Carlile (Richard)

Carlile (Richard)

THE

REPUBLICAN.

VOL. I.

From AUGUST 27th, 1819, to JANUARY 7th, 1820.

London:

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY T. DAVISON, 10, DUKE STREET, SMITHFIELD.

INDEX.

A.

B.

C.

P. PAGE

R.

S.

T.

V.

W.

TO THE

READERS OF THE REPUPLICAN.'

At the expiration of the year, at the expiration of that shadow of liberty we have lately possessed, and at the close of the first volume of this work, I feel an inclination, as well as a duty, to address a few words to you out of the usual way. This work, under its present title, was commenced at a critical period; at that moment when the troops were ordered to draw their swords on the people. It was at this critical period, that the Editor of this work pledged himself not to shrink from duty, because there was danger; but where there was danger, there to take his stand. He appeals to a discriminating public, to say, whether he has fufilled this pledge. He was at liberty when writing that short address; the next week he dated the first number of this work from a prison, and now he feels no shame in saying, that it is from a prison, and under a confinement of the strictest nature, that it is likely to be continued. The trial of the Editor occasioned some little embarrassment in attending to this work; his removal from London has added to that embarrassment: some little deviations have occurred from the proposed mode of proceeding, but the Editor hopes that a candid allowance will be made for this; and finding himself again composed and settled, to resume the second volume with the pristine vigour of the first, if a publisher can be found under the existing state of things; he trusts that a generous public will give him credit when he says, that he would not

call on any other to do that, which he would shrink from doing himself. He is fully aware of the aspect of the times: but unless they are met by a boldness equivalent to martyrdom on the part of writers and publishers, the press will become that destructive engine in England which it has proved to be in other countries. Not a word will be written on the affairs of the country, but to applaud every act of the ruling party, and their adherents will proceed from villainy to villainy, until we have an Asiatic system in reality. These fellows will by and by sit at their meals and order their janizaries to go and fetch the head of such individuals as are obnoxious to them. The present system of legislation is quite unnatural, and in direct hostility to the better judgement of the whole people of Great Britain and Ireland: it is the legislation of one man—he influences the Council Board, and thence the Parliament by bribery and corruption. How long the people will continue under this system is not for me to say: patience has already carried them beyond what prudence would dictate. Job will be no longer referred to as the emblem of patience, when the history of the present state of this country shall be written by the impartial historian.

In the course of this work, the Editor has had many queries put to him, both verbal and by correspondence, as to his object and wishes relative to the abolition of monarchy and established religious creeds: and others, expressing their disapprobation of mixing theological with political questions. He will not give an answer to individual inquirers by name, but will endeavour to give a general answer to all queries that have arisen on the subject.

In the first place, it has been the practice of ignorant or evil-minded persons to assimilate the horrors of the French Revolution with any attempt to reach a Republican form of government. But on taking a closer view of the subject, and

first satisfying ourselves of the etymology and meaning of the word Republican, we find that it really means nothing more when applied to government, than a government which consults the public interest—the interest of the whole people. Although in almost all instances where governments have been denominated Republican, monarchy has been practically abolished; yet it does not argue the necessity of abolishing monarchy to establish a Republican government. The idea that the Editor has invariably held on this subject is: first, let us have a fair and equal system of representation without excluding the suffrage of any one man of sound mind and unimpeached conduct: then let every other thing stand or fall with it, as may be found convenient or conducive to the general interest. A House of real representatives, possessing a Democratic ascendancy, renewed every year, free from the influence or controul of any other bodies or establisments. This, I conceive, would be a real Republican government. Whether the present system of hereditary monarchy could exist under such a change I am quite indifferent, knowing, that if those representatives found it beneficial, it would continue to exist; and if found to be injurious, it would be abolished. The man that would consult the welfare of a single family in preference to the welfare of a community, can neither be a patriot, philanthropist, or a social being. Those political writers who urge the necessity of preserving and adhering to that part of the English legislature which at present consists of King and Lords, and who wish to extend the suffrage of representation to every man, evasively argue an absurdity which they previously know to be impracticable. A conflict might be carried on for some years between the powers, a continual dispute about rights and privileges would be inevitable, irritation would increase, and an appeal to force for the decision would be the conse-

quence, as was the case in the reign of Charles the First. I should much doubt the honesty and integrity of that man who called himself a Radical Reformer, (which is considered to apply as a term of distinction to those who advocate universal suffrage,) when he should say, "I do not contemplate any change in the present state of the monarchy, in case of gaining the point in reforming the House of Commons." I will admit candidly on my own part that such an incongruous idea does not exist in my bosom. I cannot reconcile it with my idea of the effects of equal and full representation. I hold as opinion, that an expensive hereditary system of monarchy as existing at present in this country, would not be countenanced by the representatives of the whole people. —If ever the contrary is shown to me, I will become as good a subject to that monarchy as any subject that ever existed under any former monarchy: but until then I must beg the indulgence of retaining my opinions.—A free and perfect House of Commons, and every other department subservient to that. These are my republican ideas.

With respect to the aboliton of established religious creeds, I do not contend for its necessity in any other instance than where they are attempted to be enforced as a matter of uniformity by the secular arm: they then become disgusting, degrading, and injurious. I maintain on this head, that no goverment should legislate as to what shall or shall not be the religion of its subjects; or what differences should exist in their creeds. It is a subject connected with the mind; the mind may be debased and rendered hypocritcal, but can never be regulated by any standard. The question has been asked, Whether I consider every believer in divine Revelation the foe to civil liberty, or even republican government? I answer by no means: I know the contrary. I can have no objection, that a certain number of persons or families holding similar

opinions, should have a chapel and a preacher agreeable to their minds, provided they meet the expences themselves: but if I am called on to contribute, I should object, and say, I see no need for any species of public worship of any Being, real or imaginary. I am very willing to contribute to the support of public lectures on the various sciences; of the one I can see utility, of the other I cannot. But whilst religion is made the engine of the state to forge fresh fetters, and whilst the established priesthood who are supported out of the taxes, are the supple tools of every existing authority; I for one shall live and die its foe. I have an uniform opinion of every species of religion; that is, wherever it is allowed to predominate over dissenting opinions, it becomes the worst of despotisms. I again repeat that an established priesthood, of whatever tenets, is incompatible with civil liberty. Look for instance to the local magistracy of this country, and see what it is composed of: you will find the majority to be priests of the Established Church, and we have not been without some rare specimens of their conduct of late. It has been said in St. Stephen's Chapel, that the unpaid magistracy of this country was of the greatest importance, and should not be spoken of disrespectfully: that if persons who devoted their time and services to the administration of the laws and of justice, without fee or reward, were exposed to censure or disrespect, they would cease to act. How can it possibly be said to be without fee or reward, when every priest knows, whatever may be his ability, or whether he has any or not, that there are rich benefices in store if his conduct affords a little gratification to those who have them at their disposal. Every man is more or less guided by self interest. I do not believe there is such a being as a disinterested man: there may be shades of difference in this respect. Let us for a moment take a view of the conduct of the Rev. Parson

Hay, of Manchester repute. This man was first intended by his friends for the Bar—was actually sent to study and to pass the degrees for that purpose, but turned out to be what is vulgarly called a numskull. And as the Rev Parson was not adapted for the Bar, he must step into the pulpit, where he would not have to deliver himself extempore, but where every thing necessary to be said might be said from written or printed books: this answers very well. The gentleman obtains a living, and soon after the Commission of the Peace in the County of York, near Doncaster, where he continues to exercise his influence over a weekly newspaper published in that town. The magistrates of Manchester and its neighbourhood, each and individually have an objection to preside as Chairman at the Quarter Sessions. What is to be done? Why there is this Reverend Magistrate in Yorkshire, who will jump at at any thing in the shape of stipend, is applied to, and agrees to perform the office as Chairman (although commissioned for another county) for the sum of £400 per year. By this means Mr. Hay bears the title of a Manchester magistrate. His further acts and deeds, are they not written in the Chronicles of the Boroughmongers, in the PEOPLE'S BOOK? The Rev. Mr. Ethelstone who ascends his pulpit to preach peace and the Christian religion, surrounded with military and fixed bayonets, is another of these respectable unpaid magistracy. These are a sample of the whole, allowing for the difference of circumstances and situation. As a proof of the despotism of every species of religion, I would instance the Scottish Covenanters, who, when by the aid of John Knox, and other furious fanatics, they had thrown down the despotism of the Roman Catholic religion, assumed a despotism in their new form as Covenanters, or adhering to a certain covenant which they presumed to have made with the person they called Lord Jesus, still more

odious, cruel, and destructive, and afterwards their presbytery became very little better. The same was the case of what is called the present Established Church of England, who threw off only the shadow of the Roman Catholic system, and retained the substance: it harassed in an unparallelled manner the poor Scottish Covenanters and Presbyterians, because they would not embrace the Episcopacy and Liturgy of the English Church. History does not display more cruelty and horrible barbarity under any other Church, than has been practised by the present established Church of England on the Scottish Covenanters and Presbyterians: it nearly approached to an extermination by the faggot and sword in the time of the Stuarts. If the form of worship in the Established Church was now to be deprived of the support of the statute law, and any other system, such as Calvinism, Arminianism, or Socinianism, were to predominate, the same system of persecution would revive: every other sect would be proscribed as in error. I would carry this idea and assertion even to the Quakers, quiet and inoffensive as they now are: I doubt not, but in case of prevalence as a system of religion, a thorough change would take place in their characters, and that arrogance and conceit which has been invariably found in the strongest sect, would be found amongst them. The United States of America are evidently degenerating in character and morals, in consequence of the prevalence of fanaticism amongst them. This fanatic poison had so deeply imbued the inhabitants of that neighbourhood where Paine's remains lay, that a mound of earth was not allowed to mark the spot; it was no sooner raised, than these gentry, in honour to their Lord and Master, would come and kick and scuffle it down. America may regenerate before its degeneration becomes dangerous. A few men with splendid talents, and the free exercise of the press, may soon

set all right in that country. If fanaticism does not make an inroad on their liberty it will reach a certain degree, and find a sudden check, should a portion of the press be allowed to assail it. In England the case is different; we are approaching to censorships, and are not many degrees off the faggot.

With respect to the introduction of theological subjects or disputes in an alleged political publication, I must contend for its propriety, seeing that the corruptions of the legislature so deeply rooted in, and so ardently supported by the Church. And further, because I sincerely believe, that the system of religion observed in this country, has been one of despotism's strong holds. I therefore repeat, that my warfare is with error and delusion of all kinds, particularly that which I can clearly perceive has a tendency to degrade my countrymen, by becoming a bar to the sciences and civil improvements: because, thereby, its defects are inevitably displayed. I hope to see the day, and witness the deed, when an English Senate shall disown the divinity of the Christian Religion. It is science, the parent of all that can render life desirable or worth preserving, that has been the devil in the Christian religion. Science is that innovation so much deprecated by the interested adherents to that religion. Science has been continually at war with it. Christianity prevailed over science for several centuries, and not only checked its progress, but almost annihilated its former growth. Science is the Antichrist. Let the shade of GALILEO speak to this:—let the living LAWRENCE speak.

For my own part I have fairly examined every thing that fell into my hands in defence of the Christian religion: the more I read the stronger is my conviction. I approve and admire the moral part of it wherever I see it in practice; it is its assumed divinity alone that I deprecate; this is the

parent of hypocrisy; it is this that has armed the bigot and the fanatic with those destructive weapons he has wielded for so many centuries. Let us rejoice, it is on the decline: its decay is much more rapid than its growth. My situation for the last year has furnished me with an ample knowledge of the rapidity of its decay. Well may the priests clamour against those who oppose it, and cry blasphemy—blasphemy—blasphemy! Heresy, schism, and blasphemy are the daughters of this religion; they were born to her at a very early period, whilst she was in her youth, just as she reached the age of puberty; they have grown up and followed the mother wherever she has gone, and will no doubt be consigned to the same tomb, at the same time.—*Ave tempus!*

I shall now quit this part of the subject, with a hope that sufficient cause has been shewn why this publication should be continued as it has begun. There is another observation I would make, and which is of importance to the Editor: in certain seasons of the year politics become very dull—no public business stirring—we have only to contemplate the distresses of the country and its population. At such times it will be a fertile source, and desirable to introduce the theological subject; to admit the disquisitions of such correspondents as are not ashamed to publish their names with their opinions; and what is of still more importance to the Editor, it gives the publication an interest it would not otherwise enjoy.

As the price and size of pamphlets, touching on political subjects, and commenting on the proceedings of the day, are to be regulated by a statute, a few words may not be improper as to the continuation of this publication. I have resolved to adopt the smallest size and the least price the statute will allow: as to the exact time of its operation I am not aware, but suffice it to say that the first volume will be closed with the last twopenny sheet, and the second commence with the new series. There is no doubt that each and every one of our readers would prefer a larger sized pamphlet for sixpence, than pay the additional fourpence for a stamp. In fact, this stamp should be avoided as much as any exciseable articles, where the pamphlet does not go through the post, or has not to pay the expence of carriage. It must be admitted that to pay for the stamp of a newspaper, to admit it through the post to any part of the country free of expence, is a great benefit, and a privilege of

great importance; but yet those who perceive the necessity of waging a war with the revenue, should abstain as much as possible from adding to the stamp duties, either by newspapers, or in the payment of money, or any other agreements, where the least confidence exists between the parties. The stamp duties are a dreadful impost on the country.

I shall defer my observations on the new restrictive laws until such time as I get printed copies of the Statutes from the King's printing office. By the by, I really think they have forgot to exempt the Statutes, which are printed in the form of pamphlets by the King's printer, from the operation of the new stamp duty bill.

The Editor hopes that the extended size and price will not restrict the number of his readers, although he is fully aware it must restrict the number of the pamphlets sold. Small reading societies, consisting of three or four families, are now more essential than ever: our enemies are straining every nerve to stop the reading that is now going on, for they well know that "knowledge is power."

The Editor has now to return thanks for the very extensive and liberal support he has found in this work. Its number has been very great for the short time of its publication: many weeks had not elasped, before it reached 10,000; at the moment of the trial of the Editor it extended to 15,000, but in consequence of the variations, difficulties, and embarrassments it has laboured under since that time, it has declined. Much of this might be attributed to the timidity of venders of political pamphlets in general: they are in just the same state of alarm at this moment as they were after the *famous* or rather *infamous circular* of *Lord Sidmouth*, and the *Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act*. This alarm will subside within three months, and the sale of political pamphlets become as extensive as ever. It will increase even with the distress of the country, and with that only, as they who feel distress see in those publications the real cause and remedy for the evils under which they suffer. The Editor begs further to assure his countrymen, that whether within the walls of a prison or without, his mind remains the same, his actions are alone restrained: and their support will be at all times acknowledged, and their emancipation the prayer and study of

R. CARLILE.

Dorchester Gaol, Dec. 30, 1819.

The Republican.

No. 1. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Aug. 27, 1819. [Price 2d.

TO THE PUBLIC.

As this cannot be altogether considered a new publication, but merely a continuation of that entitled "*Sherwin's Weekly Political Register*, which has been invariably the bold advocate of the only rational system of Government, namely, the REPUBLICAN; the Editor presumes that he need not make any apology for, or issue a new prospectus of this work, as its title needs no explanation, nor shall its object be disguised. As the honest avowal of sentiment, is becoming daily more dangerous to the Englishman, and the advocates of a full, fair, and equal representation, must inevitably be subject to frequent arrests and imprisonments, whilst the present deficient representation exists, the Editor humbly stands forward to fill the post of danger, ambitious of incurring, (if martyrs must be found) even *martyrdom*, in the cause of liberty. The question of reform is at this moment to be looked at in two points of view, the first is whether there is sufficient virtue to be found in the aristocracy and landed interest of the country to enforce it; or whether the unrepresented, and consequently the injured part of the community, must rouse and bring into action their strength to bring about that which *must* finally be enforced. I am of opinion that every opportunity has been afforded the former, had they possessed the virtue; and having neglected the opportunity, or rather having shewn a want of feeling altogether in the cause, the latter are imperatively called upon immediately to unite, to rally their strength; and I have no doubt but they will be found sufficiently formidable to carry the measure, with very little obstruction.

