



University
of Glasgow

Freeman, M. (2001) *Rider Haggard and rural England: methods of social enquiry in the English countryside*. *Social History*, 26 (2). pp. 209-216.
ISSN 0307-1022

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/6315/>

Deposited on: 19 May 2010

Mark Freeman

Rider Haggard and *Rural England*: Methods of Social Inquiry in the English Countryside

Although we know much about the methods used by Charles Booth, Seebohm Rowntree and other social investigators in urban Britain in the late Victorian and Edwardian periods, little has yet been written on the methods of rural surveys.¹ In 1901 the popular novelist, Norfolk landowner and practical agriculturist Henry Rider Haggard, together with Arthur Cochrane, a friend acting in a secretarial capacity, travelled around the country, visiting twenty-four counties and two Channel Islands, interviewing different authorities on rural life, with the intention of inquiring into the state of English agriculture and the reasons and remedies for the rural depopulation that appeared to be threatening its future. They carried out a total of 484 interviews, sent out hundreds of printed questionnaires, and received in addition many unsolicited written communications. The reports of the interviews were published in a series of articles entitled 'Back to the Land', which appeared twice weekly in the *Daily Express* between April and October 1901, in the *Yorkshire Post* under the title 'State and Outlook of the English Countryside', and in whole or in part in a variety of local newspapers. In 1902 the articles, together with accompanying evidence gathered from correspondents, were published as a two-volume book, *Rural England*, which has become a standard source for historians of rural life.² However, unlike Booth and Rowntree, Haggard's methods have never been closely examined. The survival of a substantial quantity of archival material, held in the Norfolk Record Office, offers a rare opportunity to analyse the structure and methodology of a rural inquiry of this kind: perhaps the nearest rural approximation to the 'retrieved riches' that have emerged from the Charles Booth archive and advanced our understanding of the achievement of *Life and Labour of the People in London*.³ This brief comment places Haggard into the context of other social

researchers, including Booth, and explains the methods of his survey and the debates to which they gave rise.

Recent research has highlighted the contestability of methods of social inquiry in the Victorian period. In particular, Eileen Yeo has demonstrated, with reference mainly to urban areas, that the development of the middle-class social survey, a tool both for gaining knowledge and asserting control, was paralleled and contested by working-class and socialist groups who advanced their own agendas for social investigation.⁴ Bertrand Taithe has shown, in his introduction to a new edition of Henry Mayhew's 'Answers to Correspondents', how Mayhew's survey of *London Labour and the London Poor* attracted correspondence from all classes of metropolitan society, and effectively became an arena of public debate on the issues of the day.⁵ The social survey, its methods and its findings, was an institution around which political debate coalesced. The reprinting in 1999 of the *Daily News* survey of 1891, together with the correspondence received, has highlighted the kinds of contestation to which the rural survey was open. The regular reports by the 'special commissioner' George Millin on the condition of the agricultural labourer in East Anglia and the home counties in the summer of that year attracted a large correspondence, published in the pages of the newspaper. The *Daily News* became a forum in which any reader, subject to editorial constraint, could express his views on the progress of the inquiry, and confirm or take issue with any of the points made.⁶

Many of the debates generated by such inquiries were methodological, and, significantly, these often centred on the sources of information used in the investigations. In mid-nineteenth century investigations the agricultural labourer was rarely used as an informant, even where his own condition was the subject of inquiry. The special assistant poor law commissioners who reported on rural women's and children's employment in 1843 consulted few labourers, relying largely on the evidence of medical officers, vicars, relieving officers and farmers;⁷ and James

