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The History of Parliament is a major academic project to create a scholarly reference work describing the members, constituencies and activities of the Parliament of England and the United Kingdom. The volumes either published or in preparation cover the House of Commons from 1386 to 1868 and the House of Lords from 1660 to 1832. They are widely regarded as an unparalleled source for British political, social and local history.

The volumes consist of detailed studies of elections and electoral politics in each constituency, and of closely researched accounts of the lives of everyone who was elected to Parliament in the period, together with surveys drawing out the themes and discoveries of the research and adding information on the operation of Parliament as an institution.

The History has published 21,420 biographies and 2,831 constituency surveys in ten sets of volumes (41 volumes in all). They deal with 1386-1421, 1509-1558, 1558-1603, 1604-29, 1660-1690, 1690-1715, 1715-1754, 1754-1790, 1790-1820 and 1820-32. All of these volumes save those most recently published (1604-29) are now available on www.historyofparliamentonline.org. The History’s staff of professional historians is currently researching the House of Commons in the periods 1422-1504, 1640-1660, and 1832-1868, and the House of Lords in the periods 1603-60 and 1660-1832. The three Commons projects currently in progress will contain a further 7,251 biographies of members of the House of Commons and 861 constituency surveys. With what is now published and in progress, the History covers 414 years of the history of the House of Commons. In addition, the House of Lords projects are currently working on 693 biographies covering 1660-1715, and the 458 covering 1603-1660.

Since 1995, the History has been funded principally by the two Houses of Parliament. It is based close to its original host, the Institute of Historical Research, University of London. It was originally founded before the Second World War, the brainchild of Josiah Wedgwood MP, a Labour parliamentarian and minister, and revived after the war when a number of the greatest British historians of the day, including Sir Lewis Namier, Sir Frank Stenton and Sir John Neale, were involved in its re-establishment. The project is governed by its Trustees, who are mainly Members and Officers of both Houses of Parliament. The quality of the project’s research and writing is monitored by an Editorial Board of historians. For further details see the History’s website at www.histparl.ac.uk.
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THE HISTORY OF PARLIAMENT REVIEW

During much of 2011, the Editorial Board of the History conducted a review of its operations, the results of which were presented, and agreed by, the Trustees, in autumn 2011.

The last review of the History’s activity was conducted in 2002, which formed the basis for the History’s current planning document (The History of Parliament Plan) and assumptions concerning publication dates. Further discussions were held in 2005-7 concerning the projects to be undertaken following the completion of the Commons, 1604-29 and 1820-32. The new review was held in the context of the launch of our website and the completion of two major projects, but also developments in research and publication more generally, especially the increasing availability and use of online resources, the financial settlement made in December 2010 covering 2011-12 and the three subsequent years, which meant a 10% reduction in the History’s Grant-in-Aid on top of level funding for the previous two years.

The Review was conducted through discussions with staff, editors, editorial board, trustees and partners, and a very valuable online survey of our principal, mostly academic, users. We received 189 responses to the survey, most of them from the academic community. We asked how respondents would describe the value of the History of Parliament to their own research. Out of 179 who answered the question, 96 (53.6%) described it as ‘an essential resource’, and 70 (39.1%) described it as ‘a useful addition to the range of resources’ they used. Many commented on the high value of the biographies and constituency histories.

In the Review, the Trustees and Editorial Board reiterated their commitment to this central task: painstaking research into the identity, connections and activities of past
Members of both Houses of Parliament, politics and elections in each constituency, and the nature of Parliament as an institution. As they remarked, ‘This extraordinary body of research is one of the most comprehensive resources for the history of a national legislature, its personnel, and politics anywhere in the world. Maintaining progress on this work, and filling in the chronological gaps are the History of Parliament’s essential priorities… We strongly believe that the History should continue to aim at the highest level of excellence in its research, compatible with continued and timely progress on writing and publication of that research.’

They also emphasised, though, that the History must pay more attention to the impact of its research. Although the History is not formally required to do so in the same way as recipients of Research Council funding increasingly are, the History needs to show that its research has made a significant and broad impact. It ought equally to ensure that it receives proper recognition for the impact that its work can have and has had already.

Key issues to emerge from the Review were the need to broaden the appeal and the work of the History, and the ambition to do this through taking the History online, through an increased engagement with academic partners and more effort at promoting its work among new audiences, and especially by moving the History closer to the present day, by working within the twentieth century through oral history and other projects. The Review will set the History’s agenda over the next decade: the beginnings of some of our work to act on that agenda can be seen within the work of the current year.

A summary of the main points of the review can be read on the History’s website.

THE HISTORY OF PARLIAMENT ONLINE

Since July all of the published work of the History of Parliament, with the exception of the most recently published 1604-29 section, has been made available online, at our website www.historyofparliamentonline.org. Around 1000 visits a day are being made to the site, which has attracted very good responses and many new
users.

The site is now being maintained by the Publications Department at the Institute of Historical Research (IHR). Work continues on the site to clean up the data, to match more images to our articles, particularly portraits of MPs. Technical work is also under way to carry out further refinements to the website.

