

DOI 10.23859/2587-8352-2017-1-2-1  
UDC 329 (410)

***Tatyana Labutina***  
Leading researcher  
Institute of World History  
of the Russian Academy of Sciences  
Moscow, Russia  
tlabutina2007@yandex.ru



## The political parties of England in the assessments of early enlighteners

---

*Abstract.* In the article, the author pays attention to the debatable character of the formation of political parties and the establishment of a bipartite system in England in the 17<sup>th</sup> – early 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, both in foreign and domestic historiography. Based on the analysis of the contemporaries' works of the era, the figures of the Enlightenment, H. Bolingbroke, J. Swift, D. Defoe, R. Steele, J. Addison, Marquess of Halifax, the conclusion is made regarding the first parties – the Whigs and the Tories – their existence at that moment and their struggle for power.

*Keywords:* England, 17<sup>th</sup>–18th centuries, political parties, the Whigs and the Tories, two-party system, enlighteners

---

### Introduction

The problem of the formation of political parties and that of a bipartisan system in England during the last two centuries remained one of the debatable issues in British historiography. Prior to the 20<sup>th</sup> century, virtually no scientist questioned the existence of any parties in the late 17<sup>th</sup> – early 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. The term ‘parties’ was used by the English educators of the 18<sup>th</sup> century G. Bolingbroke, J. Defoe, J. Swift, F. Chesterfield. D. Hume singled out “the principles that make up the very nature of our constitution” as the main criterion that was underlying the division of parliamentary factions into parties<sup>1</sup>. Apparently, the educator set the ideology at the forefront of the party division.

In the 19<sup>th</sup> – early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries, the historians spoke unanimously about the existence of the political parties in the preceding century. Moreover, the representatives

---

<sup>1</sup> Hume D. Of the Parties of Great Britain. *Hume D. Essays*. London, 1923, p. 90.

of the ‘Whig’ trend in the British historiography (T.B. Macaulay, S. Kent, K. Feiling, J. Trevelyan)<sup>2</sup> asserted that the contemporary parties of liberals and the conservatives were direct ‘descendants’ of the Whigs and the Tories of the 18th century. At the beginning of the 20th century, several scientists (I. Balmer-Thomas, J. Western, J. Jones, B. Coward)<sup>3</sup> agreed with the concept of their predecessors. At the same time, some historians (L. Namier, R. Walcott) began to challenge such a claim. In Namier's view, by 1760 there were no proper party organizations, although the names of the parties existed<sup>4</sup>. Per the American scientist, R. Walcott, at the early stage of its development, Britain's political system was a multi-party one<sup>5</sup>. At the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, there were several innovative works (J. Clarke, B. Hilton, J. Hoppit)<sup>6</sup>, whose authors entered polemics with the supporters of liberal and Marxist interpretations of British history of the 17<sup>th</sup>–18<sup>th</sup> centuries. As an example, Clarke proposed to consider the period of 1660–1832 as ‘a long 18<sup>th</sup> century’, emphasizing the continuity in the development of the British society within the specified chronological framework. The emergence of opposition political forces that manifested themselves at the time, he linked with the influence of the religious dissenters who, claiming the demands of religious freedom, switched to political struggle. The modern historian J. Black, reflecting on the early parties of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, argued that the Whig party was most likely “a group associated with informal ties, ambitions and ideology, rather than party discipline and centralized management”<sup>7</sup>. It should be noted that the analysis of the discussion that unfolded in the English-language historiography with regards to the problem of early political parties and formation of a bipartisan system was covered in detail by contemporary Russian scientists V.N. Erokhin and A.A. Kiselev<sup>8</sup>.

---

<sup>2</sup> Macaulay T.B. *History of England from the accession to the throne of James II.* T.B. Macaulay T.B. *Full composition of writings.* V. XI. St Petersburg, 1864; Kent C.B. *Early History of the Tories, 1660–1702.* London, 1908; Feiling K. *History of the Tory Party. 1640–1714.* Oxford, 1924; Trevelyan G.M. *England under the Stuarts.* London, 1937.

<sup>3</sup> Bulmer-Thomas I. *The Growth of the British Party System.* L., 1967; Western J.R. *Monarchy and Revolution. The English State in 1680's.* L., 1972; Jones J.R. *Country and Court. England, 1659–1714.* Cambridge, 1978; Coward B. *The Stuart Age. A History of England. 1603–1714.* London, NY., 1980.

<sup>4</sup> Namier L. *The Structure of Politics in the Accession of George III.* Vol. I. London, 1929, p. VII.

<sup>5</sup> Walcott R. *English Politics in the Early Eighteenth-Century.* Cambridge, 1956.

<sup>6</sup> Clark J.C.D. *English Society 1688–1832. Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancient Regime.* Cambridge, 2000; Hilton B. *Bad, Mad and Dangerous People? England 1688–1727.* Oxford, 2006; Hoppit J. *A Land of Liberty? England, 1689–1727.* Oxford, 2000.