Caird, touring rural England for *The Times* in 1850-1, interviewed only one labourer during his travels.⁸ The *Morning Chronicle* investigators, who travelled around the rural districts in 1849, found the labourer to be ‘timid and shrinking, his whole manner showing that he feels himself at a distance from you ... often doubtful when you address, and suspicious when you question him; he is seemingly oppressed with the interview whilst it lasts, and obviously relieved when it is over’.⁹ The labourer was seen as cautious and defensive, and this did not inspire confidence in the evidence he gave. However, developments in the second half of the century encouraged more use of first-hand information-gathering among rural social investigators. The formation of the National Agricultural Labourers’ Union in 1872 prompted a series of investigations by special correspondent journalists, many of whom reported details of interviews with agricultural labourers. Archibald Forbes, the *Daily News* war correspondent, was sent to Warwickshire, the heart of the Union’s activity, and instead of talking to farmers and landowners, boarded with labouring families and reported on their domestic circumstances.¹⁰ Frederick Clifford of *The Times* interviewed agricultural trade unionists when investigating the East Anglian lockouts of 1874.¹¹ In a period of social and political conflict in the countryside, this development was contested: the *Daily Telegraph*’s special correspondent, for example, scorned the conversations he overheard in village public houses, and Clifford was sceptical of the labourers’ ability to give an accurate account of their wages and earnings.¹² Thus the informant structure of inquiries like these became the subject of intense debate.

In the 1890s, when reports of widespread rural depopulation prompted another wave of special correspondents, beginning with Millin, investigators again discussed the choice of informant. As most now recognized, this choice was a political one. Peter Anderson Graham, a Northumbrian special correspondent and later editor of *Country Life*, contrasted the methods of the Liberal and the Conservative: the Liberal would rely on the evidence of Dissenting ministers, village tradesmen and, above all, the agricultural labourers themselves, whereas the Conservative

would consider landowners, farmers and Church of England parsons as the most reliable sources of information.¹³ Neither group was entirely reliable: the farmer tended to overstate his own benevolence towards his employees and the comfort in which they lived, while the labourer ‘exaggerates his toil, and minimises the reward of it’.¹⁴ This was recognized by the assistant commissioners who reported on the countryside for the Royal Commission on Labour, all of whom made some effort to communicate directly with agricultural labourers, although their inquiries were still dominated by the landowning and employing classes and provoked criticism on these grounds.¹⁵ Inquiries by special correspondent journalists became increasingly polarized. Millin, writing in the Liberal *Daily News*, advised the investigator to ‘stroll down the village and gossip with the people ... you can get some valuable side-lights on village life, and most of the folks have something valuable to say’.¹⁶ By contrast, the Conservative Arthur Cooper, who undertook a tour in direct response to Millin’s, scorned such village ‘gossip’, characterized Millin as ‘the Londoner on the jaunt’, and preferred the trustworthy evidence of farmer, landowner and parson, looking to Arthur Young’s late eighteenth century investigations as his inspiration.¹⁷ Haggard, who had stood as a Conservative candidate in the general election of 1895, located himself within the same tradition, acknowledging the influence of both Young and Caird. Caird had obtained his evidence ‘by walking or riding carefully over individual farms ... accompanied by the farmers, – by traversing estates with the landlord or his agent, – and by seeking access to the best and most trustworthy sources of local information’,¹⁸ and Haggard, presenting himself as an agricultural authority like Caird, adopted a similar method.

However, his researches were also informed by the developing social survey tradition of which Booth and Rowntree were the prime exemplars. His articles appeared in the same year as Rowntree’s survey of York, which he cited in *Rural England* as evidence of unenviable urban social conditions,¹⁹ although methodologically he was closer to Booth, using the interview method to obtain information and opinions on the working-class populations of the areas under

investigation. *Rural England* was not a sociological study on the lines of Booth's *Life and Labour*. It did not attempt to measure with any sense of quantitative certainty the social phenomena it revealed: it was rather an extended and widespread survey of opinion. Haggard later claimed that he had intended to 'arrive at the truth out of the mouths of many witnesses';²⁰ and, as L. L. Price noted in a review in the *Economic Journal*, he 'wishe[d] to draw a picture which is broadly true; and if it be proverbially questionable whether in the multitude of counsellors real wisdom can be found, we may at any rate allow that from a host of interviews a general notion of men's feelings can be drawn'.²¹ Price, however, saw Haggard as having a certain kinship with Booth and Rowntree, and his inquiry took something from the desire for dispassionate analysis embodied in the poverty surveys. Haggard explained that the methods of Caird and other nineteenth-century agricultural tourists were all 'open to the objection that they are too liable to be coloured to the tint of the author's own mind'.²² With the assistance of Cochrane, who took most of the notes, he hoped to avoid this in his own survey by the adoption of a more rigorous and formal interview method.

