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PART I. THE COUNTY

One of the basic features of English history has been its continuity, continuity in the sense that we have experienced no catastrophic upheaval such as the French Revolution. But it is all too easy to move from this acceptable statement and speak of a continuous “development”. This concept of historical evolution has grave weaknesses, however, and seems to be based upon some vague law of “progress” or upon the idea that history is like the erection of a large and complex building, moving relentlessly step by step to some great end, which it emphatically is not. Historians have written, for example, of the “gradual development” of the administrative structure of the country as being one of the outstanding characteristics of Anglo-Saxon England, or of the “rise” and “development” of countries at various stages in the past, as if there could be no disruptions in the uniform process due to peculiar circumstances at any given period in history. But surely the hazards and unexpected twists in the course of history are part of its very delight.

The treatment of “party” in historical analysis has not escaped the grasp of this evolutionary concept. W. T. Morgan, Sir Keith Feiling and G. M. Trevelyan, though they trace the Whig and Tory Parties from different starting points, Feiling from the Reformation, the others from the Restoration, agreed on the general conclusion that the “antipathies of religion and of class preserved the core of Whig and Tory tradition through all changes of party policy and of party fortune, from the days of Somers and St. John to the days of Grey and Peel.” These historians wrote before the full impact of Namierite theories concerning mid-eighteenth century politics. But if Sir Lewis’ analysis is correct, then, by the same reasoning as that which affected the views of the earlier writers, “party” is simply not possible in the period before the accession of George III.

Something which has gone hand in hand with the idea of “progress” in the history of “party” (and which has added to the confusion) has been the free use of the words “Whig”
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and “Tory” in the historical vocabulary. Sir Lewis Namier has pointed out the danger of using such terms in the political context with which he dealt: “There is more resemblance in outer forms and denominations than in underlying realities, so that misconception is easy. There were no proper party organisations about 1760, though party names and cant were current; the names and the cant have since supplied the materials for an imaginary super-structure . . . . . . . the political life of the period could be fully described without ever using a party denomination.” To put it another way, the difficulty is that “the mention of either (“Whig” or “Tory”) always brought an association of rivalry to the mind even when . . . . there was no contemporary division of principle to which it could be related.”

The pre-Namier studies argued that a Whig-Tory scheme for Queen Anne’s reign is acceptable, but that this conclusion must be qualified and that these qualifications must be stressed. W. T. Morgan divided the parties socially: the Tories were the landed class and supported non-resistance to the Crown and upheld the Church of England, while the Whigs came mainly from the trading classes and worked for civil liberties and religious toleration. Sir Keith Feiling was concerned with doctrines and divided Whig and Tory attitudes towards the Succession, the Religious Settlement and the War of the Spanish Succession. G. M. Trevelyan also supported this view. But they all emphasised the split within the Tory ranks. While recognising a conflict of opinion between Whig “moderates” such as the Dukes of Newcastle and Somerset and “extremists” like the Junto Lords, “the Whigs were agreed on the main political questions of the day: religious toleration for all Protestants; war with France by land as well as by sea; the Scottish Union; and the Hanoverian Succession. On all these issues the ‘Tories were at variance with one another.” Thus “the political history of Queen Anne’s reign cannot be understood merely in the terms of controversy between the two historic parties.” Therefore, Augustan politics have not been seen as a complete two-party system, but a broad Whig-Tory dichotomy, taking into account the qualifications, is fundamental to these studies.

Professor Walsott has recently disturbed the calm by rejecting this view. He has argued that there were, in fact, a series of “party groups”, eight in all, which could merge into two parties, but which more often acted independently. “On issues that stirred men in the later seventeenth—and eighteenth-centuries—Exclusion, the Protestant Succession, the safety of the Church—there was clearly a ‘whig’ and a ‘tory’ side which parallel closely the course of the historic streams of Whiggism and Toryism . . . . . however within the walls of Parliament as it concerned itself with the day-to-day work of government . . . . . the apparent division between two national parties dissolves into the multi-party structure normally associated with the reign of George III.” Thus, in an analysis which ends with the 1707-8 session, he sees the Marlborough-Godolphin “connexion” and the Government interest, made up of placemen, working together throughout the period and being successively assisted by the Hyde-Seymour and Nottingham-Finch “connexions”, which were dropped in 1703 and 1704, and the Harley-Foley group until early in 1708. In addition, there were about one hundred members, out of that half of the House of Commons who were not in any of the organised groups, who always voted with the Government.

So the broad Whig-Tory framework of Queen Anne’s reign has been shattered. The time of the Kit-Cat Club and of the October Club, which has been regarded as “the classic age of party warfare,” has been subjected to radical modification. Just as Christopher Hill once wrote that the Long Parliament has been “Namierised,” so now it can be said of the Augustan Age.

But a number of objections have been raised. The most fundamental of these is that Professor Walsott has transferred conclusions from one period of history to another. They are not very far apart in terms of time, admittedly, but the difference in the atmosphere of the “seventeenth century,” as the period down to 1714 has rightly been described for so long, and the mid-eighteenth century could not be more marked: one of “crisis,” the other of
serenity, one of conflict in an unstable situation, the other of co-operation. War dominated life between the Revolution and the Hanoverian Succession; there was a struggle over the Revolution Settlement when its consequences became clear, and only later could its gains be stabilised and secured. In 1702 violence was dominant in religion; there was crisis too over the Succession and, with the final destruction of the Tories in 1714, one can almost sense the relief which people felt. "I am sure you both share a joy in the nation's happiness, and the unexpected quietness at this time is certainly a particular blessing and God Grant we may make a right use of it," wrote a correspondent of a former county member, George Whichcote, in 1714, just before the arrival of George I. A year later, the same writer spoke of "the happiness this nation enjoys under the Present Government."9

The conflict in Queen Anne's reign was increased by post-Revolution developments. The failure to renew the Licensing Act in 1695 meant that pamphlets and newspapers blossomed and became the vehicles for propaganda campaigns, which resulted in retaliation and so the process snow-balled. The Triennial Act made elections more frequent and so they became more costly and campaigning and canvassing were carried on continuously. The increasing importance of Parliament meant that merchants sought seats, until then the "private preserves" of the independent gentlemen, who resented this intrusion. So controversy was bitter and general elections were fought over issues—the "tacking" of the Occasional Conformity Bill to the Land Tax (1704), the threatened invasion of the Pretender (1708), Dr. Sacheverell (1710) and the French Commercial Treaty (1713). Very few elections after 1714 until the end of the century could be said to have been conducted on bases such as these. The period down to 1714, therefore, has a right to be considered on its own and outside any uniform pattern of "development."