In the words of our famous countryman, our great and only prototype, Thomas Paine, we might say, "these are the times that try men's souls." The editor, impressed with the importance of the moment, has resolved, that no correspondence or essays be admitted into the pages of the *Republican*, unless accompanied with the real name and address of the author. In doing this, he is aware that he

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

will exclude much talent, but the necessity of every man making a frank and candid avowal of his principles and sentiments at the present moment, far exceeds any other feelings that may be put in competition with it. He hopes that there are to be found in the country, men, not only of talent, but with sufficient property and virtue to render them men of importance and weight in society, who dare openly avow what they think necessary to be done. Most periodical publications of the day, are filled with anonymous essays, correspondence and information on various subjects, which are as many proofs of a degree of talent existing in the country, equal, or superior, to any former period; but, it cannot be denied, that those essays, &c. would produce more effect and conviction, were they signed by some individual, whose motives and moral character are unimpeachable. In noticing the talent of the age, a painful reflection occurs, that it has invariably happened in those countries which have been brought to the verge of destruction by misrule, that the greatest talents and virtues have been produced. It is the misery, which ignorant, imbecile, and wicked rulers, bring on a country, that draws forth the natural energies of the virtuous mind. It was the conduct of Cæsar, which became so fatal to the liberties of Rome, that produced a CATO. It was the miseries experienced in this country, by the incursions and ravages of the Danes, that produced an ALFRED. It was the tyrannical caprice of Charles the Ist, that produced a HAMPDEN, a LILBURNE, and a CROMWELL; and that of the Second Charles, that produced a RUSSEL, and a SIDNEY. It was the cruel and oppressive conduct of the British Cabinet towards the colonists of North America, that produced a PAINE, a FRANKLIN, and a WASHINGTON. It was the accursed despotism of the ancient regime of France, that produced the talent so very conspicuous during the revolution, which often shone as brilliant as the stars in a clear atmosphere, and was as often buried in the black clouds of anarchy and misrule, until by the efficacy of its superior virtue, it became the sun of Europe, and could never have been clouded, but by the intrigues of the British Cabinet, destroying the resources and happiness of its nation, to goad a Bonaparte to become the victim of his own ambition, and his country's ruin. It is to be hoped, that the germ of revolution is not rooted out of France, but that she will again shake off her fetters, and rescue her character. Indeed it is apparent and evident, that the tree of liberty, which was planted, and which grew and bloomed

in France, although its blossom was blasted, yet it has taken a root deep and wide, spreading over the Continent of Europe, a root that will baffle the despot, who attempts to eradicate it. By dwelling on, and illustrating subjects like these, the editor hopes to rouse a unanimous and corresponding feeling among his countrymen, by endeavouring to subvert on the one hand, the evils of anarchy, and on the other, those of despotism. He will studiously point them to that state of society, which produces the greatest benefit to the greatest portion of the community—an equal representation in the legislature. The editor pledges himself that in this publication there shall be found nothing that has a tendency to create dissension among the advocates of a change in the present state of things: to those gentlemen who call themselves moderate in their claims, he would say, I have taken my stand on the rock of republicanism; I will advocate its principles, without looking back to those who do not go so far; and should the breath of calumny be raised, I shall leave it to be dispersed by the passing breeze, conscious that a rectitude of intention will sooner or later find its reward.

R. CARLILE.

Giltspur Street Compter, August, 22, 1819.

THE CRISIS.—No. I.

THE massacre of the unoffending inhabitants of Manchester, on the 16th of August, by the Yeomanry Cavalry, and Police, at the instigation of the Magistrates, should be the daily theme of the press, until the MURDERERS are brought to justice by the Law Officers of the Crown, under the instruction of the executive, or in default thereof, until the People have obtained their proper rank and station in the legislature, by an equal representation, and thereby the means of enforcing the execution of justice, which in all probability will now be witheld. When we have seen a Cashman put to death for an act, committed whilst in a state of insanity from hunger and distress, and instigated to the deed by intoxication; and when we have seen a Vaughan, a Brock, a Pelham, and a Power, the deliberate murderers of their countrymen, under the sanction of the Police establishments, screened from justice by those who hired and encouraged them, we can have but little hope,

that the Bloodhounds of Manchester will have justice done them under the present state of things. I, as an individual, have no hesitation in asserting, that the laws which once were the security of the person and property of the inhabitants of this country, are SUBVERTED; and that justice, in consequence, has fled from her seat. Then, under this state of things, let us for a moment enquire what is the duty of the man who wishes to rescue himself and the character of his country from this degradation. If he be sincere in his professions, he will not now say to the Republican, I cannot act in concert with you, because you aim at a more extended suffrage than I do, nor to the *Russell* who talks about removing to the populous town, the franchise of those boroughs, where bribery has been exposed and punished because it has been effected by a private individual, and not under the sanction and influence of the Treasury Lords. No, we must have but two parties, those who wish an effectual change, and those who are determined with their lives to support things as they are. We must have a government by representation, and if we are not strong enough to effect that, it would be far better to live under an absolute Monarchy than to remain as we are. We have nothing now more than a MOCK KING, and a MOCK PARLIAMENT, who are acted on, and moved about at the pleasure of the Boroughmongers. Englishmen! It must not remain so! We are becoming the scoff and the jest of the world, and should this state of things continue half a century longer, we shall become the most insignificant of nations, perhaps tributary to some of our neighbours! Fellow Countrymen, rouse from this fatal apathy, and play the MAN—if you are the creatures, be no longer the slaves of circumstances. Some of you must be exposed to arrests and imprisonments, some even to martyrdom, but recollect that martyrs have been found by millions to superstition, and even by thousands to despotism, and cannot martyrs be found in the great and noble cause of liberating man from his degraded condition?

The man who becomes a martyr in any attempt to benefit his country or mankind in general, dies an enviable death. The name of Hampden is never heard nor expressed by a man possessing feeling and common sense, without a degree of veneration and respect. And we have to contend against a far more destructive influence than Hampden died contending with. Had we some Hampdens in the Common House of Boroughmonger interest, they would soon rouse a feel-

ing in the country, sufficiently formidable to make it a House of Commons, devoted to the welfare of the Commons of Great Britain only. But no, the People are now left to act for themselves, they have no representatives, there is no hope of their obtaining any by the concession of their oppressors, and since they cannot make known their will by representation or delegation, they must do it collectively. The best mode of doing this, is by public meetings, and they should be convened regularly, and periodically, either weekly, monthly, or quarterly. If public meetings cannot be held peaceably without the interference of military, then the People are bound by the laws of their country, to resist any such wanton, illegal, and murderous attack, as that made on the peaceable inhabitants of Manchester; but more shall be said on this subject, when it is seen what part the executive means to take in this affair. One of two things must be done, either the Magistrates and Yeomanry Cavalry, must be brought to trial for MURDER, or some charge of High Treason must be *trumped* up against those who were connected with that meeting. In the latter case, the Magistrates will be enabled to imprison all those who are likely to be called as evidences against them, for seven months, and perhaps by that time get them all destroyed; for those men who could direct their bloodhounds to attack and destroy a peaceable meeting at noon day, are capable of directing the dagger or the poison cup to the cell of their prisoner. Oh! England, to what wilt thou come! formed by nature to contain a race of men, who might live in the most polished state of society, and command the respect of all the inhabitants of the earth, yet still the most miserable! 'Tis misrule—fatal misrule, that keeps the better half of thy children in a state of wretchedness, and starvation, whilst the few squander thy produce. When shall thy sons shake off that grovelling apathy, and awake to a sense of their degradation? When shall they again reap that which they sow? Famed for industry and peaceful content, thy inhabitants have been distinguished among nations for having at their command a plentiful supply of the necessaries of life, whilst now they are become a squalid, half-starved race of men, first goaded to desperation by starvation, then considered by their rulers fit objects for destruction by the bayonet and the sabre.

That a great deal of misery and wretchedness exists in the country, our oppressors, who are the cause of it, readily admit, yet not one step will they take to alleviate it. The

case is, that the whole system of Government is hinged on baseness and corruption, and should the attempt to amend an atom of it, be made by those who have brought it to this pitch, it would tend to accelerate the decay of the whole. Therefore, say they, we will cling to our ill-gotten gains, whilst any thing remains to be extracted from a perishing country, abandon it when it can no longer be kept together, and retire to some other country, with what we can collect from the spoil! Englishmen! This is the exact state of things under which you exist. There is yet time to recover yourselves, but for your families, and your country's sake, defer not till to-morrow, that which should be done to-day. Whilst you delay, your enemies will seek to weaken you—you cannot be stronger than at the present time—resolve and you will speedily accomplish—your enemies have taken the alarm and are on the alert—prepare and strike at them. Let your voice come round them like the rolling thunder, and let your indignation flash on them, as the destructive fluid of the terrific lightning. The majority of you have nothing to lose and every thing to gain, far better for you would it be to perish in an attempt to recover for yourselves and families the necessaries of life, than to perish from the direful effects of hunger and starvation.

As every incident that can be placed on record relative to the massacre in Manchester, may be considered of importance, I will here state the substance of one of the Resolutions which I was informed was to have been submitted to the meeting for its adoption.—"Resolved, that this meeting do henceforth abstain from the use of malt, and spirituous liquors, and all other exciseable articles, as a measure calculated to produce the most salutary effects, both in health, interest, and future welfare." And as a further proof of the peaceable disposition and intention of those who called that meeting, a dinner was provided for 200, and a resolution to set the example of drinking nothing but water, at or after the dinner. This has not the appearance of exciting the passions to commit riot, and breaches of the peace, or to create insurrection. The passions of the Yeomanry Cavalry and Police, were inflamed by strong and spirituous liquors, their reason and reflection (if ever they possessed either) was first eradicated by these means, and then they became fit agents for the *Nadins*, the *Withingtons*, the *Traffords*, and the *Fletchers* of Manchester. This observation on the dinner brings to my recollection the mis-statements and misrepresentations which have gone through the newspapers,

emanating from the murderers themselves; the article is thus: "The industry that is used in circulated incendiary placards and pamphlets in this part of the country is really astonishing. As a corroborating proof of this circumstance, at least 5000 copies of the accompanying *Address*, were seized and found in the coach that conveyed HUNT and his junto to the meeting on Monday—they were enclosed in a sheet of brown paper, bearing the following direction:—"Mr. Carlile, for Mr. Hunt."

["The Address here referred to, is that which was agreed to at Smithfield, under the title of an Address of the *People of Great Britain* to the *People of Ireland*."]

The facts are these. A gentleman who travelled from Birmingham to Manchester with me on the Sunday, and who slept at the Star Inn in an adjoining room to mine, presented me with this parcel to deliver to Mr. Hunt, and in addition to the address above mentioned, was written "with a letter." Now I carried this *immense* parcel (which if there had been 5000, they would have weighed 60lbs.) in my hand from the Star Inn to Smedley Cottage, and by some little perambulation of the streets, (never before having been in Manchester,) made the journey about three miles. In presenting them to Mr. Hunt, according to the direction, he said he could make no use of them, and did not know a better mode of distribution, than by putting them on the plates at dinner. For this purpose they were put into the *Barouche*, and I will stake my credit that there would not have been one for every plate, if 200 plates had been laid. This, then, is the "extensive distribution of incendiary pamphlets;" a number not amounting to 200, has been magnified by men, who appear as capable of lying, as of committing murder, to the immense number of 5000.

Shall it be said of England, that a Prince, a Duke, or a Magistrate, shall murder their fellow-citizens with impunity, whilst the man who resisteth his oppressor, and kills him to save his own life, is executed as a murderer? Forbid it Nature! But this is now to be attempted at Manchester. The wholesale murderers say, that before they began to use their sabres, a pistol was fired and a brick-bat thrown. This is false. Hundreds had felt the sabre before the slightest resistance was made. I was informed of one instance, where a pistol was fired with effect. One of the yeomanry cavalry made a cut at a boy, and missed him, when the boy ran away; but such was the fury and fiend-like disposition of the horseman, (for the name of *soldier* they disgrace,) that

he galloped after him, and was in the act of making another cut, when a man, who witnessed the scene, drew a pistol from under his coat, and shot the assassin. Surely this conduct on the part of the man with the pistol was laudable; and where is the man that would, in any mixed company of ten or twelve persons, impeach his conduct or motive for firing?

The word *Soldier*, according to my comprehension and definition, is an expression of security and protection, that is, that those men in any civilized state who leave the plough or any other manual labour, and become soldiers under the presumption that they are to guard and to protect the persons and property of those by whose industry they are supported; and that at any particular crisis or moment of danger, in case of invasion or any thing of that nature, the soldier should fill the post of danger, in preference to the unarmed and untrained citizen: because the citizen artisan, agriculturist, or labourer, has parted with a portion of the profits arising from his labour, to prepare the citizen soldier to the use of arms and military duty; and the citizen untrained to the use of arms, however virtuous or bold he may be to stand forward and meet the aggressor, should be kept in reserve whilst there is a sufficient military power, and not be called on to act, unless in case of emergency. This is my conception of the duty and character of a soldier. But in England, civilization is retrograding, and we are compelled to pay soldiers, that they may be ready to cut our own throats, at the nod of the magistrates. At least, that this is the object of our Rulers and Legislators, there can be no doubt. I hope the citizen soldier, who is a real soldier, and knows what military service is, is not prepared to do this. That they will not forget that they have Fathers, Mothers, Brothers, Sisters, and relatives amongst the People, and whilst perhaps they are called on by our miscreant rulers to destroy one portion of the People, perhaps another body of soldiers, at or near their homes, are actually ordered to destroy their relatives and friends. For it has been the plan of the Rulers of this country for some years past to remove the different troops of soldiers to the greatest distance from their native homes, so as to make the Soldiers and the People as foreign as possible to each other. In the days of yore, the militia were always stationary in the county in which they were raised, unless in case of actual war or invasion in the country. But in the last war on the liberties of France and the continent of Europe, the militia

of the three countries, England, Ireland, and Scotland, were completely interchanged. The English and Scotch militias were bribed to go to Ireland, and the Irish militia were bribed to come to England and Scotland, the better to prepare them to cut the throats of each other's friends and relatives, by stirring up feuds and prejudices amongst the People and Military. I remember, when a lad, hearing a serjeant of the South Devon militia boast of having seen, whilst in Ireland, one of the unfortunate "United Irishmen," hung up by the neck twenty times; that he was half hung, or hung till half dead, then cut down, and allowed to breathe a little, nineteen times for their amusement, and on the twentieth time was let hang until dead! I merely mention this to shew to what an extent provincial prejudices might be carried in the minds of illiterate, though perhaps honest men; and we have too many lamentable proofs on record of such men being filled with such prejudices, at the instigation of their officers.

At a time like the present, when every thing has the appearance of war, between the oppressor and the oppressed; when corruption is marshalling her troops, instructing her tools, and putting into exercise every engine that her malice can invent, to crush the efforts, and the hopes of the country; when ball cartridges have been distributed, swords new ground, lieutenants of counties, sheriffs, judges, and magistrates, have all received their orders to put their shoulders to the wheel, it is evident that every effort has been and will be made to drive an injured, and insulted People to deeds of desperation and vengeance; for, fools and idiots as the boroughmongers are, they could not for a moment, suppose they could *intimidate* millions of Britons; or drive them from that high ground of their "just und undoubted right and inheritance," which they have now chosen! No such idea could ever cross their minds, and their sole object was to drive them to some deeds of desperation, that might cast a stain upon their "glorious cause," and by that means prevent a number of upright men from joining their fellow countrymen in their demands for their birthright.—But most happily, they have been disappointed, and the prudent conduct of the requisitionists at Manchester, has given them a more fatal blow than they have received for some time; as every prudent man in the kingdom, must now be well aware on which side the appellation of "violence and anarchy" will now rest.

The Boroughmongers are well aware that the magical

voice of truth and common sense, though uttered by a few uninstructed mechanics, is making the most rapid and electrifying progress through the minds of every man in Britain, however many of them may be prevented for a time, from shewing their true thoughts. And the idea, that their peaceful and noble conduct will soon induce every *honest* man of property and influence to join them, has wrought that horror and consternation among them, which is only leading them more precipitately to their doom!

All their taunts, irony, satire, and malignant misrepresentations of the proceedings of the Reformers, only make the *passive* bulk of the community more anxious to hear about them, to discuss their claims, and hear their reasonings, and wherever truth and justice shall be found, there will their warmest affections center; every act of unfair play, persecution, and punishment attempted to be heaped upon their heads, rebounds with double force upon their *oppressors*, and renders the Reformers the object of public regard and respect.

One of the greatest demonstrations that a conspiracy now exists amongst the wealthy People of this country, to oppress and enslave the poor, is the conduct now pursued by the judges.

Mr. Justice BAILEY lately declared at York, that the kingdom was in a flourishing state, and that the Taxes were necessary and beneficial. GARROW, more recently at Croydon, delivered a charge to the Grand Jury, inciting the Yeomanry Volunteers of Surrey to arrange themselves against the Reformers, then about to meet on *Monday last* on *Kennington Common*, and the Grand Jury have sent forth an avowal of the same sentiments, repeating with parrot like accuracy, the language of the charge and the recent *royal* proclamation.

When Judges will incite to blood and murder on the seats of Justice; when Grand Juries, forgetting their duties to investigate into criminal offences, turn the inquest into the purposes of political slander, and there avow their determination of supporting tyranny, oppression, and the measures of plundering factions; it is time for the People to be on the alert, and betake themselves to the means of self protection, and as by the Bill of Rights allowed, provide themselves with arms against the coming evil, and to resist oppression. If unfeeling avaricious, and time serving monsters, will urge a distressed and miserable People to desperation, let them abide the consequences, let them fear the reaction of revenge, and the punishment their villainous

conduct is likely to bring down on their guilty heads. The People's conduct has been peaceable, their demands are just; obstinacy and intolerance are the conduct of their enemies, let them suddenly change it:—it would shew to the world a becoming prudence, and save them from the indignant vengeance of a highly enraged and greatly wronged People.

There being still many persons who are weak and silly enough to imagine that the present House of Commons, (as it is ridiculously called,) will of its own accord, do something in the way of Reform, the delusion must certainly vanish, when they become acquainted with the tenure on which a large proportion of the members thereof hold their seats; it is therefore necessary they should be informed, that it has become a practice with most of the great Borough Proprietors, to obtain from every person they nominate to a seat, previous to the return being made, a regular written acceptance of the CHILTERN HUNDREDS signed by his own hand, leaving a vacant space to insert a date, and which if the *tool* thus returned, should at any period evince the least spirit of independence, and give a single vote against the interest or opinion of the lordly borough-monger, is instantly filled up and forwarded to the Speaker, who immediately declares the seat vacated, and issues a new writ accordingly, and so peremptorily has this system been acted on in some instances, that it actually occurred twice during the last Parliament, that the members concerned were totally unacquainted with the favor conferred on them, till they went to take their place in the House as usual, and were then and there informed that their dignity of Senatorship had evaporated.

