THE WORKS

OF THE

REV. JOHN WESLEY, A.M.

SOMETIME FELLOW OF LINCOLN COLLEGE, OXFORD.

VOLUME XI.

WITH THE LAST CORRECTIONS OF THE AUTHOR.

LONDON:
METHODIST PUBLISHING HOUSE,
25-35 City Road, and 26 Paternoster Row, E.C.

[Entered at Stationers' Hall.]

S. J. Fraser & Co., Printers, 84-86 Tabernacle Street, E.C.

CONTENTS.

SERIOUS THOUGHTS

OCCASIONED BY

THE LATE EARTHQUAKE AT LISBON.

[PRINTED IN THE YEAR 1755.]

---

*Tua res agitur, paries quum proximus ardet.**

THINKING men generally allow that the greater part of modern Christians are not more virtuous than the ancient Heathens; perhaps less so; since public spirit, love of our country, generous honesty, and simple truth, are scarce anywhere to be found. On the contrary, covetousness, ambition, various injustice, luxury, and falsehood in every kind, have infected every rank and denomination of people, the Clergy themselves not excepted. Now, they who believe there is a God are apt to believe he is not well pleased with this. Nay, they think, he has intimated it very plainly, in many parts of the Christian world. How many hundred thousand men have been swept away by war, in Europe only, within half a century! How many thousands, within little more than this, hath the earth opened her mouth and swallowed up! Numbers sunk at Port-Royal, and rose no more! Many thousands went quick into the pit at Lima! The whole city of Catanea, in Sicily, and every inhabitant of it, perished together. Nothing but heaps of ashes and cinders show where it stood. Not so much as one Lot escaped out of Sodom!

And what shall we say of the late accounts from Portugal? That some thousand houses, and many thousand persons, are no more! that a fair city is now in ruinous heaps! Is there indeed a God that judges the world? And is he now making inquisition for blood? If so, it is not surprising, he should begin there, where so much blood has been poured on the

* This quotation from Horace is thus translated by Boscawen:—

"'Tis your own interest that calls
When flames invade your neighbour's walls."—EDIT.

ground like water! where so many brave men have b murdered, in the most base and cowardly as well as barbar manner, almost every day, as well as every night, while n regarded or laid it to heart. "Let them hunt and dest the precious life, so we may secure our stores of gold precious stones."* How long has their blood been cry from the earth! Yea, how long has that bloody *Hous Mercy*,† the scandal not only of all religion, but even of hur nature, stood to insult both heaven and earth! "And s I not visit for these things, saith the Lord? Shall not soul be avenged on such a city as this?"

It has been the opinion of many, that even this nation not been without some marks of God's displeasure. Has war been let loose even within our own land, so that Lon itself felt the alarm? Has not a pestilential sickness bro in upon our cattle, and, in many parts, left not one of t alive? And although the earth does not yet open in Engl or Ireland, has it not shook, and reeled to and fro lik drunken man? and that not in one or two places only, almost from one end of the kingdom to the other?

Perhaps one might ask, Was there nothing uncomm nothing more than is usual at this season of the year the rains, the hail, the winds, the thunder and lightn which we have lately heard and seen? particularly, in storm which was the same day and hour that they playing off Macbeth's thunder and lightning at the the One would almost think they designed this (inasmuch as entertainment continued, notwithstanding all the artille heaven) as a formal answer to that question, "Canst thunder with a voice like Him?"

What shall we say to the affair of Whitson Cliffs? of wh were it not for the unparalleled stupidity of the English England would have rang long ago, from one sea to anot And yet, seven miles from the place, they knew little mo it in May last, than if it had happened in China or Japan

The fact (of the truth of which any who will be at pains of inquiring may soon be satisfied) is this: On Tues

* Merchants who have lived in Portugal inform us, that the King had building filled with diamonds; and more gold stored up, coined and un than all the other princes of Europe together.

† The title which the Inquisition of Portugal (if not in other countrie takes to itself.

March 25, last, (being the week before Easter,) many persons heard a great noise near a ridge of mountains, called Black Hamilton, in Yorkshire. It was observed chiefly on the south-west side of the mountain, about a mile from the course where the Hamilton races are run, near a ledge of rocks, commonly called Whitson Cliffs, two miles from Sutton, and about five from Thirsk.

The same noise was heard on Wednesday by all who went that way. On Thursday, about seven in the morning, Edward Abbot, weaver, and Adam Bosomworth, bleacher, both of Sutton, riding under Whitson Cliffs, heard a roaring (so they termed it) like many cannons, or loud and rolling thunder. It seemed to come from the cliffs; looking up to which, they saw a large body of stone, four or five yards broad, split and fly off from the very top of the rock. They thought it strange, but rode on. Between ten and eleven, a larger piece of the rock, about fifteen yards thick, thirty high, and between sixty and seventy broad, was torn off and thrown into the valley.

About seven in the evening, one who was riding by observed the ground to shake exceedingly; and soon after several large stones or rocks, of some tons weight each, rose out of the ground. Others were thrown on one side, others turned upside down, and many rolled over and over. Being a little surprised, and not very curious, he hasted on his way.

On Friday and Saturday the ground continued to shake, and the rocks to roll over one another. The earth also clave asunder in very many places, and continued so to do till Sunday morning.

Being at Osmotherley, seven miles from the Cliffs, on Monday, June 1, and finding Edward Abbot there, I desired him the next morning to show me the way thither. I walked, crept, and climbed round and over great part of the ruins. I could not perceive by any sign, that there was ever any cavity in the rock at all; but one part of the solid stone is cleft from the rest, in a perpendicular line, and as smooth as if cut with instruments. Nor is it barely thrown down, but split into many hundred pieces, some of which lie four or five hundred yards from the main rock.

The ground nearest the cliff is not raised, but sunk considerably beneath the level. But, at some distance, it is raised in a ridge of eight or ten yards high, twelve or fifteen broad, and near a hundred long. Adjoining to this lies an

oval piece of ground, thirty or forty yards in diameter, which has been removed, whole as it is, from beneath the cliff, without the least fissure, with all its load of rocks, some of which were as large as the hull of a small ship. At a little distance is a second piece of ground, forty or fifty yards across, which has also been transplanted entire, with rocks of various sizes upon it, and a tree growing out of one of them. By the removal of one or both of these, I suppose the hollow near the cliff was made.

All round them lay stones and rocks, great and small, some on the surface of the earth, some half sunk into it, some almost covered, in variety of positions. Between these the ground was cleft asunder in a thousand places. Some of the apertures were nearly closed again, some gaping as at first. Between thirty and forty acres of land, as is commonly supposed, (though some reckon above sixty,) are in this condition.

On the skirts of these, I observed, in abundance of places, the green turf (for it was pasture-land) as it were pared off, two or three inches thick, and wrapped round like sheets of lead. A little farther it was not cleft or broken at all, but raised in ridges, five or six foot long, exactly resembling the graves in a churchyard. Of these there is a vast number.

That part of the cliff from which the rest is torn, lies so high and is now of so bright a colour, that it is plainly visible to all the country round, even at the distance of several miles. We saw it distinctly, not only from the street in Thirsk, but for five or six miles after, as we rode toward York. So we did likewise in the great North Road, between Sandhutton and Northallerton.

But how may we account for this phenomenon? Was it effected by a merely natural cause? If so, that cause must either have been fire, water, or air. It could not be fire; for then some mark of it must have appeared, either at the time, or after it. But no such mark does appear, nor ever did; not so much as the least smoke, either when the first or second rock was removed, or in the whole space between Tuesday and Sunday.

It could not be water; for no water issued out, when the one or the other rock was torn off. Nor had there been any rains for some time before. It was in that part of the country a remarkable dry season. Neither was there any cavity in that part of the rock, wherein a sufficient quantity of water

might have lodged. On the contrary, it was one single, solid mass, which was evenly and smoothly cleft in sunder.

There remains no other natural cause assignable, but imprisoned air. I say imprisoned; for as to the fashionable opinion, that the exterior air is the grand agent in earthquakes, it is so senseless, unmechanical, unphilosophical a dream, as deserves not to be named but to be exploded. But it is hard to conceive, how even imprisoned air could produce such an effect. It might indeed shake, tear, raise, or sink the earth; but how could it cleave a solid rock? Here was not room for a quantity of it sufficient to do anything of this nature; at least, unless it had been suddenly and violently expanded by fire, which was not the case. Could a small quantity of air, without that violent expansion, have torn so large a body of rock from the rest, to which it adhered in one solid mass? Could it have shivered this into pieces, and scattered several of those pieces some hundred yards round? Could it have transported those promontories of earth with their incumbent load, and set them down unbroken, unchanged, at a distance? Truly I am not so great a volunteer in faith as to be able to believe this. He that supposes this, must suppose air to be not only very strong, (which we allow,) but a very wise agent; while it bore its charge with so great caution, as not to hurt or dislocate any part of it.

What, then, could be the cause? What indeed, but God, who arose "to shake terribly the earth;" who purposely chose such a place, where there is so great a concourse of nobility and gentry every year; and wrought in such a manner, that many might see it and fear,—that all who travel one of the most frequented roads in England might see it, almost whether they would or no, for many miles together? It must likewise for many years, maugre all the art of man, be a visible monument of His power; all that ground being now so incumbered with rocks and stones, that it cannot be either ploughed or grazed. Nor can it well serve any use, but to tell all that see it, Who can stand before this great God?

Who can account for the late motion in the waters; not only that of the sea, and rivers communicating therewith, but even that in canals, fishponds, cisterns, and all either large or small bodies of water? It was particularly observed, that while the water itself was so violently agitated, neither did the

earth shake at all, nor any of the vessels which contained that water. Was such a thing ever known or heard of before? I know not, but it was spoken of once, near eighteen hundred years ago, in those remarkable words, "There shall be σεισμοι" (not only "earthquakes," but various "concussions" or "shakings") "in divers places." And so there have been in Spain, in Portugal, in Italy, in Holland, in England, in Ireland; and not improbably in many other places too, which we are not yet informed of. Yet it does not seem that a concussion of this kind has ever been known before, since either the same or some other comet revolved so near the earth. For we know of no other natural cause in the universe which is adequate to such an effect. And that this is the real cause, we may very possibly be convinced in a short time.

But alas! why should we not be convinced sooner, while that conviction may avail, that it is not chance which governs the world? Why should we not now, before London is as Lisbon, Lima, or Catanea, acknowledge the hand of the Almighty, arising to maintain his own cause? Why, we have a general answer always ready, to screen us from any such conviction: "All these things are purely natural and accidental; the result of natural causes." But there are two objections to this answer: First, it is untrue: Secondly, it is uncomfortable.

First. If by affirming, "All this is purely natural," you mean, it is not providential, or that God has nothing to do with it, this is not true, that is, supposing the Bible to be true. For supposing this, you may descant ever so long on the natural causes of murrain, winds, thunder, lightning, and yet you are altogether wide of the mark, you prove nothing at all, unless you can prove that God never works in or by natural causes. But this you cannot prove; nay, none can doubt of his so working, who allows the Scripture to be of God. For this asserts, in the clearest and strongest terms, that "all things" (in nature) "serve him;" that (by or without a train of natural causes) He "sendeth his rain on the earth;" that He "bringeth the winds out of his treasures," and "maketh a way for the lightning and the thunder;" in general, that "fire and hail, snow and vapour, wind and storm, fulfil his word." Therefore, allowing there are natural causes of all these, they are still under the direction of the Lord of nature: Nay, what is nature itself, but

the art of God, or God's method of acting in the material world? True philosophy therefore ascribes all to God, and says, in the beautiful language of the wise and good man,—

> Here like a trumpet, loud and strong,
> Thy thunder shakes our coast;
> While the red lightnings wave along,
> The banners of thy host.

A Second objection to your answer is, It is extremely uncomfortable. For if things really be as you affirm; if all these afflictive incidents entirely depend on the fortuitous concourse and agency of blind, material causes; what hope, what help, what resource is left for the poor sufferers by them? Should the murrain among the cattle continue a few years longer, and consequently produce scarcity or famine, what will there be left for many of the poor to do, but to lie down and die? If tainted air spread a pestilence over our land, where shall they fly for succour? They cannot resist either the one or other; they cannot escape from them. And can they hope to appease

> *Illachrymabilem Plutona?*
>
> Inexorable Pluto, king of shades?

Shall they intreat the famine or the pestilence to show mercy? Alas! they are as senseless as you suppose God to be.

However, you who are men of fortune can shift tolerably well, in spite of these difficulties. Your money will undoubtedly procure you food as long as there is any in the kingdom. And if your Physicians cannot secure you from the epidemic disease, your coaches can carry you from the place of infection. Be it so: But you are not out of all danger yet, unless you can drive faster than the wind. Are you sure of this? And are your horses literally swifter than the lightning? Can they leave the panting storm behind? If not, what will you do when it overtakes you? Try your eloquence on the whirlwind. Will it hear your voice? Will it regard either your money, or prayers, or tears? Call upon the lightning. Cry aloud; see whether your voice will "divide the flames of fire." O no! it hath no ears to hear! It devoureth and showeth no pity!

But this is not all. Here is a nearer enemy. The earth threatens to swallow you up. Where is your protection

now? What defence do you find from thousands of gold and silver? You cannot fly; for you cannot quit the earth, unless you will leave your dear body behind you. And while you are on the earth, you know not where to flee to, neither where to flee from. You may buy intelligence, where the shock was yesterday, but not where it will be to-morrow,—to-day. It comes! The roof trembles! The beams crack! The ground rocks to and fro! Hoarse thunder resounds from the bowels of the earth! And all these are but the beginning of sorrows. Now, what help? What wisdom can prevent, what strength resist, the blow? What money can purchase, I will not say deliverance, but an hour's reprieve? Poor honourable fool, where are now thy titles? Wealthy fool, where is now thy golden god? If any thing can help, it must be prayer. But what wilt thou pray to? Not to the God of heaven; you suppose him to have nothing to do with earthquakes. No; they proceed in a merely natural way, either from the earth itself, or from included air, or from subterraneous fires or waters. If thou prayest, then, (which perhaps you never did before,) it must be to some of these. Begin: "O earth, earth, earth, hear the voice of thy children! Hear, O air, water, fire!" And will they hear? You know it cannot be. How deplorable, then, is his condition, who in such an hour has none else to flee to! How uncomfortable the supposition, which implies this, by direct necessary consequence, namely, that all these things are the pure result of merely natural causes!

But supposing the earthquake which made such havoc at Lisbon should never travel so far as London, is there nothing else which can reach us? What think you of a comet? Are we absolutely out of the reach of this? You cannot say we are; seeing these move in all directions, and through every region of the universe. And would the approach of one of these amazing spheres be of no importance to us? especially in its return from the sun; when that immense body is (according to Sir Isaac Newton's calculation) heated two thousand times hotter than a red-hot cannon-ball. The late ingenious and accurate Dr. Halley (never yet suspected of enthusiasm) fixes the return of the great comet in the year 1758; and he observes that the last time it revolved, it moved in the very same line which the earth describes in her annual course round the sun; but the earth was on the other side of

her orbit. Whereas, in this revolution, it will move, not only in the same line, but in the same part of that line wherein the earth moves. And "who can tell," says that great man, "what the consequences of such a contact may be?"

Who can tell! Any man of common understanding, who knows the very first elements of astronomy. The immediate consequence of such a body of solid fire touching the earth must necessarily be, that it will set the earth on fire, and burn it to a coal, if it do not likewise strike it out of its course; in which case, (so far as we can judge,) it must drop down directly into the sun.

But what, if this vast body is already on its way? if it is nearer than we are aware of? What, if these unusual, unprecedented motions of the waters be one effect of its near approach? We cannot be certain that it will be visible to the inhabitants of our globe, till it has imbibed the solar fire. But possibly we may see it sooner than we desire. We may see it, not as Milton speaks,—

> From its horrid hair
> Shake pestilence and war;

but ushering in far other calamities than these, and of more extensive influence. Probably it will be seen first drawing nearer and nearer, till it appears as another moon in magnitude, though not in colour, being of a deep fiery red; then scorching and burning up all the produce of the earth, driving away all clouds, and so cutting off the hope or possibility of any rain or dew; drying up every fountain, stream, and river, causing all faces to gather blackness, and all men's hearts to fail; then executing its grand commission on the globe itself, and causing the stars to fall from heaven.* O, who may abide when this is done? Who will then be able to stand?

> *Quo mare, quo tellus, correptaque regia cœli*
> *Ardeat; et mundi moles operosa laboret?*†

What shall we do? do now, that none of these things may come upon us unawares? We are wisely and diligently

* What security is there against all this, upon the infidel hypothesis? But upon the Christian, there is abundant security: For the Scripture prophecies are not yet fulfilled.

† This quotation from Ovid is thus translated by Dryden:—

> "When all his blazing worlds above shall burn,
> And all the inferior globe to cinders turn?"—EDIT.

providing for our defence against one enemy; with such a watchful wisdom and active diligence, as is a comfort to every honest Englishman. But why should we not show the same wisdom and diligence in providing against all our enemies? And if our wisdom and strength be sufficient to defend us, let us not seek any further. Let us without delay recruit our forces, and guard our coasts against the famine, and murrain, and pestilence; and still more carefully against immoderate rains, and winds, and lightnings, and earthquakes, and comets; that we may no longer be under any painful apprehensions of any present or future danger, but may smile,

> Secure, amidst the jar of elements,
> The wreck of matter, and the crush of worlds!

But if our own wisdom and strength be not sufficient to defend us, let us not be ashamed to seek farther help. Let us even dare to own we believe there is a God; nay, and not a lazy, indolent, epicurean deity, who sits at ease upon the circle of the heavens, and neither knows nor cares what is done below; but one who, as he created heaven and earth, and all the armies of them, as he sustains them all by the word of his power, so cannot neglect the work of his own hands. With pleasure we own there is such a God, whose eye pervades the whole sphere of created beings, who knoweth the number of the stars, and calleth them all by their names; a God whose wisdom is as the great abyss, deep and wide as eternity;

> Who, high in power, in the beginning said,
> Let sea, and air, and earth, and heaven be made:
> And it was so: And when he shall ordain
> In other sort, hath but to speak again,
> And they shall be no more:

Yet more; whose mercy riseth above the heavens, and his faithfulness above the clouds; who is loving to every man, and his mercy over all his works. Let us secure him on our side; let us make this wise, this powerful, this gracious God our friend. Then need we not fear, though the earth be moved, and the hills be carried into the midst of the sea; no, not though the heavens being on fire are dissolved, and the very elements melt with fervent heat. It is enough that the Lord of hosts is with us, the God of love is our everlasting refuge.

But how shall we secure the favour of this great God? How, but by worshipping him in spirit and in truth; by uniformly imitating Him we worship, in all his imitable perfections? without which the most accurate systems of opinions, all external modes of religion, are idle cobwebs of the brain, dull farce and empty show. Now, God is love: Love God then, and you are a true worshipper. Love mankind, and God is your God, your Father, and your Friend. But see that you deceive not your own soul; for this is not a point of small importance. And by this you may know: If you love God, then you are happy in God; if you love God, riches, honours, and the pleasures of sense are no more to you than bubbles on the water: You look on dress and equipage, as the tassels of a fool's cap; diversions, as the bells on a fool's coat. If you love God, God is in all your thoughts, and your whole life is a sacrifice to him. And if you love mankind, it is your one design, desire, and endeavour, to spread virtue and happiness all around you, to lessen the present sorrows, and increase the joys, of every child of man; and, if it be possible, to bring them with you to the rivers of pleasure that are at God's right hand for evermore.

But where shall you find one who answers this happy and amiable character? Wherever you find a Christian; for this, and this alone, is real, genuine Christianity. Surely you did not imagine that Christianity was no more than such a system of opinions as is vulgarly called faith; or a strict and regular attendance on any kind of external worship. O no! Were this all that it implied, Christianity were indeed a poor, empty, shallow thing; such as none but half-thinkers could admire, and all who think freely and generously must despise. But this is not the case; the spirit above described, this alone, is Christianity. And, if so, it is no wonder that even a celebrated unbeliever should make that frank declaration, "Well, after all, these Christian dogs are the happiest fellows upon earth!" Indeed they are. Nay, we may say more; they are the only happy men upon earth; and that though we should have no regard at all to the particular circumstances above mentioned; suppose there was no such thing as a comet in the universe, or none that would ever approach the solar system; suppose there had never been an earthquake in the world, or that we were assured there never would be another; yet what advantage

has a Christian (I mean always a real, scriptural Christian) above all other men upon earth!

What advantage has he over you in particular, if you do not believe the Christian system! For suppose you have utterly driven away storms, lightnings, earthquakes, comets, yet there is another grim enemy at the door; and you cannot drive him away. It is death. "O that death," (said a gentleman of large possessions, of good health, and a cheerful natural temper,) "I do not love to think of it! It comes in and spoils all!" So it does indeed. It comes with its "miscreated front," and spoils all your mirth, diversions, pleasures! It turns all into the silence of a tomb, into rottenness and dust; and many times it will not stay till the trembling hand of old age beckons to it; but it leaps upon you while you are in the dawn of life, in the bloom and strength of your years.

The morning flowers display their sweets,
And gay their silken leaves unfold,
Unmindful of the noon-tide heats,
And fearless of the evening cold.
Nipp'd by the wind's unkindly blast,
Parch'd by the sun's directer ray,
The momentary glories waste,
The short-lived beauties die away.

And where are you then? Does your soul disperse and dissolve into common air? Or does it share the fate of its former companion, and moulder into dust? Or does it remain conscious of its own existence, in some distant, unknown world? It is all unknown! A black, dreary, melancholy scene! Clouds and darkness rest upon it.

But the case is far otherwise with a Christian. To him life and immortality are brought to light. His eye pierces through the vale of the shadow of death, and sees into the glories of eternity. His view does not terminate on that black line,

The verge 'twixt mortal and immortal being;

but extends beyond the bounds of time and place, to the house of God eternal in the heavens. Hence he is so far from looking upon death as an enemy, that he longs to feel his welcome embrace. He groans (but they are pleasing groans) to have mortality swallowed up of life.

Perhaps you will say, "But this is all a dream. He is

only in a fool's paradise!" Supposing he be, it is a pleasing dream.

Maneat mentis gratissimus error! *

If he is only in a fool's paradise, yet it is a paradise; while you are wandering in a wide, weary, barren world. Be it folly; his folly gives him that present happiness which all your wisdom cannot find. So that he may now turn the tables upon you, and say,—

"Whoe'er can ease by folly get,
With safety may despise
The wretched, unenjoying wit,
The miserable wise."

Such unspeakable advantage (even if there is none beyond death) has a Christian over an Infidel! It is true, he has given up some pleasures before he could attain to this. But what pleasures? That of eating till he is sick; till he weakens a strong, or quite destroys a weak, constitution. He has given up the pleasure of drinking a man into a beast, and that of ranging from one worthless creature to another, till he brings a canker upon his estate, and perhaps rotten ness into his bones. But in lieu of these, he has now (whatever may be hereafter) a continual serenity of mind, a constant evenness and composure of temper, "a peace which passeth all understanding." He has learned in every state wherein he is, therewith to be content; nay, to give thanks, as being clearly persuaded, it is better for him than any other. He feels continual gratitude to his supreme Benefactor, Father of Spirits, Parent of Good; and tender, disinterested benevolence to all the children of this common Father. May the Father of your spirit, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, make you such a Christian! May He work in your soul a divine conviction of things not discerned by eyes of flesh and blood! May He give you to see Him that is invisible, and to taste of the powers of the world to come! May He fill you with all peace and joy in believing, that you may be happy in life, in death, in eternity!

* Let this pleasing mental error remain.—EDIT.

FREE THOUGHTS

ON

THE PRESENT STATE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS.

IN A LETTER TO A FRIEND

WRITTEN IN THE YEAR 1768

Periculosæ plenum opus aleæ
Tractas ; et incedis per ignes
*Suppositos cineri doloso.**—HORAT.

You desire me to give you my thoughts freely on the present state of public affairs. But do you consider? I am no politician; politics lie quite out of my province. Neither have I any acquaintance, at least no intimacy, with any that bear that character. And it is no easy matter to form any judgment concerning things of so complicated a nature. It is the more difficult, because, in order to form our judgment, such a multitude of facts should be known, few of which can be known with tolerable exactness by any but those who are eye-witnesses of them. And how few of these will relate what they have seen precisely as it was, without adding, omitting, or altering any circumstance, either with or without design! And may not a slight addition or alteration give a quite different colour to the whole?

And as we cannot easily know, with any accuracy, the facts on which we are chiefly to form our judgment; so, much less can we expect to know the various springs of action which gave rise to those facts, and on which, more than on the bare actions themselves, the characters of the actors depend. It is on this account that an old writer advises us to judge

* Thus translated by Francis :—

"You treat adventurous, and incautious tread
On fires with faithless embers overspread."—EDIT.

nothing before the time; to abstain, as far as possible, from judging peremptorily, either of things or persons, till the time comes, when "the hidden things of darkness," the facts now concealed, "will be brought to light," and the hidden springs of action will be discovered,—"the thoughts and intents of" every human "heart."

Perhaps you will say, "Nay, every Englishman is a politician; we suck in politics with our mother's milk. It is as natural for us to talk politics as to breathe; we can instruct both the King and his Council. We can in a trice reform the State, point out every blunder of this or that Minister, and tell every step they ought to take to be arbiters of all Europe."

I grant, every cobbler, tinker, porter, and hackney-coachman can do this; but I am not so deep learned: While they are sure of everything, I am in a manner sure of nothing; except of that very little which I see with my own eyes, or hear with my own ears. However, since you desire me to tell you what I think, I will do it with all openness. Only please to remember, I do not take upon me to dictate either to you or to any one. I only use the privilege of an Englishman, to speak my naked thoughts; setting down just what appears to me to be the truth, till I have better information.

At present, indeed, I have not much information, having read little upon this head but the public papers; and you know these are mostly on one side; in them little is to be seen on the other side; and that little is seldom wrote by masterly writers. How few of them have such a pen as Junius!

But supposing we have ever so much information, how little can one rely on it! on the information given by either party! For is not one as warm as the other? And who does not know how impossible it is for a man to see things right when he is angry? Does not passion blind the eyes of the understanding, as smoke does the bodily eyes? And how little of the truth can we learn from those who see nothing but through a cloud?

