estrange's background and character reveal a great deal about him and why he is such an important individual to this essay.⁴⁰ In February 1662 Charles II gave L'Estrange the title and responsibilities of the Surveyor of the Press; it became an official unsalaried government post under the title of "Surveyor of the Imprimery" on August 15, 1663 with a monopoly over "printed material not exceeding two sheets of paper," the "sole right to print news," and the ability to license certain types of books.⁴¹ This position also carried a royal authorization to "search for and seize" unlicensed books and papers, and though this often put him into conflict with the stationers, it appears he did just that. Hinds explains that he supposedly spent "£500 each year to recruit spies," while Lois Schwoerer states "the *Calendar of State Papers* teems with general and specific search warrants that he requested and used, and stories abound of his discovering secret presses and tracking down and arresting printers,

³⁹ The term "press censor" is a general job description rather than an exact title. To my knowledge it was not used at the time. However, authors who have written on L'Estrange such as Hinds, Schwoerer, Kitchin, and Raymond use the term alongside "Stuart censor," "royal censor," "government censor," and "court censor." Discussion using this term is always of a broad nature in describing L'Estrange's role within the governments he served; alternatively, when specifics are involved his precise titled positions of "surveyor" or "licensor" are used.

⁴⁰ For more on L'Estrange see George Kitchin, *Sir Roger L'Estrange: A Contribution to the History of the Press in the Seventeenth Century* (London: Kegan Paul, Trubner & Co., 1913; rept. 1971). Also, Lois G. Schwoerer, *The Ingenious Mr. Henry Care, Restoration Publicist* (Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001), Peter Hinds, "Roger L'Estrange, the Rye House Plot, and the Circulation of Political Discourse in Late-Seventeenth-Century London," *The Library* 7 (2002): 3-35 and Anne Dunan-Page and Beth Lynch, eds. *Roger L'Estrange and the Making of Restoration Culture* (Aldershot, U.K.: Ashgate, 2008).

⁴¹ Hinds, 'The Horrid Popish Plot', 36-37.

booksellers, and publishers.”⁴² Additionally, in February 1675 L’Estrange became deputy licenser to Secretary of State Joseph Williamson, allowing him to expand his licensing capabilities into books dealing with the law and government affairs as well as other forms of political writing. His government positions allowed him to operate two news-books during the early-to-mid-1660s – *The Intelligencer, Published for the Satisfaction and Information of the People* and *The Newes*. The latter eventually merged into the former, but due to L’Estrange’s mismanagement it was replaced as the official government news organ with the *London Gazette* on January 29, 1666 – thereby costing L’Estrange his exclusive grant. However, this action allowed him to publish other things, including his infamous periodical, the *Observer*, beginning in April 1681.⁴³ Beyond the explicit responsibilities or rights attached to his government sanctioned privileges and powers, L’Estrange ventured into the public sphere via print whenever possible. As a fervent royalist he wrote dozens of pamphlets between 1678 and 1682 that expressed skepticism of the Plot and argued zealously against ideas of excluding the Duke of York from the line of succession; his name is also associated with numerous anonymously published historical works during this period. Furthermore, L’Estrange was not above putting his ear to the ground, so to speak, and venturing into the true locales of the public sphere, the coffee-houses (usually Sam’s on the corner of Ludgate Street and Ave Maria

⁴² Hinds, ‘*The Horrid Popish Plot*’, 37 and Schwoerer, *The Ingenious Mr. Henry Care, Restoration Publicist*, 15.

⁴³ L’Estrange’s *Observer in Dialogue* should not be confused with the later paper of the *Observer* published between April 01, 1702 and July 26, 1712 by a series of Whigs beginning with John Tutchin. Tutchin deliberately gave his paper the same name as L’Estrange’s infamous periodical and mimicked its dialogue format.

Lane), at a time when they were “regarded with suspicion by the government” for their potential to become places of “unregulated political discourse.”⁴⁴

However, opinions of L’Estrange were and are mixed. While Alan Marshall in his *The Strange Death of Edmund Godfrey* describes him as “a hired hack,” Hinds calls L’Estrange “an extremely important window onto the circulation of political opinion.”⁴⁵ Several critical contemporaries seem to agree with Marshall (“little hackney Roger” and “Crackfart” were popular nicknames for him); they insinuate that L’Estrange willfully distorted evidence and was motivated by a “popish affection,” financial rewards, and favor and advancement at court. His critics were so fierce in the fall of 1680 that he was himself examined before the Privy Council before being forced into exile temporarily. However, his usefulness to this study is more in line with Hinds’ interpretation, as I have less concern with how accurate or unbiased his writing was than I do with his actions and what they represent. As someone on the government payroll who often worked at the behest of warrants, L’Estrange would have naturally sought to defend it and its monarch with all his Catholic sympathies against all the seditious and libelous pamphlets and stories circulating in connection with the Popish Plot. This is not to imply that he did not believe what he was writing. With his royalist sympathies and history of supporting the Stuarts he probably did, but this is of little significance to us.

What is significant is that L’Estrange waded into the maelstrom of the Popish Plot and the subsequent Exclusion Crisis as an official with the objective of using print to shape opinion in favor of the government. He did so with a keen awareness of what was

⁴⁴ Hinds, *The Horrid Popish Plot*, 318-319. For more extensive discussion of the relationship between coffee-houses, print media, and the public sphere see any of the numerous works of Brian Cowan on the subject.

⁴⁵ Hinds, *The Horrid Popish Plot*, 236.

being discussed in print and a prolific ability to put forward rational arguments that directly addressed various printed materials through both pamphlets and his newspaper. Generally, L'Estrange viewed the printed discourse related to the Plot as "false Reports, forged Tales," and "Mis-representations" aimed at an audience incapable of judiciously weighing the evidence. Titus Oates' April 15, 1679 publication *A True Narrative and Discovery of Several very Remarkable Passages relating to the Horrid Popish Plot* is an example of exactly what L'Estrange was critical of.⁴⁶ In 1679 he sought to correct "wandering Rumours" with "Authentick Records" in the pamphlet *The History of the Plot*.⁴⁷ In the same work he criticized the sorry state of the nation when "We make every Coffee-House Tale an Article of our Faith." Later he requested that his readers "Distinguish betwixt Street Reports and Sworn-Evidences" in the pamphlet *A Short Answer to a Whole Litter of Libels*.⁴⁸ This theme of supposedly seeking to "undeceive" the public and discover the truth is ever-present in L'Estrange's works on the Plot.

An excellent example of L'Estrange's efforts to correct the inaccurate information related to the Plot is the third volume of *A Brief History of the Times*, a book he did not finish till a decade after the initial incident. It is a thorough analysis of the disappearance and death of Godfrey that seeks to invalidate the commonly accepted role this event played in the Popish Plot. In it L'Estrange first examines the testimony of Bedloe and Prance, the two principle witnesses to the murder, proving the evidence inconsistent and even conflicting. It directly challenges Prance's *A True Narrative and Discovery of*

⁴⁶ EEBO, Titus Oates, *A True Narrative and Discovery of Several very Remarkable Passages relating to the Horrid Popish Plot* (London, 1679).

⁴⁷ EEBO, Roger L'Estrange, *The History of the Plot* (London: Richard Tonson, 1679).

⁴⁸ EEBO, Roger L'Estrange, *A Short Answer to a Whole Litter of Libels* (London: Henry Brome, 1680), 13.

*Several very Remarkable Passages relating to the Horrid Popish Plot.*⁴⁹ Then in the second part L'Estrange attempts to show that Godfrey's death was a suicide rather than a murder, arguing that most of the evidence points to this being the case and that any indication to the contrary was likely the result of a botched crime scene investigation. L'Estrange was one official who understood that it was the press that generated panic, propagated the Popish Plot, and fueled political controversy by allowing every patron of the coffee-house to put forward a claim or counter-claim, thereby gaining a voice that with time thousands would hear. He also saw print as a tool that he could use to correct the uniformed, indiscriminating, and prejudiced, and his works regarding the Plot confirm this.

The second part of this episode, the Exclusion Crisis, had its impetus in the Popish Plot and the witch-hunt atmosphere it generated in the public sphere.⁵⁰ Though there is a great deal of overlap in the timeframes of the Plot and the Exclusion Crisis, it is clear that the former served as an incitement for the latter. This occurred because the Duke of York was a known Catholic, a member of the Privy Council, and heir to the throne. This combination was an issue at a time when it was believed, because of the Plot, that thousands of French troops stood ready to invade England and forcibly convert the nation to Catholicism. James' religion and his proximity to the king were seen as encouragement to Catholics and simply too much of a threat to Charles, the government, and the Protestant religion to be tolerated. It is easy to see how one could follow this line

⁴⁹ EEBO, Miles Prance, *A True Narrative and Discovery of Several very Remarkable Passages relating to the Horrid Popish Plot* (London, 1679). Note that this pamphlet, published May 26, 1679, used the exact same title Oates used a month and a half earlier, yet they are different and should not be confused.

⁵⁰ For an overview of the Exclusion Crisis see Hinds, *'The Horrid Popish Plot': Roger L'Estrange and the Circulation of Political Discourse in Late-Seventeenth-Century London* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010) again or Tim Harris, *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

of thinking to the conclusion that James not only had to be removed from the king's presence and from the Privy Council, but from the line of succession as well. This is exactly what happened. On Monday November 4, 1678, little over a month after the Plot became public knowledge, Lord William Russell proposed in Parliament the Duke's removal from the king's council and in doing so sparked intense debate. So much so that conversation eventually turned to removing of him from the line of succession – or at least the placement of certain restrictions upon his succession. The king attempted to put an end to the debate on Saturday November 9 when he addressed Parliament, but this was only a beginning.

Hinds states that “details of the speech, given in the confines of the House of Lords, found their way swiftly – and misreportedly – across London.”⁵¹ Details of how the king supposedly meant to secure the Protestant succession by replacing his brother with his bastard son, the (Protestant) Duke of Monmouth, became public and began circulating in print. Hinds explains that the people of London rang bells and started bonfires in the streets to celebrate the news. Sir Robert Southwell, a government official who apparently had some understanding of public relations, suggested the king's speech be immediately printed to clear things up and to “undeceive these mistaken Londoners.”⁵² It was, but it did nothing to clear up the confusion. EEBO contains two copies of *His Majesties most gracious speech to both houses of Parliament, on Saturday the 9th of November, 1678*, printed in London by John Bill, Christopher Barker, Thomas Newcomb, and Henry Hills. The language that Charles used including thanking Parliament for its

⁵¹ Hinds, *The Horrid Popish Plot*, 298.

⁵² Sean Kelsey, “Southwell, Robert (bap. 1608, d. 1677),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Jan 2008, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26065> and Hinds, *The Horrid Popish Plot*, 299.

assistance in the prosecution of “Popish Recusants,” saying “I am as ready to joyn with you in all the ways and means that may Establish a firm Security of the Protestant Religion” and assuring members that he meant to “make you Safe in the Reign of any Successor” is not clear as to what was to be done with the succession and even lent itself to conclusions of exclusion, so it is easy to see how the public was confused.⁵³ The November 7 through November 11 issue of the *London Gazette* only seemed to support this assumption with the November 10 “Translation of His Majesties late Proclamation, Commanding all Persons, being Popish Recusants, or so reputed, to depart from the Cities of London and Westminster, and all other places within Ten miles of the same.”⁵⁴ This public proclamation, it would seem, was ordering James, a Catholic, to depart from his brother’s presence. Debate over the “Second Test Act,” a bill that was finally passed on November 30 further vilified Catholics and seriously considered whether or not the Duke should remain anywhere near the king. It is important to note that while the Exclusion Crisis is often considered a parliamentary affair, the lines of argument deployed in the Commons or Lords were simultaneously echoed in newspapers and pamphlets directed at the public. With the situation seemingly spiraling out of control and governmental attempts at damage control only muddling the situation, Charles prorogued Parliament on December 30 until February 4, 1679.

In the interim the opposition under Anthony Ashley Cooper, 1st Earl of Shaftesbury, saw an opportunity to exploit public fears that Protestantism in England was under threat and used them to expel from office those in the government who opposed it politically. The playwright, John Dryden, was one of many, including L’Estrange, that

⁵³ EEBO, Charles II, *His Majesties most gracious speech to both houses of Parliament, on Saturday the 9th of November, 1678* (London: John Bill, Christopher Barker, Thomas Newcomb, Henry Hills, 1678).

⁵⁴ *London Gazette*, November 7, 1678 – November 11, 1678.

asserted Shaftesbury deliberately manipulated the Popish Plot for political ends. In his popular poem *Absalom and Achitophel* he rendered the Earl as a character who amplified fears of Catholics and used radical writers and booksellers who were under his influence – and likely his pay – to disseminate political opinions and influence public debates via print.⁵⁵ Drawing on Dryden, Hinds contends “The danger was from both Shaftesbury – vocal in his support of exclusion – and from the ‘multitude’ or the ‘crowd’ he spurs on.”⁵⁶ Besides the Duke of York, Shaftesbury and the opposition targeted the Lord Treasurer, the Earl of Danby – probably because he was seen as a threat. According to his ODNB article, Danby along with secretary Joseph Williamson and L’Estrange was one of a few in the government to “fully appreciated the power of the press,” perhaps because “the treasurer was himself the victim of many libels.”⁵⁷ Furthermore, “Danby’s administration” employed a “barrage of tracts, often publicized in the government sponsored *London Gazette*” to achieve its political ends. Lord Danby was impeached for his activities as the king’s secret emissary to Louis XIV. An EEBO search reveals three copies of the subsequently published *Articles of impeachment of high treason and other hgh [sic] crimes, misdemeanours and offences against Thomas, Earl of Danby, Lord High Treasurer of England as they were delivered in to the House of Lords in the name of the Commons of England, by Sir Henry Capel, December 23, 1678, together with a letter of the lord treasurers to Mr. Montague, late ambassador in France* where Danby was accused of “Traitorously encroaching” on “Regall Power,” sustaining “popish affections,” and “concealing the horred and bloody Plot and Conspiracy, contrived by

⁵⁵ EEBO, John Dryden, *Absalom and Achitophel A poem*. (London : Jacob Tonson, 1681).

⁵⁶ Hinds, ‘*The Horrid Popish Plot*’, 354.

⁵⁷ Mark Knights, “Osborne, Thomas, first duke of Leeds (1632–1712),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oct. 2008, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/20884>.

Papists, against His Majesties person and Government.”⁵⁸ On January 24, 1679 the king dissolved Parliament by proclamation before it resumed and called for new elections to save Danby from prosecution – though not from forced resignation and temporary imprisonment in the Tower – and to prevent himself from being attacked on his French policy. The *London Gazette*’s March 24, 1679 through March 27, 1679 issue reports from Whitehall on March 26 that “His Majesty hath thought fit to dismiss the Earl of Danby from the Office of Lord High Treasurer of England.”⁵⁹

L’Estrange did what he could combatting the opposition in print, but he was forced to do so with only his understanding of the public sphere and writing ability since the lapsing of the Licensing Act of 1662 in 1679 deprived him, and any other licensors, of his previous legal powers.⁶⁰ As a testament to his value, the Privy Council, upon the lapsing of the Act, summoned him in May 1679 to figure out “fit Directions... against unlicensed Bookes” and to propose stratagems for “regulating the abuses and libertyes of the Presse.”⁶¹ Though most of his suggestions came to nothing after being deemed too drastic, the government still found a use for him. His ODNB article states that “by 1679, with the press completely out of control, there was a renewed demand for L’Estrange’s... craft of political editorialist and pamphleteer.”⁶² EEBO returns fourteen results whose authorship is connected with L’Estrange in 1679 – nine original titles, three duplicates,

⁵⁸ EEBO, *Articles of impeachment of high treason and other hgh [sic] crimes, misdemeanours and offences against Thomas, Earl of Danby, Lord High Treasurer of England as they were delivered in to the House of Lords in the name of the Commons of England, by Sir Henry Capel, December 23, 1678, together with a letter of the lord treasurers to Mr. Montague, late ambassador in France.* (London: 1678), 1-5.

⁵⁹ *London Gazette*’s March 24, 1679 – March 27, 1679.

⁶⁰ The Licensing Act of 1662 – officially titled *An Act for preventing the frequent Abuses in printing seditious treasonable and unlicensed Bookes and Pamphlets and for regulating of Printing and Printing Presses* – expired in 1679, so L’Estrange, as licensor, saw his official duty of supervising the newspaper press and authority of prepublication censorship end.

⁶¹ Schwoerer, *The Ingenious Mr. Henry Care, Restoration Publicist*, 83-85.

⁶² Harold Love, “L’Estrange, Sir Roger (1616–1704),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oct 2007, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16514>.

and two anonymous associations with the reprinted works of historical authors. The year 1680 reveals forty-two more results whose authorship is connected with L'Estrange including further eighteen original titles, nineteen duplicates, and five anonymous associations. The year 1681 shows twenty-two of thirty-eight results as original titles, thirteen duplicates, and three as anonymous associations, while 1682 yields nine more results with five original titles, one duplicate, and three anonymous associations. Almost all these printed sources are related to the Plot and the Exclusion Crisis. Clearly the press censor was an active participant in the public sphere and defender of the government during this timeframe.

Returning to a specific example in early-1679, we find L'Estrange's famous pamphlet – *The Case Put*, “printed by M. C. for Henry Brome” – was one of many to come that argued against exclusion.⁶³ In the opening paragraph L'Estrange alludes to the landscape of the public sphere in 1679, stating “The Case of His Royal Highnesses Succession (in regard of the present circumstances of Plots and Popery) has been of late, sufficiently agitated, Pro and Con.” This was definitely the situation, as the newspapers and pamphlets relating to the Popish Plot and the Exclusion crisis prove. He then says “Advocates of Both sides pretend equally to support themselves upon Arguments drawn from Nature, Scripture, Law, History, Custom, and Political Expedience,” but it is obvious that L'Estrange was contemptuous of the various “hack” writers advocating exclusion. Hinds points out that L'Estrange repeatedly warned his audience against “perverted authorities” – that is, against the “misleading” and often “partisan use of

⁶³ EEBO, Roger L'Estrange, *The case put concerning the succession of His Royal Highness the Duke of York with some observations upon the political catechism, and two or three other seditious libels* (London, Henry Brome, 1679), 1-18.

historical precedents.”⁶⁴ This theme is obviously present in *The Case Put*. The author’s belief that most men should not meddle in politics and his misgivings regarding the consuming public’s ability to astutely consider what they read, another motif of L’Estrange’s works, is visible in this pamphlet as well. He asserts, the “Common man,” toward which the majority of the cheap print was being directed, “would have “difficulty” distinguishing “betwixt the Truth, and the Paradox” and determining “upon which side Reason lies.” Supporting this statement, he pointed out that contrary to being a rallying point for Catholics James was in fact a target of the Plot according to Oates’ original testimony, yet few seemed to comprehend or even recognize the widespread inconsistencies associated with the Plot and exclusion arguments. Instead, he argued, rumor was the idol that the public worshiped and the platform Plot and exclusion arguments were built upon.

When the new Parliament met on March 6 it was hostile to Catholics in general and the Duke of York in particular. Despite Charles’ announcement in his opening speech to Parliament – printed immediately afterward as *His Majesties most Gracious Speech, together with the Lord Chancellors, to both Houses of Parliament, on Thursday the 6th of March, 1678/9* – that the Duke and his wife had departed on March 3 for Holland at his command, Shaftsbury directly called for the Catholic duke’s exclusion from the line of succession.⁶⁵ In *The Case Put* L’Estrange had put great emphasis on the fact that to ask the king to part with his own brother was to ask of him a great sacrifice indeed. Secretary of state Coventry, although convinced of the veracity of the Popish

⁶⁴ Hinds, ‘*The Horrid Popish Plot*’, 329.

⁶⁵ EEBO, Charles II, *His Majesties most Gracious Speech, together with the Lord Chancellors, to both Houses of Parliament, on Thursday the 6th of March, 1678/9* (London: John Bill, Christopher Barker, Thomas Newcomb, Henry Hills, 1679).

Plot, was an early voice within the government advocating alternatives to exclusion, first speaking on November 22, 1678 in favor of a proposal that a popish successor to Charles II be deprived of certain powers and voting against exclusion in the first exclusion Parliament.⁶⁶ Despite Coventry's and others' efforts the opposition pushed forward with an Exclusion Bill, first introduced officially on May 11, 1679.

Alarmed at this action, the king again called for Parliament to be prorogued on May 27 – supposedly until August 14. However, Charles was so distressed by the House of Commons and the prospect of the opposition reintroducing the Exclusion Bill should he allow Parliament to sit that he dissolved it on July 12 before it could meet and called for fresh elections for the second time. Shaftesbury was in turn concerned that the king might be intending not to allow a new Parliament to meet at all, so he launched a petitioning campaign to pressure the king to do so. On December 7 Shaftesbury and fifteen other peers signed a petition that called on Charles to allow Parliament to meet; a similar petition of 20,000 signatures followed on January 13, 1680. These petitioners were referred to as Whiggamores or Whigs because of the Scots Covenanters with their Petition of 1638 had also been called Whiggamores. Similarly, Danby's supporters in the court party were called Tories, after Toraide – the nickname Catholic rebels in Ireland used.

