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In an article in the last number of this journal I attempted to show that there were some faults in the idea that the delayed enclosure of the open fields in the borough of Stamford was an aspect of the Cecil family's political control of the borough. Here, it is hoped to present an alternative explanation for this delay which will perhaps prove to be more watertight than its predecessor.

One point must be made clear at the outset. It is quite clear that the second Marquess of Exeter chose to prolong the existence of the open fields and that the delay was the result of his policy. Although the drama is being radically recast, the Marquess of Exeter is still the villain of the piece. It is his motives which are the subject of contention, not his actions, however, and it is to a consideration of these motives that we now turn.

According to Professor W. G. Hoskins and Mr. J. M. Lee, these motives were purely political but there is much evidence to show that they were far less sophisticated than this. The first clue to their nature appeared in the *Stamford Mercury* of 20th September, 1833 in a verbatim report of the meeting of the Municipal Reform Commissioners. James Torkington, the second largest freeholder on the open fields, who was giving evidence, was asked: "What now prevents an enclosure?" Torkington replied: "Lord Exeter stated that it was his wish before an enclosure took place to become as large a proprietor of land as he could." There is much evidence to bear out the truth of this testimony and to show that the acquisition of land not of Tory voters lay at the heart of Lord Exeter's policy.

The first and principal object of Lord Exeter's ambitions was the belt of waste which surrounded the town. This had originally been the area just outside the town's walls which had been kept clear for purposes of defence. By the 19th century the Freemen of the town had acquired the right of turning out their livestock over this area. More than this, any physical growth of the town would have to take place over this land and by the 1820's houses were being built on this area on the waste. Until 1809 there was not more than 2 or 3 houses on
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this area but by 1828 there were approximately 100 buildings of the value of £15,000
situated there. A survey of these and other encroachments on the waste, commissioned by
the Marquess of Exeter and published in 1846, emphasised the great value of that part of the
waste which encircled Stamford, by reason of the number of houses standing on it and of its
nearness to the town. By 1842, the Stamford Mercury estimated this property to be worth
£20,000.

Contemporary observers other than Torkington were well aware that Lord Exeter had his
eye on this land, though they may have been wrong, as events were to show, in assuming that
its value to him was merely a monetary one. It was clear to them, however, that he meant to
get his hands on this part of the waste by whatever means he could employ. A petition on
the subject dating from the 1820's accused him of allowing a gas works to be established on
part of the waste near to the town in 1823, and subsequently forcing the company to convey
the land to him as freehold. More problematical, and more central to our theme, was the
status of this land should an enclosure come about. This issue drew itself increasingly to the
attention both of the Marquess and the town in the 1820's when the encirclement of the
borough by enclosed parishes led to declining land values in the open fields and an increasing
atmosphere of expectancy and even indignation amongst public opinion in Stamford.

Stamford's was, however, a very special case. Under normal enclosure procedure the
waste would be carved up and added to the enclosed allotments of the freeholders. In
Stamford's case, however, the position was complicated by the fact that right of common was
exercised not by the freeholders or open field tenants, but by the Freemen of the borough. In
this case, therefore, neither of these groups had any claim to the waste. It was into this vacuum
that the second Marquess of Exeter sought to insert himself. If an enclosure was in the air
then it would be on his terms and he set about paving the way for an enclosure which would
favour his ambition. In April, 1828, he ordered those who owned buildings on the waste to
dismantle them within the fortnight or face prosecution at his suit. His purpose in disposing
of the encroachers was to extinguish any possible rival claim to the land. The editor of the
Stamford Mercury realised what was going on and described Lord Exeter's actions as "the
first steps towards it" (i.e. an enclosure).

