



**UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS**

This is a repository copy of *Caroline fever, Robert Chaloner and the North Riding Whigs*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/82893/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Chase, MS (2015) *Caroline fever, Robert Chaloner and the North Riding Whigs*. *Northern History: a review of the history of the north of England and the borders*, 52 (1). 85 - 100 (16). ISSN 0078-172X

<https://doi.org/10.1179/0078172X14Z.00000000079>

---

**Reuse**

Unless indicated otherwise, fulltext items are protected by copyright with all rights reserved. The copyright exception in section 29 of the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 allows the making of a single copy solely for the purpose of non-commercial research or private study within the limits of fair dealing. The publisher or other rights-holder may allow further reproduction and re-use of this version - refer to the White Rose Research Online record for this item. Where records identify the publisher as the copyright holder, users can verify any specific terms of use on the publisher's website.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

CAROLINE FEVER, ROBERT CHALONER AND THE NORTH RIDING  
WHIGS\*

MALCOLM CHASE

*University of Leeds*

Sunday last being the 5<sup>th</sup> of November, the usual political ceremonies of that day were postponed till Monday; when notice as given to the inhabitants of Guisborough and its neighbourhood, that a large fire would be made in the evening, in the Market-Place, and that a Green Bag, 'filled with *rubbish* and *combustibles*,' would then be committed to the flames. This mode of expressing *public detestation* of the *Green Bag* system of Ministerial notoriety, was accordingly carried into effect, between eight and nine o'clock. A large fire was made, and the PEOPLE being assembled, there was a numerous procession, preceded by persons with lighted flambeaux – a large GREEN BAG, inscribed on one side '*Perjury and Conspiracy*,' and on the other '*Pains and Penalties*,' was carried at the top of a long Fork, by a *veteran of Waterloo* – and the Band of Music, belonging to the third North York Militia enlivened the numerous concourse by martial music. In this manner they paraded the streets, and on their return to the Market-Place, the Bag was formally set on fire and burnt to atoms – the Band playing the national

tune of 'Rule Britannia,' and the People to the amount of several hundreds, hailing the destruction of the Bag and its contents by loud and continued cheers. (*York Herald & General Advertiser*, 11 November 1820)

## I

THE MANNER IN WHICH GUISBOROUGH, Yorkshire's most northerly town at the time, commemorated the Gunpowder Plot in 1820 was extraordinary. That the pious townsfolk postponed their celebration from Sunday to Monday is the least interesting aspect of the *York Herald's* description. One might ponder why the paper bothered reporting the episode at all; and still more why a succession of other newspapers picked-up the story, including the *Bristol Mercury*, Edinburgh's *Caledonian Mercury* and *The Times*, for as we shall shortly see, November 1820 was not a slack month for news.<sup>1</sup>

Momentarily, Guisborough led the country in responding to political events that autumn. It had been a year that tested governmental authority close to its limits.<sup>2</sup> In January, George III had died, and was succeeded by the flamboyant Prince Regent. The death of a monarch required a general election and in March Lord Liverpool's Tory government was returned to power with a significantly reduced majority. George IV proved a challenging obstacle to normal parliamentary government and Liverpool's

Cabinet lived under the near-constant shadow that they might be dismissed from office and replaced by the Whig opposition. The first half of 1820 saw extensive popular unrest, especially in London, the industrial North of England and west central Scotland. However, by midsummer domestic politics was completely in thrall to George IV's efforts to divorce his Queen, Caroline. The couple had spent little time together since their arranged marriage in 1795. Since 1806 Caroline had lived abroad but in June 1820 she returned to Britain after fourteen colourful years on the Continent. The King demanded a divorce as the price of Liverpool's ministry not being turned out of office. A royal divorce without a public scandal was inconceivable but George IV insisted upon it. And so in July there began the slow progress through Parliament of a Bill of Pains and Penalties, effectively a judicial enquiry into the monarch's allegation that his Queen was an adulteress, with the members of the House of Lords acting as the jury. Divorce would be the outcome if the Lords, followed by the Commons, found that the Queen (regardless of any provocation on her husband's part) had committed adultery. All other parliamentary business ground to a halt; sittings of the Commons were suspended indefinitely so that MPs could observe events in the Lords, where the riveting proceedings were spiced with sexually explicit detail. Conforming to parliamentary custom, all the papers supporting the ministerial case were sent to the Lords in a series of green felt bags.

This explains the 'large GREEN BAG' at the centre of the Guisborough bonfire celebrations as the townspeople affirmed their support for Queen Caroline and dislike of the government. An abundant harvest having drawn the teeth of popular unrest, much of the political tension and social discontent of the first half of the year were projected on to the royal divorce case. The events at Guisborough on 6 November set the tone for a broader pattern of demonstrations in the Queen's support and against the Tory government, demonstrations that reached an astonishing peak from Thursday 9 November when Lord Liverpool unexpectedly announced that the divorce bill would be abandoned forthwith. Months of harrying by his opponents in the Lords had taken their toll. Liverpool's decision was prompted by the realisation that only a slender majority in the House supported it, and that the House of Commons, when its turn came, would almost certainly find in the Queen's favour.

There are several intriguing aspects of the Guisborough celebrations. First, they occurred three days before the government actually abandoned the bill: thus an outcome popularly construed as the acquittal of the Queen was already being marked in the North Riding even as the Bill of Pains and Penalties was still being debated. Second, this was the earliest *nocturnal* demonstration anywhere in support of Caroline.<sup>3</sup> From Dingwall, more than two-hundred miles north of Edinburgh, to the fishing villages in west

Cornwall, a spate of pro-Caroline night-time demonstrations followed Liverpool's decision to drop the bill. Outside London these were mainly held the following week as the news filtered out through provincial newspapers (mostly published on Saturday).<sup>4</sup> For example, news of what had happened in Westminster on Thursday 9 November only reached Guisborough on the Sunday. 'The sacredness of the day could hardly check the people from testifying their joy', commented the *York Herald*. On Monday notices were posted inviting subscriptions to a collection for a service of plate to be presented to the Queen and announcing that on Wednesday there would be a 'general illumination'. Those who supported the Queen displayed as many lamps and candles as they could afford in their windows. Often these were placed behind coloured transparencies or white cotton fabric over-printed with pictures of the Queen or political slogans. In large towns the scale of such illuminations was often highly elaborate: in York, for example, a triumphal arch was erected over the main road into the city from the East Riding while glass painters prepared intricate portraits of the principal figures in the proceedings against the Queen.<sup>5</sup> Even in Guisborough 'there was not a cottage in the town but which exhibited glaring proofs of the exultation of its occupiers in the triumph of their much-injured Queen'. Another enormous green bag was paraded through the town, the accompanying band this time playing the Rogue's March. It was then attached to a high pole in

the Market Place and 'with all its horrid contents' blown to smithereens by the mass discharge of fire arms. The next evening at a dinner at the Cock Inn, a 'large party of gentlemen' toasted 'the health of her Majesty, and many other patriotic toasts, were drunk with enthusiastic applause'.<sup>6</sup>