<sup>7</sup> Black J. *The History of the British Isles.* St Petersburg, 2008, p. 228.

<sup>8</sup> Erokhin V.N. Political parties and society in the UK in the late 17<sup>th</sup> – early 19<sup>th</sup> centuries: a historiographical sketch. *Political Parties of England. Historical Essays.* St Petersburg, 2017, pp. 16–30; Kiselev A.A. The problem of the formation of the English bipartisan system in historiography. *Political Parties of England. Historical Essays. Decree. Op,* pp. 31–42.

Soviet historians studied the problem of originating of the parties in the context of British political history, without paying special attention to it. And only in the last decades, the scientists began to actively engage in the history of the parties of conservatives, liberals and laborites of the 19<sup>th</sup>–21<sup>st</sup> centuries. (M.V. Zholudov, M.P. Aizenshtat, T.N. Gella, E.O. Naumenkova, A.Y. Prokopov, E.G. Blossfeld and others)<sup>9</sup>, when a two-party system already existed in England. Few scientists have addressed the history of the early political parties. The problem of the formation of early Tories and Whigs was first raised by us in a few works<sup>10</sup>. S.B. Semenov and M.A. Kovalev wrote about the parties of the middle – second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century<sup>11</sup>. Whilst the above-mentioned historians defend the possibility of existence of early parties in England in the late 17<sup>th</sup> – early 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, Sokolov, following in the wake of several foreign historians (primarily J. Clarke), questioned it<sup>12</sup>. If the discussion in the historiography regarding the emergence of parties continues, the sources of that era contain irrefutable facts confirming their existence. This applies primarily to the writings of the Enlightenment figures, who not only acted as party ideologists, but also openly declared their involvement in the Tories or the Whigs. As an example, a well-known journalist and educator, Richard Steele, speaking in the House of Commons, directly stated: “I am a Whig and have been sent here (to the parliament – T.L.) by

---

<sup>9</sup> See: Political Parties of England. Historical Essays. Decree. Op. 136–333.

<sup>10</sup> Labutina T.L. *Political struggle in England during the Restoration of the Stuarts (1660–1681)*. Moscow, 1982, pp. 80–192; Ibid. The formation of a two-party system in England in covering bourgeois historiography. *Questions of history*. Moscow, 1984, no. 4; Ibid. Ideology of political parties in England in the period of formation of a bipartisan system (Review of foreign literature). *England of the 17<sup>th</sup> Century: Ideology, Politics, Culture*. St Petersburg, 1992; Ibid. The concept of political parties and party opposition in the ideology of the early English Enlightenment. *Fight Ideas in a Changing World: Actual problems of Politics and Ideology of the 19<sup>th</sup>–20<sup>th</sup> centuries*. Ufa, 1993; Ibid. The predecessors of the English liberals. The strategy and tactics of the Whigs in the early period of their activity. *European Liberalism in Modern Times. Theory and Practice*. Moscow, 1995; Ibid. Political parties in England in the era of the early Enlightenment. *Questions of General History*. Ryazan, 1997; Ibid. At the origins of British conservatism: the ideology and politics of the first Tories. *Conservatism in Russia and Western Europe*. Voronezh, 2005; Ibid. *The formation of political parties in England and their struggle in the Restoration Parliaments (1660–1681)*. Vladimir, 2010.

<sup>11</sup> Semenov S.B. *Political Views of British Radicals of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century*. Samara, 1995; Ibid. *Radical Movement and Struggle for Parliamentary Reform in England in the Second Half of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century*. Samara, 2008; Ibid. National Association and the movement for parliamentary reform in England in the 18<sup>th</sup> century. *Political Parties in England. Historical Essays. Decree. Op*, pp. 120–135; Kovalev M.A. The Tory party in the age of the Whig oligarchy in the domestic historiography. *The British World. History of Britain: Modern Research*. Moscow, 2015, pp. 195–201; Ibid. Parliamentary parties in the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century in the views of conservative opposition theorists (G. Bolingbroke, D. Hume). *British Parliament Yesterday and Today*. Moscow, 2016, pp. 169–177; Ibid. The Tory party in opposition: The ideology of intellectuals of the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century. *Political Parties of England. Historical Essays. Decree. Op*, pp. 101–119.

<sup>12</sup> *Questions of history*, 2006, no. 7, p. 167.

this party”<sup>13</sup>. We will try to find out to what extent such claims are justified, by referring to the creative legacy of the early enlighteners who personified themselves with representatives of political parties. It should be noted that these being the first attempts to address this issue, we undertook it in the context of studying the ideology of the enlightenment movement<sup>14</sup>.