Discussion of exclusion and petitions dominated the various forms of print media these two factions directed at the public between the prorogation of Charles' second Parliament on May 27, 1679 and the meeting of his third Parliament on October 21, 1680. In this period of downtime L'Estrange again represented the only prominent

⁶⁶ Stuart Handley, "Coventry, Henry (1617/18–1686)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Jan 2008, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/6477>.

governmental polemicist willing to participate in the popular discourse of the public sphere – a discourse he himself asserted was rife with “the Subject of his Royal Highnesses’s Succession to the Crown” and “made the Common Theme of the Press.”⁶⁷ His pamphlet *The Free-born Subject, or, the Englishmans Birthright: assertyed against all Tyrannical Usurpations either in Church or State* in 1679 was one of several that argued against exclusion, noting its connection to the Popish Plot. In it he considers the paradox of a man’s “birthright,” supposedly a guaranteed “liberty” to be protected by the “law,” and the same “law” used as a form of “limitation” and “subjugation” to “the government.” The wide ranging discussion of the law, the government, tyranny, religion, contemporary pamphlet literature, and the Plot in total makes a case against James’ exclusion without explicitly referencing him. L’Estrange’s two part satirical dialogue pamphlet *Citt and Bumpkin* sought to combat those in the opposition attempting to use history to justify exclusion arguments.⁶⁸ In it the two characters, ironically placed in the setting of a coffee-house, discuss taking items out of context and selective quoting to support a political position – an action it is clear L’Estrange scorns. The fact that EEBO contains three copies each of both the first and the second part of *Citt and Bumpkin* indicates that there were three distinct printings of it. This in turn suggests that the pamphlet was both popular and relevant. The existence of several anonymously written spin-off or response pamphlets including *The dialogue betwixt Cit and Bumpkin answered in another betwixt Tom the Cheshire piper, and Captain Crackbrains dedicated*

⁶⁷ EEBO, Roger L’Estrange, *The Free-born Subject, or, the Englishmans Birthright: assertyed against all Tyrannical Usurpations either in Church or State* (London: Henry Brome, 1679), 1-20.

⁶⁸ EEBO, Roger L’Estrange, *Citt and Bumpkin, in a dialogue over a pot of ale concerning matters of religion and government* (1680), 1-22, and *Citt and Bumpkin, the second part, or, A learned discourse upon swearing and lying, and other laudable qualities tending to a thorow reformation* (London: Henry Brome, 1680), 1-20.

to *Right Worshipful the Mayor of Quinborough*, the pamphlet *Crackfart & Tony*, and two copies of the pamphlet *Crack upon crack* supports this as well.⁶⁹ The first plays upon the coffeehouse setting and dialogue style of *Citt and Bumpkin* and makes reference to it frequently in a discussion of L'Estrange's arguments there in particular as well as encompassing larger points about exclusion and those in the opposition petitioning Charles and the government to let Parliament assemble. The second plays upon and addresses the first and the third the second respectively; note the connection between "Captain Crackbrains," "Crackfart," and "Crack upon crack."

A number of other voices were willing to participate in the public sphere in late-1679 and early-1680. Although numerous pamphlets were published anonymously during this time, it is believed that most were printed at the encouragement of the opposition.⁷⁰ The Duke of Monmouth was an obvious rallying point from early on, and Monmouth did little to repudiate rumors that he would replace James as heir to the throne following the latter's exclusion. Several pamphlets, the first of which was titled *A Letter from a Person of Honour; concerning the Black Box*, suggested that Monmouth's mother had actually married Charles in secret, thereby making Monmouth the legitimate heir by birth – not just potentially via some legal action.⁷¹ Two other anonymously written pamphlets with the infamous "black box" mentioned in their title appear in EEBO as

⁶⁹ EEBO, E.P., *The dialogue betwixt Cit and Bumpkin answered in another betwixt Tom the Cheshire piper, and Captain Crackbrains dedicated to Right Worshipful the Mayor of Quinborough* (1680), 1-20. *Crackfart & Tony; or, knave and fool: in a dialogue over a dish of coffee, concerning matters of religion and government* (1680), 1-18. *Crack upon crack: or, Crack-fart whipt with his own rod, by Citt and Bumpkin, If Crack-fart drawn unto the life you'd see, Loe here he hangs in formal effigie: His writings were so foul, as all suppose They'l poison us! Good reader stop your nose* (1680), 1-3.

⁷⁰ "Anonymity (no name or initials, or use of a pseudonym) became increasingly frequent. Only a handful of publications in 1588 were anonymous... In 1614 about 8 per cent of all publications were anonymous... By 1644 this had risen to around 60 per cent; it was around 57 per cent in 1688. These percentages exclude newspapers and periodical newsbooks, which were almost universally anonymous." Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*, 168-169.

⁷¹ EEBO, [Robert Ferguson], *A Letter from a Person of Honour; concerning the Black Box* (London: 1680).

well: *A Full relation of the contents of the black box, with some other remarkable occurrences* in two copies and *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, discuss'd and asserted in a letter to a friend* in three.⁷² Additionally, a variety of pamphlets debated the veracity of this rumor. *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* and *The Imposter Expos'd in a Dissection of a Villanous Libell, here Printed at Large Entituled A Letter to a Person of Honour, Concerning the Black Box* were two of these anonymously written works.⁷³ Despite critics such as L'Estrange, it never really went away. In fact, political opposition forced L'Estrange to go "away" into exile from October 1680 till February 1681. The king himself even had to eventually come out and officially address the rumor and deny the marriage on June 2, 1680 in an officially printed declaration.⁷⁴ This, like so many other declarations and proclamations that Charles made, seems largely to have been ignored.

Charles continued to play a waiting game until October 21, 1680, when he finally permitted Parliament to assemble for the third time during his reign. The Popish Plot and the Exclusion Bill were the only real issues. The Commons immediately passed the Bill, but despite Shaftsbury's impassioned speeches for exclusion on November 15 and December 23 the Lords preserved James' succession, rejecting the bill when Lord

⁷² EEBO, *A Full relation of the contents of the black box, with some other remarkable occurrences* (London: 1680) and *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, discuss'd and asserted in a letter to a friend* (London: 1680).

⁷³ EEBO, *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* (London: 1680) and *The Imposter Expos'd in a Dissection of a Villanous Libell, here Printed at Large Entituled A Letter to a Person of Honour, Concerning the Black Box* (London: 1680).

⁷⁴ EEBO, Charles II, *His Majesties Declaration to all His Subjects, June the Second, 1680* (London: John Bill, Christopher Barker, Thomas Newcomb, Henry Hills, 1680).

Halifax convinced his fellow peers that they should not take sides as Whigs or Tories. However, the opposition continued to agitate, threatening to approve no further taxation, impeach government officials, and spread the investigation of the Plot in Ireland. It and its supporters also appealed to the public sphere through print.

On January 20, 1681 Charles dissolved Parliament for a third time and called a new one to meet at Oxford in late-March. There Shaftsbury would not have the influence he did in London thanks to the London mob. Accordingly, Shaftsbury and fifteen other signatories petitioned the king on January 25 against the move to Oxford.⁷⁵ Again, an obvious reflection of parliamentary attitudes soon appeared in the public sphere via pamphlets. Hinds cites three anonymously published dialogue pamphlets – a style L’Estrange popularized with *Citt and Bumpkin* – that expressed discontent with the move.⁷⁶ One pamphlet, *Vox Populi*, published anonymously between the late-January dissolution and the commencement of the Oxford Parliament drew upon selectively quoted statutes and political writing from English history to suggest that Charles’ arbitrary disbanding of Parliament was tyrannical behavior.⁷⁷ The author claims that “those many Surprising and Astonishing Prorogations and Dissolutions” have caused “our Fears and Dangers” of Catholics to have “Manifestly increased.” L’Estrange, always on guard against selective quoting and what he deemed as the misuse of historical texts, attacked *Vox Populi* and its sequel, *Vox Regis, or, the Differences betwixt a King*

⁷⁵ *The Earl of Essex’s Speech at the delivery of the Petition to the King, Jan. 25. 1680.*

⁷⁶ Hinds, ‘*The Horrid Popish Plot*’, 108, 334. EEBO, *A Dialogue betwixt Sam. the ferriman of Dochet, Will. a waterman of London, and Tom. a bargeman of Oxford upon the Kings calling a parliament to meet at Oxford.* (London:1681), EEBO, *A dialogue between two burgesses, about chusing their next Members of Parliament* (London: 1681), and EEBO, *Plain-dealing, or, A second dialogue between Humphrey and Roger, as they were returning home from choosing Knights of the sheir to sit in Parliament* (London: 1681).

⁷⁷ EEBO, *Vox populi, or, The peoples claim to their Parliaments sitting, to redress grievances, and provide for the common safety, by the known laws and constitutions of the nation humbly recommended to the King and Parliament at their meeting at Oxford, the 21th of March.* (London, Francis Smith, 1681).

ruling by Law, and a Tyrant by his own Will, in the first few issues of his *Observer* to no avail. The message and format of *Vox Populi* and *Vox Regis* was quite popular – inspiring several other “Vox” pamphlets. Francis Smith, the publisher, even provided copies of *Vox Populi* to members of the Oxford Parliament just before it began. This particular pamphlet is interesting because it is an example of how parliamentary politics influenced the production of a piece of print media aimed at the public sphere that in turn may have influenced parliamentary politics.

When Charles’ fourth Parliament did meet on Tuesday March 21, both the Whigs and the king attended with armed soldiers. This short session, as well as the surrounding printed exchanges, was quite contentious and lasted only a week. Again the Commons called for the Duke of York to be excluded. The Privy Council suggested regency during his lifetime on behalf of his Protestant daughters, Princess Mary and Princess Anne, and this was debated briefly. However, the suggestions of a regency or “protectorate” were found lacking, and soon the Whigs refused to accept anything but exclusion. As discussion shifted away from compromise, Charles dissolved Parliament yet again.

Oxfords Lamentation in a Dialogue between Oxford and London: concerning the Dissolution of the Parliament was one of several pamphlets that expressed the public’s disappointment at the king’s decision to dissolve Parliament for a fourth time.⁷⁸

This fourth dissolution of Parliament was the last; Charles never called it again during his lifetime. In his pamphlet *A Word Against Libels and Libellers* L’Estrange grumbled that it was the “Animals of this Age” that were responsible for “creating of a

⁷⁸ EEBO, *Oxfords Lamentation in a Dialogue between Oxford and London: concerning the Dissolution of the Parliament* (London, Thomas Benskin, 1681).

Misunderstanding betwixt His Majesty and the People.”⁷⁹ The last years of Charles’ reign saw the tide turn against the Whigs, and the period is commonly referred to as one of “Tory reaction.” L’Estrange, as the foremost polemicist amongst those in support of the government in the early-1680s, was critical to this accomplishment. It was on April 13, 1681, just two weeks after the king’s dissolution of the Oxford Parliament, that L’Estrange published his first *Observer* and began his most substantial effort to influence the public sphere via print. A quotation taken from this first edition epitomizes L’Estrange’s strategy; it reads “Tis the Press that has made ‘um Mad, and the Press must set ‘um Right again.”⁸⁰ Less than two months later Shaftsbury was charged with inciting revolution. He was tried for treason on November 24, but the Whig grand jury in London dismissed the charges, thus allowing him to flee to Holland. The London populace celebrated the verdict with bell-ringing and bonfires; in the *Observer* L’Estrange called it a “Riot” and denounced the “violence and immoderate behavior.” The king ordered that no bell-ringing or bonfires should take place on November 28 when Shaftsbury was released, but some sources suggest that the order had the reverse effect on the public. Despite this clamor, the opposition foundered without its leader in the last years of Charles’ reign. When the king did die in February 1685, his brother ascended to the throne as James II with little opposition, but underlying issues related to the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis remained.

Overall the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis reveal some important realities about the public sphere, print culture, and the government’s involvement therein for the last quarter of the seventeenth century. First, various forms of print media were abundant

⁷⁹ EEBO, Roger L’Estrange, *A Word Against Libels and Libellers* (London: Joanna Brome, 1681), 12.

⁸⁰ Roger L’Estrange, *Observer*, April 13, 1681.

during this period. A search of Burney's collection of newspapers returned seventeen multiple issue titles, and several other titles that may have only produced a single issue. Most were short-lived, with the *London Gazette* serving as the major exception to this rule, but their existence alone validates a thriving newspaper market in late-seventeenth century London. Similarly, an EEBO search of the period in question returned countless other forms of print media – particularly pamphlets. In both cases the print media contained references to the people, events, and ideas related to the Popish Plot and the Exclusion Crisis, thereby demonstrating the relevance of these incidents. Secondly, the public sphere was an established, if somewhat unrecognized, entity of political influence during this timeframe; it was certainly not yet to emerge as a political force as Habermas suggests. The idea that an individual like Titus Oates could essentially concoct a supposed Popish Plot from air and have its details spread amongst the public, evolve as they were debated and contested in print, and eventually spur the trials and executions of a number of individuals who were in all likelihood innocent as well as almost force the king to alter the line of succession is amazing and speaks to the political power of the public sphere. The explosion that was the Plot was not a result of Oates and his fellow plotters' actions. Nor was the Exclusion Crisis the result of Shaftsbury and the opposition's influence, though their efforts to affect public opinion were more noticeable than the government's. Both events were illustrations of the power of the public sphere and how that power could be tapped, unintentionally or intentionally, to rival the power of the ruler or the state itself. However, this episode also reveals a third reality – that of a king and government unable to effectively manage this power base. The government's legal actions against supposed plotters and Catholics did not resolve or suppress the Plot.

Neither did the printing of Charles' numerous proclamations regarding the Plot and the Exclusion Crisis; evidence shows that they were often ignored and could even serve to fuel rumor and misunderstanding. These fruitless efforts confirm that the government did attempt to affect the public sphere via print, but it was ineffective because of the one-way, top-down nature of these efforts. Similarly, the king's many prorogations and dissolutions of Parliament were ineffective because his political opposition used his actions as ammunition in appeals to the public sphere through print. All these activities represented the old way of how the government dealt with the people. Luckily for Charles, at least one individual, Roger L'Estrange, who worked on behalf of the government realized that participation in the public sphere allowed for the most effective form of management. His acute understanding of what the opposition was saying and how it could be countered came from a deep emersion in the public sphere and print culture. L'Estrange's pamphlets and newspapers were an example of how print could be used to subtly appeal to and influence the growing zone of political power that was the public sphere. They also signified the way future government polemicists in further episodes would serve their employers successfully. Though L'Estrange's methods were only partially successful in bringing stability to his government they were actions others could learn from and build upon.

CHAPTER III

THE GLORIOUS REVOLUTION

The second of the four major events this thesis will analyze in an attempt to comprehend the evolution of the government's involvement in and management of the public sphere is the "Glorious Revolution" of 1688-1689. The impetus for the period of interest occurred when James Stuart – king of England, Scotland, and Ireland – succeeded his brother Charles II in 1685 and began a policy of religious tolerance toward Catholics and support for "high church" practices in his realms thereafter.⁸¹ Many inside the British Isles, particularly among the great nobility, and on the continent, above all William of Orange, were disturbed by the king's Catholicism and his close ties with France, but they were content to bide their time, as Mary of Modena, James's second (and Catholic) wife, had failed to produce an heir to the throne. All signs pointed to the crown peacefully transferring to James II's eldest daughter, the Protestant Mary Stuart, and her Protestant husband, the Dutchman Prince William of Orange, upon James' death.

The crisis point came when it was announced that Mary of Modena had given birth to a son – James Francis Edward – on June 10, 1688, thus displacing William and

⁸¹ The following summary is drawn primarily from Edward Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution: 1688: Britain's Fight for Liberty* (New York: Pegasus, 2008) and Eveline Cruickshanks, ed. *By Force or By Default? The Revolution of 1688-1689* (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1989).

Mary's claim. Rumors swirled about the Queen's pregnancy – her first in five years – and a group of nobles known today as the “Immortal Seven” wrote to Prince William asking him to come to England and investigate the circumstances of the royal birth. He responded by landing at Torbay with roughly 12,000 fighting men on November 5. William's invasion was heavily buttressed by various sorts of propaganda, most notably his *Declaration of Reasons*, in which he did not claim the throne, emphasized that his invasion was in response to an invitation, and asserted his purpose was to ensure a free parliament, to restore England's proper religion, and to inquire into the legitimacy of the new heir.⁸²

James II responded with gag orders against the Declaration, counter-propaganda, and the summoning of his army. James led an English force roughly twice the size of William's – albeit one that was less experienced – westward to meet the invaders, but after a brief, unsuccessful skirmish, riots in London, and key defections in the persons of John Churchill, Princess Anne, and other significant figures the decision was made to withdraw. These events caused James to lose confidence in his situation; believing all to be lost he fled on December 11. The attempt was unsuccessful, and the king was captured. A second successful attempt to escape to France followed on December 23.

James' flight raised the awkward question amongst his subjects of whether or not he had abdicated. With things in flux William assumed control of a provisional government and summoned the Convention Parliament in January 1689 to answer this and other questions. After initial disagreement between the Commons and the Lords on the issue, the Convention, prompted by William's veiled threats that he might leave

⁸² Lois G. Schworer, “Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89,” *The American Historical Review* 82, no. 4 (October 1977): 843-874.

England, announced that James had abdicated and proclaimed William and Mary joint monarchs. In the compromise that brought about this acquiescence William was forced to accept the Bill of Rights of 1689 that established a limited monarchy in England.

To justify the choice of the “Glorious Revolution” and to demonstrate the relevance of the event in the evolution of government participation in and management of the public sphere it is useful to verify that the Revolution was recognized and discussed amongst those participating in public sphere – the “public,” if you will. In her article “Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89” Lois G. Schwoerer argued that William’s propaganda was “everywhere” in 1688, bringing the Prince’s message to “every person with the slightest interest in politics,” from “one end of the British Isles to the other.”⁸³ Jonathan Israel echoes this sentiment, emphasizing in his book *The Anglo-Dutch Moment* that the “distribution and reading” of Orangist propaganda was “the very essence of the Glorious Revolution,” and even Tony Claydon in his article “William III’s Declaration of Reasons and the Glorious Revolution,” which is directed at countering many of Schwoerer’s points, concedes that William’s propaganda “permeated the whole English nation during the Dutch invasion.”⁸⁴ But we can go beyond just taking these historians’ word for it and demonstrate this relevance in the source material.

Print media such as newspapers and pamphlets aimed at a broader audience than just the educated elite or nobility is the perfect place to look, but first, a brief aside.

Critical to connecting print media to a broad public sphere is literacy. Lawrence Stone in his article “Literacy and Education in England, 1640-1900” estimated literacy for this

⁸³ Schwoerer, “Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89,” 854.

⁸⁴ Jonathan Israel, *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact* (Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 15-17 and Tony Claydon, “William III’s Declaration of Reasons and the Glorious Revolution,” *The Historical Journal* 39, no. 1 (March 1996): 90-91.

period to be about forty percent for adult males nationally and about sixty-seven percent for adult males in the cities; according to David Cressy this number might have been as high as seventy-eight percent in London itself.⁸⁵ Edward Vallance places the number at seventy percent of the adult male population by the end of the seventeenth century.⁸⁶ Cressy estimates the literacy of adult women at a slightly lower rate – forty-eight percent in London by 1690 and just twenty-five percent nationally by the Hanoverian succession.⁸⁷ Additionally, Schwoerer during her own discussion of literacy rates at the time of the Revolution notes that many newspapers and pamphlets at this time sold for just a penny, implying that they were economically accessible to, and perhaps even intended for, the masses.⁸⁸ Because things were often read aloud to groups we can be sure that others besides just the literate, buying newspapers or pamphlets for their own consumption, were able to achieve at least partial entrance into the public sphere via printed materials if they desired. Finally, the historiography of coffee-houses at this time suggests that rising prices of beer and wine pushed poorer customers to these havens of cheap refreshment as well as the ever-present newspapers, gazettes, and newsmongers therein.⁸⁹ Unfortunately, trying to estimate exactly what percentage of the illiterate population printed tracts reached is nearly impossible. Now we can turn to the sources.

For the purposes of this essay the frequency with which certain keywords appear in the print media at the time establishes a quantitative gauge for measuring the sought after relevance of the “Glorious Revolution” to the “public.” While the Burney

⁸⁵ Lawrence Stone, “Literacy and Education in England, 1640-1900,” *Past & Present*, no. 42 (February 1969): 109, 112, 125, 128 and David Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 125.

⁸⁶ Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution*, 184.

⁸⁷ Cressy, *Literacy and the Social Order*, 129, 145.

⁸⁸ Schwoerer, “Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89,” 857.

⁸⁹ Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution*, 184-185, 188-192. Again, Brian Cowan’s works provide an excellent description of the relationship between coffee-houses, print media, and the public sphere.

Collection archive is far from a complete record of all the newspapers and pamphlets circulating at the time of the “Glorious Revolution,” it provides a decent sampling of various sources of cheap, frequently published print. A search of the archive’s database shows that Charles Burney collected 275 papers or journals printed between the birth of James Francis Edward Stuart on June 10, 1688 and William’s acceptance of the Bill of Rights, and consequently the crown for himself and his wife, on February 13, 1689.⁹⁰ “King James” II is mentioned in 149 of them. The “Prince of Orange” is mentioned in forty-six of these. The young source of the controversy, James Francis Edward Stuart, appears in ten documents when “Prince of Wales” is key-worded. If “Prince” is keyword searched without adding any distinguishers to separate results between William and James Francis we see 149 results. Another person of interest, Mary of Modena, appears in twenty-four papers when “Queen” is keyword searched. William’s “Declaration” of Reasons appears only in six papers. As far as the invasion itself is concerned, “Torbay” is mentioned in just two papers, though William’s “landing” is mentioned in four. The words “invasion” and “revolution” are only sparsely used as well. The relatively small number of total papers in Charles Burney’s collection does affect the seemingly low number of results. However, one would expect the public sphere, and therefore the print media catering to it, to be teeming with recognition and discussion of a Dutch invasion augmented with substantial propaganda.