Walcott places a great deal of emphasis on personal relationships in compiling his "party groups." That this was a factor in political life is undoubted, but a family tie is not in itself conclusive evidence of common political bonds. He, moreover, seems to regard this factor as being necessary for political co-operation.10 But given the conditions of the time, when the number of people with influence was small, and when a particular family, such as the Berties, the most important noble family in Lincolnshire, might be married to half the noble families of England, personal relationships were not difficult to find.11 Thus Walcott has tended to exaggerate the size of his "party groups". Dr. Plumb began this line of attack by suggesting that there was little concrete evidence of co-operation beyond a mutual Whiggism for the Newcastle-Pelham-Townsend-Walpole "connexion".12 In Lincolnshire, family ties certainly did not mean political association; rather political principle was again and again shown to be far more important. The fourth Earl of Lindsey was estranged from his uncle, Charles Bertie, and even the Earl's relationship with his son was not always harmonious; Lord Kingston's abhorrence of the policy of his Tory relative inclined him to vote Whig in 1705. The Toryism of Sir Thomas Meres did not prevent his son-in-law, George Whichcote, from being an upright Whig. Peregrine Bertie, the fourth Earl's brother, consistently supported Lindsey, but he did not belong to the Junto "connexion", even though he was Lord Wharton's nephew.13

We should expect to see these groups voting consistently on issues not concerned with the Succession and the Church. For what other tests can we apply to adjudge the validity of Walcott's conclusions? But in day-to-day Parliamentary conflicts, his analysis again breaks down when detailed examinations of the evidence are made. Two such division lists have been systematically analysed, checking individual votes against Walcott's "connexion". But the conclusions drawn do not reveal any permanency of association, at least not in such great numbers as he allocated to the different groups. When the Earl of Nottingham voted with the Whigs in the Lords against the proposed peace settlement in December, 1711, in the Commons' division only one of his followers voted with him.14 Just as Charles Bertie, the member for Stamford, had stayed on in the Government for a year after his leader had resigned.
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in May, 1704, so his son was not among Nottingham’s supporters when the Earl opposed the peace preliminaries. 15

Similarly, in the second division list, concerning the choice of a Speaker at the beginning of the 1705 Parliament, concerted action by these groups is not seen. Only fifteen members of the Hyde-Seymour “connexion”, for example, voted for the Tory candidate, though in the November, 1701, Parliament they numbered forty-seven. 16 We are not denying the existence of such groups; indeed they did exist and in this division the Harleyite group can be clearly identified as supporting the Court and the Whigs against the High Church Tories. Arthur Moore, the member for Grimsby, belonged to this group. Although a Tory, he voted for the Whig candidate, for Harley had been working against the High Church Tories for some time. 17

These groups, such as the Marlborough-Godolphin one, did play a part in the politics of the reign. Such groups have, indeed, long been accepted and they are, of course, found in any party system, however highly organised the parties may be. But the important point is that, when reduced by the tests applied to them, they are not large enough to play the roles assigned to them by Professor Walcott. For well over half the House remained outside these groups and so the importance of the latter is obvious. Although they are now even more crucial to his argument than at the outset, he deals with the unorganised members in one page. 18 At least half of these would be needed by the Ministry, but it is not clear exactly how they would get that support. It seems that it is tacitly assumed that half would automatically vote for the Court while the other half would be Country members.

There is implied in this an assumption of inconsistency in voting habits, as there is in the idea of “party groups”. Necessitating fluctuation as one group is brought in or another rejected by the Government. But a characteristic of Queen Anne’s reign, in contrast with the extreme political instability of the 1690’s, is a high level of consistency of voting. Well over three-quarters of the 1,200 or more members who sat in the Commons between 1702 and 1714 followed a fairly uniform line. 19 Of fifty-three votes cast on nine divisions list of Lincolnshire members, only six of these show any deviation, five being registered at the end of the reign and the sixth one cast by Arthur Moore in 1705. 20 Thus, it can be concluded that “party issues meant that other undoubted divisions were largely submerged in Whig and Tory.” 21

In these local studies, the traditional view seems to hold good: E. G. Forrester in Northamptonshire, Dr. Plumb in Leicestershire and S. Turner in Surrey have all seen a Whig-Tory dichotomy in the local political life. 22 Does Lincolnshire conform? Can anything be salvaged from the wreck of the Walcottian analysis? Or is there any significant divergence from interpretations which might help towards a reconsideration of Augustan politics?

At this time, Lincolnshire was remote and isolated, more so than the twentieth century mind might realise. Political life was greatly circumscribed by this isolation and the magnates were conscious of it and found it irksome. That they did so is indicated by the way in which they settled in the south and south-west of the county. The Willoughby de Eresby’s deserted their ancestral home at Spilsby in favour of Grimsthorpe; the earls of Rutland, with their seat at Belvoir, also established themselves at Newark; the earls of Exeter had property at Stamford. “The relation of most of these seats to the north road is obvious. At Stamford, Grantham and Newark were the points of contact between Lincolnshire and the outer world.” 23

When it was possible, the gentry imitated the nobility in the south-west; the Custs left Pinchbeck for Stamford, the Brownlows built at Belton and the Thorolds at Syston and Marston, all near Grantham. Other leading families were settled in this area. Most of the remaining important gentry families lived in Lincoln itself or nearby; the Monsons of Carlton, the Husseys of Doddington, the Granthams of Goltho, the Meres family in the city. By contrast, there was a lack of gentry in Holland and few at all in the wide open spaces of Lindsey.
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The consequences of such circumstances were important, for the noble families of Exeter and Rutland were more interested in neighbouring counties—the former in Northamptonshire and the latter in Rutland, Leicestershire and Derbyshire. Their interests in Lincolnshire were limited to securing the borough seats of Stamford and Grantham respectively, although on one occasion, in 1705, the Duke of Rutland combined with the Earl of Lindsey to secure the county seats. This lack of concern about the politics of the county as a whole on the part of these noble families meant that the third member of their class, the Berties, who already had considerable influence, obtained even more. The dominance of the house of Bertie is probably the most important single factor in the affairs of the county in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

The Berties had been one of the great Royalist families of the seventeenth century. Montago, the second Earl of Lindsey, had been Lord Great Chamberlain and Lord Lieutenant of the county. The Lord Lieutenant was the greatest of all local offices, for not only did it give to its holder authority in his own locality, but also a say at Court, the centre of patronage. When the Recorderships of Lincoln and Boston are added, then the power exercised by the earls of Lindsey is obvious and very formidable indeed.

