JOHN CAMPBELL'S "SHORT PAPERS" FOR LORD BUTE IN THE *LONDON EVENING POST*

Matthew Binney, Eastern Washington University

ABSTRACT

John Campbell's (1708-1775) biographer, Guido Abbattista, has argued that Campbell sought to publish a pamphlet, *Thoughts on Public Affairs*, in 1761. However, a review of Campbell's private correspondence in 1761 with the future prime minister, John Stuart, 3rd earl of Lord Bute (1713-1792), indicates that the historian sought not to publish a pamphlet, but newspaper articles that promote the king's new reign and his administration. Six of these articles have been found in the *London Evening Post*, and they use ideas and language from Henry St. John, 1st viscount Bolingbroke to represent George III as a Patriot King, to advance the Tory policies of Bute's future administration, and to encourage a prospective peace to the Seven Years' War (1756-1763). These six, new attributions to Campbell not only expand his extensive canon, but also portray his significant role in offering the rhetoric and depicting the ideas of George III's early reign and Bute's ascendancy to premiership.

Keywords: Scotland, England, politics, John Campbell, earl of Bute, 18th century

John Campbell (1708–1775), born in Edinburgh and educated in Windsor, was one of the most celebrated historians of the mid-eighteenth century.¹ His most popular work, *Present State of Europe* (1750), attracted attention not only from the tsarina of the Russian Empire, Catherine the Great, who presented Campbell with her

¹ James Boswell refers to Campbell as "the celebrated" multiple times in *The Life of Samuel Johnson*, ed. George Birkbeck Hill (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1887), 1:418, 2:146–7.

picture,² but also from the Whig statesman, Henry Fox, 1st Baron Holland (1705–1774), and the future prime minister and fellow Scot, John Stuart, 3rd Earl of Bute (1713–1792).³ Beginning in the late 1750s, Bute's communication with John Campbell increased as the peer ostensibly recognized how he could use the historian's skills, literary connections, and reputation to support his rise to power and political ambitions.⁴ Campbell wanted to assist his countryman not only because of Bute's title and influence in the royal family but also their shared Tory, Bolingbrokean political philosophy.⁵

In late 1760, Prince George was crowned King George III and sought to style himself as a "Patriot King," Bolingbroke's notion of a sovereign who is independent from faction or interest group and committed to his people and original constitution.⁶ The king quickly selected Bute for the Privy Council, and by January 1761, Campbell signaled his willingness and intention to assist Bute and the king by writing articles in newspapers that supported the king and his administration by promoting the idea of the Patriot King,

² *Biographia Britannica*, ed. Andrew Kippis et al. (London, 1778), 3:209–15.

³ For Campbell's correspondence with Lord Holland, see British Library, Add MS 51407; for a list of his correspondence with Lord Bute, see British Library, Add Ms 36796, and see the Bute Archive at Mount Stuart, Scotland.

⁴ J. A. Lovat-Fraser, *John Stuart Earl of Bute* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1912), 8. Bute was elevated to the powerful position of Groom of the Stole and made head of Prince George's (1738–1820) household in 1756; Lovat-Fraser, *John Stuart*, 30. By 1761 Bute noted that the "best authors" were devoted to him.

⁵ Boswell, *Life of Samuel Johnson*, 1:418, mentions that Campbell cultivated relations with other Scots, observing "the shoals of Scotchmen who flocked about him."

⁶ Lovat-Fraser, *John Stuart*, 12–14, notes how George III "proposed to act the part of the Patriot King." See also Grayson Ditchfield, *George III: An Essay in Monarchy* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2002), 138, and Max Skjonsberg, "Lord Bolingbroke's Theory of Party and Opposition," *The Historical Journal* 59 (2016): 947–973.

