“Let everything I have done, said, or written be forgotten but this:” The Influence of Money, Honor, and Property in Edmund Burke’s East India Company Policy
“Let my endeavors to save the Nation from that Shame and guilt, be my monument; The only one I ever will have. Let everything I have done, said, or written be forgotten but this (The Impeachment of Warren Hastings). I have struggled with the great and the little on this point during the greater part of my active Life.”¹ In this letter, Edmund Burke (1729-1797), an eighteenth-century British statesman from Ireland revealed that he valued his work on the impeachment of Warren Hastings (1732-1818), an East India Company executive, above all else.² Burke wanted his work on this impeachment to define posterity’s perception of him for a multitude of reasons. Two prominent reasons, often overlooked by scholars, were Burke’s sense of honor and finances which also affected Burke’s overall East India Company Policy. However, recent scholarship has largely overlooked the connection between the Bengal Bubble and Burke’s honor both of which affected Burke’s impeachment efforts and his East India Company policy. The three elements that exhibited the effect the Bengal Bubble and the notion honor had on Burke’s East India Company policy including his impeachment of Warren Hastings were the significance of Burke’s property, his desire to secure an honorable reputation to posterity, and a lawsuit against Burke in 1783.

The Bengal Bubble occurred on 23 May 1769, when a British East India Company (henceforth, E.I.C.) ship named the Valentine arrived in London with the news that military conflict between the French and British erupted in India.³ This news detrimentally affected the value of E.I.C. shares, accordingly, many investors in the E.I.C. lost substantial amounts of


money. Notably, Edmund Burke’s cousin and brother heavily speculated in these stocks.⁴ Thus, the 1769 stock crash adversely impacted the Burkes’ shared finances. Before this stock crash, Edmund Burke purchased a country estate in Beaconsfield known as Gregories located a few miles from London.⁵ The 1769 stock crash nearly cost Burke his property as he frenetically sought loans to retain his recent purchase. Initially, Burke did not blame the E.I.C. for the crash.⁶ However, in 1773 Burke broke with the Rockingham Whigs line of laissez-faire E.I.C. stance and attacked the E.I.C.⁷ The parliamentary record indicated that Burke had these contentious feelings about the E.I.C. long before this speech. Burke’s negative experiences with the E.I.C. started with the 1769 stock crash. Nevertheless, scholars have failed to fully examine the influence of Burke’s personal finances and property upon his E.I.C. policy positions.

Indeed, Historians in the last 30 years have discounted the importance of the 1769 stock crash which affected Burke’s impeachment of Hastings and his E.I.C. policy. Scholars have neglected Burke’s finances and their influence on his E.I.C. policy for nearly a century. Writing in 1939, Dixon Wecter was the first and last historian to examine the influence of Burke’s finances on his E.I.C. policy.⁸ Wecter averred that “the root of family partisanship may run more deeply beneath Burke’s public life than is generally supposed...one may connect his early championship of the East India Company from about 1766 to 1772 with his kinsmen’s interest.”⁹

⁶ Edmund Burke, Debate in the Commons on Colonel Burgoyne’s Motion for a Select Committee on East India Affairs, 13 April 1772, in *Cobbett's Parliamentary History*, vol 17 (1771-1774), cols. 461-464.
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Wecter continued to assert that Burke’s “family partisanship” drove his impeachment of Hastings as well. However, Wecter failed to recognize the significance of the 1769 East India Company stock crash and Burke’s honor both of which influenced Burke’s impeachment of Hastings and his E.I.C. stance.

Perhaps the closest contemporary writer on this topic was Elizabeth Lambert’s biography of Edmund Burke which situated him at his Beaconsfield estate called Gregories.9 According to Lambert, when Burke’s cousin, William, and brother, Richard, acquired Beaconsfield, Edmund felt as though he had successfully ascended into the English gentry.10 Additionally, Lambert utilized the correspondence of Edmund Burke to make her assertion that Gregories was a crucial window into Burke’s life. Lambert did not make any connections between Burke’s finances or honor and his E.I.C. policy. Nevertheless, Lambert’s book provided both insight into the personal domestic life of Burke and a new narrative to the historiography of Burke.

Alternatively, in 1782, Burke ascended to a prominent political position and secured the title “The Right and Honorable Edmund Burke.”11 Burke’s membership in the English political establishment firmly linked his honorable reputation and the honor of the British empire together. An attack upon Britain’s honor also denigrated those who achieved honorable titles through the British government like Edmund Burke. According to Burke, the primary institution that endangered the honor of the British empire was the E.I.C.12 The E.I.C. was a publicly traded
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stock company that pursued the economic interests of English traders and later became a de facto government in India through the company’s military conquests. Furthermore, Burke believed that Warren Hastings, the governor-general of India throughout the 1770s and 1780s, embodied the corruption that threatened Britain's honorable reputation and by proxy, Burke’s own honorable reputation. Burke’s honor influenced his E.I.C. policy including the impeachment of Hastings. However, historians and scholars have not sufficiently examined the nexus between Burke’s honor and his E.I.C. political opinions. This lack of scholarship is surprising given the recent historiographical introduction of honor as a crucial concept of Enlightenment European culture.

Historian Victor Kiernan’s 1989 book *The Duel in European History: Honor and the Reign of the Aristocracy* examined the notion of honor in the mindset of Europeans. Indeed, honor was a pervasive concept in eighteenth-century Enlightenment Western Europe. Throughout Europe, men usually protected their honor with duels. However, a central tenet of the Enlightenment was reason, and it sparked critiques of the duel in Britain as an appendage of an outdated feudal culture. The social fabric Edmund Burke was part of was interlaced with Enlightenment notions of reason and logic and feudal notions of honor. These two cultural trends influenced Burke’s decisions. Ostensibly there is no evidence that Burke ever participated in a duel. Thus, Burke was a part of the Enlightenment critique of dueling through his tacit lack of participation in that social practice. However, the feudal notion that to have an honorable reputation an individual needed to own land influenced Burke. Even more, a majority of

---


Britons expected that the emerging ruling British middle class owned property. These social trends compelled Burke to purchase a country estate in 1768.

Moreover, recent historians of Burke ignored his finances and their relation to Burke’s honor completely because they wanted to repair Burke’s reputation from “The Namierite Attack,” named after historian Sir Lewis Namier (1888-1960). Namier asserted that party politics played an insignificant role in the political landscape of eighteenth-century Britain. This historiographical assertion diminished Burke’s importance in parliamentary politics since Burke was a major proponent of the Rockingham Whigs. The scholarly desire to repair Burke’s reputation paints a historiographical portrait best characterized by the art term “chiaroscuro.” This concept is the effect of contrasted light and darkness produced by light falling unevenly or from a particular direction on something. In other words, when scholars focused on Burke’s E.I.C. policy they situated his policy positions within his conservative political ideology, the chiaro component, rather than within his honor and financial life, the scuro element. Thus, recent scholarship failed to recognize how financial ruin dishonored Burke and influenced his E.I.C. policy.

Conor Cruise O’Brien’s work *The Great Melody* focused on Burke’s public speeches. This monograph treated Burke’s political thought as it related to his “Great Melody,” or Burke’s crusade against the abuse of power by government officials, including Burke’s E.I.C. stances.
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O’Brien stated that the E.I.C. was the only topic on which Burke vacillated. O’Brien contended that Burke’s stance towards the E.I.C. was not his personal voice until he spoke on an E.I.C. regulatory bill in 1783. This analysis was problematic because O’Brien monopolized Burke’s personal voice. More importantly, O’Brien did not remotely consider the possibility that Edmund Burke’s finances or honor affected his E.I.C. policy positions which included the impeachment of Warren Hastings.