⁹⁰ Burney lived between 1757 and 1817, yet the printed material collected in the archive spans a period of 200 years between 1604 and 1804. Unsurprisingly, about seventy-five percent of the total documents date from Burney’s own lifetime. Only about six percent of the total documents date from before 1716 (the period containing the five events examined in this paper), and just two and a half percent date from before 1700. Therefore, the smaller quantity of the total printed material available for earlier events such as the Glorious Revolution compared to later ones like the Hanoverian Succession is noteworthy.

A closer analysis of the documents in Burney's collection from this time period helps explain why certain keywords and the conversations around them appear somewhat infrequently – particularly in certain time periods and from certain perspectives. The newspapers and journals where these various words and their surrounding discussions appear include *Publick Occurrences Truly Stated*, *Universal Intelligence*, *English Currant*, *London Mercury or Moderate Intelligencer*, and predominantly the *London Gazette*. *Publick Occurrences Truly Stated* was a newspaper aimed at a general audience printed in London between February 21, 1688 and September 28, 1688. *Universal Intelligence* was also a newspaper printed in London and aimed at a general audience; it was printed by J. Wallis between December 11, 1688 and February 13, 1689. The *English Currant* like the previous two papers was aimed at a general audience and printed in London; it was printed between December 12, 1688 and January 4, 1689.⁹¹ Like the other short-lived Revolution era papers the *London Mercury or Moderate Intelligencer* was aimed at a general audience and printed in London; it was printed between December 15, 1688 and February 11, 1689. The *London Gazette*, discussed in detail in the previous episode of this essay, is the one major outlier in this grouping because not only did it exist long before the Revolution and long after it, but it was the “official court paper” and we have much more information about those involved in its authorship, publication, and printing.

Let us focus on the location – London. That all of these papers were printed in London is not surprising; London in the late-1600s was the center of the English print

⁹¹ This paper should not be confused with the *English Courant* printed in London in 1695 or *The English Currant or Advice Domestick and Forreign* printed in London in 1679. Similarly, the *London Mercury or Moderate Intelligencer* should not be confused with the various other “Mercury” titles printed in London in the late-1600s and early-1700s. Papers at the time were often printed for specific short-lived purposes, only to disappear upon accomplishment and later reemerge under a similar name for another purpose.

trade and accounts for greater than ninety percent of the printed documents in Burney's collection. In fact, the Printing Act (often referred to as the Licensing Act) restricted all printing to London, the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and the city of York; it also required all imported books to arrive via the port of London.⁹² It is important to note that printers of papers in the capital, simply due to the geographic proximity and regular presence of the king and the other apparatus of government, would be more at risk of government prosecution should they offend the current regime. In his article discussing the Jacobite response to the avalanche of Williamite print propaganda during the Revolution Claydon reminds us that "for the first five weeks of William's time in England, the king still exercised the plenitude of royal authority, including control of the official press."⁹³ This control was specifically exploited in regard to the *London Gazette*, which Claydon says "enjoyed a monopoly of the newspaper market," as it became the "centerpiece" of anti-William propaganda.⁹⁴ After the Prince's landing at Torbay, James increased the *London Gazette's* rate of publication to allow his government to print royal proclamations, to devote the first column of every issue to royal statements, to print denunciations of William's conduct, to highlight stories favorable to the king, to downplay William's success, and to generally manipulate the flow of information.⁹⁵ All of this was possible because of the government's hegemony over the London newspaper publishers.

The timing of these papers' existence and the keyword search results are critical as well. The only papers showing results before December 1688 are *Publick*

⁹² Astbury, "The Renewal of the Licensing Act in 1693 and its Lapse in 1695," 296.

⁹³ Tony Claydon, "William III's Declaration of Reasons and the Glorious Revolution," *The Historical Journal* 39, no. 1 (March 1996): 91.

⁹⁴ Claydon, "William III's Declaration of Reasons and the Glorious Revolution," 91.

⁹⁵ Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution*, 119-120.

Occurrences Truly Stated and the *London Gazette*, and almost all results are in fact from the official government periodical. Of note is the fact that the *London Gazette*'s time of dominance in the newspaper market was tied to King James II. It ended immediately following the chaos leading up to and including the king's first flight and capture on December 11, 1688, with *Universal Intelligence* making its first appearance that same day, the *English Currant* a day later, and the *London Mercury or Moderate Intelligencer* four days later. Although not part of the results from Burney's collection, other cheap weekly newspapers emerged from the early-December chaos and loosening government restrictions; titles such as the *Orange Gazette*, the *Harllum Currant*, the *London Courant*, and the *London Intelligence* soon jostled for space with the *London Gazette* in the news market.⁹⁶ Additionally, Henry Muddiman, the *London Gazette*'s long-time printer, was seen as having grown too close to James's regime; he saw his government monopoly revoked at this time and was forced to retire in October 1689.⁹⁷

Looking at the contents of some of these papers further explains the seemingly neutered political discussion in the newspaper results. For instance, examining the papers showing results mentioning the "Prince of Wales" reveals that eight of the ten stretching from July 2 to November 8 are simply congratulations offered to the king and court on behalf of various lords, towns, and other groups. These are all positive, and none even hint at questioning the royal birth – a discussion that was certainly happening elsewhere in print and in the public sphere in general. Additionally, nine of the ten results are from the *London Gazette*. Interestingly, the November 5, 1688 - November 8, 1688 issue of the *London Gazette* contains a declaration from the king that addresses William's

⁹⁶ Vallance, *The Glorious Revolution*, 184.

⁹⁷ "Oxford Dictionary of National Biographies" *Oxford University Press*. Last modified May, 2013. Accessed June 20, 2013. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/public/index.html>, see "Muddiman, Henry."

allegations about James Francis Edward Stuart.⁹⁸ In it James pointed to the attempt in William's Declaration of Reasons to call into "question the Legitimacy of the Prince of Wales Our Son, and Heir Apparent" as "proof" of his "Immoderate Ambition, and which nothing can satisfy but the immediate Possession of the Crown it self." The king also attempted to discredit the rumors that the newborn Prince of Wales was the son of a Jesuit or a miller and smuggled into the queen's bedchamber in a bedpan, noting the impossibility of such a scenario because "by the Providence of God, there were present at his Birth so many Witnesses of Unquestionable Credit, as if it seemed to have been the particular Care of Heaven, on purpose to disappoint so wicked and unparallell'd an Attempt." The king further attempted to discredit the rumors in the *London Gazette's* October 22, 1688 - October 25, 1688 issue wherein it was printed that "the Lords, Ladies and others, that were present at the Queen's Labor" appeared before "the Lord Mayor and Alderman of London, and the Judges, and several of their Majesties Council Learned in the Law" to "declare upon Oath what they knew of the Birth of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales."⁹⁹ The results here are typical of other keyword searches of Burney's newspaper collection, with virtually no commentary – or at least no controversial commentary – on the events leading up to William's Declaration of Reasons on October 10 followed by a one-sided series of royal proclamations and other Jacobite propaganda and counter-propaganda directed at William and his texts.

The period of very little commentary in the newspapers on the political events leading up to the Revolution first broke on September 28. The *London Gazette's* September 27, 1688 - October 1, 1688 issue contains a lengthy proclamation from James

⁹⁸ *London Gazette*. November 5, 1688- November 8, 1688. This is referring to James's infamous "counter-declaration" published on November 6.

⁹⁹ *London Gazette*, October 22, 1688 - October 25, 1688.

warning his subjects of the impending Dutch invasion.¹⁰⁰ In it he said “We have received undoubted Advice, That a great and sudden Invasion from Holland with an Armed Force of Foreigners and Strangers, will speedily be made in a Hostile manner upon Our Kingdom.” This is the first reference in the Burney Collection Newspapers to William’s “Declaration of Reasons.” The king continued “although some false Pretences relating to Liberty, Property, and Religion, conceived or worded with Art and Subtlety, may be given out it is manifest however, that no less matter by this Invasion, is proposed and purposed than an Absolute Conquest of these Our Kingdoms.” This is also the first time James used the tropes of the ghost of a bloody and ruinous Civil War and the invasion delaying his supposed intention to call Parliament. In general, this warning to and call for assistance from his people sounds patriotic, unifying, and positive, and it seems to have elicited the intended response – at least from some people. The *London Gazette*’s October 8, 1688 - October 11, 1688 issue contains the response of the “Justices of the Peace for the County of Cumberland,” in which they express their “Horror and Amazement” at the king’s proclamation warning his kingdoms of an “intended” Dutch “invasion.” The October 11, 1688 - October 15, 1688 issue of the *London Gazette* contains a similar response, initially issued on October 8, from the “Mayor, Alderman, Bailiffs, and Citizens of the City of Carlisle” to the same royal proclamation; in it they too express “surprise” and are “filled with horror.”¹⁰¹ Both responses condemn William’s actions and pledge their “allegiance” to James. Also common in the papers following James’s initial proclamation on September 28 are progress reports. The *London Gazette*’s October 22, 1688 - October 25, 1688 issue printed a report from the

¹⁰⁰ *London Gazette*, September 27, 1688 - October 1, 1688.

¹⁰¹ *London Gazette*, October 11, 1688 - October 15, 1688.

Hague on October 23 that says “The Troops are now all on Shipboard; And the Prince of Orange will embark himself so soon as the Ships from the Textl have join’d with those of the Matse.”¹⁰² Keyword searching “Prince of Orange” or “Dutch” throughout October, November, and December of 1688 results in numerous papers discussing the progress of the Dutch fleet across the Channel, its landing at Torbay, William’s actions in the west, etc. This sudden flurry of active commentary and royal proclamations in the newspapers regarding the events of the Revolution stands in stark contrast to the earlier months of silence. Understandably, William and his supporters still lacked a voice in the London based newspapers, but by late-September it seems James and his supporters had gained theirs.

One reason for the one-sided stance of the London newspapers is that James, who was not entirely blind to the power of public opinion, attempted to rigorously enforce the established laws and censor unauthorized printed material whenever possible. Schwoerer tells us that “in October George Jeffreys [James’s lord chancellor] ordered coffee houses, upon pain of forfeiting their licenses, to keep no written news but the official *London Gazette*,” and that “James issued a proclamation forbidding the discussion of political affairs by writing, printing, or speaking.”¹⁰³ Later he banned both William’s declarations and his letters from being read, received, concealed, published, dispersed, repeated, or handed about.

The king’s approach is revealed in the source material via an examination of the numerous royal proclamations James issued in the *London Gazette* in October and November. For instance, the October 25, 1688 - October 29, 1688 issue of the *London*

¹⁰² *London Gazette*, October 22, 1688 - October 25, 1688.

¹⁰³ Schwoerer, “Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89,” 859.

Gazette contains a proclamation “To Restrain the Spreading of FALSE NEWS.”¹⁰⁴ On November 2, 1688; in it James refers to the “designed Invasion of Our Kingdoms” by “the Prince of Orange” and his “Treasonable Papers and Declarations.”¹⁰⁵ He informs the readers that “a very great Number” are being printed and “several Persons are sent and employed to disperse the same throughout Our Kingdoms,” and that these documents are meant to “seduce Our People” and “corrupt Our Army.” The king also forewarns the readers that they should not “Publish, Disperse, Repeat or Hand about the said Treasonable Papers or Declarations, or any other Paper or Papers of such like nature, nor presume to Read, Receive, Conceal or Keep the said Treasonable Papers or Declarations, or any other Paper or Papers of such like nature, without discovering and revealing the same as speedily as may be to Our Privy Council, or to some of Our Judges, Justices of the Peace, or other Publick Magistrates, upon Peril of being Prosecuted according to the utmost severity of the Law.”

In theory the Licensing Act of 1662, which in 1685 was renewed for seven years, controlled the importation of books, the appointment of licensers, and the number of printers; it also prevented any printing of seditious, treasonable, or unlicensed books and pamphlets. Newspapers fell under its umbrella as well, and as a result the *London Gazette* was essentially the only licensed paper during James’ reign. The Act was meant to be a comprehensive measure for controlling the press. Its aim was prepublication, or more accurately preprinting, censorship, requiring every manuscript to be submitted to the licenser prior to printing. Approved documents were entered in the Register of the

¹⁰⁴ *London Gazette*. October 25, 1688 - October 29, 1688.

¹⁰⁵ *London Gazette*. November 1, 1688.

Stationers' Company.¹⁰⁶ By extension it reaffirmed the government's power to issue warrants to search premises for illegal presses and publications and seize both unlicensed materials and offending individuals. However, Philip Hamburger's article on the relationship between the government and the press in the seventeenth century argues that laws like the Licensing Act of 1662 were a "relatively insignificant means of restraining the printing press" and due to "legal restraints and public opinion" were hardly enforceable.¹⁰⁷ Anonymous authorship and publication made the process all the more difficult for the government to achieve prosecution for unlicensed works. Hence, James's overreliance on his royal proclamations and the existing laws, as well as the ability to enforce these, explains why the government did not more actively engage the opposition across a variety of print media.

Prince William and his allies were more experienced in using print propaganda. Schwoerer explains that William had used print media to influence public opinion in England before; he employed polemicist Peter Du Moulin to write a pamphlet in 1673 "credited with turning the Commons against the French alliance."¹⁰⁸ In late-1687 and early-1688 William again used his connections among English printers and publishers to manipulate the English government – this time by means of a printed letter of Gaspel Fagel's outlining William's views on the repeal of the Test Acts. Schwoerer also says that the main piece of the Prince of Orange's print propaganda, his *Declaration of*

¹⁰⁶ Raymond points out an obvious weakness in the Press Act's reliance on the Register of the Stationers, noting a decline in registered publications from fifty-two percent in 1614 to "in 1644 about 20 per cent of all books [including pamphlets] were entered; in 1668 this had declined to 17.5 per cent; in 1688 a mere 7 per cent." Raymond, *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*, 170.

¹⁰⁷ Philip Hamburger, "The Development of the Law of Seditious Libel and the Control of the Press," *Stanford Law Review* 37, no. 3 (Feb. 1985): 661-765.

¹⁰⁸ Schwoerer, "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89," 848. The pamphlet was titled *England's Appeal from the Private Cabal at Whitehall to the Great Council of the nation, the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled*.

Reasons, was first drafted in August of 1688, and that he solicited the opinions of his Dutch and English advisors as well as those of the English colony at The Hague in a soft release at that time.¹⁰⁹ The value of using specific clauses or words was debated, resulting in the first *Declaration of Reasons* going through several iterations before reaching its final form. This use of what might today be called “public relations” people along with the painstaking production of the *Declaration of Reasons* demonstrates William’s superior concern for and understanding of public opinion and how it could be shaped via well-designed print media – print media that does not appear in Burney’s collection.

What the public was reading and discussing during the Glorious Revolution was not limited to newspapers. Shifting the analysis of print media to other types of subject matter with the assistance of the “Early English Books Online (EEBO)” digital archive provides a larger selection of results; EEBO has 4960 documents from 1688 and 1689. Keyword searching the same time period examined above in Burney’s collection we find “Prince of Orange” produced an astounding 646 mentions in 269 different documents.¹¹⁰ “King James” received 185 hits in ninety-two records. “Revolution” resulted in 765 hits in 365 records. “Invasion” produced fifty-nine hits in twenty-eight records. “Torbay” is mentioned five times in just three sources. Not all of these references are completely relevant to the Glorious Revolution, but most are discussing the people and events involved and therefore do demonstrate through their frequency of appearance that the

¹⁰⁹ Schwoerer, “Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89,” 851.

¹¹⁰ Because EEBO’s search parameters are limited to year as opposed to the 17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers search parameters that are date specific the time period examined here is for the full two years compared to the June 10, 1688-February 13, 1689 range examined above. This does draw in extra unwanted results in the keyword search, potentially skewing the data slightly. While most results do tend to fall into the desired timeframe naturally due to topic, some do not; however, this is of little consequence, as the primary goal of the keyword search is to demonstrate relevancy via frequency of appearance – even if that appearance is slightly earlier or slightly later than the majority of the action.

Revolution was recognized and discussed in the public sphere at the time. Additionally, EEBO results contain both the Williamite propaganda critical in influencing the Revolution and the majority of the independently written pamphlets discussing it not seen in the above examination of newspapers in Burney's collection.

Chief among the other types of print media relating to the Glorious Revolution and William's propaganda effort were his two declarations, issued on October 10 and October 24 of 1688.¹¹¹ The first *Declaration of Reasons*, printed in The Hague by Arnout Leers on William's express orders, defined the Prince of Orange's policies, and the second clarified his intentions. Keyword searching "Declaration of His Highness William Henry," the first few words of the very lengthy title of William's *Declaration*, yields twenty-six hits on sixteen documents in EEBO.¹¹² Twelve of the sixteen are copies of the *Declaration* – with two of these twelve having William's printed letter to the army, his printed letter to the navy, and his printed prayer for the expedition attached. One of the twelve appears to be printed in Dutch, and another seems to be printed in German. A further three are the slightly different version of the *Declaration* directed toward Scotland. The final document is an anonymously written pamphlet reflecting upon the *Declaration*. To see both so many copies and such a variety signifies that the *Declaration of Reasons* was indeed widespread and on the public consciousness.

What is critical about these two declarations is that they were direct statements to the public – not the king, Parliament, or the Immortal Seven and the other great lords – justifying the invasion. In fact, the first page following the title page begins with "It is

¹¹¹ Hugh Speke authored a third *Declaration of Reasons* for William that was released on November 28, 1688, but the Prince did not claim responsibility for it or endorse it.

¹¹² The full title is *The Declaration of His Highness William Henry, by the Grace of God Prince of Orange, &c. of the Reasons Inducing Him, to Appear in Arms in the Kingdom of England, for Preserving of the Protestant Religion, and for Restoring the Laws and Liberties of England, Scotland and Ireland*, EEBO.

both certain and evident to all men, that the publike Peace and Happiness of any State or Kingdome can not be preserved, where the Laws, Liberties, and Customes established by the Lawfull authority in it, are openly Transgressed and Annulled.”¹¹³ This sentence is typical of the document as a whole in that it frequently discusses “all men” or refers to the “publike” good. While the king is certainly not directly addressed, he is not openly blamed either. Instead the *Declaration* puts the blame on “Evill Councillours.” As powerful as the *Declaration* was though, its “most obvious weakness was that it failed to silence its opponents.”¹¹⁴

Although it was not directed toward him, James did react to the *Declaration* in late-September and October of 1688; he attempted to take the teeth out of the document by distancing himself from the “evil counselors,” making concessions, and addressing the listed grievances of the Prince’s manifesto. The royal proclamation *By the King, a declaration. James R. Having already signified Our pleasure to call a Parliament to meet at Our city of Westminster in November next* printed in London by “Charles Bill, Henry Hills, and Thomas Newcomb, Printers to the King’s most Excellent Majesty,” in 1688 advertises these actions; EEBO shows five copies of this document.¹¹⁵ This shows that James was aware of the impact William’s propaganda was having on the public and that he was willing to respect the power of print media and respond to the *Declaration* directly. However, his actions here, though useful to Jacobite propagandists, were reactionary, and left the impression that James was an unprincipled opportunist willing to

¹¹³ *Declaration of Reasons*, EEBO.

¹¹⁴ Claydon, “William III’s Declaration of Reasons and the Glorious Revolution,” 91.

¹¹⁵ *By the King, a declaration. James R. Having already signified Our pleasure to call a Parliament to meet at Our city of Westminster in November next*, EEBO.

do or say whatever was needed in the short term with no intention of keeping these changes and promises after the Dutch threat subsided.

In addition, EEBO reveals several independently written documents referring to the *Declaration* or the Dutch invasion, and a number of these are sympathetic to James. One anonymous author wrote the pamphlet *Some reflections upon His Highness the Prince of Orange's Declaration* in 1688 sometime subsequent to William's second *Declaration of Reasons* and prior to the third one – unmentioned in this work.¹¹⁶ In it the author addresses each of William's "reasons" on a point by point basis – specifically referring to the paragraphs and sentences as he is arguing against. He touches on and dismisses explanations such as the supposed French invasion, the evil councilors, the Protestant cause, the peace and happiness of the realm, the restoration of laws and liberties, the dispensing powers, the laying aside of the lords lieutenants, the avoiding of oaths and tests, the building of chapels, Scotland, Ireland, the calling of a parliament, the Prince of Wales being an "imposter," the succession in general, and William's real reasons for invading. These and lesser points are discussed thoroughly with the author concluding that "he [William] does not seem to me to seek the King's compliance in his Declaration," and that he "designs to leave no room for it" and therefore "should not be trusted." This work was reprinted in Edinburgh, at Holy-Rood-House by Mr. P.B. Enginier, "printer to the King's most Excellent Majesty," and was clearly a government publication. This implies that the government at the very least recognized the power of independently authored print media works and recycled them into its own propaganda effort. This is not surprising, Claydon explains that "James's government was experienced in such activity" having used the works of "seasoned polemicists" such as

¹¹⁶ *Some reflections upon His Highness the Prince of Orange's Declaration*, EEBO.

Samuel Parker, Henry Care, and William Penn over the previous three years.¹¹⁷ Another independently written pamphlet, *The Dutch design anatomized, or, A discovery of the wickedness and injustice of the intended invasion and a clear proof that it is the interest of all the King's subjects to defend His Majesty and their country against it* printed and sold in London in 1688 by Randal Taylor and authored by “A true member of the Church of England” argued that James was the rightful king and that the Prince of Orange’s invasion was a crime against both God and the laws of the land. *The Dutch design anatomized* is accompanied in EEBO by two copies of *A letter to the author of the Dutch design, anatomized written by a citizen of London, for the promoting of His Majesties service* discussing the original pamphlet. Randal Taylor even republished William’s *Declaration* as *The Prince of Orange his declaration: shewing the reasons vvhy he invades England. With a short preface, and some modest remarks on it*; the subtitle “Animadversions upon the declartion of his Highness the Prince of Orange” was added referring to the strong criticism therein. In general, the independently published print media sympathetic to James focused their criticism on William’s manifesto, deploying two main arguments against it – that the invasion was illegal and that anarchy would certainly result from the Prince’s actions. Claydon argues that they achieved significant success in countering the first *Declaration of Reasons* in the public sphere, diminishing its effectiveness and demanding responses.