underscoring the connection between the monarch, people, and constitution.⁷

John Campbell's biographer, Guido Abbattista, examined Campbell's letters to Bute from January 1761 and indicated that Campbell had drafted a "pamphlet," *Thoughts on Public Affairs*, which did not appear in print, in which Campbell defines "the Voice of the People," clarifies the sovereign's role as the guardian of the constitution and defender of common interest, and finally critiques factions, indicating how they increased debts and tax burdens.⁸ This "pamphlet," according to Abbattista, appears in Campbell's letter to Bute, which Abbattista cites as "Campbell to Bute, 19th January 1761, Bute MSS 1/161/ ff. 1–3." Currently, however, this letter is listed as BU/118/1, 171, 19 January 1761 in the Bute Archive at Mount Stuart, Rothesay, Scotland.⁹ Instead of writing a pamphlet, however, Campbell states that he will "publish in short Papers such *Thoughts on Public Affairs*." He provides a summary of these prospective newspaper articles:

In the first place I shew the real use & Importance of what is called the Voice of the People and by what Limits it ought to be circumscribed. I then shew that the greatest Blessing Britain can enjoy is a King well inclined to & well acquainted with her Constitution. I proceed to prove that this is no vague or unfounded Idea but that our wisest & best Princes were really such. That such of our Princes as either had despotic Views or were unhappy had the folly to attempt governing by or were so unlucky as to fall under the Dominion of Factions. That Henry the Seventh really restored out Constitution by taking excessive Power from the Barons and by giving Independence to the Commons. That his Successors overset the Constitution again by gaining an undue Influence over the Commons. That in Modern

⁷ See Lovat-Fraser, *John Stuart*, 11, for the prince's training by Bute in Bolingbroke's philosophy.

⁸ Guido Abbattista, *Commercio, Colonie e Impero alla Vigilia della Rivoluzione Americana* (Florence: Olschki, 1990), 202.

⁹ The archival research for this article was conducted in August 2018.

Times there might possibly be a necessity of balancing of factions But that this was continued out of Policy when that necessity ceased. That the increase of our Debts & the load of our Taxes were the fruits of this Policy. That the Interest of the King & his People must be ever the same. That this Doctrine well established and steadily pursued is the only means by which the Evils can be removed. That Oeconomy will effectually do this and that in order to this blessed Effect the Administration must mean well and the People for their own sakes cordially support its Measures.¹⁰

Campbell did not seek to publish a pamphlet on “Public Affairs,” but instead sought to publish articles in newspapers that promote the king’s and Bute’s Tory politics. Some of these topics from the list above appear in short articles in the *London Evening Post*, which published five of Campbell’s “Papers” in winter and spring, and a probable sixth in the fall of 1761. Campbell published his first “short Paper” on “the Voice of the People” in the edition from Thursday 26 February to Saturday 28 February; his next from Saturday 28 February to Tuesday 3 March was on the king and constitution; his next from Thursday 5 March to Saturday 7 March demonstrates how “our wisest & best Princes were really such”; his next from Thursday 9 April to Saturday 11 April departs from his original plan, expanding upon benefits that “Individuals” enjoy “from the Conduct of . . . great Monarchs”; and his final short paper of winter/spring from Thursday 16 April to Saturday 18 April continues the previous by indicating the “Conduct” of “Princes” and “true Policy.” The sixth paper was published 27 October to 29 October, five days before the signing of the preliminaries of a peace treaty at Fontainebleau on 3 November 1761; it uses similar language from the previous papers, while promoting the prospective peace settlement for the Seven Years’ War (1756–1763).

Even though the articles are not signed by Campbell, the date of their appearance, article titles, inter-referentiality, and the substance of the letters directly match or are similar to his summary in letter

¹⁰ Correspondence from John Campbell to Lord Bute, BU/118/1, 171, Bute Archive at Mount Stuart, Rothesay, Scotland.

171 to Bute on 19 January 1761 and are similar to Campbell's moderate Tory political philosophy,¹¹ indicating a strong probability that the first five articles belong to the historian and a probability that the sixth belongs to him too.