Local celebrations were not limited to Guisborough. At nearby Marske, Upleatham and Skelton the illuminations 'were conspicuously brilliant'. The Whig baron Lord Dundas illuminated his seat at Marske Hall; his mother, the dowager Lady Dundas, did the same at her home, Upleatham Park. It is a reasonable supposition that other family members similarly illuminated: Thomas Dundas at Upleatham Hall, and Sir Robert Lawrence Dundas at Loftus Hall).<sup>7</sup> The Guisborough home of their brother in law, Robert Chaloner, MP for York, was certainly illuminated.<sup>8</sup> Elsewhere in Cleveland Redcar was illuminated 'with very few exceptions'; Tory newspapers were paraded around town and burnt, along with a green bag which was then hung from a gibbet erected over a large bonfire. In west Cleveland, the Quaker Meeting House was the only building not illuminated on Yarm's High Street. Fireworks and the incineration of a green bag were accompanied by 'the full military band of the late volunteer corps'; five pounds was raised by public subscription for distribution to the widows and orphans of the town. At Stokesley crowds had streamed down the main road to meet Lord Dundas, *en route* from Westminster to his Marske home as Parliament had been

immediately prorogued. The horses were removed from the carriage, and Dundas was then drawn triumphantly by the men of Stokesley into the town. He made a hastily improvised speech from the upper window of the Black Swan telling the throng below that 'the very spirit which would have tyrannised over the Queen today, would have been ready to have done the same thing to our-selves tomorrow'.<sup>9</sup>

Across the River Tees in Stockton, *de facto* cultural centre of west Cleveland, a green bag was hung on the neck of an effigy of the Devil and paraded round the town accompanied by a band. A formal proclamation was rung that the Devil had been found guilty of conspiracy against the Queen and had been sentenced 'to be committed to his own realm ... along with a few of his particular friends'. These comprised effigies of three key Crown witnesses against Caroline plus 'a non-descript', part-bishop and part a courier (an elaborate visual pun on the name of the ultra-loyalist newspaper, the *Courier*).<sup>10</sup> Among the most striking of the celebrations were those at Castleton, 'merely a small village', in east Cleveland, as a local antiquarian described it), huddled into the northern skirts of the North Yorkshire Moors.<sup>11</sup> The local band escorted 'a young girl – the appropriate emblem of innocence' who was carried aloft on a makeshift throne around the illuminated streets. The procession also included banners and inevitably a green bag which was incinerated alongside an effigy in the village centre.

A loyal address to Queen Caroline was adopted by acclamation and some pages from a copy of the pro-government, and therefore anti-Caroline, *Yorkshire Gazette* were ceremoniously burnt. In that spirit of thrift for which the broad acres of Yorkshire are noted, the remaining pages were then taken to Westerdale, three miles up onto the moors, for a similar act of theatrical anti-government defiance.<sup>12</sup> A loyal address to the Queen was then sent from Castleton to London where it was presented to her at Brandenburg House, her Hammersmith home, early in December.<sup>13</sup>

Such loyal addresses were a staple of opposition to the Liverpool Ministry. Guisborough's was adopted at a public meeting on 18 January, chaired by Sir Robert Lawrence Dundas, and presented to the Queen by Robert Chaloner when he returned to the capital for the new session of parliament in January. It offered Guisborough's 'heartfelt congratulations on the complete refutation of those disgraceful and unfounded charges which were brought against your Majesty'. The same meeting unanimously agreed a petition to Parliament calling for Caroline's name to be restored to prayers for the royal family in the Anglican liturgy. It was freely laced with criticism of the Liverpool government:

The present dissatisfied state of the country does not arise from any turbulent inclination of the people to foster and encourage discontent, but from a long and

uninterrupted series of misgovernment on the part of those under whose guidance and advice the affairs of state have been administered.

Guisborough's further exposure on the national stage was secured by placing an account of 'the numerous and most respectable meeting', accompanied by both texts, as an advertisement in *The Times*.<sup>14</sup>

Few communities in Britain were untouched by Caroline fever. 'The infatuation for the Queen prevails equally in the most secluded valleys of our moors as at Hampstead and Highgate', the Earl of Carlisle observed from Castle Howard.<sup>15</sup> The character and extent of the celebrations in Cleveland were in many ways typical, though as we have seen Guisborough was unique in its rehearsal on 6 November. The illuminations and raucous exuberance that greeted the news that Liverpool had abandoned the Bill against Caroline were not exactly spontaneous: notices were posted around the town two days before the mass illumination. Events at Stockton and Yarm were similarly publicized in advance, for the demonstrations were simply too intricate not to require careful pre-planning. Henry Heavisides, the printer who had produced advance publicity for the demonstration in Stockton-on-Tees, later recalled the complexity of the 'capital effigies' burnt there. These had been commissioned by

the local surgeon William Milburn, a prominent radical republican and a supporter of William Cobbett:

His Satanic Majesty, bearing a green bag, labelled 'Lies! Lies!' ... was well got up. It represented old Beezlebub with a pair of horns, a long black tail, and hooped feet which had belonged to a bullock. The whole of these effigies were suspended by the neck from a strong rope stretched in the Market Place between two tall pieces of timber, where they cut a strange and awful figure, as though a gallows ... had been erected for the execution of criminals. Underneath the effigies were placed combustibles of all kinds, and to every effigy was attached a bag of gunpowder.<sup>16</sup>

This elaborate and carefully planned choreography was also a response to 'the Six Acts', a cluster of repressive legislation introduced in the wake of the Peterloo Massacre in Manchester on 16 August 1819. The acts severely curtailed freedom both of assembly and of political expression. The impact of this legislation upon newspaper publishing and the 'unstamped press' that emerged in defiance of it is widely appreciated; however demonstrations and even peaceable meetings to discuss political issues also came within its pale. Unauthorised meetings of more than fifty people were banned. Unless licensed by a magistrate for

the purpose, 'every house, room, field, or other place' where lectures or debates occurred, and an admission charge or collection was made, was illegal, even if fewer than fifty attended. Public assemblies with flags or banners were banned, as was marching in any kind of formation even without weaponry.<sup>17</sup> Quite apart, however, from the depth and breadth of anti-ministerial feeling (which meant there were many magistrates happy to sanction meetings to adopt petitions and addresses), expressions of allegiance *en masse* to the Queen of the realm could hardly be construed as falling within the meanings of the Six Acts.