How far this succeeded is questionable. As Rosemary O'Day has noted in her study of Booth's interviews, analysing the interview process is a difficult task for the historian, despite the survival of notes taken at the time. Although Booth sent out in advance a printed schedule of questions to each interviewee, which acted as a checklist of questions to be covered, there is no way of knowing how closely the interviewer stuck to this schedule. More importantly, perhaps, the interviewer's neutrality was compromised by his selection for preservation in note form of those subjects which interested him the most, raising 'the whole issue of bias and of the nature of the interaction of interviewer and interviewed'.²³ Certainly some of the correspondence Haggard received suggests that his use of the method produced inaccuracies. Some interviewees found the experience unsettling: one wrote to Cochrane after his interview, enclosing an amended series of answers to Haggard's questions and confessing that he felt that he had

‘committed “perjury”’.²⁴ A number wrote clarifying a point they felt had not been made clearly; and the pressures of twice-weekly publication meant that errors and misleading information sometimes appeared in the articles.²⁵ Some interviewees asked that their names not be used; and one advised Haggard not to refer to his interview, as ‘the time at our disposal was so short, and conducted under such unfavourable circumstances that I was unable to place my views very clearly before you’.²⁶ This interview, to judge from Cochrane’s notebook, was brief, and was conducted in the presence of two others.²⁷ Haggard’s interviews, unlike Booth’s, were often conducted out of doors, perhaps while walking through fields, and sometimes involved talking to several people at once. Moreover, as Price suggested, Haggard may have used the interview method to steer his informants into telling him what he wanted to hear.²⁸ Haggard’s tour was advertized as an investigation of depopulation; therefore, the most enthusiastic respondents to his call for information would be those who had definite views on the subject; and in the interviews themselves Haggard would attempt to draw out the opinions of his interviewees on what he saw as the most pressing of matters. It is unlikely that the interview as used by Haggard was as neutral a tool of social research as he asked his readers to believe.

If we turn our attention to the informant base itself, a comparison with Charles Booth can again be drawn. David Englander, in an examination of Booth’s notebooks, showed that Booth’s metropolitan informant base, especially in the Industry series of *Life and Labour*, was socially more eclectic than historians who are acquainted only with the printed volumes of the survey tend to think.²⁹ However, in investigating rural areas Booth took a self-consciously elitist approach. Thus in 1891 he advised Herbert Samuel to ‘consult existing local authorities such as schoolmasters, rate collectors, postmasters, relieving officers, the clergy (Church and Dissent), and the doctors, and only to supplement and enliven the information from such sources with what the inquirer himself sees and hears from the people themselves’.³⁰ Booth’s own strategy, in his inquiry into the condition of the aged poor in villages, was to invite parsons to comment on

the poor in their midst, and in this their function was analogous to that of the school board visitors who provided most of the information for the Poverty series of *Life and Labour*. Beatrice Webb characterized this method as ‘wholesale interviewing’, arguing that, while each individual came to the interview with his own biases and prejudices, the consultation of a large group effectively cancelled them out.³¹ However, in Booth’s rural survey the large group consisted almost entirely of members of the clergy. Thus, while Booth was justified in pointing to the consistency of opinion among his informants once the inevitable and obvious biases were discounted,³² the informants themselves were drawn from a narrow social group, and reflected the outlook of that group.