Let Corruption's poison swell her victims till they burst; an honest man has neither act nor part with them!

Let them strain their lungs, with threats of persecution and vengeance, till they are hoarse—"they pass by us, as the idle wind which we regard not!" They CANNOT punish us! We are surrounded by the best feelings of every honest man in the kingdom; and every effort of their's to wrong and oppress us, covers our heads with unfading glory, and their's with indelible infamy! The poorest and most oppressed among us is now acquainted with his *rights* and his *duties*, and every effort of our enemies to make us relinquish the former, or swerve from the latter, will prove as impotent as the efforts of a petty tempest against the "gnarled oak."

We have no thought that we wish to conceal; therefore there is no *treason* among us. The bill of Major Cartwright *proves* that our demands are nothing more than for a "renovation" of our constitution: it is so *plain* that any school-boy may understand it, and so *true*, that every effort of our enemies to contradict or deny it, only proves that they have been *biting at a file*.

The passing of this bill, which deprives no one of his lawful rights, but restores the usurped rights of many, is all that we demand, *and less we will not take! And to the refusal to pass it*, and not to any other cause, must be ascribed the present agitated state of the country; and the blood of those who may happen to perish in this cause, shall rest with those men who refuse to listen to the voice of reason and justice!

The most important mode of attack to be made without arms, is to attack the revenue, to withhold the taxes, and to abstain from the use of all exciseable articles.

It is an incontrovertible fact, that a very great proportion of the vast sums of money collected in these kingdoms under the shape of Taxes, is exacted from the middling and humbler classes of the community, that the money after being so exacted, is devoted to every vile purpose inimical to the welfare and happiness of those from whom it has been wrung. With such glaring facts staring us in the face, ought we not to take a view of our domestic establishments, in order to curtail, if possible, the consumption, (if ever so trifling) of any of the articles from which the Borough-monger draw the means of prosecuting us? And though, alas, domestic comforts (or rather necessaries) are too much abridged from the above cause, yet I am convinced that much more might be done through self-denial, or from principle; and as our fair country-women are entering so intrepidly into the cause of Reform, I wish to address myself equally to them. There can be no difficulty in selecting those articles which are taxed, a difficulty might arise to select one not taxed, however I shall be bold enough to say that malt and spirituous liquors, tea, tobacco, &c. are articles used in much profusion, I might say in waste, and for persons professing principles of Reform to drink to intoxication is preposterous indeed, seeing that while they sacrifice at the Altar of Bacchus, they are nerving the arm of tyranny.

The following calculations will farther illustrate what might be effected, viz.

Suppose two millions of persons convinced of the necessity of Reform, were resolved so to abridge the consumption of particular articles as to cut off three pence per day in taxes; this, in one year, would amount to the sum of £9,125,000, and taking Mr. Preston's estimates, that working people pay more than half their earnings away in taxes, I conceive it practicable to a much greater extent. Would not such measures shake despotism itself, and teach eloquence that the contributions of the lower orders, the mob, and the swinish multitude, are of some consequence to the state?

This is a most important recommendation, and worthy the attention of all classes of society, for whilst they are making it a weapon of attack on the Borough-mongers, the most beneficial results will accrue to themselves, they would feel it sensibly both in health, comfort, and in pocket, for all the articles above alluded to, are at the same time the most expensive, and the least necessary of all articles required to support human nature. Let a man, or a man and his wife, once resolve to carry this point, and they will soon find reasons to rejoice at it. Our fields and gardens produce many a root and herb that would make a beverage equally pleasant, and far more wholesome than tea. We are too apt to neglect to do important things, because we imagine that our individual act would not effect the object aimed at; certainly it would not, but let each be eager to set the example, and we shall soon perceive its importance. Oppression and despotism must be destroyed, and I for one, would appeal to any and every weapon to effect its destruction.*

R. CARLILE.

Gilltspur Street Compter,
Wednesday, August 25th, 1819.

---

* Several valuable correspondences having been sent for insertion in the *Political Register* prior to the change of title, their insertion could not possibly take place in the *Republican*, after expressing a resolution in a former page not to admit any, without the real name and address. It will be perceived that we have availed ourselves of their able suggestions.

RECORD OF PERSECUTION,

Under the Administration of LIVERPOOL, CASTLEREAGH, CANNING, SIDMOUTH, *&c.*

RICHARD CARLILE, of Fleet-street, Publisher, was arrested on the 14th of August, 1817, on three warrants granted by Mr. Justice Holroyd, on the oath of one Griffin Swanson, a common informer, for publishing the Parodies, the sale of which had been suppressed by Mr. Hone, but for which Mr. H. was afterwards put on three several trials, and as often acquitted, to the great joy of the People, to the great grief of the Administration, and Sir Samuel Shepherd, Knt. Attorney-General, to the acceleration of the death of the then Chief Justice (Ellenborough), and to the intoxication of the present Chief Justice, to see his great prototype defeated as well as himself. On the 15th, he was committed to the King's Bench Prison, by Mr. Justice Holroyd, in default of bail, to the amount of £800, on the three several warrants. On the 13th of November, being called on to plead, he was surprized with a fourth information by the aforesaid Attorney-General, founded on the 18th Number of Vol. I. of Sherwin's Political Register. On the 20th of December, he was liberated, after an imprisonment of eighteen weeks, by entering into recognizances of £300, without either of the four informations being submitted to a Jury then or ever afterwards.

On the 16th day of January, 1819, he was informed that the "Society for the Suppression of Vice," had presented a bill to the Grand Jury, then sitting at the Old Bailey, on a charge of blasphemous Libel for the publication of the Theological Works of Thomas Paine. Bail was immediately presented, and the arrest prevented. The Indictment was removed by *Writ of Certiorari*, to the Court of King's Bench, at the instance of the Society, and further Bail required on the first day of Hilary Term, when an Information was also presented to the Court by the Attorney-General (Shepherd) against the same publication. To both the Indictment and Information, the defendant *imparled*, under an order to plead within the first eight days of Easter Term.

On the 11th day of February, a warrant was granted against the defendant, by Chief Justice Abbott, on an oath made by George Pritchard and Thomas Fair, that defendant had continued the sale of Paine's Theological Works, and that the said George Pritchard intended to prosecute. This warrant was put in force at eight o'clock in the evening, and by ten o'clock defendant was lodged within the walls of Newgate. On the 15th day of February, he was brought from Newgate, by a writ of Habeas Corpus, to the chambers of Mr. Justice Bailey, and bail was tendered and taken (a third

time) to appear and answer to the charge against the same publication. (Pritchard is Solicitor and Secretary to the Society for the Suppression of Vice, and Thomas Fair his clerk. The solicitor to so litigious, so immoral, and so secret a Society, must derive no small profit from his situation. For instance, any poor and weak-minded creature, who may be prosecuted at the instance of this Society, if he comes forward and expresses contrition and penitence for the alledged offence, the prosecution is withdrawn, on the condition that the defendant pays this fellow, Pritchard, £20 or £30, for what are called expences incurred.)—On the first day of Easter Term he pleaded to an Information and Indictment, and, in addition to those, had presented to him another Information, at the instance of the aforesaid Attorney-General, founded on No. 6, Vol. IV. of Sherwin's Weekly Political Register, and another Indictment at the instance of the aforefaid Society, founded on that part of the first volume of the Deist, entitled "Palmer's Principles of Nature." To these last two he again imparled, and on the 4th day of Trinity Term he prayed the Court to stay this accumulation of Informations and Indictments, until those to which he had already pleaded, and was prepared to defend, were disposed of. But the lenient and impartial Judges of the Court of King's Bench, forsooth, could see no need of this, and he must stand prepared to defend five, or perhaps nine, Informations and Indictments at the same time, should it be the pleasure of the Attorney-General. And, after all this, defendant expects, when he has the honour and the satisfaction of meeting the Attorney-General in the Court, (once the Court of Justice,) to hear him expatiate on the mildness of the English laws. The sittings after two different terms, (that is to say, Easter and Trinity) have been suffered to elapse, without bringing the question to an issue, whilst the publications have invariably continued on sale.

On the 21st day of August, being Saturday, he was arrested by a warrant from John Atkins, Lord Mayor of the City of London, and lodged in the Giltspur Street Compter. The warrant set forth, that defendant had published a malicious, seditious, and inflammatory Libel, tending to create disaffection in the minds of his Majesty's subjects, and breaches of the peace. On Monday the 24th, he was conducted to the Mansion House, and brought before the Lord Mayor, who, on finding bail were ready, said, that he should require twenty-four, if not forty-eight hours notice of bail, which was evidently for the purpose of annoyance, and to gratify the malicious caprice of John Atkins, the Lord Mayor, as the names tendered were unexceptionable.

On Tuesday, August 24, he was brought again before the said John Atkins, Mayor, and by a capricious discretion that would have disgraced any other Magistrate, but John Atkins, Mayor, was committed for want of sureties. The person objected to was Mr. Wooler, who holds a house at 58, Sun Street, Bishopsgate, ano-

ther at Croydon, in Surrey, and large premises, as printing-offices, at 76, Fleet Street, and who, I rather think, has as good an income as John Atkins, Mayor, himself. A Mr. Lindsay, a merchant in the city, then tendered himself instead of Mr. Wooler, when John Atkins, Mayor, said he should require forty-eight hours to enquire after him. Mr. Lindsay offered to deposit the amount of bail, when John Atkins, Mayor, refused, and by way of making another effort to obtain a *Baronetcy* and a *Treasury Borough*, committed him for want of sureties.

On Thursday, August 26th, he was again brought before John Atkins, Mayor; and this person not being able to carry his capricious discretion any farther, accepted the bail, but with the threat that if he continued the sale of the Letter, he should do it at his peril.

RICHARD CARLILE.

N. B. The persecution of any individual, of a political nature, under the present administration, may be recorded in the pages of the REPUBLICAN, if sent and signed by the sufferer himself, or, should he be dead, by his nearest relative, stating their connection with the deceased as to kin, and procuring a respectable witness as to the facts. As the hour of retribution is near at hand, the Editor is anxious to have recorded the sufferings of the People in the cause of Reform.

R. C.

To the Purchasers of "*Sherwin's Weekly Political Register.*"—Those Gentlemen who wish to complete their Sets of this Work, are advised to do it as soon as possible, in order to prevent disappointment, as very few back Numbers are left on hand.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

The Republican.

No. 2. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Sept. 3, 1819. [Price 2d.

A LETTER TO HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE REGENT,

On his thanking the Magisterial and Yeomanry Assassins of Manchester for MURDERS COMMITTED *by them on the 16th of August last.*

London, August 30, 1819.

SIR,

THE general indignation and disgust excited in the public mind, in consequence of the *atrocious Murders* committed by the Yeomanry Cavalry, at the instigation of the Magistrates of Manchester, on the bodies of the inhabitants of that town, assembled in a legal and peaceable meeting, for the purpose of discussing the best means to obtain a redress of their grievances, and a radical reform of the representative system, could have been exceeded by nothing but the Chief Magistrate of the Country sanctioning, and actually returning thanks to the *murderers!!!*—This, Sir, it appears you have done, through the medium of your Secretary of State for the Home Department, the ever-memorable SIDMOUTH; and as the document cannot be too generally read, or too much known, I shall here insert it, and make such observations upon it, as to me seem necessary.

"Whitehall, August 21, 1819.

"My Lord,—Having laid before the Prince Regent the accounts transmitted to me from Manchester, of the proceedings at that place on Monday last, I have been commanded by his Royal Highness to request, that your Lordship will express to the Magistrates of the County Palatine of Lancaster, who attended on that day, the great satisfaction derived by his Royal Highness from their prompt, decisive, and efficient measures, for the preservation of the public tranquillity; and likewise that your Lordship will communicate to Major Trafford, his Royal Highness's high approbation of the support and assistance to the civil power afforded on that occasion by himself and the officers, non-commissioned officers, and privates, serving under his command.

"I have the honour, &c.

(Signed) "SIDMOUTH.

"To the Earl of Derby, &c. Knowsley."

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

It would appear, Sir, from this Letter, that the instigators of those murders committed on the 16th of August, by the persons whom I have before alluded to, have been allowed to communicate with the Administration and Executive, on their own crimes, and that their account of the proceedings has alone been attended to. This, Sir, is not acting on the principles of English jurisprudence. It is one of the grossest violations of moral decency ever placed on record. Hundreds of disinterested persons were assembled to witness the proceedings of that day, who were competent to give an unbiassed and unprejudiced evidence of the murders committed, and of the conduct of both parties; namely, the People assembled, and the Cavalry who sabred them. Yet not one individual has been sought after to elucidate any one circumstance, or any one tittle of evidence; and the offenders are allowed, by our *virtuous*, *sanctified*, and *sapient* rulers to exculpate themselves by telling their own tale, without being confronted with any honest man who witnessed the conduct of both parties.

His Lordship is further made to say, that your Royal Highness derived great satisfaction from the prompt, decisive, and efficient measures pursued by the Yeomanry Cavalry on that day, and expressed your high approbation of the conduct of Major Trafford in leading them on—To do what?—To cut down with their sabres a peacable and defenceless People. What language can be found sufficiently strong to mark this with a due reprobation? How shall the future impartial historian record, with the necessary effect, that a Prince of the House of Brunswick, whose ancestors ascended the throne on the condition of keeping it only by their good behaviour, or as our Judges are presumed to hold their authority (*quamdiu se bene gesserint*) as long as they behave themselves well, that the Regent of Great Britain has publicly sanctioned the slaughter of several hundred of his unoffending subjects, and has not taken one step to satisfy himself of the facts of the case, or shewn the least disposition to protect any other portion of his People from a similar slaughter, but, on the other hand, has given every encouragement to it? Will he not rank him as a *competitor* with the most ferocious and cruel of the Deys of Algiers? Will he not enclose the page within a black border, which records the sanction of an English Prince to such a bloody deed? Reflect, Sir, on what you have done, and make to your indignant countrymen the necessary atonement. Let those be brought to justice who have advised you

to this act. Suffer not your name to be branded with further infamy, by lending it to such infamous purposes. The blood of your murdered countrymen cries aloud for vengeance. To you, Sir, the People look. It was under the fatally supposed mildness of your *regime*, that the People exposed themselves defenceless in a public meeting, and became tbe slaughtered victims of a brutal armed force—inhuman beings—cowards, that would have shrunk from half their number of soldiers; and such men have found the thanks of their Chief Magistrate! Oh! wipe away this stain, and wait not until an insulted People are determined to resent it. As yet, Sir, you have the opportunity to free yourself and family from this reproach. Delay not a day, lest you are a day too late. To-morrow might find the fever of a starving People heated into frenzy.

One of two things must be done. You, Sir, must replace Justice on her seat, and sweep away the corrupt and filthy influence that has of late surrounded her, or the People will recal that power, which to you by some means has been delegated, and acknowledge no sovereign but their own authority. Justice is all we ask—will you, Sir, dare deny it? My mind is dubious on this point, and cannot yet resolve. Thus much I would affirm, that if you do deny it, the fate of Charles, or James, is inevitably yours. And justly so. The time has come, when hostile feelings between the oppressor and the oppressed have been brought to hostility indeed. The irritated feelings of an injured and insulted People cannot subside. Increase they may, and increase they will, unless conciliation and redress are given. To you Sir, an opportunity has been offered, and is still held out, to restore the fading pride and liberty of your country. Many are they, who, blinded with the liberal expressions of your younger days, have still held hopes, that you might be roused from that lethargic state, into which a luxuriant disposition had involved you, and brought to perform the important duties of your office, with a vigour consonant with your early promises. But this appears to have been a vain delusion; and should this last opportunity be permitted to escape you, you are lost for ever in the good wishes of your most sanguine friends.

Build not on that idle maxim, "that a King can do no wrong." A King may do wrong—a King has done wrong—and a King may, and has been, punished for wrong-doing. Those who advise yon to proceed on this maxim, are urging you to danger; whilst they make your name an instrument

for their nefarious purposes. I say, they make your name an instrument, because it is impossible, in the case on which I now address you, that you could have examined, or deliberated, on the conduct of the Magistrates and Yeomanry Cavalry on the 16th of August. The intelligence of that proceeding could not have reached the Home Department Office until the evening of the 17th. You, Sir, were then at a distance of at least one hundred miles from the metropolis, and could not have been apprised of this affair until the 18th, or, if a few leagues at sea, until the 19th; and yet on the 21st, we find Lord Sidmouth thanking the murderers, in your name, and expressing your high approbation of the deed. This becomes another proof, that all communication between yourself and the People is cut off; it is a proof that Sidmouth is really invested with that power he lately boasted of; namely, to anticipate your wishes and opinions, to stamp with your sanction his own will and determination. For what, do the people groan under the enormous salary you extract from them, and squander in such shameless profusion? A continuation of such conduct will make them all REPUBLICANS. Reflect, Sir, that a less expensive monarchy than yours could never be shaken from its hold in this country; such an adherence is there in the minds of the People to ancient and established institutions—so little are they disposed to change. But I feel convinced, that if your life is preserved a few years longer, you will teach even an English People the necessity of Republican Governments. A timely warning has been given you. Your future fate, and that of your family likewise, depends on the line of conduct you now pursue. A spirit is arising amidst the inhabitants of this country, that will not be trifled or tampered with. You, Sir, may be now enjoying all the profusion a prodigal mind can desire, whilst reposing in the lap of luxury and pleasure. But recollect, Sir, your imagined security may be fatal, as it keeps you unprepared to meet the storm that is fast gathering around you, which you may find will unexpectedly burst upon you, and which all the congregated force of your wickedly-devising Ministers may not be able to repel, and screen you or themselves from its destructive power.