An example of the strength of that authority is provided by the treatment of one of their opponents, the Cust family. The Custs had tried to keep some Parliamentary influence against the inroads of the immensely rich Berties, but all they were doing was begging themselves. They could not withstand "the blatant exploitation of patronage" wielded by their rivals. The brother of the third Earl of Lindsey, one of the many members of the family bearing the name of Peregrine, wrote to him before the 1695 election: "I believe Sir Purry Cust will not be very willing to enter into battle with so great a family for I told him to expect, if he stood, to spend £500 or £600." He added that Philip Bertie and Lord Willoughby, the future fourth Earl, could "have no better lottery than our House to push their fortunes in." Understandably, Sir Purry, whose income only amounted to £650 per annum and who was already £5,000 in debt, did not contest the election. The Berties sat in the House of Commons in "droves" and were as numerous as the Hydes, the Seymours, the Finches and the Nottinghamss. In Lincolnshire, the house controlled a third of the seats until 1713.

But the unity of the house of Bertie was shattered at the time of the Revolution. 1688 posed some bewilderingly difficult questions for the Tories and it is not surprising that they were badly confused. Lord Willoughby summed up their position: "It was the first time any Bertie ever engaged against the crown and it was his trouble—but there was a necessity either to part with our religion and properties, or do it." They had been forced into an equivocal position by the tactlessness, indiscretion and stupidity of James II, who had brought about a revolution in politics with his dismissal of the Berties and other staunch Royalists in 1685, and were faced with an irreconcilable choice of loyalties. The first sign of a split appeared when the question of their primary loyalty—Church or Monarchy—had to be answered. Lindsey was ready, together with his followers, to support Danby and to stay at Court, but his half-brother James, who had been created the first Earl of Abingdon in 1682, threw in his lot with the Regency Party. The Earl of Lindsey's brother, Charles Bertie, "the most unwavering of High Tories," was reluctantly driven to oppose James II but, though he gave William III his support, he voted against the Dutch Prince becoming King. He allied himself with the Abingdonites. There was from now on a divergence of interest between the Abingdonite Berties of Oxfordshire and Wiltshire, together with Charles Bertie, who showed themselves to be staunch Tories throughout Queen Anne's reign, and the elder branch of the family, the Lindsayites.

As far as the county elections were concerned, the fourth Earl of Lindsey was the only nobleman involved throughout the reign. His very position in society increased the power which he held by means of his offices. The social and political leadership of the aristocracy was symbolised by the great noble buildings of the late seventeenth and early eighteenth
centuries. They were the administrative centres of large and complex economic enterprises and the great acreages necessitated considerable numbers of staff as well as tenants. Here was a firm basis of electoral support and the great wealth of the Berries meant that other weapons such as treating and free transport to the polls could be used effectively.

But Lindsey was to find that he was by no means always certain of success in the county. For the country gentlemen also possessed great weight in electoral matters simply because of their numbers. They were particularly strong in counties such as Lincolnshire, in rural communities farthest removed from the influence of London and the trading world. When it is added that Lindsey's politics for the greater part of the reign were neither Whig nor Tory, but that he orientated himself towards the Court, then a very interesting situation arose. For when the Court was alienated from the Tories, then he had to contend with the opposition of these rabidly Tory supporters: the Thoresby, the Dymokes and the Massingerberds. Families such as these, the sort of people who made up the backbone of the Tories, were soon at loggerheads with any noble who attempted to dominate the county. The smaller gentry, too, who lacked the wealth to compete with the rich merchants and noblemen, were, in the main, Tory and some, like Sir John Bolles, even flirted with Jacobitism.28

The gentry had powerful allies in the country clergy, for the situation was ideal for these men. Newspapers were rarely seen in the countryside. Partly for this reason, it was easy for the gentry and clergy, who relied on "newsletters" from their correspondents in town, to mould political opinion. Only such events as the Battle of Blenheim or the trial of Dr. Sacheverell were widely reported and talked about. So historical memories could be constantly kept alive in the parish pulpits and appeals to the negative passions of anti-Popery and anti-Puritanism as well as to enthusiasm for the Church of England were effective. There were many among the High Church clergy who were gifted writers and polemists and prominent among them was Samuel Wesley.29 He was a remarkable man and although he is chiefly known as the father of two famous sons, he is important for more than that. In the intense religio-political strife of Queen Anne's reign, in which the strongest theme on the home front was that of the Church, he played a considerable part.

Wesley had come to Epworth in 1695 into a situation which has been described, perhaps with a little exaggeration, as a "vortex of riot and incendiarism." In the Isle of Axholme, the seventeenth century had witnessed the emergence of the religious rebels, the Baptists. The Isle was their Iona. A religious census of Lincolnshire, taken in 1676,30 had revealed that one in twenty of the population was Nonconformist, but that they were concentrated in the area around Epworth, Butterwick and Crowle. Bad feeling had been exacerbated between some Dutchmen, who were working on a drainage scheme, some Huguenot refugees, and the Islemen. The situation would not therefore be eased if a man of strong ecclesiastical and political views, such as Wesley, came into the area. He had a high sense of duty, deep conviction and tremendous courage so that a clash with the Dissenters was inevitable, for, as is often the case, along with these admirable qualities, Wesley was completely lacking in tact.