This advantage then I have over both parties,—the being angry at neither. So that if I have a little understanding from nature or experience, it is (in this instance at least) unclouded by passion. I wish the same happiness which I wish to myself, to those on one side and on the other. I would not hurt either in the least degree; I would not willingly give them any pain.

I have likewise another advantage, that of having no bias one way or the other. I have no interest depending; I want no man's favour, having no hopes, no fears, from any man; and having no particular attachment of any kind to either of the contending parties.

But am I so weak as to imagine, that because I am not angry at them, they will not be angry at me? No; I do not imagine any such thing. Probably both will be angry enough; that is, the warm men on both sides, were it only for this,—that I am not as warm as themselves. For what is more insufferable to a man in a passion, than to see you keep your temper? And is it not a farther provocation, that I do not behave as he does to his opponent; that I call him no ill names; that I give him no ill words? I expect, therefore, to be abused on all sides; and cannot be disappointed, unless by being treated with common humanity.

This premised, I come to the point, to give you my "free thoughts on the present state of public affairs;" the causes and consequences of the present commotions. But permit me to remind you, that I say nothing peremptorily. I do not take upon me to affirm, that things are thus or thus. I just set down my naked thoughts, and that without any art or colouring.

"What then do you think is the direct and principal cause of the present public commotions, of the amazing ferment among the people, the general discontent of the nation?" which now rises to an higher degree than it has done in the memory of man; insomuch that I have heard it affirmed with my own ears, "King George ought to be treated as King Charles was!" Is it the extraordinary bad character of the King? I do not apprehend it is. Certainly, if he is not, as some think, the best Prince in Europe, he is far from being the worst. One not greatly prejudiced in his favour does not charge him with want of virtue, (of this he judges him to have more than enough,) but with wanting those royal vices, which (with Machiavel and the ingenious Doctor Mandeville) he supposes would be public benefits.

"But does he not likewise want understanding?" So it has been boldly affirmed. And it must be acknowledged, this charge is supported by facts which cannot be denied. The First is, he believes the Bible; the Second, he fears God; the Third, he loves the Queen. Now, suppose the First of these, considering the prejudice of education, might consist with some

share of understanding, yet how can this be allowed with regard to the Second? For although, in the times of ignorance and barbarism men imagined, "the fear of God" was "the beginning of wisdom," our enlightened age has discovered it is the end of it; that whenever the fear of God begins, wisdom is at an end. And with regard to the Third, for a man to love his wife, unless perhaps for a month or two, must argue such utter want of sense, as most men of rank are now ashamed of. But, after all, there are some who, allowing the facts, deny the consequence; who still believe, and that after the most accurate inquiry, from such as have had the best means of information, that there are few noblemen or gentlemen in the nation, (and we have many not inferior to most in Europe,) who have either so good a natural understanding, or so general a knowledge of all the valuable parts of learning.

"But suppose something might be said for His Majesty's understanding, what can be said in excuse of his bad actions; as, First, his pardoning a murderer?" I really think something may be said on this head also. Can you or I believe that the King knew him to be such? understood him to be a wilful murderer? I am not sure of it at all; neither have you any rational proof, even supposing this to have been the case, which is far from being clear. And if he did not know or believe him to be such, how can he be blamed for pardoning him? Not to have pardoned him in this case would have been inexcusable before God and man.

"But what can be said in excuse of his being governed by his mother, and fixing all his measures at Carlton-House?" It may be said, that if it was so, it is past, and so is no matter of present complaint. But who informed you that it was? any eye and ear witness? "O, it is in every body's mouth." Very well; but every body is nobody; so this proof is no proof at all. And what better proof have you, or any man, of his fixing any of his measures there? This has been affirmed an hundred times, but never was proved yet. "Nay, but is it not undeniable fact, that he spent hour after hour with her; and especially when he was hard pressed, and knew not which way to turn?" And what then? Who loves him better than his parent? And whom has he a right to love better than her? Who is more faithful to him, more steadily desirous of his welfare? And whom can he trust better? Suppose then it was true, (which is more than any

man can prove,) that he did consult her on all occasions, and particularly when he was in trouble and perplexity, who can blame him for so doing?

"Well, be this as it may, who can help blaming him for giving so many pensions?" This is a thing which I do not understand, and can therefore neither praise nor blame. Some indeed, I think, are well bestowed on men eminent in their several professions. All, I believe, are well designed, particularly those given to men who are removed from public employments. Yet, I fear, some of these are ill bestowed on those who not only fly in the face of their benefactor, but avail themselves of his favours to wound the deeper. "For were he not in the wrong, these would never turn against him!" What pity they should enjoy them another day, after such foul and flagrant ingratitude!

This fault (if it were really such) would argue too great easiness of temper. But this is quite the reverse of what is commonly objected,—inflexible stubbornness. "Nay, what else could occasion the settled disregard of so many petitions and remonstrances, signed by so many thousand hands, and declaring the sense of the nation?" *The sense of the nation!* Who can imagine this that knows the manner wherein nine in ten, I might say ninety-nine in an hundred, of those petitions are procured? A Lord or Squire (sometimes two or more) goes, or sends his steward, round the town where his seat is, with a paper, which he tells the honest men is for the good of their King and country. He desires each to set his name or mark to this. And who has the hardiness to gainsay; especially if my Lord keeps open house? Meantime, the contents of it they know nothing about.

I was not long since at a town in Kent, when one of these petitions was carrying about. I asked one and another, "Have you signed the petition?" and found none that had refused it. And yet not one single person to whom I spoke had either read it, or heard it read.

Now, I would ask any man of common sense, what stress is to be laid on these petitions; and how they do declare "the sense of the nation;" nay, of the very persons that have signed them? What a shocking insult is it then on the whole kingdom, to palm these petitions upon us, of which the very subscribers have not read three lines, as the general "sense of the nation!"

But suppose they had read all that they have subscribed, what judges are they of these matters? To put this beyond dispute, let us only propose one case out of a thousand. Step back a few years, and suppose Mr. Pitt at the head of the administration. Here comes up a petition from Newcastle-upon-Tyne, signed by five hundred hands, begging His Majesty to dismiss that corrupt Minister, who was taking such measures as tended to the utter ruin of the nation. What would Mr. Pitt say to this? Would he not ask, "How came these colliers and keelmen to be so well acquainted with affairs of State? How long have they been judges of public administration? of naval and military operations? How came they to understand the propriety or impropriety of the measures I take? Do they comprehend the balance of Europe? Do they know the weakness and strength of its several kingdoms; the characters of the Monarchs and their Ministers; the springs of this and that public motion? Else, why do they take upon them to scan my conduct? *Ne sutor ultra crepidam!* 'Let them mind their own work,' keep to their pits and keels, and leave State affairs to me."

"But surely you do not place the citizens of London on a level with the colliers of Newcastle!" I do not. And yet I suppose they were equally incompetent judges of the measures which Mr. Pitt took. And I doubt they are full as incompetent judges of the measures taken by the present ministry. To form a tolerable judgment of them requires, not only a good understanding, but more time than common tradesmen can spare, and better information than they can possibly procure. I think, therefore, that the encouraging them to pass their verdict on Ministers of State, yea, on King, Lords, and Commons, is not only putting them out of their way, but doing them more mischief than you are aware of.

"But the remonstrance! Surely the King ought to have paid more regard to the remonstrance of the city of London." Consider the case: The city had presented a petition which he could by no means approve of, as he judged it was designed not so much to inform him as to inflame his subjects. After he had rejected this, as mildly as could be done, whilst he viewed it in this light, they present a remonstrance to the same effect, and (as he judged) with the same design. What then could he do less than he did? Could he seem to approve

what he did not approve? If not, how could he testify his full disapprobation in more inoffensive terms?

As to the idle, shameless tale of his bursting out into laughter at the Magistrates, any who know His Majesty's temper would as soon believe that he spit in their faces, or struck them a box on the ear.

His Majesty's character, then, after all the pains which have been taken to make him odious, as well as contemptible, remains unimpeached; and therefore cannot be, in any degree, the cause of the present commotions. His whole conduct, both in public and private, ever since he began his reign, the uniform tenor of his behaviour, the general course both of his words and actions, has been worthy of an Englishman, worthy of a Christian, and worthy of a King.

"Are not, then, the present commotions owing to his having extraordinary bad Ministers? Can you say that his Ministers are as blameless as himself?" I do not say this; I do not think so. But I think they are not one jot worse than those that went before them; nor than any set of Ministers who have been in place for at least thirty years last past. I think they are not a jot worse than their opponents, than those who bawl the loudest against them, either with regard to intellectual or moral abilities, with regard to sense or honesty. Set twenty against twenty, or ten against ten; and is there a pin to choose?

"However, are not these commotions owing to the extraordinary bad measures they have taken? Surely you will not attempt to defend all their measures!" No, indeed. I do not defend General Warrants. But I observe, 1. The giving these, be it good or bad, is no extraordinary measure. Has it not been done by all Ministers for many years, and that with little or no objection? 2. This ordinary measure is of exceeding little importance to the nation in general: So little, that it was never before thought worthy to be put into the list of public grievances: So little, that it never deserved the hundredth part of the outcry which has been made concerning it.

I do not defend the killing of Mr. Allen. But I would have the fact truly represented. By the best information I can gain, I believe it stands just thus: About that time the mob had been very turbulent. On that day they were likely to be more insolent than ever. It was therefore judged proper

to send a party of soldiers to prevent or repress their violence. Their presence did not prevent it; the mob went so far as to throw stones at the soldiers themselves. One of them hit and wounded a soldier; two or three pursued him; and fired at one whom, being in the same dress, they supposed to be the same man. But it was not; it was Mr. Allen. Now, though this cannot be excused, yet, was it the most horrid villany that ever was perpetrated? Surely, no. Notwithstanding all the tragical exclamations which have been made concerning it, what is this to the killing a man in cool blood? And was this never heard of in England?

I do not defend the measures which have been taken relative to the Middlesex election. But let it be remembered, First, that there was full as much violence on the one side as on the other. Secondly, that a right of expulsion, of putting a member out of the House, manifestly implies a right of exclusion, of keeping him out; otherwise that right amounts to just nothing at all. Thirdly, that consequently, a member expelled is incapable of being re-elected, at least during that session; as incapable as one that is disqualified any other way. It follows, Fourthly, that the votes given for this disqualified person are null and void, being, in effect, given for nobody. Therefore, Fifthly, if the other candidate had two hundred votes, he had a majority of two hundred.

Let it be observed farther, if the electors had the liberty of choosing any qualified person, it is absolute nonsense to talk of their being deprived of the liberty of choosing, because they were not permitted to choose a person utterly unqualified.

But suppose a single borough or county were deprived of this in a single instance; (which undoubtedly is the case, whenever a person duly elected does not sit in the House;) how is this depriving the good people of England, the nation, of their birthright? What an insult upon common sense is this wild way of talking! If Middlesex is wronged (put it so) in this instance, how is Yorkshire or Cumberland affected by it; or twenty counties and forty boroughs besides; much less all the nation? "O, but they may be affected by and by." Very true! And the sky may fall!

To see this whole matter in the clearest light, let any one read and consider the speech of Lord Chief Justice Mansfield, on a motion, made by Lord Chatham, "to repeal and rescind

the Resolutions of the House of Commons, in regard to the expulsion and incapacitation of Mr. Wilkes:"—

"In this debate, though it has been already spoken to with great eloquence and perspicuity, I cannot content myself with only giving a single vote; I feel myself under a strong necessity of saying something more. The subject requires it; and though the hour is late," (it being then near ten o'clock,) "I shall demand your indulgence, while I offer my sentiments on this motion.

"I am sure, my Lords, many of you must remember, from your reading and experience, several persons expelled the House of Commons, without ever this House once pretending to interfere or call in question by what authority they did so. I remember several myself;" (here his Lordship quoted several cases;) "in all which, though most of the candidates were sure to be re-chosen, they never once applied, resting contented with the expulsatory power of the House, as the only self-sufficient, dernier resort of application.

"It has been echoed on all sides, from the partisans of this motion, that the House of Commons acted illegally, in accepting Colonel Luttrel, who had but two hundred and ninety-six votes, in preference to Mr. Wilkes, who had one thousand one hundred and forty-three. But this is a mistake of the grossest nature imaginable, and which nothing but the intemperature of people's zeal could possibly transport them to, as Mr. Wilkes had been previously considered by the laws as an unqualified person to represent the people in Parliament; therefore it appears very plainly, that Colonel Luttrel had a very great majority, not less than two hundred and ninety-six, Mr. Wilkes being considered as nobody in the eye of the law; consequently, Colonel Luttrel had no legal opposition.

"In all contested elections, where one of the parties think themselves not legally treated, I should be glad to know to whom it is they resort? Is it to the freeholders of the borough or the county they would represent? Or is it to the people at large? Who cannot see at once the absurdity of such a question? Who so ignorant of our laws, that cannot immediately reply and say, 'It is the House of Commons who are the only judges to determine every nicety of the laws of election; and from whom there is no appeal, after they have once given their determination?' All the freeholder has to do is to determine on his o[illegible] by giving him his vote; the ultimate power lies

with the House of Commons, who is to judge of his being a legal object of representation in the several branches of his qualifications. This, my Lords, I believe, is advancing no new doctrine, nor adding an iota to the privilege of a member of the House of Commons, more than what the constitution long ago has given him; yet here is a cry made, in a case that directly applies to what I have been speaking of, as if it was illegal, arbitrary, and unprecedented.

"I do not remember, my Lords, in either the course of my reading or observation ever to have known an instance of a person's being re-chosen, after being expelled, till the year 1711; then, indeed, my memory serves me with the case of Sir Robert Walpole. He was expelled the House of Commons, and was afterwards re-chosen: But this last event did not take place till the meeting of the next Parliament; and during that interval, I find no debate about the illegality of his expulsion, no interference of the House of Lords, nor any addresses from the public, to decry that measure by a dissolution of Parliament.

"Indeed, as for a precedent of one House interfering with the rules, orders, or business of another, my memory does not serve me at present with the recollection of a single one. As to the case of Titus Oates, as mentioned by the noble Lord in my eye, (Lord Chatham,) he is very much mistaken in regard to the mode; his was a trial in the King's Bench, which, on a writ of error, the House of Commons interfered in, and they had an authority for so doing. A Judge certainly may be mistaken in points of law; the wisest and the best of us may be so at times; and it reflects no discredit, on the contrary, it does particular honour, when he finds himself so mistaken, to reverse his own decree. But for one House of Parliament interfering with the business, and reversing the resolutions, of another, it is not only unprecedented, but unconstitutional to the last degree.

"But suppose, my Lords, that this House coincided with this motion; suppose we all agreed, *nem. con.*, to repeal and rescind the Resolutions of the House of Commons, in regard to the expulsion and incapacitation of Mr. Wilkes;—Good God! what may be the consequence! The people are violent enough already; and to have the superior branch of legislation join them, would be giving such a public encouragement to their proceedings, that I almost tremble while I even suppose such a scene of anarchy and confusion."

What then can we think of the violent outcry, that the nation is oppressed, deprived of that liberty which their ancestors bought with so much treasure and blood, and delivered down through so many generations? Do those who raise this cry believe what they say? If so, are they not under the highest infatuation? seeing that England, from the time of William the Conqueror, yea, of Julius Cæsar, never enjoyed such liberty, civil and religious, as it does at this day. Nor do we know of any other kingdom or state in Europe or in the world, which enjoys the like.

I do not defend the measures which have been taken with regard to America: I doubt whether any man can defend them, either on the foot of law, equity, or prudence. But whose measures were these? If I do not mistake, Mr. George Grenville's. Therefore the whole merit of these measures belongs to him, and not to the present ministry.

"But is not the general dissatisfaction owing, if not to any of the preceding causes, to the extraordinary bad conduct of the Parliament, particularly the House of Commons?" This is set in so clear a light by a late writer, that I need only transcribe his words:—

"The last recess of Parliament was a period filled with unprecedented troubles; and the session opened in the midst of tumults. Ambitious men, with a perseverance uncommon in indolent and luxurious times, rung all the changes of popular noise for the purpose of intimidation. The ignorant, who could not distinguish between real and artificial clamours, were alarmed; the lovers of their own ease wished to sacrifice the just dignity of the House of Commons to a temporary relief, from the grating sound of seditious scurrility.

"Hence the friends of the constitution saw the opening of the session with anxiety and apprehension. They were afraid of the timidity of others, and dreaded nothing more than that panic to which popular assemblies, as well as armies, are sometimes subject. The event has shown that their fears were groundless: The House supported its decisions against the current of popular prejudice; and, in defending their own judicial rights, secured the most solid part of the liberties of their constituents.

"Their firm adherence to their Resolutions was not more noble than their concessions in the matter of their own rights was disinterested and generous. The extensive privileges which,

in a series of ages, had accumulated to the members of both Houses, were certainly inconsistent with the impartial distribution of justice. To sacrifice these privileges was not only diametrically opposite to the idea of self-interest, with which some asperse the Legislature, but it has also thrown a greater weight into the scale of public freedom than any other Act passed since the Revolution. And it has reflected honour on the present administration, that a bill, so very favourable to the liberty of the subject, was brought in and carried through by them.

"The arbitrary manner of determining petitions about elections has been a serious complaint, and of long continuance. I shall not deny to Mr. Grenville the merit of bringing in a bill for remedying this grievance; but its passing as it did is a certain proof that the pretended influence of administration over a majority of the House is a mere bugbear, held forth for private views by the present opposition.

"During the whole session, the House of Lords behaved with that dignity and unalterable firmness which became the first assembly in a great nation. Attacked with impertinent scurrility, they smiled upon rage, and treated the ravings of a despotic tribune with contempt. When, with an infamous perversion of his pretended love to freedom, he attempted to extend the control of the Peers to the resolutions of the representatives of the people, they nobly rejected the golden bait; and scorned to raise the dignity of their House upon the ruins of the other. They, in short, throughout the session, showed a spirit that disdained to be braved, a magnanimity that diminished their own personal power for the ease and comfort of the inferior subject.

"If the conduct of Parliament is in any instance blamable, it is in a lenity that is inconsistent with the vulgar idea of political courage. They have been attacked with scurrility in the Lower House; in the Upper, they have been treated with indecency and disrespect. Their prudence and love for the public peace prevailed over their resentment. They knew that legal punishment is in these times the road to popularity; and they were unwilling to raise insignificant men into a consequence that might disturb the State."

So far we have gained. We have removed the imaginary causes of the present commotions. It plainly appears, they are not owing to the extraordinary badness, either of the King, of his Parliament, of his Ministers, or of the measures which

they have taken. To what then are they owing? What are the real causes of this amazing ferment among the people?

Before I say anything on this subject, let me remind you once more, that I do not dictate; I do not take upon me to affirm anything, but simply tell you what I think. I think, the first and principal spring of the whole motion is French gold. "But why do you think so?" I will tell you as plainly as I can:—

A person of a complete, uniform character, encumbered with no religion, with no regard to virtue or morality, squanders away all that he has. He applies for a place, but is disappointed. He is thoroughly exasperated, abuses the ministry, asperses the King's mother in the grossest manner, is prosecuted, (not for this, but other achievements,) and retires to France. After some time, he suddenly returns to London, sets up for a patriot, and vehemently inveighs against evil counsellors, grievances, and mal-administration. The cry spreads; more and more espouse his cause, and second him with all their might. He becomes head of the party; and not only the vulgar but the world runs after him. He drives on with still increasing numbers, carrying all before him, inflaming the nation more and more, and making their minds evil-affected, in appearance towards the Ministers of State, but in reality towards the King. Now, can any reasonable man believe that the French are ignorant of all this; or that they have no hand at all therein, but are mere unconcerned spectators? Do they not understand their own interest better? If they did not kindle the fire, will they not use all means to prevent its going out? Will they not take care to add fuel to the flame? Will they not think forty or fifty thousand louis-d'ors well bestowed on so important an occasion?

I cannot but think this is (at least) one principal spring of all the present commotions. But may not other causes likewise concur? As, First, covetousness; a love of English as well as of French gold. Do not many hunger after the lucrative employments which their neighbours enjoy? They had rather have them themselves. And will not those that are hungry naturally cry for food? Secondly, ambition. How many desire honour, perhaps more than they do money itself! and how various are the shapes which they will put on in order to attain it! Thirdly, those who are not so much under the power of these, are yet susceptible of pride or envy; and

frequently of both together. To these we may, Fourthly, add resentment. Many doubtless look upon themselves as injured, were it only on this account, that they are not regarded, yea, and recompensed, as their merits or services deserve. Others are angry because they are disappointed; because, after all their schemes, which they imagined could not fail of success, they are not able to carry their point.

Now, all these, united by these various motives, some encouraged by good pay in hand, (and perhaps by promises of more,) others animated by covetousness, by ambition, by envy, pride, and resentment, by every means animate all they have access to. They treat both rich and poor, according to their rank, with all elegance and profuseness. They talk largely and vehemently. They write abundantly, having troops enough in their service. They publish addresses, petitions, remonstrances, directed nominally to the King, (otherwise they would not answer the end,) but really to the people. Herein their orators make use of all the powers of rhetoric. They bring forth their strong reasons,—the very best which the cause will bear. They set them off with all the beauty of language, all the poignancy of wit. They spread their writings in pamphlets, newspapers, magazines, &c., to every corner of the land. They are indefatigable in their work; they never stop to take breath; but as they have tongues and pens at command, when one has done, another begins, and so on and on with a continuance. By this means the flame spreads wider and wider; it runs as fire among the stubble. The madness becomes epidemic, and no medicine hitherto has availed against it. The whole nation sees the State in danger, as they did the Church sixty years ago; and the world now wonders after Mr. Wilkes, as it did then after Dr. Sacheverel.

One means of increasing the ferment is the suffering no contradiction; the hooting at all who labour for peace, and treading them down like dirt; the using them just as they do the King, without either justice or mercy. If any writes on that head, presently the cry is raised, "O, he only writes for pay!" But, if he does, do not those on the other side too? Which are paid best I do not know; but doubtless both are paid, a very few old-fashioned mortals excepted, who, having nothing to hope, and nothing to fear, simply consider the good of their country.

"But what do you think the end will be?" It is easy to foresee this. Supposing things to take their natural course, they must go from bad to worse.

In stipulam veluti cum flamma furentibus Austris
Incidit, aut rapidus montano flumine torrens
*Exiit, oppositasque evicit gurgite moles.**

The people will be inflamed more and more; the torrent will swell higher and higher, till at length it bursts through all opposition, and overflows the land. The consequences of these commotions will be (unless an higher hand interpose) exactly the same as those of the like commotions in the last century. First, the land will become a field of blood; many thousands of poor Englishmen will sheathe their swords in each other's bowels, for the diversion of their good neighbours. Then either a commonwealth will ensue, or else a second Cromwell. One must be; but it cannot be determined which, King W——, or King Mob.

"But that case is not parallel with this." It is not, in all particulars. In many respects it is widely different. As, First, with regard to the King himself. Few will affirm the character of King Charles, even allowing the account given by Lord Clarendon to be punctually true in every respect, to be as faultless as that of King George. But other passions, as well as love, are blind. So that when these are raised to a proper height, especially when Junius has thrown a little more of his magic dust into the eyes of the people, and convinced them, that what are virtues in others, are mere vices in him, the good patriots will see no manner of difference between a King George and King Charles, or even a Nero.

The case is also widely different, Secondly, with regard to the ministry. King George has no such furious drivers about him as poor King Charles had. But a skilful painter may easily add a few features, either to one or the other, and by a little colouring make Lord North the very picture of Lord Strafford, and Archbishop Cornwallis of Archbishop Laud.

How different likewise is the case, Thirdly, with regard to

* These quotations from Virgil are thus translated by Pitt:—
"Thus o'er the corn, while furious winds conspire,
Rolls on a wide-devouring blaze of fire;
Or some big torrent, from a mountain's brow,
Bursts, pours, and thunders down the vale below,"—
"And" rolls "resistless o'er the levell'd mounds."—EDIT.

the administration of public affairs! The requiring tonnage and poundage, the imposing ship-money, the prosecutions in the Bishops' Courts, in the High Commission Court, and in the Star Chamber, were real and intolerable grievances. But what is there in the present administration which bears any resemblance to these? Yet if you will view even such an affair as the Middlesex election through Mr. Horne's magnifying-glass, it will appear a more enormous instance of oppression than a hundred Star Chambers put together.

The parallel does not hold, Fourthly, with regard to the opposers of the King and his ministry. Is Mr. Burke the same calm, wise, disinterested man that Mr. Hampden was? And where shall we find twenty noblemen and twenty gentlemen (to name no more) in the present opposition, whom any impartial man will set on a level with the same number of those that opposed King Charles and his ministry.

Nor does the parallel hold, Fifthly, in this respect: That was in great measure a contest about religion; at least, about rites, and ceremonies, and opinions, which many supposed to be religion. But all religion is out of the question now: This is generally allowed, both by the one side and the other, to be so very a trifle, that they do not give themselves the least concern about it.

In one circumstance more there is an obvious difference. The Parliament were then the King's enemies: Now they are his firmest friends. But indeed this difference may easily be removed. Let the King only take Mr. Wilkes's advice, and dissolve Parliament. The Parliament of 1640, the first which sat after the troubles began, although many therein were much dissatisfied with the measures which had been taken, yet would never have been prevailed upon to join in the schemes which afterwards prevailed. But when that Parliament was so seasonably dissolved, and a few men, wise in their generation, practising with unwearied industry on the heated spirits of the people, had procured a new Parliament to be chosen after their own heart; then it was not long ere the train took fire, and the whole constitution was blown up!

But, notwithstanding the disparity between the present and past times in the preceding respects, yet how surprisingly does the parallel hold in various particulars! 1. An handful of people laid a scheme, which few would have believed had a man then declared it unto them; though indeed it is probable

that at the beginning they had no settled scheme at all. 2. These professed great zeal for the good of their country, were vehement contenders for liberty, cried aloud against evil Ministers and the evil measures which they pursued, and were continually declaiming against either real or imaginary grievances. 3. They were soon joined by men eminent for probity as well as for understanding, who undoubtedly *were* what the others *appeared,* lovers of their King and country, and desired nothing but the removal of bad Ministers, and the redress of real grievances. 4. The spirits even of these were gradually sharpened and embittered against the King. And they were drawn farther and farther by the art of their leaders, till they had gone so far, they knew not how to retreat; yea, till they, passively at least, concurred in those measures which at first their very souls abhorred. 5. Meantime, the nation in general was inflamed with all possible diligence, by addresses, petitions, and remonstrances, admirably well devised for the purpose; which were the most effectual libels that could be imagined against the King and Government, and were continually spread throughout the land, with all care and assiduity. 6. Among the most inflamed and embittered in all England were the people of London, as the managers had the best opportunity of practising upon them. 7. All this time they professed the highest regard for the King, for his honour as well as safety; an authentic monument whereof we have in the Solemn League and Covenant. And these professions they continued with equal vehemence till within a short time of the cutting off his head!

