

LONDON ELECTORAL HISTORY – STEPS TOWARDS DEMOCRACY

6.2 HISTORY OF ELECTIONS IN WESTMINSTER, 1749-1852

Note on conventions within all electoral tables

A vote for a candidate is shown as = 1

A null-vote for a candidate is shown as = 0

A vote which might or might not be given to any other candidate (in elections for more than one seat) is shown as = *

Example:

In the three-candidate general election in Westminster (1784), the possible vote codes are: Fox 001, Wray 010, Hood 100, Wray + Fox 011, Hood + Fox 101, Hood + Wray 110.

So the aggregate of votes for each candidate is represented by Fox **1; Wray *1*; and Hood 1**.

Throughout the years from 1774-1852, Westminster experienced 22 contested elections; and, of the general elections held in the period, only four (1812; 1826; 1831; 1832) went uncontested in the constituency.¹ As in the case of the City of London, the Westminster contests attracted much contemporary attention. Westminster was not only the seat of government but also the location for much of the year of the royal court and its aristocratic entourage.

This feature naturally gave the court and aristocracy some influence within the Westminster constituency, although it was mitigated by divisions within the aristocracy. Furthermore, overt attempts to exercise influence were apt to engender an opposite reaction. Hence while some historians have controversially argued for a continuing neo-feudalism within eighteenth-century politics,² no such state of affairs applied in Westminster. It is true that the dukes of Bedford had an 'interest' arising from the extensive Bedford estate belonging to the Russell family in

Covent Garden,³ as did the dukes of Northumberland. But they had to tread carefully.

Instead, the constituency was often given the enduring character of 'Radical Westminster'. But that sobriquet, too, was overdone. Instead it is more convincing to discern a Whig, reformist and independent tradition in the constituency for much of the period 1700-1850. But the fact that such a central place was from time to time contested by famous radical candidates sent shock waves throughout the political world.

Moreover, it was not just the frequency of contested elections that made Westminster an unusual constituency. It married its independence from the crown with a strong sense of its inhabitants' own status and claims. Thus doubts were expressed in 1762 whether the son of Lord Sandys was of sufficient 'quality' to represent such a prestigious constituency, where many of the country's leading nobility and gentry lived for at least part of the year. Few of the candidates in these elections, and yet fewer of the constituency's representatives, were not men of some status. Irish peers might stand against the sons of English peers. Aware of their own status, they were prepared to submit themselves to the popular franchise in a constituency with its own reputation.

Similarly, when the government interest was represented by the Senior Service, it was considered that scarcely less than an admiral would do,⁴ even though Westminster was no naval base. Between 1734 and 1846, 11 serving members of the Royal Navy contested seats in Westminster, eight successfully. The direct link ended only in 1846, although in 1877 one Westminster MP later became First Lord of the Admiralty.⁵ Many of these men were Administration candidates;⁶ but sailors were generally considered to be sturdy characters, not easily biddable. Moreover, in 1807 the swashbuckling Captain Cochrane was a radical.⁷

In this status-conscious context, suggestions in the early nineteenth century that the great trading constituency be represented by a 'commercial man' had little effect.⁸ Only when the radical tradesmen of the Westminster Committee⁹ put forward to be their representative the name of the wealthy baronet, Sir Francis Burdett, did they achieve success.¹⁰

6.2.1 Westminster elections in the mid-eighteenth century

Nonetheless, the Westminster electorate, proud of its own claims, sought to maintain its freedom from aristocratic control and court influence. The first formation of the Independent Electors of Westminster was a product of the parliamentary election of 1741. The Independent Electors constituted the nucleus of a political club,¹¹ of oppositionist hue. The high bailiff's premature closure of the poll to ensure the return of the government-favoured candidates Sir Charles Wager and William Clayton infuriated the supporters of their opponents, Edward Vernon and Charles Edwin. After a petition against this partisan return, the election was declared void. At the ensuing contest the candidates of the Independent Electors were returned unopposed.

An electoral survey by John Perceval in the mid-eighteenth century accordingly acknowledged the political weight of this grouping, informal as it was. He estimated its supporters as twice as numerous as those liable to follow the court's recommendations. Hence if opposing the court, the Independent Electors would always win. But, in combination, the two groupings together would constitute 'prodigious numbers'. Meanwhile, the ultra Tories or Jacobites were minority, albeit a not completely negligible one.¹² His phraseology is of interest in itself, referring not to party but to 'interests' which are nonetheless held to have some cohesion:

The interest of Westminster lies in this manner, or at least pretty near ...

The Court dead influence about	2,000
The moderate and independent	4,000
The Jacobites and those who will follow them less considerably than	1,000
	7,000

which are as many as probably will vote at a common election. The rest are houses inhabited by women, or by tradesmen who out of policy will vote on no side to disoblige no party. From whence it appears how necessary it is, if a contest is apprehended or in times of great heat, to set up men of character – for the real independent interest (of which the few Jacobites assumed the title, after the others had done the work and left contending) are the great interest in Westminster – and when the

Court is very obnoxious can clearly carry it. As, on the other hand, when the Court is not, they will throw their weight into it, and so carry an election for the Crown by prodigious numbers.

This state of affairs was the background to the Westminster by-election in December 1749, which long remained in the public memory,¹³ and has subsequently received considerable attention from historians.¹⁴ Granville Gower, Viscount Trentham,¹⁵ had first been elected in 1747 on the Duke of Bedford's interest, when the Administration took regained both seats from the Independent Electors of Westminster in the aftermath of the 1745 Jacobite uprising. Trentham's appointment to office two years later led to a vigorous but ultimately unsuccessful challenge from George Vandeput,¹⁶ the candidate of the Independent Electors. Trentham's relatively slim majority inspired Vandeput to demand a scrutiny,¹⁷ which delayed the final return until May 1750. A considerable number of votes were disallowed, but the result was unchanged: see Table 58.

Table 58

Westminster parliamentary by-election, December 1749: vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1749, POLL ID 53

Date of return: 15 May 1750					
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received		Vote code	Number of records
		Poll	Scrutiny		
GRANVILLE LEVESON GOWER	71	4,811	4,103	10	4,809
George Vandeput	120	4,654	3,933	01	4,654
Total LED cases					9,463

Source: *Hist. Parl.*, 1715-54; LED.

After that excitement, somewhat of a political hiatus ensued until 1770, as successive governments sought to avoid election contests in Westminster by selecting uncontroversial candidates. The strategy was successful. In the 1760s, however, metropolitan Wilkite radicalism began to stir the constituency. And in 1770 Sir Robert Bernard was elected unopposed. He was the first opponent of the government to be elected since 1741. But this radical success was short-lived.

In 1774 there was much serious canvassing.¹⁸ The outcome was that

the Wilkite candidates, Hervey Morres¹⁹ and Charles Stanhope,²⁰ were easily defeated by the incumbent Percy²¹ and his running mate Pelham Clinton,²² son of the Duke of Newcastle, in the Administration interest. The advanced Wilkite Humphrey Cotes 'also ran'.²³ Morres petitioned the Commons against the return of Pelham Clinton, despite the large gulf in their respective votes (see Table 59). Unsurprisingly, the Select Committee determined that Clinton had been duly elected.²⁴

Table 59

Westminster parliamentary general election, 1774: vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1774, Po11 ID 54

Date of return: 26 October 1774				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
HUGH PERCY	91	4,994	1****	5,000
THOMAS PELHAM CLINTON	93	4,774	*1***	4,749
Hervey Redmond Morres	80	2,531	**1**	2,533
Charles Stanhope	112	2,342	***1*	2,323
Humphrey Cotes	27	130	****1	125
Total LED cases				7,514

Source: Hist. Parl., 1754-90; LED.

