

The Concept of Party in the Thought of Thomas Gordon

M. P. McMahon

«Party is the madness of many, for the gain of the few.»

SWIFT

Political opposition is an integral feature of modern English politics but the recognition and acceptance of party —public criticism and opposition to government in an effort to alter policy and/or oust official leaders— as a legitimate and positive characteristic of political conflict is quite recent¹ and «acceptance by government and governed of a legitimate opposition party is unknown in unsophisticated societies and alien to a number of powerful modern ideologies.»² Although regular and aggressive opposition is now a fundamental part of English politics, Englishmen, at the birth and during the long and erratic evolution of parties in the eighteenth century, condemned opposition as a pernicious threat to peace and stability. Why, exactly, did men perceive opposition as dangerous or what was the exact nature of their antipathy to party? Although the eighteenth century's rejection of opposition as a disruptive political aberration is well-known, the precise nature of that rejection needs further study. Once we possess a fuller understanding of Augustan hostility to party, scholars may analyze further the hesitant and piecemeal acceptance of political conflict as legitimate and positive.

Some attempts have been made to explain the source and nature of the anti-party attitudes so prevalent in eighteenth-century England and her American colonies but existing analyses appear both inconsistent and inadequate. In the few works that consider antipathy towards party concomitant with its actual, although unstable, existence one finds a variety of explanations. Party is seen as an «improper, unconstitutional,

and if persisted in, seditious» design against the King who had the right to make policy and to choose those ministers he wished for its execution; party rivalry indicated «illness within the body politic, malfunction within the system, not because all interests were expected to harmonize... but because public spirited men would reconcile their differences.»³ Party was an evil because unity and consensus characterized a proper polity and partisan behavior undermined that harmony, violated ethical standards and brought about a moral decline.⁴ Richard Hofstadter, who deserves credit for his early effort to enlighten our thinking on the obscure origins of the party system, describes three grounds on which party was condemned: it upset the concord of society by creating «social conflicts» not typical of the social order and by aggravating some «social conflicts» natural to society which in turn might cause «turbulence,» a disorder conducive to anarchy; it served as an instrument of tyranny in the hands of a narrow clique seeking to impose itself upon the whole society; and finally party undermined the proper affections and civic spirit of the polity.⁵ For other historians the aristocratic and deferential character of English society thwarted the conceptualization of party as an instrument of political solicitation: «Extensive political involvement with the masses, or even with people 'unknown' to the leaders of the party was shied away from as somehow degrading or unnecessary by the Whig aristocrat who felt his 'character' alone earned him the attention and respect of his countrymen.»⁶ The «deferential spirit of eighteenth-century Anglo-American society» required the maintenance of restraint and subordination in order to preserve a social harmony where the «wise and good» governed over a consenting populace and men were inculcated from childhood «to show deference to their betters, and to expect it from their inferiors.»⁷ Under such a social framework political party served no purpose, in fact, «political parties... constituted a threat to social solidarity, an impediment to good order... party organization was an engine of social disorganization.»⁸ These descriptions are insightful but they fail to present a completely cogent explanation of anti-party attitudes.

The question of party —the initial antipathy and ultimate acceptance— is a complex one and a full response would require, among other things, a thorough study of all available writings on party, especially those of the major pamphleteers and journalists whose works provide «an excellent index to prevailing attitudes.»⁹ Such a task is obviously beyond the scope of this paper but a specific examination of party in the writings of Thomas Gordon, a widely-read political polemist, will, I

believe, enhance our understanding of anti-party perceptions and initiate, at least, a more penetrating and solid analysis of party in eighteenth-century Anglo-American society. Thomas Gordon was a highly influential and active publicist in the first half of the eighteenth century and a major source, along with Viscount Bolingbroke and David Hume, on the subject of party;¹⁰ the concept of party in the thought of Thomas Gordon warrants specific attention and close study.