Now, what man that has the least degree of understanding may not see, in the clearest light, how surprisingly the parallel holds in all these circumstances?

"But do not you think it is in the power of the King to put an end to all these commotions, by only sending his mother away, changing his Ministers, and dissolving the Parliament?" He may send his mother away; and so he may his wife, if they please to rank her among his evil counsellors. He may put out his present Ministers, and desire the Lord Mayor to put others in their place. He may likewise dissolve the present Parliament, (as King Charles did that of 1640,) and exchange it for one chosen, animated, and tutored by Mr. Wilkes and his friends. But can you really believe this would mend the matter? would put an end to all these

commotions? Certainly the sending his mother to the Indies would avail nothing, unless he removed his Ministers too. Nor would the putting out these, yea, every man of them, avail anything, unless at the same time he put in every man whom Lord Chatham chose. But neither would this avail, unless he struck the finishing-stroke, by dissolving the Parliament. Then indeed he would be as perfectly safe as the "sheep that had given up their dogs."

It would puzzle the wisest man alive to tell what the King can do. What can he do, that will still the raging of the sea, or the madness of the people? Do you imagine it is in his power to do anything which will please all parties? Can he do anything that will not displease one as much as it will please the other? Shall he drive his mother out of the land? * Will this then please all parties? Nay, will not some be apt to inquire, "How has she deserved it at his hands?" "Why, she is an evil counsellor." How does this appear? Who are the witnesses of it? Indeed we have read as grave and formal accounts of the conferences at Carlton-House, as if the relater had stood all the time behind the curtain, and taken down the whole matter in short-hand. But what shadow of proof of all this? No more than of the conferences related in Tristram Shandy.

"But she is a bad woman." Who ever said or thought so, even while she was in the flower of her age? From the time she first set foot in England, was there a more faultless character in the nation? Nay, was not her whole behaviour as a wife, as a mother, as a mistress, and as a Princess, not only blameless but commendable in the highest degree, till that period of time arrived, when it was judged proper, in order to blacken her (supposed) favourite, to asperse her too? And then she was *illud quod dicere nolo!* † One would think that even the *ignobile vulgus*, "the beasts of the people," the lowest, basest herd who wore the human form, would be ashamed of either advancing or crediting so senseless, shameless a tale. Indeed I can hardly think it is credited by one in an hundred even of those who foul their mouths with repeating it. Let it die and be forgotten! Let it not be remembered that ever any Englishman took so dirty a slander into his mouth.

* This was wrote before the Princess Dowager went abroad.

† What I am reluctant to express.—EDIT.

"However, become what will of his mother, let him put away his bad Ministers." Suppose they really are bad, do you know where he can find better? Where can he find twenty men, we will not say of Christian but of Roman integrity? Point them out,—men of sound judgment, of clear apprehension, of universal benevolence, lovers of mankind, lovers of their country, lovers of their King; men attached to no party, but simply pursuing the general good of the nation; not haughty or overbearing, not addicted to passion, not of a revengeful temper; superior to covetousness on the one hand, free from profuseness on the other. I say, show me the men, only this small number; or rather, show them to His Majesty. Let clear and satisfactory proof be given that this is their character; and if these worthy men are not employed in the place of the unworthy ones, you will then have some reason to stretch your throat against evil Ministers.

"But if the matter were wholly left to him, would not Lord ——— immediately employ twenty such?" That may bear some doubt. It is not certain that he would; perhaps he knows not where to find them. And it is not certain to a demonstration, that he would employ them if he did. It is not altogether clear, that he is such himself, that he perfectly answers this character. Is he free from pride; from anything haughty in his temper, or overbearing in his behaviour? Is he neither passionate nor revengeful? Is it indisputably plain, that he is equally clear of covetousness on the one hand, and profuseness on the other? Is he steady and uniform in his conduct; always one thing? Is he attached to no party, but determined at all events singly to pursue the general good of the nation? Is he a lover of the King? Is he remarkably grateful to him, from whom he has received no common favours? If not, though he has a strong understanding, and a large share of manly eloquence, still it may be doubted, whether he and his friends would behave a jot better than the Ministers we have already.

And suppose the King were to dissolve the Parliament, what hope is there of having a better, even though the nation were as quiet and peaceable as it was ten years ago? Are not the present members, generally speaking, men of the greatest property in the land? And are they not, the greater part of them at least, as honest and wise as their neighbours? How then should we mend ourselves at any time; but especially at such a time

as this? If a new Parliament were chose during this epidemic madness, what probability of a better than the present? Have we not all the reason in the world to apprehend it would be a much worse? that it would be the Parliament of 1641, instead of the Parliament of 1640? Why, this is the very thing we want, the very point we are aiming at. Then would Junius and his friends quickly say, "Sir King, know your place! *Es et ipse lignum.** Take your choice! Be King log, or to the block!"

Does it not then appear, upon the whole, that it is by no means in the power of the King, by any step which he can possibly take, to put a stop to the present commotions; that especially he cannot make concessions without making a bad matter worse; that the way he has taken, the standing his ground, was as wise a method as he could take, and as likely to restore the peace of the nation, as any the wit of man could devise? If any is more likely, would it not be, vigorously to execute the laws against incendiaries; against those who, by spreading all manner of lies, inflame the people even to madness; to teach them, that there is a difference between liberty, which is the glory of Englishmen, and licentiousness, a wanton abuse of liberty, in contempt of all laws, divine and human? Ought they not to feel, if they will not see, that *scandalum regis*, "scandalizing the King," is as punishable as *scandalum magnatum?*† that for the future none may dare to slander the King, any more than one of his nobles; much less to print and spread that deadly poison among His Majesty's liege subjects? Is not this little less than high treason? Is it not sowing the seeds of rebellion?

It is possible this might restore peace, but one cannot affirm it would. Perhaps God has "a controversy with the land," for the general neglect, nay, contempt, of all religion. Perhaps he hath said, "Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?" And if this be the case, what can avail, unless his anger be turned away from us? Was there ever a time in which there was a louder call for them that fear God to humble themselves before him? if haply general humiliation and repentance may prevent general destruction!

* You are yourself also a log of wood.—EDIT.

† Scandalizing the nobility.—EDIT.

THOUGHTS UPON LIBERTY.

I scorn to have my free-born toe
Dragoon'd into a wooden shoe.—PRIOR.

1. ALL men in the world desire liberty; whoever breathes, breathes after this, and that by a kind of natural instinct antecedent to art or education. Yet at the same time all men of understanding acknowledge it as a rational instinct. For we feel this desire, not in opposition to, but in consequence of, our reason. Therefore it is not found, or in a very low degree, in many species of brutes, which seem, even when they are left to their choice, to prefer servitude before liberty.

2. The love of liberty is then the glory of rational beings; and it is the glory of Britons in particular. Perhaps it would be difficult to find any nation under heaven, who are more tenacious of it; nay, it may be doubted if any nation ever was; not the Spartans, not the Athenians; no, not the Romans themselves, who have been celebrated for this very thing by the poets and historians of all ages.

3. Was it not from this principle, that our British forefathers so violently opposed all foreign invaders; that Julius Cæsar himself, with his victorious legions, could make so little impression upon them; that the Generals of the succeeding Emperors sustained so many losses from them; and that, when at length they were overpowered, they rather chose to lose all they had than their liberty; to retire into the Cambrian or Caledonian mountains, where, if they had nothing else, they might at least enjoy their native freedom?

4. Hence arose the vehement struggles of the Cambro-Britons through so many generations against the yoke, which the Saxons first, and afterwards the English, strove to impose upon them; hence the struggles of the English Barons against several of their Kings, lest they should lose the blessing they had received from their forefathers; yea, the Scottish nobles, as all their histories show, would no

more bear to be enslaved than the Romans. All these therefore, however differing from each other in a thousand other respects, agreed in testifying the desirableness of liberty, as one of the greatest blessings under the sun.

5. Such was the sense of all our ancestors, even from the earliest ages. And is it not also the general sense of the nation at this day? Who can deny, that the whole kingdom is panting for liberty? Is not the cry for it gone forth, not only through every part of our vast metropolis,—from the west end of the city to the east, from the north to the south, so that instead of no complaining in our streets, there is nothing but complaining,—but likewise into every corner of our land, borne by all the four winds of heaven? Liberty! Liberty! sounds through every county, every city, every town, and every hamlet!

6. Is it not for the sake of this, that the name of our great patriot (perhaps not so admirable in his private character as the man of Ross, or so great a lover of his country as Codrus or old Curtius) is more celebrated than that of any private man has been in England for these thousand years; that his very picture is so joyfully received in every part of England and Ireland, that we stamp his (I had almost said, adored) name on our handkerchiefs, on the cheerful bowl, yea, and on our vessels of various kinds, as well as upon our hearts? Why is all this, but because of the inseparable connexion between Wilkes and liberty; liberty that came down, if not fell, from heaven; whom all England and the world worshippeth?

7. But mean time might it not be advisable to consider, (if we are yet at leisure to consider anything,) what is liberty? Because it is well known the word is capable of various senses. And possibly it may not be equally desirable in every sense of the word.

8. There are many nations in America, those particularly that border on Georgia and Carolina, wherein if one disapproves of what another says, or perhaps dislikes his looks, he scorns to affront him to his face, neither does he betray the least dissatisfaction. But as soon as opportunity serves, he steps from behind a tree and shoots him. And none calls him that does it to an account. No; this is the liberty he derives from his forefathers.

9. For many ages the free natives of Ireland, as well as the Scottish Highlands, when it was convenient for them, made an

excursion from their woods or fastnesses, and carried off, for their own proper use, the sheep, and oxen, and corn of their neighbours. This was the liberty which the O'Neals, the Campbells, and many other septs and clans of venerable antiquity, had received by immemorial tradition from their ancestors.

10. Almost all the soldiers in the Christian world, as well as in the Mahometan and Pagan, have claimed, more especially in time of war, another kind of liberty; that of borrowing the wives and daughters of the men that fell into their hands; sometimes, if they pleaded scruple of conscience or honour, using a little necessary force. Perhaps this may be termed the liberty of war. But I will not positively affirm, that it has never been used in this free country, even in the time of peace.

11. In some countries of Europe, and indeed in England, there have been instances of yet another sort of liberty, that of calling a Monarch to account; and, if need were, taking off his head; that is, if he did not behave in a dutiful manner to our sovereign lords the people.

12. Now, that we may not always be talking at random, but bring the matter to a determinate point, which of these sorts of liberty do you desire? Is it the First sort; the liberty of knocking on the head, or cutting the throats, of those we are out of conceit with? Glorious liberty indeed! What would not king mob do to be gratified with it but for a few weeks? But, I conceive, calm, sensible men do not desire to see them entrusted with it. They apprehend there might be some consequences which, upon the whole, would not redound to the prosperity of the nation.

13. Is the Second more desirable; the liberty of taking, when we see best, the goods and chattels of our neighbours? Undoubtedly, thousands in the good city of London (suppose we made the experiment here first) would be above measure rejoiced thereat, would leap as broke from chains. O how convenient would it be to have free access, without any let or hinderance, to the cellars, the pantries, the larders, yea, and the coffers of their rich, overgrown landlords! But perhaps it would not give altogether so much joy to the Lord Mayor or Aldermen; no, nor even to those stanch friends of liberty, the Common Councilmen. Not that they regard their own interest at all; but, setting themselves out of the question, they are a little in doubt whether this liberty would be for the good of trade.

14. Is it then the Third kind of liberty we contend for; the liberty of taking our neighbours' wives and daughters? Ye pretty gentlemen, ye *beaux esprits*, will ye not, one and all, give your voices for this natural liberty? Will ye not say, "If we cry out against monopolies of other kinds, shall we tolerate the monopoly of women?" But hold. Are there not some among you too, who have wives, if not daughters, of your own? And are you altogether willing to oblige the first comer with them? I say the first comer; for, observe, as you are to give the liberty you take, so you must not pick and choose your men; you know, by nature, all men are on a level. "Liberty! Liberty! No restraint! We are free-born Englishmen; down with the fences! Lay all the inclosures open!" No; it will not do. Even nature recoils. We are not yet *polished* enough for this.

15. Are we not ripe, however, for the Fourth kind of liberty, that of removing a disobedient King? Would Mr. Wilkes, would Mr. Horne, would any free Briton, have any objection to this? provided only, that, as soon as our present Monarch is removed, we have a better to put in his place. But who is he? King John? That will not sound well, even in the ears of his greatest admirers. And whoever calmly considers the characters and endowments of those other great men, who may think themselves much fitter for the office than His present Majesty, will hardly concur in their opinion; so that a difficulty lies in your way. Whatever claim you may have to this liberty, you must not use it yet, because you cannot tell where to find a better Prince.

16. But to speak seriously. These things being set aside, which the bawling mob dignify by that name; what is that liberty, properly so called, which every wise and good man desires? It is either religious or civil. Religious liberty is a liberty to choose our own religion, to worship God according to our own conscience, according to the best light we have. Every man living, as man, has a right to this, as he is a rational creature. The Creator gave him this right when he endowed him with understanding. And every man must judge for himself, because every man must give an account of himself to God. Consequently, this is an indefeasible right; it is inseparable from humanity. And God did never give authority to any man, or number of men, to deprive any child of man thereof, under any colour or

pretence whatever. What an amazing thing is it, then, that the governing part of almost every nation under heaven should have taken upon them, in all ages, to rob all under their power of this liberty! yea, should take upon them, at this day, so to do; to force rational creatures into their own religion! Would one think it possible, that the most sensible men in the world should say to their fellow-creatures, "Either be of my religion, or I will take away your food, and you and your wife and children shall starve: If that will not convince you, I will fetter your hands and feet, and throw you into a dungeon: And if still you will not see as I see, I will burn you alive?"

17. It would not be altogether so astonishing, if this were the manner of American savages. But what shall we say, if numberless instances of it have occurred, in the politest nations of Europe? Have no instances of the kind been seen in Britain? Have not England and Scotland seen the horrid fires? Have not the flames burning the flesh of heretics shone in London as well as in Paris and Lisbon? Have we forgot the days of good Queen Mary? No; they will be had in everlasting remembrance. And although burning was out of fashion in Queen Elizabeth's days, yet hanging, even for religion, was not. It is true, her successor did not go quite so far. But did even King James allow liberty of conscience? By no means. During his whole reign, what liberty had the Puritans? What liberty had they in the following reign? If they were not persecuted unto death; (although eventually, indeed, many of them were; for they died in their imprisonment;) yet were they not continually harassed by prosecutions in the Bishops' Courts, or Star-Chamber? by fines upon fines, frequently reducing them to the deepest poverty? and by imprisonment for months, yea, for years, together, till many of them, escaping with the skin of their teeth, left their country and friends, fled to seek their bread in the wilds of America? "However, we may suppose all this was at an end under the merry Monarch, King Charles the Second." Was it indeed? Where have they lived who suppose this? To wave a thousand particular instances; what will you say to those two public monuments, the Act of Uniformity, and the Act against Conventicles? In the former it is enacted, to the eternal honour of the King, Lords, and Commons, at that memorable

period: "Every Parson, Vicar, or other Minister whatever, who has any benefice within these realms, shall, before the next twenty-fourth of August, openly and publicly declare his unfeigned assent and consent to all and everything contained in the Book of Common Prayer, or shall, *ipso facto*, be deprived of all his benefices! Likewise, if any Dean, Prebendary, Master, Fellow, Chaplain, or Tutor, of any College, Hall, House of Learning, or Hospital, any public Professor, or any other person in Holy Orders, any Schoolmaster, or Teacher, or Tutor in any private family, do not subscribe hereto, he shall be, *ipso facto*, deprived of his place, and shall be utterly disabled from continuing therein."

Property for ever! See how well English property was secured in those golden days!

So, by this glorious Act, thousands of men, guilty of no crime, nothing contrary either to justice, mercy, or truth, were stripped of all they had, of their houses, lands, revenues, and driven to seek where they could, or beg, their bread. For what? Because they did not dare to worship God according to other men's consciences! So they and their families were, at one stroke, turned out of house and home, and reduced to little less than beggary, for no other fault, real or pretended, but because they could not assent and consent to that manner of worship which their worthy governors prescribed!

But this was not all. It was further enacted by the same merciful lawgivers: "If any person act as a Teacher, Tutor, or Schoolmaster, in any private family, before he has subscribed hereto, he shall suffer three months' imprisonment, without bail or mainprize."

Liberty for ever! Here is security for your person, as well as your property.

By virtue of the Act against Conventicles, if any continued to worship God according to their own conscience, they were first robbed of their substance, and, if they persisted, of their liberty; often of their lives also. For this crime, under this "our most religious and gracious King," (what were they who publicly told God he was such?) Englishmen were not only spoiled of their goods, but denied even the use of the free air, yea, and the light of the sun, being thrust by hundreds into dark and loathsome prisons!

18. Were matters much better in the neighbouring kingdom? Nay, they were inexpressibly worse. Unheard-of

cruelties were practised there, from soon after the Restoration till the Revolution.* What fining, plundering, beating, maiming, imprisoning, with the most shocking circumstances! For a specimen, look at Dunotter Castle; where young and old, of both sexes, (sick or well, it was all one,) were thrust together between bare walls, and that in the heat of summer, without a possibility of either lying or sitting; yea, without any convenience of any kind; till many of them, through hunger, thirst, heat, and stench, were set at liberty by death! Considering this; considering how many others were hunted over their native mountains, and shot whenever they were overtaken, with no more ceremony than beasts; considering the drowning, hanging, cutting off of limbs, and various arts of torturing, which were practised by order of King Charles, and often in the presence of King James, who seemed to enjoy such spectacles; it would be no wonder if the very name of an Englishman was had in abomination from the Tweed to the Orkneys.

19. But is this the case at present with us? Are we abridged of our religious liberty? His late Majesty was desired, about thirty years ago, to take a step of this kind. But his answer was worthy of a King, yea, the King of a free people: "I tell you, while I sit on the English throne, no man shall be persecuted for conscience' sake." And it is certain he made his promise good from the beginning of his reign to the end. But perhaps the case is altered now. Does His present Majesty tread in his steps? He does: He persecutes no man for conscience' sake. If he does, where is the man? I do not ask, Whom has he committed to the flames, or caused to die by the common hangman? or, Whom has he caused to die many deaths, by hunger and thirst, cold and nakedness? but, Whom has he tortured or thrust into a dungeon, yea, or imprisoned at all, or fined, for worshipping God according to his own conscience, in the Presbyterian or any other way? O, compare King Charles, gracious Charles the Second, with King George, and you will know the value of the liberty you enjoy.

20. In the name of wonder, what religious liberty can you desire, or even conceive, which you have not already? Where is there a nation in Europe, in the habitable world, which

* See Wodrow's "History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland."

enjoys such liberty of conscience as the English? I will be bold to say there is nothing like it in Holland, in Germany, (Protestant or Popish,) in either the Protestant or Popish cantons of Switzerland; no, nor in any country under the sun. Have we not in England full liberty to choose any religion, yea, or no religion at all? to have no more religion than a Hottentot, shall I say? nay, no more than a bull or a swine? Whoever therefore in England stretches his throat, and bawls for more religious liberty, must be totally void of shame, and can have no excuse but want of understanding.

21. But is not the ground of this vehement outcry, that we are deprived of our civil liberty? What is civil liberty? A liberty to enjoy our lives and fortunes in our own way; to use our property, whatever is legally our own, according to our own choice. And can you deny, "that we are robbed of this liberty?" Who are? Certainly I am not. I pray, do not face me down that I am. Do not argue me out of my senses. If the Great Turk, or the King of France, wills that a man should die, with or without cause, die he must. And instances of the kind continually occur; but no such instances occur in England. I am in no more danger of death from King George, than from the Queen of Hungary. And if I study to be quiet and mind my own business, I am in no more danger of losing my liberty than my life. No, nor my property; I mean, by any act of the King. If this is in any degree invaded, it is not by the King, or his Parliament, or army, but by the good patriots.

Hark! Is hell or Bedlam broke loose? What roaring is that, loud as the waves of the sea? "It is the patriot mob." What do they want with me? Why do they flock about my house? "Make haste! illuminate your windows in honour of Mr. Wilkes." I cannot in conscience; I think it is encouraging vice. "Then they will all be broken." That is, in plain English, Give them twenty shillings, or they will rob you of five pounds. Here are champions for the laws of the land! for liberty and property! O vile horse-guards!

> That dared, so grim and terrible, to' advance
> Their miscreated fronts athwart the way!

True, they did nothing and said nothing. Yet, in default of the civil powers, who did not concern themselves with the matter, they hindered the mob from finishing their work.

22. Why, then, these men, instead of anyway abridging it, plainly preserved my liberty and property. And by their benefit, not the care of those to whom it properly belonged, I still enjoy full civil liberty. I am free to live, in every respect, according to my own choice. My life, my person, my property, are safe. I am not murdered, maimed, tortured at any man's pleasure; I am not thrown into prison; I am not manacled; see, I have not one fetter, either on my hands or feet. And are not you as free as I am? Are not you at liberty to enjoy the fruit of your labours? Who hinders you from doing it? Does King George? Does Lord North? Do any of His Majesty's officers or soldiers? No, nor any man living. Perhaps some would hinder you, if you acted contrary to law; but this is not liberty, it is licentiousness. Deny the fact who can; am not I free to use my substance according to my own discretion? And do not you enjoy the self-same freedom? You cannot, you dare not, deny it. At this hour I am at full liberty to use my property as I please. And so are you; you do, in fact, use your house, your goods, your land, as is right in your own eyes. Does any one take them from you? No; nor does any one restrain you from the full enjoyment of them. What then is the matter? What is it you are making all this pother about? Why are you thus wringing your hands, and screaming, to the terror of your quiet neighbours, "Destruction! slavery! bondage! Help, countrymen! Our liberty is destroyed! We are ruined, chained, fettered, undone!" *Fettered!* How? Where are the fetters, but in your own imagination? There are none, either on your hands or mine: Neither you nor I can show to any man in his senses, that we have one chain upon us, even so big as a knitting-needle.

23. I do not say, that the ministry are without fault; or that they have done all things well. But still I ask, What is the liberty which we want? It is not civil or religious liberty. These we have in such a degree as was never known before, not from the times of William the Conqueror.* But all this is nothing; this will never satisfy the *bellua multorum capitum.* That "many-headed beast," the people, roars for liberty of another kind. Many want Indian liberty, the liberty of cutting throats, or of driving a brace of balls

* If the famous Middlesex election was an exception to this, yet observe, one swallow makes no summer.

through the head of those ugly-looking fellows, whom they cannot abide the sight of. Many more want the old Highland *liberty, the convenient liberty of plundering.* Many others there are who want the liberty of war, of borrowing their neighbours' wives or daughters; and not a few, though they do not always avow it, the liberty of murdering their Prince.

24. If you are a reasonable man, a man of real honour, and consequently want none of these, I beg to know what would you have? Considering the thing calmly, what liberty can you reasonably desire which you do not already enjoy? What is the matter with you, and with multitudes of the good people, both in England and Ireland, that they are crying and groaning as if they were chained to an oar, or barred up in the dungeons of the Inquisition? The plain melancholy truth is this: There is a general infatuation, which spreads, like an overflowing stream, from one end of the land to the other; and a man must have great wisdom and great strength, or he will be carried away by the torrent. But how can we account for this epidemic madness? for it deserves no better name. We must not dare to give the least intimation, that the devil has anything to do with it. No! this enlightened age is too wise to believe that there is any devil in being! Satan, avaunt! we have driven thee back into the land of shadows; keep thou among thy own kindred:

> With hydras, gorgons, and chimeras dire.

Suppose it then to be a purely natural phenomenon; I ask again, How can we account for it? I apprehend if we could divest ourselves of prejudice, it might be done very easily; and that without concerning ourselves with the hidden springs of action, the motives or intentions of men. Letting these alone, is there not a visible, undeniable cause, which is quite adequate to the effect? The good people of England have, for some years past, been continually fed with poison. Dose after dose has been administered to them, for fear the first, or second, or tenth, should not suffice, of a poison whose natural effect is to drive men out of their senses. Is "the centaur not fabulous?" Neither is Circe's cup. See how, in every county, city, and village, it is now turning quiet, reasonable men, into wild bulls, bears, and tigers!

But, to lay metaphor aside, how long have the public papers represented one of the best of Princes as if he had been one of the worst, as little better than Caligula, Nero, or Domitian! These were followed by pamphlets of the same kind, and aiming at the same point,—to make the King appear odious as well as contemptible in the eyes of his subjects. Letters succeed, wrote in fine language, and with exquisite art, but filled with the gall of bitterness. "Yes, but not against the King; Junius does not strike at him, but at the evil administration." Thin pretence! Does not every one see the blow is aimed at the King through the sides of his Ministers? All these are conveyed, week after week, through all London and all the nation. Can any man wonder at the effect of this? What can be more natural? What can be expected, but that they who drink in these papers and letters with all greediness, will be thoroughly embittered and inflamed thereby? will first despise and then abhor the King? What can we expect, but that by the repeated doses of this poison they will be perfectly intoxicated, and only wait for a convenient season to tear in pieces the royal monster, as they think him, and all his adherents?

25. At present there are hinderances in the way, so that they cannot use their teeth as they would. One is an untoward Parliament, who will not look upon the King with the same eyes that they do; but still think he has no more design or desire to enslave the nation, than to burn the city of London. A still greater hinderance is the army; even lions and bears do not choose to encounter them, so that these men of war do really at this time preserve the peace of the nation. What then can be done before the people cools, that this precious opportunity be not lost? What indeed, but to prevail upon the King to dissolve his Parliament and disband his army? Nay, let the Parliament stay as it is, it will suffice to disband the army. If these red-coats were but out of the way, the mob would soon deal with the Parliament. *Probatum est:* * Nothing is more easy than to keep malignant members from the House. Remember Lord North not long ago;† this was a taste, a specimen, of their activity. What then would they not do if they were masters of the field, if none were left to oppose them? Would not the

* This has already been put to the proof.—EDIT.