Unfortunately for the Marquess, however, there was another claimant to the waste—the
Town Council. Indeed, the Council itself could produce a healthy claim to the area of waste
which skirted the town, and this it proceeded to do. Prior to the great reform of local govern-
ment in 1835 the Stamford Town Council had a very special interest in the waste and rights
of common on the open fields, for its members were all Freemen themselves. Moreover, the
Freemen were, in a sense, a branch of the Council and for this reason the Council had con-
trolled the stocking of the waste in the open fields before the Cecil family's repurchase of the
manor in 1747, when they had let this control lapse to Lord Exeter's manor court. The
members of the Council were also well aware of what the Marquess was up to and accordingly
decided to make good their claim to the waste and, at the same time, challenge Lord Exeter's
right to dispose of the encroachers. At the Michaelmas Hall of that year, it was asserted that
Lord Exeter had no right to make the encroachers pull down their properties, that he had no
right to amerce them by means of the manor court as he was doing by 1828, and that the Council
held the waste in fee-simple. Not only this but the Council then went on to obtain legal
opinions in support of these assertions. These, when they were obtained, favoured the
Council's point of view and on the strength of these a committee was formed "to attend to
the rights and interests of the Corporation (i.e. Freemen) as well as the Corporation in case an
enclosure should take place and have full power to make such proposals to Lord Exeter for
carrying this measure into effect."

The committee requested and secured an interview with Lord Exeter's land agent and its
efforts were followed with a good deal of optimism. The *Stamford Mercury* hinted that there was now “a good prospect of the enclosure of the Stamford open fields.”\(^{18}\) Nor was the committee merely concerned with challenging Lord Exeter’s claim to the waste. It was eager to get on with the rumoured enclosure and during the negotiations offered the Marquess\(^{19}\) an allotment on the waste and on other lands around the town on which erections had been made, allowing sufficient space for holding public fairs to the Corporation.\(^{20}\)

Despite this offer, which shows that members of the Council were well aware of what lay behind the Marquess’s actions, the proposals were rejected and by the end of July 1829 the negotiations had broken down. Lord Exeter had made stipulations which the Corporation could not accept.\(^{21}\) It is unfortunately not quite clear what these stipulations may have been, but it was probable that Lord Exeter continued to insist on the removal of the property on the waste. As many of the encroachers were Freemen it would not be likely that the Council would agree to a proposal detrimental to the interests of the privileged class of townspeople which they represented.\(^{19}\)

Whatever may have happened, it was soon clear that the stand made by the Council had thwarted Lord Exeter’s plans; the encroachments stood unmolested and it was to be another fifty years before serious preparations for an enclosure were to be made in Stamford. During this time the second Marquess worked hard to make good his claim.

At first, the Marquess continued his policy of trying to intimidate the encroachers. In 1830 posts and railings were thrown up around them in an attempt to make access to them well-nigh impossible.\(^{22}\) In the following year, after the defeat of one of the Tory candidates in the Stamford Parliamentary election, a setback which was partly attributable to the Whig votes of some of the encroachers, the Marquess vented his spite by having a fresh set of notices issued on the encroachers.\(^{23}\)

As the 30’s drew on, however, it became clear that Lord Exeter was relying on other means than those of mere threats and menaces to realise his claim. It became apparent that, by means of his position as lord of the manor of Stamford, he was trying to establish that he had a special concern and interest in the waste lands of the manor to such a degree that they would be allotted to him in the event of an enclosure. The Freemen were the pawns of this policy for it was through their rights of common over the waste and his control of these rights by the manor court, that Lord Exeter hoped eventually to attain the status of ownership. Sometimes he made clear this special concern by defending their rights of common over the waste as in 1834, when he supported the Freemen in protesting against the infringement of their rights when the Turnpike Trustees sold a disused part of the Great North Road over which they had exercised grazing rights.\(^{24}\) Sometimes he tried to undermine them, when, in the late 30’s he supported a Freeman in prosecuting James Torkington, a freethinker in the open fields, who had fenced in his property to keep out the Freemen’s stock. Some sections of public opinion in the town felt that Lord Exeter had only encouraged this prosecution in the hope that it would fail so that he could take advantage of the situation. The *Stamford Mercury* alleged: “Lord Exeter is trying to infer that the Freemen have no rights and in that case (as) Lord of the Manor he can take to himself all the waste lands.”\(^{25}\) This opinion was not the exclusive property of the editor of the *Mercury*; at a meeting of the Town Council on 21st November, 1838, “It was asserted by Mr. Tebbutt that Lord Exeter was at the bottom of this and was seeking to establish a title against the Freemen.” Later in the discussion, “Mr. Torkington also stated that Lord Exeter was trying to establish a claim over the commons”.\(^{26}\)