### **Main text**

In the reign of the last Stuarts, King William of Orange and Queen Anne (1689–1714), the Tory and the Whig parties began to play a significant role in the political life of the country. The influence of the parties, behind which there stood the classes-owners as the victors in the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89, became so tangible in the life of the society that it was practically impossible to imagine the government of the country without their participation. In the arsenal of bourgeois ideologists, theories began to appear that justified the need to govern the country by alternating party ministries, which in fact legitimized the existence of political parties in the state structure of the government. Enlighteners, who had made their choice of political orientation based on the socio-economic status and joined one of the parties, became defenders and guides of Tories’ or Whigs’ ideas. Strange as it may seem, but none of the works of the educators represented positive assessments of the division in the society that had arisen in the society. On the contrary, the Enlightenment often spoke with condemning speeches about the party strife. As an example, the journalist R. Steele expressed fears that the ‘frantic party zeal’, when it reaches its full strength, can lead to a civil war and bloodshed in the country. Party conflicts, in his opinion, not only destroy the virtue and reasoning of people because of the ‘barbaric’ relationship of one party to another, but also instill hostility in the English, “rip their souls, transmitting these feelings and prejudices to their descendants”<sup>15</sup>.

Offensive political epithets were given to the political parties by the Marquess of Halifax, who himself for several years headed the Whigs. In the pamphlet ‘Thoughts and Reflections about Politics’, he argued that the “party enmity divided the world into two camps”. Halifax emphasized that many people hasten to join one of the parties ‘hurriedly’, without going into the goals and tasks that the Tories and the Whigs were setting themselves. Some fell into the ranks of the party through ignorance, “just not to stay out of work”, and only ‘a sense of shame’ keep them from leaving the party. In the party, as a rule, no one can express their own opinion, everyone should be content with the generally accepted provisions. And although the opposition party

---

<sup>13</sup> A speech supposed to be spoken by R. Steele, Esq. at the opening this Parliament. London, 1714, p. 7.

<sup>14</sup> Labutina T.L. *At the Roots of Modern Democracy. The Political Thought of English*. Moscow, 1994; Ibid. *The Culture and Power in the Era of the Enlightenment*. Moscow, 2005.

<sup>15</sup> Steele R. *Sir Roger De Coverley. Essays from the Spectator*. Boston, 1882, p. 115, 119.

criticizes the administration consisting of representatives of the ruling party, it is however concerned not with the eradication of mistakes and abuse committed by it, but only by its self-interests<sup>16</sup>. Halifax stressed that the opposition party did not think at all that it could commit even more serious sins when it comes to power. Overestimating one's capabilities without trying to look at oneself critically, the parties, as a rule, were not able to succeed, especially if the question was about the resignation of the government. Most of all, Halifax resented the fact that the parties spoke on behalf of the people. "The parties in the state are like pirates who masquerade into false clothes", he wrote in the treatise 'State Principles'. "They put forward demands for the people's good, but in reality, they pursue their real benefits". Based on the foregoing, Halifax concluded: the parties "disgrace the whole of England"<sup>17</sup>.

The well-known writer J. Swift spoke out with the condemnation of the party struggle; for many years, he worked closely with both parties. "Unfortunately," he wrote in 'The Examiner', "we split into two parties, each claiming a dominant position in the state and the church government and differing from each other only by means of struggle". The writer considered the names of the 'Tory' and the 'Whig' parties 'stupid nicknames'. Swift devoted a lot of articles to the issue of the parties in the journal 'The Examiner'. He recalled that for the first time, the parties emerged in the reign of King Charles II of Stuart (1660–85), then existed until the Glorious Revolution and have since been preserved, although their names now reflect other principles. Swift noted that the Whigs are those who approve the Glorious Revolution, as opposed to the Applicant (son of King James II Stuart – T.L.), and who consider it necessary to limit the monarchy by the law that the executive branch has no right to abolish and accept tolerance. With regards to the Tory party, the pamphleteer included people who supported the hereditary right of monarchs and considered their personality sacred and inviolable.

Swift expressed his unflattering position on the Whigs. He believed that this party was headed by "a few upstarts or ruined people who sought first and foremost to fix their own financial situation and therefore their first task was to get rich at the expense of the state treasury". Swift paid attention to the variegated social composition of the Whigs, explaining it by the fact that those forced to seek support from the various sectors of the Whig society attracted even those whose views on religion and state government were not orthodox at all. On the pages of 'The Examiner', he noted with a twist of irony: the Whigs "treat the monarchy and the church with due respect,

---

<sup>16</sup> *The Complete Works of George Savile First Marquess of Halifax*. Oxford, 1912 (hereinafter referred to as – The Complete Works of Halifax), pp. 225–227.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid*, p. 182, 226–227.

even when they take serious steps to undermine both”<sup>18</sup>. But he described the Tory party as the most suitable for the state administration.