Isaac Kramnick dedicated his work to the influence that Burke’s personal life exerted over his political thought. Kramnick’s work is still relevant because recent historians still quote his work even if it is to refute him. Kramnick devoted a chapter to Edmund Burke’s E.I.C. policy. This chapter examined the multiple influences of Edmund Burke’s obsession with the conviction of Warren Hastings. Kramnick ignored the influence of Burke’s financial situation and honor upon his E.I.C. policy. Overall, historians failed to recognize how the Bengal Bubble of 1769 implicated Burke’s honor and how these two aspects influenced Burke’s E.I.C policy.

Three factors clearly demonstrate the influential nature of the Bengal Bubble and Burke’s honor upon his E.I.C. policy positions. First, ownership of Gregories was paramount to Burke because he perceived it as material evidence of his ascent into the English gentry. In other words, Burke’s new home was a symbol of his own honor. Indeed, as a member of Parliament and British society Edmund Burke was undeniably affected by the honor culture of England. Property ownership governed this honor culture. Therefore, the Bengal Bubble nearly cost
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Edmund a crucial component of his nascent honor which influenced his E.I.C. stance and the impeachment of Hastings.

Secondly, Burke had an overarching approach to the preservation of his personal honor, which his title linked with Britain's honor as a nation, to posterity. In other words, Burke attempted to preserve the honorable reputation of the Kingdom of Great Britain to posterity since his title linked his own honor with the honor of Great Britain. Burke thought that the E.I.C. tarnished Britain’s honor as a nation. Burke’s own reputation was interlocked with that of Britain when he assumed a prominent government position and obtained the title “The Right and Honorable Edmund Burke.” Any detriment to the British Empire’s honor also sullied those whom the government had bestowed honor upon, such as Edmund Burke. Burke made this relationship clear numerous times in the 1780s when he invoked honor to promote E.I.C. regulation and the impeachment of Hastings.

Lastly, in 1783 Edmund Burke was sued for an unpaid loan his family member, William Burke, received in 1769 after the crash and Burke’s E.I.C. regulation bill failed. Burke’s failure to regulate an institution he now saw as a threat to the British kingdom’s honor directly collided with the financial hardships the E.I.C. caused him in 1769. Also, in 1783, Burke became obsessed with Hastings’s corrupt actions. Therefore, Burke began his pursuit of Hastings the
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same year Verney’s suit acutely reminded him of the Bengal Bubble. The importance of Gregories to Burke, Burke’s desire to secure for himself an honorable reputation to posterity, and Earl Verney’s suit against him are the three components which display the importance of the Bengal Bubble and honor in Edmund Burke’s E.I.C. policy positions as well as his impeachment of Warren Hastings.

The 1769 stock crash influenced Burke because he purchased Gregories only a year before. Seven years before Burke’s purchase of Gregories a friend wrote to him “that every void you feel, would be agreeably filled up by Property.”\(^{31}\) In 1768, Edmund Burke filled this void when he jointly bought a large estate in Beaconsfield with his cousin William and brother Richard. In 1768 Burke wrote to his friend Richard Shackleton that “I made a push with all I could collect of my own, and the aid of my friends to cast a little root in this Country. I have purchased a house...It is a place exceedingly pleasant.”\(^{32}\) In this letter, Burke demonstrated how valuable Gregories was to him.

Also, this purchase made sense for Burke since he recently entered parliament in 1766 for Wendover under the patronage of Earl Verney.\(^{33}\) Almost immediately upon his entrance to parliament Burke gained “prodigious applause from the public, and compliments of the most flattering kind from particulars...one from Mr. Pitt (a prominent figure in eighteenth-century British politics)” for his eloquent advocation for the abrogation of the Stamp Act, a tax on the American colonies.\(^{34}\) Burke’s career as a politician was on the rise and bestowed upon him a
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\(^{31}\) Charles O’Hara to Edmund Burke, 10 August 1762, in vol. 1 of *The Correspondence of Edmund Burke, April 1744-June 1768*, ed. Thomas Copeland (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), 144.

\(^{32}\) Burke to Shackleton, 1 May 1768, 351.


\(^{34}\) Richard Burke Sr. to James Barry, 11 February 1766, in vol. 1 of *The Correspondence of Edmund Burke, April 1744-June 1768*, ed. Thomas Copeland (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1958), 238.
degree of honor which Burke supplemented further with his purchase of Gregories. He was extremely proud of his new 600-acre estate less than 25 miles from London. Moreover, Lord Rockingham gave Burke a position as his private secretary and was committed to the advancement of Burke’s political career as well. Therefore, the purchase of Gregories made logical sense for Burke. After he had purchased Gregories, he invited his friends to revel in the splendor of his new estate. These factors clearly prove the essential nature of Gregories to Burke because this property provided an addendum to his incipient honor.

Furthermore, a metaphor from another one of Burke’s letters further linked his property and his honor together. In this letter, Burke compared aristocrats and landed gentry as two different types of plants. On the one hand, Burke perceived aristocrats as “great Oaks that shade a country.” On the other hand, Burke and men like him could only “creep on the ground…(and) belly into melons that are exquisite for size and flavor, yet still we…perish with our Season and leave no sort of Traces behind us.” Burke went on to claim that both of these plants, particularly the oaks, passed down virtues to their successors. This letter in conjunction with Burke’s earlier depiction of Gregories as a “root” meant that property, for Burke, was the source through which aristocrats and the landed gentry grew. Even more, Gregories was the primary vehicle through which Burke could pass down a venerable reputation to posterity. Gregories was a root through which more “melons” could grow and continue to pass on virtues to posterity. However, Burke explicitly stated that the landed gentry like him expired each
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season. In other words, Burke needed to keep his estate to have any chance to transmit virtues to posterity. Indeed, without roots, a plant cannot grow. Thus, without Gregories Burke had no opportunity to bequeath virtues unto posterity.

Also, Burke’s letter to the Duke of Richmond exemplified his belief that his actions would affect posterity. “Certain parties if possible,” wrote Burke, “if not the heads of certain families should make it their Business by the whole Course of their Lives principally by their Example to…(transmit to) their descendants those principles which ought to be transmitted pure and (uncorrupted) to posterity.”39 This letter proves that Burke believed the actions and decisions that people made during the entirety of their lives shaped future generations. Burke thought that it was the responsibility of groups of people to transmit worthy principles to posterity. Therefore, groups like the Rockingham Whigs were responsible for the transmission of moral principles to posterity. This belief also permeated Burke’s vigorous drive for greater E.I.C. regulations. The E.I.C. was also an institution whom Burke thought transmitted extremely negative values to posterity.40 Burke thought that the E.I.C. would destroy the entirety Britain.41 A fight against the corruption of an institution like the E.I.C. surely fell under the category of transmittable principles. Considering this aspect, the 1769 stock crash nearly destroyed Burke’s primary means, Gregories, to transmit virtues to posterity.

Additionally, Burke exemplified the inexorability of his property and his honor in a 1770 parliamentary session. Another member of parliament launched a vitriolic verbal assault against Edmund Burke. This member claimed that Burke was a Jesuit “fitted to be Secretary to the
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In eighteenth-century Protestant England, this statement was an accusation of the highest degree. Religion in England throughout the eighteenth century was a matter of the kingdom’s security. Roman Catholic kingdoms, like France, wanted to restore the Roman Catholic Stuart family to the throne of England. Hence, any association with Catholicism in England was extremely detrimental to an aspiring politician like Burke. Notably, Burke responded with a quote from the Roman politician Cicero: “Novorum Hominum Industriam odisi.” Translated into English, this meant “you hate the industry of self-made men.” Burke proclaimed himself a self-made man because despite his Irish Roman Catholic background he successfully purchased a rather large estate in Beaconsfield. Burke utilized his property to defend himself from prejudiced attacks that labeled him a Catholic.