The expression of anti-party attitudes by such a notable and influential pamphleteer is of utmost importance since the impact of his thought was both extensive and lasting. *Cato's Letters*, written by Thomas Gordon in collaboration with the renowned John Trenchard, a famous critic of standing armies in the reign of William III, appeared weekly in London newspapers from November, 1720 to July, 1723 and enjoyed immense popularity in England, America, and on the Continent. Simultaneously, they published another weekly, *The Independent Whig*, from 20 January 1720 to 4 January 1721. As «Cato,» the pseudonym for their newspaper articles and various pamphlets, Gordon and Trenchard celebrated freedom of speech and the right to resist illegal authority; censored stockjobbers and the government for their roles in the South Sea Bubble crisis; attacked standing armies and doctrines of divine right as the method and theory of «Tyranny;» they called for political independence in the election of members for parliament and in the exercise of representation in the House of Commons; and they criticized clergymen and the High-Church party for their roles in the Jacobite Conspiracy of 1722 and defended «Liberty» against the potential «Tyranny» of a papist king and its concomitant, a clergy permitted to wield power in civil matters. The writings of Thomas Gordon and John Trenchard are considered pre-eminent among the various intellectual threads that make up the political tapestry of Anglo-American culture in the eighteenth century.¹¹ In fact and quite dramatically, the «Great Mr. Locke» has been superseded by the «Divine English Cato.»

The Independent Whig and *Cato's Letters* represent the bulk of Gordon and Trenchard's journalistic essays composed during a brief but intensely productive three-year collaboration. *Cato's Letters* climaxed the public life of John Trenchard who died, 16 December 1723, six months after Cato's «Farewell» in *The British Journal* but launched the career of Thomas Gordon. Gordon, the younger «Cato» and more scholarly resuscitator of Roman personalities, rose to fame and wealth through his

association with John Trenchard and lived to enjoy a long, productive literary career. Gordon's writings, after Trenchard's death in 1723 and until his own death in 1750, constitute a large portion of his total production and the prolific Gordon remained a determinative influence in eighteenth century Anglo-America.¹² He continued to favor London newspapers as an instrument for public expression; he established himself as a Latin scholar with his translations of the works of Tacitus and Sallust to which he prefaced lengthy and significant political «Discourses;» he expanded the original, one-volume *Independent Whig* to a four-volume work with the articles he wrote during three decades. He added several essays to the 1724 publication of *Cato's Letters* and edited innumerable editions of that work. Gordon also sustained his original fame as a vociferous anticlerical, articulated as early as 1718, during the Bangorian Controversy, and climaxed in the late 1740s with several collections of his later essays against clericalism, written in response to the Jacobite Rebellion of 1745.

Several historians have noted Gordon's antipathy to party but they have not analyzed fully its meaning and place within this celebrated pamphleteer's dissection of political ills.¹³ Nor have Gordon's political «Discourses» received the close reading they warrant. Gordon dissects the causes and nature of political and social chaos through a descriptive analysis of case studies extracted from history. He succinctly states the character and value of his methodology: «To Reason from experience and examples is the best reasoning.»¹⁴ He believed England enjoyed the most perfect form of government, a limited monarchy, a «happy ballance and mixture of interests,» but dangers lurked everywhere and his interpretation of the historical record checked excessive optimism.¹⁵ England's ancient constitution had been perverted various times in the past by «usurpers» of power —James I, Charles II, Oliver Cromwell, and the last two Stuarts— and Englishmen in the early eighteenth century remained «haunted» by their past; numerous examples of monarchical tyranny and, even more important, a tradition of «conspiracy and rebellion, treason and plot» instilled their thinking with apprehension. They sought, sometimes desperately, to have and hold a system of government in which the social, economic and political life of the nation would be free, coherent and orderly.¹⁶ From his analysis of Roman history we find that Caesar «corrupted» the Commonwealth: he «confederated with every public Incendiary, with every troubler of the peace;» he «bribed the people» in order to obtain the ministers he wanted or he «bribed the Magistrates after they were chosen;» and he

«continued more and more to break her remaining balance to weaken and debauch the people and to destroy every Law of Liberty....»¹⁷ The only solution to political ills was a return to «first principles.» Caesar should have «suppressed the insolence of particulars, revived the force of the Laws and reduced the Commonwealth to her first principles and firmness;» just as England had been restored to her «first principles» with the Revolution of 1688.¹⁸ When things go wrong you put them *back* together and it is the duty and obligation of all men to check political mutations no matter from whence they derive. Although Gordon asserted the «right to resistance,» one must remember that resistance was the proper response to a major political aberration —illegal authority— and the goal was a return to a proper balance between «Power and Liberty» not the introduction of innovation nor the alteration of the social and political structure. Understandably, a man who viewed political solution in terms of a reassertion and re-establishment of a more perfect past or who aggressively defended a fixed, static political system was not inclined to perceive party as a potential instrument for peaceful, positive, political change.