6.2.2 Westminster elections in the Foxite years, 1780-1806

By the later 1780s, there was a distinct recrudescence of metropolitan radicalism, which owed much to the American war. Critics of the government instituted petitioning movements throughout the country.²⁵ Yorkshire's lead in petitioning was soon taken up in Westminster and elsewhere in the metropolis.²⁶ In February 1780 the emergent Whig leader Charles James Fox²⁷ became chairman of the Westminster Committee of Association.²⁸ At the same time, Fox, already an experienced MP at the age of 31, was adopted as candidate for the constituency.²⁹ But the Whig myth-making and organisation proved to be more self-sustaining than did the evanescent Wilkite agitations, and the Whig reform cause persisted through the years.

In the lists against Fox, were the incumbent Henry Pelham Clinton³⁰ and a naval candidate. Stationed in the West Indies, Admiral Rodney³¹ had

written to Lord George Germain, expressing his sense of the focal significance of parliament:

I beg you will look upon me as a certain but humble supporter of your measures in Parliament should I obtain a seat there at the General Election, which I hope will not be refused me ... in my opinion to be out of Parliament is to be out of the world, and my heart is set on being in.³²

The Administration, however, had misjudged Fox's appeal to the voters. In the poll, he was elected in second place to the naval hero Admiral Rodney. 'It was a mistake to propose Lord Lincoln [as Pelham was now known]', declared Edward Gibbon of Thomas Pelham Clinton. 'He is disliked by the substantial tradesmen: but they abhor Fox'.³³ The LED is ideally suited to testing this *obiter dictum* by eighteenth-century England's greatest historian. Pelham Clinton was defeated, despite his incumbency and despite Treasury expenditure of over £8,000 in his support. Enough people overcame whatever reservations they may have had about Fox – and he beat Pelham Clinton by 721 votes: see Table 60.

Table 60
Westminster parliamentary general election, 1780: vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1780, Poll ID 55

Date of return: 10 October 1780				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
GEORGE BRYDGES RODNEY	97	5,298	*1*	5,299
CHARLES JAMES FOX	35	4,878	1**	4,866
Thomas Pelham Clinton	93	4,157	**1	4,258
Total LED cases				9,134

Source: *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*; LED.

Nonetheless, Fox's claim to be the 'man of the people' and the champion of reform was subsequently tarnished after his coalition with Lord North in 1782 and the promotion of the East India Bill.³⁴ He therefore faced a testing public challenge at the general election of 1784. Also in the lists were Sir Samuel Hood;³⁵ and Sir Cecil Wray, who had

been elected unopposed in a by-election in 1782.³⁶ However, Wray was denounced as a turncoat in the Foxite press and pilloried as ‘Judas’, when he stood with Hood against Fox. The line-up thus constituted two baronets against the ‘Man of the People’, whose popularity had become controversial.

Never was an election more hotly contested. The Westminster election of 1784 was the most notorious of the period:³⁷ noteworthy for the intensity of its campaigning;³⁸ for its duration of 40 days; for its vivid election literature and caricatures; for its polling of over 12,000 electors; and, not least, for the colourful canvassing by the Duchess of Devonshire on Fox’s behalf.³⁹ The Treasury spent lavishly in an attempt to keep Fox out of Westminster.⁴⁰ And, having failed, it sought to use the scrutiny to prevent him taking his seat.⁴¹ Yet the margin between Fox and Wray of 236 votes at the poll was only reduced to 231 votes after the scrutiny: see Table 61. Fox had become a great political survivor, famed for his endurance during a long career spent mostly in opposition.

Table 61
Westminster parliamentary general election, 1784: vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1784, Poll ID 56

Date of return: 17 May 1784					
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received		Vote code	Number of records
		Poll	Scrutiny		
SAMUEL HOOD	54	6,694	6,588	1**	6,670
CHARLES JAMES FOX	35	6,234	6,126	**1	6,219
Cecil Wray	132	5,998	5,895	*1*	5,968
Total LED cases					12,237

Source: Anon., *History of the Westminster election* (1785); *Hist. Parl.*, 1754-90; LED.

Hood’s appointment to office in 1788 led to a by-election, in which he was squarely beaten by Fox’s colleague John Townshend (see Table 62).⁴² Disputes continued over the right of election in Westminster, particularly over whether the franchise lay in those ‘liable to pay scot and lot’, or in those who actually paid. A petition against the return led a parliamentary committee to look into the issue in the aftermath of the election.⁴³

However, the enormous costs to both sides in the elections of 1784 and 1788 forced a compromise upon them. The Whigs did their best to match the Treasury expenditure, and they also relied upon organisational strength on the ground.⁴⁴ Meditating ruefully, Edmund Burke, at that time a staunch Whig partisan, wrote that: ‘when I consider, how precarious Westminster is after all that has been spent to secure it, I cannot persuade myself that the fifty thousand pounds it has cost (in the three contests) is well laid out. This sum would have brought in ten members for a whole parliament at the highest price.’⁴⁵ Burke was here referring to the purchasing or financial soliciting of votes in small constituencies. Such a tactic, however, would not automatically succeed in a large, open constituency like Westminster, where the costs were great and the electors potentially mulish in their commitment to rival causes. Accordingly, in 1790 it was agreed that in future elections each side should put up one candidate only.⁴⁶

Table 62
Westminster parliamentary by-election, August 1788: vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1788, Poll ID 57

Date of return: 4 August 1788				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
JOHN TOWNSHEND	117	6,392	01	4,279
Samuel Hood	54	5,569	10	3,947
Total LED cases				8,226

Source: *Hist. Parl.*, 1754-90; LED.

The agreement of 1790 was honoured. Yet it provoked an unforeseen response from Horne Tooke,⁴⁷ the erstwhile Wilkite who had supported Pitt and Hood in 1788. The iconoclastic Horne Tooke opposed this attempt to deprive the electors of Westminster of their political voices.⁴⁸ Standing in 1790, without adequate organisation, he was roundly beaten by Fox and Hood, now recovering from his by-election defeat in 1788: see Table 63. Horne Tooke’s petition against the return was dismissed by the Commons committee as frivolous and ‘vexatious’,⁴⁹ whereupon Fox successfully sued him for the legal costs incurred in refuting the petition.⁵⁰

Table 63

Westminster parliamentary general election, 1790: vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1790, Poll ID 58

Date of return: 2 July 1790				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
CHARLES JAMES FOX	35	3,516	1**	2,688
SAMUEL HOOD	54	3,217	*1*	2,500
John Horne Tooke	58	1,697	**1	1,308
Total LED cases				5,015

Source: *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*; LED.

Horne Tooke stood again in 1796, this time supported by the artisan radicals in the London Corresponding Society. Again he was defeated, although attracting a much higher personal vote: compare Tables 63 and 64.⁵¹ Whilst Fox and Gardner⁵² had a covert alliance in 1796, Horne Tooke directed his fire towards the latter, and he appealed to his supporters to give their second votes to Fox.⁵³

It was now that a new electoral pattern emerged in Westminster, of which Fox was the beneficiary. Standing in a three-way contest between radical and Administration candidates, he received split votes from both blocs seeking to outvote the other. That ‘triangulation’ was possible in three-way contest for a two-seat constituency. It did not mean that all radicals had confidence in Fox. Instead, he was severely criticised in 1805 by the artisan reformer, Francis Place.⁵⁴ For him, Fox and Fox’s Whig ally Sheridan were mere ‘trading politicians, Tories out of place, who cared little for the people further than they could be made to promote their own interests, whether those interests were popular or pecuniary’.⁵⁵ But, for to his own supporters, Fox was a reform-minded hero of persistent opposition to Pitt and the war with France. Rival perceptions such as these kept the Westminster electors on their toes.