Haggard’s informant base was similarly restrictive, the majority being landowners, farmers, land agents and auctioneers. Haggard moved within the networks with which he was familiar – it was not uncommon for friends and family to introduce him to potential informants³³ – and sought men who could give him the kind of information he wanted. Men like Clare Sewell Read, a leading agricultural expert and a Norfolk neighbour of Haggard’s, Albert Pell, Conservative MP and Cambridgeshire landowner, and Arthur Wilson Fox, an assistant commissioner for the Royal Commissions on Labour and Agriculture in the 1890s, directed Haggard to informants and by doing so helped shape the framework within which the survey was conducted.³⁴ Furthermore, the farming interest had the advantage of organized groups, such as agricultural clubs or chambers of agriculture, which often invited Haggard to meet their members; and although he disliked this form of information-gathering, he often interviewed representatives of such groups.³⁵ By contrast, there were no meetings with representatives of agricultural trade unions, and only on a few occasions were individual labourers interviewed.³⁶ At least one of these meetings was recorded only in Haggard’s personal notebook, not in Cochrane’s more formal interview notes, suggesting that the labourer was viewed as a curiosity rather than as a part of the formal structure of the inquiry.³⁷ A similar point can be made about

the questionnaire Haggard used: it was sent out to those whom he thought might provide the kind of information he wanted; and it helped to exclude the labourer further from the processes of the investigation.³⁸

This exclusion resulted in a largely uncritical acceptance of the opinions of employers about the character and quality of their workforces. *Rural England* is full of complaints of the relative inefficiency of labourers compared with their ancestors. In Leicestershire, the men ‘either could not or would not work’, and only ‘the old men, the cripples, and the dullards’ remained on the land;³⁹ in Herefordshire the ‘young men who are worth anything went away, only the dregs remaining on the land’;⁴⁰ and in Sussex ‘no one who was fit for anything else stopped on [the land] now-a-days’.⁴¹ Haggard did not acknowledge the contestability of these assessments. By contrast, Cecil Chapman, assistant commissioner for the Royal Commission on Labour, had reported in 1894 that it was generally the opinion of the ‘masters’ that the quality of work done by labourers had declined but the opinion of the ‘men’ that it had not.⁴² Haggard’s characterization of the labouring classes as a feeble and inefficient residuum both derived from and reinforced their exclusion from the mechanisms of the investigation. The very concentration in the survey on the quality of work done, rather than on the social and economic condition of the labourers themselves, reflected the location of the inquiry within a framework dictated by the landowners’ and employers’ concerns. As one correspondent remarked at an early stage of the tour, ‘[s]o far your articles have smacked too much of the Royal Agricultural Society ... You have told us much about the landlords’ losses ... but not much about the common labourer.’⁴³

Even when Haggard wished to give ‘The Labourer’s Point of View’, he turned to Dr. Killick of Williton in Somerset, ‘a Medical Officer who had Studied the Views of the Workers’,⁴⁴ and explained that ‘the labourer is a shy bird; also he is suspicious. In any case it is difficult to persuade him to talk, or to be sure when he does talk that he is saying what is really in

his mind.’⁴⁵ He also spoke to medical officers of health at Gainsborough in Lincolnshire and Yeovil in Somerset,⁴⁶ and elsewhere recognized the value of the testimony of village schoolmasters to an investigation of depopulation, given their intimate acquaintance with rural youth.⁴⁷ Theoretically, at least, such men should have been able to supply information from a more neutral perspective, although, as other writers of the period noted, medical officers were often financially and professionally dependent on local vested interests, and therefore likely to echo their views.⁴⁸ Another possible, but unused, strategy was to interview Nonconformist ministers: Anderson Graham pointed out that, while the Church of England parson was likely to be socially distant from the labouring population, the minister was viewed by villagers as ‘just like one of ourselves’.⁴⁹ George Millin, for example, fell in with a Wesleyan preacher near Didcot, who ‘had been fighting the poor man’s battle ... he thoroughly understands the people, and is in active sympathy with them, and the consequence is that they trust him and talk over their troubles with him’.⁵⁰ The political dimension of Nonconformity discouraged Haggard from adopting this strategy. Nor did he hold public meetings of labourers, a method of information-gathering used by some of the assistant commissioners for the Royal Commission on Labour, although the format of these meetings was also contested in other quarters.⁵¹