† Rudely insulted by a turbulent mob, as he was going into the House.

avenues of both Houses be so well guarded, that none but patriots would dare to approach?

26. But (as often as you have heard the contrary affirmed) King George has too much understanding, to throw himself into the hands of those men who have given full proof that they bear him no great good-will. Nor has he reason to believe that they are much more fond of his office than of his person. They are not vehemently fond of monarchy itself, whoever the Monarch be. Therefore neither their good nor ill words will induce him, in haste, to leap into the fire with his eyes open.

27. But can anything be done to open the eyes, to restore the senses, of an infatuated nation? Not unless the still renewed, still operating cause of that infatuation can be removed. But how is it possible to be removed, unless by restraining the licentiousness of the press? And is not this remedy worse than the disease? Let us weigh this matter a little. There was an ancient law in Scotland, which made leasing-making a capital crime. By leasing-making was meant, telling such wilful lies as tended to breed dissension between the King and his subjects. What pity but there should be such a law enacted in the present session of Parliament! By our present laws, a man is punishable for publishing even truth to the detriment of his neighbour. This I would not wish. But should he not be punished, who publishes palpable lies? and such lies as manifestly tend to breed dissension between the King and his subjects? Such, with a thousand more, was that bare-faced lie of the King's bursting out into laughter before the city Magistrates! Now, does not the publisher of this lie deserve to lose his ears more than a common knight of the post? And if he is liable to no punishment for a crime of so mischievous a nature, what a grievous defect is in our law! And how loud does it call for a remedy!

28. To return to the point whence we set out. You see whence arose this outcry for liberty, and these dismal complaints that we are robbed of our liberty echoing through the land. It is plain to every unprejudiced man, they have not the least foundation. We enjoy at this day throughout these kingdoms such liberty, civil and religious, as no other kingdom or commonwealth in Europe, or in the world, enjoys; and such as our ancestors never enjoyed from the Conquest to the Revolution. Let us be thankful for it to God and the King! Let us not, by our vile unthankfulness, yea, our

denial that we enjoy it at all, provoke the King of kings to take it away. By one stroke, by taking to himself that Prince whom we know not how to value, He might change the scene, and put an end to our civil as well as religious liberty. Then would be seen who were patriots and who were not; who were real lovers of liberty and their country. The God of love remove that day far from us! Deal not with us according to our deservings; but let us know, at least in this our day, the things which make for our peace!

February 24, 1772.

THOUGHTS

CONCERNING THE ORIGIN OF POWER.

1. By power, I here mean supreme power, the power over life and death, and consequently over our liberty and property, and all things of an inferior nature.

2. In many nations this power has in all ages been lodged in a single person. This has been the case in almost the whole eastern world, from the earliest antiquity; as in the celebrated empires of Assyria, of Babylon, of Media, Persia, and many others. And so it remains to this day, from Constantinople to the farthest India. The same form of government obtained very early in very many parts of Afric, and remains in most of them still, as well as in the empires of Morocco and Abyssinia. The first adventurers to America found absolute monarchy established there also; the whole power being lodged in the Emperor of Mexico, and the Yncas of Peru. Nay, and many of the ancient nations of Europe were governed by single persons; as Spain, France, the Russias, and several other nations are at this day.

3. But in others, the power has been lodged in a few, chiefly the rich and noble. This kind of government, usually styled aristocracy, obtained in Greece and in Rome, after

many struggles with the people, during the later ages of the republic. And this is the government which at present subsists in various parts of Europe. In Venice indeed, as well as in Genoa, the supreme power is nominally lodged in one, namely, the Doge; but in fact, he is only a royal shade; it is really lodged in a few of the nobles.

4. Where the people have the supreme power, it is termed a democracy. This seems to have been the ancient form of government in several of the Grecian states. And so it was at Rome for some ages after the expulsion of the Kings. From the earliest authentic records, there is reason to believe it was for espousing the cause of the people, and defending their rights against the illegal encroachments of the nobles, that Marcus Coriolanus was driven into banishment, and Manlius Capitolinus, as well as Tiberius and Caius Gracchus, murdered. Perhaps formerly the popular government subsisted in several states. But it is scarce now to be found, being everywhere swallowed up either in monarchy or aristocracy.

5. But the grand question is, not in whom this power is lodged, but from whom it is ultimately derived. What is the origin of power? What is its primary source? This has been long a subject of debate. And it has been debated with the utmost warmth, by a variety of disputants. But as earnest as they have been on each side of the question, they have seldom come to any good conclusion; but have left the point undecided still, to be a ball of contention to the next generation.

6. But is it impossible, in the nature of things, to throw any light on this obscure subject? Let us make the experiment; let us (without pretending to dictate, but desiring every one to use his own judgment) try to find out some ground whereon to stand, and go as far as we can toward answering the question. And let not any man be angry on the account, suppose we should not exactly agree. Let every one enjoy his own opinion, and give others the same liberty.

7. Now, I cannot but acknowledge, I believe an old book, commonly called the Bible, to be true. Therefore I believe, "there is no power but from God: The powers that be are ordained of God." (Rom. xiii. 1.) There is no subordinate power in any nation, but what is derived from the supreme power therein. So in England the King, in the United Provinces the States are the fountain of all power. And there

is no supreme power, no power of the sword, of life and death, but what is derived from God, the Sovereign of all.

8. But have not the people, in every age and nation, the right of disposing of this power; of investing therewith whom they please, either one or more persons; and that, in what proportion they see good, and upon what conditions? Consequently, if those conditions are not observed, have they not a right to take away the power they gave? And does not this imply, that they are the judges whether those conditions are observed or not? Otherwise, if the receivers were judges of their own cause, this right would fall into nothing.

9. To prove this, that the people in every country are the source of power, it is argued thus: "All men living upon earth are naturally equal; none is above another; and all are naturally free, masters of their own actions. It manifestly follows, no man can have any power over another, unless by his own consent. The power therefore which the governors in any nation enjoy, must be originally derived from the people, and presupposes an original compact between them and their first governors."

10. This seems to be the opinion which is now generally espoused by men of understanding and education; and that (if I do not mistake) not in England alone, but almost in every civilized nation. And it is usually espoused with the fullest and strongest persuasion, as a truth little less than self-evident, as what is clear beyond all possibility of doubt, what commands the assent of all reasonable men. Hence if any man affected to deny it, he would in most companies be rather hooted at than argued with; it being so absurd to oppose what is confirmed by the general suffrage of mankind.

11. But still (suppose it to need no proof) it may need a little explaining; for every one does not understand the term. Some will ask, "Who are the people?" Are they every man, woman, and child? Why not? Is it not allowed, is it not affirmed, is it not our fundamental principle, our incontestable, self-evident axiom, that "all persons living upon earth are naturally equal; that all human creatures are naturally free; masters of their own actions; that none can have any power over others, but by their own consent?" Why then should not every man, woman, and child, have a voice in placing their governors; in fixing the measure of power to be entrusted with them, and the conditions on which it is entrusted? And [illegible]er

should not every one have a voice in displacing them too; seeing it is undeniable, they that gave the power have a right to take it away? Do not quibble or shuffle. Do not evade the question; but come close to the point. I ask, By what argument do you prove that women are not naturally as free as men? And, if they are, why have they not as good a right as we have to choose their own Governors? Who can have any power over free, rational creatures, but by their own consent? And are they not free by nature, as well as we? Are they not rational creatures?

12. But suppose we exclude women from using their natural right, by might overcoming right, by main strength, (for it is sure that we are stronger than they; I mean that we have stronger limbs, if we have not stronger reason,) what pretence have we for excluding men like ourselves, yea, thousands and tens of thousands, barely because they have not lived one-and-twenty years? "Why, they have not wisdom or experience to judge concerning the qualifications necessary for Governors." I answer, (1.) Who has? How many of the voters in Great Britain? one in twenty? one in an hundred? If you exclude all who have not this wisdom, you will leave few behind. But, (2.) Wisdom and experience are nothing to the purpose. You have put the matter upon another issue. Are they men? That is enough. Are they human creatures? Then they have a right to choose their own Governors; an indefeasible right; a right inherent, inseparable from human nature. "But in England, at least, they are excluded by law." But did they consent to the making of that law? If not, by your original supposition, it can have no power over them. I therefore utterly deny that we can, consistently with that supposition, debar either women or minors from choosing their own Governors.

13. But suppose we exclude these by main force, (which it is certain we are able to do, since though they have most votes they have least strength,) are all that remain, all men of full age, the people? Are all males, then, that have lived one-and-twenty years allowed to choose their own Governors? "Not at all; not in England, unless they are freeholders, unless they have forty shillings a year." Worse and worse. After depriving half the human species of their natural right for want of a beard; after depriving myriads more for want of a stiff beard, for not having lived one-and-twenty years;

you rob others (probably some hundred thousands) of their birthright for want of money! Yet not altogether on this account neither; if so, it might be more tolerable. But here is an Englishman who has money enough to buy the estates of fifty freeholders, and yet he must not be numbered among the people because he has not two or three acres of land! How is this? By what right do you exclude a man from being one of the people because he has not forty shillings a year; yea, or not a groat? Is he not a man, whether he be rich or poor? Has he not a soul and a body? Has he not the nature of a man; consequently, all the rights of a man, all that flow from human nature; and, among the rest, that of not being controlled by any but by his own consent.

14. "But he is excluded by law." By what law? by a law of his own making? Did he consent to the making of it? Before this law was passed, was his consent either obtained or asked? If not, what is that law to him? No man, you aver, has any power over another but by his own consent. Of consequence, a law made without his consent is, with regard to him, null and void. You cannot say otherwise without destroying the supposition, that none can be governed but by his own consent.

15. See, now, to what your argument comes. You affirm, all power is derived from the people; and presently excluded one half of the people from having any part or lot in the matter. At another stroke, suppose England to contain eight millions of people, you exclude one or two millions more. At a third, suppose two millions left, you exclude three-fourths of these. And the poor pittance that remains, by I know not what figure of speech, you call the people of England!

16. Hitherto we have endeavoured to view this point in the mere light of reason. And even by this means it manifestly appears that this supposition, which is so high in vogue, which is so generally received, nay, which has been palmed upon us with such confidence, as undeniable and self-evident, is not only false, not only contrary to reason, but contradictory to itself; the very men who are most positive that the people are the source of power, being brought into an inextricable difficulty, by that single question, "Who are the people?" reduced to a necessity of either giving up the point, or owning that by the people they mean scarce a tenth part of them.

17. But we need not rest the matter entirely on reasoning;

let us appeal to matter of fact. And because we cannot have so clear and certain a prospect of what is at too great a distance, whether of time or place, let us only take a view of what has been in our own country for six or seven hundred years. I ask, then, When and where did the people of England (even suppose by that word, *the people*, you mean only an hundred thousand of them) choose their own Governors? Did they choose, to go no farther, William the Conqueror? Did they choose King Stephen, or King John? As to those who regularly succeeded their fathers, it is plain the people are out of the question. Did they choose Henry the Fourth, Edward the Fourth, or Henry the Seventh? Who will be so hardy as to affirm it? Did the people of England, or but fifty thousand of them, choose Queen Mary, or Queen Elizabeth? To come nearer to our own times, did they choose King James the First? Perhaps you will say, "But if the people did not give King Charles the supreme power, at least they took it away from him. Surely, you will not deny this." Indeed I will; I deny it utterly. The people of England no more took away his power, than they cut off his head. "Yes, the Parliament did, and they are the people." No; the Parliament did not. The lower House, the House of Commons, is not the Parliament, any more than it is the nation. Neither were those who then sat the House of Commons; no; nor one quarter of them. But suppose they had been the whole House of Commons, yea, or the whole Parliament; by what rule of logic will you prove that seven or eight hundred persons are the people of England? "Why, they are the delegates of the people; they are chosen by them." No; not by one half, not by a quarter, not by a tenth part, of them. So that the people, in the only proper sense of the word, were innocent of the whole affair.

18. "But you will allow, the people gave the supreme power to King Charles the Second at the Restoration." I will allow no such thing; unless by *the people* you mean General Monk and fifteen thousand soldiers. "However, you will not deny that the people gave the power to King William at the Revolution." Nay, truly, I must deny this too. I cannot possibly allow it. Although I will not say that William the Third obtained the royal power as William the First did; although he did not claim it by right of conquest, which would have been an odious title; yet certain it is, that he

did not receive it by any act or deed of the people. Their consent was neither obtained nor asked; they were never consulted in the matter. It was not therefore the people that gave him the power; no, nor even the Parliament. It was the Convention, and none else. "Who were the Convention?" They were a few hundred Lords and gentlemen, who, observing the desperate state of public affairs, met together on that important occasion. So that still we have no single instance in above seven hundred years of the people of England's conveying the supreme power either to one or more persons.

19. Indeed I remember in all history, both ancient and modern, but one instance of supreme power conferred by the people; if we mean thereby, though not all the people, yet a great majority of them. This celebrated instance occurred at Naples, in the middle of the last century; where the people, properly speaking, that is, men, women, and children, claimed and exerted their natural right in favour of Thomas Aniello, (vulgarly called Masanello,) a young fisherman. But will any one say, he was the only Governor for these thousand years, who has had a proper right to the supreme power? I believe not; nor, I apprehend, does any one desire that the people should take the same steps in London.

20. So much both for reason and matter of fact. But one single consideration, if we dwell a little upon it, will bring the question to a short issue. It is allowed, no man can dispose of another's life but by his own consent. I add, No, nor with his consent; for no man has a right to dispose of his own life. The Creator of man has the sole right to take the life which he gave. Now, it is an indisputable truth, *Nihil dat quod non habet,* "none gives what he has not." It plainly follows, that no man can give to another a right which he never had himself; a right which only the Governor of the world has, even the wiser Heathens being judges; but which no man upon the face of the earth either has or can have. No man therefore can give the power of the sword, any such power as implies a right to take away life. Wherever it is, it must descend from God alone, the sole disposer of life and death.

21. The supposition, then, that the people are the origin of power, is every way indefensible. It is absolutely overturned by the very principle on which it is supposed to stand; namely, that a right of choosing his Governors belongs to

every partaker of human nature. If this be so, then it belongs to every individual of the human species; consequently, not to freeholders alone, but to all men; not to men only, but to women also; nor only to adult men and women, to those who have lived one-and-twenty years, but to those who have lived eighteen or twenty, as well as those who have lived threescore. But none did ever maintain this, nor probably ever will. Therefore this boasted principle falls to the ground, and the whole superstructure with it. So common sense brings us back to the grand truth, "There is no power but of God."

THOUGHTS

ON

THE PRESENT SCARCITY OF PROVISIONS.

MANY excellent things have been lately published concerning the present scarcity of provisions; and many causes have been assigned for it, by men of experience and reflection. But may it not be observed, there is something wanting still, in most of those publications? One writer assigns and insists on one cause, another on one or two more. But who assigns all the causes that manifestly concur to produce this melancholy effect? at the same time pointing out, how each particular cause affects the price of each particular sort of provision?

I would willingly offer to candid and benevolent men a few hints on this important subject; proposing a few questions, and subjoining to each what seems to be the plain and direct answer.

I. 1. I ask, First, Why are thousands of people starving, perishing for want, in every part of the nation? The fact I know; I have seen it with my eyes, in every corner of the land. I have known those who could only afford to eat a little coarse food once every other day. I have known one

in London (and one that a few years before had all the conveniencies of life) picking up from a dunghill stinking sprats, and carrying them home for herself and her children. I have known another gathering the bones which the dogs had left in the streets, and making broth of them, to prolong a wretched life! I have heard a third artlessly declare, "Indeed I was very faint, and so weak I could hardly walk, until my dog, finding nothing at home, went out, and brought in a good sort of bone, which I took out of his mouth, and made a pure dinner!" Such is the case at this day of multitudes of people, in a land flowing, as it were, with milk and honey! abounding with all the necessaries, the conveniencies, the superfluities of life!

Now, why is this? Why have all these nothing to eat? Because they have nothing to do. The plain reason why they have no meat is, because they have no work.

2. But why have they no work? Why are so many thousand people, in London, in Bristol, in Norwich, in every county, from one end of England to the other, utterly destitute of employment?

Because the persons that used to employ them cannot afford to do it any longer. Many that employed fifty men, now scarce employ ten; those that employed twenty, now employ one, or none at all. They cannot, as they have no vent for their goods; food being so dear, that the generality of people are hardly able to buy anything else.

3. But why is food so dear? To come to particulars: Why does bread-corn bear so high a price? To set aside partial causes, (which indeed, all put together, are little more than the fly upon the chariot-wheel,) the grand cause is, because such immense quantities of corn are continually consumed by distilling. Indeed, an eminent distiller near London, hearing this, warmly replied, "Nay, my partner and I generally distil but a thousand quarters a week." Perhaps so. And suppose five-and-twenty distillers, in and near the town, consume each only the same quantity: Here are five-and-twenty thousand quarters a week, that is, above twelve hundred and fifty thousand a year, consumed in and about London! Add the distillers throughout England, and have we not reason to believe, that (not a thirtieth or a twentieth part only, but) little less than half the wheat produced in the kingdom is every year consumed, not by so harmless a way

as throwing it into the sea, but by converting it into deadly poison; poison that naturally destroys not only the strength and life, but also the morals, of our countrymen?

It may be objected, "This cannot be. We know how much corn is distilled by the duty that is paid. And hereby it appears, that scarce three hundred thousand quarters a year are distilled throughout the kingdom." Do we know certainly, how much corn is distilled by the duty that is paid? Is it indisputable, that the full duty is paid for all the corn that is distilled? not to insist upon the multitude of private stills, which pay no duty at all. I have myself heard the servant of an eminent distiller occasionally aver, that for every gallon he distilled which paid duty, he distilled six which paid none. Yea, I have heard distillers themselves affirm, "We must do this, or we cannot live." It plainly follows, we cannot judge, from the duty that is paid, of the quantity of corn that is distilled.

"However, what is paid brings in a large revenue to the King." Is this an equivalent for the lives of his subjects? Would His Majesty sell an hundred thousand of his subjects yearly to Algiers for four hundred thousand pounds? Surely no. Will he then sell them for that sum, to be butchered by their own countrymen? "But otherwise the swine for the Navy cannot be fed." Not unless they are fed with human flesh! Not unless they are fatted with human blood! O, tell it not in Constantinople, that the English raise the royal revenue by selling the flesh and blood of their countrymen!

4. But why are oats so dear? Because there are four times as many horses kept (to speak within compass) for coaches and chaises in particular, as were a few years ago. Unless, therefore, four times the oats grew now that grew then, they cannot be at the same price. If only twice as much is produced, (which, perhaps, is near the truth,) the price will naturally be double to what it was.

And as the dearness of grain of one kind will always raise the price of another, so whatever causes the dearness of wheat and oats must raise the price of barley too. To account, therefore, for the dearness of this, we need only remember what has been observed above; although some particular causes may concur in producing the same effect.

5. Why are beef and mutton so dear? Because many

considerable farmers, particularly in the northern counties, who used to breed large numbers of sheep, or horned cattle, and very frequently both, now breed none at all: They no longer trouble themselves with either sheep, or cows, or oxen; as they can turn their land to far better account by breeding horses alone. Such is the demand, not only for coach and chaise horses, which are bought and destroyed in incredible numbers, but much more for bred horses, which are yearly exported by hundreds, yea, thousands, to France.

6. But why are pork, poultry, and eggs so dear? Because of the monopolizing of farms; perhaps as mischievous a monopoly as was ever introduced into these kingdoms. The land which was some years ago divided between ten or twenty little farmers, and enabled them comfortably to provide for their families, is now generally engrossed by one great farmer. One farms an estate of a thousand a year, which formerly maintained ten or twenty. Every one of these little farmers kept a few swine, with some quantity of poultry; and, having little money, was glad to send his bacon, or pork, or fowls and eggs to market continually. Hence the markets were plentifully served; and plenty created cheapness. But at present, the great, the gentlemen-farmers are above attending to these little things. They breed no poultry or swine, unless for their own use; consequently they send none to market. Hence it is not strange if two or three of these, living near a market-town, occasion such a scarcity of these things, by preventing the former supply, that the price of them is double or treble to what it was before. Hence, (to instance in a small article,) in the same town wherein, within my memory, eggs were sold six or eight a penny, they are now sold six or eight a groat.

Another cause (the most terrible one of all, and the most destructive both of personal and social happiness) why not only beef, mutton, and pork, but all kinds of victuals, are so dear, is luxury. What can stand against this? Will it not waste and destroy all that nature and art can produce? If a person of quality will boil down three dozen of neats' tongues, to make two or three quarts of soup, (and so proportionably in other things,) what wonder that provisions fail? Only look into the kitchens of the great, the nobility and gentry, almost without exception; (considering withal, that "the toe of the peasant treads upon the heel of the courtier;") and

when you have observed the amazing waste which is made there, you will no longer wonder at the scarcity, and consequently dearness, of the things which they use so much art to destroy.

7. But why is land so dear? Because, on all these accounts, gentlemen cannot live as they have been accustomed to do without increasing their income; which most of them cannot do, but by raising their rents. And then the farmer, paying an higher rent for the land, must have an higher price for the produce of it. This again tends to raise the price of land; and so the wheel runs round.

8. But why is it, that not only provisions and land, but well nigh everything else, is so dear? Because of the enormous taxes, which are laid on almost everything that can be named. Not only abundant taxes are raised from earth, and fire, and water; but, in England, the ingenious Statesmen have found a way to lay a tax upon the very light! Yet one element remains: And surely some man of honour will find a way to tax this also. For how long shall the saucy air strike a gentleman on the face, nay, a Lord, without paying for it?

9. But why are the taxes so high? Because of the national debt. They must be so while this continues. I have heard that the national expense, seventy years ago, was, in time of peace, three millions a year. And now the bare interest of the public debt amounts yearly to above four millions! to raise which, with the other stated expenses of government, those taxes are absolutely necessary.

To sum up the whole: Thousands of people throughout the land are perishing for want of food. This is owing to various causes; but above all, to distilling, taxes, and luxury.

Here is the evil, and the undeniable causes of it. But where is the remedy?

Perhaps it exceeds all the wisdom of man to tell: But it may not be amiss to offer a few hints on the subject.

II. 1. What remedy is there for this sore evil,—many thousand poor people are starving? Find them work, and you will find them meat. They will then earn and eat their own bread.

2. But how can the masters give them work without ruining themselves? Procure vent for what is wrought, and the masters will give them as much work as they can do. And this would be done by sinking the price of provisions; for then people would have money to buy other things too.

3. But how can the price of wheat and barley be reduced? By prohibiting for ever, by making a full end of that bane of health, that destroyer of strength, of life, and of virtue,—distilling. Perhaps this alone might go a great way toward answering the whole design. It is not improbable, it would speedily sink the price of corn, at least one part in three. If anything more were required, might not all starch be made of rice, and the importation of this, as well as of corn, be encouraged?

4. How can the price of oats be reduced? By reducing the number of horses. And may not this be effectually done, (without affecting the ploughman, the waggoner, or any of those who keep horses for common work,) (1.) By laying a tax of ten pounds on every horse exported to France, for which (notwithstanding an artful paragraph in a late public paper) there is as great a demand as ever? (2.) By laying an additional tax on gentlemen's carriages? Not so much on every wheel, (barefaced, shameless partiality!) but five pounds yearly upon every horse. And would not these two taxes alone supply near as much as is now paid for leave to poison His Majesty's liege subjects?

5. How can the price of beef and mutton be reduced? By increasing the breed of sheep and horned cattle. And this would soon be increased sevenfold, if the price of horses was reduced; which it surely would be, half in half, by the method above mentioned.

6. How can the price of pork and poultry be reduced? Whether it ever will, is another question. But it can be done, (1.) By letting no farms of above an hundred pounds a year: (2.) By repressing luxury; whether by laws, by example, or by both. I had almost said, by the grace of God; but to mention this has been long out of fashion.

7. How may the price of land be reduced? By all the methods above-named, as each tends to lessen the expense of housekeeping: But especially the last; by restraining luxury, which is the grand and general source of want.

8. How may the taxes be reduced? (1.) By discharging half the national debt, and so saving, by this single means, above two millions a year. (2.) By abolishing all useless pensions, as fast as those who now enjoy them die: Especially those ridiculous ones given to some hundreds of idle men, as Governors of forts or castles; which forts have answered no end for above these hundred years, unless to

shelter jackdaws and crows. Might not good part of a million more be saved in this very article?

But will this ever be done? I fear not: At least, we have no reason to hope for it shortly; for what good can we expect (suppose the Scriptures are true) for such a nation as this, where there is no fear of God, where there is such a deep, avowed, thorough contempt of all religion, as I never saw, never heard or read of, in any other nation, whether Christian, Mahometan, or Pagan? It seems as if God must shortly arise and maintain his own cause. But, if so, let us fall into the hands of God, and not into the hands of men.

LEWISHAM,
January 20, 1773.

THOUGHTS UPON SLAVERY.

[PUBLISHED IN THE YEAR 1774.]

I. 1. BY slavery, I mean domestic slavery, or that of a servant to a master. A late ingenious writer well observes, "The variety of forms in which slavery appears, makes it almost impossible to convey a just notion of it, by way of definition. There are, however, certain properties which have accompanied slavery in most places, whereby it is easily distinguished from that mild, domestic service which obtains in our country." *

2. Slavery imports an obligation of perpetual service, an obligation which only the consent of the master can dissolve. Neither in some countries can the master himself dissolve it, without the consent of Judges appointed by the law. It generally gives the master an arbitrary power of any correction, not affecting life or limb. Sometimes even these are exposed to his will, or protected only by a fine, or some slight punishment, too inconsiderable to restrain a master of an harsh temper. It creates an incapacity of acquiring anything, except for the master's benefit. It allows the master to alienate the slave, in the same manner as his cows

* See Mr. Hargrave's Plea for Somerset the Negro.

and horses. Lastly, it descends in its full extent from parent to child, even to the last generation.

3. The beginning of this may be dated from the remotest period of which we have an account in history. It commenced in the barbarous state of society, and in process of time spread into all nations. It prevailed particularly among the Jews, the Greeks, the Romans, and the ancient Germans; and was transmitted by them to the various kingdoms and states which arose out of the Roman Empire. But after Christianity prevailed, it gradually fell into decline in almost all parts of Europe. This great change began in Spain, about the end of the eighth century; and was become general in most other kingdoms of Europe, before the middle of the fourteenth.