The first article appears in the *London Evening Post* on 26–28 February, five weeks after his letter to Bute on 19 January. The 26–28 February article echoes Campbell's letter to Bute with the title, "The Voice of the Public defined," and with the content: he explains the importance and limits of "the Voice of the People."¹² In the newspaper article, Campbell distinguishes "the Voice of the People" from "Clamour": the first "is founded in Reason; it corresponds with the Truth; and is uttered with Perspicuity, and in a proper Manner," whereas the second creates "Discord" and "Confusion" as a "few artful and designing Men, by scattering plausible Propositions, and giving a Colour to them, by either feigned or exaggerated Facts, may easily excite Jealousies . . . and raise Murmurs against the wisest and best concerted Measures." The "Voice of the People" aligns with "Reason," while "Clamour" creates confusion by exaggerating facts and exciting passions. Campbell admonishes: an "Administration would be very unhappy indeed, in which these Murmurs should be mistaken for the Voice of the People."

Campbell's distinction between the "Voice of the People" and "Clamour" imitates a similar distinction in Bolingbroke's *The Idea of a Patriot King* (1749).¹³ Bolingbroke states that a Patriot King will "distinguish the voice of his people from the clamour of a faction."¹⁴ Bolingbroke's differentiation between the people and faction will become a common trope in the rhetoric of both parties, but

¹¹ See Matthew W. Binney, "John Campbell's *Present State of Europe* (1750): Toryism and balance of power," *History of European Ideas*, 44, no. 5 (2018): 543–558, DOI: 10.1080/01916599.2018.1483837.

¹² *London Evening Post*, 26–28 February 1761, *17th-18th Century Burney Collection*.

¹³ For Campbell's connections to Bolingbroke, see Abbattista, *Commercio*, Chap. 1, and see Binney, "Interest, Trade and 'Character and Circumstances'," 519–522.

¹⁴ Bolingbroke, *The Idea of a Patriot King*, in *The Works of Lord Bolingbroke* (Philadelphia: Carey and Hart, 1841), 2:404.

particularly for Tories in the early to mid-eighteenth century, as the people represent the “common interest” of all within the state,¹⁵ rather than the private interest of a favorite, group, minister, or party.¹⁶ Citizens who ignore public interest sow discord and foster corruption by pursuing private interest. Bolingbroke’s distinction between public and private interest is echoed in Campbell’s own distinction in the *London Evening Post*, when Campbell states that “the Voice of the People” involves “The People” who elect “Representatives” and “The Nobility, who by their high Birth and great Property have so great a Weigh with, and so large a Stake in the Public.” These “Representatives” and “Nobility” represent the true interest of the state.¹⁷ Instead of representing the state’s interest, faction, however, represents private interest and gain, which is contrived by what Campbell describes as, a “few artful and designing Men.” The first article not only reflects Campbell’s wording, “Voice of the People,” and topic from his letter, but also reflects the Bolingbrokean political philosophy that undergirds *The Idea of a Patriot King*: the sovereign fosters independence by focusing on public rather than private interest.

Public interest is then related to the constitution in Campbell’s next newspaper article from Saturday 28 February to Tuesday 3 March. The article’s title, “The Happiness of the Subject in having a Monarch who loves the CONSTITUTION,”¹⁸ closely follows the description in his letter to Bute: the “Blessing Britain can enjoy is a King well inclined to & well acquainted with her Constitution.” As the title indicates, Campbell stresses the monarch’s relation to the constitution, which in Bolingbroke’s political philosophy provides

¹⁵ Bolingbroke, *The Idea of a Patriot King*, 401.

¹⁶ For the negative use of “faction,” see W. Gunn, *Factions No More: Attitudes to Party in Government and Opposition in Eighteenth-Century England* (London: Frank Cass, 1972); for Tory use of “faction,” see Peter N. Miller, *Defining the Common Good: Empire, Religion and Philosophy in Eighteenth Century Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 98.

¹⁷ Campbell’s emphasis upon the “nobility” reflects Bolingbroke’s focus on “Country” ideology. See Skjonsberg, “Lord Bolingbroke’s Theory of Party and Opposition,” 958 & 973.