¹¹⁷ Claydon, “William III’s Declaration of Reasons and the Glorious Revolution,” 92-93. The pamphlets in question are *Liberty of conscience asserted* (London, 1687) by Henry Care, *A letter from a gentleman in the country, to his friends in London, upon the subject of the penal laws and tests* (London, 1687) by William Penn, and *Reasons for abrogating the test imposed on all members of parliament* (London, 1688) by Samuel Parker; all of these were printed by royal printers and licensed by James’s minister Sunderland from Whitehall.

However, William and his supporters recognized the importance of the responses, both official and independently authored, and reacted to them – specifically in some cases. The Prince’s camp issued an *Additional Declaration*, considered the second *Declaration of Reasons* but often just appended to the original, on October 24, 1688 denouncing James’s actions as “pretended acts of grace.”¹¹⁸ EEBO shows two different pamphlets that responded to “Some reflections upon His Highness the Prince of Orange's Declaration.” The first was anonymously written and printed in London sometime following the “reflections” pamphlet; it is titled *An Answer to a Paper, Intituled, Reflections on the Prince of Orange’s Declaration*. This pamphlet seems to be the independent effort of an Orangist supporter. The second, also anonymously written and printed in London at about the same time, is titled *A Review of the reflections on the Prince of Orange's declaration*. It claims to be “printed for William Churchil,” and contains the subtitle of “By the Prince of Orange’s special command.” This pamphlet, though we are unsure who the actual author was, is clearly an authorized piece from the Prince of Orange himself. Other, less specific, pamphlets exist as well, with the majority of them supporting the Williamite cause. Although the *Declaration* was the banner work of William and his supporters, Orange propaganda was not entirely reliant on that one document and offered perhaps more effective rhetoric elsewhere.¹¹⁹

Overall, an investigation of the existing historiography on the “Glorious Revolution,” newspaper results from Burney’s collection, and various other forms of print media from EEBO reveals that the government’s involvement in and management of the public sphere through print media during 1688-1689 was both noticeable and

¹¹⁸ The *Additional Declaration*, EEBO.

¹¹⁹ Claydon, “William III’s Declaration of Reasons and the Glorious Revolution,” 107.

impactful but neither as polished or extensive as that of the opposition. As literacy rates in late-seventeenth century England increased, so too did the importance of cheap newspapers, pamphlets, and other types of print media catering to a public progressively more crucial to politics. As head of state James II realized the importance of eliciting the support of the public and maneuvered his government to react to the threat that Prince William of Orange and his allies posed via print media with the use of print media. This attempt to fight fire with fire was, as Claydon has argued, somewhat successful once it was put in motion – even changing the nature of the Prince’s coup. However, this chapter has shown that James and his government both reacted late to the Williamite threat – first remaining silent on all controversial issues and then coming across as unprincipled opportunists – and took too narrow a scope – concentrating too heavily on official print media outlets such as the court newspaper and royal proclamations while the real impact on the public was being made via William’s declarations and the various pamphlets discussing the Revolution. In addition, James overvalued existing laws such as the Licensing Act and overestimated the power of his proclamations and the power of his government to enforce these laws and proclamations. This resulted in fairly tight government control of newspapers in London for the first month but little beyond that. The more experienced opposition, with its intensive propaganda campaign aimed at molding a positive image of William, explaining his purposes and policies, and presenting events in ways favorable to his interests, while simultaneously blackening the character and policies of James, was able to appeal to and influence the opinion of a broad spectrum of society.¹²⁰ Its use of a variety of print media, both early and often, and its greater interaction with both government responses and the variety of independent

¹²⁰ Schworer, “Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89,” 843.

voices discussing the Revolution in the public sphere significantly contributed to its success over James and his government during the Glorious Revolution. The fact that the English government was seemingly so outmatched in its ability to manage the public sphere through print attests to the fact that governments in other areas around Europe, like the United Provinces, were ahead in their understanding of this zone of power. It also raises the question of how this could have been the case if the public sphere, as Habermas suggests, first emerged as a political force in England. Finally, it served as an effective example of how to tap into the public sphere through print for future governments in England.

CHAPTER IV

THE SACHEVERELL “INCIDENT” AND ITS AFTERMATH

The third major event, or set of events in this case, through which this thesis will analyze the evolution of the government’s involvement in and management of the public sphere focuses on Dr. Henry Sacheverell, his preaching, his trial, and the impact they had on the existing government and the general election of 1710.¹²¹ These events are spread over approximately a year-long period between late-1709 and late-1710. The strand running throughout, connecting all of the seemingly disparate events and keeping the fire Sacheverell started stoked, is print media. By 1709-1710 many, but not all, recognized the power of the press and sought to use it as a political tool to influence public opinion. The explosion of print propaganda during this timeframe, particularly between the trial and the general election, came from both parties and both opposition and government polemicists. However, the Tory writers in the opposition appear to have generated the majority of the print media. They pressed the advantage gained by Sacheverell’s sermon and the government’s mistake of bringing him to trial; they did so by using print

¹²¹ W.A. Speck, “Sacheverell, Henry” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biographies*, Oxford University Press. Last modified 2004. Accessed June 20, 2013. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24440> and Geoffrey Holmes, “The Sacheverell Riots: The Crowd and the Church in Early Eighteenth-Century London,” *Past & Present*, no. 72 (August 1976): 55-85. Most of the biographical information in this section is drawn from Holmes unless footnoted otherwise – though there is a great deal of overlap in regard to the general information.

propaganda to keep the strong feelings aroused in both London and the countryside alive throughout the spring, summer, and autumn of 1710.¹²² This print media appeared in a variety of forms including prose pamphlets, broadsides, political poems, satires, periodical political essays, and newspapers.

The Burney Collection archive is again useful in verifying the relevance of these events in the public sphere. A variety of existing papers in the key timeframe of late-1709 to late-1710 show pertinent results and are worth looking at more closely. Among them is the *Observer*, a Whig newspaper printed in London and aimed at a general audience between April 01, 1702 and July 26, 1712; John Tutchin originally authored and edited it until his death in 1707.¹²³ George Ridpath took it over from 1709 through 1712, and Daniel Defoe's name is sometimes associated with its publication after 1707. The paper contains political commentary and appears in dialogue form, where "Observer" (abbreviated "Obs." in the paper) and "Countryman" (abbreviated "Country-m.") speak to one another. The *Post Boy* was another newspaper intended for a general audience and printed in London – this time as a single half-folio sheet Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays between June 1, 1695 and June 13, 1728.¹²⁴ The bookseller Abel Roper

¹²² "Opposition" here and going forward is used generically for any and all outside of the sitting government and its fold seeking changes. Robert Harley was perhaps chief amongst the Tories working in opposition, but he was far from united in his views with more hard-line members of the party such as Henry St. John or Sacheverell himself. Similarly, all "opposition" print media was not authorized by or originate from any one source. High Church writers like Joseph Trapp and William King who wrote on behalf of Sacheverell may have known and associated with Harley, but there is no evidence that he encouraged or coordinated their publications.

¹²³ "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers," *Observer*, publication information and G. A. Aitkin, "Ridpath, George (d. 1726)," rev. John R. Young, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/23635>. Note that John Tutchin founded this periodical and chose to call it the *Observer* in "conscious if ironic acknowledgement of Sir Roger L'Estrange's original journal of opinion" that bore the same name. The two are of completely different political persuasions and should not be confused.

¹²⁴ "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers," *Post Boy*, publication and G. A. Aitkin, "Roper, Abel (*bap.* 1665, *d.* 1726)," rev. M. E. Clayton, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, May 2011, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24070>.

published and edited this “Tory” newspaper that contained both news reports and advertisements. The *Daily Courant* existed between March 11, 1702 and June 28, 1735 and was initially published as a single one-sided sheet daily, later becoming double-sided, in London for a general audience by bookseller Elizabeth Mallet, but was taken over by its editor Samuel Buckley in 1703.¹²⁵ In terms of content, advertisements follow news from the continental press. John Baker printed the *Review of the State of the British Nation*, one of a number of variants with similar names written by the infamous “Mr. Review” – Daniel Defoe – between February 11, 1707 and July 03, 1712 as four small quarto pages three times a week.¹²⁶ Its content typically consisted of an essay on politics of two to three pages, followed by replies to letters, and finally a few advertisements. Defoe’s ODNB article calls the *Review* a “ground-breaking periodical that moved English journalism in new directions,” going on to say that “before Defoe, what news was printed was without elaboration, interpretation, or even context. The *Review* demonstrated the possibilities of using history and news for propaganda purposes.”¹²⁷ J.A. Downie says it was “an attempt to influence public opinion in the widest possible sense,” and by 1709 it was distributed not only to “border counties and to Scotland, but also as far afield as Carrickfergus in Ireland.”¹²⁸ However, Raymond notes that “circulation is not necessarily directly proportional to influence” as the *Review* “appeared

¹²⁵ “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *Daily Courant*, publication information and Ian Maxted, “Mallet, Elizabeth (fl. 1672–1706),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/66880>.

¹²⁶ “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *Review of the State of the British Nation*, publication information.

¹²⁷ Paula R. Backscheider, “Defoe, Daniel (1660?–1731),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004; Jan. 2008, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/7421>.

¹²⁸ J. A. Downie, *Robert Harley and the press: Propaganda and public opinion in the age of Swift and Defoe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979), 2.

in runs of [just] 425-50, yet was granted considerable significance.”¹²⁹ Lastly, by Summer 1710 Defoe was writing for Harley and the opposition. The *Tatler*, interesting because it existed between April 12, 1709 and December 30, 1710, was authored and published by Richard Steele and Joseph Addison (later printed by John Morphew) in London for a general audience as a folio half-sheet with printing on both sides every Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday. Although it included advertisements, a single essay dealing with a variety of world of political and societal issues dominated the paper, which was quite successful – selling in the region of 3000 copies per issue.¹³⁰ Another newspaper that came into existence during the timeframe in question was the *Examiner or Remarks upon Papers and Occurrences*, which existed January 18, 1710 through September 10, 1715 as an "ultra-tory journal." Henry St. John, Francis Atterbury, Matthew Prior, and John Freind were the founders, and William King was the original editor; by August 1710 Robert Harley gained control of it, and Jonathan Swift became its editor and primary contributor in the autumn of 1710.¹³¹ Established on October 22, 1695, the *Post Man and the Historical Account* saw print until February 13, 1729 as a single half-folio sheet three days a week that “concentrated on foreign news, with varying coverage of domestic news and very little advertising.”¹³² The editor, John de Fonvive, and publisher, Richard Baldwin, were formerly associated with Abel Roper and Abel Boyer in publishing the *Post Boy* but split from that paper to found this one; the papers

¹²⁹ Raymond, “The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century,” 129.

¹³⁰ “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *Tatler*, publication information and Pat Rogers, “Addison, Joseph (1672–1719),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Jan. 2008, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/156>.

¹³¹ “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *Examiner or Remarks upon Papers and Occurrences*, publication information and Clive Probyn, “Swift, Jonathan (1667–1745),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/26833>.

¹³² “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers,” *Post Man and the Historical Account*, publication information.

remained similar in late-1709/1710. Other short-lived or uncommonly seen newspapers that appear in Burney's collection and at least mention Sacheverell during this timeframe include the *Supplement* (London, February 09, 1708 - June 22, 1711), the *Athenian News or Dunton's Oracle* (London, March 04, 1710 - June 03, 1710), the *British Apollo* (London, February 13, 1708 - March 23, 1711), the not so short-lived or uncommonly seen *London Gazette* (London, February 01, 1666 - September 25, 1792), the *Evening Post* (London, January 19, 1710 - November 24, 1730), and the *British Mercury* (edited by A. Hill and published in London, October 04, 1710 - January 05, 1715). This wide variety of papers mentioning Sacheverell should not be surprising. W. A. Speck explains in "Political Propaganda in Augustan England" that the effective ending of prepublication censorship with the fall of James II resulted in the rise of the newspaper; a virtual monopoly became a handful of papers during the reign of William III, and with the lapse of the Licensing Act in 1695 became twelve papers by 1705 and "nearer a score" by 1710.¹³³

A more quantitative analysis of Burney's collection of newspapers confirms that Dr. Sacheverell, his preaching, and his trial were indeed subjects of significance. The database contains 247 papers that at least mention "Sacheverell" between October 28, 1709 (the first reference following his first sermon at Derby) and January 1, 1711. In total he shows up in 765 papers between July 4, 1702 and December 1, 1800. While the first appearance coincides with the Oxford sermon against occasional conformity and the last occurs over seventy-six years after Sacheverell died the range and sheer number of mentions reveal the impact his November 5, 1709 sermon and subsequent trial in 1710

¹³³ W. A. Speck, "Political Propaganda in Augustan England," *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 22, (1972): 19-20.

had on the public sphere. Moreover, the numbers indicate late-1709 and the entire year of 1710 as the critical timeframe, with forty-nine results appearing between the November 5 sermon and the beginning of the trial on February 27, 1710, thirteen results appearing between during the trial, 145 results appearing after the March 20 conclusion of the trial and before the beginning of the general election on October 2, and twenty-two results appearing during the October 2 through November 16 election.

Keyword searching indicates that other relevant individuals and subjects appeared frequently in print during our timeframe as well. The subjects of Sacheverell's sermon, including the words "false brethren," which appear in 106 papers, and "church in danger," which appears in eight papers, are commonly found in a variety of different publications. Those, in Sacheverell's view, actually "endangering" the Church and state – the government ministers – appear nearly as frequently. Interestingly, "Godolphin" is mentioned fairly rarely by name (the lord treasurer is mentioned in only twenty-three documents), but is referred to slightly more often (in thirty papers) by the appellation "Volpone." Of the other ministers, "Cowper" appears in thirty-two papers, "Sunderland" in fifty-three, "Somers" in six, "Wharton" in thirty-two, and "Orford" in thirty. "Junto" itself is only used in three papers during this timeframe. The events of the Sacheverell "incident" are found even more often, with the doctor's "impeachment" appearing in seventy-nine documents and his "trial" in 103 papers. The word "riot" appears in eighty-five papers, while "mob" appears in 142 and "crowd" appears in seventy-seven. The press clearly seems to have closely followed and reported on those involved and the events that unfolded; therefore, it can be assumed that the public sphere was teeming with recognition of and discussion on the subject from late-1709 through the end of 1710. Let

us now more closely examine the individuals and events to determine how the government managed the situation.

Recognized as a divisive figure by historians and contemporaries alike, Sacheverell's character and talents play a critical role in the events we will examine. In "The Sacheverell Riots: The Crowd and the Church in Early Eighteenth-Century London" Geoffrey Holmes says Sacheverell was "a born demagogue... recognized as such since he first electrified Oxford with a savage attack on Occasional Conformity from St. Mary's pulpit in 1702" and "also a man of turbulent character and fierce ambition... fully prepared by 1709 to exploit both the pulpit, in which he excelled, and the popular passions, which in theory he deplored, to attempt to undermine a political régime and religious toleration he loathed."¹³⁴ Similarly, Sacheverell's ODNB article refers to him as a "religious controversialist," a "firebrand," and a "provocative" preacher, known for his "inflammatory harangues."¹³⁵ While this article goes on to say that his sermons were popular with listeners, it also states that Sacheverell was "disliked by many of his colleagues" for his "overbearing arrogance and conceit" as well as for "his drunken exploits."

Sacheverell notoriously came to fame in 1709 when he preached sermons suggesting that the Anglican Church was in danger, first at Derby on August 15 and then at St. Paul's Cathedral in London on November 5.¹³⁶ While both sermons dealt with the same issues, the second was by far the more infamous of the two because of both the

¹³⁴ Holmes, "The Sacheverell Riots," 61.

¹³⁵ W. A. Speck, "Sacheverell, Henry (*bap.* 1674, *d.* 1724)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/24440>.

¹³⁶ The sermon preached at Derby in 1709 was "The Communication of Sin." However, an earlier sermon preached at St. Mary's on December 23, 1705 is considered a less famous version of "The Perils of False Brethren." These along with numerous other sermons and pamphlets demonstrate that Sacheverell's anti-dissenting sentiments existed from the very beginning of his career.

location and day it was preached. Note that the capital was the geographic center of party politics and print culture. The date, November 5, was well known to all Englanders as Guy Fawkes Day; sermons on that date typically compared the Gunpowder Plot of November 5, 1605 with William of Orange's November 5, 1688 landing at Torbay as a "double deliverance" from Catholicism. Sacheverell's sermon, titled "The Perils of False Brethren, in Church and State," did not follow the script. Instead he compared the Gunpowder Plot to the date Charles I was executed, January 30, 1649. The implication was clear; not only was the Church in danger, but the government was in danger as well. Furthermore, that danger came from both papists and radical Protestants.

The publishing of "The Perils of False Brethren" is critical to this chapter because of all the waves it caused as a piece of print media itself and for what it generated in terms of other works. Printing the message was a problem because custom called for Sacheverell to get approval from the lord mayor, aldermen, and council of London, before whom he had preached his sermon, to publish it; due to the incendiary nature of the message they denied him permission. Nevertheless, Sacheverell claimed he had been given permission and published the sermon with printer Henry Clements, who according to Holmes ran off "1000 [copies] in quarto for 1s. each and between 35,000 and 40,000 in octavo which sold for 2d."¹³⁷ Clements also printed a second edition, and numerous pirated editions exist as well. Holmes estimates that over 100,000 copies existed at the time, reaching over 250,000 people. Looking at the primary sources seems to confirm this; the November 23, 1709 through November 26, 1709 issue of the *Observer*, much to Ridpath's chagrin, tells us that "Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon on the 5th of November,

¹³⁷ Geoffrey Holmes, *The Trial of Dr. Sacheverell* (London: Eyre Methuen, 1973), 64-69.

now... is printed in a two Penny and a twelve Penny Cut... and sells like Lightning.”¹³⁸

The November 24, 1709 through November 26, 1709 issue of the *Post Boy* contains a classified ad under the “Just Publish’d” heading for “The Perils of False Brethren both in Church and State, set forth in a Sermon preached... on the 5th of November 1709. By Henry Sacheverell...” It critically informs its readers that “There are Counterfeits Cry’d about the Town, which want the Dedication, and great part of the Sermon. The only True ones are printed by Henry Clements, at the Half Moon in St. Paul’s Church yard. Price 2 d.”¹³⁹ An ad from the *Daily Courant*’s Friday, November 25, 1709 issue markets the sermon under the “This Day is Publish’d” heading listing the price as “1 s. 4to. a d. in 8yo.”¹⁴⁰

The printing of the sermon outraged the government, and it is how it handled this act that eventually led to its own demise. As discussed in the introduction, the “government” referred to here in 1709-1710 is different than the “government” in 1688-1689 in one crucial aspect. Queen Anne, unlike King James II, occupied a far less active role and is therefore not included in my analysis. Anne, as monarch and official head of state, was not under attack from Sacheverell, Harley, St. John, the opposition, or the print media, nor was she actively engaged in the attempted management of that print media in the public sphere. Yes, she did play a role in the Sacheverell verdict and in the subsequent change of the ministry, but her role in what this paper is examining was minimal. Instead, the use of the “government” in this section is in reference to the sitting ministry, its support in Parliament, and the apparatuses at its disposal for managing print media and the public sphere. More specifically, the coalition of the Godolphin-

¹³⁸ *Observer*, November 23, 1709 - November 26, 1709.

¹³⁹ *Post Boy*, November 24, 1709 - November 26, 1709.

¹⁴⁰ *Daily Courant*, November 25, 1709.

Marlborough duumvirate and the Whig Junto were the sitting ministry from Sacheverell's first sermon to their respective fall in the summer and autumn of 1710; their supporters in Parliament were generally Whigs like Jack Dolben, and the government apparatuses at their disposal for managing print media ranged from censors to propagandists.¹⁴¹

The difference between Sacheverell preaching "The Perils of False Brethren" and publishing it was that by having it printed he opened himself up to government prosecution under the Law of Seditious Libel. Chief Justice John Holt had determined in 1704 that "it was criminal to bring scandal upon the government by defaming the government in general as well as by defaming particular persons within it" via print.¹⁴² Godolphin, the lord treasurer, who was referred to in it by the nickname "Volpone," was particularly outraged.¹⁴³ Others, but not all, within the government argued that Sacheverell should be tried for seditious libel – interesting because the Whig government had brought no seditious libel prosecutions against anyone between early 1708 and 1710.¹⁴⁴ Somers alone had reservations over the reversal of policy. He had previously asserted that prosecutions could be as harmful to the government as to defendants – particularly if they were done so publically. However, Sunderland, who was a strong proponent of the prosecution, represented the majority's views; Lee Horsley in "Vox Populi' in the Political Literature of 1710" describes this attitude well, explaining that

¹⁴¹ By 1709 the "Junto," a Whig alliance in the time of William and Anne, included Cowper, Sunderland, Somers, Wharton, Orford, and Halifax – though he did not hold a cabinet position.

¹⁴² Philip Hamburger, "The Development of the Law of Seditious Libel and the Control of the Press," *Stanford Law Review* 37, no. 3 (Feb. 1985): 735-736. For more on Sir John Holt (1642–1710) or the Tutchin trial (1704) see their respective ODNB articles.