Such actions were not as contradictory as they seem to be even though they bewildered such staunch supporters as Richard Thompson who declared: that it was “melancholy to observe the inconsistencies of Lord Exeter and his agents.”\(^{20}\) The key to Lord Exeter’s actions was the Municipal Reform Act of 1835, for this piece of legislation, which abolished the old
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chartered constitutions of town government, did not establish clearly whether the privileges of borough Freemen had been abolished as part and parcel of this. Indeed, a Select Committee of the House of Commons was set up in the 1840’s to clear the matter up, but nothing reached the statute book and the question remained undecided. The question as far as Stamford and the Marquess of Exeter was concerned was this: did the Freemen’s rights of common still exist and, if not, to whom did the waste over which they exercised these rights belong? Lord Exeter, therefore, was not so much defending these rights as trying to stop others building on or selling this land which he thought rightly belonged to him. The sham nature of this defence became clear in the early ’50’s when the Freemen made a determined effort to claim ownership of the waste by applying to the Enclosure Commission for an enclosure of this part of the manor.28 The Marquess nipped this challenge in the bud by refusing his consent, which, as lord of the manor, he could do.27 In supporting the prosecution of Torkington, Lord Exeter was trying to take advantage of the situation created by the Municipal Reform Bill and if the interpretation of the Statute went against the Freemen, step in and claim the waste.

Unfortunately for him, the case failed as a result of a technical error committed at the very start of the proceedings.28 The Marquess now abandoned this policy; he made no attempt to support William Reed, a Freeman who was prosecuted by Torkington in 1843 for trespass, after he had broken down the fences which the latter had set up in the open fields and turned cattle on to it.29 Nor did the further action promised to Richard Thompson in 1845 come to anything.30 Instead, the Marquess relied on the operations of his manor court, hoping that in course of time, the amercements which it imposed on the encroachers would come to be regarded as a rent and that, in this way, the waste would ultimately become his. Once again, contemporaries quickly saw through this device. In November, 1842, the Stamford Mercury alleged: “The Marquess of Exeter has recently been trying to convert the amercement due to the Lord of the Manor for buildings on the waste into a rent and it is said that when he has got as many people into this net as possible and acquired £20,000 worth of property around the town in this way, he will consent to an enclosure”.31 He clung grimly to this course until his death in 1867, despite the fact that as a result of Torkington v. Reed the traditional system of open field cultivation fell into ruins. Reed had entered a counter plea of right of common, but was forced to withdraw it because of lack of support from his fellow Freemen and because his lawyer thought it difficult to prove the existence of such rights.32 The Freemen’s rights were not demolished but it was clear to all the landowners and tenants in the open fields that they had no means of asserting them. Torkington, by enclosing his land, had raised his rentals from 24 shillings to 50 shillings an acre and, spurred on by his example, many tenants and freeholders began to enclose.33 By the end of the 1840’s most of the ‘lands’ in the open fields had been surrounded by stone walls.34 Even the Corporation followed suit, re-letting, in 1848, land formerly leased en bloc in small paddocks in order to exact a higher rent.35 By 1850, the customary system of open field cultivation lay in ruins. James Caird described them as ‘held in little patches by farmers whose fields are intermixed with each other’.

The manor court proceedings acknowledged these changes. No field officials were appointed after 1844 but the court still met until 1863, solely for the purpose of amercing the encroachers and, indeed, by this time the amercements were commonly referred to as “rents”.37 At the same time the Marquess artificially perpetuated the Freeman’s right of common by allowing them to turn out their stock over his land on the open fields when fences and stone walls kept them off the land of others.38 If this right were allowed to become extinct, he might not realise his claim to the waste which, by custom, they were allowed to stock all the year round.
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It is quite clear that the Marquess wanted the waste around the town before he would agree to an enclosure. He was also after as much of the rest of the open fields he could grab in the meantime. By 1863, he was being fined by his own manor court for owning property on the freehold of the open fields. It is apparent from the entry in the manor court rolls that he had purchased this property from other encroachers. He allowed his tenants to plough in grass banks in the open fields whilst he enclosed grass verges alongside the Great North Road areas, incidentally, over which the Freeman exercised grazing rights. When the Council wanted land in the open fields for a municipal cemetery, Lord Exeter offered to buy all the Council’s land in the open fields for “the high price” of £90 an acre and to re-sell to the Corporation 3 acres of land for the cemetery. This offer was rejected for as potential building land the Council’s property could well fetch £500 an acre. It is probable that as the customary agriculture of the manor declined in the 1840’s, Lord Exeter tried to get as much land as he could into his hands before the wholesale process of piecemeal enclosure was complete.