Table 64

Westminster parliamentary general election, 1796: vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1796, Po11 ID 59

Date of return: 13 June 1796				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
CHARLES JAMES FOX	35	5,160	1**	1,994
ALAN GARDNER	37	4,814	*1*	944
John Horne Tooke	58	2,819	**1	1,546
Total LED cases				3,058

Source: Hist. Parl., 1790-1820; LED.

By 1802 Horne Tooke had left the most democratic constituency in terms of its wide franchise to pursue his campaign for parliamentary reform and freedom of election in the improbable constituency of Old Sarum – the most notorious rotten borough in the country. It was an irony that he himself appreciated.⁵⁶ Instead, John Graham, an auctioneer, stood for Westminster as the radical candidate.⁵⁷ He sought to appeal to electors in ‘the middle ranks of society’, against the claims of plutocratic rulers. Indeed, he urged that so important a commercial centre should be represented by an active trader, telling the electors firmly that: ‘it would not disgrace you to send a man of business into parliament’.⁵⁸ Graham, however, fared no better than Horne Tooke (compare Tables 64 and 65).

Table 65

Westminster parliamentary general election, 1802: vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1802, Po11 ID 60

Date of return: 15 July 1802				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
CHARLES JAMES FOX	35	2,671	1**	2,669
ALAN GARDNER	37	2,431	*1*	2,452
John Graham	42	1,693	**1	1,699
Total LED cases				4,682

Source: Hist. Parl., 1790-1820; LED.

The election ended after nine days, when it was clear that he had no hope of winning. He accordingly returned to his business and to political obscurity.

Thus Graham's attempt to enhance his radical reform stance by a further appeal to an anti-aristocratic and pro-middle-class platform did not succeed. Foxite reform, personified by Charles James Fox, the son of a leading Whig politician, Henry Fox, 1st Baron Holland,⁵⁹ was one thing. A radical auctioneer was a step too far.

6.2.3 Westminster elections in the early nineteenth century

Early nineteenth-century Westminster experienced a mixture of political calm and political confrontations. Not every election was hotly contested. So Fox's death in 1806, when briefly in office as the leading figure in the Ministry of All the Talents (1806), was followed immediately by uncontested by-election. The Foxite electoral tradition long continued, nurtured by Whig clubs and Foxite memorabilia.

The Ministry of All the Talents, however, could not itself long survive the loss of Fox's own talent, and its fall led in November 1806 to another general election. Anxious to assume the Foxite mantle, the experienced Whig politician and orator Richard Brinsley Sheridan⁶⁰ announced his candidature (his days as creative dramatist now well behind him). Sheridan stood on a joint ticket with the Administration candidate, Sir Samuel Hood,⁶¹ Westminster's second MP of that name. Sheridan appealed to the voters to give their two votes to himself and Hood. But worries about the sharing of election expenses⁶² precluded a formal joint campaign and joint committee.

Standing against them was the radical candidate, James Paull,⁶³ a former East India trader. He got support from Sir Francis Burdett, the veteran reformer John Cartwright,⁶⁴ and many former members of the now-banned London Corresponding Society. In the event, Sheridan was elected with Hood, but his majority of fewer than 300 votes over Paull was humiliating.⁶⁵ (See Table 66) Of the two petitions against the return, that of the electors of St Martin-le-Grand was withdrawn, while the allegations in Paull's petition were dismissed as 'false and scandalous'.⁶⁶

Table 66
Westminster parliamentary general election, 1806: Vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1806, Po11 ID 61

Date of return: 19 November 1806				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
SAMUEL HOOD	55	5,478	*1*	2,479
RICHARD BRINSLEY SHERIDAN	108	4,758	1**	2,109
James Paull	89	4,481	**1	2,199
Total LED cases				4,611

Source: *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*; LED.

At the general election of 1807 Paull sought a joint radical ticket with Sir Francis Burdett,⁶⁷ now moving into City of Westminster politics from Middlesex; but was repudiated. Thereupon Paull challenged Burdett to a duel, in which both were wounded.⁶⁸ The radical tradesmen, skilfully marshalled by Francis Place, at that point decided to form their own electoral organisation, the Westminster Committee.⁶⁹ ‘We were all of us obscure persons’, Place wrote proudly in 1806. Yet they proved the value of group action. The Westminster Committee rejected Paull and gave its backing to Burdett and the swashbuckling naval hero Lord Cochrane.⁷⁰ Paull’s independent attempt at Westminster in 1807 ended in his own humiliation. He had been publicly denounced by John Horne Tooke.⁷¹ Paull’s failure indicated how much candidates needed organised support. In the radical cause, the Westminster Committee abjured treating and instead canvassed thoroughly. The outcome was a radical triumph, in which Burdett was first elected for Westminster with Lord Cochrane, after a memorable contest.⁷² But, unfortunately for the historian, no individual-level poll book data survive for this election.

After that, Burdett and Cochrane were returned unopposed at the general election of 1812. The absence of candidates against them indicated that the Administration, with its strong majority, was prepared to accept an opposition toe-hold, even in the central constituency of Westminster. After the making of peace in 1815, however, radicalism revived nationally; and battle lines were hardened. By 1818 Burdett was contesting the Westminster seat for the third time, having been energised by a group of upper-class political reformers who met as the Rota Club

(formed 1818).⁷³ During the campaign, support for the six rival candidates ebbed and flowed.⁷⁴ On Burdett's radical flank stood the radical orator Henry Hunt,⁷⁵ with Douglas Kinnaird,⁷⁶ and the veteran reformer John Cartwright.⁷⁷ Meanwhile, Sir Samuel Romilly's⁷⁸ mainstream Whig candidature and that of Sir Murray Maxwell in the Administration interest put pressure on Burdett's opposite flank.⁷⁹

Afraid of Burdett's losing altogether, Francis Place's Westminster Committee jettisoned Kinnaird during the election, finding the Whig Romilly to be an acceptable candidate when it became clear that they could not defeat both him and Maxwell. In the event, Burdett was elected in second place to Romilly, with Maxwell not far behind: see Table 67. The pretensions of Kinnaird, Hunt, and Cartwright were shown to be of little significance. At the conclusion, the victorious Burdett was chaired through the streets in the traditional ritual. 'It is supposed that so large and orderly a crowd were never before assembled in London', wrote John Cam Hobhouse cheerfully.⁸⁰

Table 67

Westminster parliamentary general election, 1818: Vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1818, P011 ID 62

Date of return: 4 July 1818				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
SAMUEL ROMILLY	98	5,339	**1***	5,245
FRANCIS BURDETT	16	5,238	1*****	5,193
Murray Maxwell	78	4,808	***1**	4,745
Henry Hunt	59	84	*****1	57
Douglas Kinnaird	64	65	*1****	98
John Cartwright	20	23	****1*	24
Total LED cases				10,138

Source: *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*; LED.

What might thereafter have become a stable compromise between the moderation of Burdett and Romilly against the still-powerful forces opposed to reform was suddenly shattered by Romilly's suicide later in 1818. Kinnaird's name was widely canvassed to assume Romilly's seat, but the radicals had to avoid offending the Whigs, to whom Kinnaird

was unacceptable. John Cam Hobhouse,⁸¹ the son of a well-connected politician and lawyer, seemed an acceptable candidate to both reform-minded Whigs and radicals, although the suggestion of collusion between these two groups inspired John Cartwright to stand again.