4. From this time slavery was nearly extinct till the commencement of the sixteenth century, when the discovery of America, and of the western and eastern coasts of Africa, gave occasion to the revival of it. It took its rise from the Portuguese, who, to supply the Spaniards with men to cultivate their new possessions in America, procured Negroes from Africa, whom they sold for slaves to the American Spaniards. This began in the year 1508, when they imported the first Negroes into Hispaniola. In 1540, Charles the Fifth, then King of Spain, determined to put an end to Negro slavery; giving positive orders that all the Negro slaves in the Spanish dominions should be set free. And this was accordingly done by Lagasca, whom he sent and empowered to free them all, on condition of continuing to labour for their masters. But soon after Lagasca returned to Spain, slavery returned and flourished as before. Afterwards, other nations, as they acquired possessions in America, followed the examples of the Spaniards; and slavery has taken deep root in most of our American colonies.

II. Such is the nature of slavery; such the beginning of Negro slavery in America. But some may desire to know what kind of country it is from which the Negroes are brought; what sort of men, of what temper and behaviour are they in their own country; and in what manner they are generally procured, carried to, and treated in, America.

1. And, First, what kind of country is that from whence they are brought? Is it so remarkably horrid, dreary, and barren, that it is a kindness to deliver them out of it? I believe many have apprehended so; but it is an entire

mistake, if we may give credit to those who have lived many years therein, and could have no motive to misrepresent it.

2. That part of Africa whence the Negroes are brought, commonly known by the name of Guinea, extends along the coast, in the whole, between three and four thousand miles. From the river Senegal, seventeen degrees north of the line, to Cape Sierra-Leone, it contains seven hundred miles. Thence it runs eastward about fifteen hundred miles, including the Grain Coast, the Ivory Coast, the Gold Coast, and the Slave Coast, with the large kingdom of Benin. From thence it runs southward, about twelve hundred miles, and contains the kingdoms of Congo and Angola.

3. Concerning the first, the Senegal coast, Monsieur Brue, who lived there sixteen years, after describing its fruitfulness near the sea, says, "The farther you go from the sea, the more fruitful and well-improved is the country, abounding in pulse, Indian corn, and various fruits. Here are vast meadows, which feed large herds of great and small cattle; and the villages, which lie thick, show the country is well peopled." And again: "I was surprised to see the land so well cultivated: Scarce a spot lay unimproved; the low lands, divided by small canals, were all sowed with rice; the higher grounds were planted with Indian corn, and peas of different sorts. Their beef is excellent; poultry plenty, and very cheap, as are all the necessaries of life."

4. As to the Grain and Ivory Coast, we learn from eye-witnesses, that the soil is in general fertile, producing abundance of rice and roots. Indigo and cotton thrive without cultivation; fish is in great plenty; the flocks and herds are numerous, and the trees loaden with fruit.

5. The Gold Coast and Slave Coast, all who have seen it agree, is exceeding fruitful and pleasant, producing vast quantities of rice and other grain, plenty of fruit and roots, palm wine and oil, and fish in great abundance, with much tame and wild cattle. The very same account is given us of the soil and produce of the kingdoms of Benin, Congo, and Angola. From all which it appears, that Guinea, in general, is far from an horrid, dreary, barren country,—is one of the most fruitful, as well as the most pleasant, countries in the known world. It is said indeed to be unhealthy; and so it is to strangers, but perfectly healthy to the native inhabitants.

6. Such is the country from which the Negroes are brought.

We come next to inquire what sort of men they are, of what temper and behaviour, not in our plantations, but in their native country. And here likewise the surest way is to take our account from eye and ear witnesses. Now, those who have lived in the Senegal country observe, it is inhabited by three nations, the Jalofs, Fulis, and Mandingos. The King of the Jalofs has under him several Ministers, who assist in the exercise of justice. The Chief Justice goes in circuit through all his dominions, to hear complaints and determine controversies; and the Viceroy goes with him, to inspect the behaviour of the Alkadi, or Governor, of each village. The Fulis are governed by their chief men, who rule with much moderation. Few of them will drink anything stronger than water, being strict Mahometans. The Government is easy, because the people are of a quiet and good disposition, and so well instructed in what is right, that a man who wrongs another is the abomination of all. They desire no more land than they use, which they cultivate with great care and industry: If any of them are known to be made slaves by the white men, they all join to redeem them. They not only support all that are old, or blind, or lame among themselves, but have frequently supplied the necessities of the Mandingos, when they were distressed by famine.

7. "The Mandingos," says Monsieur Brue, "are rigid Mahometans, drinking neither wine nor brandy. They are industrious and laborious, keeping their ground well cultivated, and breeding a good stock of cattle. Every town has a Governor, and he appoints the labour of the people. The men work the ground designed for corn; the women and girls, the rice-ground. He afterwards divides the corn and rice among them; and decides all quarrels, if any arise. All the Mahometan Negroes constantly go to public prayers thrice a day; there being a Priest in every village, who regularly calls them together; and it is surprising to see the modesty, attention, and reverence which they observe during their worship. These three nations practise several trades; they have smiths, saddlers, potters, and weavers; and they are very ingenious at their several occupations. Their smiths not only make all the instruments of iron which they have occasion to use, but likewise work many things neatly in gold and silver. It is chiefly the women and children who weave fine cotton cloth, which they dye blue and black."

8. It was of these parts of Guinea that Monsieur Allanson, correspondent of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Paris, from 1749 to 1753, gives the following account, both as to the country and people :—"Which way soever I turned my eyes, I beheld a perfect image of pure nature: An agreeable solitude, bounded on every side by a charming landscape; the rural situation of cottages in the midst of trees; the ease and quietness of the Negroes, reclined under the shade of the spreading foliage, with the simplicity of their dress and manners: The whole revived in my mind the idea of our first parents, and I seemed to contemplate the world in its primitive state. They are, generally speaking, very good-natured, sociable, and obliging. I was not a little pleased with my very first reception; and it fully convinced me, that there ought to be a considerable abatement made in the accounts we have of the savage character of the Africans." He adds: "It is amazing that an illiterate people should reason so pertinently concerning the heavenly bodies. There is no doubt, but that, with proper instruments, they would become excellent astronomers."

9. The inhabitants of the Grain and Ivory Coast are represented by those that deal with them, as sensible, courteous, and the fairest traders on the coasts of Guinea. They rarely drink to excess; if any do, they are severely punished by the King's order. They are seldom troubled with war: If a difference happen between two nations, they commonly end the dispute amicably.

The inhabitants of the Gold and Slave Coast likewise, when they are not artfully incensed against each other, live in great union and friendship, being generally well-tempered, civil, tractable, and ready to help any that need it. In particular, the natives of the kingdom of Whidah are civil, kind, and obliging to strangers; and they are the most gentleman-like of all the Negroes, abounding in good manners toward each other. The inferiors pay the utmost respect to their superiors; so wives to their husbands, children to their parents. And they are remarkably industrious; all are constantly employed,—the men in agriculture, the women in spinning and weaving cotton.

10. The Gold and Slave Coasts are divided into several districts, some governed by Kings, others by the principal men, who take care each of their own town or village, and prevent or appease tumults. They punish murder and adultery severely;

very frequently with death. Theft and robbery are punished by a fine proportionable to the goods that were taken. All the natives of this coast, though Heathens, believe there is one God, the Author of them and all things. They appear likewise to have a confused apprehension of a future state. And, accordingly, every town and village has a place of public worship. It is remarkable that they have no beggars among them; such is the care of the chief men, in every city and village, to provide some easy labour even for the old and weak. Some are employed in blowing the smiths' bellows; others in pressing palm-oil; others in grinding of colours. If they are too weak even for this, they sell provisions in the market.

11. The natives of the kingdom of Benin are a reasonable and good-natured people. They are sincere and inoffensive, and do no injustice either to one another or to strangers. They are eminently civil and courteous: If you make them a present, they endeavour to repay it double; and if they are trusted till the ship returns the next year, they are sure honestly to pay the whole debt. Theft is punished among them, although not with the same severity as murder. If a man and woman of any quality are taken in adultery, they are certain to be put to death, and their bodies thrown on a dunghill, and left a prey to wild beasts. They are punctually just and honest in their dealings; and are also very charitable, the King and the great Lords taking care to employ all that are capable of any work. And those that are utterly helpless they keep for God's sake; so that here also are no beggars. The inhabitants of Congo and Angola are generally a quiet people. They discover a good understanding, and behave in a friendly manner to strangers, being of a mild temper and an affable carriage. Upon the whole, therefore, the Negroes who inhabit the coast of Africa, from the river Senegal to the southern bounds of Angola, are so far from being the stupid, senseless, brutish, lazy barbarians, the fierce, cruel, perfidious savages they have been described, that, on the contrary, they are represented, by them who have no motive to flatter them, as remarkably sensible, considering the few advantages they have for improving their understanding; as industrious to the highest degree, perhaps more so than any other natives of so warm a climate; as fair, just, and honest in all their dealings, unless where white men have taught them to be otherwise; and as far more mild, friendly, and kind to strangers, than any

of our forefathers were. *Our forefathers!* Where shall we find at this day, among the fair-faced natives of Europe, a nation generally practising the justice, mercy, and truth, which are found among these poor Africans? Suppose the preceding accounts are true, (which I see no reason or pretence to doubt of,) and we may leave England and France, to seek genuine honesty in Benin, Congo, or Angola.

III. We have now seen what kind of country it is from which the Negroes are brought; and what sort of men (even white men being the judges) they were in their own country. Inquire we, Thirdly, In what manner are they generally procured, carried to, and treated in, America.

1. First. In what manner are they procured? Part of them by fraud. Captains of ships, from time to time, have invited Negroes to come on board, and then carried them away. But far more have been procured by force. The Christians, landing upon their coasts, seized as many as they found, men, women, and children, and transported them to America. It was about 1551 that the English began trading to Guinea; at first, for gold and elephants' teeth; but soon after, for men. In 1556, Sir John Hawkins sailed with two ships to Cape Verd, where he sent eighty men on shore to catch Negroes. But the natives flying, they fell farther down, and there set the men on shore, "to burn their towns and take the inhabitants." But they met with such resistance, that they had seven men killed, and took but ten Negroes. So they went still farther down, till, having taken enough, they proceeded to the West Indies and sold them.

2. It was some time before the Europeans found a more compendious way of procuring African slaves, by prevailing upon them to make war upon each other, and to sell their prisoners. Till then they seldom had any wars; but were in general quiet and peaceable. But the white men first taught them drunkenness and avarice, and then hired them to sell one another. Nay, by this means, even their Kings are induced to sell their own subjects. So Mr. Moore, factor of the African Company in 1730, informs us: "When the King of Barsalli wants goods or brandy, he sends to the English Governor at James's Fort, who immediately sends a sloop. Against the time it arrives, he plunders some of his neighbours' towns, selling the people for the goods he wants. At other times he falls upon one of his own towns, and makes

bold to sell his own subjects." So Monsieur Brue says, "I wrote to the King," (not the same,) "if he had a sufficient number of slaves, I would treat with him. He seized three hundred of his own people, and sent word he was ready to deliver them for the goods." He adds: "Some of the natives are always ready" (when well paid) "to surprise and carry off their own countrymen. They come at night without noise, and if they find any lone cottage, surround it and carry off all the people." Barbot, another French factor, says, "Many of the slaves sold by the Negroes are prisoners of war, or taken in the incursions they make into their enemies' territories. Others are stolen. Abundance of little Blacks, of both sexes, are stolen away by their neighbours, when found abroad on the road, or in the woods, or else in the corn-fields, at the time of year when their parents keep them there all day to scare away the devouring birds." That their own parents sell them is utterly false: Whites, not Blacks, are without natural affection!

3. To set the manner wherein Negroes are procured in a yet stronger light, it will suffice to give an extract of "Two Voyages to Guinea" on this account. The first is taken verbatim from the original manuscript of the Surgeon's Journal:—

"Sestro, Dec. 29, 1724.—No trade to-day, though many traders came on board. They informed us, that the people are gone to war within land, and will bring prisoners enough in two or three days; in hopes of which we stay.

"The 30th.—No trade yet; but our traders came on board to-day, and informed us the people had burnt four towns; so that to-morrow we expect slaves off.

"The 31st.—Fair weather; but no trading yet. We see each night towns burning. But we hear many of the Sestro men are killed by the inland Negroes; so that we fear this war will be unsuccessful.

"The 2nd of January.—Last night we saw a prodigious fire break out about eleven o'clock, and this morning see the town of Sestro burned down to the ground." (It contained some hundred houses.) "So that we find their enemies are too hard for them at present, and consequently our trade spoiled here. Therefore about seven o'clock we weighed anchor, to proceed lower down."

4. The second extract, taken from the Journal of a Surgeon, who went from New York on the same trade, is as follows: "The commander of the vessel sent to acquaint the King,

that he wanted a cargo of slaves. The King promised to furnish him; and, in order to it, set out, designing to surprise some town, and make all the people prisoners. Some time after, the King sent him word, he had not yet met with the desired success; having attempted to break up two towns, but having been twice repulsed; but that he still hoped to procure the number of slaves. In this design he persisted, till he met his enemies in the field. A battle was fought, which lasted three days. And the engagement was so bloody, that four thousand five hundred men were slain upon the spot." Such is the manner wherein the Negroes are procured! Thus the Christians preach the Gospel to the Heathens!

5. Thus they are procured. But in what numbers and in what manner are they carried to America? Mr. Anderson, in his History of Trade and Commerce, observes: "England supplies her American colonies with Negro slaves, amounting in number to about an hundred thousand every year;" that is, so many are taken on board our ships; but at least ten thousand of them die in the voyage; about a fourth part more die at the different islands, in what is called the seasoning. So that at an average, in the passage and seasoning together, thirty thousand die; that is, properly, are murdered. O Earth, O Sea, cover not thou their blood!

6. When they are brought down to the shore in order to be sold, our Surgeons thoroughly examine them, and that quite naked, women and men, without any distinction; those that are approved are set on one side. In the mean time, a burning-iron, with the arms or name of the company, lies in the fire, with which they are marked on the breast. Before they are put into the ships, their masters strip them of all they have on their backs: So that they come on board stark naked, women as well as men. It is common for several hundred of them to be put on board one vessel, where they are stowed together in as little room as it is possible for them to be crowded. It is easy to suppose what a condition they must soon be in, between heat, thirst, and stench of various kinds. So that it is no wonder, so many should die in the passage; but rather, that any survive it.

7. When the vessels arrive at their destined port, the Negroes are again exposed naked to the eyes of all that flock together, and the examination of their purchasers. Then they are separated to the plantations of their several masters, to see

each other no more. Here you may see mothers hanging over their daughters, bedewing their naked breasts with tears, and daughters clinging to their parents, till the whipper soon obliges them to part. And what can be more wretched than the condition they then enter upon? Banished from their country, from their friends and relations for ever, from every comfort of life, they are reduced to a state scarce anyway preferable to that of beasts of burden. In general, a few roots, not of the nicest kind, usually yams or potatoes, are their food; and two rags, that neither screen them from the heat of the day, nor the cold of the night, their covering. Their sleep is very short, their labour continual, and frequently above their strength; so that death sets many of them at liberty before they have lived out half their days. The time they work in the West Indies, is from day-break to noon, and from two o'clock till dark; during which time, they are attended by overseers, who, if they think them dilatory, or think anything not so well done as it should be, whip them most unmercifully, so that you may see their bodies long after wealed and scarred usually from the shoulders to the waist. And before they are suffered to go to their quarters, they have commonly something to do, as collecting herbage for the horses, or gathering fuel for the boilers; so that it is often past twelve before they can get home. Hence, if their food is not prepared, they are sometimes called to labour again, before they can satisfy their hunger. And no excuse will avail. If they are not in the field immediately, they must expect to feel the lash. Did the Creator intend that the noblest creatures in the visible world should live such a life as this?

Are these thy glorious work, Parent of Good?

8. As to the punishments inflicted on them, says Sir Hans Sloane, "they frequently geld them, or chop off half a foot: After they are whipped till they are raw all over, some put pepper and salt upon them; some drop melted wax upon their skin; others cut off their ears, and constrain them to broil and eat them. For rebellion," (that is, asserting their native liberty, which they have as much right to as to the air they breathe,) "they fasten them down to the ground with crooked sticks on every limb, and then applying fire, by degrees, to the feet and hands, they burn them gradually upward to the head."

9. But will not the laws made in the plantations prevent or

redress all cruelty and oppression? We will take but a few of those laws for a specimen, and then let any man judge:—

In order to rivet the chain of slavery, the law of Virginia ordains: "That no slave shall be set free upon any pretence whatever, except for some meritorious services, to be adjudged and allowed by the Governor and Council; and that where any slave shall be set free by his owner, otherwise than is herein directed, the Churchwardens of the parish, wherein such Negro shall reside for the space of one month, are hereby authorized and required to take up and sell the said Negro by public outcry."

10. Will not these lawgivers take effectual care to prevent cruelty and oppression?

The law of Jamaica ordains: "Every slave that shall run away, and continue absent from his master twelve months, shall be deemed rebellious." And by another law, fifty pounds are allowed to those who kill or bring in alive a rebellious slave. So their law treats these poor men with as little ceremony and consideration, as if they were merely brute beasts! But the innocent blood which is shed in consequence of such a detestable law, must call for vengeance on the murderous abettors and actors of such deliberate wickedness.

11. But the law of Barbadoes exceeds even this: "If any Negro under punishment, by his master, or his order, for running away, or any other crime or misdemeanor, shall suffer in life or member, no person whatsoever shall be liable to any fine therefore. But if any man, of wantonness, or only of bloody-mindedness, or cruel intention, wilfully kill a Negro of his own," (now, observe the severe punishment!) "he shall pay into the public treasury fifteen pounds sterling! and not be liable to any other punishment or forfeiture for the same!"

Nearly allied to this is that law of Virginia: "After proclamation is issued against slaves that run away, it is lawful for any person whatsoever to kill and destroy such slaves, by such ways and means as he shall think fit."

We have seen already some of the ways and means which have been thought fit on such occasions; and many more might be mentioned. One gentleman, when I was abroad, thought fit to roast his slave alive! But if the most natural act of "running away" from intolerable tyranny, deserves such relentless severity, what punishment have these lawmakers to expect hereafter, on account of their own enormous offences?

IV. 1. This is the plain, unaggravated matter of fact. Such is the manner wherein our African slaves are procured; such the manner wherein they are removed from their native land, and wherein they are treated in our plantations. I would now inquire, whether these things can be defended, on the principles of even heathen honesty; whether they can be reconciled (setting the Bible out of the question) with any degree of either justice or mercy.

2. The grand plea is, "They are authorized by law." But can law, human law, change the nature of things? Can it turn darkness into light, or evil into good? By no means. Notwithstanding ten thousand laws, right is right, and wrong is wrong still. There must still remain an essential difference between justice and injustice, cruelty and mercy. So that I still ask, Who can reconcile this treatment of the Negroes, first and last, with either mercy or justice?

Where is the justice of inflicting the severest evils on those that have done us no wrong? of depriving those that never injured us in word or deed, of every comfort of life? of tearing them from their native country, and depriving them of liberty itself, to which an Angolan has the same natural right as an Englishman, and on which he sets as high a value? Yea, where is the justice of taking away the lives of innocent, inoffensive men; murdering thousands of them in their own land, by the hands of their own countrymen; many thousands, year after year, on shipboard, and then casting them like dung into the sea; and tens of thousands in that cruel slavery to which they are so unjustly reduced?

3. But waving, for the present, all other considerations, I strike at the root of this complicated villany; I absolutely deny all slave-holding to be consistent with any degree of natural justice.

I cannot place this in a clearer light than that great ornament of his profession, Judge Blackstone, has already done. Part of his words are as follows:—

"The three origins of the right of slavery assigned by Justinian, are all built upon false foundations: (1.) Slavery is said to arise from captivity in war. The conqueror having a right to the life of his captives, if he spares that, has then a right to deal with them as he pleases. But this is untrue, if taken generally,—that, by the laws of nations, a man has a right to kill his enemy. He has only a right to kill him in

particular cases, in cases of absolute necessity for self-defence. And it is plain, this absolute necessity did not subsist, since he did not kill him, but made him prisoner. War itself is justifiable only on principles of self-preservation: Therefore it gives us no right over prisoners, but to hinder their hurting us by confining them. Much less can it give a right to torture, or kill, or even to enslave an enemy when the war is over. Since therefore the right of making our prisoners slaves, depends on a supposed right of slaughter, that foundation failing, the consequence which is drawn from it must fail likewise.

"It is said, Secondly, slavery may begin by one man's selling himself to another. And it is true, a man may sell himself to work for another; but he cannot sell himself to be a slave, as above defined. Every sale implies an equivalent given to the seller, in lieu of what he transfers to the buyer. But what equivalent can be given for life or liberty? His property likewise, with the very price which he seems to receive, devolves *ipso facto* to his master, the instant he becomes his slave: In this case, therefore, the buyer gives nothing, and the seller receives nothing. Of what validity then can a sale be, which destroys the very principle upon which all sales are founded?

"We are told, Thirdly, that men may be born slaves, by being the children of slaves. But this, being built upon the two former rights, must fall together with them. If neither captivity nor contract can, by the plain law of nature and reason, reduce the parent to a state of slavery, much less can they reduce the offspring." It clearly follows, that all slavery is as irreconcilable to justice as to mercy.

4. That slave-holding is utterly inconsistent with mercy, is almost too plain to need a proof. Indeed, it is said, "that these Negroes being prisoners of war, our captains and factors buy them, merely to save them from being put to death. And is not this mercy?" I answer, (1.) Did Sir John Hawkins, and many others, seize upon men, women, and children, who were at peace in their own fields or houses, merely to save them from death? (2.) Was it to save them from death, that they knocked out the brains of those they could not bring away? (3.) Who occasioned and fomented those wars, wherein these poor creatures were taken prisoners? Who excited them by money, by drink, by every possible means, to fall upon one another? Was it not themselves?

They know in their own conscience it was, if they have any conscience left. But, (4.) To bring the matter to a short issue, can they say before God, that they ever took a single voyage, or bought a single Negro, from this motive? They cannot; they well know, to get money, not to save lives, was the whole and sole spring of their motions.

5. But if this manner of procuring and treating Negroes is not consistent either with mercy or justice, yet there is a plea for it which every man of business will acknowledge to be quite sufficient. Fifty years ago, one meeting an eminent Statesman in the lobby of the House of Commons, said, "You have been long talking about justice and equity. Pray which is this bill; equity or justice?" He answered very short and plain, "D—n justice; it is necessity." Here also the slave-holder fixes his foot; here he rests the strength of his cause. "If it is not quite right, yet it must be so; there is an absolute necessity for it. It is necessary we should procure slaves; and when we have procured them, it is necessary to use them with severity, considering their stupidity, stubbornness, and wickedness."

I answer, You stumble at the threshold; I deny that villany is ever necessary. It is impossible that it should ever be necessary for any reasonable creature to violate all the laws of justice, mercy, and truth. No circumstances can make it necessary for a man to burst in sunder all the ties of humanity. It can never be necessary for a rational being to sink himself below a brute. A man can be under no necessity of degrading himself into a wolf. The absurdity of the supposition is so glaring, that one would wonder any one can help seeing it.

6. This in general. But, to be more particular, I ask, First, What is necessary? and, Secondly, To what end? It may be answered, "The whole method now used by the original purchasers of Negroes is necessary to the furnishing our colonies yearly with a hundred thousand slaves." I grant, this is necessary to that end. But how is that end necessary? How will you prove it necessary that one hundred, that one, of those slaves should be procured? "Why, it is necessary to my gaining an hundred thousand pounds." Perhaps so: But how is this necessary? It is very possible you might be both a better and a happier man, if you had not a quarter of it. I deny that your gaining one thousand is necessary either to your present or eternal happiness. "But, however, you

must allow, these slaves are necessary for the cultivation of our islands; inasmuch as white men are not able to labour in hot climates." I answer, First, it were better that all those islands should remain uncultivated for ever; yea, it were more desirable that they were altogether sunk in the depth of the sea, than that they should be cultivated at so high a price as the violation of justice, mercy, and truth. But, Secondly, the supposition on which you ground your argument is false. For white men, even Englishmen, are well able to labour in hot climates; provided they are temperate both in meat and drink, and that they inure themselves to it by degrees. I speak no more than I know by experience. It appears from the thermometer, that the summer heat in Georgia is frequently equal to that in Barbadoes, yea, to that under the line. And yet I and my family (eight in number) did employ all our spare time there, in felling of trees and clearing of ground, as hard labour as any Negro need be employed in. The German family, likewise, forty in number, were employed in all manner of labour. And this was so far from impairing our health, that we all continued perfectly well, while the idle ones round about us were swept away as with a pestilence. It is not true, therefore, that white men are not able to labour, even in hot climates, full as well as black. But if they were not, it would be better that none should labour there, that the work should be left undone, than that myriads of innocent men should be murdered, and myriads more dragged into the basest slavery.

7. "But the furnishing us with slaves is necessary for the trade, and wealth, and glory of our nation." Here are several mistakes. For, First, wealth is not necessary to the glory of any nation; but wisdom, virtue, justice, mercy, generosity, public spirit, love of our country. These are necessary to the real glory of a nation; but abundance of wealth is not. Men of understanding allow that the glory of England was full as high in Queen Elizabeth's time as it is now; although our riches and trade were then as much smaller, as our virtue was greater. But, Secondly, it is not clear that we should have either less money or trade, (only less of that detestable trade of man-stealing,) if there was not a Negro in all our islands, or in all English America. It is demonstrable, white men, inured to it by degrees, can work as well as them; and they would do it, were Negroes out of the way, and proper encouragement given them. However, Thirdly, I come back to the same point:

Better no trade, than trade procured by villany. It is far better to have no wealth, than to gain wealth at the expense of virtue. Better is honest poverty, than all the riches bought by the tears, and sweat, and blood, of our fellow-creatures.