It is clear from this evidence that Torkington’s testimony to the Municipal Reform Commissioners in 1832 was substantially correct: “Lord Exeter stated that it was his wish before an enclosure took place to become as large a proprietor of land as he could.” Those who believe that political motives lay behind the delay would argue that he wanted to control the votes of as many householders as he could, and that this would mean acquiring as much land as he could before agreeing to an enclosure. There are substantial objections to this point of view. Lord Exeter knew that if he hoped to acquire land it could not be from the other freeholders. Not only would they refuse to sell as the Corporation did in 1845, but it is doubtful whether the Marquess could raise sufficient funds to buy them all out. His successor had to borrow money from Richard Thompson to cover his expenses when the enclosure eventually came about in the 1870’s and had to abandon a projected enclosure of his estates at Barrowden because he admitted it “difficult to find funds for two such large works at the same time out of the Estate receipts.” There is evidence that the Cecil estates suffered badly in the depressions of the ’30’s and ’40’s. In 1850-51 “the tenants on the estate are represented as being in the most hopeless state of despondence on account of the present low prices of agricultural produce . . . . . . The estate is said to be low-rented.” Lord Exeter only owned just over half the land in the open fields and as there was so much he could not hope to acquire, so many votes he could never control, it is hardly likely that this was the aim behind his policy.

In fact, Lord Exeter refused to enclose because he could not acquire certain land in the open fields—that land being the customary waste of the manor which the Freeman stocked all the year round. Firstly, part of it, the waste that skirted the town was extremely valuable—this emerged from the Survey of 1846, although the Marquess must have been substantially aware of this beforehand, otherwise he would not have commissioned the valuation. Secondly, the Marquess may have genuinely believed in the justice of his cause. His persistence may have arisen in part from a conviction that his position of lord of the manor entitled him to the fee-simple of the waste. Thirdly, the family was sincerely interested in the well-being and development of the town. All Stamford’s public utilities stemmed from the generosity and patronage of Burghley House. When the enclosure came about, his successor wielded his influence to secure a major part of the land on the edge of the town; land which has subsequently been devoted to amenities such as playing fields, allotments, open spaces and homes for old people and children. It may be that the second Marquess had this destiny in mind for all or part of the waste once it had become his property.

Other important causes of Cecil refusal and delay emerge from the evidence offered above. The status of the Freeman’s rights after 1835 were another thorny problem; if they still existed the second Marquess claimed that he had “been assured that every proprietor of Open Field
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land would in the event of an enclosure have less acres than at present and it would therefore be more prudent not to incur the expense of an enclosure exceedingly more costly than usual." This sentiment was shared by Torkington: "I will not agree to an enclosure unless it is first admitted that no such rights exist." Allied to this problem was the question of expense; the third Marquess had to borrow to set the enclosure on foot. Much more difficult it must have seemed to his predecessor in the depressions of the 30's and 40's and faced with the problem of Freemen's rights.

It has been argued that the enclosure came about in the 1870's after the abolition of the household franchise in 1867 although, if we believe that the Marquess of Exeter's policy was to limit building and to control votes, it is difficult to understand why, so soon after the passing of the Second Reform Bill, he should agree to a measure which would destroy what control he had over building in the town and which would encourage the new voters to come and live in Stamford. One would have thought that the measure would have hardened the hearts of the Stamford Cecils and not have led them to unbend. Indeed, if we assume that the Cecils were not after votes but land, some interesting reasons emerge which account for the reversal of this policy.