Like any other high-profile social investigation, Haggard’s survey was widely discussed. For example, the Tunbridge Wells Farmers’ Club held an adjourned debate on the articles, which Haggard was invited to attend; and H. E. Palmer, editor of the *Yorkshire Post*, saw the survey ‘referred to constantly at agricultural shows’.⁵² It was not always praised, even by those in whose interests it was written: a group of farmers at the Hertfordshire Agricultural Show expressed strong disagreement with Haggard’s articles on their county.⁵³ The volume of unsolicited correspondence received by Haggard and the *Daily Express* was impressive. Many communications criticized his methodology, especially the make-up of the informant base, and much of it had an overtly political dimension. J. Martin White, a prominent member of the

Sociological Society and a former Liberal MP, wrote suggesting that some labourers be consulted; and he later suggested contacting the Liberal agent in each area visited, ‘because the farmers and landlords are mostly Unionists, whereas I understand you want to get the two sides of the question’.⁵⁴ A number of other letters recommended that Haggard consult some labourers, some mentioning particular examples by name;⁵⁵ and one from a labourer remarked that ‘[t]his subject is not one that has been often – if at all – written upon from the labourers [*sic*] point of view ... [and] I trust that I may be able to give some information from the labourers [*sic*] standpoint.’⁵⁶

There is evidence that a more democratic informant structure would have resulted in different findings in some key areas, because the reasons given for the exodus of the rural population by labourers or those intimately acquainted with them – and those of a Liberal political complexion – often differed from those typically advanced by farmers and Conservatives. In particular, insecurity of cottage tenure was mentioned much more often by Liberal investigators; and as many farmers had a vested interest in the perpetuation of the tied cottage system, they were unlikely to give it the same prominence. A letter from ‘A Grateful Reader’ explicitly linked the non-identification of this cause of depopulation with the methodology adopted in Haggard’s survey. Haggard published part of this letter in *Rural England*; the unpublished section is italicized below:

*May I venture, very respectfully, to suggest the desirability of other sources of information. With only one or two exceptions landlords, farmers, land agents, auctioneers and others of the owning and employing fraternity have been your informants. Let me suggest to you Clergymen, Non-Conformist Ministers, Village Blacksmiths & men of his [*sic*] type, Leaders of village Chapels, and above all the Labourers themselves. Until now ... your articles are obviously one-sided. My idea is, when you extend the scope of your enquiries,*

you will discover that after all Farmers are not in such a bad way You, when you consult another class will learn the true explanation of the labour difficulty. The slavish system of Tied Cottages is the great factor. The farmers use this as a whip, and drive away the best of the labourers Security of tenure would mean, as any one can see, security of labour.⁵⁷

The suggestions of the 'Grateful Reader' were clearly not to Haggard's liking, and elsewhere in the same chapter he advanced a strong defence of the tied cottage system, based on his personal experience.⁵⁸ By contrast, White mentioned it first in his list of causes of depopulation;⁵⁹ Millin had given it a central place in his analysis;⁶⁰ and it featured regularly in investigations of rural housing at the turn of the century.⁶¹

The exclusion of the labouring classes from direct participation in Haggard's inquiry located his methods and findings within elite discourses in which representations of the labourer were likely to be unflattering. The preponderance of farmers and landowners in the informant base ensured the subsumation of the interests of the rural labouring classes beneath those of their employers and landlords. Unsurprisingly, Haggard concluded that, within rural communities, the small landowners had suffered the most from the crisis in agriculture, the farmers now did 'no more than make a hard living', but that the labourers were 'more prosperous to-day than ever before'.⁶² Unlike George Millin's survey, Anderson Graham's inquiries of the 1890s, and even some of the reports of the Royal Commission on Labour, *Rural England* gave the reader little insight into the world of the agricultural labourer. Lacking access to the mechanisms of the inquiry, labourers had to react to Haggard's articles in other ways. Thus at St. Neots in Huntingdonshire, a group of labourers gathered outside the home of one of Haggard's informants, hooting and jeering him, and threatening him with physical harm if he strayed from the premises.⁶³ Examples like this suggest a far from passive response to what were often

critical and judgmental articles written from the standpoint of rural elites, over the shaping of which the bulk of the agricultural population had little influence. Haggard's survey, like others of the period, was an institution established to construct a view of rural England, in which different voices competed for attention using the various means at their disposal; and once in the public domain, his reports became live and contestable pieces of social research.