REVIEWS

A number of reviews of our recent publications have now appeared. Reviews of 1820-32 have referred to its monumental proportions, while they have also recognised the need for the History’s work after 1832 to be less comprehensive in order to avoid being swamped by the amount of information available. Frank O’Gorman in *Parliaments, Estates and Representation* refers to its ‘monumental achievement’, and suggests that in many respects the picture provided by the volumes ‘excitingly deepens, the thrust of existing interpretations of the early nineteenth century British political system’, though he calls for ‘sharper thematic utilization’. Robert Saunders in the *English Historical Review* similarly refers to a ‘monumental work that will be an essential reference for the political history of its times’, while he has also referred to the change that will be necessary (and indeed is underway) in the successor project, covering 1832-68, to integrate with the increasing amount of digital publications, and has pointed to areas to which more attention could be given. Peter Thomas in *Welsh History Review* makes the same observation: that the traditional format for the History cannot cope with the information explosion that occurs in the early nineteenth century, and recognises that the decision has already been taken to produce rather more compressed accounts for the later period. Yet he too remarks on the ‘outstanding work of consistently high standard, a repository of learning that will be quarried for decades’.

A few reviews of 1604-29 have now appeared. Allen Boyer, in *The Seventeenth Century* wrote that ‘This magisterial study … is one of those rare works in which historians who came of age during the reign of Elizabeth II can hold up a masterpiece to match the scholarship of the great Victorians. The physical heft of these six volumes reflects an uncommon depth and breadth of research: a sustained intellectual effort measured in thousands of pages… innumerable shrewd, well-grounded judgments’. Christopher Thompson in the IHR’s online *Reviews in History*, argued with some of the judgments made in the Introductory Survey but acknowledged that the work had ‘revealed far more than was previously know about the careers of its members and the overall composition of the House, about its procedures and relations with the king and the House of Lords. A flood of light has been thrown on early Stuart Parliamentary elections in the counties and boroughs and on the attitudes of the electorate’. A review by Michael Schaich also appeared in the German journal *Historische Zeitschrift*.

Reviews of *Honour, Interest and Power*, Mark Kishlansky, in *History Today* referred to the book as ‘a welcome foray into attracting a general audience’; Grant Tapsell in *History* called it ‘a resounding
success: wide-ranging, deceptively deeply researched and often very droll’, and wrote that ‘this wholly admirable book makes readily accessible a wealth of detail for specialists, a helpful range of digestible topics for students and an intelligent guide for all those interested in a powerful institution during a period when it may have been at the peak of its political significance’. Grayson Ditchfield, in Parliamentary History, suggests that the volume ‘could be seen as a trailer, or taster, for its successor, and in a sense it is. But it is a much more substantial achievement than such a verdict might imply. It is a substantial and high-quality production in its own right; deeply researched, fully up to date, and beautifully illustrated history’. Richard Gaunt in the London Journal remarked on the ‘accessible, readable style’ of the volume and the sumptuous range of illustrations (including contemporary portraits and manuscripts) that adorn the text’.

RESEARCH

In terms of the (admittedly crude) measure of the number of words written, the collective output of the History of Parliament over the year probably exceeded that of any previous year. Staff at the history, together with a small number of externally commissioned authors, produced more than 1.8 million words, in 508 articles. This does not include the articles revised by the House of Lords 1660-1832 section, nor does it count the work done on the Proceedings of the Parliament of 1624 by the early seventeenth century House of Lords section, nor the Oral History project on which we have recently embarked. A selection of the articles completed by each project is described below; a list of new articles completed is given at the end of this Review.

The House of Commons, 1422-1461

The Medieval section completed 137 articles during the year comprising 173,645 words. Among them were notices of the following Members:

John Jurdeley was a courtier who played an important part in Henry VI’s foundation of Eton College, of which he was himself a benefactor. Thomas Vaughan (exec.1483), was a Welshman who became master of the ordnance to Henry VI and sat for Marlborough in 1455, before deserting Lancaster for York; treasurer of the chamber to Edward IV and chamberlain to the prince of Wales when returned for Cornwall in 1472 and 1478 he was later executed by Richard of Gloucester. Thomas Hardegrave was the royal officer of the otter-hunt for over 40 years until removed by Henry VII. Nicholas Wotton II (d.1454), a Wiltshire lawyer who sat for Marlborough in 1422, also attended five other Parliaments as proxy for the abbot of Malmesbury. Philip Baynard I (b.c.1398) was an important Wiltshire esquire connected with the Hungerford family, who served as sheriff of Wiltshire during the troubled year of 1450, which saw the murder of the bishop of Salisbury in the county; while Sheriff he returned himself to Parliament as MP for Calne; his son, Robert Baynard (d.1501 was a prolific Wiltshire lawyer who is commemorated by a splendid memorial brass in Lackham church, which depicts his numerous children. Nicholas Jones was a gentleman from Tetbury, Gloucestershire who was returned to the 1453 Parliament while he and others were prisoners at Gloucester; he fought for the Talbots at Nibley Green in 1470, was charged with being
an accessory to murder following that battle but was afterwards pardoned. Sir William Herbert (c.1423-1469) was a Welshman and a pivotal figure in the mid 15th century, who became one of the richest men in England after Edward IV’s accession and much celebrated by Welsh bards. Sir Thomas Mallory (c.1416-1471), the famed author of the Morte d’Arthur and a Warwickshire MP in 1445, suffered a lengthy period of imprisonment for reasons that remain puzzling. Thomas Stanley II (1406-59): represented Lancashire in ten Parliaments; one of the most important men to sit in the Commons in the 15th century he was successively lieutenant of Ireland, and controller and chamberlain of the royal household. Sir James Pickering (1413-60), great-grandson of a Speaker, sat for Yorkshire in three Parliaments. An association with the Nevilles led to his support for York at the first battle of St. Albans, his attainder in 1459 and his death with York at Wakefield.