In the first place, it became apparent that the attempt to turn the amercements imposed by the manor court on the encroachers into rents, was proving abortive by the 1860's. Usage was denying, not confirming, the Cecil's title to this land. Many of the encroachers on the waste, whose property the second Marquess had tried to gather into his net, were claiming that their buildings stood on freehold land, and were refusing to pay the amercements imposed by the manor court. If these claims were allowed to grow unchecked, the waste would be fragmented into a mosaic of small freeholds over which the Cecils had no claim. A manor court memorandum book for the year 1863 records sixteen refusals to pay the amercements imposed by the manor court. One encroacher, replying from Bedford, said that he had bought the property "years back and had no idea Lord Exeter had any claim on it." Another, Rowe, said "he had never paid and never will" and gave "plenty of abusive language into the bargain." Unfortunately, the court memorandum book is the only source of evidence of these refusals to pay, and it is difficult to estimate the extent of this recalcitrance. Nevertheless, it is evident that some of these properties were being purchased as "freeholds" by individuals who did not even live in Stamford and who were unaware of the unique legal status of the property they were buying. It is also clear that some of the occupiers, at least, were repudiating the suggestion that Lord Exeter had any control over the waste. It was probably clear to the third Marquess, who succeeded to the title in 1867, that this policy was not having the desired results. The complete abandonment of this policy was made clear by the Stamford Enclosure Act, when the encroachers were given the opportunity to enfranchise their properties by payment of a sum assessed by the Valuer to the Marquess as lord of the manor. One crumb of comfort remained; under Section 33 of the Act, these payments were to defray the Marquess' share of the enclosure expenses and, as his solicitors had received £1,235-11-4 by the 3rd October 1873, they probably did much more than this.

Secondly, it seems clear that the no enclosure policy was undermining the benevolence and patronage which characterised the relationship between the family and the town. By the late 1860's the town was becoming disfigured and unhealthy by reason of the many houses which had been built around it on the waste, and there is evidence that public opinion was becoming resentful. "There are," declared Richard Thompson, "300 or 400 houses on the outskirts of the town of a miserable nature, many of which are without a single inch of ground and without prior accommodation and such must continue unless an enclosure takes place." Later, he admitted, in the strictest confidence: "There are very strong reasons why the matter should proceed—if only as a counterpoise to things which have created a good deal of annoy-
ance in the town.” Moreover, although both Mr. Lee and Professor Hoskins imply that the enclosure marks the end of a period when the family tried to use the land around the town to influence the outcome of Parliamentary elections in Stamford, evidence from the time of the enclosure would seem to point to the opposite. The enclosure seems to have been an opportunity to renew patronage and to curry public opinion in favour of the Tory party.

Lord Exeter wanted to provide the town with a recreation ground; he was concerned about the siting and provision of allotments “for the labouring poor”; he tried to get powers granted to him under the Stamford Enclosure Act to grant and control such allotments and when the government insisted that this power should be given to the Corporation, Richard Thompson “came away, disgusted with the illiberal way the matter was treated.” Despite this setback, the Marquess used his influence to the advantage of his family. He held up the process of allotting the enclosed lands because “I do not believe that until I have selected the ground that I have exchanged for mine, that such an exchange can be considered effected.” Thompson thought that “It would be very desirable if your Lordship would go round the open fields and consider where you would have your allotments.” When he learnt that part of his property which was an old enclosure was to be allotted and exchanged as open field land, he protested: “I cannot allow this, as most of such land is within the limits of the town and to give up such land would lessen my influence. What I give up in or near the town must lessen my influence.” At the same time, his agents were concerned with the political consequence of the enclosure. Lord Exeter’s Stamford solicitors considered that “An enclosure would make a difference of 60 to 80 votes to us . . . We would never be beaten in this town and would find it mortifying to be so.”

At the outset of the proceedings, John Torkington, the descendant of the Cecils’ adversaries on the 30’s and 40’s had admitted that “Lord Exeter had shown a disposition to improve the town,” and, indeed, the land so gave the Cecils control, not as election managers, but as town planners and in the decades after the enclosure the “improvement” of the town rested largely in their hands.

What were the ultimate aims of the Cecils’ use of the Stamford open fields? Was it to control elections up to 1867 and was the third Marquess attempting to move with the times and substitute physical for political control of the town? Or is there a common thread? Both men were seeking land. It is quite clear that the third Marquess sought land to gain influence. It can hardly have been political influence, for the subsequent use to which this land was put was, and is to-day, of great significance in the life and development of Stamford. Was this the aim of the second Marquess as well in delaying the enclosure? A great deal remains to be uncovered before an authoritative pronouncement can be made on this question, but it may well be that the surrounding of Stamford with enclosed blocks of Cecil property in 1875, was the successful consummation of the earlier abortive attempt to surround it with Cecil-owned waste in earlier decades. Both men wanted an enclosure on their own terms, the third Marquess was able to impose his, but the second was unable to do so. His terms may well have been identical with those of his successor.
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