¹⁸ *London Evening Post*, 28 February–3 March 1761, 17th-18th Century Burney Collection.

stability and order to the state. Bolingbroke emphasizes that the “constitution will be revered by him [the Patriot King] as the law of God and of man.”¹⁹ This “constitution” should be revered because it secures the public good and provides the people with “liberty.” The “old constitution” promotes liberty rather than “betray[s]” it because the monarch upholds the “most important interests of their country,” rather than subordinates the country’s interest “to their own interest and humor, or to those of a party.”²⁰ The “interests of their country” originate, for Bolingbroke, from a nation’s “common interest” and “common spirit,”²¹ which is expressed in the “old constitution,” or, as he states in *Remarks on the History of England* (1731) in its “first principles” in the “original constitution.”²² Those who pursue this “common” public interest align themselves with the original constitution; those who pursue private interest depart from it. As such, “liberty” relates to the interest of all rather than the interest of the few.

This distinction between public and private interest, which Campbell outlined in the 26–28 February article, appears again in the 28 February–3 March article, as the historian draws upon Bolingbroke’s account of the constitution. Campbell states that the “greatest Blessing divine Providence can bestow upon this Country is, a King well acquainted with, and well inclined to our excellent Constitution.” A sovereign who is “well acquainted with” the constitution “will be more jealous for the Vigour of the Constitution, than of his own Prerogative.” The sovereign will be more “jealous” for the constitution, rather than his own interest or “Prerogative,” because, as Bolingbroke indicates, the constitution reflects the country’s “interest,” rather than private interest. Common interest, rather than private interest, points to the “good of the people,” which should be the “true end of government.”²³ Bolingbroke’s “good of the people” is echoed in Campbell’s the “Voice of the People” from

¹⁹ Bolingbroke, *The Idea of a Patriot King*, 392.

²⁰ Bolingbroke, *The Idea of a Patriot King*, 388.

²¹ Bolingbroke, *The Idea of a Patriot King*, 401.

²² Henry Bolingbroke, *Remarks on the History of England*, in *The Works of Lord Bolingbroke*, (Philadelphia, PA: Carey and Hart, 1841), 1:292–455, 302.

²³ Bolingbroke, *The Idea of a Patriot King*, 391.

the historian's previous article and is reinforced in the current article through the king's familiarity with the constitution. For Bolingbroke, the king's reverence for the constitution will promote common interest or "the Good of the People," and for Campbell the king's attachment to the constitution will produce "private Satisfaction" in his "Pursuit . . . of Public Felicity."

The monarch's relation to the "Constitution" reappears in Campbell's next article of 5–7 March as the historian offers historical examples of monarchs' policies that have aligned with the constitution in "Instances of constitutional Monarchs from the English History."²⁴ These "Instances" provide historical examples of policy, particularly in the reigns of Henry I (r. 1100–1135), Edward I (r. 1272–1307), and Edward III (r. 1327–1377), and they mirror Campbell's original plan to discuss leaders who were attentive to the constitution in his letter to Bute: "I proceed to prove that this is no vague or unfounded Idea but that our wisest & best Princes were really such." Campbell's method of describing previous kings' policies follows a model of history that was articulated by Bolingbroke: i.e., historical degeneration.²⁵ Historical degeneration relates to political theory because a state's original constitution, according to Bolingbroke, becomes corrupted over time. The original constitution derives from a nation's distinct circumstances, its "common spirit," which originates from a country's distinct geography and the "spirit and character of the people."²⁶ Over time this constitution can be corrupted as ambitious princes, ministers, favorites and/or factions create policies, as already indicated, that serve their own interest rather than the people's interest. In *Remarks on the History of England*, he states: "There must be some good in

²⁴ *London Evening Post*, 5–7 March 1761, *17th–18th Century Burney Collection*.

²⁵ For an explanation of historical degeneration, see William Fenton and Elizabeth Moore, eds., introduction to Joseph François Lafitau, *Customs of the American Indians Compared with the Customs of Primitive Times* (Toronto: Champlain Society, 1974–77), 1:xlvi–xlviii; Isaac Kramnick has identified this degeneration in *Bolingbroke and His Circle: The Politics of Nostalgia in the Age of Walpole* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1968; repr. 1992), 33.