Constituencies completed included the following: Westbury, a small borough in the west of Wiltshire was enfranchised in Feb. 1449, probably on the initiative of the sheriff of Wiltshire, the courtier John Norris. On the death of Sir John Chideock in 1450 the patronage of the borough was split between his daughters, the wives of two other courtiers, William Stafford and William Stourton. It is thus not surprising that the borough throughout the period under review normally returned court placemen. Few counties were more clearly divided between York and Lancaster than Herefordshire, represented by a distinguished and active group of MPs. Wootton Bassett, a then insignificant Wiltshire backwater nominally under the overlordship of Richard, duke of York was enfranchised in 1447, undoubtedly as a source of easy seats for the administration’s nominees.

The House of Lords, 1603-1660

Over the year, the Section has been working on the 1624 Parliamentary proceedings project as well as on biographies. Nevertheless, the four members of the section produced 43 biographies totalling almost 200,000 words. They included the following biographies:

Henry Rich, 1st Lord Kensington and 1st earl of Holland (1590-1649) was the francophile captain of the king’s guard and a client of the Duke of Buckingham, who sat 3 times in the Lords during the 1620s. Francis Bacon, 1st Viscount St. Alban (1561-1626), was the famous lord chancellor, whose attempt to manage Parliament for the king in 1621 ended with his own impeachment. John Thornborough, bishop of Worcester (1551/2-1641) a controversial bishop, aroused the ire of the Commons in 1604 by publishing a tract in favour of the Union with Scotland. Lancelot Andrewes, bishop of Winchester (1555-1626) the celebrated preacher, was a favourite with James I, one of the most formidable Anglican theologians of his day, and an early anti-Calvinist. William Bourchier, 3rd earl of Bath (c.1557-1623) a north Devon peer with an aversion to sitting in Parliament, nevertheless found that he had to enlist the support of his fellow peers in 1606 to prevent the passage of a bill hostile to his interests. William Cotton, bishop of Exeter (c.1550-1621) was an outrageous nepotist who failed to secure promotion to a wealthier bishopric. William Paulet,
4th marquess of Winchester (by 1568-1629) was a Catholic peer who generally avoided sitting in Parliament, attending only the opening ceremonies. The entry on Charles Stuart, duke of Cornwall (1600-49) charts in detail the early life of Charles before he became king in 1625, paying particular attention to his years as Prince of Wales, when he was transformed from a shy, biddable youth into the leader of a parliamentary coup d'état against his father in 1624. Henry West, 4th Lord De La Warr (1603-1628), a short lived Hampshire peer, pursued a military career, serving on the Cadiz expedition in 1625; admitted to the Lords while technically under-age, he sat four times in the Lords. Thomas West, 3rd Lord De La Warr (1577-1618) became governor of Virginia, saved the colony from destruction and introduced Pocahontas to the Jacobean Court. John Savile, 1st Lord Savile (1556/7-1630) was a hardline member of the Privy Council ennobled towards the end of his life, who sat only once in the Lords, on the final day of the 1629 session. George Tuchet, 11th Lord Audley (1553-1617) was one of England's poorest peers, who nevertheless became deeply involved in the Plantation of Ulster. Thomas Coventry, 1st Lord Coventry (1578-1640) was lord keeper under Charles I, a man of moderate political instincts whose aversion to Buckingham and the Forced Loan, and support for Parliaments and the Puritan iconoclast Henry Sherfield, meant that his political position was often precarious. William Feilding, 1st Viscount Feilding and 1st earl of Denbigh (by 1587-1643) was the first peer ever to tour India and Persia; the hapless commander of a failed naval expedition to La Rochelle in 1626, he owed his ennoblement to the fact he was brother-in-law to the royal favourite, George Villiers, 1st duke of Buckingham.

The House of Commons, 1640-1660
This section is approaching the completion of all of its first drafts. Its five staff produced 69 articles over the year, comprising 491,725 words. Among them were the following Members and constituencies.