While the historical record verified innumerable failures and precarious successes, the real root of any society's distress lay with human nature itself. In his writings Gordon observes, describes, and analyzes those past successes and failures but he also articulates certain basic assumptions about human nature that help the reader grasp more fully his conception of what constitutes «good» government; his view of power as a necessary but dangerous element in the political system; and his antipathy to party. Gordon's perception of human nature plays a highly determinative role in his analysis of society and is intrinsically related to his convictions about the viability and security of particular institutions. He explicitly underscored the interdependence between an adequate understanding of man's character and the establishment and maintenance of effective government: «...he who knows little of human Nature, will never know much of the Affairs of the World, which every where drive their Motion and Situation from the Humours and Passions of Men.»¹⁹ One achieved the «Art of Governing» by dealing effectively with human nature, since «knowledge of Politicks» was based on the «Knowledge of the Passions,» that is, the emotions and ambitions of men.²⁰ This may sound mechanistic to modern readers better versed in the sociology of ideas and more exposed to the complexities of human psychology, but a close scrutiny of Gordon's works and an effort to explicate his thinking require attention to his «a priori» assumptions; he

makes them and they constitute a political yardstick with which he measures both men and institutions.

Among men of rank, «Great Men,» —those who held considerable property and occupied or desired to acquire positions of political authority— «passion» reigned over «principle.»²¹ No effective political system could permit itself illusions about human nature and survival of the polity demanded constant attention to the ever-present dangers of man's nature. Given the character of men, government must attempt to hold avarice, greed, and ambition in check through laws and by tying the private interests of men to the public interest.²² The political structure might be able to check and restrain power but there was no absolute guarantee against encroachment, and a «Court» which permitted «Countenance, Flattery, Insinuations, and Zeal» to prevail would lead to «and intire dissolution of government.»²³ There is little ambiguity in Gordon's opinion of «Great Men» —those who could and did play an active role in society— and the following quote accurately reflects his viewpoint and its implication for the political order:

Men are so far from having any Views purely publick and disinterested, that Government first arose from every Man's taking care of himself... Hence it is that the making of Laws supposes all Men naturally wicked... For Men to act independently on their Passions, is a Contradiction; since their Passion enter into all that they do, and are the Source of it... Concord and Security are preserved by the Terror of Laws, and the Ties of mutual Interest; and both... derive their Strength from the Impulses of Self-Love... that Constitution which trusts more than it needs to any Man or Body of Men, has a terrible Flaw in it.²⁴

Cato's Letters are well-know for their vociferous attack on the corruptness of ministers and the theme of the Court as a «great Exchange» remains throughout Gordon's political essays and discourses. Less understood but equally, if not more, significant is Gordon's fear of the aims and methods of ambitious individuals who have been dispossessed of their political positions and/or who are denied access to the glory and profits of office and privilege: those «out of power.» Ambitious men aspiring to privilege deluded the populace, always credulous, with complaints, often false, against those in power in an effort to stir up discontent and undermine confidence in and loyalty to government. This reflects the contemporary attitude toward parties in general: «Parties

at this time were commonly regarded as mere factions designed to keep one group of politicians in and another out of office, with 'truth and justice' having no place in their interests.»²⁵ But Gordon emphasized the dangerously inflammatory character of party methods upon the precarious balance between authority and liberty characteristic of the English Constitution. At times, party convictions contradicted the essential nature of the English Constitution, for example Jacobites who supported theories of divine right, but in *all* cases, basic party tactics threatened the stability of the social order. «Certain Men,» «Bodies of Men,» «Party-Men,» employed their «Great Abilities» «to mislead the honest but unwary Multitude» which, under their seduction, was «very vitious and turbulent.»²⁶ The «Commonalty» deluded by ambitious men outside the power center became «tumultuous» — an unrestrained segment in the polity that could destroy the fragile fabric of English government.