²⁶ Bolingbroke, *The Idea of a Patriot King*, 393.

the first principles of every government But this good degenerates . . . and governments . . . tend to dissolution.”²⁷ Since the “good in the first principles” degenerates over time, threatening the stability of the state, then succeeding reigns and administrations must mend these corruptions by passing laws that re-align with the principles in the original constitution. Indeed a constitution that a “wise” people were “happy enough to establish” must be defended and maintained by a Patriot King,²⁸ and a Patriot King will defend and maintain that constitution by seeking “the re-establishment of a free constitution, when it has been shook by the iniquity of former administrations.”²⁹

Campbell observes the significance of repairing degeneration of the English constitution in “Henry the First.”³⁰ Henry I “promised to relieve [his subjects] from all their harsh Laws that had been made by his Predecessor.” Campbell implies that William II (r. 1087–1100) was not sufficiently “acquainted with the Saxon Laws and with the Import of his Peoples Wishes.” William II’s corruptions in the original Saxon constitution were recognized by Henry I, according to Campbell, and the monarch corrects them by reviving “the old and mild Mode of Government,” creating “new Laws [that] were in favour of Liberty and of his Subjects.” Henry I appears as a Patriot King, for Campbell, since he acknowledged corruptions and rectified them by re-establishing original principles and the corresponding liberty of his people. Campbell then recounts the policies of Edward I and Edward III: the first “placed the Purse effectually in the Power of the People” and the second “had recourse to his Parliament, never questioned their Power.” For Campbell, these actions indicate how both monarchs “fixed and established our

²⁷ Bolingbroke, *Remarks on the History of England*, 302.

²⁸ Bolingbroke, *The Idea of a Patriot King*, 391.

²⁹ Bolingbroke, *The Idea of a Patriot King*, 388.

³⁰ We see similar ideas about degeneration and corruption in Campbell’s previous works: for instance, in Campbell’s *Lives of the Admirals* (London, 1742) 2:227, he warns about the “Miseries flowing from the Ruin of our old Constitution”; in his *Present State of Europe* (Dublin, 1750), 464, he identifies the “Ambition of Princes, the Desire of aggrandizing certain august Families, the pernicious Inclination of pursuing private and particular views.”

Constitution” as well as “promoted its Perfection.” Their attention to the constitution “enabled them to triumph over all their Enemies” and made them “beloved and admired.” Campbell’s historical examples reinforce the connection between the sovereign and constitution, indicating how past reigns and administrations may corrupt, but future reigns and administrations may correct by passing laws that fix and establish “our Constitution.”

Campbell’s article of 9–11 April departs from the summary in his letter by expanding upon these corrections, indicating how they benefit a people: “The Benefits resulting to Individuals from the Conduct of these great MONARCHS.”³¹ Campbell stresses that the previous article from 5–7 March connects directly to his current one of 9–11 April: “[See our Paper of Saturday the 7th of the last Month].” From the former article, the “Princes who fixed and established our Constitution,” then advance, in the latter article, the “Ease, Safety, and Welfare of their Subjects.” Ease, safety, and welfare increase in the “three Reigns” of Henry I, Edward I, and Edward III, as Campbell again demonstrates by using historical examples that exhibit the “Prudence and Goodness of these Princes.” The princes’ prudence repaired corruptions in the original constitution, which was caused, for instance, by the “Norman Conquest”: “the Consequences of it had shaken at least, if not subverted the very Foundation of the State.” The three kings corrected this dangerous degeneration and stabilized the state by ensuring that lands were “settled and improved,” which produced “Profits.” Henry I restored “the Saxon Mode of maintaining public Tranquillity”; Edward I “mitigated Punishments”; and Edward III enacted “many new Writs” that offered “Relief” for his subjects. Campbell insists that these monarchs’ policies assisted “Private Persons of every Degree” and provided their subjects with ease and safety, which ultimately—as he suggests will be explained in his next paper—allows citizens to exert their “Industry, for the improving their own Concerns and in making Provision for their Posterity.”