In the first decade of the new century, poor Samuel Wesley suffered a series of disasters which might have destroyed the fighting spirit of most people, but he remained unwavering in his loyalty to the High Church Tory cause. Already deep in debt, misfortune befell his family in 1702 when the rectory was burnt down and early in 1704, while Wesley himself was away in London, his flax was destroyed. This, together with the fact that the price of grain was low at this time, added to his plight. Of course, he knew quite well that it had been "wilfully fired and burned in the night." To the main factor in the situation was the political agitation against the rector because of his polemical writings against the Dissenting interest. This clash is important for Wesley's case gives a unique instance of how High Church clergy used their influence in support of Tory candidates.

The cause of the parish clergy was given peculiar prominence at this time. Convocation, which had not been summoned after the failure of Comprehension in 1690, met again between
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1701 and 1717, only to relapse again into obscurity for 150 years, except for one occasion in 1754. Such a body had the effect of enhancing the clergy's political power because it acted as a sort of focus of their discontent and it is yet another characteristic which sets Queen Anne's reign apart from the ages immediately before and after it and thus outside any uniform pattern. Moreover, there was a clash within Convocation itself between the High Church clergy and the predominantly Low Church bishops. This greatly increased the politico-religious controversy and it is clearly seen in Lincolnshire. Samuel Wesley was again at the head of the parish priests and the importance of the conflict is enhanced by the fact that his opponent was William Wake, who became Bishop of Lincoln in 1705. Both these men attended Convocation from the time when it was first summoned, Wesley having been elected as a proctor in 1701. Already on this national level the two were in opposition, for Wake was always found in the small minority in the Lower House of Convocation who were opposed to the extremism of the majority of the clergy, of whom Wesley rapidly became one of the main spokesmen. By 1705, therefore, the local conflict was already latent.32

In the county the Whig interest was really non-existent in spite of the concentration of Dissenters in the Isle of Axholme. The clergy and the country gentlemen were far more numerous and politically significant.

The most important single individual in county affairs was undoubtedly the fourth Earl of Lindsey and his political attitude would inevitably be reflected in the election results. This was indeed so, the first four elections of Queen Anne's reign all being controlled by the Earl. Therefore when we consider that the 1702 and 1710 elections gave the Tories victory and the Whigs gained a clear majority in 1708, Lindsey's activities need explanation. He was a most curious character: unlike the vast majority of peers, we cannot pin a party label on him. Rather he followed what must have seemed to many a devious line, absenting himself from the Lords on several important occasions, sometimes leaving his proxy vote with another Lord and sometimes omitting to do so. It may be thought that the reason for this was his political inactivity, but his electoral activity precludes that possibility.

What Lindsey seemed to do was to trim his sails to suit the prevailing wind from the Court. At least, this is what he did until after 1710, when he rejected his long association with the Court. His highly unusual political stance caused no problems, though, in the second election of 1701 and the first of Queen Anne's reign in 1702. With the backing of the Earl, Sir John Thorold and Charles Dymoke, the Hereditary Champion of England, members of two long-established Lincolnshire families, were elected without a contest. A Whig candidate, Colonel George Whichcote, from Harpswell near Gainsborough, tried to win some support to enable him to contest the election, but all attempts failed. He had a certain basis of support among the Baptist freeholders in the Isle of Axholme, but the problem was to transport these electors to the polls. Here he came up against a difficulty which he had to face on more than one occasion. To try to bring his supporters to Lincoln, he wrote to the Duke of Newcastle and Sir John Newton asking for assistance. He was confident of giving his "opponents a fair meeting," but he met with little success in spite of professing a "hearty loyalty to my King."33

If he met with ill-success in this election, then there was little hope of any better fortune in the first general election of the new reign. For the Tories were buoyant and enthusiastic about the prospect of Anne ruling the country. Not only was she a Stuart, which would ease their consciences about the Revolution, but she was also devotedly attached to the Church of England. She might protest at being independent of party,34 but she roused the wild hopes of the right-wing Tories. The election was certainly not a landslide victory for them, "interest" and the many "pocket" boroughs always prevented this in the seventeenth and eighteenth century elections, but they made significant gains. In the county, there was no deviation from the national pattern and Sir John Thorold was again elected along with Charles Dymoke. The latter died at the end of 1702 and was replaced by his brother, Lewis, in February of the following year. There is no evidence that Whichcote even bothered to stand.
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The first Ministry of the new reign was almost wholly Tory, but their enthusiasm for the Church of England had destroyed their electoral strength by 1705. The Test Act of 1673 said that no one could hold State or municipal office unless he had taken Communion according to the rites of the Church of England. The result was that many Dissenters became "occasional conformists" to overcome this disability. Tory passion was more bitter on this issue and it caused the deepest cleavage within the Ministry. A Bill to hang out the "bloody flag of defiance" and to suppress Occasional Conformity was introduced in November, 1702, but it was dropped after passing the House of Commons. The leaders of the Ministry were not hostile to such a measure at that stage. Further bills were introduced in 1703 and 1704, but by the latter date the Court had definitely cooled towards the idea. The third occasion produced an attempt to "tack" the Occasional Conformity Bill to a Land Tax Bill. It was opposed, of course, in the Lords, an important factor, for a Whiggish Upper House served to increase political strife still further. The Bill was also defeated in the Commons. This was achieved by a combination of three factors: the Court which could not allow the Land Tax to be jeopardised because of the war effort; some Tories who were not prepared to place zeal for the Church before loyalty to the Queen and who became known as "sneakers"; and the Whigs, now supporting the Court. So the "tack" was fatal to the Tory right-wing.