Even the gentry, those who possessed property without the privileges of nobility and usually in the «Interests of Truth and Liberty,» were highly susceptible to the pernicious manipulation of power seekers.²⁷ Although they were honest and did not need to be feared, like «Great Men,» on the basis of their natural aspirations («Ambition» meant little within the range of their social and economic possibilities), they were gullible and their inclination to «take the impressions that are given them, follow the opinions of such as lead them,» made them easy prey for the machinations of party.²⁸ But it was when Gordon turned to the largest group in society, the «Multitude,» that he perceived a particularly dangerous situation. He feared the «Multitude» under the influence of ambitious «seducers» and he described a politically volatile situation in which the limited characteristics of men at both ends of the social ladder, the bulk of society itself, actively converged and carelessly created an atmosphere and condition so inflammatory that it threatened the very existence of the country. Ambition at the center coagulated to form oligarchy but outside, in the society at large, it periled the nation with potential anarchy. Absolute monarchy —«Tyranny»— was not his only concern, as is often believed; he considered loyalty to the government and the maintenance of authority crucial issues in his time.²⁹

Gordon feared the ignoble ends of certain individuals and the impressionable nature of the people because in concert they upset the essential stability of the political structure and threatened the society with chaos, anarchy, and finally, civil war. «Tis owing to the arts and industry of

seducers, that the People are sometimes uneasy and discontent under a good Government;» and once misled they attempt to overthrow government.³⁰ In each case, the people were inclined to rise up under seductive technique, a process associated with «party» in the thought of Thomas Gordon.

In all Gordon's writings one observes an explicit criticism of men who lead a party, adhere to a party, or who respond to party rhetoric. Like many of his contemporaries, he viewed «Party» as part and parcel of the search for «jobs and place»³¹ but he was most concerned with the operation and effect of «party-men» upon the nation as a whole. Described in as modern terms as possible, Gordon saw parties as combinations of men held together by a mutual desire to maintain or obtain power and in competition with each other for the same ends; parties usually had a name or label and there was a demand for group loyalty; party did not represent a distinct or viable set of political principles nor was it acceptable as a legitimate political instrument. Parties were odious because they were tools for political aggrandizement based on blind loyalty and sustained by hypocrisy; but worst of all, they were divisive by nature. Gordon believed such things because of his essentially pessimistic view of human nature, as indicated above, and he drew his conclusions from personal experience and, most of all, from his study of History, especially Roman: one of the major manifestations of Roman corruption was the rise of parties, that noble state «fell a Victim to Ambition and Faction.»³² The following paragraphs seek to elucidate Gordon's descriptions of party as he perceived them from his own experience in politics and from his study of the past.

Gordon believed, like many of his contemporaries, that the existence of parties in the polity implied a political aberration: «there had been no such thing as Party, now in *England*, if we had not been betrayed by those whom we trusted.»³³ Parties were not only a manifestation of political malfunction but the differences between them were not material or real and he could «name two great Parties in *England* [Whig and Tory], who, when they were out of Power, seemed to place the Sum of Publick Spirit, in entrenching upon the Royal Authority; and when they were in Power, to know no other Law but the Prerogative Royal.»³⁴ They were not consistent in their views and there was «no Reliance upon what Parties say of one another;»³⁵ nor was there much hope that these groups would dissolve themselves. Instead, the competition between them was ceaseless, based on an unending process of rivalry and vengeance. One group obtained power and proceeded

to dedicate itself to the preservation of its position which ultimately led to its unpopularity, while the out group gained public favor by opposing «that invidious Increase of Power,» thus «they are encouraged, indeed enabled, to make fresh Efforts; and such Efforts furnish their Rivals with a Pretence for seeking further Strength.»³⁶