¹ But see M. Freeman, 'Investigating Rural Poverty: Problems of Conceptualisation and Methodology' in J. Bradshaw and R. Sainsbury (eds.), *Getting the Measure of Poverty: The Early Legacy of Seebohm Rowntree* (Bristol, forthcoming).

² H. R. Haggard, *Rural England, being an Account of Agricultural and Social Researches Carried out in 1901 and 1902* (2 vols., London, 1902). (Subsequently RE.)

³ D. Englander and R. O'Day (eds.), *Retrieved Riches: Social Investigation in Britain 1840-1914* (Aldershot, 1995); R. O'Day and D. Englander, *Mr. Charles Booth's Inquiry: Life and Labour of the People in London Reconsidered* (London, 1993).

⁴ E. J. Yeo, *The Contest for Social Science: Relations and Representations of Gender and Class* (London, 1996), 58-90, 237-45 and *passim*.

⁵ B. Taithe (ed.), *The Essential Mayhew: Representing and Communicating the Poor* (London, 1996), 26.

⁶ *Life in the Victorian Village: The Daily News Survey of 1891* (2 vols., London, 1999).

⁷ M. Freeman, 'Social Investigation in Rural England 1870-1914' (PhD, Glasgow, 1999), 28-9.

⁸ J. Caird, *English Agriculture in 1850-51* (London, 1968 [1st. ed. London, 1852]), pp. 84-5.

⁹ Quoted in K. D. M. Snell, *Annals of the Labouring Poor: Social Change and Agrarian England* (Cambridge, 1987 [1st. ed. Cambridge, 1985]), 6-7.

¹⁰ Freeman, 'Social Investigation', *op. cit.*, 55-6.

¹¹ F. Clifford, *The Agricultural Lockout of 1874, with Notes upon Farming and Farm-Labour in the Eastern Counties* (London, 1875).

¹² *ibid.*, 26, 30, 180; Freeman, 'Social Investigation', *op. cit.*, 72-5.

¹³ P. A. Graham, *The Rural Exodus: The Problem of the Village and the Town* (London, 1892), 41-2, 106-8.

¹⁴ *ibid.*, 108.

-
- ¹⁵ Freeman, 'Social Investigation', *op. cit.*, 116-30.
- ¹⁶ *Life in the Victorian Village*, *op. cit.*, vol. I, 172.
- ¹⁷ *ibid.*, vol. II, 243.
- ¹⁸ Caird, *op. cit.*, xxxiv.
- ¹⁹ *RE*, vol. II, 566.
- ²⁰ H. R. Haggard, *The Days of My Life: An Autobiography* (2 vols., 1926), vol. II, 142.
- ²¹ *Economic Journal*, XIII (1903), 207.
- ²² *RE*, vol. I, xi.
- ²³ R. O'Day, 'Interviews and Investigations: Charles Booth and the Making of the Religious Influences Survey' in Englander and O'Day, *op. cit.*, 157.
- ²⁴ Crossman to Cochrane, 1 July 1901, Norfolk Record Office (hereafter NRO) MS4692/25 (Herts.).
- ²⁵ For example, Leney to Haggard, 14 May 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Kent).
- ²⁶ Dorman to Haggard, 13 September 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Yorks.).
- ²⁷ NRO MS4692/22, book 14, 64-6.
- ²⁸ *Economic Journal*, XIII (1903), 207, 209-10.
- ²⁹ D. Englander, 'Comparisons and Contrasts: Henry Mayhew and Charles Booth as Social Investigators' in Englander and O'Day, *op. cit.*, 105-42.
- ³⁰ Booth to Samuel, 10 November 1891, Samuel papers, House of Lords Record Office, A/155 I/10. The letter has also been quoted in G. Himmelfarb, *Poverty and Compassion: The Moral Imagination of the Late Victorians* (New York, 1991), 98n.
- ³¹ B. Webb, *My Apprenticeship* (Harmondsworth, 1971 [1st. ed. London, 1926]), 236-40. However, Booth communicated with the parsons using the questionnaire rather than the interview.
- ³² C. Booth, *The Aged Poor in England and Wales* (London, 1894), 167.