But support for the Ministry was now very narrowly based. The "tackers" were rejected and Government influence was used against them in the 1705 election. They again used the Church and the oppressive Land Tax as issues. But war not religion was dominant with the Ministry and with this they were helped by the new spirit abroad after the Battle of Blenheim in 1704. The other hand, the Crown did not support the Whigs though it solicited the more moderate elements of that Party and brought them into the Government. The result of such tactics was to return a Parliament in which neither party had a working majority. But rejection of the Tories meant that the Government must work with the Whigs and, in fact, it was dependent on their support. Thus it promoted a Whig for the Speaker's Chair which "marked a decisive shift in the Government's parliamentary policy from a Tory to a whig scheme." The series of removals were carried out by the new Ministry and not the least significant of these was the snapping of "one ancient link with the older Toryism" with "the removal of Charles Bertie, in the old days Danby's alter ego, from the Ordnance." At a time when his High Toryism was alienating him from the Government, his nephew, the Earl of Lindsey, was doing precisely the opposite, and by this time he had accommodated himself to the new Ministry. In 1705, he left his proxy vote for the Occasional Conformity Bill, which seems to indicate just how "Court" he was before 1705. But in the 1705 election he brought in two Whigs, his brother, Albemarle Bertie, and George Whichcote. It seems that he accommodated himself to the Court as soon as he was certain as to how the Court would be orientated in the coming election. The division over the "tack" in November, 1704, clearly indicated that the Ministry would oppose its supporters, but it was by no means so clear as to whom the Court would support in 1705. Hence Lindsey's delay until February, 1705, before changing his political colours. There can be no doubt about this change—the reports which were made of it indicate his definite shift. We must hesitate, however, to pin a Whig label on him as readily as did these correspondents, for his colours changed once more with the Tory success in 1710. His "Whiggism" then was rather pallid in its support for the Godolphin Ministry. It was sufficient, however, to warrant a Marquiseate as a reward by the Whigs for their new ally.

But the important point to the squirearchy was the fact that the Earl's allegiances were no longer to the Tory camp and his tremendous "influence" did not deter them from opposition. It is obvious that Lindsey too realised that he would have to draw swords with the country gentlemen. The Tories held most of the country seats throughout England, even when circumstances favoured the Whigs. So Lindsey called upon the support of the Duke of Rutland, an undoubted Whig. Even this powerful combination of local interests did not have matters all their own way for the "tacking" interest was only just defeated.
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Lindsey's candidates were opposed by Sir John Thorold and Lewis Dymoke, the sitting members, who had the almost completely united support and backing of the country gentlemen. Significantly, however, a relative of Sir John, Lord Kingston, alienated by the "tack", decided to vote for the Whigs. But Sir William Massingham was perhaps a better example of the sort of people who played a part in the political life of the county. Whatever the circumstances, he faithfully supported the Tory candidates, even though he had misgivings about recent policy: "I should think they had done better not to have been for the tacking of the bill," but he nevertheless determined "to vote for the old ones." The "tackers" also attempted to muster further support from more doubtful sources. A joint letter was sent to Sir John Newton, but he declared for their opponents even before Lindsey's leaning were known.40

The result of the election would be pleasing, thought the Duke of Newcastle, to Robert Harley, who had constantly worked against the extremist elements within the Tory Party. He would not be sorry to hear of the defeat of "lofty Sir John" Thorold, of which he had actually had notice a month earlier.41 But such a narrow defeat of the "tackers" could hardly have been reassuring for the future. If the Tories could maintain such support in adverse circumstances, then they could almost be assured of victory when the tide of opinion was running their way, even faced by the opposition of the Earl.

Alongside the country squires, the clergy threw in their not inconsiderable weight on the High Tory side and in Samuel Wesley we have a good example of the parish priest at work. At the beginning of 1705, Wesley had been called to London after printing a poem on the Battle of Blenheim, for which the Duke of Marlborough appointed him chaplain to the regiment of one Colonel Lepelle which would be staying in the country for some time. He also hoped for a prebend of the Queen to help him out of his difficulties. Before setting out for London to receive his reward, he had already made known his intention of voting for one of the "tackers", Sir John. But he planned to give his second vote to George Whitchcote, who was a good friend. However, in spite of their "considerable intimacy", Wesley soon found that he was unable to do so. His reasons for opposing Whitchcote were clearly set out in a letter of 11 April, 1705 "Colonel Whitchcote . . . is as firm to the Church of England as any . . . but yet when it comes to a party cause every body knows how the votes run in both Houses, and it would be ungrateful to disoblige a body of men who have been the chief cause of ones election." Wesley was referring to the support which the Whig candidate drew from the Dissenters in the Isle of Axholme. He related how, only a few months before, Whitchcote had mysteriously refused to bring some Dissenters before the court for not paying their tithes and some Quakers who had not paid their Church assessments for several years. When he put up as a candidate in the election, his motive became clear: "if he had done justice in a case where the Dissenters were concerned it would have endangered the losing or weakening his interest among them." Political and especially religio-political issues, therefore, created irreconcilable divisions, even among friends.42

The violence poured on Wesley and his fellow clergy did make some of them stay at home during the election, but Wesley himself was not deterred. Perhaps this was why further hostilities were directed against him when the election was over. His old friend Whitchcote turned against him. With Lindsey's assistance, he was dismissed from his chaplaincy, before he had been able to obtain any benefit from the office, and he finally found himself a prisoner in Lincoln Castle. The ostensible reason for this action was given as Wesley's debts; he was indeed in financial difficulties and in particular was in debt to "one Pindar . . . . a relation or zealous friend of Mr. Whitchcote."43 The real cause, however, was plain: his opponents' problems might be eased if such a troublesome person was out of the way and so Wesley was gaolled for six months, from 23 June to 23 November, 1705.

Wesley's case also had a much wider significance. High Church organs reported his plight and he appealed to the dons of Oxford for aid. The university constituencies were the basis of the High Church movement, their narrow Anglicanism corresponding to that of
the lower clergy. John Hutton, the Archdeacon of Stow, to whom Wesley wrote soon after being imprisoned, sent a circular letter of one of the Whig candidates to Dr. Charlett, President of University College, with the advice that the receiver should “spew him out of your College.” Wesley did not communicate his desperate position direct to Oxford until 21 September, 1708; but a quick reaction was forthcoming from the university and by 2 October considerable financial support had been accumulated.44

A little while later, Wesley wrote to William Wake, before the new Bishop of Lincoln had been confirmed in his diocese. The letter, outwardly friendly, hinted at future trouble. He repeated with unflagging energy all his setbacks and his devotion to the Church of England and made a hardly disguised attack on the Bishop when he protested that his second book against the Dissenters had been “written by the direction and command of our late Rt. Rd. Diocesan,” Bishop Gardner.45 However, Wake was fortunate in that the first years of his new office saw a great deal of Convocation and that the Administration was still solidly Tory. The Upper House was dominant over the clergy. For the folly of the “tack” had weakened the Tory Party and made the Queen’s political advisers hostile to High Church claimants for preferment in Church as well as State. Wake’s own new appointment can be looked upon as the “symbol of the new policy of Her Majesty’s administration in state and Church.”