8. "However this be, it is necessary, when we have slaves, to use them with severity." What, to whip them for every petty offence, till they are all in gore blood? to take that opportunity of rubbing pepper and salt into their raw flesh? to drop burning sealing-wax upon their skin? to castrate them? to cut off half their foot with an axe? to hang them on gibbets, that they may die by inches, with heat, and hunger, and thirst? to pin them down to the ground, and then burn them by degrees, from the feet to the head? to roast them alive? When did a Turk or a Heathen find it necessary to use a fellow-creature thus?

I pray, to what end is this usage necessary? "Why, to prevent their running away; and to keep them constantly to their labour, that they may not idle away their time: So miserably stupid is this race of men, yea, so stubborn, and so wicked." Allowing them to be as stupid as you say, to whom is that stupidity owing? Without question, it lies altogether at the door of their inhuman masters; who give them no means, no opportunity, of improving their understanding; and, indeed, leave them no motive, either from hope or fear, to attempt any such thing. They were no way remarkable for stupidity while they remained in their own country: The inhabitants of Africa, where they have equal motives and equal means of improvement, are not inferior to the inhabitants of Europe; to some of them they are greatly superior. Impartially survey, in their own country, the natives of Benin, and the natives of Lapland; compare (setting prejudice aside) the Samoeids and the Angolans; and on which side does the advantage lie, in point of understanding? Certainly the African is in no respect inferior to the European. Their stupidity, therefore, in our plantations is not natural; otherwise than it is the natural effect of their condition. Consequently, it is not their fault, but yours: You must answer for it, before God and man.

9. "But their stupidity is not the only reason of our treating them with severity. For it is hard to say, which is the greatest, this, or their stubbornness and wickedness." It may be so: But do not these, as well as the other, lie at your door? Are not stubbornness, cunning, pilfering, and divers other vices,

the natural, necessary fruits of slavery? Is not this an observation which has been made in every age and nation? And what means have you used to remove this stubbornness? Have you tried what mildness and gentleness would do? I knew one that did; that had prudence and patience to make the experiment; Mr. Hugh Bryan, who then lived on the borders of South Carolina. And what was the effect? Why, that all his Negroes (and he had no small number of them) loved and reverenced him as a father, and cheerfully obeyed him out of love. Yea, they were more afraid of a frown from him, than of many blows from an overseer. And what pains have you taken, what method have you used, to reclaim them from their wickedness? Have you carefully taught them, that there is a God, a wise, powerful, merciful Being, the Creator and Governor of heaven and earth? that he has appointed a day wherein he will judge the world, will take an account of all our thoughts, words, and actions? that in that day he will reward every child of man according to his works? that then the righteous shall inherit the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world; and the wicked shall be cast into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels? If you have not done this, if you have taken no pains or thought about the matter, can you wonder at their wickedness? What wonder, if they should cut your throat? And if they did, whom could you thank for it but yourself? You first acted the villain in making them slaves, whether you stole them or bought them. You kept them stupid and wicked, by cutting them off from all opportunities of improving either in knowledge or virtue: And now you assign their want of wisdom and goodness as the reason for using them worse than brute beasts!

V. 1. It remains only to make a little application of the preceding observations. But to whom should that application be made? That may bear a question. Should we address ourselves to the public at large? What effect can this have? It may inflame the world against the guilty, but is not likely to remove that guilt. Should we appeal to the English nation in general? This also is striking wide; and is never likely to procure any redress for the sore evil we complain of. As little would it in all probability avail, to apply to the Parliament. So many things, which seem of greater importance, lie before them, that they are not likely to attend to this. I therefore

add a few words to those who are more immediately concerned, whether captains, merchants, or planters.

2. And, First, to the captains employed in this trade. Most of you know the country of Guinea; several parts of it, at least, between the river Senegal and the kingdom of Angola. Perhaps, now, by your means part of it is become a dreary, uncultivated wilderness, the inhabitants being all murdered or carried away, so that there are none left to till the ground. But you well know how populous, how fruitful, how pleasant it was a few years ago. You know, the people were not stupid, not wanting in sense, considering the few means of improvement they enjoyed. Neither did you find them savage, fierce, cruel, treacherous, or unkind to strangers. On the contrary, they were, in most parts, a sensible and ingenious people. They were kind and friendly, courteous and obliging, and remarkably fair and just in their dealings. Such are the men whom you hire their own countrymen to tear away from this lovely country; part by stealth, part by force, part made captives in those wars which you raise or foment on purpose. You have seen them torn away,—children from their parents, parents from their children; husbands from their wives, wives from their beloved husbands, brethren and sisters from each other. You have dragged them who had never done you any wrong, perhaps in chains, from their native shore. You have forced them into your ships like an herd of swine,—them who had souls immortal as your own; only some of them leaped into the sea, and resolutely stayed under water, till they could suffer no more from you. You have stowed them together as close as ever they could lie, without any regard either to decency or convenience. And when many of them had been poisoned by foul air, or had sunk under various hardships, you have seen their remains delivered to the deep, till the sea should give up his dead. You have carried the survivors into the vilest slavery, never to end but with life; such slavery as is not found among the Turks at Algiers, no, nor among the Heathens in America.

3. May I speak plainly to you? I must. Love constrains me; love to you, as well as to those you are concerned with.

Is there a God? You know there is. Is he a just God? Then there must be a state of retribution; a state wherein the just God will reward every man according to his

works. Then what reward will he render to you? O think betimes! before you drop into eternity! Think now, "He shall have judgment without mercy that showed no mercy."

Are you a man? Then you should have an human heart. But have you indeed? What is your heart made of? Is there no such principle as compassion there? Do you never feel another's pain? Have you no sympathy, no sense of human woe, no pity for the miserable? When you saw the flowing eyes, the heaving breasts, or the bleeding sides and tortured limbs of your fellow-creatures, was you a stone, or a brute? Did you look upon them with the eyes of a tiger? When you squeezed the agonizing creatures down in the ship, or when you threw their poor mangled remains into the sea, had you no relenting? Did not one tear drop from your eye, one sigh escape from your breast? Do you feel no relenting now? If you do not, you must go on, till the measure of your iniquities is full. Then will the great God deal with you as you have dealt with them, and require all their blood at your hands. And at "that day it shall be more tolerable for Sodom and Gomorrah than for you!" But if your heart does relent, though in a small degree, know it is a call from the God of love. And "to-day, if you will hear his voice, harden not your heart." To-day resolve, God being your helper, to escape for your life. Regard not money! All that a man hath will he give for his life! Whatever you lose, lose not your soul: Nothing can countervail that loss. Immediately quit the horrid trade: At all events, be an honest man.

4. This equally concerns every merchant who is engaged in the slave-trade. It is you that induce the African villain to sell his countrymen; and in order thereto, to steal, rob, murder men, women, and children without number, by enabling the English villain to pay him for so doing, whom you overpay for his execrable labour. It is your money that is the spring of all, that empowers him to go on: So that whatever he or the African does in this matter is all your act and deed. And is your conscience quite reconciled to this? Does it never reproach you at all? Has gold entirely blinded your eyes, and stupified your heart? Can you see, can you feel, no harm therein? Is it doing as you would be done to? Make the case your own. "Master," said a slave at Liverpool to the merchant that owned him, "what, if some of my countrymen were to come

here, and take away my mistress, and Master Tommy, and Master Billy, and carry them into our country, and make them slaves, how would you like it?" His answer was worthy of a man: "I will never buy a slave more while I live." O let his resolution be yours! Have no more any part in this detestable business. Instantly leave it to those unfeeling wretches who

Laugh at human nature and compassion!

Be you a man, not a wolf, a devourer of the human species! Be merciful, that you may obtain mercy!

5. And this equally concerns every gentleman that has an estate in our American plantations; yea, all slave-holders, of whatever rank and degree; seeing men-buyers are exactly on a level with men-stealers. Indeed you say, "I pay honestly for my goods; and I am not concerned to know how they are come by." Nay, but you are; you are deeply concerned to know they are honestly come by. Otherwise you are a partaker with a thief, and are not a jot honester than him. But you know they are not honestly come by; you know they are procured by means nothing near so innocent as picking of pockets, house-breaking, or robbery upon the highway. You know they are procured by a deliberate series of more complicated villany (of fraud, robbery, and murder) than was ever practised either by Mahometans or Pagans; in particular, by murders, of all kinds; by the blood of the innocent poured upon the ground like water. Now, it is your money that pays the merchant, and through him the captain and the African butchers. You therefore are guilty, yea, principally guilty, of all these frauds, robberies, and murders. You are the spring that puts all the rest in motion; they would not stir a step without you; therefore, the blood of all these wretches who die before their time, whether in their country or elsewhere, lies upon your head. "The blood of thy brother" (for, whether thou wilt believe it or no, such he is in the sight of Him that made him) "crieth against thee from the earth," from the ship, and from the waters. O, whatever it costs, put a stop to its cry before it be too late: Instantly, at any price, were it the half of your goods, deliver thyself from blood-guiltiness! Thy hands, thy bed, thy furniture, thy house, thy lands, are at present stained with blood. Surely it is enough; accumulate no more guilt; spill no more the blood of the innocent! Do not hire another to shed blood; do not pay

him for doing it! Whether you are a Christian or no, show yourself a man! Be not more savage than a lion or a bear!

6. Perhaps you will say, "I do not buy any Negroes; I only use those left me by my father." So far is well; but is it enough to satisfy your own conscience? Had your father, have you, has any man living, a right to use another as a slave? It cannot be, even setting Revelation aside. It cannot be, that either war, or contract, can give any man such a property in another as he has in his sheep and oxen. Much less is it possible, that any child of man should ever be born a slave. Liberty is the right of every human creature, as soon as he breathes the vital air; and no human law can deprive him of that right which he derives from the law of nature.

If, therefore, you have any regard to justice, (to say nothing of mercy, nor the revealed law of God,) render unto all their due. Give liberty to whom liberty is due, that is, to every child of man, to every partaker of human nature. Let none serve you but by his own act and deed, by his own voluntary choice. Away with all whips, all chains, all compulsion! Be gentle toward all men; and see that you invariably do unto every one as you would he should do unto you.

7. O thou God of love, thou who art loving to every man, and whose mercy is over all thy works; thou who art the Father of the spirits of all flesh, and who art rich in mercy unto all; thou who hast mingled of one blood all the nations upon earth; have compassion upon these outcasts of men, who are trodden down as dung upon the earth! Arise, and help these that have no helper, whose blood is spilt upon the ground like water! Are not these also the work of thine own hands, the purchase of thy Son's blood? Stir them up to cry unto thee in the land of their captivity; and let their complaint come up before thee; let it enter into thy ears! Make even those that lead them away captive to pity them, and turn their captivity as the rivers in the south. O burst thou all their chains in sunder; more especially the chains of their sins! Thou Saviour of all, make them free, that they may be free indeed!

The servile progeny of Ham
  Seize as the purchase of thy blood!
Let all the Heathens know thy name:
  From idols to the living God
The dark Americans convert,
And shine in every pagan heart!

A

CALM ADDRESS

TO

OUR AMERICAN COLONIES.

Ne, pueri, ne tanta animis assuescite bella,
*Neu patriæ validas in viscera vertite vires.**—VIRGIL.

[PRINTED IN THE YEAR 1775.]

TO THE READER.

I WAS of a different judgment on this head, till I read a tract entitled, "Taxation no Tyranny." But as soon as I received more light myself, I judged it my duty to impart it to others. I therefore extracted the chief arguments from that treatise, and added an application to those whom it most concerns. I was well aware of the treatment this would bring upon myself; but let it be, so I may in any degree serve my King and country.

A late tract, wrote in answer to this, is wrote in just such a spirit as I expected. It is strewed over with such flowers as these: "Contemptible sophistry! Fallacious to the last degree! Childish quirks! Pitiful sophisms!" with strong assertions, repeated over and over, and with florid quotations. But all the arguments which are produced therein, may be contained in a nut-shell.

The writer† asserts twenty times, "He that is taxed without

* Thus translated by Pitt:—

"O check your wrath, my sons; the nations spare;
And save your country from the woes of war;
Nor in her sacred breast, with rage abhorr'd,
So fiercely plunge her own victorious sword!"—EDIT.

† Or writers. For I am informed by a correspondent in Bristol, that this letter was wrote by two Anabaptist Ministers, assisted by a gentleman and a tradesman of the Church of England.

his own consent, that is, without being represented, is a slave." I answer, No; I have no representative in Parliament; but I am taxed; yet I am no slave. Yea, nine in ten throughout England have no representative, no vote; yet they are no slaves; they enjoy both civil and religious liberty to the utmost extent.

He replies, "But they may have votes if they will; they may purchase freeholds." What! Can every man in England purchase a freehold? No, not one in an hundred. But, be that as it may, they have no vote now; yet they are no slaves, they are the freest men in the whole world.

"Who then is a slave?" Look into America, and you may easily see. See that Negro, fainting under the load, bleeding under the lash! He is a slave. And is there "no difference" between him and his master? Yes; the one is screaming, "Murder! Slavery!" the other silently bleeds and dies!

"But wherein then consists the difference between liberty and slavery?" Herein: You and I, and the English in general, go where we will, and enjoy the fruit of our labours: This is liberty. The Negro does not: This is slavery.

Is not then all this outcry about liberty and slavery mere rant, and playing upon words?

This is a specimen of this writer's arguments. Let us just touch upon his quotations:—

"All the inhabitants of England," says the fanciful Montesquieu, as one terms him, "have a right of voting at the election of a representative, except such as are so mean, as to be deemed to have no will of their own!" Nay, if all have a right to vote that have a will of their own, certainly this right belongs to every man, woman, and child in England.

One quotation more: "Judge Blackstone says, 'In a free state, every man who is supposed to be a free agent ought to be in some measure his own governor.' Therefore, one branch, at least, of the legislative power should reside in the whole body of the people." But who are the whole body of the people? According to him, every free agent. Then the argument proves too much. For are not women free agents? Yea, and poor as well as rich men. According to this argument, there is no free state under the sun.

The book which this writer says I so strongly recommend, I never yet saw with my eyes. And the words which he says

I spoke, never came out of my lips. But I really believe, he was told so.

I now speak according to the light I have. But if any one will give me more light, I will be thankful.

Brethren and Countrymen,

1. The grand question which is now debated, (and with warmth enough on both sides,) is this, Has the English Parliament a right to tax the American colonies?

In order to determine this, let us consider the nature of our colonies. An English colony is, a number of persons to whom the King grants a charter, permitting them to settle in some far country as a corporation, enjoying such powers as the charter grants, to be administered in such a manner as the charter prescribes. As a corporation they make laws for themselves; but as a corporation subsisting by a grant from higher authority, to the control of that authority they still continue subject.

Considering this, nothing can be more plain, than that the supreme power in England has a legal right of laying any tax upon them for any end beneficial to the whole empire.

2. But you object, "It is the privilege of a freeman and an Englishman to be taxed only by his own consent. And this consent is given for every man by his representatives in Parliament. But we have no representatives in Parliament. Therefore we ought not to be taxed thereby."

I answer, This argument proves too much. If the Parliament cannot tax you because you have no representation therein, for the same reason it can make no laws to bind you. If a freeman cannot be taxed without his own consent, neither can he be punished without it; for whatever holds with regard to taxation, holds with regard to all other laws. Therefore he who denies the English Parliament the power of taxation, denies it the right of making any laws at all. But this power over the colonies you have never disputed; you have always admitted statutes for the punishment of offences, and for the preventing or redressing of inconveniences; and the reception of any law draws after it, by a chain which cannot be broken, the necessity of admitting taxation.

3. But I object to the very foundation of your plea: That "every freeman is governed by laws to which he has consented:"

As confidently as it has been asserted, it is absolutely false. In wide-extended dominions, a very small part of the people are concerned in making laws. This, as all public business, must be done by delegation; the delegates are chosen by a select number. And those that are not electors, who are far the greater part, stand by, idle and helpless spectators.

The case of electors is little better. When they are near equally divided, in the choice of their delegates to represent them in the Parliament or National Assembly, almost half of them must be governed, not only without, but even against, their own consent.

And how has any man consented to those laws which were made before he was born? Our consent to these, nay, and to the laws now made even in England, is purely passive. And in every place, as all men are born the subjects of some state or other, so they are born, passively, as it were, consenting to the laws of that state. Any other than this kind of consent, the condition of civil life does not allow.

4. But you say, you "are entitled to life, liberty, and property by nature; and that you have never ceded to any sovereign power the right to dispose of these without your consent."

While you speak as the naked sons of nature, this is certainly true. But you presently declare, "Our ancestors, at the time they settled these colonies, were entitled to all the rights of natural-born subjects within the realm of England." This likewise is true; but when this is granted, the boast of original rights is at an end. You are no longer in a state of nature, but sink down into colonists, governed by a charter. If your ancestors were subjects, they acknowledged a Sovereign; if they had a right to English privileges, they were accountable to English laws, and had ceded to the King and Parliament the power of disposing, without their consent, of both their lives, liberties, and properties. And did the Parliament cede to them a dispensation from the obedience which they owe as natural subjects? or any degree of independence, not enjoyed by other Englishmen?

5. "They did not" indeed, as you observe, "by emigration forfeit any of those privileges; but they were, and their descendants now are, entitled to all such as their circumstances enable them to enjoy."

That they who form a colony by a lawful charter, forfeit no

privilege thereby, is certain. But what they do not forfeit by any judicial sentence, they may lose by natural effects. When a man voluntarily comes into America, he may lose what he had when in Europe. Perhaps he had a right to vote for a knight or burgess; by crossing the sea he did not forfeit this right. But it is plain, he has made the exercise of it no longer possible. He has reduced himself from a voter to one of the innumerable multitude that have no votes.

6. But you say, "As the colonies are not represented in the British Parliament, they are entitled to a free power of legislation. For they inherit all the right which their ancestors had of enjoying all the privileges of Englishmen."

They do inherit all the privileges which their ancestors had; but they can inherit no more. Their ancestors left a country where the representatives of the people were elected by men particularly qualified, and where those who wanted that qualification were bound by the decisions of men whom they had not deputed. You are the descendants of men who either had no votes, or resigned them by emigration. You have therefore exactly what your ancestors left you; not a vote in making laws, nor in choosing legislators; but the happiness of being protected by laws, and the duty of obeying them.

What your ancestors did not bring with them, neither they nor their descendants have acquired. They have not, by abandoning their right in one legislature, acquired a right to constitute another; any more than the multitudes in England who have no vote, have a right to erect a Parliament for themselves.

7. However, the "colonies have a right to all the privileges granted them by royal charters, or secured to them by provincial laws."

The first clause is allowed: They have certainly a right to all the privileges granted them by royal charters; provided those privileges be consistent with the British constitution. But as to the second there is a doubt: Provincial laws may grant privileges to individuals of the province; but surely no province can confer provincial privileges on itself! They have a right to all which the King has given them; but not to all which they have given themselves.

A corporation can no more assume to itself privileges which it had not before, than a man can, by his own act and deed, assume titles or dignities. The legislature of a colony may be compared to the vestry of a large parish, which may lay a

cess on its inhabitants, but still regulated by the law, and which, whatever be its internal expenses, is still liable to taxes laid by superior authority.

8. But whereas I formerly allowed, "If there is, in the charter of any colony, a clause exempting them from taxes for ever, then they have a right to be so exempted;" I allowed too much. For to say, that the King can grant an exemption from the power of Parliament, is saying in other words, that one branch of the legislature can grant away the power of the others. This is so far from being true, that if there is, in the charter of any colony, a clause exempting them from taxes for ever, yet, unless it were confirmed by an act of the whole Legislature, that clause is void in itself. The King (to use the phrase of the law) was "deceived in his grant," as having given that which he had no right to bestow.

Of all these charters, then, it may be said, either they do contain such a clause, or they do not. If they do not, the plea of charter-exemption drops. If they do, although the charter itself stands good, yet that clause of it is null and void, as being contrary to the principles of the British Constitution.

9. Give me leave to add a few words on this head: The following acts show clearly, that, from the Restoration, the colonies were considered as part of the realm of England, in point of taxation, as well as everything else:—

25th Charles II., chap. 7, expressly relates to the colonies, and lays several specific duties on commodities exported from the plantations.

9th Anne, chap. 10, orders a revenue to be raised in America from the post-office.

9th Anne, chap. 27, lays a duty on several goods imported into America.

3d George II., chap. 28, lays a duty on all rice exported from Carolina to the South of Cape Finisterre.

8th George II., chap. 19, extends the same to Georgia.

6th George II., chap. 13, lays several duties on rum, sugar, and molasses imported into North-America.

10. All that impartially consider what has been observed, must readily allow that the English Parliament has an undoubted right to tax all the English colonies.

But whence then is all this hurry and tumult? Why is America all in an uproar? If you can yet give yourselves time to think, you will see the plain case is this:—

A few years ago, you were assaulted by enemies, whom you were not well able to resist. You represented this to your mother-country, and desired her assistance. You was largely assisted, and by that means wholly delivered from all your enemies.

After a time, your mother-country, desiring to be re-imbursed for some part of the large expense she had been at, laid a small tax (which she had always a right to do) on one of her colonies.

But how is it possible, that the taking this reasonable and legal step should have set all America in a flame?

I will tell you my opinion freely; and perhaps you will not think it improbable. I speak the more freely, because I am unbiassed; I have nothing to hope or fear from either side. I gain nothing either by the Government or by the Americans, and probably never shall. And I have no prejudice to any man in America: I love you as my brethren and countrymen.

11. My opinion is this: We have a few men in England who are determined enemies to monarchy. Whether they hate His present Majesty on any other ground than because he is a King, I know not. But they cordially hate his office, and have for some years been undermining it with all diligence, in hopes of erecting their grand idol, their dear commonwealth, upon its ruins. I believe they have let very few into their design; (although many forward it, without knowing anything of the matter;) but they are steadily pursuing it, as by various other means, so in particular by inflammatory papers, which are industriously and continually dispersed throughout the town and country; by this method they have already wrought thousands of the people even to the pitch of madness. By the same, only varied according to your circumstances, they have likewise inflamed America. I make no doubt but these very men are the original cause of the present breach between England and her colonies. And they are still pouring oil into the flame, studiously incensing each against the other, and opposing, under a variety of pretences, all measures of accommodation. So that, although the Americans in general love the English, and the English in general love the Americans, (all, I mean, that are not yet cheated and exasperated by these artful men,) yet the rupture is growing wider every day, and none can tell where it will end.

These good men hope it will end in the total defection of North-America from England. If this were effected, they trust the English in general would be so irreconcilably disgusted, that they should be able, with or without foreign assistance, entirely to overturn the Government; especially while the main of both the English and Irish forces are at so convenient a distance.

12. But, my brethren, would this be any advantage to you? Can you hope for a more desirable form of government, either in England or America, than that which you now enjoy? After all the vehement cry for liberty, what more liberty can you have? What more religious liberty can you desire, than that which you enjoy already? May not every one among you worship God according to his own conscience? What civil liberty can you desire, which you are not already possessed of? Do not you sit, without restraint, "every man under his own vine?" Do you not, every one, high or low, enjoy the fruit of your labour? This is real, rational liberty, such as is enjoyed by Englishmen alone; and not by any other people in the habitable world. Would the being independent of England make you more free? Far, very far from it. It would hardly be possible for you to steer clear, between anarchy and tyranny. But suppose, after numberless dangers and mischiefs, you should settle into one or more republics, would a republican government give you more liberty, either religious or civil? By no means. No governments under heaven are so despotic as the republican; no subjects are governed in so arbitrary a manner as those of a commonwealth. If any one doubt of this, let him look at the subjects of Venice, of Genoa, or even of Holland. Should any man talk or write of the Dutch Government, as every cobbler does of the English, he would be laid in irons before he knew where he was. And then, woe be to him! Republics show no mercy.

13. "But if we submit to one tax, more will follow." Perhaps so, and perhaps not. But if they did; if you were taxed (which is quite improbable) equal with Ireland or Scotland, still, were you to prevent this, by renouncing connexion with England, the remedy would be worse than the disease. For O! what convulsions must poor America feel, before any other Government was settled? Innumerable mischiefs must ensue, before any general form could be established. And

the grand mischief would ensue when it was established; when you had received a yoke which you could not shake off.

14. Brethren, open your eyes! Come to yourselves! Be no longer the dupes of designing men! I do not mean any of your countrymen in America; I doubt whether any of these are in the secret. The designing men, the Ahithophels, are in England; those who have laid their scheme so deep, and covered it so well, that thousands, who are ripening it, suspect nothing at all of the matter. These well-meaning men, sincerely believing that they are serving their country, exclaim against grievances, which either never existed, or are aggravated above measure; and thereby inflame the people more and more, to the wish of those who are behind the scene. But be not you duped any longer; do not ruin yourselves for them that owe you no good-will, that now employ you only for their own purposes, and in the end will give you no thanks. They love neither England nor America, but play one against the other, in subserviency to their grand design of overturning the English Government. Be warned in time; stand and consider, before it is too late; before you have entailed confusion and misery on your latest posterity. Have pity upon your mother-country! Have pity upon your own! Have pity upon yourselves, upon your children, and upon all that are near and dear to you! Let us not bite and devour one another, lest we be consumed one of another! O let us follow after peace! Let us put away our sins! the real ground of all our calamities; which never will or can be thoroughly removed, till we fear God and honour the King!

A Sermon preached by Dr. Smith, in Philadelphia, has been lately reprinted in England. It has been much admired, but proceeds all along upon wrong suppositions. These are confuted in the preceding tract; yet I would just touch upon them again.

Dr. Smith supposes, 1. They have a right of granting their own money; that is, of being exempt from taxation by the supreme power. If they "contend for" this, they contend for neither more nor less than independency. Why then do they talk of their "rightful Sovereign?" They acknowledge no Sovereign at all.

That they contend for "the cause of liberty," is another mistaken supposition. What liberty do you want, either civil or religious? You had the very same liberty we have in England. I say you *had;* but you have now thrown away the substance, and retain only the shadow. You have no liberty, civil or religious, now, but what the Congress pleases to allow.

But you justly suppose, "We are by a plain original contract entitled to a community of privileges, with our brethren that reside in England, in every civil and religious respect." (Page 19.) Most true. And till you appointed your new sovereigns, you enjoyed all those privileges. Indeed you had no vote for members of Parliament; neither have I, because I have no freehold in England. Yet the being taxed by the Parliament is no infringement either of my civil or religious liberty. And why have you no representatives in Parliament? Did you ever desire them?

But you say again, "No power on earth has a right to grant our property without our consent." (Page 22.)