Walter Yonge I, a diarist and Member for the newly-restored constituency of Honiton was a Presbyterian and an active member of the Devon county committee between 1646 and 1648 whose parliamentary career ended with his exclusion from the House at Pride's Purge in Dec. 1648. The Scot Sir Archibald Johnston of Wariston was a Member of Cromwell’s ‘Other House’ in 1657-9: a prominent covenanter during the 1640s and bitter opponent of the English invaders in the early 1650s, he was persuaded, against his better judgement, to work with the Cromwellian regime from 1657 onwards. In May 1659 he joined the council of state, becoming president in June, and sided with the officers in October, making himself a figure of hatred in Scotland and a target for royalist retribution after 1660. He was executed in 1663. His private, and brutally honest, diaries, allow his career to be analysed in some detail. Another Member of the ‘Other House’, Thomas Belasyse, 2nd Visc. Fauconberg came from a strongly royalist family, but nevertheless married Cromwell’s daughter in November 1657, and was appointed to the new upper chamber a month
later. He became something of a favourite for Oliver, and a key political supporter for Richard, attracting the animosity of the army. The regicide Edmund Ludlowe was politically significant throughout the period, but had a relatively short career actually at Westminster. Ludlowe’s huge Memoir ostensibly relates to the period after 1660, but contains much retrospective comment clues to attitudes and actions in the chamber. Another regicide, Miles Corbett, was a very active MP for Great Yarmouth in the Short and Long Parliaments, who frequently served as a committee chairman, most notably as one of the chairmen of the Committee for Examinations. He was executed in 1662. Roger Hill II, a successful barrister, kept a parliamentary diary in 1642, and wrote letters to his wife, which often give interesting insights into what was happening in Parliament. A very active MP and skilled parliamentary draughtsman, for a brief period after the Rump was restored, he became a rare example of someone serving as an MP and a judge simultaneously. Sir William Waller was for much of the civil war the highest ranking MP in the parliamentarian armies, and as a result, he spent long periods during his earliest years away from Westminster, but was a major figure in the House when he returned. His dispute with the earl of Essex was partly fought in and through Parliament. By 1647 he was one of the leading Presbyterian MPs, playing a key role in Parliament’s attempts to persuade the army to disband. Robert Reynolds was a Middle Temple lawyer extremely active over a long period as MP, he was regarded by the Presbyterians as an ally until 1647, but after a period of absence from the House returned returned to the Rump in 1649 with the intention ‘to do some good’; in the 1659 Parliament he advocated parliamentary rule with limited chief magistrate. Sir John Clotworthy, an Antrim landowner and opponent of Strafford, was an ally of John Pym 1640-3, and a leading influence over Irish affairs. One of the 11 members impeached in 1647, and imprisoned after Pride’s Purge, he re-emerged as a supporter of Cromwell and the defender of the Irish Presbyterians. Edward Hopkins, originally from Shropshire, was prominent in the founding of Connecticut: attracted back to England by the godly potentialities of the Rump Parliament, he served as an admiralty commissioner and navy commissioner. Sir Henry Vane I, Chairman of the admiralty committee and the committee for revenue was a key figure at Westminster throughout the 1640s. The biography shows how enduring and important a figure Vane was, despite the failure of most historians properly to separate him from his son or to recognise his importance. Edward Hyde, a Middle Temple Lawyer who became one of the leading moderate royalists in 1640-2, whose History of the Rebellion was the most influential account of the Civil War.

The section has also completed more of its articles on the powerful executive committees which handled business on behalf of the Long Parliament. The Committee of Examinations investigated rumours and plots against Parliament, remanded individuals to prison and released them on bail, particularly in London. In the later phase of its life it examined authors and printers of material objectionable to Parliament, including the Leveller leader John Lilburne. The Committee of Safety
was Parliament’s main executive standing committee in 1642-3. The article traces the growth and membership of the committee from its origins in the crisis of 1641-2 to its eventual eclipse by the Committee of Both Kingdoms, Parliament’s main executive standing committee between 1644 and 1648, and a product of the alliance between the Covenanting Scots and the English parliamentarian Junto.

The House of Commons, 1832-68

The five staff of the section, plus a small number of external contributors, completed 224 articles over the year, containing 491,725 words in total. Among the articles completed were the following.