However, a majority among the Whigs then nominated George Lamb⁸² as their candidate, when the reform group sought to assert their own independence. Little distinguished the liberal moderation of Hobhouse from that of Lamb,⁸³ although the two gentlemen-reformers pitched their appeals to different elements of the electorate. The shock to the reformers of Romilly's success in 1818 was small compared with that of 1819, which saw Lamb elected with a majority of some 600 votes over Hobhouse.⁸⁴ Table 68 further shows that John Cartwright was again an 'also ran'. This result marked the last of the five unsuccessful attempts to enter parliament made by this dogged reformer in a nearly 40-year span from 1780 to 1819.

The Commons received a petition against the return, alleging bribery and intimidation of the electors by Lamb's agents, as well as the partiality of the high bailiff.⁸⁵ The petition was discharged. Meanwhile, the supporters of reforms pursued their claims of partiality by the high bailiff Morris in the courts, in the case of *Cullen v. Morris*.⁸⁶ The outcome of this dispute established the principle that it was the refusal to pay rate demands, rather than failure to pay in the absence of a demand, that disqualified a Westminster householder from voting.

The death of George III in 1820 brought the parliament to an end. In the general election of that year Burdett held his seat, whilst Hobhouse now ousted Lamb.⁸⁷ His vote remained almost unchanged from his by-election tally in 1819; but Hobhouse's votes surged substantially: compare Tables 68 and 69. Thereafter Hobhouse sat for Westminster until 1833, and Burdett until 1837. But the oppositionist glory was departed. Neither was a systematic radical in the manner of Hunt or Cartwright, and their moderate independence had a broad appeal in the prosperous commercial constituency. For each the somewhat theatrical pose of the 'gentleman radical' masked a more moderate practice, enabling them to gain successive re-elections while liberating them from the shackles of having to give formal pledges to their constituents.

Table 68

Westminster parliamentary by-election, March 1819: Vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1819, Po11 ID 63

Date of return: 3 March 1819				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
GEORGE LAMB	67	4,465	001	3,493
John Cam Hobhouse	52	3,861	100	3,042
John Cartwright	20	38	010	21
Total LED cases				6,556

Source: *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*; LED.

Table 69

Westminster parliamentary general election, 1820: vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1820, Po11 ID 64

Date of return: 25 March 1820				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
FRANCIS BURDETT	16	5,327	1**	4,416
JOHN CAM HOBHOUSE	52	4,882	**1	4,038
George Lamb	67	4,436	*1*	3,573
Total LED cases				7,586

Source: Stooks Smith; *Hist. Parl., 1820-32*; LED.

The pairing of Burdett and Hobhouse was unchanged until the early 1830s. Hobhouse was then appointed to office in the Whig administration post-1832. In April 1833 he gained the incongruously unradical post of Chief Secretary to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. A by-election followed, which he won. But Hobhouse subsequently resigned from the government to express his disagreement over a question of taxation. He thus sought re-election in May of the same year. There followed the spectacular defeat of a high-profile former minister. The assiduous courting of the remnants of the Westminster Committee by a rival liberal candidate, George DeLacy Evans,⁸⁸ an Irish army officer, succeeded. Hobhouse was forced to go carpet-bagging, and, after more than a year out of the Commons, was

returned at a by-election for Nottingham.

Almost at the end of his long political career, Sir Francis Burdett crossed the floor of the House to join the conservatives. He had been increasingly at odds with the Whig administration for some time. In those happy prelapsarian days, MPs would offer themselves to their constituents in a by-election in such cases. The contested by-election of May 1837 was to be Burdett's last in Westminster, and he did not stand in the election for the first parliament of Victoria's reign. Nonetheless, his successful retention of his seat, having crossed the floor, suggests both that Burdett had something of a personal vote and that most voters were not fire-breathing radicals.

In the general election later in 1837, the liberal DeLacy Evans held the seat to which he had first been elected at a by-election in May 1833. But the conservative Sir George Murray⁸⁹ failed to retain the personal vote built up by Burdett, which indicated that the conservative vote, though not negligible, did not command a majority at this time: see Table 70. Instead, the poll was headed by John Temple Leader,⁹⁰ who now secured the seat which he had unsuccessfully contested when Burdett crossed the floor. Leader, who was one of the 'philosophical radicals', was a liberal with radical leanings, expressing sympathy for the Chartists' campaign for manhood franchise. In that context, his success was notable: the pairing of himself and DeLacy Evans covered the spectrum from moderate pre-reform liberalism to advanced radicalism, in support of manhood suffrage and the secret ballot.⁹¹

Table 70
Westminster parliamentary general election, 1837: vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1837, Poll ID 65

Date of return: 27 July 1837				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
JOHN TEMPLE LEADER	70	3,723	*1*	3,760
GEORGE DELACY EVANS	30	3,715	1**	3,693
George Murray	81	2,620	**1	2,609
Total LED cases				6,327

Source: Craig; LED.

Burdett's retention of his seat after crossing the floor in 1837 had signalled that the imagery of 'Radical Westminster' had effectively come

to an end. In truth, the epithet had always been somewhat of a misnomer. The constituency's tradition had tended to be one of independence⁹² and liberal oppositionism to successive governments rather than one of outright support for radical reform causes. Nonetheless, the turbulence of many of its elections – and the demonisation of Fox by his political enemies – made the constituency seem much more radical than it was.

In the general election of 1841, at a time of conservative success nationally, the conservative Henry Rous, a naval man, was placed at the head of the poll,⁹³ after a close three-cornered fight (see Table 71). DeLacy Evans lost his seat, while, strikingly, his more radical fellow-incumbent, John Temple Leader, kept his. But Leader did not offer a long-term campaigning focus for radical politics. He was no Fox or Burdett. Indeed, Leader changed his career abruptly in 1844, leaving England for the life of a connoisseur in permanent residence in Italy.

Table 71

Westminster parliamentary general election, 1841: vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1841, Poll ID 66

Date of return: 1 July 1841				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
HENRY JOHN ROUS	100	3,338	**1	3,344
JOHN TEMPLE LEADER	70	3,281	*1*	3,272
George DeLacy Evans	30	3,258	1**	3,253
Total LED cases				6,602

Source: Craig; LED.

The conservative rally, however, did not last long. Rous took an office in government in 1846, precipitating a by-election, which he lost. The liberal DeLacy Evans regained the seat. In 1852 Westminster remained a liberal redoubt. The conservative candidate, George Finch-Hatton (Lord Maidstone)⁹⁴ polled respectably but came third. The victors were both liberals, the newcomer John Villiers Shelley⁹⁵ pushing DeLacy Evans into second place. The trailing fourth candidate was William Coningham,⁹⁶ another liberal (see Table 72). If there were no radical firebrands in Westminster now, the conservatives, who put up only one candidate, were also cool. Liberal Westminster, at the mid-century, held sway.

Table 72

Westminster parliamentary general election, 1852: vote codes and distribution of votes in Table PW1852, P011 ID 67

Date of return: 9 July 1852				
Candidate Name	ID	Votes received	Vote code	Number of records
JOHN VILLIERS SHELLEY	107	4,199	1***	4,093
GEORGE DELACY EVANS	30	3,756	**1*	3,669
George Finch-Hatton	34	3,373	***1	3,269
William Coningham	25	1,716	*1**	1,654
Polled				8,549
Unpolled electors				6,334

Source: Craig; LED.