Gregories was a physical manifestation of Burke’s diligence and proof that he assimilated into English culture. An observer of British parliament confirmed this fact when he wrote that “He (Edmund Burke) wants nothing but that sort of dignity annexed to rank, and property in England.” This letter exhibited two important factors. First, this letter demonstrates that a venerable reputation came with the purchase of property in England. Secondly, this letter proves that Edmund Burke wanted the reputation that came with property. Considering these two elements, Burke utilized his purchase of Gregories as a mechanism through which to defend his
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personal honor against attacks, prove that he conformed to English standards of society, and supplement his already growing reputation as an orator in the House of Commons. Obviously, Gregories was acutely important to Burke and the 1769 stock crash nearly cost him his property. The debt created by the 1769 stock crash influenced the rest of Burke’s E.I.C. political decisions because he did not want future generations to believe that his regulations were profit driven.

Therefore, the acquisition and retention of Gregories was fundamental for Burke for two reasons. First, Burke thought that if he did not possess property then there was no way that posterity would remember him. Hence, for Burke, a prerequisite of securing a reputation to posterity was the ownership of property. Secondly, the purchase of Gregories enhanced Burke’s nascent sense of honor. These two aspects explain over £10,000 in loans Burke acquired to purchase Gregories.48 These loans also exhibit that even before the stock crash Burke was in a tenuous financial situation. More importantly, any threat to Burke’s property including the 1769 stock crash was a threat to Burke’s ability to secure an honorable reputation to posterity. The Bengal Bubble threatened the continued growth of the “root” through which more “melons” would grow.49

Burke’s situation demonstrates that honor in eighteenth-century England intertwined with the rapid economic growth and downturn of the 1760s and 1770s.50 Many Englishmen were concerned with the nexus of materialism and disregard for propriety that resulted from recent economic growth. A primary example was the growth in East India Company stocks throughout the 1760s spurred by Robert Clive, an E.I.C. executive. In 1764 Clive utilized his vast wealth he
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gained while in India to attain a position of leadership in the E.I.C.\textsuperscript{51} Clive then employed corrupt practices to increase the value of company shares and his wealth. Clive wrote to one of his colleagues in 1765 to “lose no time in purchasing all the stock you can, for I am persuaded the stock of the Company must be doubled.”\textsuperscript{52} Clive then utilized his massive new found wealth to pursue political power in Britain.\textsuperscript{53} Clive’s pursuit of political power upset the traditional trajectory of politicians, like Burke, in Britain. This example demonstrates the British fear of materialistic disregard for propriety. However, Burke and his family greatly benefited from the rapid increase in stock prices drove by Clive. The rise in share values was the impetus for Edmund Burke’s purchase of Gregories. Edmund Burke was able to buy his estate only because William and Richard had speculated in E.I.C. stocks.\textsuperscript{54} However, just as positive economic events affected Burke so too did negative ones.

When E.I.C. stocks crashed in 1769 because of the British-French conflict in India, it nearly cost Edmund Burke his new country estate.\textsuperscript{55} In this ironic instance, the E.I.C. stock gave Edmund Burke the means with which to purchase Gregories and then almost took those same means away. After the crash, Burke wrote in a letter that “I wrote indeed in much security...not at all apprehending the ruin of our Situation in the light, I now see and feel it but too distinctly...You may easily guess the cause.”\textsuperscript{56} This drop in stock prices financially ruined
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Richard, William, and Edmund. Edmund frantically sought any source of money to keep his Gregories estate. Burke needed to keep Gregories because it was the primary vehicle through which Burke’s reputation would reach posterity and a crucial component of his inchoate honor.

Incidentally, the 1769 crash was the context in which Warren Hastings continued his rise to power within the E.I.C. The 1769 crash was also a financial disaster for Laurence Sulivan, an E.I.C. executive. Sulivan was Clive’s primary rival within the company. They both jockeyed for the position of the company’s Board of Directors chairman position throughout the 1760s. Company rules in the 1760s dictated that each stockholder possessed of £500 or more was entitled to only one vote. Clive and Sulivan circumvented this rule by splitting their stock amongst their cronies to gain more votes in the company. Therefore, both men had heavily invested in the E.I.C. and lost money in the crash. The crash impacted Sulivan more so than Clive because Clive already amassed an enormous fortune. In an attempt to regain his fortune Sulivan sent his son Stephen to India under the watch of Sulivan’s protege, Warren Hastings.

Hastings’s prominence in the E.I.C. started with Clive’s tenure in India. Clive promoted Hastings from company clerk to E.I.C. representative for a local Indian ruler. Hastings resigned from this position and returned to England due to his disagreements with company officials in India. Nonetheless, Hastings’s position as a representative gained him a reputation for integrity among E.I.C. executives much like Burke’s speeches in parliament gained him an honorable
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reputation. Due to Hastings’s probity company executives offered him the second senior position at Madras which he took. This office situated Hastings as the primary candidate for the position of governor-general created by an E.I.C. regulatory act of parliament in 1773.

At any rate, the possible publication of the effect that the stock crash had on the Burkes greatly concerned Edmund Burke.⁶² He did not want this information published because he knew it would invite attacks upon his reputation that he could not defend. Burke defended attacks upon his honor, like the one that labeled him a Catholic, with Gregories.⁶³ If a newspaper outlet published that the 1769 stock crash financially ruined Burke, then he could not have claimed in 1772 that he was a self-made man because it would have exposed the fact that Burke shared finances with William and Richard. Edmund Burke did not want others to know that he purchased Gregories with the help of his brother and cousin.⁶⁴ Furthermore, Burke was not the only person in England negatively affected by the stock crash. A popular magazine at the time remarked that “(t)o see sheep driven to the butchery is not more affecting than to see those innocent dupes...hurried into the India house...to vote away the value of the little property they possess.”⁶⁵ This quote clearly shows the negative affect the 1769 stock crash had on the growing class of property owners in England. Property, which Burke believed, was the primary means for people to bestow virtues upon posterity.⁶⁶
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At first, however, Burke did not blame the E.I.C for the recent stock crash. In reality, Burke justified the actions of members of the company in a parliamentary speech.\(^{67}\) Even more, Burke advocated for the amnesty of company employees in India. Burke would not advocate amnesty for men he believed cost him and others their property which impaired their ability to entrust virtues to posterity. Scholars often attribute this defense of the company to Burke’s membership in the Rockingham Whigs.\(^{68}\) Admittedly, this is a logical and well-supported explanation. Nonetheless, Burke’s desire to secure honorable reputation to posterity played a major role in his E.I.C. policy decisions at this time. Notably, his defense of the company caused Sullivan to offer Burke a position as a commissioner of the E.I.C. in 1772 which Burke turned down.\(^{69}\) This offer was more than tempting to Burke since he could have easily made a fortune and paid down his debt from the 1769 crash and purchase of Gregories. However, if Burke accepted this position, he would have comprised his honor because his advocacy for E.I.C. employees’ amnesty was the main, if not the only, reason Sullivan offered him this position.\(^{70}\) Undoubtedly, critics of Burke could have easily linked these two events together and destroyed his reputation. Thus, the debt created by 1769 stock crash and Burke’s purchase of Gregories directly affected Burke’s E.I.C. policy because he turned down a position under the guise of honor.