One important thing must have already impressed your mind, if you pay the least attention to the affairs of the country you are so amply paid for superintending. The Magistrates, for whose murderous conduct you have expressed a decided approbation, have vainly attempted to institute a

charge of High Treason against those who were prominent at that meeting, and who had the good fortune to escape the sabre; and yet, with all that perjury and villainy could do, they could not, with the approbation of your Ministers, trust the charge before a Jury; and all this treason is at length softened down to a Conspiracy and Misdemeanor, which is a vague, unmeaning, and pitiful charge, for any Administration to lay before a Jury. The time, my forboding spirit tells me, is near at hand, when the traitors to their country's welfare will find their due elevation. Those traitors are to be found in your Cabinet; they are the members of your Administration! Bring them to justice, fill their places with honest men, and you will see the prosperity of your country on its return. But whilst the fundholder is supported by the labour of the wretched and miserable artisan and agriculturist—whilst an immense standing army is kept up for the purpose of intimidation, and for the purpose of extracting half the profits of the labourer to support the idle and the dissolute—whilst the extreme of luxury and dissipation is enjoyed by one portion of the community, at the expence and destruction of the necessaries of life for the other—whilst the laws are violated, and murders are committed in open day, by those in whose hands the sword of Justice has been placed—and whilst the violation of those laws, and those murders committed, receive the sanction of the constituted authorities, I think I may safely affirm, that we have arrived to that stage of society, when every liberal and constitutional writer has argued the necessity and the justice of a People appealing to their *dernier resort*, an appeal to force, to annihilate the existing order of things, and to begin *de novo*. Reflect on this, Sir, ere it be too late.

RICHARD CARLILE.

A SECOND LETTER TO LORD SIDMOUTH,

Secretary of State for the Home Department,

On the conduct of the Magisterial and Yeomanry Assassins of Manchester, on the 16th August, 1819; and on his Lordship's conduct as subsequently connected with that Assassination.

MY LORD, *London, September, 1, 1819.*

ON the 18th of August, I addressed a public letter to your Lordship, and endeavoured through the medium of

that letter to give the public a narrative of the proceedings at Manchester, on the 16th, having been a spectator of the horrid massacre, committed on that day, by your faithful servants, the Yeomanry Cavalry. The letter produced that effect, which I had both desired and anticipated, and I have to return you my sincere thanks for the benefit you have conferred on me, by the notice you have taken of it at Downing Street, and at the Home Department. There is no question, but that the instructions given to *Morris* the Police Officer, to go and make oath of its being an unlawful, inflamatory, and seditious libel, before your worthy coadjutor the Lord Mayor (Atkins), emanated from your office, and that his sapient worship the Mayor, was the mere mouthpiece of your will and intention. Oh! what a gratifying moment it would have been, to have occupied a secret place, in that conclave of imbecility, and folly, where my Lord Viscount Sidmouth, Secretary of State for the Home Department, Member of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, High Steward for the Dean and Chapter of the Holy Church of St. Peter, Wesminster, &c. &c. &c.: his Honour and Worship Sir John Silvester, Knt., Recorder of the City of London, the terror of the innocent, and the scoff of the guilty, &c. &c.: and the Right Honourable John Atkins, expectant Baronet, Mayor of the City of London, and Lord of Finsbury, late Member of Parliament for the said City, &c. &c., and others, their fellows, sat cutting up this said letter by piecemeal, analysing its different parts, and endeavouring to make it a compound of constructive treason! The "wise saws," the starts, the fits of mingled fear and imbecile indignation, would have formed a fine subject for the pencil of Hogarth. Four full days and nights it took this sapient junto, to come to some decision, and not even then, would they have decided, had not the Attorney General shewn more wit and prudence, and sent their worships home to take the bail. But to be serious, my Lord, and to call your attention to your conduct, as connected with the Massacre at Manchester, I will say no more of his worship the Mayor in this letter, but devote another to the purpose, and address it to him.

In my last, I stated to your Lordship, that I should wait and see, what farther steps would be taken by the Executive and the Administration in this horrid affair at Manchester. I could not at that moment have imagined, that without any fair and candid examination of the matter, and within five days of the Massacre, you would have been found the instru-

ment of the Executive, in expressing its *high approbation*, in conjunction with your own, of the conduct of the MURDERERS. Experience, and close observation of your general character, had induced me to give you credit for being prepared to pursue desperate measures against the advocates of a fair and equal representation; but I could not, I did not imagine that my Lord Sidmouth, who affects to carry a mind and disposition tempered with religion, should have first prepared the minds of the Yeomanry Cavalry, to commit this act. and having broken the peace, violated the law, and committed murder in a wanton, deliberate and uncalled-for attack, on a peaceable and legal assemblage of the inhabitants of Manchester, that he should have unhesitatingly, and even without enquiring iuto the facts of the case, have expressed his *high approbation* of such murderous conduct, on the part of the Manchester and Cheshire Yeomanry Cavalry. 'Tis done. It cannot be recalled. But yet I still have hopes that the time is not far distant, when this act with many others, will form sufficient grounds for your impeachment, and I doubt not your conviction. Do not smile my Lord, I have no idea that such will be the case under the present state of things; a change is apparently at hand, when you, and each of you must answer for the bloody deeds that have met your *high approbation*.

Nothing can exceed the contempt shewn for the existing laws, by those who are paid large salaries to enforce them. The People have been ever ready to appeal to those laws, but their oppressors have at all times shewn the disposition to act as if they were exempt from their influence. The magistrates of the metropolis have of late been chiefly employed with their Police Officers in watching the walls, to see what placards have been stuck against them, and whenever they find any that are objectionable to their minds, they are busily employed to demolish them. They dare not meet the principal, whose name is attached to the bill, as the act of parliament requires, but give vent to their spleen by the demolition of the placard, after it has been stuck up; or perhaps, illegally arrest the man who obtains an honest shilling by sticking them. Several cases of this kind have of late occurred, which reflects the highest disgrace on the Police establishments, at the head of which your Lordship stands. There are two instances which have come under my cognizance and which I shall hear narrate. The first is, the man who was holding a show-board with a placard on it before the door of the Crown and Anchor

Tavern, in the Strand, announcing that a meeting was then holding there, to express an opinion of the Manchester Massacre. It has been invariably the practice, when any meeting of importance has been holden at that, or any other tavern, that a man has been employed to stand at the entrance of the house, with a placard announcing the intention of such meeting ;—such was the case at this time, a man who perhaps could not read the placard, was standing at the entrance of the tavern, with it on a show-board. He is surrounded by five or six Police Officers from Bow-street, taken (it appears) without any warrant, before the sitting Magistrate (Mr. Farrant) and committed to the Cold Bath Fields Bastille, for (what they please to call) having published an unlawful, malicious, and seditious libel, is actually kept in confinement seven days, until bailed out, whilst they durst not touch or molest the real author, printer and publisher of that placard, who comes to the meeting, and addresses that meeting openly and publicly, in language of disapprobation and execration of the conduct of the actors in the Manchester Massacre, far more strong and pointed, than any thing inserted in the placard. How contemptible and disgraced must such a magistracy appear in the eyes of every liberal-minded and reflecting man!

Another instance worthy of record in these eventful times, has occurred in the Borough of Southwark ; but there, I am aware your Lordship has not so much influence as in the county of Middlesex. A man is found standing on Kennington Common, with a board, on which is inscribed ORDER, ORDER, and on which is pasted a printed bill, announcing that a meeting, which was intended to have been held on that day and on that spot, was postponed, and that the inhabitants of the Borough of Southwark were requested to unite with the inhabitants of the county of Middlesex, and City of London, and to meet in Smithfield on a future day, on which placard an intention was also expressed, of making an appeal to the Prince Regent to stand forth and save the People from the massacre with which they were threatened by merciless tyrants. The man is first requested by the Police Officers to move on and not to congregate a crowd, when the very nature and object of his board was to disperse them, and to prevent their disappointment in expecting a meeting to take place. The man moves on, according to the request of the Police Officer, and after some deliberation on their parts, they seize him and his board, and take him off to Union Hall before the sitting Magistrate.

The Magistrate takes the word of the man for his appearance the next morning. The man accordingly appears—the Magistrate openly declares that he finds no charge against him, but puts him in a coach in the custody of an Officer, and sends him off to the Lord Mayor, that is out of one county into another, to see if the Lord Mayor can find any charge against him. The Lord Mayor finds no charge against him, and sends him back to the Magistrates of Union Hall, who, at length, venture to commit him for publishing what they call a seditious libel, namely, holding a board in his hand with Order inscribed on it. The man is imprisoned six days, the Quarter Sessions comes on, an indictment is laid before the Grand Jury containing three counts, and charging the man with sedition, a severe contest takes place with the Grand Jury, as it appears a few honest men happened to be amongst them, they cannot agree over night to find the bill, they break up, and the next morning after some warm conversation, a majority of them find the bill. The man is called on to put off his trial until the next Sessions, he refuses and demands trial *instanter;* he is put before the Jury. A Counsel on the part of the Crown, makes a long, raving, ranting, speech. The man tells his own tale for about a quarter of an hour, when the Jury become disgusted to see the time of a Court of Justice wasted in this manner, and almost immediately acquit him, and the man carries off his obnoxious board and placard in triumph, laughing at the fools, his prosecutors.

This my Lord, is the manner in which the Magistrates of the Metropolis employ themselves; they are becoming the scoff and jest of every man possessing common sense, and your Lordship in your Magisterial capacity, does not cut a much better figure. Take shame to yourselves. Your Police Offices but ill accord with the old English regulation of constable and beadle. They are become the nurseries of crime, they never prevent, whilst there is hope of further profit being made of the criminal.

Having sufficiently noticed the Magistracy and Police establishments of the metropolis, I would draw the attention of your Lordship to those of Manchester, where both Magistrates and Police display such a want of feeling, such a want of legal knowledge, and such an evident brutality, that they appear adapted to preside only over a horde of savages. How contemptible have they been made to appear! Whenever Mr. Hunt has stood before them, they are ready to shrink into themselves, and almost afraid to utter an expression lest

they should commit some blunder. Dressed up in a "little brief authority," they inflict a terror on the minds of those over whom they have some influence; bring before them a man bold and honest, who knows the extent of their duty and authority, and who is bold enough to correct them when they exceed either, and they sink into all their native littleness.

The annals of this Country have been more disgraced within the last month than within any month during the reign of James the Second. His Chief Justice Jefferies, and his General Kirk boldly attacked any and every person that was opposed to them. With the Judges and Magistrates of the present day all is evasion. We find them in country-towns, and before country juries, strongly condemning in the conduct of the agent, what in London they are compelled to countenance in the principal. Almost every judge that has been engaged on the summer circuit, has been found preaching to the grand jury a sermon, either on what they call sedition or blasphemy. At Exeter, Judge Best disgraced himself and the seat he sat on, by pointing out an individual to the notice of the Grand Jury, which Jury, parrot-like, echoed back his charge by immediately finding a bill against that individual for seditious and blasphemous publications. It might be naturally expected that the individual was the original publisher of such pamphlets, but no such thing; they were published in London, two years since, and three London Juries have found them to be no offence; and Mr. Justice Best has had an opportunity of seeing them publicly exposed for sale during the last two years. The Attorney General has been compelled, from motives of fear, to withdraw three informations that had been filed against the present publisher, and many complete editions of them have been sold since that time.

Before an enlightened Jury they durst not try a political question. Perhaps they have hopes of finding Juries at Exeter of the same stamp as the Warwickshire Jury, who lately tried Russell, of Birmingham; when the Lord Chief Justice (Abbott,) with a contempt for all judicial and moral decency, told the Jury that the publication, in his opinion, was a profane and seditious libel; although his Lordship had presided at one of the trials of Mr. Hone, where the Jury convinced his Lordship of the contrary. The Jury echoed back the charge, and the foreman of the Jury, who was the only special juror, and appeared to be the only man amongst them that knew his letters, after having pronounced the ver-

dict Guilty, ludicrously recommended the defendant to mercy, which is as much as to say he should not be punished; and actually slept in the same room, at the same inn with the defendant, and candidly told him, that he did not know they had a right to give a verdict contrary to the judgment of the Judge. The defendant stands virtually acquitted, for nothing but the subtle and wily conduct of the Judge could have drawn from them a verdict of guilty. They had no idea of the man being guilty, it was their ignorant fear of the Judge that induced them to pronounce it. Those men are guilty who have ruined him with the expence of this persecution, and the guilt hangs heavy on their minds.

This, my Lord, should impress on the minds of future defendants in cases of libel, that a puerile courtesy and submission to the dictate of the Judge, may be fatal to them. In a case of libel, the man who presides in the court is at such time no Judge; he is a mere officer of the court to enforce order and regularity of proceeding. The Jury are the sole Judges: and I for one would rise and interrupt the man who presided, if he dared to give an opinion that would tend to prejudice my case. Had Russell elevated the minds of the Jury by pointing out to them the importance and extent of their authority in his case, and at the same time pointed out to them the extent of the authority of the man presiding in the court, they would have most assuredly pronounced him *not guilty*. The contrary verdict arose entirely from their ignorance of the forms of law, and the extent of their own authority.

I have been led into a digression from the subject of this letter, in consequence of the disgraceful conduct of the Judges and Magistrates both in town and country, within the last month. They are become the veriest tools of corruption, whilst Justice has neither share nor lot amongst them. The very Home Department over which your Lordship presides is the mere receptacle of spies and informers, of frivolous and idle charges which you and your coadjutors are daily striving to magnify into something terrible. Your sole aim and object is to impress on the minds of the few who possess property in the country, that there is a conspiracy on foot to deprive them of that property. That conspiracy exists, but not amongst the people. That conspiracy is in the cabinet. And it is much to be feared that too many will be led away by false alarms until they are hoodwinked into the snare.

I shall conclude this, my Lord, with an endeavour to im-

press on your mind, that no effort on your part can wipe away the blood that has been spilt at Manchester; nor the stains that have fallen on the seat of Justice. Both cry aloud for redress. Redress or revenge must and will be had, and I would earnestly advise your Lordship to hasten to the stool of repentance.

R. CARLILE.

A LETTER TO JOHN ATKINS, ESQ.
Lord Mayor of the City of London.

MY LORD,

THE late acquaintance that has arisen between us, requires that some explanation should be given to the public of the motives by which you have been actuated. In the first place, there is no doubt, but that you received orders to issue your warrant from the Home Department, to the *chief* of which, the obnoxious letter was addressed. And your Lordship, eager to display your servility, contrived to put the warrant in force at that period, when it would become most offensive, being the Saturday afternoon. At the time of my arrest, you were not to be found, and I had the satisfaction of being deprived of your Lordship's presence until Monday. I would contrast this conduct with that of the Common Sergeant, at the time when Mr. Hunt laid a bill before the Grand Jury, charging Stoddart, Quin, and Mitchell, with publishing a malicious libel in their paper, called the New Times, in which libel he was held up as a fit person for assassination. The Grand Jury without hesitation, found the bill on the Saturday. Mr. Hunt applied to the court then sitting at the Old Bailey for a warrant—a warrant was granted but to prevent those worthy gentlemen from being molested on the Saturday, the Common Sergeant ordered the execution of it to be suspended until the Monday, and this is what you call equal justice. I am arrested on the Saturday, on the Monday morning I rise from my *straw bed* and find myself surrounded with military, the first communication made to me is, that your Lordship has ordered no one to see me but in the presence of the Governor. Although this to me, was a mere matter of indifference and proved nothing but your Lordship's malignity towards me. And likewise, that in his presence no political conversation should take place—very pretty my Lord—I suppose your Lordship was of opinion, that I should have leisure to con-

trive the burning of the city, the destruction of the church and state, or some very important thing, and therefore your Lordship was determined that I should do all myself, as you took care not to allow me any agents to concert with, out of the prison.—A very prudent caution, my Lord, to save yourself from the hysterics.—However, to proceed, I had the honour to meet your Lordship on the Monday, your Lordship is not quite certain whether I can be bailed or not, but your Lordship in the mean time, very condescendingly offers to fill up the time in enquiring after the persons I offer as bail. The bail would have been unobjectionable before an honest Magistrate. I have only to regret that I have disgraced one of them, by putting his responsibility in competition with your Lordship's.