³³ Silas J. Weaver to Mrs. Maddison Green, 18 May 1901, Jessie Hartcup to Cochrane, 4 March 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Worcs.); Bevan to Haggard, n. d., NRO MS4692/25 (Cambs.); letters in NRO MS4692/25 (Norfolk).

³⁴ *RE*, vol. II, 30ff, 528; *DE*, 27 July 1901; Fox to Haggard, 12 June 1901, 18 July 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Herts.).

³⁵ Bannister to Haggard, 13 April 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Yorks.); Hunt to Haggard, 15 April 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Gloucs.); letter from F. W. Denham, *DE*, 17 April 1901; *RE*, vol. II, 320.

³⁶ *RE*, vol. I, 247, 300, 444, 458-60; vol. II, 369-70.

³⁷ NRO MS4692/24a, 37-8.

³⁸ For a more detailed discussion of Haggard's questionnaire, see Freeman, 'Social Investigation', *op. cit.*, pp. 154-5, 287-8.

³⁹ *RE*, vol. II, 249.

⁴⁰ *ibid.*, vol. I, 304.

⁴¹ *ibid.*, vol. I, 113.

⁴² BPP, *Royal Commission on Labour: Assistant Commissioners' Reports on the Agricultural Labourer, Vol. I: England, 1893-4* (Cd. 6894), II, 29, 69, 114; Freeman, 'Social Investigation', *op. cit.*, 122.

⁴³ Sweetman to Haggard, 25 April 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Essex).

⁴⁴ *DE*, 30 May 1901.

⁴⁵ *ibid.*; *RE*, vol. I, 225-6.

⁴⁶ *RE*, vol. I, 254; vol. II, 234-8.

⁴⁷ *DE*, 20 June 1901.

⁴⁸ Freeman, 'Social Investigation', *op. cit.*, 244.

⁴⁹ Graham, *op. cit.*, 52.

⁵⁰ *Life in the Victorian Village, op. cit.*, vol. II, 125..

⁵¹ Freeman, 'Social Investigation', *op. cit.*, 127-30.

⁵² Durrant to Haggard 17 June 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Kent); Palmer to Haggard, 28 July 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Yorks.).

⁵³ *RE*, vol. I, 512.

⁵⁴ White to Haggard, 25 April 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Counties Unvisited); 3 May 1901 (quoted), 9 May 1901, 11 May 1901, 13 May 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Wilts.).

⁵⁵ For example Gastling to Haggard, 13 April 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Suffolk); Muscott to Haggard, 7 May 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Oxon.); Harper to Haggard, 19 May 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Gloucs.).

⁵⁶ [Triveby?] to ed. of *Daily Express*, 17 April 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Hunts.).

⁵⁷ 'A Grateful Reader' to Haggard, [?]/6/1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Wilts.); and reprinted (with corrections) in *RE*, vol. I, 48-9.

⁵⁸ *RE*, vol. I, 38-9.

⁵⁹ White to Haggard, 3 May 1901, NRO MS4692/25 (Wilts.).

⁶⁰ *Life in the Victorian Village, op. cit.*, vol. I, 68-9, 171-2, and *passim*.

⁶¹ Freeman, 'Social Investigation', *op. cit.*, 241-6.

⁶² *RE*, vol. II, pp. 543-5.

⁶³ Stone to Haggard, n. d., NRO MS4692/25 (Hunts.). See *DE*, 20 August 1901.