Subsequently, only a year later in 1773 Burke launched an attack against the E.I.C. that made his prior defense seem disingenuous. Specifically, Burke proclaimed the E.I.C. was a
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“mill-stone” that would drag Britain down into the abyss.\textsuperscript{71} He then called the company a “viper” that would destroy Britain.\textsuperscript{72} This aberration in Burke’s stance demonstrates that he did not entirely agree with the Rockingham stance of deregulation. Furthermore, the parliamentary record stated that “he (Burke) always had his fears” about the E.I.C.\textsuperscript{73} This statement proves that Burke did not trust the E.I.C.

Moreover, a letter Burke wrote four days before his speech foreshadowed his deviation from the Rockingham Whig line in 1773. Burke wrote that “The India Business, which has subverted the little sense of mankind, has so distracted our party, that the Idea of opposition to the ministry is ridiculous...It is to be our Business all this Session...and I suspect for ever.”\textsuperscript{74} The tone in this letter is palpably sarcastic. Burke did not believe that the parliamentary regulations of the E.I.C. were in any way rational because they did not solve any of the underlying corruption in the company that was a reason for the continued stock crashes.\textsuperscript{75} Later in his career, Burke advocated for further E.I.C. regulatory legislation that he believed would solve the problems with the 1773 act.\textsuperscript{76} Burke’s stance later in his career illustrated that he was extremely upset that the Rockingham Whigs advocated a laissez-faire stance that did nothing to stop the corruption present in the E.I.C. Therefore, Burke was not satisfied with either the Rockingham position on
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E.I.C. policy or the 1773 legislation because neither solved the corruption in the E.I.C. which was another reason, aside from the British-French conflict, for the stock crash in 1769.

Furthermore, in 1782, one year before Burke’s placement on an E.I.C. parliamentary committee he obtained the title of “The Right Honorable Edmund Burke.” In 1782 Lord North resigned as Prime Minister because his ministry’s majority in the House of Commons was in decline. North’s slow loss of his parliamentary majority ostensibly began with the loss of the American civil war in Yorktown. Lord Rockingham, the leader of the political party of which Burke was a member, procured a majority in the House of Commons and ascended to the position of Prime Minister (P.M.). Lord Rockingham rewarded Burke for his service in the Rockingham Whigs with the position of Paymaster-General of the Forces. Rockingham would have likely given Burke a position on his Cabinet, but the two men had grown estranged from each other. Although, Burke’s position was not part of the P.M.’s cabinet it was a part of the Privy Council. The Privy Council was the political institution from which the Cabinet developed. Moreover, Burke’s new office endowed him with the title “The Right and Honorable Edmund Burke.” Burke finally had achieved honorable recognition from the British government that he had desired since 1767. In this sense, the institution Burke wanted membership in ever since his purchase of Gregories finally bestowed him with honor. More importantly, this title marked the transformation of Burke’s honor into its adolescent form.

Burke’s “Honorable” new title firmly associated Burke’s reputation with the British government. Hence, for Burke to successfully secure an honorable reputation to posterity, he needed to ensure that the honor of the British nation was protected because his recently acquired
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title firmly linked the two together. Nonetheless, Burke felt his new position did not endow him with the political agency necessary to complete this goal. Rather Burke felt his only political agency was his parliamentary membership. Prior to Burke’s position as Paymaster, the Commons elected him as a member of an E.I.C. select committee in 1781. In other words, Burke’s position as Paymaster afforded him an “honorable” reputation linked directly to the honor of Britain without any means to defend Britain’s honor. However, Burke’s position on the E.I.C. select committee afforded him agency that he could utilize to defend Britain's honor. Therefore, Burke’s attempted regulation of the E.I.C. through Fox’s East India Bill was Burke’s venture to use his political agency in defense of the British nation’s honor which was a proxy of his own honor.

Burke utilized the honor of the British kingdom to justify his regulatory bill against the E.I.C. nominally Fox’s East India Bill. Burke argued that the regulation of the E.I.C. “will turn out a matter of great disgrace or great glory to the whole British nation.” This brilliant tactic appealed to the pervasive concept of honor in eighteenth-century Britain. In this sense, Burke simultaneously defended Britain’s honor and his own honor through the ubiquitous nature of honor in eighteenth-century Britain. Burke’s appeal succeeded as the bill passed the House of Commons. However, the bill did not pass in the House of Lords because King George III utilized his influence there to undermine the bill. Burke’s legislation sought to establish a group of seven commissioners who held office for four years. These commissioners would have
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analyzed the performance of the E.I.C. Burke proclaimed that these commissioners would stop E.I.C. executives’ abuse of the local populace of India.\textsuperscript{85} Moreover, Burke believed that these commissioners would vindicate the honor of the British nation and by proxy himself because the commissioners would have stopped this abuse.\textsuperscript{86}

Surprisingly, Burke was reminded of the 1769 crash only months before the speech on Fox’s Bill. Earl Verney, the speculation partner of William and Richard as well as the man who gave Burke his first seat in parliament, sued Edmund Burke in 1783.\textsuperscript{87} Verney sued Burke on 16 June 1783, just nine days before another one of Burke’s E.I.C. committee reports.\textsuperscript{88} Verney brought this suit because “Edmund Burke...in the year 1769 had occasion to borrow 6,000l. (pounds) for the purpose of paying money due on such mortgage (Burke’s Gregories Mortgage).”\textsuperscript{89} Verney’s bill in the chancery goes on to proclaim that William Burke borrowed the £6,000 and then gave that money to Edmund.\textsuperscript{90} William borrowed money from Verney because of the 1769 stock crash. Thus, regardless of the veracity of Verney’s suit, it poignantly reminded Edmund Burke of the 1769 stock crash months before Burke’s speech on Fox’s East India Bill.

Burke responded to this suit in November of 1783.\textsuperscript{91} Burke claimed that while he received a significant portion of money in 1769 to amortize the Gregories loan, he could not
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remember if it was exactly £6000. Edmund Burke further claimed that he never asked William to acquire this loan for him. Moreover, Edmund declared that while “their (Edmund and William) fathers did sometimes call each other cousins” there was no proof they were related. Edmund purposefully distanced himself from William for two reasons. Firstly, the most obvious reason was that Burke wanted to win the lawsuit, so that he did not have to pay Verney. Secondly, a more detailed analysis reveals that Burke’s claim that he was not related to William was a defense of his honor.

A year before Verney’s suit in 1782 a series of published letters, written under the pen name Asiaticus, accused Edmund of using his position in parliament to further William’s own career in India. Therefore, when Edmund distanced himself from William through his response to Verney’s lawsuit he effectively refuted Asiaticus’s claim that the goal of his E.I.C. policy was to further William’s career. Indeed, Asiaticus’s claim that Edmund’s pursuit of Hastings was primarily meant to advance William’s career relied on the familial relationship between Edmund and William.

The claim that Edmund was not related to William was a marked change in Burke’s attitude towards William. In 1771, Burke wrote a letter in which he explicitly called William Burke his kinsmen. Even more, Edmund Burke defended William Burke from the attacks of Dr. Markham who was another one of Edmund’s friends. This previous assertion clearly demonstrates that Edmund had to distance himself from William in public because Edmund’s
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honor was at stake. Therefore, the disavowal of Edmund’s familial relation to William was both politically expedient and beneficial to Edmund’s honor. Nevertheless, Fox’s East India Bill had still failed, and Burke needed to find another avenue through which to protect the honor of Britain and himself. This new avenue was the impeachment of Warren Hastings.