Tuesday comes, I again appear before your Lordship, and you affect to be dissatisfied with one of the bail. But the fact was, that your Lordship, and your Lordship's friend, the learned and accomplished Recorder, combined your legal knowledge, and found, that in writing and publishing this letter, I had committed HIGH TREASON; and I had to enjoy safe custody 48 hours longer. Quickly your confirmed evidence is laid before the Attorney General, and he—*impudent upstart*—treats with contempt and derision, the deliberate and well-weighed opinions of two such eminent *civic civilians*. Never forgive him, my Lord; depend on it, that the Attorney General is a REPUBLICAN and a DEIST, or he would have acquiesced in your honest wishes. I hope your Lordship will report the case at the *next levee*, and get so dangerous a man dismissed from that office. For whilst he remains there, I fear your Lordship will have no trials for HIGH TREASON, BLASPHEMY, or SEDITION. It was a most unfortunate circumstance for your Lordship, that your old friend, *Sir Samuel Shepherd*, had not remained in that office, he, *poor fellow*, was the ready tool of such sapient advisers; he blundered on right or wrong, and shrunk neither from disgrace nor calumny. However, your Lordship finding your definition of High Treason contemptuously treated, you were then so obligingly condescending as to take the proposed bail, and never shall your Lordship's admonition that followed, be effaced from my memory. I must confess, my Lord, I was rather ungrateful at the moment, but your Lordship's *well known humanity* will be no doubt exercised, when you recollect, that I had not time to reflect on the threatened perils my misconduct had incurred. It appears, however, that your Lordship had anticipated my

docile disposition, and felt justified in not exercising your dire and dread authority. So strong are the obligations your Lordship has conferred on me, that I have resolved to publish *a brief memoir* of your Lordship's valuable life, as soon as your friends have furnished me with the necessary and promised information. In consequence of my good intentions towards your Lordship, I trust, that if Sidmouth should this week order you to issue another warrant, you will have the goodness to give me due notice, that I might bring some dozen gentlemen as bail, that your Lordship might have good choice; until then, I bid your Lordship farewell.

R. CARLILE.

TO MR. CARLILE.

SIR,

PERMIT me, as your fellow-countryman to thank you for the patriotic firmness with which you have encountered the exactions and tyrannical measures that have been adopted towards you, by our present short-sighted Rulers. It is the duty of every well-wisher to his country, and every real friend to human happiness, to countenance and encourage that line of conduct which you, with so much credit to yourself and so much advantage to the public, have perseveringly pursued. It is not simply a question whether you shall be allowed to follow your own peaceable avocations, or waste the prime of your years in a dungeon; it is a question between the present Government and the People of the British Empire;—between a hypocritical "Vice Society," and a liberal-minded public;—between boroughmongering despotism and universal liberty.

The verdicts of the Juries to which, *perhaps*, your string of persecutions will be submitted, will decide the important question, whether Englishmen have a right to speak and publish the honest dictates of their consciences, or whether they shall become a band of hypocritical and contemptible slaves, crawling about, like the reptiles of Spain, at the feet of their oppressors, and depending upon the favour of police officers and the mercy of priests. I confess, however, I have no fear of the result. I cannot imagine that a London Jury will consent to become the instruments of bigotry and intolerance: that they will rear an Inquisition upon the ruins of Magna Charta and the Bill of Rights: that they will say to the inhabitants of Great Britain, at this enlight-

ened era of science and civilization, you shall not read or promulgate opinions that may militate against the decrees of the Council of Nice!

With what shadow of consistency can Protestants forbid the dissemination of opinions that may not happen to square exactly with their own? Have they forgot the blood which, at the epoch of the Reformation, their ancestors shed in defence of their civil and religious rights? Was it laudable and praise-worthy *then* to overturn a system which had existed, "as by law established," nearly a thousand years, and shall the senseless cry of heresy and sedition *now* be raised against those who calmly and dispassionately endeavour to point out the errors and absurdities of that which has not only scarcely existed three hundred, but is so divided aud subdivided by the arts of "fishers of men," and the folly of human gudgeons, that it has become a thing of shreds and patches, a tattered garment, scarcely containing a piece of the original, and barely sufficient to hide the nakedness of priestcraft?

Let us remember, too, that at the period of the Reformation, the press, that glorious palladium of the Rights of Man, was yet in its infancy, that the means of information then possessed by the mass of the People were few and imperfect; that if they wished for either religious or political instruction, they were obliged "to submit themselves lowly and reverently to their *spiritual pastors and masters*," and remain content with, or at least unable to dispute, the *dictum* of the man whose interest it was to keep them in ignorance and superstition. But that little grain of mustard-seed is now become a goodly tree; the sources of knowledge have been opened to all classes of the community; and the philanthropy of Lancaster, and the defensive, but short-sighted, policy of the patrons of Bell, have enabled almost every child in the kingdom to partake of the advantages resulting therefrom.

And shall we retrograde from this sunny eminence of knowledge, to the cold and misty vale of ignorance and superstition? Shall we forbear to get wisdom and understanding merely because the acquisition may be uupleasant to those who are in self assumed authority over us? Base, and grovelling, and unworthy of the blessings of light and liberty, must be the slave who would subscribe to so diabolical a doctrine.

Nor can I conceive how the sincere Christian—the man who wishes to regulate his life according to the precepts of the virtuous Founder of Christianity, can bring himself to

support a bigoted and vindictive spirit of persecution. Can he fail to remember that his great master pronounced such subjects not cognizable before human tribunals; that he warned his disciples not to boast of being the children of Abraham, nor to exclaim "the temple of the Lord, the temple of the Lord;" but to do Justice, love Mercy, and hate Hypocrisy: that he commanded them to "prove all things" and "hold fast to that which is good:" and forbade them to rest their hopes of pleasing the Deity, upon the observance of rights and ceremonies, or the adherence to particular creeds; for, said he, "the time will come when men shall neither worship God in this temple or upon that mountain, BUT IN SPIRIT AND IN TRUTH."

Do not imagine, Sir, that because I argue in this manner, I believe your persecutors to be actuated by any, even the most erroneous sense of Religion. The chief priests and scribes of Jerusalem, made long prayers and enlarged the phylacteries of their garments, not for the purpose of glorifying God, but that they might "devour widows' houses!"

But I know there are many well-meaning, and estimable persons in private life who really believe that the writings to which you have given increased publicity, are really of an immoral and blasphemous tendency. They believe this because they have heard them condemned in the most unqualified manner, by persons whose reverend garb, and sanctimonious demeanour, precluded the suspicion of insincerity and injustice. Alas! that we should be thus duped and misled by the artifices of men who fatten upon our fears, and laugh at our credulity. To such persons I would say, arouse yourselves from your mental lethargy; take your talent from the napkin, and be no longer the voluntary dupes of priestcraft and corruption; read, like "the noble Bereans" of old—read and examine the *scriptures*, that is *the writings*, for yourselves; if they contain any thing contrary to reason and morality, reject and condemn them; but, if like the discourses of him whose authority you will not disregard, they breathe a spirit of glory to God, and peace and good will to all mankind, then retract your erroneous opinions, regard with suspicion the men who have endeavoured to rob you of the glorious privilege of reason, and boldly come forward and vindicate the characters and intentions of those who are suffering for the cause of *civil and religious liberty*.

JOSEPH FITCH.

Old Road Academy, Stepney, Aug. 31, 1819.

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

The Republican.

No. 3. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Sept. 10, 1819. [Price 2d.

TO THE
INHABITANTS OF MANCHESTER,
AND ITS VICINITY,

Who met together in St. Peter's Field on the 16th day of August last, for the purpose of discussing the best means of obtaining a Radical Reform in the House of Commons, and who escaped with their Lives from the wanton and murderous Attack made on them by that brutal armed force, called the Cheshire and Manchester Yeomanry Cavalry.

Fellow Citizens,

One who witnessed your resolute, and at the same time peaceable and uniformly well-disposed conduct, at the public meeting of the 16th ult. presumes to address you on the subject of that meeting, and the murderous attack of the brutal armed force, who were sent amongst you, by those who disgrace the names of Magistrates of Manchester. To me it was a painful moment, to think that such a body of fine resolute men should have been surprised unarmed by a cowardly and ferocious armed force—cowardly murderers, that would have shrunk from fifty of you with your pikes; yet who could riotously and wantonly plunge their sabres in the bosoms of the women, because they knew the men had no weapons to protect them. The subject of this address to you, is to point out the necessity of your holding another public meeting, to pass those resolutions, and to make that appeal to the Nation, on the necessity of uniting to obtain a fair and equal representation, which was intended on the last meeting. And when I recommend this, I would also earnestly recommend, that you be prepared to act on the defensive, in case a similar attack, as was made on the last meeting, should again be attempted. I pledge myself again to make one with you, should I be at liberty at the time the meeting shall take place.

We must not be alarmed at a Grand Jury echoing the idle and frivolous charge of the Magistrates of Manchester, that to meet to discuss a question relative to our future interest

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

and welfare, is a conspiracy to subvert the laws and government of the country. We have a duty to perform to ourselves, our families, and our country; therefore, neither the fear of pains or penalties, arrests or imprisonments, nay, even death itself, should not deter us from performing that duty. If the House of Commons, in its present degraded constitution, be the Government of the Country, or part of the law of the land, then let us boast of the epithet of Conspirators, and boldly declare that our object is to subvert such a House of Commons, and to alter it into a House of the Representatives of the whole People of Great Britain and Ireland. We have no secret intentions. To make conspiracy a crime, it is necessary that some secret and malicious motive should actuate the conspirators. There is no such thing existing among us, men of Lancashire and Cheshire, but I will tell you where a criminal conspiracy does exist, and where its baneful influence has been most deeply felt. In the first place, there is a Holy Alliance, or, in other words, a Criminal Conspiracy with the Despots of Europe, to abridge and destroy the liberties of their subjects, and to make their own authority absolute.

On a smaller scale, and next in rotation, there is a Conspiracy in the Cabinet or the Administration of affairs in this country, to destroy the middle class of society, and to bring this country into the same condition as Spain at present, and France before its revolution. These are conspiracies that inflict the most deadly evils on society. The great mass of the People of this country are not only deprived of even the least shadow of liberty, but are deprived of the necessaries of life, and their only means of obtaining them—a fair requital for their hard labour.—Is it not in the course of nature that you should conspire together to get rid of such evils as those? Yet you do not conspire secretly—your conspiracy is open—you openly state your grievances to the existing authorities; those authorities treat both you and your complaints with contempt; and does it not follow as an imperative necessity, that you should threaten to effect by force what you find unattainable by milder means? The necessity is not only a justification of your threatening, but of your putting that threat into execution. The Law of Nature pronounces that resolution just, and commands you to act on it. This is the case at issue between the People and the existing authorities. The powers that be, have not only by excessive taxation raised the price of the necesaries of life to an extraordinary pitch, but by pressing so very hard

on the manufacturing and commercial interest have caused a diminution of wages to the labourer, in a ratio equal to the increase of the price of bread and other necessaries.

This has produced the extreme of misery. Those who have employ cannot even supply themselves and families with the necessaries of life, and those who have none are perishing daily—whilst our Rulers and their dependants are increasing their extravagancies and luxuries with the increasing hunger and misery of the people. It is from this and similar conduct, that the people have been made to feel the danger they are exposed to, and in contemplating the remedy they find nothing efficacious but the necessary controul of the democratic part of the Government over the other part. In examining that which should be the democratic part of the Government, they have found that its character and virtues have been undermined, and that it is become the mere tool of the executive and its lawless administration by the means of Borough-mongering influence. The result is, the People say to the existing authorities give us our proper controul in the legislature, by our undoubted right of expressing our voice by our representatives, the answer is—you are virtually represented—the persons whom we have delegated to be your representatives do all that we conceive to be necessary; therefore we cannot hazard the dangerous experiment of changing the system for fear of annihilating the whole. The People reply to this, saying, we are not satisfied that you should delegate persons as our representatives, we are capable of performing that office more to our own advantage, we demand it as our interest, right, and privilege so to do. The existing authorities finding no alternative but to grant the necessary reform, or support their power by a standing army, have recourse to the latter expedient, and have caused the destruction of many advocates for reform, though strictly peaceable citizens, by their military power, and if the military will consent to cut the throats of their friends and relatives, we have no alternative but to prepare to sell our lives as dear as possible; or to obtain, by the necessary means, the necessary reform.

In advising you to call another public meeting, I would earnestly recommend you to do it at the earliest time possible, after the Assizes for your county are holden, and at the same time seek some more advantageous spot for self-defence, in case of attack, than St. Peter's Field—it was, of all places, the most unfortunate for an unarmed people to be assailed by a brutal armed force. We must not shrink

from duty from the terror of a similar attack. Let every man be prepared to sell his life as dearly as possible, and I'll pledge mine that we can beat off the combined Yeomanry Cavalry of the whole country. If it is the determination of the Government to interrupt a public discussion of the necessity of Parliamentary Reform, we, knowing that such public discussion is consistent, and sanctioned by the standing laws of the country, must determine, on our part, to meet and discuss the question, even should it be at the hazard of our lives. Nothing to me can be more noble than to meet death on such ground—to sell our lives in defence of our rights, against the violation of law, and against the assault of a military despotism. But this I can say on my part, that in this country, under the present state of things, I will never attend a public meeting on any political question of Reform, without arms. Once having narrowly escaped with life is to me a sufficient justification.—I trust that I have here pointed out to you the necessity of attending that meeting with arms in your hands.

I shall next call your attention to the conduct of the Grand Juries in the Counties Palatine of Chester and Lancaster; and as the first in order I will take that of Chester. It appears that after a sermon addressed to the Grand Jury both by the Judge and Recorder at Chester, on sedition and blasphemy, the Grand Jury felt it their duty to echo back the substance of those sermons. In the first place, they parody Sidmouth's letter of thanks to the brutal Yeomanry of Cheshire and Manchester, which, by the bye, must certainly be a malicious and irreligious Libel, with a strong tendency to bring into contempt the existing order of things both in Church and State, and which, I doubt not, but the present Chief Justice, in charging the Jury, would pronounce to be a profane and seditious Libel, as every thing that proceeds from my Lord Sidmouth must be presumed to be sanctified. The next article proceeding from the Grand Jury is a parody on the sermons of the Judge and Recorder, and as the same act in this country that is an offence in a poor man is not so in the wealthy man or man of interest and influence with the Government, I shall, without the fear of an information, insert it, and endeavour to make it my text, and write a sermon upon it.

" COUNTY PALATINE OF CHESTER.

" We the Grand Jury of the county palatine of Chester, at the assize holden at Chester, on the 1st day of September, 1819, feel

it incumbent at this time, to declare our indignation at the machinations of artful and itinerant demagogues, who disseminate papers of the most dangerous and seditious tendency at public meetings; with freedom in their mouths, and fraud and plunder in their hearts, employ the most inflammatory language, insidiously inculcate, under the specious veil of Reform, hatred and contempt of our Constitution, and instigate the ignorant and unwary even to exert physical force (that is, violence and open arms) for the enforcement of their visionary claims, at once useless to themselves, destructive of the rights and property of their fellow-subjects, and involving the whole country in one general ruin.

"Nor can we refrain from declaring our disgust and horror at the odious and blasphemous publications poured forth throughout the country, in which the Holy Scriptures are held up to derision, reviled, and scoffed at, and audaciously denounced to the people as false, with the malignant intention of eradicating from their minds all moral checks, and all the hopes and comforts to be desired from religion; but with the most serious and peculiar anxiety and detestation, we contemplate the unremitting exertions to poison the minds of the rising generation with the same horrid and detestable doctrines.

"We, therefore, strongly impressed with the excellence of our Constitution, protecting all ranks and degrees of society, are firmly resolved by every means in our power, to enforce the due execution of the laws against the seditious and disaffected, and against all who, either by their acts, or otherwise, endanger the public peace and safety of the realm.

"Resolved, that the declaration now produced, and unanimously adopted, be inserted in all the county papers, and in two of the London papers.

"JOHN THOMAS STANLEY, Foreman.

"Grand Jury-room,
Chester Castle, September 2."

In the first place my beloved, the authors of my text declare their indignation at the machinations of artful itinerant demagogues, who disseminate papers of the most dangerous and seditious tendency at public meetings, &c. Now as the whole of this paragraph is ambiguous in the extreme, I have been pondering with myself to find out who or what those demagogues are, or whence they came from, and I can find no persons in the country that will answer to the description given by the Grand Jury, but what are called the clergy—they are the only demagogues that I have ever witnessed in this country, who disseminate papers of the most dangerous and seditious tendency at public meetings: with freedom and salvation in their mouths, and fraud and plunder in their hearts; insidiously inculcating both by writing

and speaking, that the path they point out is the only road to Reform and happiness. They instigate the ignorant and unwary to throw aside their reason, and with that their moral duty, and study, by a mysterious superstition to enforce their visionary claims, at once useless to themselves, destructive to their peace and morality, and involving the whole country in one general ruin. I know not by what mischance the Grand Jury could be induced to make so insidious an attack on this privileged class. But this is not all; they have, I find, carried their malignity further, and followed up their first charge with all the force an envenomed mind could give. They charge those persons with pouring forth throughout the country the most odious and blasphemous publications. Now, this passage confirms my opinion, that this wanton attack is made on the clergy, as I know of no publication that can be considered blasphemous, but that which derogates the character of the Deity. I know of no publication that ever came under my view, that had a tendency to derogate the character of the Deity so much as that which we know to be industriously circulated by the clergy and their adherents: namely, what they call the Bible or Old Testament. And we farther know, that this class of persons decry every book as false, that is founded on truth and reason. I doubt not, my friends, but that you in conjunction with this Grand Jury contemplate with the most serious and peculiar anxiety and detestation, the unremitting exertions to poison the minds of the rising generation with the same horrid and detestable doctrines. The last paragraph of this declaration appears, though insidiously, to be levelled at the brutal Yeomanry Cavalry of that and a neighbouring county who violated the law, murdered the peaceable inhabitants and endangered the public peace and safety of the realm.