¹⁴³ "Volpone" is Italian for "sly fox." Additionally, it was the title of controversial English playwright Ben Jonson's 1606 satire of greed and lust. Sacheverell's use of the nickname had slanderous intentions. Although Godolphin and Marlborough were in fact moderate Tories, their alliance with the Whig Junto against fellow Tories like Robert Harley and Henry St. John brought accusations from Sacheverell that Godolphin had in fact sold out to the Whigs; critical here is the fact that Godolphin had forced Harley out of the administration in 1708.

¹⁴⁴ Hamburger, "The Development of the Law of Seditious Libel and the Control of the Press," 746-747.

“by prosecuting him, the Whig ministry had hoped to discredit Tory attacks on government policy and dissuade other clergymen from meddling in politics.”¹⁴⁵ After further debate as to exactly whose jurisdiction the sermon fell under the government upon the advice of the earl of Wharton, cabinet minister and Junto lord, finally made the decision to impeach Sacheverell before the House of Lords on December 13, 1709. Another notorious Whig and government subordinate, Jack Dolben, chaired the committee that framed the four articles of impeachment drawn up on January 9, 1710 and presented to the Lords three days later; these articles cited Sacheverell’s suggestion that there had been no resistance in the Glorious Revolution, his claim that toleration of occasional conformity was “unwarrantable,” his assertion that the current administration put the Church of England “in great peril and adversity,” and his suggestion that the “false brethren” within both the administration and the Church were destroying the constitution. Sacheverell was given till January 28 to reply, but when he did his response was uncompromising.

Examining the newspapers in Burney’s collection between Sacheverell’s infamous sermon on November 5, 1709 and the beginning of his trial on February 27, 1710 reveals that the doctor was the talk of the town. Twenty-five issues in a variety of papers during this timeframe carry classified ads for pamphlets discussing Sacheverell in some way; ranging in seriousness and in the supportive or critical stances they take these pamphlets include “A Defense of Dr. Sacheverell: or, Passive Obedience prov’d to be the Doctrine of the Church of England from the Reformation to these Times,” “A Vindication of Dr. Sacheverell,” “The Picture of Malice: Or, A True Account of Dr.

¹⁴⁵ Lee Horsley, “‘Vox Populi’ in the Political Literature of 1710,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 38, no. 4 (August 1975): 335.

Sacheverell's Enemies, and their Behavior, with regard to him, since the 5th of November last," "Mr. Tolland's Reflections on Dr. Sacheverell's Sermon, at St. Paul's, Nov. 5, 1709," "The Modern Fanatick," and others. The public was also able to follow the legal proceedings between sermon and trial. The subject of Sacheverell being impeached, or later of his actual impeachment, comes up in four issues. The December 24, 1709 through December 28, 1709 issue of the *Observer* appears to be the first to bring up impeaching him for high treason; the *Observer's* January 14, 1710 through January 18, 1710 issue has a printed letter that reports "The House of Commons have got Sacheverell into Custody."¹⁴⁶ In the Thursday, January 19, 1710 issue *Review of the State of the British Nation* Defoe reports that "Dr. Sacheverell having been impeach'd by the Commons, is deliver'd up to the Lords to be try'd." He adds that the "House... refus'd him Bail, and prepar'd their Articles" giving "time to make his Answer."¹⁴⁷ With government action against Sacheverell came criticism of the government from the opposition though. Sunderland vigorously tried to restrain the Tory press, closing down two short-lived newspapers and making arrests for slander against the government, but most opposition papers and pamphlets successfully offered criticism while walking a fine line to avoid official action. The February 15 through February 22 issue of the Tory *Examiner or Remarks upon Papers and Occurrences* simultaneously remarks on the main thrust of Sacheverell's sermon and the existing administration's decision to prosecute the doctor when it declares "I take the State to be truly in danger, both as to its Religion and Government, when a Set of Ambitious Politicians, bred up in a Hatred of the Constitution, and a Contempt for all Religion, are forc'd upon exerting these Qualities in

¹⁴⁶ *Observer*, December 24, 1709 - December 28, 1709 and January 14, 1710 - January 18, 1710.

¹⁴⁷ *Review of the State of the British Nation*, January 19, 1710.

order to keep or increase their Power.”¹⁴⁸ The subjects of Sacheverell’s sermons, the doctor himself, and the clergy were all discussed in newspapers as well. “Mr. Review” alone makes reference to these topics in six issues between January 7 and March 16, usually taking an anti-Sacheverell, anti-clergy stance.¹⁴⁹

The subsequent trial of Sacheverell lasted from February 27 until March 20, and although the doctor was eventually found guilty, both his sentence and the future of the government were influenced by the “groundswell of sympathy and support” for him during this timeframe. This was much to the chagrin and despite the best efforts of the Whig *Observer* and the ostensibly neutral *Review of the State of the British Nation*. Each newspaper defended the government and criticized Sacheverell’s position throughout the trial. Burney’s collection shows eleven results for the *Observer* between the beginning and the end of the trial. Seven of the eleven are news pieces and four are advertisements. Every news piece discussed Sacheverell and his trial – usually with either “Observer” or “Countryman” asking the other “What news of Sacheverell?” Other topics that appear frequently and often times interwoven with the discussion of Sacheverell’s trial are the “high-flying” faction, the spread of seditious pamphlets, the government, and the mob. The connection between “Sacheverell and his Faction,” a common phrase in the *Observer*, must have been obvious to the public and government alike. Reporting on the previous day’s happenings in each issue, the *Observer* defends the government and denounces Sacheverell and the opposition continually.

¹⁴⁸ *Examiner or Remarks upon Papers and Occurrences*, February 15, 1710 – February 22, 1710.

¹⁴⁹ Daniel Defoe is often referred to as “Mr. Review” because of his periodical the *Review* (February 19, 1704 – June 11, 1713); it takes a variety of different names throughout its existence, but all of them contain the word “Review.” Backscheider, “Defoe, Daniel.”

The *Review of the State of the British Nation* also discussed the trial on a regular basis; it did so in seven issues between February 16 and March 14. The Thursday, March 9 issue is particularly interesting because Defoe mentioned that “the Doctor in managing his Defense has thought fit to justify his Saying the Church was in Danger, by endeavoring to show the Church in Danger, from sundry writings... and... from the *Review* and the *Observer*.”¹⁵⁰ Sacheverell’s reference to Defoe’s paper specifically as evidence during his trial in this way prompted a response in the March 9 issue and others going forward. For example, in the Saturday, March 11 issue of the *Review* Defoe criticized the clergy and further defended himself and the *Review* from Sacheverell’s accusations.¹⁵¹ In it he wrote “Would the people, who, blinded by Parties, shut their Eyes against their Understandings, and cry out of the Danger of the Church, but consider this, Here they would find the real Danger of the Church – Not in Dissenters..., but in... the Inferior Clergy.” He went on to argue that he and his paper were unjustly targeted and to reverse the assertions, saying “let Dr. Sacheverell bring me in attacking the Church, and putting her in Danger, because I have so exposed the Immoralities of the Clergy, among which he may be conscious of his own Share.”

It is not absolutely clear to what degree the *Review* or the *Observer* were associated with the government at this time. Neither was an official organ such as the *London Gazette* was in 1688. Defoe is known to have written for money as early as the late 1690s, and by the summer of 1704 – under the direction of Harley, the then secretary of state – he had changed his tact from criticizing Godolphin’s government to defending it. Defoe is regularly associated with Harley and moderation, and it is well known that he

¹⁵⁰ *Review of the State of the British Nation*, March 9, 1710.

¹⁵¹ *Review of the State of the British Nation*, March 11, 1710.

began to work for the new chancellor of the exchequer again in August of 1710. In *Robert Harley and the press: Propaganda and public opinion in the age of Swift and Defoe* J. A. Downie reveals that Defoe “continued to write for the reformed Godolphin ministry” in some capacity even while Harley was out of office, and goes on to say that “he served his whig employers diligently and loyally,” backing “them up to the hilt during the Sacheverell trial and its aftermath.”¹⁵² Furthermore, ODNB states that between “at least 1707” and the “accession of George I (autumn 1714) he received an income of between £400 and £500 per year from the government.”¹⁵³ Similarly, Ridpath, who Downie says “was supported by the Junto,” is known to have been associated with Lord Wharton since 1687 when he dedicated a pamphlet to the Junto lord while living under his roof.¹⁵⁴ Unlike Defoe though, Ridpath was an active Whig journalist who did not associate with just whoever happened to be in power and willing to pay for his services; the trouble he got into with Harley’s ministry in 1712-1713 demonstrates this. In any case, the activities of each paper – particularly during the trial – demonstrate that they at least formed an informal arm of the government in its foray into print culture in the public sphere at the time.

However, opposition writers were active as well, and their papers in combination with the government’s misguided public prosecution of Sacheverell roused the passions of the mob. Violent riots erupted on the night of March 1; the March 4, 1710 through March 8, 1710 issue of the *Observer* discusses them in some detail, beginning with

¹⁵² J. A. Downie, *Robert Harley and the press: Propaganda and public opinion in the age of Swift and Defoe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979): 103, 124.

¹⁵³ Backscheider, “Defoe, Daniel.”

¹⁵⁴ Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 13. and Aitkin, “Ridpath, George.”

“Observer” asking “Countryman” if “the Rebellion there [is] quite supress’d.”¹⁵⁵ The *Observer* reports that an “unthinking, rascally brutish Mob of Papists, Nonjurors, Jacobites, High-Flyers, and House-breakers” destroyed five dissenting meeting houses and made bonfires of their contents.¹⁵⁶ Additionally, it claims that citizens were confronted in the streets and questioned as to whether or not they were “for the doctor.” A number of Whig politicians were also threatened and had their homes targeted. The *Observer* states that the houses of the “great Lords of England,” specifically that of the “Earl of Wharton,” were targeted because of the lords’ “steadfast Adherence to the Interest of this Country against Popery and Tyranny.” Pamphlets handed out condemning the Bank of England and Presbyterians further provoked the mob. Only when troops were called in the next morning did the mob disperse. The only official government reaction to the March 1 riots in print is a royal proclamation that Anne released the next day; it appears in the March 2, 1710 through March 4, 1710 issue of the *London Gazette*.¹⁵⁷ In it the queen announced that she was informed that “the Streets and Passages leading through our Cities of London and Westminster, and suburbs thereof, have been filled of late with great Numbers of loose, idle, and disorderly Persons, who resort thither in crowds, and in a riotous tumultuous manner offer Violence.” The queen went on to call these individuals and groups “Traitors,” “Rebels,” “Papists,” and “Enemies of our Government” as well as to threaten that henceforth anyone involved in such “mobs” or activities will be prosecuted to the “utmost Severity of the Law.” For

¹⁵⁵ *Observer*, March 4, 1710 - March 8, 1710.

¹⁵⁶ *Observer*, February 25, 1710 - March 1, 1710 and March 8, 1710 - March 11, 1710. Ridpath, like Defoe, is in an interesting place here because in theory he supported and was on the record supporting the people’s right to revolution against bad government. Both authors sidestep this moral dilemma with Defoe claiming that the Sacheverell mob was not “natural” but “forc’d” and Ridpath claiming that it was “no ordinary ‘Prentice Mob.’” Lee Horsley, “‘Vox Populi’ in the Political Literature of 1710,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 38, no. 4 (August 1975): 347-348.

¹⁵⁷ *London Gazette*, March 2, 1710 - March 4, 1710.

months afterward Sunderland conducted investigations with minimal success in an attempt to determine who was responsible for the riots. These reactive legal measures were typical of the government's response throughout late-1709 and 1710.

Despite the queen's proclamation or the secretary's investigations and arrests, further riots occurred in support of Sacheverell after the verdict, during his midsummer progress, and during the autumn elections. Burney's collection contains 105 papers between the end of Sacheverell's trial on March 20, 1710 and the end of the year that mention the "mob." "Riot" or "riots" appears in sixty-two papers during the same timeframe, and Sacheverell's "cavalcade" is also discussed. The doctor himself is mentioned in 184, so it is obvious he was still a hot topic after the conclusion of his trial. The *Observer* alone discussed the "mob" in twenty-seven issues following the trial – the first on March 22 and the last on October 21. In every instance Ridpath connected Sacheverell's name to it, often referring to it in the possessive as "Sacheverell's mob." Similar results are found in the *Review*, where "mob" appears thirty-two times. Defoe also connected the mob with Sacheverell throughout the late-spring, summer, and early-autumn; in doing so he attached connotations of radicalism, party strife, and "faction" with the doctor and the Tories in the opposition while simultaneously implying that the government's position was one of moderation. Defoe's tactic of depicting the position he supported as moderate or sensible in contrast to the opposition's position as radical or extreme was used by both sides. The efforts of writers in support of the government, however, could not stop the wave of public opinion; the damage from Sacheverell's sermons and trial were done, and no amount of damage control was reversing the situation.

The reaction of the crowds foreshadowed the dismissal of Godolphin and the Junto ministers and the Tory landslide victory in the next set of parliamentary elections. In fact, the latter – viewed ahead of time as a likely outcome if not a near certainty – necessitated the former. The secretary of state, Lord Sunderland, was the first to go; Anne dismissed him on June 14 and replaced him with a Tory. Defoe “angrily denounced the failure to make a stand in his support, which allowed the ministerial changes to proceed piecemeal.”¹⁵⁸ He criticized the “High-Flyers... that are now courting the mob, and putting themselves forward for Parliament-Men” in the Tuesday, June 20 issue of the *Review of the State of the British Nation*, arguing that they had “treated a Man of Honour [Sunderland] without Manners,” that they derived “joy” from his fall because he “was a Restraint to their impudent Pamphleteers,” and that “they have nothing to lay to the Charge of my Lord S-----d.”¹⁵⁹ In the July 12 through July 15 issue of the *Observer* Ridpath, through the persona of Countryman, warned his audience of a potential Catholic conspiracy between the Pretender, the French clergy, and the Tory high-fliers; he connected the “laying aside” of the “Earl of Sunderland” with “more Changes... expected in Posts” and “Sacheverell’s Cavalcades” and “mobs.”¹⁶⁰ As Ridpath predicted, Sunderland was followed by Somers on September 21, Cowper on September 23, and Orford and Wharton in October. Godolphin himself fell from power on 8 August 1710. In a similar way to the Sunderland dismissal, Defoe tried to make a stand in the *Review*, but it was to no avail.

The ministerial changes in the summer and early autumn of 1710 allowed Tory propagandists in the opposition to push for a new parliament. Opposition newspapers

¹⁵⁸ Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 124.

¹⁵⁹ *Review of the State of the British Nation*, June 20, 1710.

¹⁶⁰ *Observer*, July 12, 1710 – July 15, 1710.

and pamphlets connected Sacheverell's cry of "Church in danger" to his impeachment, his trial, and the ministerial changes. They also linked these events to a new parliament as the logical conclusion to what they argued was the people's cry for change. The August 10 through August 17 issue of the *Tory Examiner or Remarks upon Papers and Occurrences* strings Sacheverell, the fall of the ministry, and a natural Tory victory in the upcoming general election together, stating "that so inconsiderable a Man as Dr. Sacheverell shou'd be able to draw the People after him, and prepare 'em for choosing a new Parliament, of a quite different Complexion from the Present," and that "this Consequence is pretty evident" because if he "can have influence enough upon the People, to make 'em oppose the Ministry, then the interest of that Ministry with the People, cannot be very considerable."¹⁶¹ Tory propagandists in the opposition such as Dr. Joseph Trapp – a friend of and clergyman like Sacheverell – were especially active throughout the summer and fall. His pamphlets, *An Ordinary Journey No Progress, or, A Man doing his Own Business No mover of Sedition, Most Faults on One Side*, and *The True Genuine Tory-Address, and the True Genuine Whig-Address, Set Against one another* appear frequently in the classified ads of the *Tory Examiner*. Another high church writer, William King, published five pro-Sacheverell pamphlets in this time period, among them *A Second Letter from Tom Boggy to the Canon of Windsor, Occasioned by the Late Panegyric Given Him by the Review of Thursday, July 13, 1710*. During this same timeframe Whigs like Benjamin Hoadly threw themselves into the election campaign; Hoadly, who had been recommended for preferment by the Commons the same day they voted to impeach Sacheverell, wrote a series of pamphlets in support

¹⁶¹ *Examiner or Remarks upon Papers and Occurrences*, August 10, 1710 – August 17, 1710.

of the Whig cause.¹⁶² One, *The Thoughts of an Honest Tory*, attempted to turn public opinion against the Church party via an unflattering characterization of the views of an average Tory. Yet another Whig writer, Arthur Maynwaring, published the pamphlet *Four Letters to a Friend in North Britain* in August; it attempted to connect Sacheverell and High-Church with Jacobitism and popery.¹⁶³ Still other polemicists in support of the Godolphin ministry wrote against the dissolution of parliament, against further changes in the ministry, and against the changes already made. Even the Whig lords themselves often took up the pen and wrote in their own defense; Somers, Cowper, Halifax, and the young Walpole acted as apologists for the Junto. Cowper's *Letter to Isaac Bickerstaff* is an example of this. Despite their best efforts though, neither they nor the newspapermen and pamphleteers like Ridpath, Defoe, Hoadly, and Maynwaring were able to stall the surge of public support for the Tories instigated the previous November.

This chapter has shown that the government, or its clients, did participate in and try to influence the public sphere in late-1709 and 1710 with both legal tools and with print; why then was this so ineffective? The ministry itself was to blame. Both the decision to prosecute Sacheverell for seditious libel and the subsequent public trial were completely mishandled. It had the effect of making him a martyr in the eyes of the populace, confirmed in the riots on his behalf during the trial, following the verdict, throughout his summer progression, and at the time of the autumn parliamentary elections. The impeachment and public trial also had the effect of stimulating fierce partisanship, uniting the Tories and permanently isolating Godolphin, Marlborough, and

¹⁶² Stephen Taylor, "Hoadly, Benjamin (1676–1761)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Jan. 2008, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/13375>.

¹⁶³ Henry L. Snyder, "Maynwaring, Arthur (1668–1712)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oct. 2005, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/17809>.

their Whig allies from them. The ministry is also to blame for not using print to exert a greater influence on the public. Even while newspapermen and pamphleteers like Ridpath and Defoe continually commented and wrote on behalf of the government, it was without specific support or instruction. Downie echoes this sentiment. He calls Godolphin “unimaginative” and says “the government neglected to sponsor the production and distribution of propaganda.”¹⁶⁴ He goes on to write that “the whigs palpably failed to do anything about the question of propaganda and counter-propaganda until forced to do so by a particular political exigency. As for Marlborough and Godolphin, their interest in the press was minute.”¹⁶⁵ Marlborough did not even know who “the author of the *Review* is.” This kind of indifference to a man, Defoe, who was on the government’s payroll and one of the few fighting for it in the paper wars shows a lack of comprehension as to what exactly they had inherited from Harley.

The Sacheverell “incident,” stretching over roughly a year-long period between late-1709 and late-1710 and focusing on Dr. Henry Sacheverell, his preaching, his trial, and the impact they had on the existing government and the general election of 1710, is widely studied because of the wealth of political pamphlets and newspaper sources available. A thorough examination of these events combined with both a quantitative and a qualitative analysis of newspaper results from Burney’s collection reveal that the government’s involvement in and management of the public sphere through print media during this timeframe was dramatically different from the government approach practiced under James II. In 1688 King James and his government faced a political as well as a military crisis; there the ministry and the king both confronted their demise. Queen

¹⁶⁴ Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 104.

¹⁶⁵ Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 114.

Anne's less active role in the Sacheverell "incident" is explained by the fact that the crisis facing the government in late-1709 and 1710 was purely political. The sitting government was under threat from the opposition, not an external threat. Obviously this is why the government did not and could not respond to the crisis with military means, but it could and did respond with the law and print media. However, the analysis above shows that this government, like its predecessor, mismanaged the tools at its disposal for influencing the public sphere. While Sacheverell used the printing of his incendiary sermons to reach a larger audience, the government saw an opportunity to use the laws against printing seditious material to prosecute him and thereby suppress his message – at least in theory. The inspection of opposition newspapers and pamphlets above shows how polemicists used Sacheverell's impeachment, trial, and sentence, proclaiming the doctor's martyrdom to the masses via the press, thus touching on the passions of the "mob." It is also clear that the Whig newspaperman who tried to counteract the Tory press were outmatched in the production print media and lacking in government support. This may be explained in the fact that both the Whig Junto and the Duumvirate failed to grasp the power of print as a tool to influence public opinion. The claim that Godolphin "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" sums this undervaluing up well.¹⁶⁶ On the other hand, Harley, St. John, and the Tory opposition set a high value upon print media as a tool to influence the public. Their clever use of print to continually play upon the passions stirred during the Sacheverell "incident" brought about a revolution in opinion amongst the public in general and the electorate specifically. This brought down the sitting government and resulted in a new Tory

¹⁶⁶ John Oldmixon, *The Life and Posthumous Works of Arthur Maynwaring* (London, 1715), p. 158.

ministry and Parliament, proving that governments were becoming subject to public opinion and accountable for managing it.

CHAPTER V
THE END OF THE WAR OF THE SPANISH SUCCESSION AND THE TREATY OF
UTRECHT

The fourth period of importance studied here is the end of the War of the Spanish Succession and the subsequent peace agreement, the Treaty of Utrecht, in 1713.¹⁶⁷ Again, it is a set of events worth examining for two reasons: first, during this timeframe both the government and the opposition produced and directed at the public sphere copious amounts of print media in efforts to manage or influence it and second, this print media had a noticeable impact on the political situation – resulting in specific actions that brought about the end of Britain’s participation in the hostilities and the initial acceptance of the Treaty. Newspapers and pamphlets are the two most prolific sources through which the relevance of these events can be shown. They are also the best types of print media to analyze in an effort to discover just how the government participated in and managed the public sphere, so I will again begin by taking a closer look at what the online databases divulge before turning to a more direct investigation of the events.