This move towards the Whig camp was accentuated in the 1705–8 Parliament. The circumstances of the Union with Scotland in 1707 inclined Marlborough to the Whigs. This measure was pushed through with the energetic support of the Whigs, including Lord Granby, the member for Grantham, as one of the Commissioners, but with Tory hostility to the recognition of Presbyterianism. But they made no headway against the Court and the Whigs. When the Junto Lords were finally admitted to office in November, 1708, it looked as though there would be a long spell of Whig rule. For the threat of the Pretender’s invasion in 1708, which might almost have been stage-managed by the Court because of its convenience, helped to swing attention away from the war and unite the Court and public opinion against the Tories.

If our hypothesis about the Marquis of Lindsey as being more consistent to the Court than to Whig or Tory is correct, we should expect him to support the Whig candidates in the 1708 election. He did, in fact, bring in George Whichcote again, but he allowed his son, Peregrine, Lord Willoughby, to have the second seat, replacing his brother Albemarle. These developments are interesting for, however much Professor Walcott tried to cover up the divergences in the political attitudes of the Lindseyite line of the Bertie family by simply labelling all of them “Whigs”, such a conclusion is far too simple to be able to explain the twists and turns in the positions of both the Marquis and his son.

Looking ahead a little, we find that Lord Willoughby was a Whig in 1714, but he voted for Dr. Sacheverell and is included on the list of 159 Members of the October Club.46 Now a comparison of the Sacheverellite lists which are available shows some discrepancies and the second list is not wholly reliable, but at least we can be certain that those members on it are not Whigs. Moreover, both these lists are of anti-Court members, so Lord Willoughby would seem to be in opposition to his father on the Sacheverell issue. However, Lindsey’s Whiggery in support of the Godolphin had always been of a rather weak variety and, by the time of this division, he may well have again been worried by the Queen’s attitude. What did Anne think of the impeachment of the doctor? Would she throw the whole weight of Government influence on the side of the Tories in the next election? In spite of the difficulties which the extremists among the Tories had given the Government, she was still a High Churchwoman and therefore had some sympathy with that Party now being furiously attacked by the Whigs. The fact that Lindsey was worried is evidenced by the finding that he conveniently absented himself from the Lords in the time of the division. And he could not possibly have been a factor which might reveal his disinterestedness but which could be far more significant. It could reveal that he was again following the Court: uncertain as to precisely how the Court was moving, his dilemma could best be solved by staying at home, but watching closely for developments.
So, though we cannot say that Lord Willoughby and his father were directly opposed, the one anti and the other pro-Court, we can say that they were by no means united in their interpretations of the political issues of the day. If we add to this fact that Albermarle Bertie had been brought in on Lord Wharton's interest at Cockermouth in 1708 and therefore stood on a solid Whig platform, and that Charles Bertie was as solidly Tory as ever, then the Berties are a good example of how even the closest of personal ties snapped under the strain of political principles.

However, this does not really explain the basis on which Lord Willoughby was elected in 1708 when Lindsey was more obviously "Court Whig" than he was a year or so later. It could be that he opposed his father's interest, but this is hardly likely. Or it could be that Lindsey had obliged the Court in 1702 and 1705 by bringing in men who would not be hostile and so now, when his son had come of age, he considered that the Court could not be too ungrateful towards him if he brought in a Tory as well as a Whig. It was usual for a son of a noble to be found a seat when he came of age as, for example, in the case of Lord Granby, the son of the Duke of Rutland, who was elected for Grantham in 1698. But in this instance there was no divergence of political principle between father and son.

Perhaps the most plausible interpretation is the one suggested by Mr. G. S. Holmes, though it must remain a suggestion because of the lack of any clear evidence. Most probably, Lord Willoughby was elected in the Whig interest. But, when he became involved in the hustle and bustle of Parliamentary life and party warfare, it may be that a young, impressionable mind such as his did not remain unaffected. The sort of Whiggism which his father practised would not have led him to have been inculcated with a deep and burning dislike of Toryism. One could say that his mind was still very much an open one. If this supposition is correct, then it is not difficult to see that the other members of the Bertie family who had seats in Parliament might attempt to influence him. Or, he could have been attracted by and impressed with the activity which his great uncle, Charles Bertie, displayed in the High Tory cause. Such a seasoned campaigner, by this time one of the Grand Old Men of the Party, could help enormously to wean any of doubtful allegiance into the Tory cause.

The younger element too would not neglect the opportunity of gaining a new recruit and it appears that one of the members for Lincoln City, Thomas Lister, would have been particularly interested in any waverters. For he seems to have acted as a kind of Tory "Whip" for Lincolnshire members; at any rate, it looks as though he did so in the attack on the Duke of Marlborough in 1712. Preserved among Robert Harley's paper are several lists of members which the Lord Treasurer himself drew up indicating which way most men were expected to vote on various issues. This particular list is one of a number of people he considered ought to be canvassed and who in turn could put pressure on Tory members. Lister's Toryism was clear; he was an October Club member and the fact that he was also Equerry to the Master of the Horse, the Duke of Somerset, from 1707-12 seems to indicate that he was as good a man as any for the task. Did Lister influence Lord Willoughby, if indeed he acted in this capacity prior to the Marlborough debate? Or did the solicitations of the Tory members in general have any appreciable effect? On the other hand, true Whiggish men like Lord Granby, who was not so much older than Peregrine, might have been expected to put the opposite viewpoint just as strongly.

Unfortunately, the validity of these speculations cannot be accurately ascertained. Whatever the reasons, Peregrine clearly stood on a Church platform with Lewis Dymoke in 1710. His father had once more stayed loyal to the Court and backed these two in opposition to the Whig candidate, George Whitchot. If the Lindsey interest was divided, the Whig would have polled more votes than he in fact did. But, if Harley's calculations were correct, Lindsey's move came at the very last minute for, in a list of peers contained in Harley's private memoranda in the British Museum, the Marquis is listed alongside Somerset and Newcastle and this only a week or so before the county election. So, although there was apparent unity between father
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and son, it may have been more apparent than real and Lord Willoughby was probably a far closer political friend of Champion Dymoke than his father.