The famous journalist J. Addison raised the question of the sources for the party enmity to appear in the country. The Enlightener drew attention to the fact that in England, during the reign of Queen Anne, the interest in politics in various strata of the society was noticeably more active. With humor, the journalist wrote in one of the numbers of ‘the Freeholder’: “Our island, which was formerly called the nation of saints, can now rightly be called the nation of state men. Almost every representative of it, regardless of age, profession or gender, has its own view on ministers and their government”. Addison showed how various issues of state policy aroused close interest among representatives of all walks of life. The English nobility is a ‘politician from birth’ and teaches communities how to entrust their power to those representatives who can be controlled through jurisdiction or privileges, and in this way, restrict the legislative power. University students, rural yeomen, squires, world judges – everyone was interested in politics. The fair sex equaled men: hardly any woman would be found in the kingdom, who had not heard of the contradictions in the church or the state. In a word, concluded Addison, “every member of the society is aware of the changes in the constitution and is well versed in state affairs”<sup>19</sup>. And in this society, well-orientated in politics, the discord begins; open hostility to each other is sparked by party disagreements, and sometimes just belonging to this or that party. “Our children join the factions before they even know where the right hand is and where is their left,” Addison wrote in ‘The Freeholder’. “They barely learned to speak, but the words ‘Whigs’ and ‘Tories’ become their first in life. Even in infancy they are trained to hate one half of the nation and take control of all the malice and fury of the party before they get the mind”<sup>20</sup>. With the condemnation of the party feud, Addison appeared on the pages of ‘The Spectator’. The parties make honest gentlemen hate each other, he wrote. “It cannot fall on a country a more terrible punishment than this terrible spirit of discord, which divides the state into two different people and makes its people hostile and alien to each other”. The Enlightener emphasized that the party strife was harmful to the society. The party spirit influenced the morals and sound judgments of members of the society, revealed pre-assets for external enemies. Finally, when “a fierce party spirit flares up in full force, it causes civil war and bloodshed ... it fills the nation with vengeful hatred and destroys all the germs of good, compassion and humanity”<sup>21</sup>.

---

<sup>18</sup> The Examiner. London, 1712, p. 13, 104, 111, 163, 166.

<sup>19</sup> Addison J. *The Freeholder or Political Essay*. London, 1751, p. 302–303, 305.

<sup>20</sup> Ibid, p. 302.

<sup>21</sup> /Addison J./ *Selections from Addison’s Papers Contributed to the Spectator*. Oxford, 1894, p. 40–41.

Addison noted that during the period of political crises, the party struggle caused ‘the strongest ferment’ even in the minds of the weaker sex. “In all the city, there is hardly a person who does not consider herself capable of judging the most complicated disputes, church and state,” the journalist testified in one of the issues of the journal ‘The Freeholder’. “Oyster sellers are convinced of the illegality of our bishops, and the maidens affirm the inviolability of their rights”. The Enlightener believed that the ‘party zeal’ would only give “incited hatred and party strife among men and to a large extent deprive women of that natural charm with which they are endowed with birth”<sup>22</sup>.

In one of the issues of the journal ‘The Spectator’, Addison ironically portrayed a fictitious sketch of a visit to the theatre, where he drew attention to two groups of women who were lodged in the opposites and were ready to fight each other. He noticed that the ‘flies’ adorned the faces of women were attached differently: some on the right side of the face, others – on the left. It was also noteworthy that the ladies exchanged ‘extremely hostile glances’ with each other. In the middle boxes, there were a lot of ladies whose ‘flies’ were glued on both sides of the face, and at first glance it seemed that those ladies had come to the theatre for the sole purpose: to listen to the opera. Meanwhile, to the outside observer, it became clear that the ladies sitting in the middle, kept neutrality. However, day by day the number of the latter noticeably reduced, which could be determined by how their flies moved to the ‘Tory’ or the ‘Whig’ side, depending on which party they joined. Evil tongues argued that in those ‘movements’ a big role was played by men, the locations of whom the ladies sought, and that the flies were attached to the right or left in accordance with the principles of the man, whom these ladies favored. And only a few of them acted based on their own principles or in the interests of the fatherland, Addison concluded<sup>23</sup>. He condemned such ‘party’ activity of women, believing that the ladies should rather promote the unity than the strife of the parties.

In disapproval of the party divisions, Addison proposed to unite the efforts of all people, regardless of their party affiliation, against a common enemy. “As for me,” he wrote, “I sincerely would like all honest people to unite in the society for the mutual support, whatever party they belong to ... We should not continue to treat our compatriots as Whigs or Tories, but consider deserved people as our friends, and in scoundrels to see our enemies”<sup>24</sup>.

---

<sup>22</sup> Addison J. Essay from the magazine ‘The Freeholder’. *England in a Pamphlet. English Publicist Prose of the Early 18<sup>th</sup> Century*. Moscow, 1987, pp. 92–93; Addison J. Selections from Addison’s Papers Contributed to the Spectator. Op. cit, p. 258.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid, pp. 256–258.

<sup>24</sup> The Freeholder...Op. cit, pp. 302–305; Addison J. *Selections from Addison’s Papers Contributed to the Spectator*. Op. cit, pp. 40–43.