Queen Caroline fever was both spontaneous and contrived, rooted in the popular mood yet carefully nurtured by opponents of the Liverpool Ministry. The bedrock of the agitation was an effusion of cheap pamphlets, emanating from radical rather than Whig publishers, riding the unpopularity of the Government and monarch as well as responding to increasing literacy and demand for cheap, illustrated literature. Metropolitan radical pressmen especially exploited the Queenite cause to develop cheap pamphlets, mostly in the form of light satirical verse and therefore outside the reach of the Six Acts. Graphic satire (i.e. cartoons) also flourished because of legal difficulties in prosecuting visual material. The result was one of the greatest publishing phenomena of the early nineteenth century. The year 1820 was a record one for the production of graphic satire and fully three-quarters of it commented on the royal

marriage; and at least fifty-two editions of *The Political House that Jack Built*, to name but one example of the pamphlet output, appeared within these twelve months.<sup>18</sup>

Benjamin Rudd, a North Riding magistrate (from Marton, now a suburb of Middlesbrough), was so perturbed by the circulation of 'atrocious handbills' and the 'infamous caricatures' displayed in local shop windows that he wrote to Viscount Sidmouth, the Home Secretary about it.<sup>19</sup> 'I am persuaded that at no period of the History of England did there exist a more deep laid conspiracy for overturning the Government of the Country than actually exists at this time', Rudd told Sidmouth.<sup>20</sup> According to a book pedlar brought before him for questioning, Queenite material entered the area from Newcastle, direct from the presses of the radical *Tyne Mercury* and Eneas Mackenzie. The latter was secretary of the Northern Political Union and a warm admirer of the ultra-radical Thomas Spence (1740-1814) whose followers included those responsible for the Cato Street conspiracy to assassinate the Cabinet in February 1820.<sup>21</sup> The *Tyne Mercury* was outspoken in its support for Caroline, but very little other indigenous Tyneside Queenite literature survives.<sup>22</sup> It seems therefore likely that Mackenzie or the *Mercury* were regional distributors of literature brought via the coastal trade from London.

Whilst it is true that, as Robert Poole observes, 'no subsequent radical cause offered the same potential for subversive

loyalty as the Queen Caroline affair',<sup>23</sup> it was a key stage in the development of a more-nationalised politics, anticipating (or more-accurately laying a foundation for) the reform movement a decade later and, even, Chartism. Its effectiveness in mobilising hitherto largely latent radical sentiment is evident in Stockton-on-Tees, generally 'considered the very pink and essence of loyalty' at the time.<sup>24</sup> During the General Election that spring, it had been prominent in the Tory campaign against the sitting Whig MP for County Durham, Lord Lambton. Fully a fifth of those signing a requisition calling on the Auckland landowner Richard Wharton to stand against Lambton were from Stockton and the adjacent parish of Norton, the greatest concentration of signatories anywhere in the county. They included Thomas Jennett (Mayor of Stockton), the partners in the town's bank, and all three Anglican clergymen of Stockton and Norton.<sup>25</sup> However, for political vigour no Teesside cleric matched Thomas le Mesurier, rector of Haughton le Skerne, between Stockton and Darlington. Le Mesurier punched a teenager who shouted 'Lambton forever!' outside his church with such force the hapless youth lost a tooth.<sup>26</sup> Lambton responded by attacking local clergy as 'solely occupied in fomenting broils and disturbances ... instead of inculcating from the pulpit charity and good will among men'. County Durham Whigs warned against 'venal Priests', '*black superlatives*, who eagerly embark in all the toil and dirt of canvassing for the pensioned Court Candidate, ogling, cajoling and

*threatening* whenever they have the authority'.<sup>27</sup> Once re-elected to Westminster, Lambton presented petitions to Parliament from both Stockton and Yarm defending the Queen. 'With the exception of the postmaster and one or two individuals who lived upon the taxes', Lambton claimed, all of Yarm's inhabitants supported the Queen.<sup>28</sup>

## II

The dominance of the Whig Dundas and Chaloner families in east Cleveland meant that the tensions evident in the Stockton area were not replicated there. The Caroline affair was a convenient focus around which to organise opposition to the Tory government and the eye-catching way Guisborough anticipated the national mood on 6 November is significant. The town's population in 1821 was only 1,912 and Robert Chaloner owned over ninety per cent of the land in the parish (though the family had sold many freeholds in the town's centre).<sup>29</sup> Little of any note happened in Guisborough without Chaloner's knowledge and express approval. He was a noted benefactor to the town: for example he had sold the land for the town's Providence School for a nominal sum in 1804, and in 1814 obtained royal letters patent to license Guisborough's weekly market, its two annual wool markets and six public fairs.<sup>30</sup> Chaloner was also a Major in the North Riding Militia, the regiment that provided the band that enlivened pro-Caroline demonstrations in

the town and of which his brother-in-law, Lord Dundas, was the colonel.<sup>31</sup> The choice of the Cock Inn for indoor celebrations on 15 November was also carefully calculated. There were seventeen public houses in the town in Guisborough, but the Cock Inn was the town's posting house and where social, business and administrative matters of moment were conducted.<sup>32</sup>

All this suggests that the events of 6 November were carefully orchestrated; so too, of course, does the illumination of the leading Whig houses in east Cleveland. And in determining the style in which Caroline's 'acquittal' was celebrated, Guisborough led the nation. Not only was 6 November the first recorded nocturnal demonstration of support for Queen Caroline, by turning its Guy Fawkes celebrations into a burlesque attack on the ministerial green bags, the town provided the prototype for subsequent demonstrations nationwide. Throughout 1820 grotesquely large green bags had been staple features of radical literature and cartoons.<sup>33</sup> However, there is only one earlier account of a green bag's appearance in a demonstration, in London in August. That, though, was in daylight and no attempt was made to burn it.<sup>34</sup> It was Guisborough that provided the first example of the receptacle's nocturnal incineration and within days the practice became commonplace. As at Stockton and Castleton, many communities also burnt effigies of Crown witnesses who had testified against the Queen. However, it was unusual to burn effigies of government

ministers whilst there is only one recorded incident (albeit at York) in which an effigy of George IV himself was committed to the flames.<sup>35</sup> Green bags, on the other hand, were very nearly ubiquitous. In a febrile political climate policed by the Six Acts, they stood-in for both the monarch and his ministers. Effectively they symbolised and embodied the political system itself.