The ‘opulent’ Staffordshire pottery manufacturer William Taylor Copeland (1797-1868), dismissed by Benjamin Disraeli as ‘a thick-headed Alderman’, represented Stoke-on-Trent as a moderate Conservative MP for three decades, an effective promoter of local interests. Francis Finch (1793-1874) was ‘an ill-conditioned radical’, who sat briefly for Walsall before fleeing to the United States in 1839 to avoid creditors after the collapse of his bank. His wife, who was left penniless, became hysterical after receiving a letter from him containing only a will and a power of attorney, which she took as evidence that he had committed suicide, prompting the election manager Joseph Parkes to describe Finch as a ‘vain man … utterly without principle or feeling’. Edmund Peel (1791-1850): Brother of the party leader Sir Robert Peel, Edmund was a Conservative who briefly sat for Newcastle-under-Lyme on two occasions. Although he was generally a party loyalist, his early support for altering the corn laws foreshadowed his brother’s famous conversion to free trade in 1846. ‘Miserably afflicted with the gout’, he was forced into early retirement on account of the illness, prompting pundits to quip that he did not have ‘a sound leg to stand up on’. Philip Henry Howard (1801-1883) was the second English-born Catholic to sit in the post-emancipation Commons. A Liberal MP for Carlisle for over two decades, he remained an outspoken advocate of the rights of Catholics. Wilfrid Lawson (1829-1906) was a leading temperance campaigner and the first parliamentary spokesman for the United Kingdom Alliance. A ‘most unusual combination of humanitarian and humorist’, he dedicated the majority of his speeches in this period to the temperance issue, but had little success with his ‘Permissive bill’ which proposed that drink-shops should be suppressed in any neighbourhood where a two-thirds majority of the inhabitants voted against their continuance. Edmund Potter (1802-1883), grandfather of Beatrix, was an internationally renowned calico printer and an ‘ardent supporter’ of the Liberal cause whose speeches mainly addressed commercial matters, but his avid interest in artistic education was reflected in assiduous select committee service. Fully committed to laissez-faire, he was an outspoken critic of trade unions. Lord Adolphus Frederick Charles William Vane (afterwards Vane-Tempest) (1825-1864), described by a contemporary as ‘a dissipated and unprincipled young nobleman’ served with distinction in the Crimea, but his experience at the front seriously affected his health, and thereafter he suffered repeated bouts of mental instability. Robert Stephenson (1803-1859) following in the footsteps of his father George,
was one of the most prominent engineers of the 19th century, particularly in railway construction and bridge-building. His friendship with the railway entrepreneur George Hudson helped to secure his return as Conservative MP for Whitby in 1847, where he served until his death. An extremely lax attender in the division lobbies, he was more active in the committee-rooms, where he sat on inquiries into a variety of technical questions, ranging from London’s water supply and sewage disposal to the ventilation of the House of Commons. *Thomas Read Kemp* (1782-1844) was the charismatic developer of the Nash-inspired ‘Kemptown’ at Brighton and a noted philanthropist. His unceasing taste for fashion, speculation and altruism never quite matched his purse. Various schemes to clear his debts, including a disastrous auction of all his regency houses in Brighton, seem to have benefitted his agents far more than himself. *Thomas Twysden Hodges* (1809-1865), the ne’er-do-well son of the long-serving Liberal Member for West Kent Thomas Law Hodges, was an inconspicuous Liberal MP for Rochester, who treated life as a practical joke and ran up enormous debts. Following his defeat in 1852 he fled to Plymouth, where he apparently threw the bailiffs into the sea who were attempting to prevent his absconding. He travelled to Australia at the height of the gold rush, and for a time made money as the landlord of the *Bull’s Head* in Melbourne. *The Hon. Francis John Robert Villiers* (1819-62) an inactive Tory MP for Rochester with a taste for the turf, Villiers quit the Commons after only three years, having created a society scandal by forging bills of exchange in association with ‘a whore, bawd and usurer’ called Mrs Edmonds. The affair threatened to implicate others but the offending bills were quietly bought up by Lady Jersey and the matter closed. *William Parsons, Lord Oxmantown* (1800-1867), the eldest son of Lord Rosse, Oxmantown, made a ‘personal odyssey from reformism to conservatism’ and divided steadily against measures of reform. He retired at the 1835 general election in order to concentrate on scientific research, principally the construction of his innovative telescope at Birr Castle. *Edward William Pakenham* (1819-1854) joined the Grenadier Guards aged 18, accompanied his regiment to the Crimea and was killed at Inkerman in November 1854, making him one of a handful of MPs to die on military service. *William Henry Maule* (1788-1858), a brilliant mathematician at Cambridge, became a successful commercial lawyer and counsel to the Bank of England in 1835. Maule struggled to make an impact in the Commons before he was elevated to the bench in 1839. He subsequently enjoyed a wide reputation as an outstanding if somewhat eccentric judge. *Michael Arthur Bass* (1837-1909), heir to ‘England’s premier brewery’, sat for over 20 years, but was better known as one of Britain’s most successful and wealthy businessmen. After his ennoblement as Baron Burton he became a Liberal Unionist and led the successful campaign of the drink trade against temperance legislation. *Edward Harbottle Grimston* (1812-1881) was a Fellow of All Souls, Oxford and a notable cricketer. Described as ‘a regular psalm-singing, snuffling saint’, he resigned his seat in 1841, took holy orders and spent the next 40 years as rector of a rural parish in Essex. *Richard Young* (1809-1871), a sluice-keeper
from a modest background in the Fens, became the principal ship-owner in Wisbech and a leading figure in its civic life. In 1865 he was elected as a Liberal for Cambridgeshire, against the wishes of the Whig gentry. John Stewart (1789-1860), the illegitimate son and heir of a wealthy sugar plantation and slave owner in Demerara, was probably of mixed race and, if so, would have been the very first MP from an ethnic minority background. Thomas Assheton Smith (1776-1858) the Welsh slate magnate, sat for Caernarvonshire as a firm supporter of the Tories from 1832-37. His many distractions, which included construction of the steam yacht ‘Menai’, a significant influence on the Post Office’s attitude to steam packets, meant that he was a fairly lax attender, and tales about the legendary ‘Tom Smith’ leaving the hunting field regularly to post to Westminster for a division and returning to hunt next morning were clearly exaggerated. Nicholas Kendall (1800-1878) a local party organizer who became an MP, enjoyed neither the wealth nor landed status usually associated with Conservative county members. At Westminster he became ‘an indefatigable worker in committees - one of those quiet energetic businessmen, by whom the real work of the nation is done, while the ornamental representatives are letting off oratorical fireworks’. Philip Wykeham Martin (1829-78), heir to the medieval moated estate of Leeds Castle in Kent, was an active backbencher and regular speaker, whose legislative achievements included the Spirits Act 1862 and the Innkeepers Liability Act 1863, but is probably better remembered for dropping dead in the Commons library in 1878, the first time that a Member had died on the parliamentary estate since the assassination of Spencer Perceval. Leicester Viney Samwell Vernon (1798-1860), a distinguished army sapper, was elected for Chatham in 1853 as a ‘stop-gap’. Ridiculed by Punch for his thespian activities, he nevertheless became an important contributor to military debates, and achieved notoriety for adopting a ‘dramatic, humorous manner and style’ of speaking. His very ‘promising’ career was cut short by a ‘peculiarly distressing’ fatal accident with his coach and horses in St. James’s Street.