“Industry” occupies Campbell’s thoughts in his newspaper article of 16–18 April, in which he alludes to his previous article of

³¹ *London Evening Post*, 9–11 April 1761, *17th-18th Century Burney Collection*.

9–11 April: “[See our Paper of Saturday last.].” The title of his current article refers to the same monarchs, Henry I, Edward I, and Edward III: “The political Conduct of these Princes particularly considered.”³² This time Campbell provides historical examples of these monarchs’ policies, indicating how they encourage “Industry” as well as “Trade and Commerce,” while limiting “exorbitant Power.” Regarding industry and commerce, Henry I, for example, “removed all Impediments to Navigation in the great Rivers throughout the Kingdom” and “enacted that the same Weights, Measures, and Money, should be used throughout his Dominions”; Edward I “put a Stop to Theft and Robbery” and “made the Statute of Acton Burnel [Burnell] . . . for the Ease of Merchants”; Edward III “put the price of Provision and of Labour, both under the Care of the Magistrate, and thereby made them both cheap, preventing Monopolies” and “fixed Staples as he judged most proper for the Convenience of Commerce.” Apart from industry and commerce, Campbell underscores how they limited excessive power. For instance, Henry I “punished the Instruments of his Predecessor’s Exactions, and restrained the Power of his Clergy and Barons”; Edward I “made the Statute of Mortmain, to prevent excessive Donations to the Church”; and Edward III “passed a Law for the Redress of Ecclesiastical Grievances, and for preventing the Pope and Cardinals making Spoil of his Subjects.” Campbell ends by insisting that these examples at once demonstrate that “true Policy” requires that monarchs attend to “the general Welfare of those who were its Subjects” and also demonstrate that we should “look up with Reverence to our Ancestors, and free us in a great Measure from those Prepossessions we are too apt to entertain of the Barbarity of past Times.” Campbell’s concern with the past reflects his Tory, Bolingbrokean political philosophy: past reigns and administrations passed laws that corrected corruptions to the original constitution and as such offer insights and instruction for the current monarch and his ministers.³³ These past examples point to the necessity and

³² *London Evening Post*, 16–18 April 1761, 17th-18th Century Burney Collection.

³³ That degeneration and corruption offer a Tory perspective, see Mark Knights, “The Tory Interpretation of History in the Rage of Parties,” *The Huntington Quarterly* 68, no. 1/2 (2005): 353–373, 359: “rather than

urgency for a modern Patriot King, like George III, who holds an eye towards the past to act confidently and independently in the present. Such a Patriot King will defend the original constitution by upholding public interest and rejecting the clamour of factions while encouraging industry and commerce, thereby bringing about prosperity.

In the article of 27–29 October, Campbell appears to have neglected the rest of his original plan, particularly when political affairs changed, as William Pitt the Elder (1708–1778) resigned on 5 October and prospects for peace increased. That this “Paper” belongs to Campbell remains less assured than the previous five since his private letters do not contain direct references to it.³⁴ Yet the phrases, ideas, and concerns reflect Campbell’s previous “Papers,” his political philosophy, and his pressing apprehensions after Pitt’s resignation.³⁵ In his letters 172 through 175 to Bute, Campbell indicates that he strives to publish if not daily, at least weekly upon the political situation. He indicates his concerns in his letter to Bute on 6 November: “This Resignation and the Clamour it has occasioned has loosened the whole Frame of our Constitution but a few vigorous Steps an apparent Firmness in the King’s Ministers

progress, the Tory interpretation emphasized the prevalence of decay and corruption.”

³⁴ Besides Campbell, Bute had several other pensioned writers: Philip Francis (1708–1773), Edward Richardson, William Guthrie (1708?–1770), Arthur Murphy (1727–1805), and James Ralph (d. 1762). See John Brewer, *Party Ideology and Party Politics at the Accession of George III* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976), 223.