Condemning the division of the society into parties and emphasizing its disastrous consequences for the country, almost all educators preferred to declare their ‘nonparty’ status. Mr. Bolingbroke argued that his views “differed from the arguments, both Tories and Whigs”<sup>25</sup>. The famous writer D. Defoe stated that he was writing his pamphlets not for the sake of remuneration or serving the party, but exclusively “for the sake of the society”. Swift preferred to act as a peacemaker for the disputing parties, and Addison declared his neutrality. What explains the desire of the Enlightenment to dissociate themselves from the parties and declare their ‘nonparty’ status? There were many reasons for this. First, these were fears for personal safety, which were experienced by the most famous pamphleteers and journalists who stood guard over the interests of one or another party and supported them on the pages of the opposition press. As an example, Defoe, who was in the service of the Tory Ministry, but who continued to sympathize with the Whig ideas, eventually lost the confidence of both parties. “Two days ago,” Defoe wrote in the ‘Review’, “I simultaneously received two letters: one from an angry Whig, and the other from an angry Jacobite (a supporter of James II Stewart – T.L.). The first threatens to hang me when his party comes back to power, and the other threatens to kill immediately”<sup>26</sup>. Serious fears for his safety were voiced by Swift as well. When in 1710 there was a threat of changing the Tory cabinet, to strengthen the position of which the enlightener had done a lot, Swift had to turn to the Secretary of State St. John (Lord Bolingbroke) for help. “After dinner, I took him aside,” Swift later recalled, “and recalling all the services that I (the Tory ministers – T.L.) provided to them (for the Tory ministers) and for which they did not ask for any compensation, believing that at least, I can count on security, “and asked to be sent abroad” before the onset of change”<sup>27</sup>.

Not the least role among the reasons forcing pamphleteers and journalists to declare their ‘non-partisanship’ was played by their mercantile considerations. In one of the numbers of ‘The Spectator’, Addison said that he received many letters reproaching him for violating the ancient Greek law, which forbade any person to remain neutral when the entire population of the country was split into parties. Nevertheless, the educator considered it necessary to take a neutral position, believing that “he will lose all his influence if he sinks to insults of any party”. It is not improbable that the journalist was afraid to lose not only his readers' confidence, but also the revenues that his publication brought.

The statements about ‘non-partisanship’ were made deliberately, in our opinion, also so that the enlighteners could appear in the eyes of public opinion as independent

---

<sup>25</sup> Bolingbroke. The idea of the King-Patriot. *Bolingbroke. Letters on the Study and Use of History*. Moscow, 1978, p. 208.

<sup>26</sup> /Defoe D./ *A Review*. Vol. 8. London, 1711, p. 339.

<sup>27</sup> Swift J. *A Diary for Stella*. Moscow, 1981, p. 252.



journalists or pamphleteers who were able to express not someone else's opinion but their own. Thus, the Enlightenment hoped to attract as many supporters as possible to the party's side.

In reality, the attitude of the Enlightenment to the parties depended on whose interests they defended themselves. As a rule, those who supported 'money interests' (Defoe, Steele, Addison), spoke with the most flattering appraisals of the Whig party and its policies. Those who were closer to the interests of the 'land people' (Swift, Bolingbroke), with obvious antipathy spoke about the Whigs and their principles, often distorted the goals of this party to compromise it in the eyes of the public opinion, but at the same time praising the Tory party in every way. It is noteworthy that Addison pointed out this feature when he asked himself what had brought the English into the ranks of this or that party. In his opinion, most fellow citizens when choosing a party, were guided by their education and personal gain. Addison rightly argued that the disputes between the parties were devoid of any adherence to principles and were conducted primarily "because of the highest positions in state government", and therefore most the ruling party "in reality, agrees with the opinion of those who are in opposition". Addison also managed to notice the fact that 'land' and 'monetary interests' rested at the heart of party divisions<sup>28</sup>.

It should be noted that many educators pointed to the common interests of both parties. In the words of Defoe and Addison, the idea of identity of the goals of both parties was expressed, first, as satisfaction of their own mercantile interests, as well as unwillingness to accept any changes in the public administration. Bolingbroke spoke about the same thing, stressing that the Tories who came to power pursued the same "material benefits in personal and party interests as the Whigs". He noted that the Tories had come to the palace in the reign of Queen Anne, "to take the government into their own hands, to attenuate the Whigs so that the Queen turned her favor to the Tories, entrusting them with important positions in the kingdom"<sup>29</sup>.

Perhaps another thing united the Tories and the Whigs. This was the use by both parties of the people masses as a kind of pressure lever in their struggle. In the reign of the last Stuarts, the political activity of not only the upper and middle strata of England, but also of the lower classes, had sharply increased. Defoe on the pages of the magazine 'The Review' wrote: "Our plowmen talk about poor management of the court, while the mob sings ballads and writes lampoons against the government, seeing in taxes, war and the behavior of ministers of abuse"<sup>30</sup>. Such an activity of people's lower classes was often used for their purposes by both parties. "We (the

<sup>28</sup> /Addison J./ Selections ... Op. cit, p. 45.