The choice of a Waterloo veteran to carry the green bag around Guisborough was also freighted with meaning. It did more than simply associate the demonstrators with a great patriotic victory, for it graphically underlined the fissure that had opened up between the Government and its more radical critics on the use of troops to police political demonstrations. Radical papers depicted the heroes of Wellington's army as 'ignoble tools of ... corrupt and contemptible faction'.<sup>36</sup> Peterloo intensified allegations that the army was being used as tools of an incipient military despotism. The *Republican*, a radical journal circulating widely in Cleveland, bluntly claimed George IV's only ambition appeared to be that of 'a military despot'.<sup>37</sup>

### III

In terms of what is generally known about the history of Guisborough and its leading family, Robert Chaloner (1776-1842) is a shadowy figure remembered primarily for selling the family's

historic seat and for being declared bankrupt in 1825, when the York bank of which he was a partner, Wentworth, Chaloner & Rishworth, failed during the national financial crisis of 1825-6. Chaloner did not defend his parliamentary seat at the 1826 general election and put his estate, mired in debt, into the hands of trustees.<sup>38</sup> Thereafter he lived in Ireland as the agent for the County Wicklow estates of Earl Fitzwilliam, the Whig grandee and uncle of Chaloner's wife Frances. However, in 1820 Robert Chaloner was a figure of considerable influence in Yorkshire political and financial circles. As well as his seat in Guisborough he maintained an elegant residence on one of York's most fashionable streets, Castlegate. He was a York alderman and a former Lord Mayor. He had been Member of Parliament for Richmond (North Riding) from 1810 until 1818, making way for one of Lord Dundas's grandsons. He immediately became the Whigs' manager in York and masterminded Whig victories there in both the 1818 and 1820 general elections. At the latter the Whigs captured both seats. York's freemen were cheerfully and openly venal and the cost of contesting the constituency had hitherto meant Whigs and Tories agreed to split the two seats. Chaloner overthrew this pact. Tory election squibs portrayed 'BANKING BOB' Chaloner boasting of how he managed the York electorate: 'The City! I know how to handle her: / She'll swallow anything, 'pon honor.'<sup>39</sup> Lord Howden, the ministerialist candidate, complained of 'an avowed coalition'

between the Dundas and Fitzwilliam interests (personified in Chaloner). 'What could be done against Ld Fitzwilliam's purse?', Howden asked Sidmouth, frankly doubting if any Tory candidate could be found in future 'to oppose the strength & resources of the Fitzwilliam Family, & the Hostility and opposition of a *vile Corporation* lost in their Rancour, to a sense of their Dignity & Justice'.<sup>40</sup>

The £20,000 or £25,000 that Fitzwilliam was reputed to have spent between 1818 and 1820 on electioneering in York undoubtedly played a larger part than Chaloner himself in winning both the city's parliamentary seats.<sup>41</sup> It is important to understand why Fitzwilliam was prepared to spend so heavily to win York for the Whigs, and why he entrusted the task of realising his investment to Chaloner. The city was both one of the most important borough constituencies in Britain and the centre of its largest and most politically sensitive county constituency. The previous October, George IV and Sidmouth had peremptorily dismissed Fitzwilliam from the Lord Lieutenancy for Yorkshire after he appeared on the platform of a county meeting that adopted resolutions highly critical of how the Government handled Peterloo. The Tory Viscount Lascelles was appointed in his place. Fitzwilliam was far less supportive of Peterloo's victims than he was painted.<sup>42</sup> Less eminent Whigs were, however, not so fastidious: in 1819-20 there was a groundswell of increasing opposition to Tory policy and

Robert Chaloner, a leading member of the York Whig Club, was one of the most vocal anti-ministerialists. From the inception of his management of the Whig cause in the city, his aim had been to secure both York's parliamentary seats.<sup>43</sup> Although admitting that he was 'terrified of the expense' incurred at the 1820 general election, he also assured Fitzwilliam that the Tories were now 'in a most lamentable condition' and predicted both seats were secure for the Whigs 'for a long time to come'.<sup>44</sup>

The Government for its part smarted at its candidate's failure at York and monitored the constituency closely: Lord Sidmouth even discussed the feasibility of re-capturing at least one of the seats with George IV's private secretary.<sup>45</sup> Both the Whig MPs were notable figures. Marmaduke Wyvill, elected in both 1818 and 1820, enjoyed an almost talismanic status as the son of his more-famous father, 'the reverend and truly venerable CHRISTOPHER WYVILL ... advocate of Parliamentary Reform ... who had steadily adhered to the great cause which Mr PITT and many others had so basely deserted'. In the words of the editor of the 1820 York pollbook, 'the very name of WYVILL is a pledge of unyielding opposition to corruption and tyranny, of steady zeal in the cause of Parliamentary Reform'.<sup>46</sup>

York's second MP, newly elected at the 1820 general election, was Robert Chaloner's brother-in-law Lawrence Dundas of Marske Hall, east Cleveland, the heir to the Dundas peerage.

The first Baron Dundas was seriously ill at the time of the general election and he died three months later. In terms of both family connections and the micro-politics of the constituency, Chaloner was the obvious person to replace Lawrence on his accession to the Lords. At a by-election on 28 June 1820 Robert Challinor was returned unopposed, even though controversially he had declared his support for granting civil rights to Roman Catholics and for the 'practical reform' of parliament.<sup>47</sup>

The York Whig Club was central to Chaloner's purposes. Unlike most of the Whigs at Westminster, it espoused 'radical reform' unambiguously: 'A continued System of Profusion and Waste, has oppressed the PEOPLE with Burdens difficult to be endured ... We call that reform *radical*, which shall root out *Corruption*, and substitute the *voice* of the *People*'.<sup>48</sup> The Club appears to have absorbed an earlier local group of 'Political Protestants' and brought together the popular York electorate (much of it artisanal) and leading Whig families in 'a sound, efficacious and enlightened political combination'. That, at least, was the opinion of the anti-ministerialist *York Herald*. The loyalist *Yorkshire Gazette* was predictably less complimentary and placed 'this cats meat assemblage of Legislators' somewhere 'between the Whigs and the Radicals, *a little above the mud, but not out of the smoke*'.<sup>49</sup>

Whig politics in the city of York were by no means harmonious. The popular electorate inclined more to Wyvill than to the Fitzwilliam-Dundas interest. However, Robert Chaloner's father William, a friend of Wyvill senior, had worked closely in the latter's Yorkshire Association.<sup>50</sup> Chaloner's consequent standing with the Wyvillites complemented his marriage into the Dundas and Fitzwilliam families. His wife, Frances, was not only Fitzwilliam's niece but also daughter of the first Baron Dundas. In addition Robert himself was the nephew of the Earl of Harewood (his paternal aunt had married the latter). He was therefore the first cousin of Lascelles, the new Lord Lieutenant. When Harewood died in April 1820 and Lascelles succeeded him, Chaloner was among the chief mourners at the old Earl's funeral.<sup>51</sup> Well-connected, confident and articulate, Chaloner was an obvious person to whom the septuagenarian Earl Fitzwilliam could turn both for advice and to manage his political interests in York and the North Riding.