Notes

- ¹ Full data and analysis available in *WHD*.
- ² For claims for continuing aristocratic influence, see esp. H. Wellenreuther, *Repräsentation und Grossgrundbesitz in England, 1730-1770* (Stuttgart, 1979).
- ³ For the Russell family's Bedford estates, see www.bedfordestates.com. And for the family's electioneering, see M.C. and R.R. Battestin, 'Fielding, Bedford, and the Westminster election of 1749', *Eighteenth-Century Studies*, 11 (1977-8), pp. 143-85.
- ⁴ They were: Admiral Sir Charles Wager (MP for Westminster, 1734-41); Admiral Edward Vernon (contested Westminster, 1741); Admiral Sir Peter Warren (MP for Westminster, 1747 – July 1752); Admiral Sir George Rodney (MP for Westminster, 1780-2); Admiral Lord Hood (MP for Westminster, 1784-8 and 1790-6); Admiral Sir Alan Gardner (MP for Westminster, 1796-1806); Admiral Sir Samuel Hood (MP for Westminster, 1806-7); Captain Thomas Cochrane (MP for Westminster, 1807-18); Captain Sir Murray Maxwell (contested Westminster, 1818); Sir Thomas Cochrane (contested Westminster, 1835); and Captain Henry Rous (MP for Westminster, 1841 – February 1846).
- ⁵ He was William Henry Smith (1825-91), professional politician, scion of the book-selling family; contested Westminster, 1865; MP for Westminster, 1868-85; MP for Westminster Strand, 1885 – October 1891; said to be the model for Gilbert's satirical portrayal of Sir Joseph Porter, K.C.B. in *H.M.S. Pinafore* (1878).

- ⁶ T. Jenks, 'Language and politics at the Westminster election of 1796', p. 438, suggests that all Anti-ministerialist candidates between 1780 and 1818 challenged a 'political admiral' at the polls. But in 1807 the naval man was himself an Anti-ministerialist.
- ⁷ See below, n. 63.
- ⁸ BL Twining Papers, Add. Ms. 39,936, fo 133.
- ⁹ For the Westminster Committee, see G. Wallas, *The life of Francis Place, 1771-1854* (revised edn, 1918), pp. 44-8; and D. Miles, *Francis Place, 1771-1854: the life of a remarkable radical* (Brighton, 1988).
- ¹⁰ See section 6.2.3 and below n. 60.
- ¹¹ For the political and social role of such groups, see Clark, *British clubs and societies*.
- ¹² Cited in *Hist. Parl., 1715-54*, i, p. 286.
- ¹³ For a contemporary account, see Anon., *A genuine and authentic account of the proceedings at the late election for the city and liberty of Westminster* (London, G. Woodfall, 1749). The election generated an enormous printed output, little of which has survived. But see the BL nonce-book 'A collection of broadsides relating the parliamentary elections for Westminster, 1741-51'. Selections were reprinted in Anon., *A true and impartial collection of pieces, in prose and verse, which have been written and published on both sides of the question during ... the Westminster election* (London, W. Owen, 1749); and Anon., *Trentham and Vandeput: a collection of the advertisements and hand-bills, serious, satirical and humorous, published on both sides during the election for ... Westminster* ([London] Dicky Norris, 1749).
- ¹⁴ See N. Rogers, 'Aristocratic clientage, trade and independency: popular politics in pre-radical Westminster', *Past and Present*, 61 (1973), pp. 70-106; and idem, *Whigs and cities*.
- ¹⁵ Granville Leveson Gower, Viscount Trentham (1721-1803), MP for Bishop's Castle, December 1744 – 1747; MP for Westminster, 1747-54; MP for Lichfield, April 1754 – December 1754. See *Hist. Parl., 1715-54*, ii, p. 211, and *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*, iii, p. 39.
- ¹⁶ Sir George Vandeput, Bt (1723-84), contested Westminster, 1749.
- ¹⁷ The extensive minutes of the scrutiny are in BL, Lansdowne Ms. 509. See also WAC

- E/3078, and Anon., *Considerations on the determination of the scrutiny for the city and liberty of Westminster* (London, J. Barnes [1751]). This pamphlet is in ULL.
- ¹⁸ There is much 1774 Westminster election material in the papers of Pelham Clinton's election agent Abraham Bayley: BL Add. Ms. 33,123.
- ¹⁹ Hervey Redmond Morres, Viscount Mountmorres [I] (c.1743-97), contested Westminster, 1774. See *ODNB*.
- ²⁰ Charles Stanhope, Viscount Mahon (1753-1816), MP for Thetford, September 1774–74; contested Westminster, 1774; contested Maidstone, May 1777; MP for Chipping Wycombe, 1780 – March 1786. See G. Stanhope and G.P. Gooch, *The life of Charles, 3rd Earl Stanhope* (1914); *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*, iii, p. 462; and *ODNB*. Not to be confused with Charles Stanhope, Viscount Petersham (1753-1829), MP for Westminster, December 1776 – April 1779.
- ²¹ Hugh Percy, Lord Warkworth (1742-1817), MP for Westminster, March 1763 – December 1776. See *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*, iii, pp. 267-8.
- ²² Thomas Pelham Clinton, Lord Lincoln (1752-95), returned for East Retford, 1774; MP for Westminster, 1774-80; contested Westminster, 1780; MP for East Retford, December 1781 – February 1794. Confusingly, he was known as Pelham Clinton in 1774, but as Lincoln in 1780. See G.E. C[okayne] (ed.), *The complete peerage* (13 vols, 1910-59), ix, pp. 533-4, and *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*, iii, p. 261.
- ²³ Humphrey Cotes, wine merchant of Westminster and quondam treasurer of Wilkes's benevolent fund. See I.R. Christie, 'The Wilkites and the general election of 1774', in idem, *Myth and reality in late eighteenth-century British politics* (1970), pp. 244-60.
- ²⁴ *CJ*, 35, pp. 40; 76-83.
- ²⁵ On petitioning campaigns, see E.C. Black, *The Association: British extra-parliamentary political organization, 1769-93* (Cambridge, Mass., 1963). See also I.R. Christie, *Wilkes, Wyvill and reform: the parliamentary reform movement in Britain, 1760-85* (1962); and J.E. Bradley, *Popular politics and the American revolution in England* (Macon, Ga, 1986).
- ²⁶ The experience of the metropolitan movement in support of the American colonists is discussed in J. Sainsbury, *Disaffected patriots: London supporters of revolutionary America, 1769-82* (Gloucester, 1987).
- ²⁷ Hon. Charles James Fox (1749-1806), MP for Midhurst, 1768-74; MP for

Malmesbury, 1774-80; MP for Westminster, 1780-4; MP for Tain Burghs, 1784 – March 1785; MP for Westminster, 1785 - September 1806. See *ODNB*; *BDMBR*. By far the most famous of Westminster's representatives, Fox has been the subject of many studies from early hagiography to the present day. D. Schweitzer, *Charles James Fox, 1749-1806: a bibliography* (New York, 1991) is a useful guide. His *Speeches of the Rt. Hon. Charles James Fox, in the House of Commons* (6 vols, 1815) contains some of the great set pieces of a golden age of parliamentary oratory. Meanwhile, Mitchell, *Charles James Fox* is a fine scholarly life.