<sup>29</sup> Bolingbroke H. St. *A Letter to Sir William Windham*. London, 1787, p. 13.

<sup>30</sup> Wilson W. *Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel Defoe, containing a Review of his Writings and his Opinions upon a Variety of Important Matters Civil and Ecclesiastical*. London, 1830, vol. 2, p. 394.

Whigs) used the crowd for various reasons, directing its efforts to eliminate any abuses. But when the work was finished, the mob did not have anything bad in mind”, Defoe acknowledged with cynicism<sup>31</sup>.

Meanwhile, the elements of the crowd evoked fears of the propertied strata. Defoe also wrote the following: “People are made disobedient, furious, and sometimes just unreasonable” during the street protests. At the same time, “property ceases to be protected”, which may lead subsequently to a ‘general revolution’<sup>32</sup>. Considering the foregoing, Defoe urged the parties with special caution to attract the lower classes to their side and rely on them ‘up to a certain limit’, since the direction of their spontaneous movement is unpredictable. “The so-called people, the crowd, the mob, like a large raft in a river flowing out of the sea, gathers speed and rushes down the river, sweeping everything in its path, and nothing can stop it, but it's worth the strength of the current to weaken, or change the direction of the river; it immediately turns back with the same force as before, moving in the opposite direction. Thus, there is no benefit of this crowd to either party,” the enlightener concluded<sup>33</sup>. Fears that people's lower ranks used by the political parties as a lever of pressure can oppose the powers that be, forced the bourgeois enlightener to demand the publication of more severe laws aimed at subordinating the people to the authorities”. From all this, it becomes clear to me that the degree of subordination to the government should be properly controlled by the laws,” and the goal of any government is primarily to “prevent riots and confusion among the people, that is, in short, protect us from the crowd, from the mob”, Defoe concluded<sup>34</sup>. Apparently, in the masses of the people, the educator saw a more danger for his party than in the political opponents. And although he tactically allowed the use of the lower classes to defeat the Tory party, he simultaneously confirmed that it was easy to reach a compromise with the last Whigs if it was necessary to ‘curb’ the elements of the masses.

It became obvious from the statements of the enlighteners that in the party struggle they were defending interests of the propertied classes. And indeed, although the party representatives claimed that they defended the national interests, but in practice it became obvious that this was not true. This fact was recognized even by some of the enlighteners. For example, Halifax argued that the parties “put forward demands for the people's good, but pursue their real benefits”<sup>35</sup>. Meanwhile, most educators continued to advocate the idea that the Tories or the Whigs (depending on which party the ideologist was attached to) expressed the interests of all sectors of society and

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid, vol. 3, pp. 103–104.

<sup>32</sup> /Defoe D. / *A True Collection of the Writings of the Author of the True-Born Englishman*. Vol. I. London, 1703, p. 451.

<sup>33</sup> Defoe D. *The Shortest Way to Peace and Union. Famous Pamphlets*. London, 1890, p. 452.

<sup>34</sup> Defoe D. *A Hymn to the Mob*. London, 1715, p. 1.

<sup>35</sup> *The Complete Works of Halifax*, p. 182.

fight for their own good. At the same time, they shyly concealed the fact that the “blessing of the people” meant exclusively some benefit for the bourgeois and the ‘new’ nobles. The class orientation in the ideology of the Enlightenment became more and more obvious. As for most ordinary Englishmen, who were far from politics, the preferred choice of the party was of no fundamental importance to them.

Since in the reign of the last Stuarts in England there was a process of formation of a bipartisan system, the enlighteners could not ignore the problem of the party opposition. Most detailed issues were covered by Bolingbroke. To reflect on the need to create a party opposition in the government of the country, the educator appealed when he found himself in emigration in France after accession to the English throne of George I of Hanover. Out of work, the prominent British civil servant could not hide his disappointment with the changes that had taken place in the country, because of which he hated that the Whig party won. Contemporary parties seemed to Bolingbroke ‘wretched worms of the earth’, which were capable of ‘poisoning everything around’. The favorite topics of the discussions for these parties, in his opinion, were ‘bribery and dependence’. The parties “stand up for the first as a means of government, worthy of praise, and for the second – I mean the corrupt, hidden entanglement – as an integral part of our constitution,” he wrote in ‘A Dissertation upon Parties’. To contradict such negative phenomena in the political life of the society, the educator offered to create an opposition party. In detail, this issue was considered by him in the work ‘Letters on the Spirit of Patriotism’. “Anyone who aspires to destroy the constitution, who pursues only ambition and self-interest, thirsts for power and personal enrichment, ... should be resisted if this is possible and they are not completely mired in vices,” Bolingbroke wrote. For this purpose, it is necessary to create an opposition. Meanwhile, many political figures of the country believe, the educator continued, that the creation of an opposition to a dishonest government is voluntary, and therefore every person has the right to enter it and leave it when they please. Bolingbroke regarded this opinion as a delusion. He considered creating opposition to bad management the duty of every honest person. Bolingbroke was sure that the party that “is oppositional and acts systematically, giving preference to the wise before the stupid, honest before the dishonest in government, will enjoy great respect, authority and will easily achieve the goal”<sup>36</sup>.