Burke’s speech “On Fox’s East India Bill” saw Burke target Warren Hastings, the Governor-General of India.96 Philip Francis, an opponent of Hastings, had recently returned from India and slowly convinced Burke that Hastings was corrupt.97 Francis implied that Hastings bribed a rival. Burke discussed Hastings’s perceived corruption with Francis while he sat on the E.I.C. select committee.98 Burke trusted Francis as an expert on Hastings’s corrupt practices.99 Eventually, after research of his own, Burke perceived Hastings as the embodiment of E.I.C. corruption that threatened the honor of Britain. Burke convinced other MPs to help him impeach Hastings.100 Burke was concerned with his reputation throughout this political process. Burke wrote in 1786 that “I felt myself from the beginning of this affair (Hastings’s Impeachment) in great peril as to my reputation.”101 This letter exhibits that Burke felt his own honor was also at stake in the impeachment. Burke’s concern with his reputation was entirely justified.

Notably, when Burke brought the impeachment charges against Hastings, a litany of caricaturists lampooned him. These scurrilous depictions in a forum of mass media had the
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potential to ruin an individual’s reputation in a modernizing society like Britain. For example, James Gillray portrayed Burke as the leader of a group of prominent British politicians positioned to steal Hasting’s acquired fortune in India. Gillray’s caricature depicted Burke as a distractor who fired a blunderbuss at Hastings with a bag of ammunition labeled charges. Another caricature displayed Burke as a Catholic throwing mud at Warren Hastings. Truly, a multitude of different caricaturists negatively depicted Edmund Burke. These caricatures clearly show that Burke’s reputation was under attack for the impeachment of Warren Hastings. Some of these caricatures also supplemented Asiaticus’s belief that the impeachment of Hastings was a farce created by Burke for his own monetary gain.

Despite this caricatures Burke continued with the impeachment of Warren Hastings. This continuation exemplified that Burke was not as concerned with his contemporary reputation as he was with an honorable reputation to posterity through his defense of Britain’s honor. The belief that Burke utilized the honor of Britain was also a theme of the political caricatures that surrounded Hastings’s impeachment. In a political caricature, by William Dent, Burke was depicted as the leader of the impeachment while he beat a drum labeled “Impeachment, For the Honor of the Nation.” This caricature clearly displayed that Burke’s primary concern in the impeachment was Britain’s honor and, therefore, his own honor. Burke wanted to ensure that
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posterity saw him as a figure who wanted to prevent the detriment the E.I.C. had on the British nation’s honor.

More importantly, during the opening of Hastings’s impeachment in the House of Lords Burke proclaimed that “the credit and honor of the British nation itself will be decided by this decision.”\footnote{107} Upon a superficial analysis, Burke invoked the nation’s honor as a justification for impeachment. However, upon a closer scrutiny of this quote Burke’s own honor was implicated in Hastings’s impeachment. Burke had attained the “dignity and rank” within British society he desired because he was now officially “The Right and Honorable Edmund Burke.”\footnote{108} Therefore, Burke’s assertion that the honor of Britain was at stake in the impeachment meant that his honor was also at stake. Burke believed that the successful impeachment of Warren Hastings would secure an honorable reputation to posterity for the British empire and by proxy, himself. Indeed, Burke admitted as much in a letter he wrote before the start Hastings’s trial in 1788.\footnote{109}

Specifically, Burke stated that “my business is not to consider what will convict Mr. Hastings, (a thing we all know to be impracticable) but what will acquit and justify myself to those few persons and to those distant times which may take a concern in these affairs and the actors in them.”\footnote{110} Burke was correct as the impeachment of Hastings failed. Also, it is important to distinguish that Burke wrote the parenthetical statement in this letter. This quotation clearly proves that Edmund Burke’s primary goal in the impeachment of Warren Hastings was to secure a venerable reputation to posterity. Even more, this quote demonstrated that Burke was more concerned with his future reputation than his contemporary reputation. Burke believed that future
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generations would recognize the impeachment of Hastings as evidence that Burke did not want to exploit the E.I.C. for his financial gain.

The 1769 stock crash and Burke’s pervasive concern with honor affected the impeachment of Hastings and his E.I.C. policy. The stock crash of 1769 caused financial hardships for the Burkes that reverberated throughout their lives. However, recent scholarship is overwhelmingly concerned with Burke’s stance on the French Revolution and his philosophical ideas. While these works are imperative to the study of Burke, they do not justify the lack of scholarship regarding Burke’s honor and finances as they relate to his E.I.C. policy and impeachment efforts. Admittedly, there are works on Burke’s E.I.C. stance and impeachment of Hastings. However, historians defense of Burke from the Namierite attack has created a biased interpretation of these events.

Three events clearly demonstrate that Burke’s honor and the Bengal bubble influenced his E.I.C. policy and impeachment of Hastings. First, the stock crash nearly cost Edmund Burke his recently acquired country estate.111 Gregories was a crucial component in Burke’s nascent honor and the stock crash nearly eviscerated his newly found status. Secondly, Edmund Burke was sued by Earl Verney in 1783 only months before Burke’s advocation for Fox’s East India Bill.112 This suit acutely reminded Burke of the 1769 stock crash the same year his E.I.C. regulatory bill failed. Considering this series of events, Burke could not regulate an institution that had caused him financial harm and was now wreaking havoc on the reputation of the Kingdom of Britain itself. Lastly, Burke’s correspondence and continued use of Britain’s honor as a justification for his E.I.C. regulation and Hastings’s impeachment illustrated that Burke was
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extremely concerned with the procurement of a venerable reputation to posterity. All three of these components prove the 1769 stock crash and Burke’s ever-present concern with his honor influenced his E.I.C. policy and impeachment of Warren Hastings. Admittedly, the Bengal Bubble and Burke’s honor were not the only factors that influenced his E.I.C. policy but are still overlooked by historians. Also, the political caricatures that depicted Burke provided a contemporary litmus test for his honor amongst British society. However, there was no way for Burke to know whether the depiction of him as the venerated Roman politician Cicero or a Catholic throwing mud at Hastings would survive to posterity.113

Primary Source Annotated Bibliography


This act was meant to curb East India Company corruption which occurred through stock splitting in the 18th century. Edmund Burke examined this act in a parliamentary committee in 1781. While he was on this committee Burke spoke on the previous act’s failures.


This set of letters written to the East India Company directors and Edmund Burke. These letters questioned Burke’s motivation for his impeachment of Hastings. These letters expose how contemporaries negatively perceived Edmund Burke’s attempt to impeach Hastings.


Boyne’s caricature was one of the few characters of Burke that displayed him honorably. This caricature demonstrated that there was a belief that Burke’s impeachment of Hastings was honorable.


This book contains numerous speeches and writings that Edmund Burke gave over the course of his career in parliament. This source indicated that Burke’s frustrations with the East India Company grew more pronounced over the course of his life. Also comparing Burke’s Parliamentary speeches with his personal correspondence exhibits that Burke realized that the company was a corrupt and harmful to both the people of Britain and India.


Burke gave this speech in parliament as part of his committee’s report on the East India Company. This speech occurred only 9 days after Burke was sued by Earl Verney.


This source is a nine volume set of all of Burke’s correspondence. These sources confirmed the influence of Burke’s personal finances and honor on his East India Company policy and the impeachment of Warren Hastings.