- ²⁸ BL Minutes of the 'Westminster Committee of Association', 2 February 1780 – 11 July 1785, Add. Ms. 38,593-5. The Committee was to 'prepare the plan of an Association ... to support the laudable reform, and such other measures, as may conduce to restore the freedom of parliament'. It proposed electoral registration, voting by ballot, payment of MPs, and the abolition of their property qualification: see BL Add. Ms. 38,593, fos 43-4.
- ²⁹ The Westminster electorate's response to Fox is afforded detailed study in Corfield, Green and Harvey, 'Westminster man', pp. 157-85.
- ³⁰ See above n. 21.
- ³¹ Sir George Brydges Rodney, Lord Rodney (1719-92), MP for Saltash, May 1751 – 1754; MP for Okehampton, November 1759 – 1761; MP for Penryn, 1761-8; MP for Northampton, 1768-74; MP for Westminster, 1780 – June 1782. See *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*, iii, pp. 368-70; and *ODNB*.
- ³² Cited in D. Spinney, *Rodney* (1969), p. 343, which is otherwise unconcerned with Rodney's parliamentary career.
- ³³ J.E. Norton (ed.), *The letters of Edward Gibbon* (3 vols, 1956), ii, p. 251.
- ³⁴ J. R. Dinwiddy, 'Charles James Fox and the people', *History*, 55 (1970), p. 342; and see L.G. Mitchell, *Charles James Fox and the disintegration of the Whig party, 1782-94* (Oxford, 1971).
- ³⁵ Sir Samuel Hood, Bt, Lord Hood [I] (1724-1816); MP for Westminster, March 1785 – July 1788; MP for Reigate, August 1789 – 1790; MP for Westminster, 1790-6. See *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*. Not to be confused with his cousin Sir Samuel Hood, later MP for Westminster, 1806-7: see below, n. 57.
- ³⁶ Sir Cecil Wray, Bt (1734-1805), MP for East Retford, 1768-80; MP for Westminster, June 1782 – 1784. His election address is in Anon., *A full and authentic account of the whole of the proceedings in Westminster Hall ... at a general meeting of the*

electors of Westminster ... containing the genuine speeches of Sir Cecil Wray (London, J. Stockdale, 1784). See *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*, iii, pp. 663-5; and *ODNB*.

- ³⁷ See Anon., *History of the Westminster election, containing every material occurrence* (1784; 2nd edn, 1785). The claim that the book contains ‘every material occurrence’ is no idle boast. See also the BL nonce book, ‘A collection of squibs, notices, addresses, etc. relating to the Westminster election, 1784’.
- ³⁸ See on this D.R. McAdams, ‘Electioneering techniques in populous constituencies, 1784-96’, *Studies in Burke and his Time*, 14 (1972-3), pp. 23-53.
- ³⁹ Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire (1757-1806) has now become the subject of much feminist scrutiny: see E. Chalus, *Elite women in English political life, c.1754-90* (Oxford, 2005); J.S. Lewis, ‘1784 and all that: aristocratic women and electoral politics’, in A.J. Vickery (ed.), *Women, privilege, and power: British politics, 1750 to the present* (Stanford, Ca, 2001), pp. 89-122; P. Deutsch, ‘Moral trespass in Georgian London: gaming, gender and electoral politics in the age of George III’, *Historical Journal*, 39 (1996), pp. 637-56; A. Stott, ‘“Female patriotism”: Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire, and the Westminster election of 1784’, *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 17 (1993), pp. 60-84; R. Lana, ‘Women and the Foxite strategy in the Westminster election of 1784’, *Eighteenth-Century Life*, 26 (2002), pp. 46-69; and A. Foreman, *Georgiana, Duchess of Devonshire* (1998).
- ⁴⁰ A. Aspinall (ed.), *The later correspondence of George III* (5 vols, Cambridge, 1962-70), i, p. 52, cites estimates of the Treasury expenditure on Hood’s Westminster campaign in 1784 as £20,000 – which was paid off over many years.
- ⁴¹ For the 1784 Westminster scrutiny, see BL Add. Ms. 36,226; Bodleian Ms. Eng. Hist. c. 236; Anon., *History of the Westminster election* (2nd edn, 1785), pp. 539-74; and Anon., *Thoughts on the merits of the Westminster scrutiny, and the probable causes of its institution* (1785). Contemporary debates on the scrutiny as shown in Anon., *Fox and Pitt’s speeches in the House of Commons* (London, J. Debrett, 1784) have been replicated in debates between the Pittite historian P. Kelly, ‘Pitt versus Fox: the Westminster scrutiny of 1784-5’, *Studies in Burke and his Time*, 14 (1972-3), pp. 155-62; and the Foxite historian L. Werkmeister, ‘Pitt versus Fox: a response to Paul Kelly’, *ibid.*, 15 (1973-4), pp. 45-50.
- ⁴² Hon. John Townshend (1757-1833), MP for Cambridge University, 1780-4; contested Cambridge University, 1784; MP for Westminster, August 1788 – 1790; MP for Knaresborough, March 1793 – 1818. See *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*, iii, p. 553; and *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*, v, pp. 406-8.
- ⁴³ The key issues are summarised in *CJ*, 44, pp. 518-19. Meanwhile the minutes of this

parliamentary committee can be found in TNA, PRO 30/8/237 and also in the Library of Lincoln's Inn, at press-mark LP 297. See also section 3.4 on the Westminster franchise.

- ⁴⁴ See D.E. Ginter, 'The financing of the Whig party organization, 1783-93', *American Historical Review*, 71 (1966), pp. 421-40; and on Whig organization, see idem, *Whig organization in the general election of 1790: selections from the Blair Adam papers* (Berkeley, Ca, 1967).
- ⁴⁵ T.W. Copeland (ed.), *The correspondence of Edmund Burke* (10 vols, Cambridge, 1958-78), v, p. 414.
- ⁴⁶ The agreement of 1790, which was to cover the whole of the ensuing parliament, is cited in *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*, i, p. 337.
- ⁴⁷ Rev. John Horne Tooke (1736-1812), contested Westminster, 1790; contested Westminster, 1796; MP for Old Sarum, February 1801 – 1802. See *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*; *ODNB*; *BDMBR*, pp. 490-3. For Horne Tooke's 1794 trial on the charge of treason, see also A. Wharam, *The treason trials, 1794* (Leicester, 1992), pp. 194-226; and J. Barrell, *Imagining the king's death: figurative treason, fantasies of regicide, 1793-6* (Oxford, 2000). Alexander Stephens, *Memoirs of John Horne Tooke* (2 vols, 1813) appeared shortly after Horne Tooke's death. Biographical studies include M.C. Yarborough, *John Horne Tooke* (New York, 1926); and C. and D. Bewley, *Gentleman radical: a life of John Horne Tooke, 1736-1812* (1998). See also section 1.10.2.
- ⁴⁸ John Horne Tooke, *To the electors of Westminster* (1790) drew the electors' attention to 'the evident conjunction of two contending parties, in order to seize ... the representation of Westminster, and to deprive you even of that shadow of election, to which they have lately reduced you, [that] calls aloud on every independent mind to endeavour to frustrate such attempts'.
- ⁴⁹ *CJ*, 46, pp. 45-6; 194.
- ⁵⁰ See Anon., *Proceedings in an action for debt, between Charles James Fox, plaintiff, and John Horne Tooke, Esq., defendant* (1792).
- ⁵¹ For this election, see Jenks, 'Language and politics', pp. 419-40. For radicalism throughout the decade, see J. Graham, *The nation, the law and the king: reform politics in England, 1789-99* (2 vols, Lenham, Md, 2000).
- ⁵² Sir Alan Gardner, Bt, Lord Gardner [I] (1742-1808/9), MP for Plymouth, February 1790 - 1796; MP for Westminster, 1796-1806. See *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*, ii, p. 483; *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*, iv, pp. 3-4; and *ODNB*. The date of Gardner's death is

problematic; like Francis Place, he died after retiring to bed on New Year's eve.