Research by Brian Barber has demonstrated that Fitzwilliam was a reluctant radical. Lauded as a victim of monarchical and ministerial prejudice, he was actually not at all favourable towards defending the organisers of the Peterloo meeting.<sup>52</sup> Although he was highly critical of the Government's capitulation to the King's demand they pursue Caroline ('The House of L<sup>ds</sup> is to be roll'd in the Kennel for the preservation of Minsters', he told his wife<sup>53</sup>), he declined to act as one of her nominees in confidential negotiations with senior

members of the King's court. Fitzwilliam was convinced of Caroline's 'great impropriety of conduct', concluding 'the inference must be Adultery'. while his 'horror of parliamentary reform' was an open secret.<sup>54</sup>

Robert Chaloner however was a man of different mettle. He not only repeatedly called for Catholic emancipation and parliamentary reform but also attacked the Government for pursuing repressive policies that 'infringed the liberties of the people'. Chaloner was emphatic that 'he highly approved of the conduct of the Queen'; and he conspicuously associated himself with the Parliamentarian side in the English Revolution, 'the cause for which Hampden bled in the field and Sydney on the scaffold'.<sup>55</sup> The Tory *Yorkshire Gazette*, a regular critic of Chaloner and the Whigs, opined that the sole objective of such sentiments was 'in plain terms, the annihilation of the constitution and revolution throughout the land'.<sup>56</sup> Speaking at York in late September Chaloner rounded on George IV for his hypocrisy in manipulating Liverpool into securing the royal divorce:

We are told, and seriously too, that his Majesty has nothing to do with this investigation. (*Laughter.*) Oh! No! poor man, he is no party to it, *not he* – he lives in retirement and does not meddle with the matter at all. (*Loud applause.*) The Ministers next say, that they are

drawn into it, that it is forced upon them, and they are obliged to do their duty. – (*Applause.*) Did, then, the PEOPLE bring it forward? (*Cries of no! no!*) ... We are told that it was for the preservation of the morals of the country. What *hypocritical cant* was this!<sup>57</sup>

This is a fair specimen of the populist tenor of Chaloner's platform oratory. The *Yorkshire Gazette* fastidiously declined to report any details of his speech at York's Guildhall on 15 November 1820, in which he attacked the 'obnoxious' Six Acts and the Government's failure to reduce the size of Army now that it was peacetime. 'They wantonly squandered the money of the people', Chaloner declared, and 'deprived us of our liberties'.<sup>58</sup> His voting record in Parliament while MP for Richmond earlier in the century had been indifferent.<sup>59</sup> Now, however, he voted against the Government on all key resolutions concerning the Queen, as well as for reductions in the Government establishment and civil list, for a full parliamentary inquiry into Peterloo, for Lord Russell's proposals for parliamentary reform and for the repeal of all the Six Acts.<sup>60</sup> At meetings of the York Whig Club, Chaloner also associated himself with support for the Spanish and Portuguese revolutions of 1820, both of which profoundly unsettled Liverpool's Cabinet.<sup>61</sup> Privately, he seems to have entertained even more radical opinions. 'I know not where my improvement in radicalism will stop', he told his wife's cousin and

brother-in-law, Lord Milton, in January 1822. 'It is a plant of powerful growth with me just now. I dare not write all I think'.<sup>62</sup>

Chaloner, however, was no naïve idealist. The surviving evidence is of a ruthless political operator who, backed by the Fitzwilliam fortune, wielded formidable influence over the York electorate. Characterised as 'the violent party' by the Tories' defeated candidate in the 1820 general election, York's Whigs and their radical allies effectively closed down all critical public discussion of the Caroline affair. Despairing of a fair hearing, those who took the King's side withdrew from the public meeting advertised in York, at which the propriety of including the Queen in the Anglican liturgy was discussed. Signatures to a loyal address to George IV could only be collected privately.<sup>63</sup> The situation was similar at Northallerton, a borough whose two seats at Westminster had been split amicably between Whig and Tory since 1745.<sup>64</sup> Yet Chaloner and Wyvill successfully packed public meetings that had been called by local Tories to adopt a loyal address to the monarch. A 'constitutional' (i.e. highly critical) address was adopted in its place.<sup>65</sup>

In other respects, however, Chaloner showed himself to be highly pragmatic: in December 1820 he advised Fitzwilliam against calling a Yorkshire County Meeting to petition for reform, even though the divorce debacle had mired the Government in unpopularity, because he feared that to do so would expose

divisions among the region's Whigs.<sup>66</sup> Privately the Dundas circle also sneered at the cause of the Queen they so publicly espoused. While at Northallerton for the first Quarter Session of 1821, the new Lord Dundas allegedly made a remark about the Queen so crude that a shocked loyalist, writing to Sidmouth, 'would not soil this letter with a repetition of it'. The author also claimed that a 'Fitz Whig' MP was heard to say, 'We all know that the Queen is a d----d b---h, but Sir, we must have a Revolution'. Another had declared 'that he did not care whether the Queen proved guilty or innocent, but that she should have his vote & interest in the House of Commons'.<sup>67</sup> Chaloner presumably was one of the MPs mentioned, quite possibly the one who declared 'we must have a Revolution'.

#### IV

Momentarily, with the open encouragement of the local Whig elite, the North Riding, especially Guisborough, captured national attention in November 1820 as it led the way in devising a spirited form of popular theatre to celebrate the humiliation of the Government and the monarch it served. The cause of an injured Queen was an irreproachable opportunity for radicals to come out into the open, along with Whigs who held more-cautious but still progressive views. It was thus an opportunity for the Whigs to make a very public play for popular support, without necessarily

committing themselves to meaningful parliamentary reform. Although Caroline's 'acquittal' was a matter of nationwide jubilation, Chaloner's home town celebrated it with a combination of alacrity and abandon that stands out. The loyalist *Yorkshire Gazette* laid this entirely at the door of Chaloner and his circle, 'a few cunning and insidious demagogues'. It ascribed the fierceness with which the pro-Caroline cause was pursued in the North Riding to Whig resentment of Fitzwilliam's dismissal as Lord Lieutenant: 'we hear of no meetings in any part of the country [that is, Yorkshire] except those emanating from one and the same source: and this from a quarter where a sense of personal disappointment mixes with political feeling'. The editorial then detailed public meetings to petition against the Ministry in Malton, York and Richmond ('a Borough belonging to another branch of the same family'), also alleging that further south, in Rotherham, Fitzwilliam had personally 'distributed *largesses* amongst the mob to encourage them to illuminations and rejoicing'.<sup>68</sup> It pointedly commented on 'the low character and absence of respectability' of the York meeting (attended by Chaloner); but it curiously omitted to mention Northallerton where not only had householders who refused to participate in the Queenite illumination had their windows smashed (in defiance of a magistrates' prohibition and special constables recruited to enforce it) but the pro-ministerialists were out-

manoeuvred and the borough's petition to Parliament turned into an attack on 'the foul and malignant conspiracy' directed at Caroline.<sup>69</sup>