Burke, Edmund. Debate in the Commons on Colonel Burgoyne’s Motion for a Select Committee on East India Affairs, 13 April 1772. In *Cobbett's Parliamentary History*, Volume 17 1771-1774, cols. 461-464.

In this session of parliament Burke defended the East India Company in his speech. Burke’s speech here demonstrated that he did not at first believe the company was at fault. However, Burke only seems to defend the company here because of the Rockingham Whigs stance on the company.

Burke, Edmund. Debate in the Commons on the Resolutions to let the Territorial Acquisitions remain in the Possession of the East India Company for a limited time, 5 April 1773. In *Cobbett's Parliamentary History*, Volume 17 1771-1774, cols. 835-836.

This was a speech that Burke gave about the recent East India Company annexation of territories in India. In this speech Burke pilloried the East India Company which did not comport with his party’s stance on the company.

In this letter Burke invited his friend Charles O’Hara to spend time at his newly purchased estate. This letter demonstrated that Burke was extremely proud of his new estate.


Burke wrote to his friend Charles O’Hara and requested money from him. This letter helps to illuminate the dire financial situation that Burke was in.


Burke wrote this letter prior to his return to parliament in 1773. In this letter, Burke hinted that he was aggravated with both his parties and the current regulatory bill on East India Company.


In this letter, Burke lamented that his new position as Paymaster-General of the Forces lacked political agency. Accordingly, Burke used his parliamentary position to defend his new title “The Right and Honorable Edmund Burke.”


In this letter, Edmund extolled the virtues of William Burke who helped Edmund attain his first seat in Parliament, despite also being a financial burden on Edmund after the 1769 stock crash. This letter shows that Edmund needed to defend his kinsmen because they were proxies of his personal status. However, with the impeachment of Warren Hastings Edmund exonerated himself from the negative reputation engendered by his shared family finances and their unscrupulous stock investments.


In this letter Burke wrote to an English Noblemen about what virtues their current generation should bequeath to the future generations. Burke employed language in this letter that was very similar to the same language he used when he wrote to Shackleton about Gregories.

Burke wrote this letter to the Duke of Richmond and stated that he refused Sulivan’s offer to become a commissioner. Burke turned this position down because of his desire to secure an honorable reputation to posterity. He was only offered this position due to his recent defense of the East India Company.


In this letter Burek revealed that he did not want posterity to remember him for anything else except his impeachment of Hastings. This letter provides an insight into Burke which this paper analyzes.


This letter demonstrated that Burke trusted the judgement of Philip Francis. Francis was an opponent of Hastings and convinced Burke that Hastings was corrupt. This belief was Burke’s primary impetus for his pursuit of hastings.


This letter provided further evidence that Burke believed that Hastings’s conduct in India tarnished the reputation of Britain’s honor in India.


In this letter, Edmund Burke and his brother Richard told Charles that the recent stock crash had ruined them. The tone of this letter was urgent and indicated that Burke was in financial trouble.


Burke wrote this letter to his acquaintance Richard Shackleton. Burke informed Shackleton that he purchased Gregories. Notably, Burke employed rhetoric that compared his purchase to the protrusion of a “root” into the ground.

Burke recounted that his attempt to impeach Hastings placed his reputation in great danger. However, Burke believed that he was going to vindicate the honor of Britain and himself through Hastings’s impeachment.


This was one of Burke’s first speeches in the impeachment of Warren Hastings. In this speech Burke employed the honor of the British nation to justify the impeachment of Hastings. In other words, if Hastings was not impeached it would detrimentally affect the honor of Britain and the honor of Burke himself.


Burke gave this speech on a new regulatory bill for the East India Company. Burke was the main architect of this bill and it failed in 1783. This failure was the same year he was sued by Earl Verney.


This collection of speeches helped to supplement the work “From a Speech in Opening the Impeachment of Warren Hastings.” The entirety of the speech provided more evidence that Burke utilized the honor of Britain as a justification for Hastings’s impeachment.


This letter from Edmund Burke’s brother was indicative of Edmund’s rising status in parliament. Notably, Richard states the sitting prime-minister complimented Edmund.


This letter was from one of Edmund Burke’s family members to one of their friends. This letter recounted an attack on Edmund Burke in parliament and how Burke defended himself. Burke’s defense of his honor relied on his purchase of Gregories.
Clive’s letter to his associate in London clearly exhibited Clive’s desire to stock-job. This rise in stocks propelled by Clive allowed Edmund Burke to purchase his country estate in Beaconsfield because his family members were invested in that stock.


Dent’s caricature highlighted Burke’s use of Britain’s honor as justification for the impeachment of Warren Hastings. This caricature also negatively displayed Hastings. Notably, Dent drew Hastings giving money to the politicians who opposed his impeachment.


This court case occurred in 1783 when Earl Verney brought a suit against Edmund Burke for £6,000. Verney had speculated in East India Company stocks with William and Richard Burke. After the 1769 stock crash Verney lent William £6000, which Verney believed was utilized by Edmund to pay for Gregories. This case occurred the same year Burke’s regulations on the East India Company failed.


This was one of the many caricatures that Burke was portrayed negatively in. This particular caricature depicts Burke firing a blunderbuss at Hastings while other members of Burke’s party try to steal Hastings wealth from India.


In this letter Charles Lee wrote about his experience in English Parliament. Notably, Lee mentioned that Edmund Burke wanted an honorable reputation. Thus, a foreign dignitary demonstrated the crucial nature of property in Burke’s life.


Charles O’Hara, a friend of Edmund Burke, wrote this letter and demonstrated the importance of property to Edmund Burke. The emphasis on property is indicative of how important it was in eighteenth-century England.
Rambert’s caricature depicts Burke as a jesuit throwing mud at Warren Hastings. This is yet another example of the negative depictions of Burke during his attempted impeachment of Hastings.


This magazine article decried the East India Company’s actions and the negative effect they had on the majority of stockholders. This source shows that the practice of avaricious stockholders at the upper levels of the East India Company adversely affected shareholders like William Burke. Also, this source indicates that people believed their financial troubles were caused by delinquent company employees in India who siphoned funds from the company’s revenue stream.

Secondary Source Annotated Bibliography


Black’s book focused on the politics and government of Britain throughout the eighteenth-century. This source determines the domestic political context of Edmund Burke’s life.


Colley’s book provided an excellent historical context of eighteenth-century Britain. Notably, Colley description of the emergence of a distinct British ruling class defined Burke’s social milieu. Also, Colley examined and explained England’s anti-Catholic sentiment which directly applied to Burke’s Irish Roman Catholic background.


In this work Debruyn examined Burke through the character Don Quixote. More relevantly, DeBruyn cited Kramnick in her work. This citation demonstrates that Kramnick’s work is still relevant.

Derry’s book provides excellent context for Burke’s work on Fox’s East India bill. Derry stated that King George III utilized his influence in the House of Lords to kill Fox’s East India Bill.


Gardner’s monograph supplied a general history of the East India Company. In particular, Gardner clearly explained Hastings’s rise to power in India.


Joseph’s article provided background on Robert Clive that demonstrated his negative effect on the traditional trajectory of politicians in eighteenth-century Britain. In particular, Joseph traced Clive’s use of his wealth to gain political power in Britain.


Kiernan’s book provided extremely valuable context to the pervasive honor culture of Europe. Additionally, Kiernan also treated the connection between honor and dueling in eighteenth-century England. Lastly, Kiernan also examined the interplay between honor and the Enlightenment.