¹⁶⁷ For a general overview of the peace negotiations as well as the events leading up to them see James W. Gerard, *The Peace of Utrecht: A Historical Review of the Great Treaty of 1713-1714, and of the Principal Events of the War of the Spanish Succession* (1885. Reprint, New York: Forgotten Books 2012). For Britain’s role specifically see B. W. Hill, “Oxford, Bolingbroke, and the Peace of Utrecht,” *The Historical Journal* 16, no. 2 (June, 1973): 241-263.

Searching the Burney Collection archive for relevant papers between late-1710 and early-1713 reveals a number of the same newspapers analyzed previously to still be in existence. Familiar titles like the *Examiner or Remarks upon Papers and Occurrences*, the *British Apollo*, the *Evening Post*, the *London Gazette*, the *Observer*, the *Post Boy*, the *Post Man and the Historical Account*, the *Tatler*, the *Daily Courant*, the *Review of the State of the British Nation*, and the *British Mercury* appear frequently. However, it also shows new newspapers such as the *Medley*, the *Supplement*, the *Spectator*, the *Flying Post or The Post Master*, the *Dublin Gazette*, the *Hermit*, the *Protestant Post-Boy*, the *Britain*, the *Guardian*, the *Reconciler*, and the *Mercator tr Commerce Retrieved*. Among the papers not previously discussed is the *Medley*. It was published between October 5, 1710 and August 1, 1712 in London as a Whig response to Swift's *Examiner*.¹⁶⁸ Arthur Maynwaring founded it and he and John Oldmixon edited it, and Richard Steele and Anthony Henley are among its known contributors. The *Supplement* was published in London between February 9, 1708 and June 22, 1711 and edited by Abel Boyer.¹⁶⁹ Joseph Addison and Richard Steele began the *Spectator*, publishing it in London and printing it as a two-column periodical on a single half-sheet folio on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays between March 1, 1711 and December 6, 1712.¹⁷⁰ Its essays ranged across a wide variety of topics. The Whig paper the *Flying Post or The Post Master* was published between January 1, 1695 and February 2, 1731. It was originally published as a half-folio in London for a general audience as "the chief Whig" newspaper and edited by George Ridpath (d. 1726) until 1713; during that year it

¹⁶⁸ "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers," *Medley*, publication information.

¹⁶⁹ "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers," *Supplement*, publication information.

¹⁷⁰ "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers," *Spectator*, publication information. See also Cowan, "Mr. Spectator and the Coffeehouse Public Sphere," 345-366.

appeared as a small folio of four to six pages, and after that year it was edited by Stephen Whatley (fl. 1712-1741). The *Dublin Gazette* as the name implies was published in Dublin, Ireland between August 24, 1708 and December 28, 1797 by Ann Sandys on a specific government license.¹⁷¹ It was in fact the first newspaper in Ireland to act as the official voice of the government – similar to its English equivalent, the *London Gazette*. The *Hermit* was a short-lived periodical published in London between August 4, 1711 and February 23, 1712 and printed for John Morphew containing essays on religious and ethical topics.¹⁷² Philip Horneck and Abel Boyer published the *Protestant Post-Boy* in London between November 15, 1711 and June 21, 1712.¹⁷³ Another Steele and Addison paper, the *Guardian*, was published in London between March 12, 1713 and October 1, 1713.¹⁷⁴ The short-lived *Reconciler* was published in London between April 30, 1713 and June 19, 1713.¹⁷⁵ Finally, the *Mercator tr Commerce Retrieved* was another Defoe production; he wrote and edited it with the intention of persuading the public that following the Treaty of Utrecht trade between Britain and other European nations, including France, was both possible and to Britain's advantage. It was published three times a week in London as a single half-folio sheet between May 26, 1713 and July 17, 1714.¹⁷⁶

Keyword searching Burney's collection in selected timeframes yields hits in various newspapers on key individuals, events, and phrases, thereby demonstrating that they were topics of relevance and discussion within the public sphere to which these

¹⁷¹ "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers," *Dublin Gazette*, publication information.

¹⁷² "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers," *Hermit*, publication information.

¹⁷³ "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers," *Protestant Post-Boy*, publication information.

¹⁷⁴ "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers," *Guardian*, publication information.

¹⁷⁵ "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers," *Reconciler*, publication information.

¹⁷⁶ "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers," *Mercator tr Commerce Retrieved*, publication information.

papers catered. For example, between Queen Anne's naming Robert Harley Chancellor of the Exchequer on August 10, 1710 and the final conclusion of the Treaty of Utrecht on March 31, 1713 "Harley" appears in 190 papers. Under his ducal appellation, "Oxford," he is mentioned in 620 issues. Harley's infamous Secretary of State, Henry "St John," is mentioned in 253 papers; St. John appears under his own title, "Bolingbroke," in forty-three results. The Duke of "Marlborough" shows 569 results during this same timeframe; 145 of these are from the year following his December, 29, 1711 dismissal. "Utrecht," the name of the peace treaty, shows 683 results, while the generic "peace treaty" returns 169 hits when searched between these dates. "Allies," admittedly another generic term, appears in 1956 papers, while the narrower "Grand Alliance" shows up in just 116. "Emperor" appears 1247 times, while "Charles VI" shows only twenty-four hits. "Dutch" shows up in 1407 issues. "France" yields an astounding 2464 results, with "French" showing an even greater 3746 hits. The French claimant to the Spanish throne, "Philip of Anjou," is mentioned in 471 papers. Even various discussion topics and pamphlets can be searched for provided the right keywords are used. The "Conduct of the Allies" was both a popular subject during the peace campaign and one of Swift's pamphlets; it returns fifty-two hits – some news articles and some advertisements. Similarly, "Barrier Treaty" returns 129 results; seventy-four of which are news pieces, likely discussing the settlement itself, and fifty-five are advertisements, undoubtedly for either Swift's famous pamphlet on the accord or pamphlets responding to him. Less common words and phrases yield reduced results, but these searches – especially when sorted by dates and papers – often provide specific examples. Below a closer analysis of these particular individuals, events, and topics will explain why they appear so commonly

in Burney's archive and help determine how the government participated in and managed the public sphere through print.

By the second decade of the eighteenth century all the belligerents in the War of the Spanish Succession, which had begun in 1701 with the fear of what both France and Spain, as well as Spain's empire, being under the control of the House of Bourbon would mean for the rest of Europe, were exhausted – physically and financially. Neither side had any distinct advantage. In addition, a series of critical events between 1710 and 1712 caused the Alliance to waver from its original purpose. The rise of a new Tory ministry and Tory controlled Parliament in 1710 was one of these events. The death of the Holy Roman Emperor Joseph I on April 17, 1711 and subsequent accession of the imperial candidate, the Archduke Charles, to the imperial throne as Charles VI was another. The fall of the Duke of Marlborough as a result of a combination of personal and political factors was a third. These factors, among others, provoked a push for peace in Britain. That drive is reflected in print through newspapers and pamphlets. It was not an organic initiative but a carefully managed operation that the government undertook.

The peace campaign began in earnest in late-1710 with Robert Harley and the Tories' ascent to power. Harley's ODNB article reports that "the ministry's tentative peace negotiations with France... had opened as early as July 1710."¹⁷⁷ In "Oxford, Bolingbroke, and the Peace of Utrecht" B. W. Hill states "Harley and Shrewsbury began to communicate with France from the beginning of August 1710 through the earl of Jersey and a French chaplain of his household, Francois Gaultier."¹⁷⁸ He knew that his

¹⁷⁷ W. A. Speck, "Harley, Robert, first earl of Oxford and Mortimer (1661–1724)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oct. 2007, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12344>.

¹⁷⁸ Hill, "Oxford, Bolingbroke, and the Peace of Utrecht," 244.

ministry had been carried into office on a wave of war-weariness in the public sphere as well as on the back of Sacheverell's sermons and mismanaged prosecution. Unlike previous governments however, Harley's had an adroit understanding of how to carefully manage public opinion through the use of various forms of print media. This was primarily due to the cunning and foresight of Harley himself. Habermas submitted that "Harley was the first statesman to understand how to turn the new situation to his advantage," and "the first to make the 'party spirit' a 'public spirit.'"¹⁷⁹ J. A. Downie in *Robert Harley and the press: Propaganda and public opinion in the age of Swift and Defoe* observes that "one of Harley's first steps on returning to office was to set about rebuilding the government propaganda machine."¹⁸⁰ Harley sought to preside over a moderate government. He himself was a Tory, but he recognized that hard-liners such as his former friend and subordinate Henry St. John would completely alienate the Whigs if they were allowed. Thus, Harley's government faced with the difficult task of needing to appease both sides, so throughout the late-summer and autumn of 1710 he recruited and put on his payroll when necessary men of skill to moderate the tone and bring certain groups into the fold; these men included Abel Boyer, Abel Roper, Simon Clement, Daniel Defoe, Jonathan Swift, and several others.

Each served a specific role and had a particular audience. Simon Clement had worked for Harley previously when he was secretary of state; he "was the first of the new propagandists recruited" and he soon emerged as Harley's "personal propagandist," writing the pamphlet *Faults on Both Sides* in an effort to pump the brakes on the intense

¹⁷⁹ Habermas, *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, 59.

¹⁸⁰ Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 122. Godolphin, as mentioned in the previous section, notoriously neglected the polemicists left on the government payroll following Harley's dismissal in 1708.

partisan climate during the summer of 1710.¹⁸¹ Abel Boyer, who had previously tried to gain Harley's patronage on several occasions, finally had some success with a letter he wrote to the new chief minister on August 15. Downie says "his *Political State* counted as almost a fifth ministerial paper in the first months of 1711 (the others were the *Examiner*, the *Review*, the *Post Boy*, and the *Gazette*)."¹⁸² Even the *Mercator* with its devotion to commerce and trade could be considered a ministerial press organ. Other newspapermen and pamphleteers inhabited a place where they served the government and the party. Unlike his predecessor, Harley encouraged all those that were potentially of use – even if they were not on the payroll. However, Harley's most effective propagandists were "Mr. Review" and "Mr. Examiner."

Ever the mercenary, Defoe abandoned his old government employers before the new ones were even in office. He wrote Harley on July 17 and assured him he would support him in his efforts to heal the breach between the parties; after a brief period during which Defoe seemed to be writing for both sides, the *Review* began to assume a Harleyite position. In theory, however, the *Review* was neutral. His task was difficult, for his audience was still essentially a Whig one. Charles Leslie, editor of the Tory *Rehearsal*, claimed Defoe's audience was "largely urban and illiterate, and they absorb the paper's arguments by gathering together about one that can read and listening."¹⁸³ Similarly, the Tory Ned Ward in *Vulgus Britannicus* asserted that the *Review* was "read

¹⁸¹ Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 122.

¹⁸² Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 163. Unfortunately, no copies of the *Political State* survive as part of Burney's 17th-18th Century Newspaper Collection.

¹⁸³ Richard I. Cook, "'Mr. Examiner' and 'Mr. Review': The Tory Apologists of Swift and Defoe," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (February, 1966): 131-132, "17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers," *Rehearsal*, publication information, and Robert D. Cornwall, "Leslie, Charles (1650–1722)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Oct. 2007, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/16484>.

most by cobblers and by porters.”¹⁸⁴ In “‘Mr. Examiner’ and ‘Mr. Review’: The Tory Apologists of Swift and Defoe,” Richard I. Cook accuses these estimations of partisan bias towards what these two fervent Tories saw as a “Whig paper.” Cook argues that Defoe would not “waste his efforts (nor Harley his money)” on the “mob,” and in reality Defoe’s audience consisted of the “commercial middle class.”¹⁸⁵ This audience was a key political power-bloc that necessitated careful management on the part of the new government based on moderation. The trouble lay in the fact that the composition of Defoe’s audience ensured that it was basically hostile to the Tories and skeptical of Defoe’s message. This made it impossible for him to use the partisan tones of his counterparts and even saw him take stances against the government on occasion. He did his best to assure his readers that the Harley ministry was “Whig” in principle and to defend government actions and official propaganda statements alike.

Swift, who arrived in London in September of 1710, was foremost amongst Harley’s new stable of propagandists and the man behind the government’s most polished propaganda releases. His intended audience was the Tory gentry in the country – referred to in his tracts as the “Landed Interest” – as well as the hard-line Tory backbenchers in the Commons. This audience was no-less essential to the government than Defoe’s commercial middle-class; it too formed a major political power center and needed to be managed appropriately. Swift’s goals were twofold: to reinforce Tory sympathies and to convince the rural squires that the Harley ministry would guard their interests. He did employ partisan tones with little fear of alienating readers. Swift’s primary tool was the

¹⁸⁴ Cook, “‘Mr. Examiner’ and ‘Mr. Review,’” 131-132 and James Sambrook, “Ward, Edward [Ned] (1667–1731),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/28682>.

¹⁸⁵ Cook, “‘Mr. Examiner’ and ‘Mr. Review,’” 133.

Examiner, which he took over from then editor William King and the original Tory authors St. John, Freind, Atterbury, and Prior. His polemical essays in the paper made use of a variety of stylistic methods – hyperbole, irony, parody, and satire to appeal to his specific audience. Interestingly, Cook asserts that Swift “accepted no money” from Harley for his work with the *Examiner*, and that his actions were determined more as friend or courtier to the first minister and a supporter of his government than as an employee like Defoe.¹⁸⁶ As an alternative, Downie posits that he took no money because he “preferred to think he had maintained his integrity as a writer” by not doing so.¹⁸⁷ Whether through preferment for a specific position or Harley’s treating him to free dinners though, Swift expected to be rewarded in other manners – a fact cynical contemporaries such as Oldmixon viewed with contempt. On the payroll or not, Swift and his newspaper were the government’s instruments, even after he passed the editorship of the *Examiner* to Mrs. Manley in June 1711.

Beyond the *Examiner* Swift wrote important pamphlets for Harley like the *Conduct of the Allies* and controlled or contributed to other newspapers. Abel Roper’s *Post Boy* was among these. Downie quotes Swift as once saying “Roper is my humble slave” and Irvin Ehrenpreis who contended that “there can be little doubt” that Roper’s *Post Boy* “was a ministerial paper.”¹⁸⁸ Although Roper catered to Tory sympathizers generally loyal to the government, the sheer numbers of his readership, which Geoffrey Holmes estimates was close to 50,000 over the course of its existence, indicate the *Post*

¹⁸⁶Cook, “‘Mr. Examiner’ and ‘Mr. Review,’” 128, 145. As mentioned in the previous section, Defoe received between £400 and £500 per year from the government between 1707 and the ascension of George I.

¹⁸⁷ Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 131.

¹⁸⁸ Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 131; *The Prose Writings of Jonathan Swift*, ed. H. Davis (Oxford, 1939-1975): XVI, 519: March 21, 1712; and Irvin Ehrenpreis, *Swift: The Man, His Works, and the Age* (London, 1962): II, 577.

Boy's influence on the public sphere.¹⁸⁹ After a vacancy that lasted over a year, Harley allowed the official government paper, the *London Gazette*, to go to one of Swift's nominees, William King, at the beginning of 1712.¹⁹⁰ Charles Ford, another Swift nominee, replaced King by July 1, 1712. Swift and the other newspapermen and pamphleteers that Harley recruited had specific roles and purposes in the government's management of public opinion. If they failed to properly achieve their purposes or thought to exercise their literary independence by writing without consulting the general policies of the government, then they could be removed as Swift was from the *Examiner's* editorship in June of 1711 after displaying opinions too much like those of St. John.

The year 1711 was critical for the peace campaign. On April 17, 1711 the Emperor Joseph died unexpectedly of smallpox at the age of just thirty-two, and his younger brother Charles of Austria became the Hapsburg successor.¹⁹¹ Several London papers followed the Emperor's illness closely throughout April, with some, such as the April 14 through April 18 issue of the *Observer*, noting the problems his potential death could cause; it commented that "The face of Affairs looks very cloudy... so that things seem to draw to a general Crisis."¹⁹² Other newspapers also commented both just before and just after his death about how this would have drastic consequences because

¹⁸⁹ Geoffrey Holmes, *British Politics in the Age of Anne* (London: Macmillan, 1967): 30.

¹⁹⁰ Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 164 and Hugh de Quehen, "King, William (1663–1712)," *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, Jan. 2008, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/15604>.

¹⁹¹ The April 17, 1711 - April 19, 1711 issue of the *Tatler* is the first in Burney's archive to report on the Emperor's death; other London papers report on the event in the following days. His younger brother Charles of Austria would go on to become the future Charles VI.

¹⁹² *Observer*, April 14, 1711 – April 18, 1711.

Charles was also the Allies' candidate for the Spanish succession.¹⁹³ Allowing the vast Spanish Empire to fall under the dominion of the Habsburg Emperor would upset the balance of power just as much as if the French candidate gained control of it. Peace had long been a goal for the Tories and Harley's government, which had informed the French court in December 1710 that it would no longer insist upon the exclusion of Philip of Anjou. Nonetheless, the Chancellor of the Exchequer felt that the time was not right for the British to approach the French, as the government's position was not yet secure and to do so would appear as if Britain was abandoning her allies. However, by spring of 1711 the situation had changed, and the Emperor's death caused others to see the need for peace. On April 26 Harley, upon Shrewsbury's insistence, revealed to the cabinet preliminary articles for peace that the French had secretly presented to Britain. On May 23 Harley was promoted to the position of Lord Treasurer and elevated to the peerage as earl of Oxford and Mortimer; in that month he also dispatched Matthew Prior to France to carry fuller suggested peace terms, including demands on behalf of Britain and demands on behalf of the rest of the Allies.¹⁹⁴

Before Prior returned with the French diplomat, Nicolas Mesnager, in the second week of August the newspapers, and therefore the public, had no knowledge that negotiations were already taking place. Meetings between the French representatives and the cabinet occurred on August 15, August 29, September 20, and September 27 and generated continuous alterations in the proposals of both sides; the preliminary articles

¹⁹³ "Allies" here refers to the coalition opposed to France, including the Holy Roman Empire, Great Britain, the Dutch Republic, Portugal, and the Duchy of Savoy and termed the "Grand Alliance" as it was in the Nine Years War (1688-1697).

¹⁹⁴ On promotion to the position of Lord Treasurer Harley (now Oxford) effectively became the Prime Minister. On the subject of Matthew Prior, this is the same man who assisted in editing the Tory *Examiner* before Swift took over as its sole editor in the fall of 1710. He and Swift were also close friends, often dining together and discussing political matters.

were finally signed on the last meeting and forwarded to emissaries from the other Allies. Upon receiving the preliminaries, the imperial envoy, Gallas, immediately allowed the Whig *Daily Courant* to publish them on October 13; examination of that issue reveals seven “Preliminary Articles on the Part of France, for effecting a general Peace,” said to be “communicated to the Ministers of all the High Allies... by Order of Her Majesty” and “signed... AT LONDON, the 27th of September... By Virtue of a full Power from the King” by “Mesnager.”¹⁹⁵ Other newspapers quickly reprinted the preliminary articles, Roper in the October 13 through October 16 issue of his *Post Boy*, Ridpath in the October 13 through October 16 issue of his *Flying Post*, John de Fonvive in the October 27 through October 30 issue of the *Post Man and the Historical Account*, and it is obvious the articles became general knowledge shortly thereafter because several papers including the *London Gazette*’s October 23 through October 25 issue and the *British Mercury*’s October 24 through October 26 issue discussed them in varying capacities. The results of the preliminary negotiations were to be put to a vote when Parliament met in December. The whole enterprise of attempting to influence public opinion through print the previous year, from St. John’s conspiracy thesis laid out in *A Letter to the Examiner* in the early-autumn of 1710 to Swift’s *The Conduct of the Allies* in the late-autumn of 1711 just weeks before the motion for peace in Parliament, was precisely directed at achieving a favorable response at this point.

Throughout 1711 the government used its various writers to release print propaganda that would help the peace campaign gather momentum while it simultaneously maintained publicly that Britain was committed to the war aims of the Allies. The government’s polemicists worked hard to lay the groundwork for the

¹⁹⁵ *Daily Courant*, October 13, 1711.

preliminary terms of peace, and Defoe was one of the most active. Two themes are identifiable in issues of the *Review* beginning in the late-spring of 1711. The first is trade and the benefits peace would have on it. In “Defoe and the Peace Campaign” Lawrence Poston III asserts that “Defoe... professed to be supremely confident of the advantages in store for English trade,” and that he was “unequivocally at one with” the government’s policy and “proved a knowledgeable propagandist for it.”¹⁹⁶ The Tuesday, September 18, issue of the *Review* discusses what peace with France would mean for vintners and the wine trade for example. Additionally, Poston – pointing to the *Review* in June and July – contends that Defoe was persistently writing about trade – particularly the possibility of the French being removed from the Americas as a competitor and the constant need to safeguard Britain’s trading interests in Spain, no matter who ended up as king there. Defoe’s purpose of persuading the public that trade between Britain and other European nations, including France, was both possible and to Britain’s advantage is something that began in 1711 but persisted even past the Treaty’s conclusion – as his *Mercator tr Commerce Retrieved* indicates. The second theme noticeable in the *Review* in 1711 is a distinct anti-Austrian policy. The June 16 issue of the *Review* brings up how Britain has “spent Millions of Money, and Thousands of brave Soldiers” so that the Emperor Charles could have Naples and Sicily.¹⁹⁷ The later November 22 issue advised its readers to “remember Austrian Cruelty, German Exorbitance, as well as French.”¹⁹⁸ With an eye on his audience, Defoe, unlike some of his Tory colleagues, walked this line of being critical of the Allies carefully. In particular he avoided criticizing the Protestant Dutch. In the

¹⁹⁶ Lawrence Poston III, “Defoe and the Peace Campaign, 1710-1713: A Reconsideration,” *Huntington Library Quarterly* 27, no. 1 (November, 1963): 7, 9.