It remained unclear from the arguments of Bolingbroke, which ultimate goal the opposition pursued. Did it suggest a change in the form of a government or removal of officials, or, confining themselves to their formal admission, allowed only a few critical remarks about the government officials of all ranks? The enlightener did not

---

<sup>36</sup> Bolingbroke. Discourse on the parties Bolingbroke. *Letters on the Study and Use of History. Decree*. Op, p. 182; Bolingbroke. Lord Viscount H. St. John. *Letters on the Spirit of Patriotism*. London, 1757, p. 22, 62.

give any answer to these questions. In the Bolingbroke's theory, attention is drawn to the fact that he made distinctions between the opposition of the king and ministers. Bolingbroke regarded criticism of the king as an 'unconstitutional' act, considering at the same time, that the actions of ministers should be criticized by the opposition. Apparently, in the 'opposition' theory, Bolingbroke believed the king could not 'act badly', and the highest officials of the state-ministers were responsible for governing the country. Important in the theory of 'opposition' was Bolingbroke's conclusion that with the help of the party opposition it was possible to achieve simultaneously two goals: 'tie' the actions of the supreme ruler and put up a screen to protect against the elements of the masses that can lead to a civil war. Thus, the party opposition was a kind of a detonator, preventing the establishment of the tyranny of the ruler, on the one hand, and the onset of chaos and anarchy, on the other.

### **Conclusion**

The appeal of the enlighteners to the problem of parties and the party opposition confirmed that in that historical period, the classes that had formed these parties gained considerable weight in the state and public life of the country. The bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie nobility no longer had to fight for power with the king, since the legislation of the Glorious Revolution strictly outlined the boundaries of the executive power. At the new stage in the political struggle, other forces appeared in England, which entered the battle: the 'land' and 'money' interests. Their representatives equally needed support and assistance from the parties, therefore the ideologists of the Tories and the Whigs equally defended the goals and tasks of the respective classes. The existence of a bipartisan system greatly facilitated the rule of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie nobility, opening access to government alternately to representatives of 'land' and 'monetary' interests. It goes without saying, there was no question of any principled nature of the party's opposition at that time, since both the Tories and the Whigs defended only the interests of the propertied strata. The popular lower classes remained outside the political structures created by the bourgeois ideologists, and they were remembered only in exceptional situations when it was required to 'press' their political opponents from the arena of struggle or to remind the supreme ruler about the past events of the civil war when they became unnecessarily obstinate and intractable in relations with the legislative power. Thus, the political parties at the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century took a solid place in the structure of the state government, having become an integral part of the constitutional order of England. A significant role in this process was played by educators who substantiated and then popularized the idea of the need for the parties and party opposition in the state structure of England. The reasoning of the enlighteners regarding the parties was not the result of their 'cabinet' reflections; they did not have speculative or abstract cha-

racter. On the contrary, all the Enlightenment representatives, despite the declarations of their ‘non-partisanship’, in word and deed confirmed their commitment to the Tories or the Whigs. The party orientation, which was primarily social affiliation, was the determining factor in the ideology of the Enlightenment. And since the differences in the ideology of the parties, to which the enlighteners adjoined, were not of fundamental nature, it is not surprising that the Tories of the Enlightenment and the Whig educators adhered to the same views on the origin of the state power, the constitutional structure of the country, the parliamentary privileges and the royal prerogative.