However, Chaloner and those like him who prominently associated themselves with the cause of Queen Caroline were playing for high stakes. Ultimately they lost. The temporary alliance forged by the Whigs with popular radicalism in pursuit of justice for Caroline tainted them in the mind of the political nation and hence further contributed to their long-running exclusion (dating from 1807) from power at Westminster for a further decade. After the initial furore during the closing weeks of 1820, the divorce scandal served to strengthen Tory resolve.<sup>70</sup> 'The radical faction avail themselves of every passing event to insult and revile the King & to subvert our ancient & most excellent Constitution in Church & State', Bartholomew Rudd wrote from Marton in January 1821, whilst 'the Whigs avail themselves of the numbers & strength of the Radicals to subvert the Ministers'. 'I think it the bounden duty of every loyal Man', Rudd therefore concluded, 'publicly to declare his principles in times like these'.<sup>71</sup> When Fitzwilliam and Chaloner presented a county-wide petition to the Crown calling for the dismissal of Liverpool's Ministry, a West Riding Tory declared, 'from the bottom of my soul, I hope his Majesty will kick their - - - -'. Shrewdly this commentator also predicted that the Whigs, by 'giving the Radicals string, and thus making them useful Puppets' would ultimately 'force the people to rally round the throne'.<sup>72</sup> When Mary,

Lady Milton (Robert Chaloner's sister-in-law) was presented to the Queen in June 1821 she was vilified in *John Bull* which claimed her willingness to meet Caroline indicated that she approved of, and maybe even shared, the Queen's sexually promiscuous habits. The newest and most outspoken of the loyalist papers, *John Bull* had achieved a circulation of ten thousand within a month of its launch in December 1820, precisely targeting the same readership that had devoured Queenite literature.<sup>73</sup>

By July 1821 the public mood had subsided sufficiently for George IV's coronation to be held uneventfully. (It had been postponed the previous summer because the Cabinet feared both the mood of the London crowd and mutinous tendencies in the brigade of guards). Queen Caroline was forcibly refused admission to Westminster Abbey and not a Whig voice was raised in protest. Her death two months later removed the last shreds that clothed Whig opportunism. There was limited appetite for power among the self-styled 'friends of the people' at Westminster; opportunity to humiliate the Ministry, rather than any principled bid for power, animated the Whig interest. And as James Stuart-Wortley (the independent Tory MP for the County of Yorkshire) summarised the situation, 'the country had not sufficient confidence in any other set of public men to put them in the places of the present ministers'.<sup>74</sup>

As David Gent has recently observed, the Whigs 'stand at the heart of historical accounts of British politics in the 1830s and

1840s', although 'knowledge of how the Whigs' support was forged on the ground remains surprisingly limited'.<sup>75</sup> Through a study of an attempt to build such support during more opaque years a decade before the Reform Crisis, this article has sought to illuminate the frailty of the Whig's popular appeal. It depended upon extraneous factors beyond the control even of managers like Robert Chaloner whose sentiments were more radical than those who dominated the Whig interest. The Caroline affair was no more than a flirtation with popular radicalism, one that served only to strengthen Whig perceptions that their interests lay in cooperation with liberals not radicals, that is with moderate reformers in the unenfranchised major industrial towns.

*'A little above the mud, but not out of the smoke'*, to adapt the *Yorkshire Gazette's* description of the York Whig Club,<sup>76</sup> was a place with which Chaloner was comfortable but not a majority of Whigs and certainly not Fitzwilliam. The York Whig Club itself was effectively defunct by the spring of 1823. Its chairman had frankly told Lord Milton that suspicion was widespread that 'the Whig party only wish to make a tool of the people to get their own party into power and ultimately to leave efficient reform in the lurch'.<sup>77</sup> It was to be a further nine years, in the extraordinary circumstances of the Reform Crisis, before the Whigs achieved office. Of that victory Robert Chaloner, however, was no more than a spectator from his virtual exile in County Wicklow. His inability to defend his York

parliamentary seat had occasioned a falling-out between supporters of the Dundas and Wyvill factions; and it saw the election of a 'Blue' (that is ministerialist) candidate in Chaloner's place. Humiliatingly, given core Whig principles, James Wilson of Sneaton Castle, Whitby, was a Jamaican slave-owner and anti-Catholic, and he forced the withdrawal of Thomas Dundas from the electoral contest at York even before the hustings were held.<sup>78</sup> The debacle can only have added to the spiralling decline of Chaloner's reputation, vividly apparent in the omission of any mention of his having represented York, in an allegedly 'authentic' parliamentary record published in the city in 1842, the year of his death.<sup>79</sup>

---

\* Acknowledgment is made to the Arts & Humanities Research Council for its award of a Research Fellowship in 2010-11 which facilitated this work. I am also grateful for opportunities to discuss this research at meetings of the Cleveland & Teesside and Northallerton local history societies.

<sup>1</sup> *Bristol Mercury* and *Caledonian Mercury*, 20 Nov. 1820; *The Times*, 14 Nov. 1820.

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed account and analysis of the events of 1820 see M. Chase, *1820: Disorder and Stability in the United Kingdom* (Manchester, 2013).

<sup>3</sup> A search of thirty-eight digitised British newspapers (including major titles such as *Bristol Mercury*, *Bury & Norwich Post*, *Caledonian Mercury*, *Derby Mercury*, *Leeds Mercury*, *Morning Chronicle*, *Morning Post*, *Newcastle Courant*, *Observer*, *The Times* and *Trewman's Exeter Flying Post*) has failed to identify any nocturnal demonstration earlier than Guisborough's).

<sup>4</sup> Chase, *1820*, pp. 186-93.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 187.

<sup>6</sup> *Y(ork) H(erald & General Advertiser)*, 25 Nov. 1820.

<sup>7</sup> On 18 November Robert Lawrence Dundas chaired a public meeting in Guisborough that adopted a loyal address to the Queen and a petition highly critical of the Government. See *The Times*, 25 Jan. 1821.

---

<sup>8</sup> *YH*, 25 Nov. 1820.

<sup>9</sup> *YH*, 25 Nov. 1820; *Durham Chronicle*, 18 and 25 Nov. 1820.

<sup>10</sup> *Durham Chronicle*, 18 and 25 Nov. 1820; H. Heavisides, *Annals of Stockton-on-Tees* (1865), reprinted in H. Heavisides, *Centennial Edition of the Works of Henry Heavisides* (1895), pp. 393-4.