¹⁹⁷ *Review of the State of the British Nation*, June 16, 1711.

¹⁹⁸ *Review of the State of the British Nation*, November 22, 1711.

October 9 issue of the *Review* Defoe assured his readers that the ministry would never conclude a treaty “without the necessary Agreement, Knowledge, Concert and Consent of our Allies, or at least, the States of Holland,” and in the November 24 issue he says “No Breach has ever been made in the Friendship and good Understanding between the English and the Dutch.”¹⁹⁹ Nevertheless, his anti-Austrian statements were precursors of the more pointed denunciations of the Allies in general to follow at the end of the year.

Defoe did not limit himself to only using the *Review* to lay the foundation for peace. He released carefully contrived pamphlets aimed at defending the intentions of the ministry such as *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: and how far she is obliged not to make peace without them* on October 6.²⁰⁰ This lengthy title, as Downie points out, speaks volumes. Defoe alluded to the fact that the War was costly and needed to end, but he did so in a conciliatory tone, acknowledging that Britain did have obligations to the Allies. An audience that would normally completely disregard the more extreme allegations of more partisan propaganda might give this title a chance. In doing so they might become more open-minded to later pamphlets such as Swift’s *The Conduct of the Allies*. This was without a doubt Oxford’s hope when he commissioned Defoe to write this. Also interesting is the timing of this pamphlet, after the conclusion of the preliminary articles but just before their release to the envoys of the other Allies. Oxford had to know that after the preliminaries were communicated to these representatives it was only a matter of time before they became

¹⁹⁹ *Review*, October 9, 1711 and *Review*, November 24, 1711.

²⁰⁰ For in depth analysis of this pamphlet see Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 139.

public knowledge, so Defoe's *Reasons why this Nation Ought to put a Speedy End to this Expensive War* probably was meant to make the public less surprised at and generally more accepting of the agreements they would soon learn of.

Although the preliminary terms of the peace were not announced before Parliament until December, it appears that the public knew something was happening by autumn 1711.²⁰¹ The Tuesday, September 18 issue of Abel Roper's *Post Boy*, among others, confirms this; it states "The Rumours of Peace continue; many still affirming, That the Negotiations are far advanc'd in England."²⁰² The government had to take special care at this time to make sure the public was willing to accept peace before specifics were announced. The October 9 through October 11 issue of the *Post Boy* positively articulated to its largely receptive Tory readership how close to announcing terms the government was as well as the virtues of these yet undisclosed terms, declaring "That the Treaty of Peace is so far advanc'd, that we have Hopes, in a few Days time, we shall be able to inform the Publick of the Particulars, which are so glorious and advantageous to this Nation and all the Allies, that it will be lasting, safe, and honourable, to the great Satisfaction of all good and honest men."²⁰³ Between Prior's return in August and when Oxford brought Mesnager and the preliminary peace terms before Parliament in December Defoe in the *Review* intermittently discussed the state of the War and paved the way for a potential peace, but he had to step more carefully than Roper. He insisted in the October 18 issue of the *Review* that the preliminary agreements between British and French negotiators were not "preliminaries" at all, but rather were

²⁰¹ Though it was not made public, St. John and Dartmouth signed the preliminary articles on behalf of Britain in September 1711.

²⁰² *Post Boy*, September 18, 1711.

²⁰³ *Post Boy*, October 9, 1711 – October 11, 1711.

“proposals.”²⁰⁴ Although Poston shows through an examination of letters to Harley that Defoe clearly knew that this was not the case, he told his Whig-leaning audience what they were more inclined to receive.²⁰⁵ His readership accepted that the government could listen to unofficial “proposals” from the French without compromising its allies, but they might not have been willing to consent to the official “preliminary” agreements that were taking place.

The climax of the government’s peace campaign in 1711 came with the release of Swift’s pamphlet, *The Conduct of the Allies*, on November 27. Aimed at taking up and extending St. John’s conspiracy thesis, it made quite a splash upon its release. The first edition sold 1000 copies in two days, with copies “sent in numbers to the country by great men... who subscribe for hundreds.”²⁰⁶ Cook explains that the Tory leaders took special pains to distribute Swift’s tracts to the places where they would do the most good. The second edition sold the same number in five hours, and the third in less than a week. By the sixth edition (before the end of January 1712) over 11,000 copies had sold – not including the numerous pirated versions. The December 1 through December 4 issue of the *Post Boy* is just one of countless newspapers in late-1711 and early-1712 that contains an advertisement for the popular pamphlet; it states “This Day is publish’d, the Third Edition of *The Conduct of the Allies*, and of the late Ministry, in beginning and carrying on the present War.”²⁰⁷ That a third edition was already needed just four days after the first was published establishes how quickly *The Conduct of the Allies* sold. Further evidence of this exists in the Thursday, December 6 issue of the *Examiner or Remarks*

²⁰⁴ *Review of the State of the British Nation*, October 18, 1711.

²⁰⁵ Poston, “Defoe and the Peace Campaign, 1710-1713,” 11-12.

²⁰⁶ For the publication information discussed in this paragraph see Probyn “Swift, Jonathan,” Cook, “‘Mr. Examiner’ and ‘Mr. Review,’” 131, and Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 143-144.

²⁰⁷ *Post Boy*, December 1, 1711 - December 4, 1711.

upon Papers and Occurrences that advertises that “To Morrow will be Publish’d, The Fourth Edition Corrected; of the Conduct of the Allies.”²⁰⁸ In addition Swift’s pamphlet’s impact is demonstrated in the numerous responses it spawned. *Remarks on a False, Scandalous, and Seditious Libel entitled the Conduct of the Allies and the late Ministry*, printed for one A. Baldwin was one of these; this pamphlet is first mentioned in the classified ads of the *Spectator*’s Thursday, December 6 and Monday, December 10 issues, little more than a week after Swift’s original.²⁰⁹

Despite the government’s print campaign the opposition was active as well and succeeded in preventing the preliminary peace settlement in the winter of 1711-1712. Their activity is well documented in newspapers and pamphlets and is often associated with Grub Street.²¹⁰ Just a week after Samuel Buckley’s *Daily Courant* leaked the preliminary articles, its October 20 issue advertised a pamphlet critical of the terms called *Remarks on the Preliminary Articles offer’d by the French King, in Order to Procure a General Peace*.²¹¹ Both Ridpath’s *Observator* and his *Flying-Post, or, Postman* were critical of the preliminary articles and the prospect of the government’s proposed peace with France in general throughout the months leading up to Parliament’s consideration of them. Two additional Whig polemicists of note were John Oldmixon and Arthur Maynwaring. Together they set up and edited the *Medley*; the weekly paper that existed between late-1710 and late-1711 as a counter to Swift’s *Examiner*. 156 mentions to “peace,” forty-five mentions to the “peace treaty,” ninety-six references to “Spain,” sixty-

²⁰⁸ *Examiner or Remarks upon Papers and Occurrences*, December 6, 1711.

²⁰⁹ *Spectator*, December 6, 1711 and December 10, 1711.

²¹⁰ Grub Street was a street in London famous for its concentration of impoverished 'hack writers', aspiring poets, and low-end publishers and booksellers; it existed on the margins of London's journalistic and literary scene, and established government polemicists like Swift spoke and wrote of it with disdain.

²¹¹ *Daily Courant*, October 20.

four references to the “emperor,” and fourteen references to “partition” appear in the *Medley*. Moreover, Oldmixon released a string of pamphlets attacking Swift and responding to government pamphlets such as *The Conduct of the Allies*. Oldmixon’s barrage of pamphlets also named Defoe as a turncoat and a mercenary for the Tory ministry. Besides engaging in personal attacks on government writers or direct responses to specific Harleyite propaganda the opposition pursued its own objectives. In general the opposition was unwilling to accept an end to the War that did not result in the entirety of the Spanish possessions ending with Austria; a common rallying cry was “No peace without Spain!” It denounced both partition schemes and scenarios where Philip of Anjou would receive Spain. The Earl of Nottingham, a renegade Tory who sided with the Whig Junto against the government’s preliminaries during the winter of 1711-1712, was one of many in the opposition who asserted that it would be impossible to keep the interests of Louis and Philip separate. In the pamphlet *The Allies and the Late Ministry Defended against France* Francis Hare, Marlborough’s chaplain-general, argued that it would be better to give Spain to Austria than to destroy “a great and antient Monarchy, by parceling it out into so many Pieces as is intended in the new Scheme, which neither Princes nor People can possibly be long easy in.”²¹² Hare also wrote that the government propaganda that suggested that Austria would become too powerful should it gain control of Spain was mere partisan “banter” and complained that Harley’s ministry treated Austria badly. In general the opposition’s print propaganda was so fierce that in late-1711 it prompted the government to react. Fourteen opposition printers and publishers were incarcerated for seditious writing; virtually every one had close connections with

²¹² Francis Hare, *The Allies and the Late Ministry Defended against France*, Pt. IV (London, 1712), p. 68 and Alexander Pettit, “Hare, Francis (1671–1740),” *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford University Press, 2004, accessed May 30, 2014, <http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/12298>.

Maynwaring. Government attempts to use the Law of Seditious Libel against the opposition continued into 1712. By September of that year even Ridpath and his printer, William Hurt, were arrested for printing scandalous and seditious reflections on the Oxford ministry; Hurt was eventually prosecuted and Ridpath was forced to flee to the United Provinces. Such legal efforts show that loyal propaganda alone was not enough to carry out the peace campaign in the face of opposition print – as Oxford’s ministry discovered in December 1711.

Though the Commons passed the peace terms easily in December, the Lords narrowly passed a motion preventing any settlement in which Spain and the Indies would be ceded to the French candidate. Nottingham was amongst the few key defectors. Rather than allowing the queen to dismiss some of those who had prevented the terms though, Oxford convinced her to create twelve new lords from a list he provided to give his ministry a majority in the upper house. The chief minister also maintained the Tory back-benchers in the Commons support for his government by allowing them to remove several of those who had voted against the peace terms. Walpole and Marlborough were among these. A resolution accusing him of corruption expelled Walpole from the Commons and even earned him a brief stint in the Tower of London. A similar resolution against Marlborough brought about his dismissal and replacement with a Tory. The Wednesday January 2, 1712 issue of the *Daily Courant* reported “Her Majesty has thought fit to remove the Duke of Marlborough from all his Employments.”²¹³ While the January 4, 1712 issue of the *London Gazette* announced “Her Majesty hath been

²¹³ *Daily Courant*, January 2, 1712.

graciously pleased to Constitute his Grace the Duke of Ormond Commander in Chief of all Her Majesty's Land Forces."²¹⁴

The dismissal of a war hero like the Duke of Marlborough generated tremendous fury amongst the populace and had to be handled carefully. The job of the government propagandists was to suppress these public objections that the opposition's charge of ministerial ingratitude had provoked. Swift's *The Conduct of the Allies* had opened the floodgates by charging Marlborough with corruption and self-aggrandizement, but it was not the first time he attacked the general. The February 8, 1711 issue of the *Examiner* contained Swift's allegorical "Letter to Crassus," a fictional message of advice to the Roman Triumvir Marcus Crassus upon the subject of greed.²¹⁵ The February 22, 1711 issue of the *Examiner* followed up on this letter; in it Swift noted "I heard my self censur'd t'other Day in a Coffee-House, for seeming to glance in the Letter to Crassus against a certain Great Man" (Marlborough).²¹⁶ Without mentioning the name, he went on to admit that the letter was indeed directed at the duke. Swift continued the theme he put forward in *The Conduct of the Allies* and in his "Letter to Crassus" in a number of issues of the *Examiner* in early 1712. The January 3, 1712 through January 10, 1712 issue of the *Examiner* is quite striking; in it Swift condemned Marlborough's skimming of funds meant for the troops – though it was a common practice at the time – saying "If he hath been Guilty to the Degree that it is believ'd... he should meet the Reward... that such Actions deserve."²¹⁷ Swift, careful to appear as unbiased as possible because even amongst his Tory audience some still held the general in high esteem, claimed to only be

²¹⁴ *London Gazette*, January 3, 1712 – January 5, 1712.

²¹⁵ *Examiner or Remarks upon Papers and Occurrences*, February 8, 1711.

²¹⁶ *Examiner or Remarks upon Papers and Occurrences*, February 22, 1711.

²¹⁷ *Examiner or Remarks upon Papers and Occurrences*, January 3, 1712 – January 10, 1712.

dealing with the facts as he went into specifics on the issue, saying “I will only meddle at present with that part of his Conduct, already discovered by the Commissioners appointed for taking the Publik Accounts, concerning the Bread-Money.” He deems “His G---e’s Behaviour, in this Particular, to be the greatest piece of Cruelty that ever was acted, considering how large are his Possessions, and how many warrantable ways he hath had of getting.” The soldier’s life is a hard one, Swift explained, and “Persons of Humanity” would “soften rather than add to their Distress, to give them more than the Value of a Penny a Day, rather than take a Penny from them.” Swift’s intentions were twofold in this and other issues of the *Examiner*: first, he endeavored to quiet the cries of indignation at Marlborough’s treatment by showing that he had been amply rewarded for his services, and second, he attempted to demonstrate that the duke’s own character flaws justified his dismissal. However, because his Tory audience was less enthralled with Marlborough as a national hero Swift had some leeway with how harsh of an approach he decided to take on the matter.

Defoe did not have this luxury. As mentioned above, the *Review*’s readership was predominately Whig in composition, and the Whigs generally idolized the general. Hence, Oxford’s government needed Defoe to convince his segment of the public sphere that Marlborough’s removal was warranted without completely alienating it. In the January 22, 1712 issue of the *Review* he did just that; he wrote cautiously of Marlborough’s removal, regretting that it was based on printed accusations and condemnation in the court of public opinion. He prefaced all his arguments with praise of the duke in one way or another before offering some small criticism. Eventually he concluded that the removal “really needs no Justification at all” because the queen

needed no legal justification to dismiss a general; Defoe went on to say “I am persuaded the greatest Guilt which has displac’d the Duke of Marl----gh, is the Error in Policy, and Prudence among Friends.”²¹⁸ While the Whigs saw the queen’s dismissal of a man who had served her so well for so long as morally unjustifiable and Swift saw it as totally justifiable based on character flaws, Defoe, ever mindful of his audience, sidestepped the whole question. The position he took in the *Review* probably did not satisfy his readership, but it likely did not offend them either.

The government’s peace campaign in 1712 persisted in the same vein it had in 1711. Government and opposition polemicists alike waged the paper war with heavy doses of partisan propaganda in both newspapers and pamphlets; the one major difference was that the negotiations themselves were out in the open. The peace congress assembled for the first time at Utrecht on the 18-29 of January. Burney’s collection shows that “Utrecht” appears in forty-two papers from January 1, 1712 until the congress’ commencement and is mentioned in 108 issues between that time and the Treaty’s conclusion. With several papers devoted to foreign news and even domestic periodicals interested in the political ramifications of the peace congress, the public was kept well abreast of the negotiations. Hill explains that strategically “the British ministers planned to repeat the tactics of the preliminary negotiations by conducting the essential business with France behind the backs of the other participants until the time was ripe to force the latter to either accept the terms thus agreed or lose British military and diplomatic support.”²¹⁹ This high-handed policy was sure to provoke negative responses from both the Allies and the opposition press at home, so it had to be heavily

²¹⁸ *Review of the State of the British Nation*, January 22, 1712.

²¹⁹ Hill, “Oxford, Bolingbroke, and the Peace of Utrecht,” 252-253.

buttressed with print propaganda aimed at prohibiting the Dutch or the other Allies from gaining public sympathy. Dutch demands for a secure barrier against future French aggression – an echo of the Barrier Treaty that Marlborough and Townshend had negotiated with them in 1709 – provided the government’s writers an opportunity. On February 21 Swift released *Some Remarks on the Barrier Treaty*. It was essentially a sequel to *The Conduct of the Allies*, dealing with the pretensions of the Allies. Swift’s new pamphlet was advertised as “This Day is publish’d” in the February 21 through February 23 issues of the *Post Boy* and the *Evening Post*; each paper subsequently advertised the pamphlet in later issues as “Just Publish’d” – as did the March 6 through March 13 issue of the *Examiner*. The February 27 through March 1 issue of the *Obsevator* denounced it, and both the March 6 through March 8 issue of the *Post Man and the Historical Account* and the March 7 issue of the *Spectator* advertised a response pamphlet printed by one “A. Baldwin” and titled *Remarks upon Remarks: in Vindication of the Protestant Succession, and the Barrier Treaty, against the Reflections of the Author of the Conduct of the Allies*. In addition, the *Daily Courant*’s Tuesday, March 11 issue advertised a pamphlet again printed for A. Baldwin and titled *The Allies and the late-Ministry defended against France and the present Friends of France*. Finally, the *Post Man and the Historical Account*’s March 20 through March 22 issue advertised a pamphlet titled *A Full Answer to the Conduct of the Allies, To which is added, some Observations on the Remarks on the Barrier Treaty*. Clearly Swift’s criticism of the Allies received significant attention in print, both from loyal newspapermen and pamphleteers and from those in the opposition.

Defoe was as active a commentator on the question of war and peace in 1712 as he was in 1711. He continued to use the *Review*, printed three times a week, to support Swift's grand releases and the government's peace campaign, but he also released pamphlets of his own. Downie informs us that he wrote thirteen of them between October 1711 and July 1712.²²⁰ *A Further Search into the Conduct of the Allies, And the Late Ministry, as to Peace and War*, published on June 5 was an example of how his previously firm stance in support of the Dutch began to come around to Oxford's intended portrayal of the Allies.²²¹ As mentioned above, Defoe is unique amongst the government's writers in that he did not always take the official ministerial line and even wrote against Oxford's wishes on occasion, but the composition of his audience explains this to a large degree. This position also put him in a situation where he was responsible for preparing the way for the major government releases as well as for defending them afterward. One of the government actions he had to defend was the so-called "Restraining Orders" that St. John gave to Marlborough's successor, Ormonde, on May 10. The command was designed to convince the Dutch to stop dragging their feet and accept the present peace terms; it essentially withdrew British forces from the field, since Ormonde was prohibited from engaging the French. On May 28 the matter was raised in the House of Lords, and the ministry was forced to reveal the Restraining Orders publically; the opposition criticized Ormonde and the ministry for what they argued was an abandonment of the Allies. Defoe again had to come to the government's defense. He endorsed the Restraining Orders in the *Review* on May 31; in it he asked his audience if they would have the troops continue to fight and die against the soldiers of a state that

²²⁰ Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 147.

²²¹ This stance would later be taken even further with his pamphlet *The Justice and Necessity of a War with Holland, In Case the Dutch Do not come into Her Majesty's Measures, Stated and Examined* (July, 1712).

Britain was basically at peace with.²²² Soon after his pamphlet *Reasons Against Fighting* offered a more elaborate defense of the Restraining Orders. Throughout the summer the *Review* even contained articles in which Defoe regretfully pondered whether war with the Dutch would become necessary; in the July 3 issue of the *Review* Defoe compared Britain and Holland to “two Brothers drawing their swords upon one another.”²²³ The last issue of the *Review of the State of the British Nation* ran July 29, 1712; Defoe published a further nine issues of a paper named just “*Review*” between August 16 and October 21, but after that he grew weary of the constant struggle with the Whigs and stopped writing on foreign policy or peace for the government.

Even as the treaty was all but concluded critical events that would later affect the government and its management of the public sphere were yet to unfold. On August 1 Parliament finally found a legal tool to supplement the Law of Seditious Libel in its effort to control opposition writers.²²⁴ That tool was the Stamp Act of 1712, and it was effectively a tax on newspapers, periodicals, and pamphlets beyond what most people could reasonably afford. This tax discouraged cheap, anti-government printed material that catered to the masses such as that of Grub Street, while pro-government papers and pamphlets often received stipends to counter the tax.²²⁵ Burney’s archive shows 2188 individual newspaper issues between the creation of the Stamp Act and the signing of the Treaty of Utrecht eight months later, but 2946 in the eight months prior to the Stamp Act.

²²² *Review of the State of the British Nation*, May 31, 1712 and Poston, “Defoe and the Peace Campaign, 1710-1713,” 14-15.

²²³ *Review of the State of the British Nation*, July 3, 1712.

²²⁴ For a detailed discussion of the Stamp Act of 1712 see Hamburger, “The Development of the Law of Seditious Libel and the Control of the Press,” 748-751 or Downie, *Robert Harley and the press*, 149-161.

²²⁵ “Print runs suggest that circulation [of newspapers] substantially declined in 1712 with the introduction of the Stamp Tax... periodicals may no longer have been profitable in the 1710s, and were kept afloat not by coffee-house subscriptions but by party subsidies.” Raymond, “The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century,” 129.

This bucks the trend of a general increase in newspapers printed throughout the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries and shows that the tax did have an impact on the opposition press. Also revealing are the papers that printed their last issue in this time period: including the *Observer* on July 26, the *Medley* on August 1, 1712, the *Spectator* on December 6, 1712, two other Addison and Steele papers the *Guardian* and the *Reconciler* in 1713, and the *Protestant Post Boy* a few months prior to the Act.