As the extinction of religion has been hinted at by this Grand Jury, it may not be premature here to make a frank and candid avowal that it is my opinion that morality would increase in a ratio with the decrease of religion. I for one do boldly affirm not only my opinion, but my firm and deliberate conviction, that all and every species of religion is an imposture and fraud practised by base and designing men on the credulous part of mankind, and that such base and designing men have never hesitated to support it by force and violence whenever reason has been opposed to it. And that instead of its being necessary to propagate good morals among mankind, it is the very bane of morality and civilization.

We will now leave the Chester Grand Jury, and look after those of Lancaster, and as nothing that I can offer myself in the way of observation on their conduct can equal the description Mr. Pearson, the London Solicitor, has given of them; although it has appeared in all the newspapers of the day, yet it cannot be too often read, or too much dwelt upon; and consequently I shall here insert it.

To Major CARTWRIGHT *and* S. BROOKS, *Esq.*
Treasurers of the Committee.

DEAR SIRS,

THIS day the Grand Jury has been occupied chiefly with the several bills of indictment preferred before them for offences alleged to have been committed at Manchester on the 16th. The first bill which was brought under their consideration, was an indictment against Mr. James Platt, one of the Manchester Police constables, for perjury, supposed to have been committed in evidence which he gave at the examination of Mr. Hunt, Mr. Moorhouse, and others, at the New Bailey, on the 27th of August. It will be recollected that on that occasion, the principal act of conspiracy imputed to the Defendants was their presence on the hustings on the 16th, and in order to bring Mr. Moorhouse within the reach of the law, Platt deposed to having seen him upon the hustings on the occasion alluded to. The first witness on the back of the bill was Mr. Pearson, who gave in evidence, that Mr. Platt had not only sworn that he saw Mr. Moorhouse on the hustings, but upon his particular attention being called by that Gentleman to his personal appearance, assured the Magistrates of his clear conviction that he was upon the hustings at the time sworn to. Mr. Moorhouse then appeared before the Jury, and gave in evidence that he was not on the hustings on any part of the 16th; that he met the cavalcade on the approach to the Meeting; and Mr. Hunt, at about a quarter of a mile distance, seeing him inconvenienced by the pressure of the crowd, invited him to get into the carriage, which having done, he was dragged to the Meeting, and immediately on his arrival there, when within ten or twelve feet of the hustings, descended from the carriage, and taking an opposite direction, proceeded to a neighbouring public-house, and remained there till after the Meeting had broken up. Mr. Hunt and Mr. Whinson then followed, deposing to the same facts, and positively swearing that at no one time was Moorhouse on the hustings. John Collier was next examined, who proved satisfactorily that he opened the door of the carriage to admit Mr. Moorhouse, and also let him out, and that he then went away, as before described. Then followed the evidence of James Moorhouse, the Prosecutor's son, and Charles Gould, who proved that they were in situations at the Meeting which commanded a complete view of the hustings, from beginning to the end, and that on no part of the day was the Prosecutor there. Samuel Dann, Mary

Williams, and Jesse Swan, were next called, and proved that from the time Mr. Hunt came on the ground till after the dispersion of the multitude, and the destruction of the hustings, Mr. Moorhouse was in the Windmill public-house, and did not leave their sight for one minute. Similar evidence was adduced against Robert Darbyshire, jun. also one of the Police Constables; but although a Grand Jury is called upon only to decide whether a sufficient PRIMA FACIE case is made out to send a Defendant to take his trial, the Gentlemen thought fit to throw out the bills in question, although the same Jury, upon precisely the same testimony had found, on the previous day, a true bill against the celebrated alarmist, Richard Owen. The only difference between his case and theirs was, that Mr. Owen is only an occasional assistant to the Police, whereas the other two Gentlemen are regular practitioners, unless, indeed, it may be considered that it made a difference to the Grand Jury that before they decided upon the latter cases the bill of indictment against Mr. Hunt for a conspiracy, had been laid before them, from the back of which it appeared that the aforesaid Mr. Platt and Mr. Darbyshire were material witnesses for that prosecution, and that as their evidence could not be dispensed with, it might have been uncivil to such Gentlemen to impugn their testimony by finding a true bill against them for perjury. The next proceeding upon which the Grand Jury was engaged was that of hearing evidence on the bill of indictment against Mr. Hunt and his friends for a conspiracy. The first witness called in was the celebrated Mr. Nadin, who remained under examination about half an hour. It should be observed, that during his examination Mr. Milne, the Solicitor for the prosecution, was called into the room and remained there some little time; but, inasmuch as the attendance of a professional Gentleman upon such an occasion is irregular, it is impossible to guess his business; he, however, in violation of the universal rules of practice, brought out the bill of indictment, and strengthened his case by adding another witness to the list. Two other witnesses were then called in, but as they are not known to belong to Mr. Nadin's corps, a description of them cannot be obtained—then there following seven of the Police-runners, including the celebrated Mr. James Platt, and the renowned Mr. Darbyshire jun. and the case was closed by a Mr. Lomas, at present a stranger, and a Mr. Heifa, a decayed barber, belonging to the Society of Friends, or at least assuming the garb of that respectable body. Notwithstanding, however, the quality of the witnesses, the Grand Jury found the bill, and the evidence of Mr. Darbyshire jun., and Mr. James Platt was sufficient to fix Mr. Moorhouse as a conspirator with the rest. The Jury deliberated about 25 minutes before they called the next case.

Although five bills for maliciously cutting, had been sent into the Grand Jury on Friday morning as early as one o'clock, and the bill against Mr. Hunt and his friends did not go in till the Saturday morning, yet the Grand Jury thought fit, in defiance of ordinary usage, and a very spirited remonstrance in writing sent in by Mr. Hunt, to let the last be first, and the first last.

The first indictment for maliciously cutting, was preferred by Mr. Gilmore, of Manchester, a respectable tradesman, who proved, that while he was at his dinner with his family, on the 16th, he heard a noise, and being informed that the Yeomanry were ordered out to disperse the multitude, went towards the ground, and having arrived at the top of the street where his house was situated, and found the people running towards him, chased by the Yeomanry, turned round, and was retiring to his house, walking on the flag stones, when, within 25 paces of his own door, one of them struck at his head with his sabre; his hat, however, protected him from the blow, but having been knocked from his head he was in the act of stooping to pick it up, when one of the gallant Yeomanry found that the opportunity of a bare-headed man, unarmed, in a defenceless position, was not to be lost, and cut him with his sword and inflicted a wound on the head. The Prosecutor's son was a witness of the transaction, and joined with his father in giving evidence on the bill. When, however, it was brought in by the Grand Jury, the Public was astonished with the sound of "Not found against Edward Tebbutt."

The next bill was against the same person, preferred by Eliz. Farren, a poor interesting looking woman, who was standing in the neighbourhood of the Meeting, with her infant child at her breast; this, however, was no protection from the rude attack of the Yeomanry. Seeing Mr. Tebbutt, one of the Yeomanry coming, she held her child down, and prayed of him to spare her infant, while, however in the act of saving her child, she received a deep sabre wound, three inches long, from the crown of her head to the top of the forehead, her child fell from her arms, and received a severe contusion on the head, of which it is at this day suffering. The woman instantly fell, from the shock of the blow, but although she was a neighbour of the GENTLEMAN who inflicted the wound, he repeated his attack, and struck at her with his sword as she was falling; the sword, however, got entangled in her clothes, and did not do her any further injury; she was soon afterwards taken home in a fainting state; but neither the sight of a gasping wound, nor the evidence of the woman, were sufficient to convince the Grand Jury, and the bill was rejected; it should be observed, that the woman deposed, that at the time she was attacked, she did not, nor does she now believe that the Riot Act had been read; and further, that there had not been any tumult, any stones thrown, or any resistance, or insult, offered to the Yeomanry, or any other persons.

The following case shared the same fate; it was an indictment against Ed. Meagher, for maliciously cutting under Lord Ellenborough's Act. Cheetham, the Prosecutor, proved, that after the Meeting had been dispersed, he was going down one of the streets in Manchester, the opposite direction to the Meeting, about a quarter of a mile from the spot, where he was met by a small party of the Yeomanry; there were two or three strangers walking the same way with the Prosecutor, when Meagher cried out, "Damn you,

disperse," to which Cheetham replied, "You stop the way, give us room, and we will be gone." Meagher then appeared to make room for passing, by riding out a yard or two from the wall, when Cheetham attempted to pass, and Meagher cried out, "Damn you, I will cut your head off," and immediately made a desperate stroke at him, which, after cutting clean off about seven inches of the rim of his hat, took effect in the neck just under the ear, and inflicted a dreadful gash three inches long and one inch deep. The person of the author of the outrage was described by the next witness, Nathan Broadbent, who gave evidence as to the activity of Meagher in dealing out his gashes indiscriminately upon all around with a blood-thirsty fury.

The next indictment, against one Thomas Shelmerdine, by a poor woman, upwards of 60 years old, who went out to the purlieus of the Meeting, to seek for a lad her son, when seeing the Yeomanry coming, she strove to make her escape, when Shelmardine rode up to her in a furious manner; having known him from a child, she cried out, "Tom Shelmardine, thee wilt not hurt me, I know:" deaf, however, to her supplications, he rode her down, and cut her on the head with his sabre, from the effects of which she thinks it probable she shall never recover.

The last indictment which was preferred, was against one Carlton, by a little boy, who received a most dreadful wound on the head from the sabre of this person. This lad, William Leigh, had, boy-like, attended the Meeting from curiosity, and was one of those composing a thick, compact body created by the attempts of the crowd to escape—upon the heads, shoulders, necks, and arms of these poor wretches, the Yeomanry were dealing out their cuts with a liberal hand, when the poor lad having caught the eye of Carlton, whom he knew, he ran towards him to get out of the crowd; but his acquaintance replied to his application for safety, by a blow at his head, which gave him a deep wound, full three or four inches long: the Grand Jury, however, threw out the bill. Numbers of other cases could have been preferred, but it would have been unavailing: it became evident that the Jury acted upon some fixed principle, which would have rendered all efforts to obtain redress unsuccessful. It was clear, that the rejection of the bills did not arise from what appeared on the testimony of the witnesses, nor from a disbelief of their evidence, but probably from preconcerted opinions as to the reading of the Riot Act, or some other facts not then before them. Tottering old age, unsuspecting youth, manly spirit, defenceless woman, and unoffending infancy, had in vain presented themselves before the Inquests of their country seeking for redress, and sued in vain: it therefore became useless again to intrude upon their attention.

It may be observed that each of the witnesses upon all the bills, denied that to their knowledge or belief, the Riot Act had been read;—denied that any violence had been used, stones thrown, resistance presented, or insults offered—they were peaceable

Citizens and had been maliciously wounded; the Grand Jury, therefore, could not have been acquainted with any of these facts from the only legitimate sources of information, the evidence of the witnesses on each of the bills. If the Grand Jury decided upon any evidence which they received from other quarters than that of the witnesses on the respective bills, they assumed to themselves an authority the law does not recognize, and erected a tribunal to try the cases instead of exercising the powers delegated to them by the Constitution, of examining the evidence adduced for the Prosecution, and deciding as to its sufficiency to call upon the offending party to appear and answer before a Jury of his country. Whether the reading of the Riot Act can give authority to soldiers, or those who bear the name, to butcher indiscriminately, peaceable men, women, and children; whether the order of a Magistrate places those against whom it is directed out of the pale of the law's protection, and renders them liable to be hunted and massacred like wild beasts, might perhaps have furnished the armed parties with materials for the shadow of a shade of defence; but the reading of the Act, the dictum of the Magistrates, was not and could not have been legally in evidence before the Inquest—indeed, the only evidence respecting it was, that no such means had been adopted. I hope, however, that the exertions of the People to obtain something like redress for the sufferers, will never relax till the authors of their woe are brought to punishment; and that so long as the principle, that "whoso sheddeth man's blood by man shall his blood be shed," remains a part of the law of retributive justice. The Assizes for this county will be furnished with records of the bloody deed.

I am now convinced that there is no freedom for England till the People regain the right of electing their Sheriffs. So long as the King's Ministers elect the Sheriffs, and the Sheriff's elect the Grand Jury, so long will the blood of the murdered cry unavenged from the ground. I am now preparing a full Report of some of the numerous dreadful cases of the wounded sufferers, which, on my return to town, will be laid before the Committee,

I am, dear Sirs, your's very truly,

Lancaster, Sept. 5, 1819. CHARLES PEARSON.

Men of Cheshire and Lancashire, this letter needs no comment; you see now what is the force of prejudice in the minds of those who are hostile to your interests and welfare, and who will never stickle to make you a sacrifice for their own aggrandisement. You see also from this conduct of your Grand Jury, the necessity of a firm, unanimous, and resolute conduct on your part. Prepare to hold another meeting, and I trust we shall be all prepared to say, that we will have an equal and full representation, or perish in an effort to obtain it. Yours in civic affection,

R. CARLILE.

VINDICATION OF FEMALE POLITICAL INTERFERENCE.

SIR,

IN humbly addressing the Editor of the new periodical paper entitled "The Republican," I seek repose in my study from the public meeting just held in Palace Yard, (50,000 people indignant at the Manchester atrocities,) where Sir F. Burdett and Mr. Hobhouse appeared to contend, as if their retaining fees were received, *whether* the *humanity* of the Prince Regent and his progenitors (reader, remember the *tender mercies* of Culloden, North America, Corsica, Poland, Holland, Belgium, East Indies, and Parga) was most conspicuous, or the astonishing *patriotism* of the *Whigs*, not one of whom, however, had deigned to grace the meeting!

To the rising generation, then, but to the female sex in particular, do I devote an hour's research, as others have forgotten it, just to remind the world, that the interference of the lovely female sex at Manchester and other places, where they have presented the *heroine*, even to the charge of cavalry, was not so extremely novel and impertinent.

The task is not difficult, and the young men especially, will thank me for collating what they will not find in the silly, because almost exclusive, study of Grecian and Latin classics.

Requesting then, that the student will previously store his mind by the perusal of many an eminent writer in praise of that sex, which he knows, numbers with it, and controls the *graces*, the *muses*, and the *virtues*, and that the *heroines* of the *Grecian poet* were among the striking figures of his subject. I will remind him that, when the inhabitants of the northern regions descended south, they appear to have rejected, or escaped the oriental refinements which overran Greece and Italy: and in the Saxon and Danish conquests, it seems that the *natural equality of the sexes* was preserved inviolable. So far from immuring women in seraglios, and otherwise degrading them, the northern tribes, and especially the whole of Germany, reverenced the female sex, as if possessed of superior intelligence, and *deliberated with them in natural emergencies*. Tacitus says, they believed that their women were endowed with a divine and prophetic spirit, so that they always consulted them, and never neglected their oracular responses. De mor. Germ. Ch. VIII.

And we find that in this island, the Abbesses had seats in the Great Council, holden 694. Saxon Chron. And also in the succeeding one, Historia Ingulphi An. 855. And again, "Venerunt ad generalem Vocationem Abbates, Priores, *Abbatissa*," M. Paris An. 1210. At an ecclesiastical synod* on some important points, we find *the Abbess Hild* presiding even over the Scottish party. Bede, Hist. Eccl. III. Ch. 25. By Hicks's Thesaurus we find that women among the Saxons retained separate property, could bequeath legacies even during the life of the husband; and other women besides Abbesses, who sat and decided in county courts ("the great seats of Saxon justice," says Blackstone) were in equal numbers with the men, *and, capital punishments were extremely rare.* After Abbots and Nobles are mentioned, the ladies follow, with many other "thanes and good wives," whose names are omitted. Vide Dissertatis Epistolaris, pp. 5.

Our British establishment presents a strange inconsistency in allowing women to wield the sceptre, without being entitled to hold any subordinate situation.

We should not, however, forget that our Queen Boadicea headed our troops, and made the last great effort against Roman tyranny; or the actions of the four succeeding Scandinavian heroines; or our Elizabeth, and Anne; or those of the reigns of Elizabeth and Catharine of Russia. so tremblingly alive are women to the preservation of the human species. Read this ye Manchester savages! During their time, *not one Russian subject fell by the hand of the public executioner!*

May we not then infer from all this, that women have possessed *coequal power?* And that it materially tended to assuage the malignant and brutal passions of men? Does not every succeeding *male* parliamentary session present further acts of power, from the fountain of a more sanguinary description? Could such have been enacted, if the benevolent and compassionate female had held equal sway?

---

* A certain *synod* composed of the *highest* dignitaries, was held in this country, not four years ago, but veiled in *impenetrable secrecy.* It was to consider whether the divine writings and *reason* did not justify a further spiritual and pastoral consolation to mankind, *on the sublime and benignant subject of grace.* The promulgation and effect was lost 29 to 31!! This note will attract ministers of God's word of *every description*, and induce them, 'tis hoped, not only to enquire about this secret synod, but to *re-peruse* this letter, and adapt the object of it to *practical* admonition.

Little knows the historian, when he collates the facts of the American and French revolutions, if he does not give the women their due weight in the arduous contests: but for their animated influence, few young volunteers would have been found! a Bastile and rank despotism would still have existed.

But, I trust, for every useful purpose, I have sufficiently engrossed your pages: let the philosophers of our sex deliberately consider, whether, in their time, the main supporters of our infancy; the consolation of the adult; and the dernier solace under every affliction, and at the great and trying hour of death!—*have not most unjustly been degraded in their rank in society?* and whether the incalculable sufferings and distress of our dear country are not likely to be *diminished* rather than *encreased*, by the confederation of that sex, which, in profane, or sacred, or modern writ, appear to have *humanized* and *refined* the age, and *decreased our atrocities, in equal ratio with their then standard in human society.*

I would have preferred an anonymous signature, but it is incompatible with your pledge.