<sup>11</sup> J. W. Ord, *History and Antiquities of Cleveland* (1846), p. 342.

<sup>12</sup> *YH*, 25 Nov. 1820.

<sup>13</sup> *Morning Chronicle*, 5 Dec. 1820.

<sup>14</sup> *The Times*, 25 Jan. 1821; *The Times*, 1 Feb. and *Morning Chronicle*, 30 Jan. 1821.

<sup>15</sup> Quoted in C. W. New, *The Life of Henry Brougham to 1830* (Oxford, 1961), p. 252.

<sup>16</sup> Heavisides, *Annals*, pp. 383, 393-4; M. Chase, 'Atheists and Republicans in Early Nineteenth-Century Cleveland', *Bulletin of the Cleveland and Teesside Local History Society*, 47 (Autumn 1984), pp. 29-36 and 'Chartism, 1838-1858: Responses in Two Teesside towns', *NH*, XXIV (1988), 148.

<sup>17</sup> *English Historical Documents, Volume XI: 1783-1832*, ed. A. Aspinall and E. A. Smith, (1959), pp. 335-41; R. Poole, 'The March to Peterloo: Politics and Festivity in Late Georgian England', *P&P*, 192 (August 2006), 141-43.

<sup>18</sup> Chase, *1820*, pp. 179-80.

<sup>19</sup> T(he) N(ational) A(rchives), H(ome) O(ffice) 40/14, Rudd to Sidmouth, 9 Oct. 1820. See also HO 41/6, fol. 281.

---

<sup>20</sup> TNA, HO 40/14, Rudd to Sidmouth, 16 Oct. 1820.

<sup>21</sup> E. Mackenzie, *Memoir of Thomas Spence* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1826) and *A Descriptive and Historical Account of the Town and County of Newcastle upon Tyne* (Newcastle upon Tyne, 1826), vol. 1, 399sq; A. Bell, 'Mackenzie, Eneas (1777–1832)', *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford, 2004 [<http://www.oxforddnb.com.wam.leeds.ac.uk/view/article/17576>, accessed 20 Jan. 2014]

<sup>22</sup> M. Milne, 'The *Tyne Mercury* and Parliamentary Reform, 1802–1846', *NH*, XIV (1978), 231.

<sup>23</sup> Poole, *Past & Present*, 192, 143.

<sup>24</sup> *Durham Chronicle*, 18 Nov. 1820.

<sup>25</sup> Local Studies Library, N(ewcastle) C(entral) L(ibrary), L324/D962 'Addresses, songs &c. connected with the 1820 Durham County Election', fols 19 (testimonial to Wharton) and 20 (*See the Nakedness of the Land: List of Mr Wharton's Requisitionists*).

<sup>26</sup> *Durham Chronicle*, 5 Aug. 1820. Anonymous Whig backers successfully funded a high profile civil action for damages against Le Mesurier, a friend of Sidmouth. The two corresponded regularly on political matters, e.g. D(evon) H(eritage) C(entre) (formerly the Devon County Record Office), Sidmouth Papers, 152M/C/1819/OH/128 and 129 (13 and 16 Dec. 1819) and 152M/C/1820/OF/3 (4 Oct. 1820).

---

<sup>27</sup> NCL, L324/D962 'Proceedings of the Durham County Election, 1820', fols 23, 38, 50; *Courier* 24 April 1820.

<sup>28</sup> *The Times*, 2, 3 and 7 Feb. 1821.

<sup>29</sup> E. Baines, *History, Directory & Gazetteer of the County of York*, Volume 2 (Leeds, 1822); figure of 1841 landownership (91%) cited by G. Dixon and B. J. D. Harrison, *Guisborough Before 1900* (Leeds, 1994), p. 82.

<sup>30</sup> Dixon and Harrison, *Guisborough Before 1900*, pp. 87, 122

<sup>31</sup> *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons, 1820-1832: Volume IV Members A-D*, ed. D. R. Fisher, (Cambridge, 2009), pp. 989-90 (hereafter *History of Parliament IV*).

<sup>32</sup> Dixon and Harrison, *Guisborough Before 1900*, p. 89; Baines, *Yorkshire Directory*, p. 446.

<sup>33</sup> Street literature from 1820 in the British Library includes (all published in London) *A Map of Green Bag Land; An Account of the Most Wonderful and Laughable Trial and Execution of a Green Bag, near St. Steven's Bay, this morning; The Farce of the Green Bag; The Filthy Bags so Green O!* [broadside ballad], *The Green Bag: 'a dainty dish to set before a king'*; *Green Bag Oddities; or, Give the Devil his due; The Horrible Filthy Green Bag! ...* ; *The Magic Lantern; or Green Bag Plot laid open ...* ; *Modern Anecdotes of the New Green-Bag-Room*. Satirical prints from 1820 in the British Museum, Department of Prints and Drawings, include (all published in London) 'A new Italian farce called the Green Bag by Permission';

---

'The rats at work- or how to get out of the bag.- Qui Caput ille Fecit.'; 'Another green bag!! Or plundering the Queen's plate'; 'A peep into the green bag- now on both houses of Parliament'; 'The broken crown, or, the disasters of a green-bag chief!!!'. See also Chase, *1820*, pp. 177-8.

<sup>34</sup> *Observer* , 20 Aug. 1820. For an account of green bag protests nationally see Chase, *1820*, especially pp. 187-8.

<sup>35</sup> The York account may be mistaken: it was the recollection of one who was only a teenager at the time and is uncorroborated in any contemporary account: see W. B. Lighton, *Narrative of the Life and Sufferings of William B. Lighton* (Concordia, NY, 1838), p. 49.

<sup>36</sup> M. Lobban, 'From Seditious Libel to Unlawful Assembly: Peterloo and the Changing Face of Political Crime, c. 1770-1820', *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, vol. 10, no. 3 (Autumn, 1990), 327-8.

<sup>37</sup> *Sherwin's Weekly Political Register*, 21 Aug. 1819; *Republican* , 24 Sept. 1819. For the popularity of *Republican* in Cleveland see Chase, *Bulletin of the Cleveland and Teesside Local History Society*, 47.

<sup>38</sup> *The Times* , 13 Dec. 1825 and 20 March 1826); North Yorkshire County Record Office, Chaloner Papers, ZFM/313 (papers relating to the bankruptcy).

<sup>39</sup> York Minster Library, Folio Y/H 8.421 WIL[25] *York Spring Meeting, 1818: a List of the Horses, and Colours of the Riders, entered to run for the Parliament Stakes over the Corporation*

---

*Course* (York, [1818]); *ibid.*, WIL[29] *The Lament of Lowry* (York, [1818]).