³⁵ Not only do the ideas indicate Campbell’s authorship, but also the style too. Two types of stylometry software, JStylo and JGAAP, were used on this article and repeatedly indicated, in comparison to similar articles in *London Evening Post* and to writings by Guthrie, Ralph, Murphy, Francis, that the article reflects Campbell’s writing style. Instead of maintaining that stylometry proves the article belongs to Campbell, I maintain that it and similarities to Campbell’s thought indicate a higher probability that it is his as well as indicate the need for future analysis. See JStylo: Andrew McDonald, Sadia Afroz, Aylin Caliskan, Ariel Stolerma, and Rachel Greenstadt, “Use Fewer Instances of the Letter ‘I’: Toward Writing Style Anonymization.” PETS 2012. Drexel University; and see JGAAP, Evaluating Variations in Language Labs, Duquesne University.

and a strict Connection amongst themselves will very quickly recover every thing and fix the Government upon a sound bottom.”³⁶ Campbell sees the commotion that accompanies Pitt’s resignation as a threat not only to the state but also the possibility for peace: “All calm & considerate People seem to wish for a good Peace & regret that the opportunity was lost when we were so near it and I verily believe would be glad to see it recovered which that I may be and that the King may enjoy the Satisfaction of giving Peace to Europe & Security to his Subjects.”³⁷ Indeed the prospective peace is the focus and theme of the article of 27–29 October. The peace is promoted by the writer by indicating how it, a Patriot King, and his competent administration will secure the constitution and place the “Government upon a sound bottom.” The writer draws from phrases and ideas in Campbell’s previous papers, such as “Voice of the People” and “Industry,” security of property, even ostensibly alluding to those publications, while stressing the increase of commerce, and the writer echoes Campbell’s 19 January letter to Bute by calling for a “Reduction of Debts and Taxes.”³⁸

The writer presumably alludes to Campbell’s earlier papers in the *London Evening Post* when he obliquely refers to “the Principles mentioned in a former Paper, and which ought ever to be remembered.” He adds that these “Principles, enforced by the Voice of the People” show that the war was “prosecuted with Effect”: pointedly, Canada “has been reduced,” the “Sugar Islands [Martinique] might be conquered,” the “Conquest of Guadalupe has been effected,” and the French in the Neutral Islands “have been driven out.” Indeed “Reason,” which “corresponds with the Truth” rather than “Clamour,” shows that the war has been sufficiently prosecuted by accomplishing significant goals. Not only does the article’s language, “Voice of the People,” reflect Campbell’s earlier articles, but also it reflects his private approval of Bute’s and the administration’s actions in Martinique. Indeed the day after the published article appears, Campbell praises Bute and the administration for sending additional troops in his letter of 30

³⁶ Mount Stuart Archive, BU/98/6, 632, November 6th, 1761.

³⁷ Mount Stuart Archive, BU/98/6, 632, November 6th, 1761.

³⁸ *London Evening Post*, 27–29 October 1761, *17th-18th Century Burney Collection*.

October 1761: “I lay hold of this Opportunity to congratulate your Lordship on the Wisdom of the Administration in sending additional Force from Europe to support the Enterprize against Martinico.”³⁹ Campbell applauds Bute on the deployment of Admiral George Rodney from Portsmouth earlier in October, whose presence and forces strengthen the “Enterprize” in Martinique, showing that it “might be conquered.”⁴⁰ Campbell’s ideas about “the Voice of the People” and his private correspondence with Bute indicate how the 27–29 newspaper article directly aligns with Campbell’s concerns about Pitt’s resignation and the corrections that a prospective peace—in the hands of the right minister—will deliver to the “loosened . . . Frame of our Constitution.”