Then you have no Sovereign; for every Sovereign under heaven has a right to tax his subjects; that is, "to grant their property, with or without their consent." Our Sovereign* has a right to tax me, and all other Englishmen, whether we have votes for Parliament-men or no.

Vainly, therefore, do you complain of "unconstitutional exactions, violated rights, and mutilated charters." (Page 24.) Nothing is exacted but according to the original constitution both of England and her colonies. Your rights are no more violated than mine, when we are both taxed by the supreme power; and your charters are no more mutilated by this, than is the charter of the city of London.

Vainly do you complain of being "made slaves." Am I or two millions of Englishmen made slaves because we are taxed without our own consent?

You may still "rejoice in the common rights of freemen." I rejoice in all the rights of my ancestors. And every right which I enjoy is common to Englishmen and Americans.

But shall we "surrender any part of the privileges which we enjoy by the express terms of our colonization;" that is, of our charter? By no means; and none requires it of you. None desires to withhold anything that is granted by the

* That is, in connexion with the Lords and Commons.

express terms of your charters. But remember! one of your first charters, that of Massachusetts-Bay, says, in express terms, you are exempt from paying taxes to the King for seven years; plainly implying, that after those seven years you are to pay them like other subjects. And remember your last charter, that of Pennsylvania, says, in express terms, you are liable to taxation; yea, it objects against being taxed by the King, unless in connexion with the Lords and Commons.

But "a people will resume," you say, "the power which they never surrendered, except"—No need of any exception. They never surrendered it at all; they could not surrender it; for they never had it. I pray, did the people, unless you mean the Norman army, give William the Conqueror his power? And to which of his successors did the people of England (six or seven millions) give the sovereign power? This is mere political cant; words without meaning. I know but one instance in all history wherein the people gave the sovereign power to any one: That was to Massaniello of Naples. And I desire any man living to produce another instance in the history of all nations.

Ten times over, in different words, you "profess yourselves to be contending for liberty." But it is a vain, empty profession; unless you mean by that threadbare word, a liberty from obeying your rightful Sovereign, and from keeping the fundamental laws of your country. And this undoubtedly it is, which the confederated colonies are now contending for.

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON LIBERTY.

OCCASIONED BY A LATE TRACT.

[PRINTED IN THE YEAR 1776.]

---

1. It was with great expectation that I read Dr. Price's "Observations on the Nature of Civil Liberty, the Principles of Government, and the Justice and Policy of the War with

America;" and I was not disappointed. As the author is a person of uncommon abilities, so he has exerted them to the uttermost in the tract before us, which is certainly a master-piece of its kind. He has said all that can be said upon the subject, and has digested it in the most accurate manner; and candour requires us to believe that he has wrote with an upright intention, with a real design to subserve the interest of mankind in general, as well as the subjects of the British empire. But as the Doctor is a friend to liberty, so he can "think and let think." He does not desire that we should implicitly submit to the judgment, either of him or any other fallible man; and will not therefore be displeased at a few further observations on the same subject. That subject is,

2. The liberty which is now claimed by the confederate colonies in America. In order to understand this much-controverted question, I would set aside everything not essential to it. I do not therefore now inquire, whether this or that measure be consistent with good policy; or, whether it is likely to be attended with good or ill success: I only want to know, is their claim right or wrong? Is it just or unjust?

3. What is it they claim? You answer, "Liberty." Nay, is it not independency? You reply: "That is all one; they do claim it, and they have a right to it."

To independency? That is the very question. To liberty they have an undoubted right; and they enjoy that right. (I mean, they did, till the late unhappy commotions.) They enjoyed their liberty in as full a manner as I do, or any reasonable man can desire.

"What kind of liberty do they enjoy?" Here you puzzle the cause, by talking of physical and moral liberty. What you speak of both is exactly true, and beautifully expressed: But both physical and moral liberty are beside the present question; and the introducing them can answer no other end than to bewilder and confuse the reader. Therefore, to beg the reader "to keep these in his view," is only begging him to look off the point in hand. You desire him, in order to understand this, to attend to something else! "Nay, I beg him to look straight forward; to mind this one thing; to fix his eye on that liberty, and that only, which is concerned in the present question: And all the liberty to which this question relates, is either religious or civil liberty."

4. "Religious liberty is, a liberty to choose our own religion; to worship God according to our own conscience. Every man living, as a man, has a right to this, as he is a rational creature. The Creator gave him this right when he endowed him with understanding; and every man must judge for himself, because every man must give an account of himself to God. Consequently, this is an unalienable right; it is inseparable from humanity; and God did never give authority to any man, or number of men, to deprive any child of man thereof, under any colour or pretence whatever." *

Now, who can deny that the colonies enjoy this liberty to the fulness of their wishes?

5. Civil liberty is a liberty to dispose of our lives, persons, and fortunes, according to our own choice, and the laws of our country.

I add, *according to the laws of our country:* For, although, if we violate these, we are liable to fines, imprisonment, or death; yet if, in other cases, we enjoy our life, liberty, and goods, undisturbed, we are free, to all reasonable intents and purposes.

Now, all this liberty the confederate colonies did enjoy, till part of them enslaved the rest of their countrymen; and all the loyal colonies do enjoy it at the present hour. None takes away their lives, or freedom, or goods; they enjoy them all quiet and undisturbed.

"But the King and Parliament can take them all away." But they do not; and, till it is done, they are freemen. The supreme power of my country can take away either my religious or civil liberty; but, till they do, I am free in both respects: I am free now, whatever I may be by and by. Will any man face me down, I have no money now, because it may be taken from me to-morrow?

6. But the truth is, what they claim is not liberty; it is independency. They claim to be independent of England; no longer to own the English supremacy.

A while ago, they vehemently denied this; for matters were not then ripe: And I was severely censured for supposing they intended any such thing. But now the mask is thrown off: They frankly avow it; and Englishmen applaud them for so doing!

Nay, you will prove, that not only the colonies, but all

* See a tract, entitled, "Thoughts upon Liberty."

mankind, have a right to it; yea, that independency is of the very essence of liberty; and that all who are not independent are slaves.

Nay, if all who are not independent are slaves, then there is no free nation in Europe; then all in every nation are slaves, except the supreme powers. All in France, for instance, except the King; all in Holland, except the Senate; yea, and these too; King and Senate both are slaves, if (as you say) they are dependent upon the people. So, if the people depend on their governors, and their governors on them, they are all slaves together.

Mere play with words. This is not what all the world means by liberty and slavery; therefore, to say, "If the Parliament taxes you without your consent, you are a slave," is mere quibbling. Whoever talks thus, should say honestly, "Reader, I give you warning, I affix a new sense, not the common one, to these words, *liberty* and *slavery*." Take the words in this sense, and you may prove there are slaves enough in England, as well as America; but if we take them in the old, common sense, both the Americans and we are free men.

7. But you say, "The Parliament has already deprived them of one great branch of liberty, by enacting, that, in the cases there specified, they shall be tried in England."

I answer, How grievously did they abuse that liberty before it was taken away! Let any fair man consider the case: How often have we heard of their quiet and peaceable submission to pay the duties by law established! And what a merit has been made of this by all their advocates! But it was a merit that never belonged to them; for the duties were not paid. All this time they did not, in fact, pay one half, no, not a quarter, of those duties. They continually defrauded the King of the far greater part of them, without shame or fear. Indeed, what should they fear? They did not deign to do it privately, like their fellows in England; no, they acted openly in the face of the sun. Ship-loads of tea, for instance, were brought into Boston harbour, and landed at noon-day, without paying any duty at all. Who should hinder it? If a custom-house officer hindered, was it not at the peril of his life? And if, at any time, a seizure was made, and the cause came to be tried by a Boston jury, what would follow? It was no more than, "Ask your fellow, whether you are a thief."

8. Permit me to mention one eminent instance: The famous Mr. John Hancock, some time since, brought into Boston a ship-load of smuggled tea, at noon-day. Just then came in the ships from London, laden with the same commodity, which, by the removal of the former tax, they were now enabled to sell cheaper than him. What could he now do *pro patria?* as Mr. Evans says; in plain English, not to lose by his cargo? All Europe knows what was done: "Some persons in disguise," Dr. Price tells us, "buried the English tea in the sea." It was not so commonly known who employed them, or paid them for their labour: To be sure, good Mr. Hancock knew no more of it than the child unborn!

9. Now, I desire to know of any reasonable man, what could the English Government do? No officer could seize the smuggled goods; or, if he did, no jury would condemn the smuggler. There was therefore no possibility that the King should have his right, without taking some such step as was taken. There was not any alternative, but either to give up the customs altogether, (as the evil was increasing more and more,) or to try the offenders here; so that still they had as much liberty as their notorious offences allowed.

With what justice, then, can this be urged as a violation of their liberty! "O!" cries the man in yon stone doublet, "Bondage! slavery! Help, Englishmen! I am deprived of my liberty!" Certainly you are; but first you deprived the man of his purse.

"What! Do you compare Mr. H. to a felon?" I do, in this respect: I compare every smuggler to a felon; a private smuggler to a sneaking felon, a pick-pocket; a noon-day smuggler, to a bold felon, a robber on the highway. And if a person of this undeniable character is made President of a Congress, I leave every man of sense to determine what is to be expected from them.

10. To return: As the colonies are free, with regard to their persons, so they are with regard to their goods. It is no objection that they pay out of them a tax, to which they did not previously consent. I am free; I use my money as I please, although I pay taxes out of it, which were fixed by law before I was born, and, consequently, without my consent; and indeed those taxes are so moderate, that neither they nor I have reason to complain.

"But if the Parliament tax you moderately now, it is possible they may, hereafter, tax you immoderately." It is possible, but not probable; they never have done it yet: When they do, then complain.

We are not talking of what may be, but what is; and it cannot be denied, they are free (which is the present question) in all the three particulars which Judge Blackstone includes in civil liberty.

11. But liberty will not content either them or you. You now openly plead for independency, and aver that the colonies ought to be independent on England, to assert their own supremacy, (1.) Because they are half as many as the English. (2.) Because in a century they will be twice as many.

The argument runs thus: If the Americans are half as many as the English, then they have a right to be independent. But they are half as many; therefore, they have a right to be independent.

I deny the consequence in the first proposition: Number does not prove a right to independency. I deny the second proposition too: They are not half as many; even though you swell the number of the Americans as much as you diminish the number of the English.

I have been surprised lately, to observe many taking so much pains to extenuate the numbers of the inhabitants of England. For what end is this done? Is it to make us more respectable to our neighbours? or merely to weaken the hands of the King and ministry? I say the King and the ministry; for I lay no stress on their pompous professions of love and loyalty to the King: Just such professions did their predecessors make to King Charles, till they brought him to the block.

12. "But are they not half as many? Do not the confederated provinces contain three millions of souls?" I believe not. I believe they contain about two millions. But, allowing they did, I make no doubt but the English (beside three millions of Scots and Irish) are ten millions at this day.

"How can that be, when there are only six hundred thousand in London?" Believe it who can, I cannot believe there are so few as fifteen hundred thousand in London and its environs, allowing only two miles every way from the walls of the city.

"But we know there were no more than six hundred

thousand, when the computation was made in the late reign; allowing that there were, at an average, five in each house." They who make this allowance, probably fix their computation at their own fire-side. They do not walk through every part of the town, up to the garrets, and down to the cellars. I do; and by what I have seen with my own eyes, frequently fifteen, eighteen, or twenty in one house, I cannot believe there are fewer, at an average, than ten under one roof; and the same I believe of Bristol, Birmingham, Sheffield, and most other trading towns. Besides, how many thousand houses have been added to London within these thirty or forty years?

13. "But the people of England are continually decreasing." So it has been confidently affirmed; but it is a total mistake. I know the contrary, having an opportunity of seeing ten times more of England, every year, than most men in the nation. All our manufacturing towns, as Birmingham, Sheffield, Manchester, Liverpool, increase daily. So do very many villages all over the kingdom, even in the mountains of Derbyshire. And, in the mean time, exceeding few, either towns or villages, decrease.

And it is no wonder the people should increase, considering the amazing increase of trade which has been lately, not in London only, but much more in Bristol, Birmingham, Sheffield, Leeds, Manchester, and indeed all parts of the kingdom, which I have had the opportunity of observing. There was a considerable decay of trade before; but the tide is turned, and it now pours in abundantly. So greatly were our American friends mistaken, who hoped, by shutting up their ports, to ruin most of the manufacturers in England, and so starve us into compliance with their demands.

"However, in a century, the Americans will be twice as many as the English." That admits of a doubt; but when they are, then let them avail themselves of it.

14. "Nay, not only the Americans, but all men, have a right to be self-governed and independent." You mean, they had a right thereto, before any civil societies were formed. But when was that time, when no civil societies were formed? I doubt hardly since the flood; and, wherever such societies exist, no man is independent. Whoever is born in any civilized country, is, so long as he continues therein, whether he chooses it or no, subject to the laws and to the supreme governors of that country.

Whoever is born in England, France, or Holland, is subject to their respective Governors; and "must needs be subject to the power, as to the ordinance of God, not only for wrath, but for conscience' sake." He has no right at all to be independent, or governed only by himself; but is in duty bound to be governed by the powers that be, according to the laws of the country. And he that is thus governed, not by himself, but the laws, is, in the general sense of mankind, a free man; not that there ever existed any original compact between them and those Governors. But the want of this does not make him a slave, nor is any impeachment to his liberty; and yet this free man is, by virtue of those laws, liable to be deprived, in some cases of his goods; in others, of his personal freedom, or even of his life. And all this time he enjoys such a measure of liberty, as the condition of civilized nations allows; but no independency: That chimera is not found; no, not in the wilds of Africa or America.

Although, therefore, these subtle metaphysical pleas for universal independency appear beautiful in speculation, yet it never was, neither can be, reduced to practice. It is in vain to attempt it:

Sensus moresque repugnant,
*Atque ipsa utilitas, justi prope mater et æqui.**

15. Let us, however, give a fair hearing to these pleas, as they are urged by this masterly writer; and it may be worth while to trace the matter to the foundation, surveying it part by part:—

"Any will, distinct from that of the majority of a community, which claims a power of making laws for it, produces servitude. This lays the line between liberty and slavery." (Page 5.)

I must beg leave to stop you on the threshold. All this I totally deny; and require solid, rational proof of these assertions; for they are by no means self-evident.

"From what has been said, it is obvious, that all civil government, as far as it is free, is the creature of the people. It originates with them; it is conducted by their direction. In every free state, every man is his own legislator; all taxes are free gifts; all laws are established by common consent. If laws are not made by common consent, a Government by them is slavery." (Page 7.)

* This quotation from Horace is thus translated by Boscawen:—
"Sense, morals, 'gainst such laws unite,
And public good, true source of right."—EDIT.

Here is a group of strong assertions. But how are they supported? "O! they are inferred from what has been said." But what has been said, has as yet nothing to support it. If, then, these assertions stand at all, they stand by themselves. Let us try if they can. "All civil government, as far as it is free, is a creature of the people." It is, if we allow your definition of freedom; that is, if we allow you to beg the question.

16. But before we can move a step further, I must beg you to define another of your terms. This is the more necessary, as it occurs again and again; and indeed the whole question turns upon it. What do you mean by *the people?* "All the members of a state?" So you express it, page 8. "All the individuals that compose it?" So you speak in the next page. Will you rather say with Judge Blackstone, "Every free agent?" or with Montesquieu, "Every one that has a will of his own?" Fix upon which of these definitions you please, and then we may proceed.

If my argument has an odd appearance, yet let none think I am in jest. I am in great earnest. So I have need to be; for I am pleading the cause of my King and country; yea, of every country under heaven, where there is any regular Government. I am pleading against those principles that naturally tend to anarchy and confusion; that directly tend to unhinge all government, and overturn it from the foundation. But they are principles which are incumbered with such difficulties as the wisest man living cannot remove.

17. This premised, I ask, Who are the people that have a right to make and unmake their Governors? Are they "all the members of a state?" So you affirmed but now. Are they "all the individuals that compose it?" So you said quickly after. Will you rather say, "The people are every free agent?" or, "Every one that has a will of his own?" Take which you will of these four definitions, and it necessarily includes all men, women, and children. Now, stand to your word. Have all men, women, and children, in a state, a right to make and unmake their Governors? They are all free agents, except infants; and even these have a will of their own. They all are "members of the state;" they are, all and every one, "the individuals that compose it." And had ever the people, as above defined by yourself, a right to make and unmake their Governors?

18. Setting Mr. Evans's witticisms aside, I seriously desire him, or Doctor Price, or any zealous assertor of the king-making right of our sovereign lords the people, to point out a single instance of their exerting this right in any age or nation. I except only the case of Thomas Aniello, (vulgarly called Massanello,) in the last century. Do not tell me, "There are many;" but point them out. I aver, I know of none. And I believe it will puzzle any one living to name a second instance, either in ancient or modern history.

19. And by what right, (setting the Scriptures aside, on which you do not choose to rest the point,) by what right do you exclude women, any more than men, from choosing their own Governors? Are they not free agents, as well as men? I ask a serious question, and demand a serious answer. Have they not "a will of their own?" Are they not "members of the state?" Are they not part of "the individuals that compose it?" With what consistency, then, can any who assert the people, in the above sense, to be the origin of power, deny them the right of choosing their Governors, and "giving their suffrages by their representatives?"

"But do you desire or advise that they should do this?" Nay, I am out of the question. I do not ascribe these rights to the people; therefore, the difficulty affects not me; but, do you get over it how you can, without giving up your principle.

20. I ask a second question: By what right do you exclude men who have not lived one-and-twenty years from that "unalienable privilege of human nature," choosing their own Governors? Is not a man a free agent, though he has lived only twenty years, and ten or eleven months? Can you deny, that men from eighteen to twenty-one are "members of the state?" Can any one doubt, whether they are a part of "the individuals that compose it?" Why then are not these permitted to "choose their Governors, and to give their suffrages by their representatives?" Let any who say these rights are inseparable from the people, get over this difficulty, if they can; not by breaking an insipid jest on the occasion, but by giving a plain, sober, rational answer.

If it be said, "O, women and striplings have not wisdom enough to choose their own Governors;" I answer, Whether they have or no, both the one and the other have all the rights which are "inseparable from human nature." Either,

therefore, this right is not inseparable from human nature, or both women and striplings are partakers of it.

21. I ask a third question: By what authority do you exclude a vast majority of adults from choosing their own Governors, and giving their votes by their representatives, merely because they have not such an income; because they have not forty shillings a year? What, if they have not? Have they not the rights which, you say, belong to man as man? And are they not included in the people? Have they not a will of their own? Are they not free agents? Who then can, with either justice or equity, debar them from the exercise of their natural rights?

"O, but the laws of the land debar them from it." Did they make those laws themselves? Did they consent to them, either in person or by their representatives, before they were enacted? "No; they were enacted by their forefathers long before they were born." Then, what are they to them? You have assured us, that if men may give away their own liberty, they cannot give away the liberty of others, of their children or descendants. Nay, you have told us, that no man has a right to give away his own liberty; that it is unalienable from the nature of every child of man. Never, therefore, patronize those iniquitous laws. No; if you are a lover of liberty, an enemy to slavery and oppression, exhort them to shake off this servile yoke.

22. To set this whole matter in another light, I beg leave to repeat the sum of a small tract lately published.* Have not the people, in every age and nation, the right to dispose of the supreme power; of investing therewith whom they please, and upon what conditions they see good? Consequently, if those conditions are not observed, they have a right to take it away. To prove this, it is argued, "All men living are naturally equal; none is above another; and all are naturally free masters of their own actions; therefore, no man can have any power over another, but by his own consent; therefore, the power which any Governors enjoy, must be originally derived from the people, and presupposes an original compact between them and their first Governors."

23. But, who are the people? Are they every man, woman, and child? Why not? Is it not one fundamental

* Thoughts on the Origin of Power.

principle, that "all persons living are naturally equal; that all human creatures are naturally free; masters of their own actions; that none can have any power over them, but by their own consent?" Why, then, should not every man, woman, and child, have a voice in placing their Governors, in fixing the measure of their power, and the conditions on which it is intrusted? And why should not every one have a voice in displacing them too? Surely they that gave the power have a right to take it away. By what argument do you prove, that women are not naturally as free as men? And if they are, why have they not as good a right to choose their Governors? Who can have any power over free, rational creatures, but by their own consent? And are they not free by nature as well as we? Are they not rational creatures?

24. But suppose we exclude women from using their natural right, by might overcoming right, what pretence have we for excluding men like ourselves, barely because they have not lived one-and-twenty years? "Why, they have not wisdom or experience to judge of the qualifications necessary for Governors." I answer, (1.) Who has? how many of the voters in Great Britain? one in twenty? one in an hundred? If you exclude all who have not this wisdom, you will leave few behind. But, (2.) Wisdom and experience are nothing to the purpose. You have put the matter upon another issue. Are they men? That is enough. Are they human creatures? Then they have a right to choose their own Governors; an indefeasible right; a right inherent, inseparable from human nature. "But in England they are excluded by law." Did they consent to the making of that law? If not, by your original supposition, it can have no power over them. I therefore utterly deny that we can, consistently with that supposition, exclude either women or minors from choosing their own Governors.

25. But, suppose we exclude these by main force; are all that remain, all men of full age, the people? Are all males, then, that have lived one-and-twenty years, allowed to choose their own Governors? Not in England, unless they are freeholders, and have forty shillings a year. Worse and worse! After depriving half the human species of their natural right for want of a beard; after having deprived myriads more for want of a stiff beard, for not having lived one-and-twenty years; you rob others, many hundred thou-

sands, of their birthright for want of money! Yet not altogether on this account neither; if so, it might be more tolerable. But here is an Englishman who has money enough to buy the estates of fifty freeholders, and yet he must not be numbered among the people, because he has not two or three acres of land! How is this? By what right do you exclude a man from being one of the people, because he has not forty shillings a year; yea, or not a groat? Is he not a man, whether he be rich or poor? Has he not a soul and a body? Has he not the nature of a man; consequently, all the rights of a man, all that flow from human nature; and, among the rest, that of not being controlled by any but by his own consent?

"But he that has not a freehold is excluded by law." By a law of his own making? Did he consent to the making of it? If he did not, what is that law to him? No man, you aver, has any power over another, but by his own consent: Of consequence, a law made without his consent is, with regard to him, null and void. You cannot say otherwise, without destroying the supposition, that "none can be governed but by his own consent."

26. See now to what your argument comes. You affirm, all power is derived from the people; and presently exclude one half of the people from having any part or lot in the matter. At another stroke, suppose England to contain eight millions of people, you exclude one or two millions more. At a third, suppose two millions left, you exclude three-fourths of these; and the poor pittance that remains, by I know not what figure of speech, you call the people of England!

27. Hitherto we have endeavoured to view this point in the mere light of reason; and, even by this, it appears, that this supposition, which has been palmed upon us as undeniable, is not only false, not only contrary to reason, but contradictory to itself; the very men who are most positive that the people are the source of power, being brought into an inextricable difficulty, by that single question, "Who are the people?" reduced to a necessity of either giving up the point, or owning that by *the people*, they mean scarce a tenth part of them.

28. But we need not rest the matter entirely on reasoning. Let us appeal to matter of fact; and, because we cannot have so clear a prospect of what is at a distance, let us only take a view of what has been in our own country. I ask, then, When

did the people of England (suppose you mean by that word only half a million of them) choose their own Governors? Did they choose (to go no further) William the Conqueror? Did they choose King Stephen or King John? As to those who regularly succeeded their fathers, the people are out of the question. Did they choose Henry the Fourth, Edward the Fourth, or Henry the Seventh? Who will be so hardy as to affirm it? Did the people of England, or but fifty thousand of them, choose Queen Mary, or Queen Elizabeth, or King James the First? Perhaps you will say, "If the people did not give King Charles the supreme power, at least they took it away." No; the people of England no more took away his power, than they cut off his head. "Yes; the Parliament did, and they are the people." No; the Parliament did not: The House of Commons is not the Parliament, any more than it is the nation. Neither were those who then sat the House of Commons; no, nor one quarter of them. But, suppose they had been the whole House of Commons, yea, or the whole Parliament, by what rule of logic will you prove that seven or eight hundred persons are the people of England? "Why, they are the delegates of the people; they are chosen by them." No, not by one half, not by a quarter, not by a tenth part of them: So that the people, in the only proper sense of the word, were innocent of the whole affair.

29. "But you will allow, the people gave the supreme power to King Charles the Second at the Restoration." I will allow no such thing, unless, by the people, you mean General Monk and ten thousand soldiers. "However, you will not deny that the people gave the power to King William at the Revolution." I will; the Convention were not the people, neither elected by them: So that still we have not a single instance, in above seven hundred years, of the people of England's conveying the supreme power either to one or more persons.

30. So much both for reason and matter of fact. But one single consideration will bring the question to a short issue. It is allowed, no man can dispose of another's life, but by his own consent: I add, No, nor with his consent; for no man has a right to dispose of his own life: The Creator of man has the sole right to take the life which he gave. Now, it is an indisputable truth, *Nihil dat quod non habet*,—"None gives what he has not." It follows, that no man can give to another a right which he never had himself; a right which

only the Governor of the world has, even the wiser Heathens being judges; but which no man upon the face of the earth either has or can have. No man, therefore, can give the power of the sword, any such power as gives a right to take away life: Wherever it is, it must descend from God alone, the sole disposer of life and death.

31. The supposition, then, that the people are the origin of power, or that "all government is the creature of the people," though Mr. Locke himself should attempt to defend it, is utterly indefensible. It is absolutely overturned by the very principle on which it is supposed to stand, namely, that "a right of choosing his Governors belongs to every partaker of human nature." If this be so, then it belongs to every individual of the human species; consequently, not to freeholders alone, but to all men; not to men only, but to women also; not only to adult men and women, to those who have lived one-and-twenty years, but to those that have lived eighteen or twenty, as well as those who have lived threescore. But none did ever maintain this, nor probably ever will; therefore, this boasted principle falls to the ground, and the whole superstructure with it. So common sense brings us back to the grand truth, "There is no power but of God."

32. I may now venture to "pronounce, that the principles on which you have argued, are incompatible with practice," even the universal practice of mankind, as well as with sound reason; and it is no wonder "that they are not approved by our Governors," considering their natural tendency, which is, to unhinge all Government, and to plunge every nation into total anarchy.