- ⁵³ See Anon., *Jordan's complete collection of all the addresses and speeches of the Hon. C.J. Fox, Sir A. Gardner, and J.H. Tooke, Esq., at the late interesting contest for Westminster, together with the addresses and resolutions of the Committee for promoting Mr Tooke's election ...; to which are added ... the speeches of J.H. Tooke, Esq.* (London, J.S. Jordan, 1796).
- ⁵⁴ Francis Place (1771-1854), artisan social reformer and political campaigner: see Wallas, *Life of Francis Place*; Miles, *Francis Place*; *ODNB*; and *BDMBR*.
- ⁵⁵ Wallas, *Life of Francis Place*, p. 40.
- ⁵⁶ See C. and D. Bewley, *Gentleman radical*, p. 211.
- ⁵⁷ John Graham (1756-1826); contested Westminster, 1802. A member of the firm of Graham and Hindle, auctioneers, and of Wright and Graham, sheriff's brokers, John Graham corresponded with Sheridan (whom he may also have known professionally): see *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*, ii, p. 268.
- ⁵⁸ Anon, *The picture of parliament* (1802), p. 83.
- ⁵⁹ Henry Fox, 1st Baron Holland (1705-74): MP for Hindon, 1738; MP for New Windsor, 1741-61; MP for Dunwich, 1761-April 1763; in House of Lords as peer, 1763-74; held sundry offices of state including Surveyor General of Works, 1737-42; Paymaster General, 1757-63; amassed fortune; purchased Holland House, 1767. See *Hist. Parl., 1714-54*; *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*; *ODNB*.
- ⁶⁰ Richard Brinsley Butler Sheridan (1751-1816), MP for Stafford, 1780-1806; MP for Westminster, 1806-7; contested Wexford county, 1807; MP for Ilchester, 1807-12; contested Stafford, 1812. By 1806 Sheridan's glory days, at the time of the impeachment of Warren Hastings, had long been lost in the alcoholic haze that led to the sobriquet 'Sherry'. See *Hist. Parl., 1754-90*; *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*; *ODNB*. Biographers chiefly concentrate on Sheridan's career as a dramatist. For Sheridan as politician, see C.A. Clayton, 'The political career of Richard Brinsley Sheridan' (unpub. Oxford University D.Phil. thesis, 1992). The volumes reprinting the *Speeches of the Rt Hon. Richard Brinsley Sheridan* (5 vols, 1816) contain some of the great set-pieces of the age.
- ⁶¹ Sir Samuel Hood (1762-1814), MP for Westminster, 1806-7; MP for Bridport, 1807-12. See *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*, iv, p. 225; and *ODNB*. Not to be confused with his cousin: see above, n. 34.

- ⁶² The surviving election accounts for Hood's campaign, as recorded by Frederick Booth, his agent in St Margaret and St John, are located in WAC Acc. 36/144.
- ⁶³ James Paull (1770-1808), MP for Newport, Isle of Wight, June 1805 – 1806; contested Westminster, 1806; contested Westminster, 1807. See *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*, iv, pp. 733-5; *ODNB*; *BDMBR*, pp. 368-9. The minutes of the committee which sat on Paull's petition against the return for Westminster are in *BPP* (1806-7), III, pp. 421-82.
- ⁶⁴ For John Cartwright (1740-1824), see below, n. 71.
- ⁶⁵ There is a contemporary account of the election in Anon., *History of the Westminster and Middlesex elections, in the month of November, 1806* (1807).
- ⁶⁶ *CJ*, 62, p. 256.
- ⁶⁷ Sir Francis Burdett, Bt (1770-1844), MP for Boroughbridge, 1796-1802; MP for Middlesex, 1802 – July 1804; MP for Middlesex, March 1805 – February 1806; contested Middlesex, 1806; MP for Westminster, 1807-37; MP for Wiltshire North, 1837 – January 1844. See M.W. Patterson, *Sir Francis Burdett and his times, 1770-1844* (2 vols, 1931); J.R. Dinwiddy, 'Sir Francis Burdett and Burdettite radicalism', *History*, 65 (1980), pp. 17-31; C. Hodlin, 'The political career of Sir Francis Burdett (unpub. Oxford University D.Phil. thesis, 1992); *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*; *Hist. Parl., 1820-32*; *ODNB*; and *BDMBR*, pp. 68-72. Some primary source material is in Bodleian Ms. Eng. Hist. b. 200. Dod and McCalmont describe him as a Liberal until 1837; Stenton describes him as a Whig. See also section 5.2.4 and within that n. 55.
- ⁶⁸ For the culture of duelling, see V.G. Kiernan, *The duel in European history: honour and the reign of aristocracy* (Oxford, 1988); and Markku Peltonen, *The duel in early modern England: civility, politeness and honour* (Cambridge, 2003).
- ⁶⁹ For the Westminster Committee, see Wallas, *Life of Francis Place*, pp. 44-8; Miles, *Francis Place*, pp. 65-9; 118-19; and election publications in n. 72 below.
- ⁷⁰ Thomas Cochrane, Lord Cochrane (1775-1860), contested Honiton, June 1806; MP for Honiton, 1806-7; MP for Westminster, 1807 – July 1814; MP for Westminster, July 1814 – 1818. Much that has been written about him, including his own self-justificatory *Autobiography of a seaman* (2 vols, 1861), concerns his naval exploits, a swashbuckling tradition enjoyably continued by the film *Master and Commander: the other side of the world* (dir. Peter Weir, 2003). Biographical studies include C. Lloyd, *Lord Cochrane* (1947); D. Thomas, *Cochrane* (1978); and R. Harvey, *Cochrane: the life and exploits of a fighting captain* (2000). For his political career, see *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*, iii, pp. 461-8; *ODNB*; *BDMBR*, pp. 90-3. For the stock

exchange scandal which led to Cochrane's temporary suspension from the Commons, see too P. Johnson, 'Civilising Mammon', in P. Burke, B. Harrison and P. Slack (eds), *Civil histories: essays presented to Sir Keith Thomas* (Oxford, 2000), pp. 301-19.

- ⁷¹ See J. Horne Tooke, *A warning to the electors of Westminster* (1807); and Paull's reply in Anon., *A refutation of the calumnies of John Horne Tooke* (1807).
- ⁷² For the 1807 election, see J.C. Jennings, *The proceedings of the late Westminster election* (London, J. Bell, 1808) in BLPES; Anon., *An exposure of the principles of the disciples of the daemon of darkness ... also an elucidation of the hocus pocus practised in the late Westminster election* (London, Chapple, 1807) in BLPES; and Anon., *An exposition of the circumstances which gave rise to the election of Sir Francis Burdett, Bt, for the City of Westminster; and of the principles which governed the Committee who conducted that election* (London, Samuel Tipper, 1807).
- ⁷³ Miles, *Francis Place*, p. 119.
- ⁷⁴ For details, see *ibid.*, pp. 119-24.
- ⁷⁵ Henry Hunt (1773-1835), contested Bristol, July 1812; contested Bristol, 1812; contested Westminster, 1818; contested Preston, 1820; contested Somerset, 1826; contested Preston, 1830; MP for Preston, December 1830 – 1832. See H. Hunt, *Memoirs of Henry Hunt, Esq., written by himself in His Majesty's jail at Ilchester* (3 vols, 1820-2); J. Belchem, *'Orator' Hunt: Henry Hunt and English working class radicalism* (Oxford, 1985); J.W. Osborne, 'Henry Hunt, 1815-30: the politically formative years of a radical MP', *Red River Valley Historical Journal of World History*, 5 (1981), pp. 177-94; *ODNB*; and *BDMBR*.
- ⁷⁶ Hon. Douglas James William Kinnaird (1788-1830), contested Westminster, 1818; contested Bishop's Castle, 1818; MP for Bishop's Castle, July 1819 – 1820; returned for Bishop's Castle, 1820. See *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*, iv, pp. 340-41; and *ODNB*.
- ⁷⁷ John Cartwright (1740-1824), contested Nottingham, 1780; contested Boston, 1806; contested Boston, 1807; contested Westminster, 1818; contested Westminster, March 1819. See F.D. Cartwright (ed.), *The life and correspondence of Major Cartwright* (2 vols, 1826); N.C. Miller, 'John Cartwright and radical parliamentary reform', *English Historical Review*, 83 (1968), pp. 705-28; J. Osborne, *John Cartwright* (Cambridge, 1972); *ODNB*; and *BDMBR*, pp. 82-5.
- ⁷⁸ Sir Samuel Romilly (1757-1818), MP for Queenborough, March 1806 -1807; MP for Horsham, 1807 – February 1808; MP for Wareham, April 1808 - 1812; contested