The existence of party thwarted the development and potential leadership of men who were sincerely concerned with the public interest. Such individuals judged independently, looking to a man's conduct and action for guidance not to his group affiliation. But a primary interest of party was loyalty to a «Cause» and, as a result, a man was competent and trustworthy if he was a «good Party-Man.» and men received the group's esteem «for no earthly Consideration, but that of their Bigotry to their Party, and of their Party to them, whilst Men of the most amiable Turn, of the greatest Accomplishments, and finest Talents, are,... at best, shunned and cursed; only for not being infatuated with the epidemical Madness of Party!»³⁷ It also «shakes and lessens the Integrity of Men» within its ranks: when an individual was accepted as a «Chief» or «Leader» his supporters made no demands upon him; the rank and file was «disposed to see all Excellency and no Fault in him,» and as a result, he pursued, freely, his own motives and personal whims which, given human nature, were self-seeking and unrelated to the true interests of the public.³⁸ Gordon explained explicitly:

... from this Spirit, this baneful and pestilent Spirit of Party, the ablest and best Men are often precluded from the Service of their Country; the weakest, the worst, and most contemptible, employed in its Service; and the best Men often forced from that Service, to make room for the worst.³⁹

Parties did not unite men under certain principles; they did not attract, select or promote civil servants; they first emerged from conditions of duress; they reaped havoc with Truth; and their natural condition was discord. Party, an anathema to the polity, was particularly dangerous to the security of «Liberty;» and it weakened the nation to such a degree that foreign observers would quickly realize its ripeness for invasion. Gordon considered the «Croud,» the «Vulgar,» the «Rabble» as particularly susceptible to party machinations: with «only a few Cant Words, such as will always serve to animate a Mob,» the multitude —who trusted without reserve; had little apprehension of evil; were fickle; credited information too readily; chased names and no-

tions— «are brought into Measures pernicious to themselves and baneful to their Liberties...»⁴⁰ Gordon poignantly warned all men against their persistent attraction and attachment to «Sounds, Names, Persons, Modes, Colours» which caused them «to be drawn into Faction» by blindly following such rhetoric.⁴¹ Party leaders pretended to represent essential principles distinct from those of their adversaries but the only real division was one of «Name and Men... the *Red* and the *White*;» each side claimed support for the Country and both «think their own mutual Hate to be Zeal for the Public.»⁴²

The people followed and supported Catiline in just such a manner even though they were fully aware that his power meant only public disorder and revolution.⁴³ This was a serious indictment; Gordon never expressed great faith in the people at any point in his writings but he even went so far as to suggest that the people sometimes welcomed chaos and that party played up to and reinforced such venality and made «licentiousness» a serious threat to England. Gordon commented on Sallust's analysis of the «Conspiracy of Catiline» and pointed out that the Roman author attributed civil disorder to the people and not to the misconduct of the Magistrates; Gordon did not believe Sallust had exaggerated and Gordon himself stated that the Roman people «had nothing to lose and a Chance to get» from the destruction of Rome.⁴⁴ How did the people reach such a state? They were not naturally prone to corruption itself but to falseness in general: to «sounds,» «names,» «deluders,» and «seducers» who deceived them with ease. They could be corrupted and once in that condition they were dangerous. Many of his examples of this seduction process are related to religious figures, who were often of course political leaders as well. The clergy from their pulpits had a special place and a particular talent for blinding the credulous populace and they often roused the people to sedition. Thomas a Becket enchanted the people with his cant and charm when actually he was a «turbulent,» «rebellious,» «mischievous» priest, the worst England ever saw!»⁴⁵ The Christians under the «brave, generous, wise, humane» Julian became «licentious and turbulent» because they were constantly «instigated by the arrogance and ambition of the Bishops» who, to acquire their opulent churches, broke the «public Peace» and often raised «Tumults and Seditions.»⁴⁶ The clergy, both like and as party-men, were a lethal menace when they resorted to popular appeal and declamation to achieve their ambitious purposes. The Atterbury Plot of 1722, an effort to restore the Stuart Pretender to the English throne led by the Bishop of Rochester, High-Churchman and Tory,

represented for Thomas Gordon a pernicious mixture of priestcraft and party which he censored vociferously in *Cato's Letters*, pamphlets, and in the government press.⁴⁷