It is necessary to include this book because it is one of the very few sources that is critical of Edmund Burke. Kramnick argues that Burke’s political ideology, conservatism, was driven by rage. Kramnick paints Burke as a staunch defender of the old aristocracy of Europe. On the one hand, Burke attacks the Jacobins because their governmental innovations disregard aristocratic traditions. More relevantly Kramnick argues that India was an arena in which Burke could display his conservative ideology. It is evident that Burke saw Hastings as a usurper of the old Indian order. In other words, a western Jacobin that decimated the eastern aristocracy. This book showed that Burke was a conflicted man. However, there is no reference to the 1769 stock crash which almost cost Burke his Gregories estate at Beaconsfield and its effects on the trial of Warren Hastings.


Lambert’s book is a biography of Edmund Burke that situates him at his Beaconsfield estate. According to Lambert when Edmund and his kinsmen purchased Beaconsfield, Edmund felt as though he was ascending into the English gentry. Notably, Lambert provided excellent context for Edmund Burke’s desire to purchase Gregories in 1765 and the pernicious pecuniary effects of the East India Company stock crash four years later.

Langford examined the history of Britain from 1727-1789 with particular emphasis on manners and economic values in eighteenth-century Georgian Britain. Langford avers that these concepts are crucial components of eighteenth-century Britain. This source illuminated the cultural and political context of the era in which Burke and Hastings both lived. Alternatively, these ideas informed the decisions of Burke’s public and private life.


In this work Paul Langford asserted the importance of property as it related to political power and honor in eighteenth-century England. This monograph helps to provide context and demonstrate that Burke’s desire to own property and retain it was part of the culture which he lived in.


This work is the first of a two-volume biography of Edmund Burke. Lock’s biography is a relatively impartial especially when compared with other biographies such as the ones by Kramnck and O’Brien. Additionally, this source exhibits how the scholarship on Burke has evolved over time to less biased interpretations.


This book is the concluding volume of Lock’s biography of Edmund Burke. In this volume, Lock reviewed the trial of Warren Hastings through Burke’s perspective on a day to day basis. Additionally, Lock recounted the situation of Britain and Burke before the impeachment of Hastings. This source explained the context of Burke’s personal life and the political situation of Britain during and before the trial of Warren Hastings in my thesis.


O’Brien’s thematic biography treated Burke’s political thought as it relates to his crusade against the abuse of power. In particular, O’Brien considers this theme as it relates to Burke and the East India Company. O’Brien states that India is the only topic on which Burke vacillated. Upon his entrance to parliament in 1767 Burke defended the company from any form of oversight. However, later in his career Burke advocated parliamentary supervision of the East India Company. Nevertheless, this source is biased as O’Brien is from Ireland and tends to portray Burke as a closet Roman Catholic. O’Brien further proves that scholarly work on Burke often overlooks the influence of Burke’s personal life on the trial of Warren Hastings.

Robbins’s book argued that corporations, specifically, the East India Company played a crucial role in the development of the modern world. However, Robbins is biased in his approach to the East India Company. One of the primary goals of Robbins’s book is to hold “today’s corporate sector more fully accountable.” While this endeavor is noble, it adversely affects Robbins’s presentation of evidence. However, I believe this book provides an excellent account of the battle over the East India Company’s Board of Directors between Clive and Sullivan, both prominent figures in the East India Company in the mid-eighteenth-century. This battle and Clive’s subsequent victory set the company on a crash course with Edmund Burke’s personal finances.


Robinson’s book provides details of political caricatures that specifically relate to Edmund Burke’s life. This book contains many political caricatures and is therefore a primary source as well. The most crucial of these caricatures are those that relate to Burke’s impeachment of Hastings. The provide evidence that Burke was driven by honor.


Wecter’s work is important because he was the last historian to write about the influence of Edmund Burke’s finances on his political policy. Wecter asserted that Burke’s position on the East India Company correlated with the financial interests of his family members. However, Wecter failed to examine the consequences that the Bengal Bubble had on Burke.
Appendix 1
Political Caricatures Surrounding the Impeachment of Hastings


James Gillray’s depiction of Burke here is rather scurrilous. Edmund Burke has a bag of ammunition titled charges which he is shooting out of a blunderbuss at Warren Hastings who is seated upon a horse and is holding a shield of honor given to him by the Crown. The two other figures are Charles James Fox, who is poised to stabbed Hastings, and Lord North, who is stealing Hastings’s money. Robbins describes Burke here as “In armour but barefoot, Burke is depicted as impractical, excitable and ineffective.

This caricature was a negative depiction of Edmund Burke. In this picture Burke is depicted as the front right Roman Catholic horse while the other horses are Sheridan, North, and Fox. They are all pulling a enormous wagon-load of evidence against Hastings. The poster in the back reads “For a Few Days will be performed a Comedy called Impeachment by a Ragged Company (late) His Majesty's Servants.”

William Dent’s caricature *Poor Vulcan and His Cyclops*... was an adverse depiction of Burke. The scene in this caricature is in the workshops of Vulcan, the Roman god of fire and metalworking who with the help of the cyclops made thunderbolts for Jove until he was banished from heaven. In this version Burke is a cyclops on the left hammering the twisted metal available to him into “proof” with another cyclops on the right whose face is concealed but is likely Phillip Francis. Burke is also on the anvil as a sulking hen and on the anvil’s foundation as a maimed figure of “the force of envy.” Fox in this picture is Vulcan and North is the stoker of the flames.
In this drawing caricaturist John Boyne represented Burke honorably. Previously, Boyne’s caricatures disparaged Burke’s reputation. In this picture Edmund Burke is depicted as the famous Roman politician Marcus Tullius Cicero. Cicero prosecuted Gaius Verres who utilized his position as magistrate of Sicily to extort the local populace there. Therefore, it is quite clear the Verres was symbolic of Warren Hastings. The speech at the bottom of this illustration is the start of Cicero’s speech against Verres, however, words like “Rome” and “The Republic” are switched with “British People,” “W H (Warren Hastings),” “Indostan,” and “Britons.” In the background, Britannia (female personification of Britain) assuages a woman who is supposed to travel to India. Fox and North are seated behind Burke. North is turned away from Burke. This situation was rather ironic because Fox and Burke had threatened Fox with impeachment. This drawing was ostensibly the only caricature of Burke that was not scurrilous.
Another caricature by John Boyne that clearly demonstrates his usual scurrilous depiction of Edmund Burke. Burke is an indigent street vendor selling salt fish. Boyne was inspired to depict Burke as a street vendor because the word ‘hastings’ was the name of a pea sold in the markets of London and because of Burke’s incessant pursuit of impeachment of Warren Hastings. Behind Burke playbills reference Hastings’s impeachment.

This caricature represented the speech that Richard Sheridan gave in the commons to impeach Hastings for his treatment of the begums of Oudh. Edmund Burke is the leading figure of the “Ayes,” or the “British Battalion.” Burke stands on the right hand side beating the drum of “Impeachment” which is further labeled “For the Honor of the Nation.” This caricature clearly demonstrates that Burke utilized the honor of the nation to pursue the impeachment of Hastings. Richard Sheridan who stands in front of Burke wears a helmet entitled “Sublime and Beautiful Sherry” to exhibit he is embouchure of Burke (one of Burke’s most well known work is *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*). Sheridan also holds the bellows of “argument,” another bellows titled “Wit,” a sash entitled “humanity,” and spews bolts from his mouth entitled “Truth,” “Conviction,” and “Justice.” The “Bengal Battalion” on the left hand side is led by William Pitt the Younger (the sitting P.M). Pitt is is directly beneath the flag of the “Bengal Battalion” and is stabbing Warren Hastings, who stands in the middle, with a spear entitled “Refined Candour.” After being stabbed Hastings gushes out coin that the Bengal Battalion seizes in addition to the money Hastings is already giving them from his right hand entitled “peculation” and mouth. Burke’s counterpart on the left is Henry Dundas who plays a set of bagpipes, filled with coin, titled “Music hath charms to sooth &c.” Dundas was the Treasurer of the Navy for Pitt and was essentially the head of the Board of Control for India, which was a powerful conduit for patronage.