Westmorland, one of the smallest English counties, was dominated by the earl of Lonsdale, head of the Lowther family, whose 39,299 acres in the county was 8 per cent of the county’s total acreage. The Conservatives, or ‘Yellows’, enjoyed political hegemony over the Liberals or ‘Blues’ in this period, and according to the Blue-supporting Carlisle Journal, opposition to the Lowther interest was ‘useless’. The most consistent voice of opposition was provided by the Liberal Kendal Mercury, while the Westmorland Gazette, inspired by the poet William Wordsworth and financed by the earl of Lonsdale, further fostered partisan rivalries. One of the most fertile and productive agricultural regions in Britain, West Norfolk had been created as a parliamentary constituency in 1832. Its early reputation as a Whig ‘pocket borough’ under the sway of the former MP Thomas William Coke of Holkham was dramatically overturned in 1837, when the Conservatives captured both seats. Stafford, probably the most corrupt borough in the reformed political system, had only narrowly escaped
disenfranchisement in the 1830s. Elections were frequently contested by several candidates, many of them mavericks, adventurers and lawyers on the make. As they all spent money liberally and had poor local connections, detailed policy statements were used to differentiate themselves to the shoemakers, who dominated the electorate. Tamworth, traditionally shared between the Tory Peels and Whig Townshends, was controlled by the Conservatives after the mid-1830s, even though Sir Robert Peel, the local patron and Conservative leader, refused to use his influence to return a second candidate. Peel was so sensitive to allegations of interference that he challenged a defeated Whig candidate to a duel after one election. Peel’s indifference allowed the Townshends to recapture a seat in 1847, but his wisdom in remaining aloof was underlined by the by-election of 1863, when the clumsy campaign of his Palmerstonian son and successor, on behalf of his preferred candidate, was met with a humiliating rebuff.

The section also held a valuable colloquium in the Jubilee Room in Westminster Hall in May 2011, in which it benefited from feedback on its work so far from a wide range of scholars in nineteenth century British politics, and laid out its further plans for the project.

**The House of Lords, 1660-1715**

This section’s output over the year amounted to 25 biographical articles and chapters for the institutional history comprising 527,890 words altogether, as well as revisions of many of our earlier articles. The new articles included the ones listed below.

*Thomas Osborne, earl of Danby (later duke of Leeds)* was premier minister under both Charles II and William III. Danby was unashamed in his efforts to advance his own and his family’s interests. One of the signatories of the invitation to William of Orange he was always a controversial figure and faced two attempted impeachments. *Robert Danvers alias Villiers (formerly Wright and Howard)* (1624-74), 2nd Viscount Purbeck was regarded as a member of the House in 1660 (when it hoped to try him for treason). Then, in a decision that was only overturned by statute in the 20th century, the House decided that he was unable to renounce his peerage. It subsequently decided, however, that his legitimacy under the common law was insufficient to overcome doubts about his biological paternity and refused to recognise his descendants as members. *Sidney Godolphin, earl of Godolphin*, the archetypal civil servant, fundamental to the success of Marlborough’s military campaigns, first served in the treasury under Charles II, and ended up as lord treasurer for the first eight years of Anne’s reign. *Hans Willem Bentinck, earl of Portland*, was the principal ‘favourite’ of William of Orange, whom he served for 35 years until his unexpected retirement in 1699. As William III’s groom of the stole, he remained the principal conduit for correspondence and access to the king and wielded a great deal of influence. With Sunderland he
engineered the 'turn to the Whigs' of 1693-4 but faced great opposition himself in Parliament for his wealth, influence and the large grants of land given to him by the king. Robert Harley, earl of Oxford & Earl Mortimer (1661-1724), was one of the most important figures at the Augustan court. During his career he progressed from being a Country Whig to the effective head of the Tories. His manipulation of events and emergence at the head of a new ministry in 1710 has acquired mythic status but his four years in power at the end of Queen Anne's reign proved a struggle, which he eventually lost a few days before her death. Lawrence Hyde, earl of Rochester (1642-1711), skilfully made the most of his relations at court to emerge as lord treasurer under his brother-in-law, James II, but damaged his reputation as a stalwart of the Church of England by participating as a member of the controversial ecclesiastical commission. Hostile to James's religious programme, he took a prominent part in the early days of the Convention of 1689 but his efforts to establish a regency rapidly lost momentum. Out of office, he continued to be a prominent force as a manager of committees and then resumed office towards the end of his life in Harley's new ministry. John Churchill, duke of Marlborough, was the most illustrious figure of the age, soldier, courtier, diplomat and politician. His role in the Lords, and indeed in domestic politics, has been overshadowed by his exploits in the war against Louis XIV. This article rehabilitates his political role. Theophilus Hastings, 9th earl of Huntingdon (1696-1746) was raised in the pious household of his half-sister Lady Elizabeth Hastings. He first sat in the House in 1723, but did not have an active parliamentary life, and contemporaries regretted what they saw as his withdrawal of his talents from public life. His own fame was later eclipsed by that of his widow Selina, the foundress of the 'Lady Huntingdon's Connexion' of evangelical ministers. Henry Compton, bishop of London (1632-1713), Tory aristocrat and royalist, was the only bishop to sign the invitation to William of Orange. Active in arms for the 1688 revolution he was a vigorous diocesan and parliamentarian. Anthony Ashley (Cooper), 3rd earl of Shaftesbury (1671-1713), was a 'Country Whig' philosopher and patron of the publisher John Toland. His ability to make an impact in Parliament was severely limited by his atrocious health. His Characteristics of Men, Manners, Opinions, Times has become a central text for the study of early enlightenment attitudes.