Once the spirit of party prevailed, reconciliation was difficult because the people were «infatuated, thus drunk with Faction, delighting in Antipathy and endless Discord, making a Merit of heightening popular Rage and Dissention,» and once in that condition they were indifferent to the «Expedients of Peace and Reconciliation.»⁴⁸ The reign of William III and the «late Queen's time» were recent examples of party strife: one party (Tory) charged the other with «Designs to destroy the Monarchy and Church. —A terrible Charge, but notoriously false, yet swallowed by the Vulgar.» The consequences were a «furious Ferment» and «Spirit of Division» which threatened to «blow-up» government. Party-men, like Cromwell and his Agitators, «raised a Spirit which they afterwards, when they desired to lay it, could not...»⁴⁹ Gordon warned his countrymen to resist party because England's «greatest Hazard» lay in the existence of contending faction.⁵⁰

In his discourse, «Of Factions and Parties,» published for the last time and not paradoxically as some scholars believe, in mid-nineteenth-century Spain, Gordon provided his most vivid and explicit depiction of the nature and results of party machinations: one group attempts to destroy its opponent by exalting itself and by falsely accusing its competitor; such haranguing creates anger and ill-will; as the animosity and rancor intensify —one party thinking themselves «as innocent as Angels, and the other Party as black as Devils»— the breach widens; «mutual Fury and Fierceness are increased by mutual Lyes an Inventives; Reason is lost in Rage; Justice is swallowed up in Revenge;» and finally, this party hatred «inflames and divides» the public, a «High-way is raised to Blood and Massacre» and it all leads to «Licentiousness and Rebellion.» Party leaders were «incendiaries» and «demagogues» since they rose on popular ignorance and promoted strife and discord; although they pretended to love their Country, they only animated and perpetuated divisions.⁵¹

Given his assumptions about human nature —an unprincipled minority and an ignorant majority— and his deep concern for the maintenance of the fragile balance between liberty and authority, Thomas Gordon perceived party as a vicious and divisive activity —a political embodiment of man's most negative characteristics and against all sources of potential harmony and equilibrium— that produced a dangerously inflammatory situation and threatened the society with po-

litical and social chaos. When and how political thinkers overcame such fears is another story but Gordon's descriptions of party indicate the complexity and depth of the eighteenth century's apprehension and suggest, at least, the reasons for a long-term Anglo-American rejection of political opposition as legitimate and positive. The survival of Hobbesian views of human nature in a major radical pamphleteer of the English Enlightenment leads one to consider nineteenth-century Romanticism the crucial political liberator.

NOTES

1. Rober Dahl, *Political Oppositions in Western Democracies* (New Haven, 1966), pp. XIII - XXI.
2. J. A. W. Gunn, editor, *Factions No More: Attitudes to Party in Government and Opposition in Eighteenth-Century England, Extracts from Contemporary Sources* (London, 1972), p. 1.
3. Bernard Bailyn, *The Origins of American Politics* (New York, 1968), pp. 36 - 37.
4. Michael Wallace, «Changing Concepts of Party in the United States: New York, 1815 - 1828,» *American Historical Review* 74 (December, 1968), p. 453.
5. Richard Hofstadter, *The Idea of a Party System: The Rise of Legitimate Opposition in the United States, 1780 - 1840* (Berkeley, 1969), pp. 12 - 13.
6. Donald C. Ginter, *Whig Organization in the General Election of 1790* (Berkeley, 1967), p. XLVIII.
7. David Hackett Fischer, *The Revolution of American Conservatism: The Federalist Party in the Era of Jeffersonian Democracy* (New York, 1965), pp. XIV and 4 - 5.
8. Fischer, pp. 10 and 27.
9. Gunn, «Preface» to his valuable collection of eighteenth-century English writings on party.
10. Gunn, p. 162 for a contemporary's (Dr. John Brett) acknowledgement of Thomas Gordon's significance and p. 260, note 3 where the editor explains that Dr. Brett's thoughts deserve attention because they contain information on the major figures at mid-century on the question of party — Bolingbroke, Gordon and Hume.
11. Clinton Rossiter, *Seedtime of the Republic: The Origin of the American Tradition of Political Liberty* (New York, 1953), pp. 141-146 and 192; Bernard Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins of the American Revolution* (Cambridge, Mass., 1967) and *The Origins of American Politics*; Lance G. Banning, «The Quarrel