It was rumoured that Willoughby might form a pact with Whichcote in the 1710 election, but it is clear that it did not materialise, if indeed it was contemplated at all. The Whig was badly defeated and not surprisingly so when one considers the formidable weight carried by the opposition. Lindsey sided with the country squires and the clergy and, moreover, did so when the situation was ideal for them.

Of all the influences in the 1710 election, the Court, the nobility, the chief landowners, the merchants, the greatest was that of the Church. Dr. Sacheverell raised the issue. By choosing 5 November, 1709, the anniversary of William III’s arrival in England, he ensured that the problem would be posed in its most acute form. His sermon seemed like an attack on the Revolution and as a consequence undermined the Act of Settlement and the Hanoverian Succession. The loyalty of the country squires was further secured by the fact that the hated Land Tax fell heavily upon their shoulders. Also, the unpopular war and the discontented lower classes made propaganda all that more effective.

Given such a situation, Whichcote had little hope of success. His only constant support came from the Dissenters but their power could not equal that of the opposition even though they again subjected Wesley to persecution, which followed the same pattern as before. Whig support was very limited and in no sense can one speak of a “Whig Party” in Lincolnshire at this time. There were a few Whig families such as the Granthams and the Monsons and their hatred of the Tories, as expressed in the correspondence of the time, is undoubted, but they were almost totally ineffective when the Tories were a complete unity. This could be the reason why Henry Monson, for example, found a seat elsewhere. Whichcote found it impossible to compete with the rich Bertie house. He threatened not to stand because of the expenses it would entail, which he estimated at £200. The Berties had been prepared to spend much more than this in opposition to the Cust family. Even this amount, however, was beyond Whichcote’s capacities and it necessitated an appeal to the Duke of Newcastle.

More important, however, he showed not a little naivety in his comments before the election and sadly miscalculated the strength of the clergy. He completely misunderstood the political situation. His letter to the Duke in March, 1710, in which he comments upon the High Churchmen, is worth quoting in full: “I find all the persons, who endeavour to excite the people, in greater heats here than the Oxonian parsons in London. And indeed they press their non-resistance doctrine so far that they rather incite the people against themselves than the Government, which I tell all my friends they are only angry at because they cannot have the administration of it themselves; and I do not doubt my arguments out of the pulpit will be as prevailing as theirs in it.” He tried to make some excuse after the result had been declared, saying that 500 of his votes had come in late. But even if they were added to the actual number of votes he polled, the total would still have been far below those of his opponents. In the same letter he made the rather pathetic comment that “Your Grace may perceive of the elections the very small number of low Churchmen chosen, that the bent of the nation is against us.”

Whichcote was a true Whig but he could make little headway against a county electorate whose bias had always been towards Toryism. His only hope was to have the backing of some great noble, as he had in 1705 and 1708. He was in truth little more than a mere aristocratic nominee, being quite unable to compete with the country squires and the parish clergy if he did not have that support. From this moment, when the heyday of the Tories began, he went into obscurity, not bothering to stand again, even in 1715.

Not only had the Whig politicians badly underestimated the forcefulness of the constant cry of “the Church in danger” which was heard throughout the reign and more especially in 1710. Their allies, the Whig bishops and, in particular, Bishop Wake had also done so. The clergy had a tremendous psychological power and were “the ideal propaganda spreaders” of the High Church party: they were easily persuaded and could equally easily persuade others.
that Dr. Sacheverell’s impeachment and Hoadley’s doctrines were plainly the first manoeuvres in the plan to destroy the Church. Wake was a liberal man, active in his work for moderation; his attempts to bring about a reconciliation with continental Protestants and the stress which he placed on the need for friendliness towards recusants and Dissenters in his visitations illustrate this well. But it was hopeless to try to persuade the great mass of the parish clergy to vote Whig. Wake was warned by two Archdeacons of what effect his attitude would have on the clergy. The Archdeacon of Buckingham wrote that he would “only stir a nest of hornets if he attempted to put pressure on his clergy to record a Whiggish vote,” while Archdeacon Frank of Bedford was also very wary of rousing “the body of the clergy into convulsions.” The Bishop’s attempts to influence voters were not really very successful. He sent one of his clergy, Laurence Eachard, prebendary of Louth and subsequently Archdeacon of Stow, to Lincoln but the result was hardly satisfactory. A great mass of the clergy was reported, in what must have been an unforgettable sight and a demonstration of their solidarity in favour of the Tory Party, to have “marched in a body to the number of about 150 headed by Sir Willoughby Hickman,” while only a handful voted for Whickcote.

During the years of the “red-hot” Tory Parliament, the clergy’s success continued: an Occasional Conformity Act was finally passed in 1711 and the Naturalisation Act of the Whigs was repealed in 1712. In the next Parliament, the Schism Act was passed in 1714, the culmination of a long campaign by the High Church polemical writers. Samuel Wesley was to be found at the forefront of this campaign. He also scored two more local successes when he defeated the Bishop’s candidate in the election of proctor for the Lincoln diocese and when he clashed with Wake when the latter visited Epworth in June, 1712.

From now until 1717, when Convocation again lapsed, the struggle between Wesley and Wake was once more on a national level. But this Erastian—High Church conflict, one of the most important themes in Augustan politics, had been vividly seen in microcosm in county affairs. And it gained in significance because of the personalities involved, both typical of their respective camps and both at the forefront of political-religious controversy, the one a fanatical polemicist in the High Church Tory cause, the other the leading protagonist of the Whig bishops. The clergy in this reign had the most success with regard to elections, in alliance with the other steadfast upholders of High Tory principles, the country gentlemen.

The issues which dominated the last years of Queen Anne’s reign were those of the Peace with France and the Hanoverian Succession. With the accession to power of a Tory Government, peace negotiations replaced the all-out war effort of the Whigs. On no other issue were the Tories so united, but even on this issue fears were soon expressed. Some were doubtful about the terms of peace offered to Louis XIV in 1711 and they revealed their apprehensions in a division in December of that year. Perhaps Louis XIV was being given more than he deserved? Perhaps the Pretender’s accession would be eased by the signing of the preliminaries? Party divisions were already opening long before the Treaty of Utrecht was signed. After that, the Tories had acute misgivings and the Treaty of Commerce was defeated in June, 1713, about eighty Tories voting against the Bill. This split was made permanent by the issue of the Succession, fatal for the Tory Party because they had clung to the possibility of a Stuart Restoration.