S. FERRAND WADDINGTON.

London, Sept. 2nd, 1819.

From the following Correspondence it is pretty evident, that the Trials of the Informations filed against the Editor, by the late Attorney-General, will come on about the middle of October. The Information on the Theological Works of Thomas Paine will be first tried.

Lincoln's Inn, Sept. 2, 1819.

SIR,

WE are directed by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, to acquaint you, that His Grace will be in Nottinghamshire in the month of October, and that if you should require his attendance upon your trial according to the subpœna with which he has been served, you must take the trouble to enquire at Lambeth Palace, about a week previous to the day appointed, where you will obtain His Grace's exact address; and upon notice being then sent his Grace, and suitable arrangements made, His Grace will not fail to attend.

His Grace concludes that you will be aware of the great

inconvenience he must be subjected to by such a journey, and that you will not require his attendance unless it be very material.

We are, Sir,
Your obedient Servants,
FORSTER, COOKE, and FRERE.

Mr. Carlile.

Fleet Street, Sept. 4, 1819.

MY LORD,

I FEEL it my duty to express the warm approbation I felt on receiving the candid information from Messrs. Forster, Cooke, and Frere, where your Grace may be found in the month of October, should the presence of your Grace be required on my trial.

I beg to assure your Grace, that my motive in serving you with a *subpœna* was neither idle nor frivolous, and shall deem the presence of your Grace to be of the highest importance, not only to my interest as an individual, but to the interest of Truth and Justice, and, consequently, the interest of mankind in general.

In conjunction with your Grace, it is my intention to serve with a *subpœna*, the persons in this country most eminent in theology, astronomy, and oriental literature.

I further beg leave to assure your Grace, that such questions for such evidence as I may find necessary to elicit, shall be put by me with a due impression of the importance and rank of those to whom I shall be addressing myself.

I beg leave to subscribe myself,
Your Grace's
Most obliged and obedient Servant,
RICHARD CARLILE.

To his Grace
The Archbishop of Canterbury.

Fleet Street, Sept. 6, 1819.

SIR,

As the adjourned sittings in the Court of King's Bench are near at hand, I beg leave to enquire, whether it is your intention, as His Majesty's Attorney-General, to prosecute

in the ensuing sittings in the month of October, those Informations filed against me by His Majesty's late Attorney-General Sir Samuel Shepherd, and should it be your intention to proceed, which of them you will be pleased to take first.

Flattering myself that I shall find in you, Sir, a generous opponent, I would entreat the earliest notice of trial that might possibly be given, as it is my intention to serve with *subpœnas*, several persons of rank and distinction, eminent in the theological, scientific, and literary world, for whose convenience and accommodation I am solicitous to obtain the earliest notice, as many of them are resident in distant parts of the country, and would wish, at least, a week's notice for attendance.

I am, Sir,
Your most obliged and obedient Servant.
RICHARD CARLILE.

Sir Robert Gifford, Knt.
His Majesty's Attorney General.

SIR,

IN answer to your enquiry, I have to state, that it is certainly my intention that the Informations against you which stand for trial at the adjourned sittings in October should be tried at those sittings; and that the Information against you for publishing a blasphemous libel, which stands prior in order to the other in the list of Causes, will first come on for trial.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient Servant,
R. GIFFORD.

Linc. Inn.
Sep. 7, 1819.

We had prepared a Letter to the Mayor of Exeter this week, on his illegal and arbitrary conduct towards James Tucker, but such is the press of matter at this moment, that we found our pages filled before we were aware of it: next week to a certainty. ED.

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

The Republican.

No. 4. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Sept. 17, 1819. [Price 2d.

THE CRISIS.—No. II.

One month has just elapsed since the peaceable inhabitants of Manchester were indiscriminately massacred and murdered by the drunken and furious Yeomenry Cavalry, set on by the Magistrates of that town to perform the horrid deed: yet already we can see the howling storm, emanating from those black misdeeds, encircling the very seat of government, and justly so, when that government is capable of giving its sanction to a violation of the compact on which it has been founded. Already we find all that was virtuous in the country, that kept aloof from the call for Reform, now the foremost to contend for its necessity and its immediate adoption. There are none left against us but the vicious, the interested, and the dependent. The expression of feeling displayed on Monday, by the return of Mr. Hunt to London from the scene of blood and perjury, and the still more disgraceful scene of a Judge of Assize, a Grand Jury, and a venal Magistracy, countenancing and protecting the perpetrators of this scene of blood and perjury: I say, the expression of feeling was such as to make a lasting impression on those who are opposed to us in our claim, and to fix an indelible stain on all who hereafter keep aloof, and shut their ears to reason and common sense.

On the part of the injured we have seen men demanding redress in vain in a Court of Assize before a Grand Jury, we have seen justice denied in a most villainous and barefaced manner by those who are commissioned as a Magistracy to execute the laws. Persons have been murdered by an armed force, more disgraceful than any murder committed by the banditties which are said to exist on the Continent of Europe, and the very Coroner who is sworn to inquire into the real cause of the death of every person with whom there may be a suspicion that the death was not natural, shuffles and shrinks from the inquiry, lest the verdict should be (as it ought to be) WILFUL MURDER. These are serious times. Nothing but the threats and the din of civil war are to be heard. The powers that be, are sensible of the crimes they have committed, and the wounds they have inflicted on the peace of the community, and they appear determined

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

to leave every thing a wreck, rather than retire from their places. Their soldiers are all they depend on, and it appears they have some fears and suspicions of those, as an experiment has been made to try them in case of need. The whole of the Foot Guards were on Monday night last roused from their rest by the bugle, about 12 o'clock, and ordered to rendezvous in St. James's Park; about 1500 of them ran some one way, and some another, to the place appointed, and were kept there until 3 in the morning, when they discovered the whole to be a false alarm, and a mere experiment to try their disposition to make an attack on the people.

It is not to be denied, it should not be concealed, that we are on the eve of an eventful crisis. Whether that crisis shall end in a military despotism, or produce a restoration of our rights, liberties, and privileges as men, does, in my opinion, depend on the virtue and the fortitude of the People. We must resolve to act instantaneously and unanimously when the moment arrives that our last effort is at stake. That time, I fear, is not far distant; let us be prepared to meet it with a firm and cool determination. Let not a moment be lost, but let every man make that preparation his means will admit of. Our enemies are plotting in secret our destruction as freemen, they are beyond the reach of the law—they build their hopes of success on our supineness, and our apathy becomes their safeguard. Rouse, my fellow countrymen, let us unite with the present intended victims to oppression, and hurl destruction to its cause. A fatal delay, will most assuredly deprive us of the opportunity; and the name and character of our country, will be lost through the criminal tameness of its inhabitants. We shall then become what Greece and Rome now are, the victims of despotism or superstition. Our children will inevitably wear the yoke of bondage, to some foreign power, unless we seize the present moment for their emancipation. We shall not consult our own safety by remaining inactive, but merely preserve ourselves to become the alternate victims to gratify the insatiable thirst of some dark minded despot. We have the experience of history before us, which invariably points out to us, that whenever a banditti have the reins of government similar to those in the administration of affairs in this country, they must be violently driven from it, or they will destroy the only hopes of restoration. Your country is your parent, she must not be abandoned to the lawless depredator. A system of Espionage is again on foot, fellow-countrymen,

beware, you need not mingle with strangers, every man can make himself the most useful in his own district; he cannot become useful in a district where he is a stranger, and he must necessarily be exposed to suspicion—do not be misled by any stranger; whatever are his pretences, suspect him until you are satisfied by unquestionable authority, that he is sincere. Your general conduct and conversation should be open and undisguised, you have no secrets; do not allow yourself to be betrayed into any. Our several and united efforts are best to be made by communications with each other through the press—here we have nothing to fear, the nearer the present system approaches its dissolution, the more danger you will individually be exposed to. Sacrifices may be required to be offered up at the shrine of despotism —let us hope they will be but few. The noble attitude which the friends of liberty are beginning to display on all occasions on which they are called forth, shakes the very nerves of our opponents. The metropolis has this week displayed 300,000 men, expressing their indignation at the conduct of the murderers at Manchester, and the Government subsequently sanctioning those *murders*. They were composed of many men of property as tradesmen, as well as mechanics and labourers.

The fury of the Magistrates of Manchester does not seem to decrease, but on the other hand, the more crime and villainy they commit, the more hardened they appear to grow in it. Will it be believed when it is said, that after accumulating five indictments against Mr. Wroe, the proprietor of the Manchester Observer, and demanding bail so excessive, that he has been compelled for some weeks to absent himself from his business, that they should arrest every person in his employ, not excepting his wife and infant children, merely because Mr. Wroe was virtuous enough to cause a report of their dark, designing, and bloody deeds to be put on record? This they have done, and done it by the recommendation of Sidmouth to the country magistrates, that they should not mind making a stretch beyond the law to suppress the publication of truth. The time surely will come, when we shall have an opportunity of bringing justice on their heads, or was it not for this hope, I for one, should deem it prudent to execute it in a summary way, as they do their villainous acts, without regard to the law.

R. CARLILE.

A LETTER TO THOMAS FLOOD, ESQ. MAYOR OF EXETER,

On his arbitrary and illegal Conduct towards James Tucker, with a Caution to him and other Magistrates as to their future Conduct.

SIR,

IN addressing you publicly, I beg to be understood as looking only at your magisterial character, which from various circumstances that have occurred between yourself and Mr. Tucker, induces me to think that you are not guided by the most prudent and honourable motives. I shall commence my observations with giving you a narrative of what I know of his character, and of what I have heard through the medium of the public papers and epistolary correspondence, of your conduct towards him.

Mr. Tucker called on me in London, and being out of employ, expressed a wish to become an agent for the circulation of my political publications, in Exeter and its vicinity: I readily acquiesced in the proposal, having been a resident in that city, and knowing that political information had not made that progress in Exeter and Devonshire in general, as it had in the northern counties. Mr. Tucker was quite a stranger to me, but I perceived an urbanity of manner combined with a bold and resolute disposition, that instantly induced me to place confidence in him; and I have the pleasure to inform you, Sir, that his whole conduct, up to this time, has confirmed my opinion that he is a man (although poor,) possessing an honest and an honourable mind, which is but rarely met with in the circle of officious or official characters in the present day. He had scarcely commenced the sale in a public way, when the magistracy leagued themselves together to crush him, and this by the contemptible means of bringing a charge against him of having six or eight months before that time, sold *cider without a licence*—a penalty of £10, was demanded, and Mr. Tucker not having the money at hand, was thrown into prison. The spirit of freedom immediately took fire in the bosoms of its advocates who were resident in Exeter, and you Sir, must have startled at that spirit, when you saw the extorted sum placed before you in a few hours, and the liberation of the man demanded by those who perhaps had never seen him, but felt disgusted at your treacherous attack on a political opponent. The next account I heard, was the arrest of some person

with whom he had left a few copies of different publications for sale. You then ventured to rob the man of his pamphlets, at least you countenanced that robbery, by detaining the pamphlets taken by your officer without paying for them! A worthy magistrate, certainly! Depend on it, Sir, that the men who are now advocating that Reform in parliament, and the toleration of civil and religious liberty, which must inevitably take place, in spite of your opposition, will protect the man whom your malignity and imprudence strives to make a victim of—every effort of yours to injure, will only produce a benefit to the individual. You have now, Sir, by your insinuations to Justice Best, and by his scandalously pointing out the man to the Grand Jury, overwhelmed him with two or three new indictments, which for the moment has deterred any house-keeper from standing forward to bail him; but I yet trust that the citizens of Exeter will recollect that they have an important duty to perform for themselves, in standing forward to bail Mr. Tucker against all the indictments that may be accumulated upon him. I say they should stand forward and bail him, and not suffer a farthing to be extorted from him in the shape of fee. A few spirited house-keepers would soon teach you the folly of your conduct, Sir: they would make you as contemptible as his Lordship, the Mayor of London.

Perhaps, Sir, you are ignorant of the nature of the question between the Government and the People: it appears to me, that you have blindly adhered to what in your country towns and cities is called the Pitt Principle, or supporters of the constitution, as by law established, which Sir, you may perhaps consider to be consonant with the *semper fidelis* on your city arms. But if you examine into the reality of the case, and reason on the abstract principle of what a constitution or a social compact ought to be, you will find that the shadow of a constitution which England had once to boast of, is quite annihilated—that there is not a vestige left. There was a time when the House of Commons had something like a controul over the other branches of the legislature; but that controul is quite destroyed, and through the influence of Boroughmongering, they are become the base and contemptible tools of every vicious faction that can get into power. There is no representation in the country. The decree which the Ministers put forth under the sanction of the Boroughmongers, must be the line of conduct, for what is now called the House of Commons, to pursue. And

you, Sir, are one of those puerile Magistrates that would adhere to any system so that you had the favour of the party in power. Whether you possess common sense as an individual, and are capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, on matters of government and legislation, I, having no personal knowledge of you, cannot pretend to say, but of this I am certain, that you are an individual that would change with any change in government, and would to-morrow be as ready to espouse a Republic, as to-day a Monarchy.

I hope the time is not far distant, when you, Sir, will find that you have made a dangerous experiment in your wanton violation of the law in the person of Tucker; the advocates of that cause which you have thought proper to oppose will not allow your conduct to pass unnoticed, and I further hope and flatter myself, that every step you take to crush him whilst he stands firm against you, will have the desired effect, to elevate him both in his own mind, and in that of the citizens of Exeter.

Perhaps, Sir, you are not aware that to arrest on a charge of libel it is necessary that the warrant should be issued by one of the Judges of the Court of King's Bench: you, Sir, have no legal authority to issue a warrant against any man on a charge of libel. Actions or informations for libel were conducted as other actions at law prior to the Attorney Generalship of Sir Vicary Gibbs, who brought a bill into parliament to enable the Judges of the Court of King's Bench to hold to bail in cases of libel. Although there is a vague act extant passed in the 48th year of George III. cap. 58, entitled "*An Act for amending the Law with regard to the course of proceedings on Indictments and Informations in the Court of King's Bench in certain cases; for authorising the execution in Scotland of certain warrants issued for offences committed in England; and for requiring officers taking bail in the King's suit to assign the Bail-bonds to the King.*" Yet, as this Act does not refer to, or repeal any portion of the bill introduced by Sir Vicary Gibbs, and passed into an act for enabling the Judges of the Court of King's Bench to hold to bail in case of libel: this vague application to certain cases, (an Act that would have disgraced any legislative body but the tools of the Boroughmongers who meet in St. Stephen's Chapel, at Westminster,) must consequently be considered to except cases of libel. The "Society for the Suppression of Vice," have, however, ventured to arrest and detain my person in the gaol of Newgate

for several days on this Act, because it is the only one of many infamous Acts that could be found in their malignant opinions, to reach me, having given them security to meet the same charge before. However, I shall conclude on the legality of the question, with a promise that it shall shortly be decided in an endeavour to recover damages equal to the injury sustained, and advert to your conduct of last week, in arresting Mr. Tucker's sister, and finally, breaking up his little shop, by extorting a promise from her not to attend it, nor to obtain any other person to act in her stead. I have no further intelligence on this head, than what I have seen in the London Papers of this day. You, Sir, finding the mind of the man was virtuously invincible, have now further disgraced yourself by frightening, and then tampering with his sister. The papers inform me that, to put a stop to the circulation, you "bought up the whole stock of sedition, and caused it to be burnt in the Market-place." I shall rejoice at this, if I find you have been honest enough to pay the full and fair price for it, as I have a stock that will quickly renew it, the whole of which I am inclined to think even the Mayor of Exeter would not be willing to purchase.

I now repeat my call on the honest housekeepers of Exeter to come forward and rescue Tucker from your malignant persecution. I will give any two housekeepers my bond to any amount that bail may be required for him. I would, Sir, address myself to the Citizens of Exeter, and say,—the man is worthy of your protection: your Chief Magistrate has disgraced himself. The ground-work of the prosecution of Tucker is, that he has sold publications arguing the necessity of a change of government from an oligarchy to the representative system; and you, Sir, unable to meet those arguments by any thing rational, have had recourse to an authority invested in your hands for a very different purpose, to crush him by force and violence—for a violation of law to injure another, is violence. To the advocates of a fair and equal representation I would say, Sir, that they are in duty bound, for their own interest, to lend the man an helping hand who is now imprisoned, and suffering for want of bail in their cause. To you, Sir, as Chief Magistrate of the City of Exeter, I would address myself and say, that you are ignorant of, or wilfully blind to the interests of the Citizens of Exeter; they have the same, or perhaps superior capacities of mind, for judging of the merits or demerits of those publications with yourself, and, no doubt, would hastily reject them, if they bore the character, or had the ten-

dency, which you ascribe to them. You, Sir, may find the thanks of Sidmouth in the name of the Regent, or of the Bishop and Clergy of the diocese, but the honest part of the community will inflict that punishment on you, your conduct has merited—their just indignation.

RICHARD CARLILE.

P. S. I have received a Letter from a Gentleman in Exeter since writing the above, which informs me, that you paid the fair price for the goods taken and burnt, and that you dared to send your officers to take the next parcel from the Mail Coach office, which evidently amounted to an act of felony, and for which you and your officers should have exchanged places with Mr. Tucker. I find your malignity has been carried so far as to deprive his poor mother of the relief she stood in need of and received from the city. I have no room for further comment at the present but your future conduct shall be duly noticed, and your past behaviour further commented on.