<sup>40</sup> DHC, Sidmouth Papers, 152M/C/1820/0I/23, Howden to Sidmouth, 5 Mar. 1820; 152M/C/1820/0Z, Howden to Sidmouth, 11, 13 and 16 Mar. 1820.

<sup>41</sup> The lower figure was the Tory's estimate: see DHC, Sidmouth Papers, 152M/C/1820/0I/23, Howden to Sidmouth, 5 Mar. 1820. The higher estimate was Fitzwilliam's own, cited by E. A. Smith, *Whig Principles and Party Politics: Earl Fitzwilliam and the Whig party, 1748-1833* (Manchester, 1975), p. 362.

<sup>42</sup> B. Barber, 'William Wrightson, the Yorkshire Whigs and the York "Peterloo" protest meeting of 1819', *YAJ*, 83 (2011).

<sup>43</sup> S(heffield) A(rchives), Wentworth Woodhouse Muniments, Fitzwilliam Mss F48/146, Challinor to Fitzwilliam, 27 June 1818). (Documents in this collection will henceforward be cited as Fitzwilliam Mss, WWM, with the call number.)

<sup>44</sup> SA, Fitzwilliam Mss, WWM/F48/172 and 169 (letters to Fitzwilliam, 15 Mar. and 2 Mar. 1820); *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons, 1820-1832: Volume III. Constituencies Part 2*, ed. D. R. Fisher, (Cambridge, 2009), p. 289 (hereafter *History of Parliament III*).

<sup>45</sup> DHC, Sidmouth Papers 152M/C/1820/0Z, 11 Mar. (Howden to Sidmouth) and 20 Mar. 1820 (Sidmouth to Sir Benjamin Bloomfield, private secretary to George IV).

---

<sup>46</sup> *The Poll for Members in Parliament to Represent the City of York* (York, 1820), p. vii.

<sup>47</sup> *YH*, 1 July 1820.

<sup>48</sup> North Yorkshire County Record Office, Chaloner Papers, ZFM/332c, Declaration of the York Whig Club, 8 Feb. 1819.

<sup>49</sup> *YH*, 30 Sept. 1820. *Y(ork) G(azette)*, 22 Jan. 30 Sept. 1820. For a detailed account of the Club see P. Brett, *The Rise and Fall of the York Whig Club, 1818-1830* (Borthwick Paper 76: York, 1989); also A. J. Peacock, 'Edmund Gill, Poet, Son of Crispin and Political Protestant', in *Essays in York History*, ed. A. J. Peacock, (York, 1997), pp. 179-88.

<sup>50</sup> I. Christie, 'The Yorkshire Association, 1780-4: A Study in Political Organisation', *HJ*, vol. 3, no. 2 (1960), p. 147.

<sup>51</sup> *YH*, 22 Apr. 1820.

<sup>52</sup> Barber, *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 83.

<sup>53</sup> SA, Fitzwilliam Mss WWM/G/14/38 (letter to Countess Fitzwilliam, 23 Oct.).

<sup>54</sup> SA, Fitzwilliam Mss WWM/G/14/13 and G/14/8 (letters to Countess Fitzwilliam, 30 and 24 Aug. 1820); WWM/F/84/2 (letter to Brougham, 15 June 1820); Smith, *Whig Principles and Party Politics*, p. 347. See also SA, WWM/F/64/100, the notebook kept by the Earl throughout the trial.

<sup>55</sup> *YH*, 1 July 1820.

<sup>56</sup> *YG*, 7 Oct. 1820

---

<sup>57</sup> *YH*, 30 Sept. 1820.

<sup>58</sup> *YG*, 7 Oct. 1820; *Bristol Mercury*, 20 Nov. 1820.

<sup>59</sup> *History of Parliament IV*, p. 628.

<sup>60</sup> *The Electors' Remembrancer, or, Guide to the Votes of Each Member of the House of Commons* (1822).

<sup>61</sup> *YH*, 30 Sept. 1820. On the significance of the Continental revolutions of 1820 for the United Kingdom see Chase, *1820* pp. 94, 96, 125, 166-69.

<sup>62</sup> SA, Fitzwilliam Mss WWM, 1 Jan. 1822, quoted in *History of Parliament IV*, p. 629.

<sup>63</sup> DHC, Sidmouth Papers, 152M/C/1820/OR/22, Howden to Sidmouth, 7 Dec. 1820.

<sup>64</sup> *History of Parliament III* p. 276.

<sup>65</sup> TNA, HO 40/16 fol. 77, 18 Jan. 1821, poster, 'Inhabitants of Northallerton and its vicinity, be on your guard'; *Durham Chronicle* and *YH*, 30 Nov. 1820; *The Times*, 22 Dec. 1820, 1 and 4 Jan. 1821.

<sup>66</sup> SA, Fitzwilliam Mss WWM/102/8 (Chaloner to Fitzwilliam, 6 Dec. 1820).

<sup>67</sup> TNA, HO 40/16, fols 75-6, 18 Jan. 1821: letter from Drakard of Northallerton to Sidmouth.

<sup>68</sup> *YG*, 25 Nov. 1820.

<sup>69</sup> TNA, HO 40/15/55 printed prohibition, Northallerton, 17 Nov. 1820. J. L. Saywell, *The History and Annals of Northallerton*,

---

*Yorkshire* (Northallerton, 1885) pp. 158-9; *Hansard*, new series, 1821, IV, 66.

<sup>70</sup> Chase, 1820, pp. 200-15.

<sup>71</sup> TNA, HO44/7/17, Rudd to Blanshard, 6 Jan. 1821.

<sup>72</sup> [W. Atkinson], *Letters to Lord Viscount Milton; to which is added a Sermon to Electors and Men in Office* (Bradford, 1821), pp. 6 and 12.

<sup>73</sup> *John Bull*, 17 June 1821; Chase, 1820, p. 211.

<sup>74</sup> *Hansard*, new series, 1821, IV, 226.

<sup>75</sup> D. Gent, 'The Politics of Disinterest: The Whigs and the Liberal Party in the West Riding of Yorkshire, 1830-1850', *NH* XLIX, no. 2 (September 2012), 303.

<sup>76</sup> YG, 22 Jan. 1820.

<sup>77</sup> Brett, *York Whig Club*, pp. 24, 26.

<sup>78</sup> *History of Parliament III*, pp. 290-1.

<sup>79</sup> *Crosby's Parliamentary Record: Containing a Brief Historical Origin of the British Senate; An Authentic Result of the Contested Elections in Britain and Ireland* (York, 1842): pp. 152-3 list election results for the city extending back to 1713, but omit all contests between the 1820 and 1830 general elections.