The government was challenged not from the opposition press but from within during the final stretch of the peace campaign. On September 28 St. John, now Viscount Bolingbroke, opposed Oxford in cabinet, recommending the immediate signing of a separate peace with France.²²⁶ Oxford favored the continuation of negotiations in an effort to make the settlement at Utrecht a general treaty and prorogued parliament for ten months, during which time he attempted to maximize support for the treaty. While Oxford's participation in the negotiations waned after October, he maintained control of the ministry and the negotiations until the treaty was actually completed. However, the bitter divide between the two men left the Tory party split and the government unable to direct any effective print campaign at the public sphere. Philip's official renunciation of his rights to the French inheritance should anything befall the future Louis XV from Madrid in November 1712, the January 19-30, 1713 signing of the revised Barrier Treaty with the Dutch, and Shrewsbury's attempt to hammer out a commercial treaty between Britain and France in January 1713 were the only key events that remained before the peace, and none of them received excessive coverage in the newspapers or pamphlets.

²²⁶ St. John was created Viscount Bolingbroke in the beginning of July, and he was bitterly disappointed that his rank in the peerage was below Oxford's. He even held Oxford responsible for the supposed slight though the decision was the Queen's alone. Many historians point to this action as the beginning of the acrimonious divide between the two men, and indeed the government, though Oxford's thorough upbraiding of Bolingbroke in the September 28 meeting appears more critical to the direction of the peace.

Great Britain eventually signed the Treaty of Utrecht on March 31, 1713; the other members of the Grand Alliance minus Austria signed it by April 11. At the time, both houses of Parliament favored the general terms of the peace. Britain received considerable concessions, while the Allies had to settle for much less than they desired.

This and the former chapters on events of the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries have confirmed that the best way a government could influence the course and character of a political debate within the public sphere was to participate in that debate through the sponsorship of loyal print propaganda. The Oxford government's use of patronage to cultivate the friendship, dependence, and support of loyal newspapermen and pamphleteers in an effort to manage public opinion during the peace campaign between autumn 1710 and spring 1713 was previously unmatched. This is not to say that Oxford did not also use legal tools – he certainly did. His government deployed both the Law of Seditious Libel and the Stamp Act of 1712 against the opposition press to some degree of success. However, his efforts to bring about peace concentrated on influencing the public via pro-government writers like Swift, Defoe, Boyer (for a time), Roper, Clement, King, and many more. This chapter reveals that the combination of cleverly worded and carefully timed releases of pro-government pamphlets like Swift's *The Conduct of the Allies* with day to day newspaper expositions such as those in Defoe's *Review* either paving the way for or defending the grander works could be an effective path toward managing the public sphere through print. It also demonstrates that Oxford's government was aware of the need to provide varying degrees of propaganda to a wide array of potential government supporters; hence, papers like Swift's *Examiner* or Roper's *Post Boy* could preach to the choir so to speak, while

Defoe's *Review* had to cautiously justify or even criticize government actions when appropriate. It is fair to say that the Oxford ministry's peace campaign represented the peak of governmental management of the public sphere through print in the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries and served as an example for future Whig administrations of how to achieve political stability. This success on the part of the government to tap into a zone of power not previously harnessed in Britain also points to a blurring of the lines between public authority and private civil society. Furthermore, it represents the end of the government's transition period – its pursuit of control over the public sphere through print – and might represent the beginning of the end of the public sphere itself as Habermas described it.

CHAPTER VI

CONCLUSION

The clear differences that existed between 1678 and 1713 in the public sphere, print culture, and government participation in and management of these spaces mark the intervening years as an important transition period in the history of England, but not quite in the way Habermas described it in *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*. In 1678 the public sphere was already an incipient zone of political power, and it was separate from the government. The voice of the public was a force to be reckoned with throughout this period – and potentially to be tapped into. In addition, the number of newspapers and pamphlets directed at the public grew between 1678 and 1713. The literacy rate simultaneously rose. The correlation between the emergent power exhibited by the public sphere and the increasing amount of print media is and was evident, and many within the government took steps to evolve in their treatment of these areas as well. For instance, new laws to regulate printed material and the spaces where it was read were created while old laws often had to evolve or be put aside as ineffective. Also critical to its own efforts at successfully becoming more involved in and better managing the public sphere was how the government put shrewd newspapermen and pamphleteers on the payroll, and how it fashioned them into an organized political machine. When considered closely within their proper contexts such details confirm the assertions of this thesis – that changes took place across these three areas of interest,

resulting in an increased government use of print to harness the power of the public sphere after 1713.

The systematic analysis of the four episodes above highlights specific differences in the public sphere, in print, and between how the government dealt with print and the public sphere in 1678 and how it dealt with these same areas in 1713. These specific differences combine to show significant change over time. The Popish Plot in 1678 and the subsequent Exclusion Crisis was a natural starting point not only because the abundance of source material available but because it can be viewed as the beginning of a shift by the English government toward greater involvement in the public sphere and greater use of print media to influence it. Despite Habermas' contention that the public sphere did not become political until the flurry of events in 1694-1695 increased the importance and availability of capital, allowed rational-critical debate to flourish, and increased the role and authority of Parliament and the constituency, evidence reveals that already it played a significant role in politics. However, Charles II's government gave the impression of being only partly aware of the public sphere's existence or the impact it was having on the political situation through print on the Plot and the Exclusion Crisis. In this case the government was very much like those of its Stuart predecessors when it came to its participation in and management of the public sphere. That is to say it was not very involved. In 1678 the emerging public sphere existed as a space in which individuals came together to discuss and identify societal issues with the aim of influencing politics – not just literature and art. This could be an actual physical space such as a coffeehouse where literal political discourse took place, but it could also be a virtual zone of discourse that connected the readership of a certain newspaper or

pamphlet – or even those concerned with a specific issue discussed across a variety of print media. This was a problem for the Restoration monarch. The reason why the public generating political opinions was an issue is that politics had traditionally been the realm of the king, his ministers, and the ruling class. Charles, his brother James Duke of York, the Earl of Danby, Henry Coventry, and others within the government still saw the political situation as a one-way-street where they would learn of issues, decide what to do about them, and use their powers to resolve them. Whether it was with Titus Oates and his bizarre revelations about the Popish Plot, the suspicious death of Sir Edmund Berry Godfrey, or the Exclusion Crisis, Charles and his government sought to use their power in a top-down fashion. The numerous ineffective proclamations the king issued regarding the Plot are an example of this. This approach met with difficulties, as the Plot and rumors about Godfrey's death spun out of control and fed into an increasingly inflexible Exclusion movement. Political instability and its connection to the relative level of governmental nonparticipation in print and the public sphere is apparent during the first episode. Only the efforts of Roger L'Estrange represented the nascent attempts of one individual working on behalf of the government to participate in and manage the public sphere using print. Future government officials dabbling in print with an eye on managing public opinion would use L'Estrange as an example despite the relative lack of impact he achieved in bringing stability to England during the Plot and the Exclusion Crisis.

The Glorious Revolution of 1688-1689 was the second episode selected because it demonstrated that even as the government of James II did participate in and attempt to manage the public sphere through print to a degree, it was still leaps and bounds behind

the opposition. This fact alone might justify an examination of the Low Countries in general and Holland in particular rather than England as the epicenter for emergent government awareness of the public sphere. Overall, the analysis of this event shows that, yes, James and his government did use newspapers and printed proclamations, and, yes, they did directly respond to opposition print such as the issued counter-declaration to William of Orange's *Declaration of Reasons*. These actions were similar to those his brother had taken during the Popish Plot and Exclusion Crisis. They show he certainly exhibited no less political savvy than his brother, and suggest that he perhaps receives more blame and accusations of having been outmaneuvered by William of Orange in the realms of the public sphere and print culture than is warranted. In fact, James took a step beyond Charles' government and even employed official print propagandists – a first – to fight the paper war for him. Nevertheless, his government's overreliance on the official newspaper, the *London Gazette*, and the traditional means of political power, including the army and the legal tools at their disposal, contributed to James' downfall.

Exploration of James' activities in this area demonstrated that even while he acted competently, his political influence and the impact of his printed propaganda and counter-propaganda extended little beyond the boundaries of London itself. The sheer volume, variety, and organization of William's print campaign in comparison to that James' government put forth makes it clear that the English state was yet to fully grasp the power of print as a tool to influence the masses – and by extension the power of the public to influence politics. It is therefore evident that the downfall of James and his government was critically affected by their abstention from greater participation in and management of the public sphere and print media.

The Sacheverell “incident” and its aftermath, like the episodes before it, is an excellent set of events to examine because of the abundance of source material related to it as well as the particular political set of circumstances surrounding it. Furthermore, it falls within the bounds of time during which Habermas saw the public sphere as politicized. More than that though, I included it as one of the four episodes because it shows that the government, or its apparatuses, did participate in and try to influence the public sphere in late-1709 and 1710 with both legal tools and with print but still fell from power. It shows that these attempts did have some success. This level of involvement surpassed governmental efforts during the reigns of Charles II or James II. Perhaps this was proof of the beginning of the end of a public sphere free of government involvement, and thus the beginning of the end of the public sphere itself according to Habermas. However, the analysis in this episode shows that the decisions on behalf of the ministry to prosecute Sacheverell for seditious libel and subsequently to publicly try him were disastrous and too much to overcome for an under-supported and misused group of loyal polemicists. Sacheverell used the printing of his incendiary sermons to reach a larger audience. Opposition newspapers and pamphlets exhibit that hostile polemicists used Sacheverell’s impeachment, trial, and sentence to proclaim the doctor’s martyrdom to the masses via the press and further fuel the passions of the “mob.” Loyal Whig polemicists who tried to counteract the opposition Tory press – like those working on behalf of the government in 1688-1689 – were outmatched in the production of print media and lacking in government support. Although the public sphere and potential government participation in and management of it had evolved since the Glorious Revolution, the same issue of a government that did not appreciate the value of print or comprehend its

nuances as well as the opposition still existed. Neither the Whig Junto nor the Duumvirate fully understood the power of print as a tool to influence public opinion; conversely, Harley, St. John, and the Tory opposition set a high value upon print media as a tool to influence the public. As a result, instability and an unrestrained public sphere was again the norm, and the sitting government was replaced with a new Tory ministry and Parliament more aware of the power of print and public opinion replaced it.

The final episode, including the three year span between the late-summer and early-autumn of 1710 and the spring of 1713 and encompassing the end of the War of the Spanish Succession and the Treaty of Utrecht, represents a culmination of government participation in and management of the public sphere through print and of this period of transition. It is a useful closing event (or series of events) for this thesis because while both the government and the opposition polemicists produced and directed at the public sphere colossal numbers of newspapers, periodicals, and pamphlets in efforts to manage or influence it, the outcome was different. For once, the government's action had a noticeable impact on the political situation – resulting in specific actions that brought about the end of Britain's participation in the hostilities of the War and the initial acceptance of the Treaty. The government had finally succeeded in effectively using print to tap into the independent power base that was the public sphere. The lines had been blurred. Was the public sphere independent of the government or a part of it? Evidence suggests the latter – that this is an example where Oxford's government institutionalized the public sphere into the governmental apparatus as a way of effectively legitimizing its own power. The breakdown of the episode illustrates that the reason Oxford was successful in influencing the course and character of a political debate within

the public sphere was that he and his government participated within that debate through the sponsorship of loyal print propaganda. The use of patronage to cultivate the friendship, dependence, and support of loyal newspapermen and pamphleteers was previously unmatched. In combination with legal apparatuses such as the Law of Seditious Libel and the Stamp Act of 1712, efforts to bring about peace concentrating on persuading the public through pro-government writers like Swift, Defoe, Boyer (for a time), Roper, Clement, King, and others eventually brought about the desired result – the Peace of Utrecht. Cleverly worded and carefully timed releases of pro-government pamphlets like Swift's *The Conduct of the Allies* with day to day newspaper expositions such as those in Defoe's *Review* either paving the way for or defending the grander works could be an effective path toward managing the public sphere through print. The need to provide varying degrees of propaganda to a wide array of potential government supporters was also recognized and critical to success. Overall, the Oxford ministry's peace campaign represented the peak of governmental participation in and management of the public sphere through print in this late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth century period of transition. Furthermore, it served as an example for future Whig administrations of how to use print to achieve political stability via a public sphere that was effectively controlled.

None of this excessively threatens the theoretical landscape of the emergent public sphere. Nor does it imply that the changes discussed in this thesis only occurred in this late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth century timeframe or that the realms of print and the public sphere had not seen transformation before and did not continue to see evolution afterward. However, it is interesting that Habermas saw the public sphere as

developing politically in England only after 1694-1695 and only existing independently for a limited amount of time. The analysis done in the pages above adds its weight to the work of others who have disagreed with the German sociologist on the timeline for this emergence and transformation. Instead of demonstrating the advent of the public sphere in England during the late-seventeenth and early-eighteenth centuries, this investigation reveals that the public sphere already existed as a political force in 1678, and that real the significant development between that date and 1713 was the government's increasing use of print to participate in and manage the new zone of power. Still, Habermas' assertions that the public sphere was transformed and ultimately undermined and destroyed during this limited time when demarcations between public authority and private civil society became blurred and when the state entwined itself in rational bourgeois discourse can, perhaps, be seen in the conclusions of this thesis.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Astbury, Raymond. "The Renewal of the Licensing Act in 1693 and its Lapse in 1695." *Oxford Journals* 5, no. 4 (1978): 296-322.
- Beaver, Dan. "Conscience and Context: The Popish Plot and the Politics of Ritual, 1678-1682." *The Historical Journal* 34, no. 2 (June, 1991): 297-327.
- Becker, Marvin B. *The Emergence of Civil Society in the Eighteenth Century: A Privileged Moment in the History of England, Scotland, and France*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1994.
- Brewer, John. *The Pleasures of the Imagination: English Culture in the Eighteenth Century*. New York: Farrar, 1996.
- British History Online. "June, 1643: An Ordinance for the Regulating of Printing." University of London Institute of Historical Research & History of Parliament Trust. Last modified November 2013. Accessed November 4, 2014. <http://www.britishhistory.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=55829>
- Claydon, Tony. "William III's Declaration of Reasons and the Glorious Revolution." *The Historical Journal* 39, no. 1 (March 1996): 87-108.
- Cook, Richard I. *Jonathan Swift as a Tory Pamphleteer*. Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1967.
- Cook, Richard I. "'Mr. Examiner' and 'Mr. Review': The Tory Apologetics of Swift and Defoe." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 29, no. 2 (February 1966): 127-146.
- Cowan, Brian. "Mr. Spectator and the Coffeehouse Public Sphere." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 37 (2004): 345-366.
- Cowan, Brian. *The Social Life of Coffee: The Emergence of the British Coffeehouse*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Cowan, Brian. "The Rise of the Coffeehouse Reconsidered." *The Historical Journal* 47 (2004): 21-46.
- Cressy, David. *Literacy and the Social Order: Reading and Writing in Tudor and Stuart England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

- Cruikshanks, Eveline, ed. *By Force or By Default? The Revolution of 1688-1689*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers Ltd., 1989.
- De Beer, E. S. "The English Newspapers from 1695 to 1702." In *William III and Louis XIV: Essays 1680-1720*, edited by Ragnhild Hatton and J. S. Bromley. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1968.
- Downie, J. A. *Robert Harley and the press: Propaganda and public opinion in the age of Swift and Defoe*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979.
- "Early English Books Online (EEBO)" ProQuest LLC. Last modified 2013. Accessed August 19, 2013. <http://eebo.chadwyck.com/home>.
- Frey, Linda, and Marsha Frey, eds. *The Treaties of the War of the Spanish Succession: An Historical and Critical Dictionary*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995.
- Gerard, James W. *The Peace of Utrecht: A Historical Review of the Great Treaty of 1713-1714, and of the Principal Events of the War of the Spanish Succession*. 1885. Reprint, New York: Forgotten Books 2012.
- Habermas, Jürgen. *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Translated by Thomas Burger and Frederick Lawrence Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1991.
- Hamburger, Philip. "The Development of the Law of Seditious Libel and the Control of the Press." *Stanford Law Review* 37, no. 3 (Feb. 1985): 661-765.
- Harris, Tim. *London Crowds in the Reign of Charles II: Propaganda and Politics from the Restoration until the Exclusion Crisis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
- Harris, Tim. *Politics under the Later Stuarts: Party Conflict in a Divided Society, 1660-1715*. London: Longman, 1993.
- Hattendorf, John B. *England in the War of the Spanish Succession: A Study of the English View and Conduct of Grand Strategy, 1702-1712*. New York: Garland, 1987.
- Hauser, Gerard. "Vernacular Dialogue and the Rhetoricity of Public Opinion." *Communication Monographs* 65 (1998): 83-107.
- Hill, B. W. "The Change of Government and the 'Loss of the City'. 1710-1711." *The Economic History Review* 24, no. 3 (August 1971): 395-413.
- Hill, B. W. "Oxford, Bolingbroke, and the Peace of Utrecht." *The Historical Journal* 16, no. 2 (June, 1973): 241-263.

- Hinds, Peter. *'The Horrid Popish Plot': Roger L'Estrange and the Circulation of Political Discourse in Late-Seventeenth-Century London*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Holmes, Geoffrey. *British Politics in the Age of Anne*. London: Macmillan, 1967.
- Holmes, Geoffrey. "The Sacheverell Riots: The Crowd and the Church in Early Eighteenth-Century London." *Past & Present*, no. 72 (August 1976): 55-85.
- Holmes, Geoffrey. *The Trial of Dr. Sacheverell*. London: Eyre Methuen, 1973.
- Horsley, Lee. "'Vox Populi' in the Political Literature of 1710." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 38, no. 4 (August 1975): 335-353.
- Hyland, P. B. J. "Liberty and Libel: Government and the Press during the Succession Crisis in Britain, 1712-1716." *The English Historical Review* 101 (1986): 863-888.
- Israel, Jonathan. *The Anglo-Dutch Moment: Essays on the Glorious Revolution and its World Impact*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Jacob, Margaret C. "The Mental Landscape of the Public Sphere: A European Perspective." *Eighteenth-Century Studies* 28 (1994): 95-113.
- Jones, Clyve, ed. *Britain in the First Age of Party 1680-1750*. London: The Hambledon Press, 1987.
- Kenyon, John. *The Popish Plot*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1972.
- Kitchen, George. *Sir Roger L'Estrange; A Contribution to the History of the Press in the Seventeenth Century*. 1913. Reprint, New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1971.
- Knights, Mark. *Politics and Opinion in Crisis 1678-1681*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Lake, Peter and Steve Pincus. "Rethinking the Public Sphere in Early Modern England." *Journal of British Studies* 45 (April 2006): 270-292.
- Lane, Jane. *Titus Oates*. London: Andrew Dakers Limited, 1949.
- Maden, F. F. *A Critical Bibliography of Dr. Henry Sacheverell*. Edited by W. A. Speck, Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas Libraries, 1978.
- Marshall, Alan. *The Strange Death of Edmund Godfrey: Plots and Politics in Restoration London*. Stroud, U.K.: Sutton Publishing, 1999.
- "Oxford Dictionary of National Biographies" *Oxford University Press*. Last modified

- May, 2013. Accessed June 20, 2013. <http://www.oxforddnb.com/public/index.html>.
- Pincus, Steve. *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2009.
- Plumb, J. H. *The Growth of Political Stability in England*. London: Macmillan, 1967.
- Poston, Lawrence, III. Source "Defoe and the Peace Campaign, 1710-1713: A Reconsideration." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 27, no. 1 (November, 1963): 1-20.
- Raymond, Joad. "The Newspaper, Public Opinion, and the Public Sphere in the Seventeenth Century." In *News, Newspapers and Society in Early Modern Britain*, edited by Joad Raymond. London: Frank Cass & Co. Ltd., 1999.
- Raymond, Joad. *Pamphlets and Pamphleteering in Early Modern Britain*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Richards, James O. *Party Propaganda under Queen Anne: The General Elections of 1702-1713*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press, 1972.
- Roberts, Clayton. "The Fall of the Godolphin Ministry." *Journal of British Studies* 22, no. 1 (Autumn, 1982): 71-93.
- Roberts, Clayton. "The Growth of Political Stability Reconsidered." *Albion: A Quarterly Journal Concerned with British Studies* 25, no. 2 (Summer, 1993): 237-256.
- Schwoerer, Lois G. *The Ingenious Mr. Henry Care, Restoration Publicist*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2001.
- Schwoerer, Lois G. "Propaganda in the Revolution of 1688-89." *The American Historical Review* 82, no. 4 (October, 1977): 843-874.
- Shuger, Debora. *Censorship and Cultural Sensibility: The Regulation of Language in Tudor- Stuart England*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2006.
- Speck, W. A. "Political Propaganda in Augustan England." *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society* 22 (1972): 17-32.
- Stone, Lawrence. "Literacy and Education in England, 1640-1900." *Past & Present*, no. 42 (February 1969): 69-139.
- Treadwell, Michael. "The Stationers and the Printing Acts at the End of the Seventeenth Century." In *The Cambridge History of the Book in Britain: Volume IV 1557-1695*, edited by John Barnard and D. F. McKenzie, 755-778. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press, 2002.

- Vallance, Edward. *The Glorious Revolution: 1688: Britain's Fight for Liberty*. New York: Pegasus, 2008.
- Wall, Cynthia, ed. *A Concise Companion to the Restoration and Eighteenth Century*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2005.
- Weber, Harold. *Paper Bullets: Print and Kingship under Charles II*. Lexington, KY: The University Press of Kentucky, 1996.
- Zaret, David. *Origins of Democratic Culture: Printing, Petitions, and the Public Sphere in Early-Modern England*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- “17th-18th Century Burney Collection Newspapers” *British Library*. Last modified February 17, 2013. Accessed June 9, 2013. http://ezproxy.uakron.edu:2097/bncn/start.do?prodId=BBCN&userGroupName=uakron_main&finalAuth=true.