with Federalism: A Study in the Origins and Character of Republican Thought» (Ph. D. diss., Washington University, 1971), pp. 83-87, 125-126; Caroline Robbins, *The Eighteenth-Century Commonwealthman: Studies in the Transmission, Development and Circumstance of English Liberal Thought from the Restoration of Charles II until the War with the Thirteen Colonies* (Cambridge, Mass., 1959), chap. IV; J. G. A. Pocock, «Machiavelli, Harrington and English Political Ideologies in the Eighteenth Century,» *William and Mary Quarterly*, 3d Ser., XXII (1965), pp. 573 - 583 and *The Machiavellian Moment: Florentine Political Thought and the Atlantic Republican Tradition* (Princeton, New Jersey, 1975), pp. 467-477; Quentin Skinner, «The Principles and Practice of Opposition: The Case of Bolingbroke versus Walpole,» in Neil McKendrick, editor, *Historical Perspectives: Studies in English Thought and Society* (London, 1974); and Gordon Wood, *The Creation of the American Republic* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1969).

12. Bailyn, *The Ideological Origins*, p. 41; H. Trevor Colbourn *The Lamp of Experience* (Chapel Hill, N. C., 1965), pp. 200 ff.; and David L. Jacobson, «Thomas Gordon's Works of Tacitus in Pre-Revolutionary America,» *Bulletin of the New York Public Library*, LXIX (1965), pp. 58 - 64.

13. David L. Jacobson, editor, *The English Libertarian Heritage* (New York, 1965), pp. XLIII - XLIV; and Robbins, pp. 115 - 125.

14. Thomas Gordon, *The Works of Tacitus in Four Volumes to which are prefixed Political Discourses Upon that Author* (London, 1737), 2nd edition, Vol. I, Discourse V, section VI. This is the copy Thomas Jefferson possessed and he had Gordon's translation of *Tacitus* intercalated in a seventeenth-century Amsterdam edition of the Latin work. The two volumes of the «Discourses» are bound together in a single book in the Rare Book Room of the Library of Congress. In his first publication of *Tacitus*, Gordon attached 10 discourses to the 1728 Volume I and 12 discourses to the 1731 Volume II; all references to the *Tacitus* «Discourses» will give volume, discourse, and section numbers. John Trenchard and Thomas Gordon, *Cato's Letters; or Essays on Liberty, Civil and Religious, And other important Subjects*, 3rd edition (London, 1733; reprint edition, New York, 1969), No. 18, p. 121 «... Mankind will be always the same, will always act within one Circle, and when we know what they did a Thousand Years ago, in any Circumstance, we shall know what they will do a Thousand Years hence in the same. This is what is called Experience the surest Mistress and Lesson of Wisdom.

15. *Cato's Letters*, Nos. 70 and 25; *Tacitus*, Vol. I, Discourse VII, section XIII.

16. J. H. Plumb, *The Growth of Political Stability in England, 1675 - 1725* (London, 1967), p. 15; Isaac Kramnick, *Bolingbroke and His Circle: The Politics of Nostalgia in the Age of Walpole* (Cambridge, Mass., 1968), p. 251 where he explains that *Cato's Letters* reflect a greater concern for the checking and restraining of Parliament and ministers rather than for the restraint of monarchy; and William T. Laprade, *Public Opinion and Politics in Eighteenth-Century England to the Fall of Walpole* (New York, 1936), p. 308.

17. *Tacitus*, Vol. I, Discourse III, section II.

18. *Tacitus*, Vol. I, Discourse IV, section IV.

19. *Cato's Letters*, N.º 31, p. 237.