#### References

1. Addison J. Esse iz jurnala ‘Frigolder’ [The essay from the Freeholder magazine]. *Anglia v pamflete. Angliiskaya publicisticheskaya proza nachala vosemnadzatogo veka* [England in a LPamphlet. English Publicist Prose of Early 18<sup>th</sup> Century], 1987, pp. 410–412.
2. Addison J. *Selections from Addison’s Papers Contributed to the Spectator*. Oxford, 1894.
3. Addison J. *The Free-Holder or Political Essay*. London, 1751.
4. *A Speech Supposed to be Spoken by R. Steele, Esq. at the Opening This Parliament*. London, 1714.
5. Blek J. *Istoria Britanskikh ostrovov* [A History of British Islands]. St Petersburg, 2008. (In Russian)
6. Bolingbroke H. Idea o korole patriote [The idea about the patriotic King]. *Pisma ob izuchenii i polze istorii* [Bolingbroke. Letters on Studying and Advantage of History], 1978, pp. 197–239.
7. Bolingbroke H. Rassujdenia o partiyah [Reasoning on parties]. *Pisma ob izuchenii i polze istorii* [Letters on Studying History and its Benefit], 1978, pp. 165–196.
8. Bolingbroke H. St. *A Letter to Sir William Windham*. London, 1787.
9. Bolingbroke Lord Viscount H. St. John. *Letters on the Spirit of Patriotism*. London, 1757.
10. Clark J.C.D. *English Society 1688–1832. Religion, Ideology and Politics during the Ancient Regime*. Cambridge, 2000.
11. Defoe D. *A Hymn to the Mob*. London, 1715.
12. /Defoe D./ *A Review*. Vol. 8. London, 1711.
13. /Defoe D. / *A True Collection of the Writings of the Author of the True-Born Englishman*. Vol. I. London, 1703.
14. Defoe D. The Shortest Way to Peace and Union. *Famous Pamphlets*. London, 1890.
15. Erohin V.N. Politicheskii partii i obshchestvo v Velikobritanii v konze XVII – nachale XIX vv. Istoriograficheskii ocherk [Political parties and society in Great Britain at the end of 18<sup>th</sup> – early 19th centuries: A historiographic sketch]. *Politicheskii partii Anglii. Istoricheskii ocherki* [Political Parties of England. Historical Sketches]. St Petersburg, 2017, pp. 16–30. (In Russian)
16. Feiling K. *History of the Tory Party. 1640–1714*. Oxford, 1924.
17. Hilton B. *Bad, Mad and Dangerous People? England 1688–1727*. Oxford University Press, 2006.
18. Hoppit J. *A Land of Liberty? England 1689–1727*. Oxford, 2000.
19. Hume D. Of the Parties of Great Britain. *Hume D. Essays*. London, 1923.

20. Kiselev A.A. Problema formirovaniya angliiskoy dvuhpartiinoy sistemi v istoriografii [The Problem of formation of the English two-party system in the historiography]. *Politicheskii partii Anglii. Istoricheskii ocherki* [Political Parties of England. Historical Sketches]. St Petersburg, 2017, pp. 31–42. (In Russian)
21. Kovalev M.A. Parlamentskii partii seredini 18 veka v predstavleniyah teoretikov konservativnoy oppozitsii (H. Bolingbroke, D. Um) [Parliamentary parties of the mid-18<sup>th</sup> century in representations of theorists of conservative opposition (H. Bolingbroke, D. Hume)]. *Britanskii parlament vchera i segodnya* [The British Parliament Yesterday and Today]. Moscow, 2015, pp. 195–201. (In Russian)
22. Kovalev M.A. Partia tory v apohu vigskoy oligarhii v otechestvennoy istoriografii [The Tory party during an era of the Whig oligarchy in a domestic historiography]. *Britanskii mir. Istoria Britanii: Sovremennii issledovania* [The British World. History of Britain: Modern Researches]. Moscow, 2015, pp. 195–201. (In Russian)
23. Labutina T.L. *Kultura i vlast v apohu Prosveshenia* [The Culture and Power in Era of Enlightenment]. Moscow, 2005. 458 p. (In Russian)
24. Labutina T.L. *Politicheskaya borba v Anglii v period Restavratsii Stuartov (1660–1681)* [Political Struggle in England during the Restoration of Stuarts (1660–1681)]. Moscow, 1982. 207 p. (In Russian)
25. Labutina T.L. *U istokov sovremennoy demokratii. Politicheskaya misl angliiskogo Prosveshenia* [The Origins of Modern Democracy. Political Thought of the English Enlightenment]. Moscow, 1994. 303 p. (In Russian)
26. Namier L. *The Structure of Politics in the Accession of George III*. Vol. I. London, 1929. 290 p.
27. *Politicheskii partii Anglii. Istoricheskii ocherki* [The Political Parties of England. Historical Sketches]. St Petersburg, 2017. 356 p. (In Russian)
28. Semenov S.B. *Politicheskii vzgladi angliiskih radikalov XVIII veka* [Political views of the English radicals of the 18<sup>th</sup> century]. Samara, 1995. (In Russian)
29. Semenov S.B. *Radikalnoe dvizhenie i borba za parlamentsku reformu v Anglii vo vtoroy polovine XVIII veka* [The radical movement and fight for parliamentary reform in England in the second half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century]. Samara, 2008. 360 p. (In Russian)
30. Steele R. *Sir Roger De Coverley. Essays from the Spectator*. Boston, 1882.
31. Swift J. *Dnevnik dlya Stelli* [A Journal to Stella], 1981. 616 p.
32. *The Complete Works of George Savile First Marquess of Halifax*. Oxford, 1912.
33. *The Examiner*. London, 1712.
34. Walcott R. *English Politics in the Early Eighteenth-Century*. Cambridge, 1956.
35. Western J.R. *Monarchy and Revolution. The English State in 1680's*. London, 1972. 421 p.
36. Wilson W. *Memoirs of the Life and Times of Daniel Defoe, Containing a Review of His Writings and His Opinions upon a Variety of Important Matters Civil and Ecclesiastical*. London, 1830. Vol. 2, 3.