This, in truth, is the tendency of the whole book; a few passages of which I shall now recite, begging leave to make a few remarks upon them. But I must ask the reader's pardon, if I frequently say the same thing more than once; for, otherwise, I could not follow the author.

33. "All the members of a state" (which necessarily include all the men, women, and children) "may intrust the powers of legislation with any number of delegates, subject to such restrictions as they think necessary." (Page 8.) This is "incompatible with practice:" It never was done from the beginning of the world; it never can; it is flatly impossible in the nature of the thing. "And thus, all the

individuals that compose a great state partake of the powers of legislation and government." *All the individuals!* Mere Quixotism! Where does that state exist? Not under the canopy of heaven. "In this case, a state is still free," (but this case has no being,) "if the representatives are chosen by the unbiassed voices of the majority." Hold! this is quite another case; you now shuffle in a new term: The *majority* we were not talking of, but *all the members* of a state. The majority are not *all the individuals* that compose it; and pray, how came the minority to be deprived of those rights, which you say are "unalienable from human nature?"—"But we disguise slavery, keeping up the form of liberty, when the reality is lost." It is not lost; I now enjoy all the real liberty I can desire, civil as well as religious. The liberty you talk of was never found; it never existed yet. But what does all this lead to, but to stir up all the inhabitants of Great Britain against the Government?

34. To inflame them still more, you go on: "Liberty is more or less complete, according as the people have more or less share in the Government." This is altogether contrary to matter of fact: The greater share the people have in the Government, the less liberty, either civil or religious, does the nation in general enjoy. Accordingly, there is most liberty of all, civil and religious, under a limited monarchy; there is usually less under an aristocracy, and least of all under a democracy. What sentences then are these: "To be guided by one's own will, is freedom; to be guided by the will of another, is slavery?" (Page 11.) This is the very quintessence of republicanism; but it is a little too barefaced; for, if this is true, how free are all the devils in hell, seeing they are all guided by their own will! And what slaves are all the angels in heaven, since they are all guided by the will of another! See another stroke: "The people have power to model Government as they please." (Page 12.) What an admirable lesson, to confirm the people in their loyalty to the Government! Yet again: "Government is a trust, and all its powers a delegation." (Page 15.) It is a trust, but not from the people: "There is no power but of God." It is a delegation, namely, from God; for "rulers are God's ministers," or delegates.

35. How irreconcilable with this are your principles! Concerning our Governors in England, you teach, "A Parliament forfeits its authority by accepting bribes." If it does,

I doubt all the Parliaments in this century, having accepted them more or less, have thereby forfeited their authority, and, consequently, were no Parliaments at all: It follows, that the Acts which they enacted were no laws; and what a floodgate would this open! You teach further: "If Parliaments contradict their trust," (of which the people are to judge,) "they dissolve themselves." And certainly, a Parliament dissolved is no Parliament at all. And seeing "a state that submits to such a breach is enslaved," what should the people do? Knock them on the head, to be sure. And who can doubt, but they have an unalienable power so to do, seeing "Government was instituted for the people's sake, and theirs is the only real omnipotence." (Page 16.)

36. And, lest your meaning should not yet be plain enough, you conclude this article thus: "These reflections should be constantly present to every mind in this country. There is nothing that requires to be more watched than power; there is nothing that ought to be opposed with a more determined resolution than its encroachments. The people of this kingdom were once warmed with such sentiments as these." Exactly such, in the glorious days of Watt the Tyler, and of Oliver Cromwell. "Often have they fought and bled in the cause of liberty; but that time seems to be going." Glory be to God, it is not going, but gone. O may it never return! "The fair inheritance of liberty, left us by our ancestors, we are not unwilling to resign." We are totally unwilling to resign either our civil or religious liberty; and both of these we enjoy in a far greater measure than ever our ancestors did. Nay, they did not enjoy either one or the other, from the time of William the Conqueror till the Revolution. "Should any events arise," (and you give very broad intimations that they have arisen already,) "which should render the same opposition necessary that took place in the time of King Charles the First,"—the same opposition which made the land a field of blood, set every man's sword against his brother, overturned the whole constitution, and cut off, first, the flower of the nation, and then the King himself,—"I am afraid all that is valuable to us would be lost: The terror of the standing army would deaden all zeal," for these noble exploits, "and produce a general servitude." (Page 18.)

37. What a natural tendency has all this, to instil into the good people of England the most determined rancour

and bitterness against their Governors, against the King and Parliament! And what a natural tendency has all that follows to instil the same both into the English and the Americans! On these passages also, I shall beg leave to subjoin a few short observations:—

"A country that is subject to the legislature of another country, in which it has no voice, and over which it has no control, is in slavery." This is palpably false. Take one instance out of many: Pennsylvania was subject (till now) to the legislature of England, in which it had no voice, and over which it had no control; yet it never was in slavery; it never wanted either civil or religious liberty; nay, perhaps it was more free in both respects than any other country in the universe. "In a country thus subjugated to another," (a very improper, as well as invidious word,) "there is little or nothing to check rapacity." If you mean the rapacity of the English Government, the insinuation is cruelly false; it never existed; no such rapacity was ever exercised. "And the most flagrant injustice and cruelty may be practised without remorse or pity." (Page 20.) This is purely calculated to inflame; for no such injustice or cruelty was ever practised, nor was ever likely to be, either in this or any other province of America. That which follows is a curious sentiment indeed; I know not that ever I met with it before: "The government of one country over another" (suppose of England over North-America, or over the West Indian islands) "cannot be supported but by a military force. This is a state of oppression no country could submit to, an hour, without an armed force to compel them." (Page 23.) Was ever anything more palpably false! The English Government, both in the islands and North-America, is the government of one country over another; but it has needed no armed force to support it for above these hundred years: And this Government which you would persuade them is oppressive, all the colonies did not only submit to, but rejoice in, without any armed force to compel them. They knew, and felt, they were not oppressed; but enjoyed all the liberty, civil and religious, which they could desire.

38. We come now to more matter entirely new: "No country can lawfully surrender their liberty, by giving up the power of legislating for themselves, to any extraneous jurisdiction; such a cession, being inconsistent with the

unalienable rights of human nature, would either not bind at all, or bind only the individuals that made it." (Page 25.) This is a home thrust. If this be so, all the English claim either to Ireland, Scotland, or America, falls at once. But can we admit this without any proof? Ought assertions to pass for arguments? If they will, here are more of the same kind: "No one generation can give up this for another." That is, the English settlers in America could not "give up their power of legislating for themselves." True, they could not give up what they never had. But they never had, either before or after they left England, any such power of making laws for themselves as exempted them from the King and Parliament; they never pretended to any such power till now; they never advanced any such claim; nay, when this was laid to their charge, they vehemently denied it, as an absolute slander. But you go further still: "When this power" (of independency) "is lost, the people have always a right to resume it." Comfortable doctrine indeed! perfectly well calculated for the support of civil government!

39. To the same good end, you observe: "Without an equal representation of all that are governed, government becomes complete tyranny." (Page 27.) Now, you had told us before, "There is not such an equal representation in England:" It follows, "The English Government is complete tyranny!" We have, however, the comfort to know that it never was any better since the Parliament subsisted. For who can say that there ever was an equal representation since the conquest? We know further, that we have only neighbour's fare; for we cannot find there is any nation in Europe, no, nor in the habitable world, where the Government is not as complete tyranny as our own; we find none wherein there is "an equal representation of all that are governed." But will any man affirm, in cool blood, that the English Government is "complete tyranny?" We have certainly enjoyed more complete liberty since the Revolution, than England ever enjoyed before; and the English Government, unequal as the representation is, has been admired by all impartial foreigners.

40. "But the sword is now to determine our rights: Detested be the measures which have brought us to this." (Page 33.) I once thought those measures had been originally concerted in our own kingdom; but I am now persuaded they were not.

I allow that the Americans were strongly exhorted by letters from England, "never to yield or lay down their arms till they had their own terms, which the Government would be constrained to give them in a short time:" But those measures were concerted long before this; long before either the Tea Act or the Stamp Act existed; only they were not digested into form,—that was reserved for the good Congress. Forty years ago, when my brother was in Boston, it was the general language there, "We must shake off the yoke; we never shall be a free people till we shake off the English yoke." These, you see, were even then for "trying the question," just as you are now; "not by charters," but by what you call, "the general principles of liberty." And the late Acts of Parliament were not the cause of what they have since done, but barely the occasion they laid hold on.

41. But "a late Act declares that this kingdom has power to make statutes to bind the colonies in all cases whatever! Dreadful power indeed! I defy any one to express slavery in stronger terms." (Page 34.) *In all cases whatever!* What is there peculiar in this? Certainly, in all cases, or in none. And has not every supreme Governor this power? This the English Parliament always had, and always exercised, from the first settlement of the American colonies. But it was not explicitly declared, because it was never controverted. The dreadfulness of it was never thought of for above an hundred years; nor is it easy to discern where that dreadfulness lies. Wherein does it consist? The Parliament has power to make statutes, which bind Englishmen likewise, in all cases whatever. And what then? Why, you say, "I defy any one to express slavery in stronger terms." I think I can "express slavery in stronger terms." Let the world judge between us. Slavery is a state wherein neither a man's goods, nor liberty, nor life, are at his own disposal. Such is the state of a thousand, of ten thousand, Negroes in the American colonies. And are their masters in the same state with them? in just the same slavery with the Negroes? Have they no more disposal of their own goods, or liberty, or lives? Does any one beat or imprison them at pleasure; or take away their wives, or children, or lives; or sell them like cows or horses? This is slavery; and will you face us down that the Americans are in such slavery as this? You answer, Yes, with regard to their goods; for the English Parliament "leaves them

nothing that they can call their own." (Page 35.) Amazing! Have they not houses, and lands, and money, and goods of every kind, which they call their own? And did they not enjoy, a few years since, complete liberty, both civil and religious, instead of being bound to hard labour, smarting under the lash, groaning in a dungeon, perhaps murdered, or stabbed, or roasted alive, at their masters' pleasure?

42. But, "did not their charters promise them all the enjoyment of all the rights of Englishmen?" (Page 40.) They did; and they have accordingly enjoyed all the rights of Englishmen from the beginning. "And allow them to tax themselves?" Never so as to exempt them from being taxed by Parliament. It is evident from the Acts of Parliament now in being, that this was never granted, and never claimed till now: On the contrary, the English Government has ever claimed the right of taxing them, even in virtue of those very charters. But you ask, "Can there be an Englishman who would not sooner lose his heart's blood, than yield to such claims?" (Page 47.) A decent question for a subject of England to ask! Just of a piece with your assertions, that "our constitution is almost lost;" that the claims of the Crown have "stabbed our liberty;" and that "a free Government loses its nature, the moment it becomes liable to be commanded by any superior power." (Page 49.) *From the moment it becomes liable!* This is not the case with the colonies; they do not become liable to be commanded by the King and Parliament; they always were so, from their first institution.

43. "The fundamental principle of our Government is, the right of the people to grant their own money." No; if you understand the word people, according to your own definition, for all the individuals that compose the state, this is not the fundamental principle of our Government, nor any principle of it at all. It is not the principle even of the Government of Holland, nor of any Government in Europe. "It was an attempt to encroach upon this right in a trifling instance, that produced the civil war in the reign of King Charles the First." O no! it was the actual encroaching, not on this right only, but on the religious as well as civil rights of the subject; and that, not in one trifling instance only, but in a thousand instances of the highest importance. "Therefore, this is a war undertaken, not only against our own constitution, but on purpose to destroy other similar constitutions in America, and to substitute in their

room a military force." (Page 50.) Is it possible that a man of sense should believe this? Did the King and Parliament undertake this war, on purpose to overturn a castle in the air, to destroy a constitution that never existed? Or is this said purely *ad movendam invidiam*, "to inflame the minds of the people?" I would rather impute it to the power of prejudice; as also the following wonderful sentence: "How horrid, to sheathe our swords in the bowels of our brethren, for no other end than to make them acknowledge our supremacy!" Yes, for this end,—to make them lay down their arms, which they have taken up against their lawful Sovereign; to make them restore what they have illegally and violently taken from their fellow-subjects; to make them repair the cruel wrongs they have done them, as far as the nature of the thing will admit, and to make them allow to all that civil and religious liberty whereof they have at present deprived them. These are the ends for which our Government has very unwillingly undertaken this war, after having tried all the methods they could devise to secure them without violence.

44. Having considered the justice, you come now to consider the policy, of this war. "In the last reigns, the colonies, foregoing every advantage which they might derive from trading with foreign nations, consented to send only to us, whatever it was for our interest to receive from them; and to receive only from us, whatever it was for our interest to send them." (Page 67.) They *consented to do this!* No! they only pretended to do it; it was a mere copy of their countenance. They never did, in fact, abstain from trading with other nations, Holland and France in particular. They never did, at least for forty years past, conform to the Act of Navigation. They did not send only to us what we wanted, or receive only from us what they wanted. What! did they not "allow us to regulate their trade in any manner which we thought best?" (Page 68.) No such thing. They only allowed us to make laws to regulate their trade. But they observed them as they thought best; sometimes a little, sometimes not at all. "They fought our battles with us." Certainly we fought theirs: And we have sad reason to remember it; for had Canada remained in the hands of the French, they would have been quiet subjects still.

45. "But what calamities must follow" from this impolitic war! See "the empire dismembered." (Page 73.) If it be,

that is not the consequence of the war, but rather the cause of it. "The blood of thousands shed" (it is not yet; perhaps it never may) "in an unrighteous quarrel." Doubtless unrighteous on their part, who revolt from their lawful Sovereign; and therefore whatever blood is shed will lie at their door. "Our strength exhausted." No, not yet; as they that try may find to their cost. "Our merchants breaking." But far more before the war than since. "Our manufacturers starving." I pray, where? I cannot find them: Not in London, in Bristol, in Birmingham, in Manchester, in Liverpool, Leeds, or Sheffield; nor anywhere else, that I know; and I am well acquainted with most of the manufacturing towns in England. "The funds tottering." Then the stocks must sink very low: But that is not the case. "And the miseries of a public bankruptcy impending." Just as they have done these hundred years. Fifty years ago I used to be much alarmed at things of this kind. When I heard a doleful prophecy of ruin impending on the nation, I really imagined something would follow. Nay, nothing in the world: These predictions are mere *brutum fulmen;* thunder without lightning.

46. Now for a little more of this fine painting! But, remember! it is not drawn from the life. "A nation once the protector of liberty in distant countries, endeavouring to reduce its own brethren to servitude." Say, to lay down the arms which they have taken up against their King and country. "Insisting upon such a supremacy over them as would leave them nothing they could call their own." (Page 89.) Yes; the supremacy insisted on would leave them all the liberty, civil and religious, which they have had from their first settlement. You next compare them to the brave Corsicans, taking arms against the Genoese. But the Corsicans were not colonies from Genoa: Therefore, there is nothing similar in the case. Neither in that you next quote, the case of Holland. You say, Yes: "The United Provinces of Holland were once subject to the Spaniards; but, being provoked by the violation of their charters, they were driven to that resistance which we and all the world have ever since admired." (Page 90.) *Provoked by the violation of their charters!* yea, by the total subversion both of their religious and civil liberties; the taking away their goods, imprisoning their persons, and shedding their blood like water, without the least colour of right, yea, without the very form of law; inso-

much that the Spanish Governor, the Duke of Alva, made his open boast, that "in five years he had caused upwards of eighteen thousand persons to fall by the hands of the common hangman." I pray, what has this to do with America? Add to this that the Hollanders were not colonies from Spain, but an independent people, who had the same right to govern Spain, as the Spaniards to govern Holland.

47. As another parallel case, you bring the war of the Romans with the allied states of Italy. But neither is this case parallel at all; for those states were not colonies of Rome, (although some colonies were scattered up and down among them,) but original, independent states, before Rome itself had a being. Were it then true that "every Briton must approve the conduct of those allies," (page 91,) it would not follow, that they must approve the conduct of the Americans; or that "we ought to declare our applause, and say, We admire your spirit; it is the spirit that has more than once saved us." We cannot applaud the spirit of those who usurp an illegal authority over their countrymen; who rob them of their substance, who outrage their persons, who leave them neither civil nor religious liberty; and who, to crown all, take up arms against their King and mother-country, and prohibit all intercourse with them.

48. See an argument of a different kind: "The laws and religion of France were established in Canada, on purpose to bring up thence an army of French Papists." (Page 94.) What proof have you, what tittle or shadow of proof, for this strange assertion, that the laws and religion which they had before in Canada were established on purpose to bring an army thence? It is manifest to every impartial man, that this was done for a nobler purpose. Every nation, you allow, has a natural liberty to enjoy their own laws, and their own religions: So have the French in Canada; and we have no right to deprive them of this liberty. Our Parliament never desired, never intended, to deprive them of this; (so far were they from any intention of depriving their own countrymen of it!) and on purpose to deliver them from any apprehension of so grievous an evil, they generously and nobly gave them a legal security, that it should not be taken from them. And is this (one of the best things our Parliament ever did) improved into an accusation against them? "But our laws and religion are better than theirs." Unquestionably they are; but this gives us no right to impose the one or the

other, even on a conquered nation. What if we had conquered France, ought we not still to have allowed them their own laws and religion? Yea, if the Russians had conquered Constantinople, or the whole Ottoman empire, ought they not to have allowed to all they conquered, both their own religion and their own laws; nay, and to have given them, not a precarious toleration, but a legal security for both?

49. "But the wild Indians, and their own slaves, have been instigated to attack them." I doubt the fact. What proof is there of this, either with regard to the Indians or the Negroes? "And attempts have been made to gain the assistance of a large body of Russians." Another hearty assertion, which many will swallow, without ever asking for proof: In truth, had any such attempts been made, they would not have proved ineffectual. Very small pay will induce a body of Russians to go wherever they hope for good plunder. It might just as well have been said, "Attempts were made to procure a large body of Tartars."

50. Now for a little more encouragement to your good friends and allies in America: "The utmost force we can employ does not exceed thirty thousand men to conquer half a million of determined men, fighting for that sacred blessing of liberty, without which man is a beast, and government a curse." (Page 95.) I am not sure that our utmost force is either thirty, or forty, or fifty, thousand men. But are you sure, that "half a million, at least, are determined to fight" against them? Yes: For "a quarter of the inhabitants of every country are fighting men; and the colonies consist of two millions." Here are several points which are not quite clear. I doubt, (1.) Whether those colonies contain two millions. I doubt, (2.) Whether a quarter of the inhabitants of any country are fighting men: We usually reckon a sixth part. I doubt, (3.) Whether a quarter of the American fighting men, are determined to fight in so bad a cause; to fight, not for liberty, which they have long enjoyed, but for independency. Will you affirm, that "without this, man is a beast, and government a curse?" Then, show me where man is not a beast, and where government is not a curse.

51. But you give them more encouragement still: "In the Netherlands, a few states thus circumstanced withstood the whole force of the Spanish monarchy; and, at last, emancipated themselves from its tyranny." *(Ibid.)* *Thus circumstanced!*

No; they were in wholly different circumstances; they were cruelly and wantonly oppressed; they were robbed both of civil and religious liberty; they were slaughtered all the day long; and, during the contest, which was really for liberty, they were assisted by the German Princes, by England, and by France itself. But "what can thirty thousand men do, when they are to be fed from hence?" (Page 96.) Do you think they will stand with their finger in their eye? If they cannot find food at land, (which would be strange,) the seas and rivers are open. "Their maritime towns they are resolved to burn themselves." They will think twice, before they execute that resolution. "As to their trade, the loss of it will do them unspeakable good." Will it indeed? Then let them acknowledge their benefactors. "They rejoice particularly in the last restraining Act: This will furnish them with a reason for confiscating the estates of all the friends of our Government among them." (Page 97.) *A reason!* All the friends of our Government are infinitely obliged to you for suggesting this to them, who are full ready to improve any hint of the kind; and it will be no wonder if they soon use these enemies of their country as the Irish did the Protestants in 1641.

52. "One consideration more. From one end of America to the other, they are fasting and praying: But what are we doing? Ridiculing them as fanatics, and scoffing at religion." This certainly is the case with many; but God forbid it should be the case with all! There are thousands in England (I believe full as many, if not many more than in America) who are daily wrestling with God in prayer for a blessing upon their King and country; and many join fasting therewith; which, if it were publicly enjoined, would be no scandal to our nation. Are they "animated by piety?" So are we; although "not unto us be the praise." "But can we declare, in the face of the sun, that we are not aggressors in this war?" We can. "And that we mean not, by it, to acquire dominion or empire, or to gratify resentment?" (Page 99:) I humbly believe, both the King and his Ministers can declare this before God: "But solely to gain reparation for injury," from men who have already plundered very many of His Majesty's loyal subjects, and killed no small number of them.

53. You now proceed to answer objections; and mention, as the First, "Are they not our subjects?" You answer:

"They are not your subjects; they are your fellow-subjects." Are they indeed? Do you affirm this? Then you give up the whole question; then their independency, which you have so vehemently maintained, falls to the ground at once.

A Second objection, you say, is this: "But we are taxed; why should not they?" You answer: "You are taxed by yourselves; they insist on the same privilege." I reply, They are now taxed by themselves, in the very same sense that nine-tenths of us are. We have not only no vote in the Parliament, but none in electing the members: Yet Mr. Evans says, "We are virtually represented:" And if we are, so are the Americans. You add: "They help you to pay your taxes, by giving you a monopoly of their trade." They consented, as you observed before, to do this; but they have not done it for many years: They have, in fact, traded to Holland, to France, to Spain, and everywhere they could. And how have they helped us, by purchasing our manufactures? Take one instance out of a thousand: They have taken large quantities of our earthenware, for which they regularly required three years' credit. These they sold to the Spaniards, at a very advanced price, and for ready money only. And did they not hereby help themselves, at least, as much as they helped us? And what have we lost by losing their custom? We have gained forty, fifty, or sixty per cent. The Spaniards now come directly to Bristol; and pay down ready money, pieces of eight, for all the earthenware that can possibly be procured.

54. A Third objection, you say, is this: "They will not obey the Parliament and the laws." You answer: "Say, They will not obey your Parliament and your laws; because they have no voice in your Parliament, no share in making your laws." (Page 100.) So, now the mask quite falls off again. A page or two ago, you said, "They are your fellow-subjects." Now, you frankly declare, they owe no subjection to our Government, and attempt to prove it! To that proof I reply: Millions in England have no more voice in the Parliament than they; yet that does not exempt them from subjection to the Government and the laws. But "they may have a voice in it if they will." No; they cannot, any more than the Americans. "Then they so far want liberty." I answer, (1.) Whether they do or no, they must needs be subject; and that not only for wrath, for fear of punishment,

but for conscience' sake. (2.) They do not want liberty; they have all the liberty they can desire, civil as well as religious. "Nay, I have no other notion of slavery, but being bound by a law to which I do not consent." If you have not, look at that man chained to the oar: He is a slave; he cannot at all dispose of his own person. Look at that Negro sweating beneath his load: He is a slave; he has neither goods nor liberty left. Look at that wretch in the Inquisition: Then you will have a far other notion of slavery.

55. You next advance a wonderful argument to convince us that all the Americans are slaves: "All your freehold land is represented; but not a foot of theirs; 'nay,' says an eminent man, 'there is not a blade of grass in England but is represented.'" This much-admired and frequently-quoted assertion is altogether new! I really thought, not the grass, or corn, or trees, but the men of England, were represented in Parliament. I cannot comprehend, that Parliament-men represent the grass, any more than the stones or clay of the kingdom. *No blade of grass but is represented!* Pretty words! But what do they mean? Here is Mr. Burke; pray, what does he represent? "Why, the city of Bristol." What, the buildings so called; or the ground whereon they stand? Nay, the inhabitants of it: The ground, the houses, the stones, the grass, are not represented. Who till now ever entertained so wild a thought? But let them stand together, the independency of our colonies, and the representation of every blade of grass!

56. You conclude: "Peace may be obtained upon the easy, the constitutional, and therefore the indispensable, terms of an exemption from parliamentary taxation, and an admission of the sacredness of their charters." (Page 107.)

Are not you betraying your cause? You have been all along pleading, in the most explicit manner, for their exemption, not only from parliamentary taxation, but legislation also. And, if your arguments prove anything, they certainly prove this, that the colonies have an unalienable right, not only to tax, but to make laws for themselves; so that the allowing them the former is nothing, unless we allow the latter also; that is, in plain terms, unless we allow them to be independent on the English Government.

As to your other term of peace, there is unquestionably such a thing as the forfeiting of a charter: Whether the

colonies have forfeited theirs or not, I leave others to determine. Whether they have or have not, there can be no reason for making the least doubt but, upon their laying down their arms, the Government will still permit them to enjoy both their civil and religious liberty in as ample a manner as ever their ancestors did, and as the English do at this day.

57. I add a few words more: Two or three years ago, by means of incendiary papers, spread throughout the nation, the minds of the people were inflamed to an amazing degree; but the greater part of the flame is now gone out. The natural tendency, or rather the avowed design, of this pamphlet, is, to kindle it again; if it be possible, to blow up into a flame the sparks that yet remain; to make the minds of His Majesty's subjects, both at home and abroad, evil-affected toward his Government; discontented in the midst of plenty, out of humour with God and man; to persuade them, in spite of all sense and reason, that they are absolute slaves, while they are actually possessed of the greatest civil and religious liberty that the condition of human life allows.

Let all who are real lovers of their country use every lawful means to put out, or, at least, prevent the increase of, that flame which, otherwise, may consume our people and nation. Let us earnestly exhort all our countrymen to improve the innumerable blessings they enjoy; in particular, that invaluable blessing of liberty, civil as well as religious, which we now enjoy in a far more ample measure than any of our forefathers did. Let us labour to improve our religious liberty, by practising pure religion and undefiled; by worshipping God in spirit and in truth; and taking his "word for a lantern to our feet, and a light in all our paths." Let us improve our civil liberty, the full freedom we enjoy, both as to our lives, goods, and persons, by devoting all we have, and all we are, to his honourable service. Then may we hope that he will continue to us all these blessings, with the crown of all, a thankful heart. Then shall we say, in all the changing scenes of life,—

> "Father, how wide thy glories shine,
> Lord of the universe and mine!
> Thy goodness watches o'er the whole,
> As all the world were but one soul;
> Yet counts my every sacred hair,
> As I remain'd thy single care!"