An Oral History of parliamentarians

During the year, the History of Parliament embarked, with the financial support of Dods, the publishers of the House Magazine and Dods Parliamentary Companion, and with the help of the British Library, on a project to create a sound archive of people involved in politics at national and constituency level, and will provide a unique record of post-2nd World War British political history. It is inspired by the 1930s project of the History of Parliament’s founder, Colonel Josiah Wedgwood, which used a questionnaire to capture from MPs who sat in Parliament from 1885 to 1918 impressions of
their political careers. These formed the basis for biographical sketches of each Member. The project will go well beyond Wedgwood’s, however. Initially focussing on parliamentarians, it is intended to interview former Members of the House of Commons and senior Members of the House of Lords. A series of questions, based loosely on Wedgwood’s questionnaire, forms the basis for the interviews. The questionnaire has been drawn up in collaboration with academic partners to provide insights into the development of political careers in the second half of the twentieth century, and to illuminate the changing patterns of parliamentary politics, in particular the professionalization of politics; the history of the constituency surgery and the development of constituency pressures; the changes in parliamentary lobbying; the relationship with constituency parties, and with councillors and other local activists; the increase in parliamentary activity, particularly select committees, all-party groups and other activities at Westminster; the history of election campaigns.

The project will be related to, but distinct from, the existing project based at the Parliamentary Archives which focuses on the staff of the Palace of Westminster, and we hope that there will be co-ordination and co-operation between the two projects. However, the History of Parliament project will be focused on Members, rather than parliamentary staff. While it will draw out unique information possessed by Members about their activities within Parliament and their impressions of it, it will also make a particular point of collecting information about Members’ constituency links and other extra-parliamentary activities: campaigns and contacts with lobby groups; local links to newspapers and local campaigns and so on.

The initial project will also prepare the ground for a bid to the Heritage Lottery Fund. This will be for an oral history project covering the history of the relationship between politics at Westminster and politics and political organisation in constituencies; the relationship between people and Parliament and how it has changed over the last fifty to sixty years. During the course of the initial project we will explore with our interviewees and other interested parties the appropriate questions to ask, and establish a set of constituencies on which we would focus for the larger project (it is unlikely to be feasible to cover the whole country).

Work on the project began in November 2011, with a seminar for our first interviewers. With the help of Charlene Hewston, from Dods, and Priscila Pivatto, who has been working on a voluntary basis, it has now grown into a serious project, with 25 interviews so far undertaken, and many others in the pipeline.

**Parliamentary Proceedings of 1624**

In addition to these projects, the History has begun work on the completion of the Yale Center for Parliamentary History’s unfinished project to publish the parliamentary proceedings of the 1624 Parliament, with a grant from the Leverhulme foundation of £97,000.
In January 2012 Philip Baker took up the appointment of researcher on the project. He has been reviewing the material collected by the Yale Center, and will is now preparing the edition using the methods and principles established by the Yale Center under the immediate supervision of Andrew Thrush and the staff of the 1603-1660 House of Lords project. These staff (Ben Coates, Simon Healy and Paul Hunneyball as well as Andrew Thrush) are also working on preparing the material relating to the House of Lords during the Parliament.

The Yale project dates back to the 1620s and one of the great historians of the pre-Revolution English Parliament, Wallace Notestein.

**Academic collaborations**

The History is a partner in the **LIPARM project**, which will link the parliamentary record together for the first time by creating a unified metadata scheme for all of its key elements. LIPARM is a collaboration between King’s College London, the History of Parliament Trust, the IHR, the Centre for Data Digitisation and Analysis, Queen’s University Belfast, the UK Parliament Web and Intranet Service and the Northern Ireland Assembly, and is funded by the Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC).

People, bills, acts, items of business, debates, divisions and sessions will all be described by the scheme and will be linked together across resources which are currently spread out and isolated. For the first time, it will be possible to trace a given MP’s entire voting record or to find every speech they made. It will be possible to follow the passage of every bill or act, and every contribution to the debates that accompany it. Both the historical and the contemporary record of parliamentary proceedings will become accessible in this way for the first time.