The corrections that a “Peace” will produce include “lasting Tranquility” in which “Subjects of the Crown of Great Britain . . . may occupy their Possessions undisturbed, and reap the Fruits of their Industry and Labour.” The writer’s reference to “Tranquility” and “Possessions” reiterates Campbell’s argument about settled possessions, or property, and industry from his paper of 9–11 April: “The Benefits resulting to Individuals from the Conduct of these great Monarchs.” Indeed, tranquility produces security for one’s property, and security encourages industry, and industry, as the writer adds in the article of 27–29 October, promotes commerce: “the reciprocal Commerce between the Colonies and their Mother Country” will offer most telling “Fruits of a War.” This connection between the colonies, the “Mother Country,” commerce, and prosperity reiterates what Campbell stated earlier in his career, for instance, in his Preface to the second volume of *Navigantium Atque Intinerantium Bibliotheca* (1748): “The great Point with respect to Plantations, is to shew, that the Riches, Power, and Happiness of the Mother-Country, depends, in a great Measure, upon them; and that, on the other Hand, this Connection is so far from being grievous, burthensome, or prejudicial to the Colonies, that, on the contrary, their Peace, Welfare, and Prosperity, are dependant upon this only; so that the Benefits and Advantages of Settlements and their Mother-

³⁹ Mount Stuart Archive, BU/118/1, 173.

⁴⁰ See Julian Corbett, *England in the Seven Years’ War, A Study in Combined Strategy* (London: Longmans, Green, & Co, 1907), 2:210–211.

Countries are always reciprocal.”⁴¹ The reciprocal connection—especially through commerce and trade—between the “Mother Country” and her “Settlements” promotes the prosperity of both, and this prosperity, as indicated in this last paper, can increase with an earnest peace that secures property and encourages industry.

This prosperity represents a correction to the constitution as it will reduce taxes and debt. Campbell indicates in his letter of 19 January to Bute that he wishes to write upon “the increase of our Debts & the load of our Taxes,” yet after Pitt’s resignation, the writer does the opposite in the article of 27–29 October—thereby promoting Bute’s political objectives for peace—by insisting that a successful peace will produce a “Reduction of Debts and Taxes.” This argument upon debt originates from, for instance, “Old Whig” positions, argued by Charles Davenant,⁴² and reflects Campbell’s earlier writings, such as *Navigantium* and *Present State of Europe*. In the first, he indicates how the Genovese state suffers because they deal “in Money instead of Goods” and “Funds and negotiable Debts to Manufactures.”⁴³ In the second, he indicates how Louis XIV’s large army is “burdensome and ruinous to the Kingdom” as “heavy taxes are raised upon the laborious and industrious part of the People.”⁴⁴ Debts and excessive taxes, which accompany an improperly managed war, prevent people from securing property, encouraging industry, dealing in manufactures, increasing commerce, promoting trade, and ultimately achieving prosperity. As such, this focus upon reducing debt and taxes, this use of similar phrases and ideas (such as “Voice of the People” and stability of property), this reference to earlier articles in the *London Evening Post*, this similarity between the article and Campbell’s apprehensions about the constitution and peace, which he mentioned in his letters to Bute, and this similarity between the article and his moderate Tory political philosophy, indicate that this article from 27–29 October was probably written by Campbell.

⁴¹ *Navigantium Atque Intinerantium Bibliotheca* (London, 1748), 2:n.pag.

⁴² See Abbattista, *Commercio*, Chap. 1, and see Binney, “Interest, Trade and ‘Character and Circumstances,’” 527–530.

⁴³ Campbell, *Navigantium*, 1:xvi.

⁴⁴ Campbell, *The Present State of Europe*, 290.

Nonetheless all articles that Campbell published in the *London Evening Post* in 1761 reflect his role as a propagandist for Bute and George III, as peer and monarch sought to depict the new reign in words and ideas that reproduce Bolingbrokean political philosophy. The attribution of these newspaper articles to Campbell not only expands Campbell's already significant canon, but also identifies more specifically the historian's direct contributions to representing the ideas, rhetoric, and policy of George III's early reign and Bute's rise to power. George III will indeed be a Patriot King: an independent monarch, attentive to the constitution and public good, who reigns in private interest, secures property, promotes industry and commerce, which ultimately produces a prosperous state and formidable empire.