Bristol, 1812; MP for Arundel, December 1812 - 1818; MP for Westminster, 1818 - November 1818. His *Memoirs of the life of Sir Samuel Romilly* (3 vols, 1840) may be supplemented with modern biographies such as P. Medd, *Romilly: a life of Sir Samuel Romilly, lawyer and reformer* (1968); *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*, v, pp. 36-43; and *ODNB*.

⁷⁹ There is a great deal of material on these elections in BL Add. Mss 27,837-50; in the BL nonce book, 'A collection of addresses, pamphlets, posters, squibs, etc., relating to the Westminster election, 1818'; and in WAC E/3349.

⁸⁰ Miles, *Francis Place*, p. 124.

⁸¹ John Cam Hobhouse, later Baron Broughton (1786-1869), contested Westminster, march 1819; MP for Westminster, 1820 - May 1833; contested Westminster, May 1833; MP for Nottingham, July 1834 - 1847; contested Nottingham, 1847; MP for Harwich, April 1848 - March 1851. J.C. Hobhouse's *Recollections of a long life* (1863-5, ed. C. Carleton [Lady Dorchester], 6 vols, 1909-11) may be supplemented with R.E. Zegger, *John Cam Hobhouse: a political life, 1819-52* (Columbia, Mo, 1973). See also *ODNB*; and *BDMBR*. Dod and McCalmont describe him as a Liberal.

⁸² Hon. George Lamb (1784-1834), contested Cockermouth, 1818; MP for Westminster, March 1819 - 1820; contested Westminster, 1820; MP for Dungarvan, February 1822 - January 1834. See *Hist. Parl., 1790-1820*, iv, pp. 354-6; and *ODNB*. Dod and McCalmont describe him as a Liberal.

⁸³ Indeed, Hobhouse and Lamb were curiously connected. Hobhouse's close friend Lord Byron was famously the lover of Lady Caroline, the sister-in-law of George Lamb. Meanwhile, both Hobhouse and Lamb were later to hold office in the post-reform Whig administration.

⁸⁴ A contemporary if partisan account of the by-election of 1819 is Anon., *An authentic narrative of the events of the Westminster election, ... including the speeches of the candidates. Together with the report of the Westminster Reformers: compiled by order of the committee appointed to manage the election of Mr Hobhouse [with portrait]* (1819). A more judicious appraisal is W. Thomas, 'Radical Westminster', in idem, *The philosophic radicals: nine studies in theory and practice, 1817-41* (Oxford, 1979), pp. 46-94.

⁸⁵ *CJ*, 74, pp. 240-1.

⁸⁶ See section 3.4.1 and within that n. 15.

⁸⁷ A contemporary account of this election is in Anon., *Westminster election, 1820* (1820).

- ⁸⁸ George DeLacy Evans (1787-1870), MP for Rye, March 1830 – 1830; contested Rye, 1830; MP for Rye, 1831-2; contested Rye, 1832; contested Westminster, 1832; MP for Westminster, May 1833 – 1841; contested Westminster, 1841; MP for Westminster, February 1846 – 1865. See Anon., *Westminster election: an authentic report of proceedings at a meeting of the electors ... to hear Colonel Evans* (London, W. Barnes, 1832); George DeLacy Evans, *A letter to the electors of Westminster* (1833); E.M. Spiers, *Radical general: Sir George DeLacy Evans, 1787-1870* (Manchester, 1983); and *ODNB*. Dod, McCalmont and Stenton all describe him as a Liberal.
- ⁸⁹ Sir George Murray (1772-1846), MP for Perthshire, April 1824 – 1832; contested Perthshire, 1832; MP for Perthshire, May 1834 – 1835; contested Westminster, 1837; contested Manchester, September 1839; contested Manchester, 1841. See *ODNB*. Dod, McCalmont and Stenton all describe him as a Conservative.
- ⁹⁰ John Temple Leader (1810-1903), MP for Bridgwater, 1835 – May 1837; MP for Westminster, May 1837 – 1847. See *ODNB*. The autobiography of J.T. Leader, *Rough and rambling notes, chiefly of my early life* (Florence, 1899) is accurately entitled, although the attached memoir, pp. 61-73 (first published in 1837) has some useful material on his parliamentary career and his election for Westminster. Dod and McCalmont describe him as a Liberal; Stenton describes him as a radical reformer.
- ⁹¹ Anthony Trollope (1815-82), himself an unsuccessful Liberal candidate for parliament (see section 3.1 and within that n. 18), identified support for the ballot, with its consequential assault upon aristocratic and employer influence, as the chief dividing issue between liberals and radicals: see his political novel *Can you forgive her?* (1864; in St Albans, 1973 edn), p. 221: “I suppose that is the crux” ... “I’m told you can never be entitled to call yourself a Radical till you’ve voted for the ballot”.
- ⁹² On this theme, see M. McCormack, ‘Metropolitan “radicalism” and electoral independence, 1760-1820’, in M. Cragoe and A. Taylor (eds), *London politics, 1760-1914*, pp. 18-37; and, more generally, M. McCormack, *The independent man: citizenship and gender politics in Georgian England* (Manchester, 2005). But see also M. Baer, *The rise and fall of radical Westminster, 1780-1890* (2012).
- ⁹³ Henry John Rous (1795-1877), MP for Westminster, 1841 – February 1846. See *ODNB*. Rous’s career in the navy, and his patronage of the turf, have attracted considerably more attention than has his career in the Commons. T.H. Bird, *Admiral Rous and the English turf* (1939), lists his mounts from *Achievement* to *Zinganee*, but says nothing about his political career. Dod, McCalmont and Stenton all describe

him as a Conservative.

- ⁹⁴ George James Finch-Hatton, Viscount Maidstone (1815-87), MP for Northamptonshire North, 1837-41; contested Westminster, 1852; contested Cambridge, August 1854. Dod, McCalmont and Stenton all describe him as a Conservative.
- ⁹⁵ Sir John Villiers Shelley, Bt (1808-67), MP for Gatton, 1830-1; MP for Great Grimsby, 1831 – August 1831; contested East Sussex, 1841; MP for Westminster, 1852-65; contested Bridgwater, 1865. He was author of a pamphlet on free trade. See *ODNB*; and a brief sketch in G. Fletcher, *Parliamentary portraits*, 3rd series (1862), pp. 36-42. Dod and McCalmont describe him as a Liberal.
- ⁹⁶ William Coningham (1815-84), contested Brighton, 1847; contested Westminster, 1852; MP for Brighton, 1857 – February 1864. Dod, McCalmont and Stenton all describe him as a Liberal.