20. *Cato's Letters*, N.º 39, pp. 47 - 48.
21. *Cato's Letters*, N.º 44, p. 78.
22. *Cato's Letters*, N.º 22, p. 154; N.º 24, pp. 178-179; see also Nos. 33, 39, 40, 43, 44, and 47.
23. *Tacitus*, Vol. I, Discourse IX, section II and Vol. II, Discourse II, section I.
24. *Cato's Letters*, N.º 40, p. 54; N.º 31, p. 237; and N.º 40 pp. 53 and 55.
25. Charles B. Realey, *The Early Opposition to Sir Robert Walpole, 1720 - 1727* Lawrence, Kansas, 1931), p. 35.
26. *Cato's Letters*, N.º 24, p. 178; *Tacitus*, Vol. II, Discourse IX, section I; and Thomas Gordon, *The Works of Sallust to which are Prefixed Political Discourses Upon that Author* (London, 1762), 2nd edition. Original in the New York Public Library, photocopy in The American University Library, Washington, D. C. Gordon attached nine discourses to his translation of *Sallust* first published in 1744. All references to *Sallust* will give the discourse, section and page numbers. *Sallust*, Discourse I, section III, pp. 15 - 25.
27. *Cato's Letters*, N.º 22, p. 153 and Nos. 31, 44 and 45.
28. *Tacitus*, Vol. II, Discourse IX, section II.
29. See note 16 and *Sallust*, Discourse IX, pp. 159-202.
30. *Tacitus*, Vol II, Discourse IX, section VI.
31. Realey, p. 35.
32. *Cato's Letters*, N.º 18, pp. 120-121.
33. *Cato's Letters*, N.º 16, p. 108.
34. *Cato's Letters*, N.º 16,, pp. 107 and 109; N.º 76, pp. 85-86; and see N.º 18, p. 122
35. *Sallust*, Discourse I, section I, p. 5.
36. *Sallust*, Discourse I, section I, p. 5 and see section II, p. 10 and section III, pp. 10, 16 and 17.
37. *Sallust*, Discourse I, section I, p. 7 and see section II, p. 14 and section I, p. 9.
38. *Sallust*, Discourse I, section II, p. 14 and section I, p. 9.
39. *Sallust*, Discourse I, section II, p. 12,
40. *Sallust*, Discourse I, section II, p. 12.
41. *Sallust*, Discourse I, section III, p. 17.
42. *Sallust*, Discourse I, section III, pp. 20 and 22.
43. *Sallust*, Discourse VI, section V, p. 105 where Gordon quotes Sallust: «The Commonalty, in a Body, from a Passion for public Changes, approved the Pursuits of *Catiline*; and, in doing so, seemed but to follow their usual Bent: ... for Novelties and Change; and, from Disgust to their own Condition, labour to introduce universal Confusion. In popular Comotions and Discord, they find their Subsistence without Pains and Care; since Poverty, which never has any thing to lose, is, upon such Occasions, readily supported.»
44. *Sallust*, Discourse VI, section V, pp. 105 and 104.
45. *Tacitus*, Vol. II, Discourse IX, section V.
46. *Tacitus*, Vol. I, Discourse VII, section XI and *Cato's Letters*, N.º 51.
47. Once alert to the reality of the Atterbury Plot, Gordon wrote for Walpole's administration in the *St. James's Journal*, a newspaper created to offset

«a Crisis of remarkable Danger and Disquiet,» in an effort to heal «Divisions and Distractions» by counteracting those who were turning «the Hearts of the People against the Government,» and stirring «them up to Tumult and Sedition.» See the «Dedication» to a «complete set of *St. James's Journal*» (3 May 1722 to 18 May 1723) compiled by Thomas Robe in 1732 and dedicated to the Queen, in the Burney Collection of newspapers in the British Library; and *St. James's Journal* (London) 3 May 1722 or Thomas Gordon, *The Humorist*, 4th edition (London, n. d.), Vol. II, pp. 240 - 246.

48. *Sallust*, Discourse I, section III, p. 23.
49. *Sallust*, Discourse I, section I, pp. 6 and 5.
50. *Sallust*, Discourse I, section I, p. 5.
51. *Sallust*, Discourse I, pp. 1 - 25.