The Tory country squires in the county split on these issues, although the majority of them remained firm in their adherence to Tory principles and indeed won one seat from the Marquis of Lindsey in 1713 and continued to hold it after the succession of the Hanoverian, George I. But the divisions within the Tory ranks were deep and real and their extent is well epitomised in the way in which Lincolnshire members voted on the problem of the French Commercial Treaty and in their reasons for so doing. Thomas Lister remained a solid Tory and voted for the treaty. Sir John Thorold had been a good Tory before 1710, voting for the “tack”, but for some time now he had been voting against the Tory Ministry: he was one of the “Whimsical”
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Tories, or one who had become an inveterate opponent of the Government. Lewis Dymoke also opposed the treaty, but this was only the first sign of his rebellion: he can be numbered among the Hanoverian Tories, or those who feared for the Hanoverian Succession. Charles Bertie, who appears to have voted in opposition, was a member of that group now violently opposed to Robert Harley, the Earl of Oxford. The Tories had broken up into numerous splinter groups, irreconcilably opposed. But the attitude which most of the county's squires still took can perhaps be illustrated by the fact that Dymoke's wavering meant that he was dropped in the 1713 election and his place was taken by Sir Willoughby Hickman, a good, sound Tory, as we have already seen.

By 1713, Lindsey had again changed his footing. He now stood, not on a Tory or a Court basis, but as a Whig and it seems that his son had also dropped his former associations, October Club and all. Evidence as to why and exactly at what time these changes took place is again scanty but a few points can be made.

To deal with Peregrine first. As already indicated, he was a Whig by 1714, for in March of that year he voted against the expulsion from the House of Commons of Richard Steele, who, in what might have been just another pamphlet in the party warfare if he had not appended his name to "The Crisis," attacked the Queen and her ministers. Further, in the Worsley MS Peregrine is described as a pure Whig. Now this list is regarded as having an impressive accuracy, if we are careful to take into account the understandable errors which were made; understandable because it was compiled in 1715, most probably by a member of King George's entourage or at least someone who had been in France until recently. Thus the writer, an inexperienced observer of the party scene in England, sometimes identified a "Whimsical," as for example, Sir John Thorold, as "un Whig qui votera souvent avec les Tories." If then it identified Lord Willoughby simply as a Whig with no qualifications, then his hostility to the Tory Ministry must have been even more inveterate and long-lasting than Sir John's. So he probably moved to the Opposition in 1712 or at the latest 1713. No vote is recorded for him, however, in the division on the Treaty of Commerce in June, 1713. The most likely explanation would seem to be that he was unavoidably absent from Parliament at that time.

As regards his father, we can pin down his move as being at least as early, if not earlier. According to the House of Lords Proxy Books for 1710-12, Lindsey was clearly still a Court man in the 1710-11 session for he left his proxy vote with the Earl of Abingdon, his half-cousin, obviously a Court Tory. Towards the end of the session, however, in May, he clashed with Harley, who in that month became the Earl of Oxford and Mortimer. The title of the Earl of Oxford had belonged to the family of de Vere and the Marquis was a descendant. So, "encouraged by the Lord Wharton and others, (he) endeavoured to obstruct, and entered his claim before the Duke of Newcastle, then Privy Seal." Whether this incident had any effect on the Marquis it is difficult to say. Oxford certainly did not seem to think that it had, for in the Hamilton Division of 20 December, 1711, the Lord Treasurer expected Lindsey's vote to be favourable to the Court. He did in fact vote against the Court, his first gesture of rebellion in the whole reign. This was undoubtedly for he left his proxy (yet again he used it!) with the Opposition Whig, Marlborough.

The consequences of the Marquis of Lindsey's vacillations are of obvious importance for an understanding of county politics. He was almost supreme in county affairs for a good deal of the reign and, therefore, was able to bring in whoever he wished. Until 1713 they were all supporters of the Court except for his son in 1708, who seemed to have been pretty independent of his father. What Lindsey did for most of the reign was to follow the Court, whatever its political leanings. This is clearly illustrated by his vote for the Church in 1703 and in the anxieties he suffered during the winter of 1709-10.

Such a political orientation was not unique, but it was unusual for Queen Anne's reign. Groups of peers were usually found allied together in opposition to other groups to fight out the battles in county elections, and these peers were usually quite clearly either Whig or Tory, as
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for example the Duke of Rutland and the Earl of Exeter. But Lindsey was the lone noble concerned in Lincolnshire, except for the one occasion in 1705, when he had the support of Rutland. And the very fact that he needed that assistance points to two conclusions: one, the undoubtedly strong Tory interest in the county and, two, the very weak Whig representation, so weak that we cannot say that a Whig Party existed at all until Lindsey himself definitely became its leader in 1713. It might appear from the unpleasantnesses to which Samuel Wesley was subjected at the hands of the Isleonian Dissenters that the Whigs had a good deal of support; but for all that, they were ineffective when compared with the clergy and, when conditions were adverse, in 1701, 1702, 1710 and 1713, they made no impact at all.

While Lindsey moved from a true Court to a Court Whig to a Court Tory and finally to an Opposition Whig position, the Tories demonstrated throughout their constancy and solidarity. So, too, did their formidable allies, the parish clergy. Thus they opposed Lindsey in 1705, coming near to defeating his interest, and in 1713 his hitherto decisive interest was broached when Sir Willoughby Hickman was elected. He continued to represent the county on into the Hanoverian period as a sign of the survival of local Toryism.

The peculiar position of the Marquis of Lindsey thus makes the county politics somewhat unusual and certainly out of line with previous local studies and with the national picture. Lincolnshire neither falls into a Whig-Tory dichotomy nor into a Court-Country framework, though the latter could be used to interpret the events down to 1710. From then onwards, even that pattern breaks down, for Lindsey himself displayed an opposition to the Court, something which was in complete contrast to the role which the Bertie House had played throughout the seventeenth century.

(A second article, on the boroughs still appear in our next number. The appendices will follow the second article).
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