The project has three main strands. The first will devise the metadata schema itself, which will allow the contents of the parliamentary record to be described in a controlled and systematic way. The second will be the creation of authority lists for key components of the record, including lists for people, sessions, items of legislation and division: each component will receive a unique identifier, allowing it to be linked to from any digitised resource. The third component will be a pilot union catalogue, which will offer metadata records for two important collections, demonstrating how they can be linked together using the unified scheme.

The History has hosted the main meetings for the project, and has been closely involved in a series of discussions with historians and parliamentary staff on the project and the scheme. It has also assisted with the construction of the controlled vocabularies, including the creation (with the help of the parliamentary archives) of the first complete list of Acts of Parliament.

The History also developed in collaboration with the Institute of Historical Research, the University of Exeter and the School of
Oriental and African Studies a bid for a Leverhulme Trust Programme Grant on the theme of ‘Patronage’. Our bid was shortlisted, but not eventually selected to receive an award.

The History was successful, however, in collaboration with the Institute of Historical Research, in securing two AHRC collaborative doctoral awards. These will be dedicated to research in association with the 1832-68 project.

A meeting of the network of European Parliamentary Historians (EuParl.net) was held at Bloomsbury Square in August 2011 to discuss funding for an international project on Parliaments in Europe in the twentieth century. Participants included the Montesquieu Institute (a state-funded collaboration between a number of universities in the Netherlands), the Centrum voor parlementaire geschiedenis at the University of Nijmegen and the Kommission für geschichte des parlamentarismus und der politischen partien (Commission for the History of Parliamentarism and political parties), which is funded by and works closely with the German Bundestag, the University of Jyvaskala in Finland, and the Comité d’histoire parlementaire et politique in France, which works with the Sénat.

ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

Competitions

The History continues to work both on its own and with partners in both Houses and elsewhere to encourage scholarly and public interest in the history of the UK Parliament.

One way in which we do this is to sponsor competitions for schools and undergraduates. As in previous years, we ran two competitions for schools. We received 40 entries for the competition for 11-14 year-olds, which was judged by Paul Hunneyball, I and Susan Vittery from the Education Service in Parliament. We agreed to award the prize to Camellia Richards from The Abbey School, Reading for her diary of a gardener to the 2nd Lord Fairfax, covering the period from 1628 to the execution of Charles I. Anneka Wehnes, from St Leonard’s Mayfield School in East Sussex was highly commended for a passionately royalist speech on the execution of Charles I.

11 entries were received for the sixth form competition. As on previous occasions, we asked Sean Lang and Fiona Kisby, two teachers of sixth form history, to judge the competition. We decided to award the prize to Sakshi Rathi, from the North London Collegiate School, for her well-informed and well-organised essay on the Home Rule crisis. However, we decided to give a special commendation to an essay by Adam Dyster from the Sixth Form College in Colchester for a well-researched and deeply engaged essay on the importance of the publication of parliamentary debates.

There were ten entries in the dissertation competition. The decision on the winner was a particularly difficult one, with very different views among the Editorial Board. In the end, the consensus view was that it should go to Ryan
McCourt, of Queen’s University Belfast for his thesis on ‘Ernest Blythe as Minister for Finance in the Irish Free State, 1923-32’, which provided a strong sense of the often unconstructive views of a key politician in his Cumann na nGaedheal party: as McCourt argued ‘it seems curious that historians have said so little of the man who had so much to say about everything’.

Parliament

The Editorial Board also provided input to the Advisory Committee on Works of Art on updating the list it maintains of parliamentarians and others who should be featured in Parliament’s works of art collection. The History has also been involved in the updating of the guidebook to the Palace of Westminster.

The History continues to be involved in the digitisation programmes of both Houses of Parliament, participating in the Parliamentary Digitisation Board, Dr Caroline Shenton, and its successor, the digitisation Programme Board.

The annual lecture was held on 1 November in the Attlee Suite, Portcullis House, and was given by one of the History’s Trustees, Lord Norton of Louth. His subject was ‘Resisting the Inevitable? the Parliament Act 1911’.

Media

One of the volumes of The History of Parliament 1386-1421 was featured in Dan Cruickshank’s programme ‘The Country House Revealed’ on 10 May, in which it was used to provide information on the builder of South Wraxall Manor. Philip Salmon appeared on a BBC Parliament programme on the same evening, covering the rebuilding of the House of Commons after the bombing of 1941.

CHANGES

During the year our long-serving Treasurer, Sir Alan Bailey, retired from the Trustees. The Trustees and the staff of the History are enormously grateful to him for his wisdom and experience over the years. His place has been taken by Sir Graham Hart, former permanent secretary from the Department of Health, and also a historian of seventeenth-century Cambridgeshire. Two ex-officio Trustees changed during the year. On becoming Clerk of the House of Commons, Robert Rogers was replaced as a Trustee by the Clerk Assistant, David Natzler. On the retirement of the Clerk of the Parliaments, Michael Pownall, he was replaced by the Reading Clerk in the House of Lords, Dr Rhodri Walters.
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