In this caricature Edmund Burke is on the right depicted as one of two “celebrated Prize fighters” the “Irish Buffer” whose glasses and which lay beneath him. Warren Hastings stands on the left is given the title “the Bengal Bruiser,” while his turban lays beneath him. Dent was referring to a fight that occurred in January between the professional boxers Humphries & Mendoza.

Johann Ramberg’s libelous depiction of Edmund Burke shows him as a Jesuit, encouraged by a satyr, throwing mud at Warren Hastings who stands on the left in a turban. Ramberg was a protege of George III, who helped defend Hastings. Therefore, this caricature was rather biased. Fox also to the right of Burke picks mud up from the street to throw at Hastings. Also, to the left of Hastings a pair of lawyers attempt to abscond with Hastings purse.
A negative depiction of Burke and detrimental to his honor. In this picture, Burke and Fox are illustrated as weather vanes titled “Impeachment” that are sitting on top of an envious Philip Francis (Hastings primary rival during his tenure as Governor-General). Burke and Fox attack Hastings, who stands on the left under the flag “India Preserved,” with bombastic rhetoric depicted in the smoke that blows behind them. Lord North sleeps on the left with a fallen flag titled “America Lost.”

This picture was yet another attack on Burke’s reputation. Dent drew Burke, Sheridan, and Fox as clowns. Burke is on the left, Sheridan is in the middle, and Fox is on the right. Three posters entitled “The Prodigious Monster arrived from the East,” “The Oratorical Tragedy,” and “Dancing on the Tight Rope” hang behind the clowns. “The Oratorical Tragedy” quotes *Hamlet*: “or the Power of the pathetic over the beautiful. He would drown the stage with tears and cleave the general ear with horrid speech.”
In this picture Dent placed Burke in the clouds, holding a scroll titled “Impeachment.” Hastings is carried in a litter by lawyers and is protected from Burke’s invective by a royal umbrella held by a Lord Chancellor who holds a bag of coin titled “Treatise on Friendship.” Hastings is carried to St. James’s Place over the heads sleeping of lords who are titled “Honor”. In the background Fox and Sheridan carry a witness to an unpredictable weathervane of “evidence.” The witness also holds a bag of coin and Fox asks the witness “Why not swear here what you have asserted elsewhere?”

James Sayers’s negative depiction of Burke in this caricature is the operator of a projector that distorts images to unproportionally large sizes. For instance, a flea becomes an elephant, a wart is transformed into Mount Ossa on top of Pelion and Olympus (like when the giants tried to scale heaven in Greek mythology, which is commentary on the monumental task of impeachment), the tears of Indian victims of Hastings’s rapacious policies are magnified into an ocean, and a weasel is magnified into a whale which swims in the magnified ocean.

This caricature is also another denigrating depiction Edmund Burke. In this caricature Fox inserts Burke, the bellows of long-windedness, into Sheridan’s anus which produces a stream of words from Sheridan including: “Jaghire Elephant Oude Bamboo Cages Begums Begums Begums Plundered Princesses Sacrificed begums Filial duty wantonly destroyed Shackled Eunuchs Sustenance forbid Strangled Ministers Treaties violated Rebellion Nominal Cruelties confirmed Incontrovertible Evidence Natives Annihilated. Witnesses Biased Defence Denied.”

In this caricature Dent depicts Burke as a demonic Catholic holding a cross entitled “Charges.” Burke points to apparitions of Hastings’s previous crimes and compels Hastings to choose death in a form offered by Burke’s colleagues including: poison, rope, dagger, or pistol. Philip Francis stands on the far left of the drawing and holds Burke’s spectacles in front of Hastings as to force Hastings to view the situation through Burke’s eyes. Burke says to Hastings “Ay now you are my good spirits, black, white, blue and grey. Torment him with a choice of death, let him not rest night nor day, whilst I raise up those shades, and thou my chief spirit F(rancis). Source of the charges, thou Imp of Envy strip him of his plumage and hold my spectacles to his eyes, that he may see as I do, confess, die and be dam’d for hoarding his riches.”
Appendix 2
Timeline Link

http://rizzoseniorresearch.digitalscholars-unca.com/patrick-randalls-timeline/
Appendix 3
Edmund Burke’s Financial Relationships
Color Coded. The numbers 1, 2, and 3 represent what Verney thought happened to the £6000

Richard Burke and William Burke both partnered with Earl Verney to

Richard Burke, William Burke, and Earl Verney all heavily invested in E.I.C.

Richard Burke

Earl

William

Edmund

Gregory

E.I.C. Investment

Richard Burke shared money with his brother

William Burke shared money with his cousin Edmund Burke. In Verney’s 1783 suit he accused Edmund of taking £6000 from William after the 1769 Crash.

Edmund Burke entered Parliament under the patronage of Earl Verney in 1765.

Edmund Burke utilized the money that his brothers made from their E.I.C. investments

loan he gave to William Burke in 1769.
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Cover Letter

Dear Dr. Rizzo

I believe that in the final draft of my paper I successfully addressed the majority of comments that you, Dr. Spellman and Alex recommened to me. Per Alex’s requests I put a space between parenthetical statements and fixed some footnote issues. Per your request I reorganized my historiography to include Kiernan, tightened up some sections about the significance of Gregories, and made sure the formatting on my footnotes was precise. Additionally my ratio is 71 primary source footnotes out of 113 footnotes which equals approximately 62.8% of total footnotes. Per Dr. Spellman’s request I made some important adjustments regarding my diction, notably, I removed my repetition of the word “impact.” Also, per my own criticism I reorganized my bibliographies to ensure they were in alphabetical order and I believe that I completely removed any remaining sentences I previously constructed in the passive voice.

I did not, however, add very much else to the paper. I felt as though the appendixes would speak more to readers for this topic than additional text would. Therefore, aside from editing and flushing out a few topics, I spent a fair amount of time constructing what I think are some very helpful appendices. The first appendix contains myriad political caricatures that surrounded Burke’s impeachment of Hastings. I believe this will help readers gain insight into the impeachment of Hastings and the social dynamics of eighteenth-century Britain as well. The second appendix includes my timeline which I think will help readers get a grip on the chronology of this topic. The third appendix is a color coded chart of Edmund Burke’s financial relationships to help readers understand how Burke purchased Gregories and Verney’s alleged flow of money from Verney to William to Edmund to amortize Gregories. My final appendix is a chart of East India Company stock from The Corporation that Changed the World... by Nick Robbins.

Lastly, I would like to thank you, Dr. Spellman, Dr. Pearson, and Alex for your dedicated readings and critiques of my paper. I am only so lucky to have a group of historians so knowledgeable about my topic and willing to share that knowledge with me. I must admit this process was maddening, inspiring, and at times overwhelming. Nevertheless, I loved every single minute of it.

Thank you all for your help

Sincerely Patrick Randall
Meeting Four (prior to submission of final paper)

Student: Patrick Randall  
Professor: Bill Spellman  
Date: 11/4/2016

Progress Notes:
We met for a final review of 2nd draft. Patrick will send me final revisions over the weekend and I will provide feedback on Monday 7 November.