TO MR. CARLILE.

DEAR SIR,

PERMIT me, though but faintly, to express my gratitude to you. About five weeks since, accidentally came into my hands a number of the DEIST, which since, with the rest of the numbers of the first volume, I have read with great inward joy.

After this I obtained the "Age of Reason," and having now read the first and second parts, and began the third, with so much satisfaction and delight, that I shall not do justice to my feelings, without embracing this opportunity of making my most grateful acknowledgements to you, for what you have done, and are now doing, for the emancipation of mankind.

I cannot content myself to read to the end, before I entreat you to accept of my sincerest heart-felt thanks, for the inexpressible benefit and pleasure I have individually experienced from reading those two invaluable books, which nobody but yourself dared to publish, though they contain nothing but truth.

The good you had offered your fellow-countrymen is unlimited, and infinite, and instead of the Government using every possible effort, and unjustly straining every nerve to punish you, for the courage you have evinced by the things you have lately published, in my opinion you are deserving of a better name, and a higher honour, than the sovereign of this kingdom ever bestowed upon an individual.

In my own mind I am at a loss to determine, whether you or the immortal Paine merits the greatest gratitude and praise from mankind. However, this I will say, had it not been for your undaunted mind, we should have remained ignorant of the merits of the most valuable work that ever an Englishman produced. Go on with intrepidity, hero of truth and opposer of error; no doubt but your reward and satisfaction will be more than equal to your indefatigable exertions.

In my youth I was taught and obliged by my parents to read the Bible, but no other book; this mode of treatment not only gave me a great dislike to reading the Bible, but to reading of any kind, and rather than go to school, I went to sea, unknown to my parents. Thus, at eighteen years of age, I was almost unable to read ten words in any book, or scarcely write my own name. After the age of eighteen, having a mechanical turn of mind, I bent my attention to this, and I very soon obtained a sufficient knowledge of several of the common mechanical arts, as to be able to work at them pretty well.

Next I had a taste for chemistry, but in this I made but very little progress, in consequence of my still retaining a great dislike to books. However, my mind was occupied in learning something or other of a useful nature, until I arrived at the age of twenty-two:—(I am now about thirty-one). About this time I happened to hear a Mr. Alexander Fletcher, preach at a chapel in Miles's Lane, in London. This gentleman so much engaged my attention, that I attended his ministry three times almost every Sunday, during my stay in town, which was several months. His preaching brought so powerfully to my mind those early religious instructions I had received from my parents, which were principally the fear of God, the Devil, and Hell, that I have been ever since in a labyrinth about those mysteries contained in the Bible and New Testament. Sometimes I have been even wretchedly and miserably perplexed by those mysterious doctrines of the Christian Religion; and although I could not believe them, yet I dared not disbelieve them, but continued to read the Bible with "fear and trembling," and thus my life has been spent in continual dread and misery. But I doubt not you will be better able to conceive the tranquillity of my mind, and the happiness I now enjoy than I can possibly express by words.

I remain, Dear Sir, &c.

JOHN BRILL.

Mrs. Todd's Lodgings,
Peterborough, Sept. 12, 1819.

The following anecdote respecting the Age of Reason, we venture to hold out as authentic, having received it through a respectable channel:—

During the late confinement of the Prince Regent with the gout, he one evening inquired of his Librarian, (Dr. Clarke) what were those Deistical writings of Paine that made so much noise. "I will have them read to me, Doctor," exclaimed the Prince. Accordingly, Dr. Clarke read them during two evenings. The Regent paid the most profound attention, and at the close of the second evening's reading thus spoke to the Librarian, "I have the whole, Doctor—I recollect every point; and when the Dandy Bishop* visits me at Brighton, in October, I will make him answer me every objection."†

TO THE EDITOR OF THE REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

YOUR late excellent remarks on the executive, have educed a few from me, on another branch of our constitution.

We are often told, that the House of Peers forms a most salutary check, alike on the prerogative of the crown, and the licentiousness of the lower branch of our constitution. There are other advantages which we are *said* to derive from the existence of the *noble house*; but which are perhaps *too evident* to your readers, to need my notice. Allow me, however, to offer through "*The Republican*," the following picture of the present state of the House of Peers.

	Created previous to the present reign.	By the present King.	By the Regent.	Total.
Dukes,	16	1	1	18
Marquisses,	1	11	5	17
Earls,	52	36	11	99
Viscounts,	5	12	5	22
Barons,	26	1	17	134
			Total English Peers	290

The sixteen Representative Peers for Scotland, are all of

---

* Supposed to be Pelham, Lord Bishop of Exeter.

† We would recommend the Regent to attend the Court of King's Bench in October, when the trials of the Editor come on, instead of putting his questions to the Bishop.

longer standing than the commencement of the present reign; but the twenty-eight Representative Peers for Ireland, have all been created within that period.

Thus with the 2 Archbishops, and 24 Bishops, the house consists of 360 members; of which, only 116 are of earlier creation than the present reign, and during the 7 years of the regency, there have been no less than 39 added. We pretty well know, that men obnoxious to the ruling powers on any account, are seldom exalted, *at least in this manner.*

As the right of conferring titles *(and thereby giving one man equal power to reject or impose laws, with the representative of, perhaps, thousands* as honest men as himself) is vested in the crown, of course it is able, at any time, to change the aggregate opinion of that *august* body, by slipping into the scale a sufficient number of its mercenary slaves, and thereby destroying *that happy balance* of our constitution so highly extolled. We are told, that the three branches have equal power, but if two of them are thus virtually but one, the remaining one cannot withstand the combination. The fact that a money bill must originate in the Commons, is so much a mere question of privilege, between the two Houses, that it need not be touched on.

In offering this statement, I would not be thought averse to the existence of titles*, but, on the contrary, I think it a cheap and an easy method of rewarding merit. The title may be bestowed, but the possessor should not be invested with any privileges, not in common with his fellow-countrymen; for no man can render such services to his country, as to entitle him to a portion of its liberties.

Could we trace the motives and objects which have contributed to the ennobling the 244 peers of this reign's creation) individually, we shall find, that their titles have generally been the reward of their servility, and we should consider, that every one stands as a blot, in the annals of his country, who arrives at the Temple of Honour by any other way, than through that of Public Virtue.

I am, Sir, your constant Reader,

46, Speldhurst Street, Burton Crescent. J. A. PARRY.

---

* The Editor begs leave to express his dissent to the existence of any title, either honorary or otherwise, and his opinion that a sense of having done a duty, and the private esteem of his fellow-citizens, is all the honour an honest man would wish.

To the Readers of the Republican.

ALREADY has the REPUBLICAN been honoured, not yet that I know of with the notice of the Attorney-General, but, strange to say, with the notice of the Police Magistrates.—It appears that our Attornies-General, weary of filing Informations against Political Writers, have left the annoyance of the vendors to the Police, who, it seems, under the direction of their Lieutenant, (Sidmouth) are anxious to outstrip the Police of France and the Continent in general, by defining what is, and what is not libellous, or, I should rather say, seditious. How sorry must this saint be to think that he is at this moment denied the gratification of issuing his *Lettres de Cachet.* Four persons, who are in the habit of selling, in their way of business, the political pamphlets of the day, were arrested on Tuesday se'nnight, and brought before Mr. Birnie, at Bow Street, for selling the second number of this work. They were Mr. Cahuac, of Blackman Street, in the Borough of Southwark, who was dragged to Bow Street, even whilst the Magistrates were sitting at Union Hall;—Mr. Watling, of the Strand;—Mr. Shorter, of Wych Street;—and Mr. Harris, of Broad Court, Long Acre. Bail was ready for the whole of them, and they, one and all, refused to pay any fee, to the great mortification of Mr. Birnie and his Oath-makers.

Mr. Watling made Mr. Birnie hide his face, by telling him, that he had sold more than 600 of the Pamphlets amongst his neighbours, who had discovered no evil tendency in it, and that it was very strange that he, a Police Magistrate, should be so quick of perception. Mr. Birnie furiously replied that he had not read it, and that he knew nothing of it until they were brought before him on the charge. This was a mere quibble, which every one present gave the silent lie to, as it was the different Officers engaged at the Bow Street Office who made oath, that the publication was seditious and inflammatory. Mr. Birnie was particularly insolent to Mr Harris, by repeating a malignant accusation that had before been brought up. His conduct was every thing but the Gentleman towards Harris and his bail.

A strange anomaly took place, with respect to this publication and arrest for it. The Magistrate causes four persons to be arrested for selling this pamphlet, and actually takes the bail of the Editor, Printer, and Publisher for the appearance of two of them, whilst the author of this mischief (if mischief there be any) passes some days unmolested

although always to be found and forthcoming to meet a charge of this nature. *O Tempora, O Mores!!!*

On the Thursday following two others were arrested, namely, a Mr. Whitehorn, of Somers Town, and Mr. Sainsbridge, of Pulteney Court. Bail was immediately tendered, and taken, and the Editor again received, after some quibbling attempt on the part of Mr. Conant, the then sitting Magistrate, to invalidate his competence to justify the required bail. These two persons also refused to pay any fee. On Friday, the Bow Street Magistrates, evidently ashamed of the dirty work they had performed, sent one of their Officers to the Mansion-House to make oath, that the Editor (*strange to say*) had published this wicked and heinous libel. His Lordship expressed his reluctance at granting the warrant, and took the proffered bail without the 48 hours' notice.

On Monday last a vendor, of the name of Francis, in the borough of Southwark, was arrested, and taken before the sitting Magistrate, (Mr. Evance) who politely excused the fees when he found Mr. Francis would not pay them. It is due to all those persons to say, that they have boldly continued the sale of all the Numbers of the Republican, fo which they have the thanks of

R. CARLILE.

Miscellanea,

On the Necessity of Union, and its good Effects.

A STRONG proof that the middle classes are awakening to a sense of their danger, is evident from the encouragement that has been given by them to the labourers in the manufacturing districts, to violate the Combination Law. A correspondent whom we have quoted before, has expressed himself in the following manner:—

"But what shall I say of the wonderful relaxation of the 'Combination Law?' How shall I speak of the spirit that has dictated the late gentle, and almost approving notice of your efforts to reduce your grasping masters to some sense of reason on your miseries? Are you become so numerous, so enlightened, and resolute that you can no longer be treated with rigour and oppression? Or, are your tyrants become merciful and humane? Do you suppose you

would have been suffered to go on thus, if you were less numerous, less united, or less resolved? Oh no! Never! The already bursting jails would have been crammed with your persons! Your children would have perished by famine, and your names would have been blotted out from the face of the earth! Remember this to your latest breath; *and call in your past experience to confirm it.*

"Union, co-operation, and perseverance will bring you through all your troubles; and recollect, that you have a duty to perform to your children as well as to yourselves; and that is, to prevent them from being reduced to the horrible state that you are now reduced to, by thoroughly cleansing that Augean Stable of abominations, aptly called 'The House of Corruption,' and placing *your own* deputies there; to be a shield and defence to yourselves and your posterity for ever! All other concessions are but temporary, and you may rest assured, will be recalled, as soon as you are in a situation to *command* them; but when once you are faithfully represented in parliament, it will be your House of Refuge for ever!

"The late resolution of some manufacturers to increase your wages, I consider as the certain forerunner and harbinger that you will most assuredly, and that very soon, gain this important point; for the Combination Act was a trite convention between the Boroughmongers and the chief manufacturers, in which the latter, in consideration of having your *bodies* at their disposal, at their own price, engaged to secure to the former your *souls*, that is, your acquiescence in every tax, and imposition, that the former might think proper to lay upon your shoulders; and this is the true secret, why your masters have uniformly refused to join with you in your patriotic endeavours. But as they now see that the Boroughmongers are no longer able to enforce the performance of their part of the contract, it is to be hoped that a sense of *self-interest* will prevent your employers from keeping aloof from you any longer, and from sharing that fate, which is most assuredly preparing for the Borough Tyrants."

Mr. Tucker, who has been immured in the City Prison of Exeter, for selling the political pamphlets of the day, for several weeks past, has given us a further proof of his zeal and sincerity in the great cause of Liberty and Equal Representation, by the following suggestion, to which we would call the attention of our readers:—

"The great benefits that would result to the Reformers in abstaining from all exciseable articles, and the speedy effects it would have in reducing their enemies the Boroughmongers, have been so clearly demonstrated, and is a measure so decisive, that no means should be left untried, in order to bring it into immediate practice.

"For this purpose, I would suggest a few hints, that may prompt some able hand to draw up a regular scheme that may carry it into execution.

"First, That books should be opened for the signatures of all who are desirous to adopt this measure; and that every individual at the time of signing should make a short declaration to the following effect:

"I, A. B., do hereby declare, that I will partly abstain from the use or consumption of all exciseable articles, from the date hereof; until I have obtained the full and free exercise of the whole of my natural and constitutional rights and liberties, as witness my hand.

"Secondly, That the total amount of the number who have so declared, be communicated to the Independent Press, and announced weekly.

"By thus publicly declaring and adding their signature, would be a powerful stimulus to fulfil their engagements. Reporting the numbers from different parts weekly would answer two good purposes,—the friends of Reform would be animated, and anxiously look forward to the result, whilst fresh numbers would be eager to encrease their list.

"On the other hand, it would enable their enemies to calculate the probable deficiencies of their grand treasury, the Revenue; and the mortification of finding those magazines of their wealth continually decreasing."

Another Correspondent has suggested that any tavern or ale-house-keeper, losing his licence in consequence of his being favourable to the cause of a determination to change the present system of things, should open a house immediately, (announcing under what circumstances) for the sale of good spring water or any other wholesome beverage that might exclude, as far as possible, any thing that is excised; and we doubt not, from the spirit and disposition of the times, that such persons would be well supported.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

To *Mr. Fowler*, the Editor would beg leave to say, that his warfare is with tyranny and delusion, and considering that delusion, whether it be called civil or religious, is to him the same; he will attack it indiscriminately, and more particularly that which he considers more pernicious to the morals of society, namely, the fraud and delusion of the latter. With many others, it is the opinion of the Editor, that Paine, by his political writings, conferred a blessing on the nations in which they have been read—but by his theological writings he became the real benefactor and the saviour of mankind—from the continuation of those curses—Priestcraft and Religion. Mr. F. is not well acquainted with the history of Paine's Writings; the Political Works were long suppressed before the Theological Works made their appearance. Many individuals had suffered two, three, and four years imprisonment for the political works before the theological works were known in this country; it was in December, 1792, that the information against Paine himself was tried at the Guildhall, London, and it was not until 1797, that the Age of Reason was prosecuted in the person of Williams. The Editor has no doubt but the suggestion of Mr. F. originated from the purest motive, but hopes on a reconsideration, Mr. F. will find it to be an error in judgment.

To *F. Junius*, the Editor must renew his pledge to insert no correspondence as a whole, without the real name and address. Many others have been received with the real name and address, which will be thrown into the *treasury of hints and ideas*, and made the best use of possible,—a prerogative which all Editors must necessarily assume. And the Editor here begs it to be observed, that this is the last notice he can afford to correspondents, as it is considered a waste of paper by the general reader. To notice all the correspondence that comes to hand, would almost fill the weekly number:—the Editor hopes this will be a sufficient apology to all.

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

The Republican.

No. 5. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Sept. 24, 1819. [Price 2d.

A LETTER TO HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE REGENT;

On his answer to the Address and Petition of the Citizens of London, in Common Council assembled, praying his Royal Highness to institute an enquiry into the conduct of the Magistrates and Yeomanry Cavalry of Manchester.

Sir,

The most important epoch of your life has passed. In all ages when a Prince has had the misfortune to preside in a country where the People are pressed to the ground with oppression, emanating either from himself or his advisers there has been a certain period when a disposition has been shewn on the part of the oppressed to effect a reconciliation, and a reformation of abuses with the oppressor or oppressors, by means of petition, or rational argument. For some years past, this disposition has been evident on the part of the People of this country towards you Sir. Their remonstrance has been humble, though dignified; their petition has been made on grounds incontrovertible, and in language unobjectionable, whilst they have been invariably received by you with an insolent *hauteur*, or silent contempt. The last which has been presented to you by the citizens of London has received an answer that crowns the whole, it is at the same time a piece of daring and finished impudence, and coming from a person in your station in life, an irritating, and to you and your family, a piece of dangerous insolence. I shall copy the address and petition, with your answer to it, in this letter, for the purpose of analyzing its parts, and making the proper observations on it.

"The humble ADDRESS and PETITION of the LORD MAYOR, ALDERMEN and COMMONS of the CITY of LONDON, in Common Council assembled.

"May it please your Royal Highness,

"We his Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Commons of the City of London in Common Council assembled, humbly approach your Royal Highness, with feelings

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

of the most serious alarm and regret at the extraordinary and calamitous proceedings which have recently taken place at Manchester.

"We humbly represent to your Royal Highness, that under the free principles of the British Constitution, it is the undoubted right of Englishmen to assemble together for the purpose of deliberating upon public grievances as well as on the legal and constitutional means of obtaining redress.

"That for an exercise of this right a Meeting was held at Manchester on the 16th August last, and without entering into the policy or prudence of convening such assembly, it appears to us, from the information which has transpired, that the said Meeting was legally assembled, that its proceedings were conducted in an orderly and peaceable manner, and that the People composing it were therefore acting under the sanction of the laws and entitled to the protection of the magistrates.

"We have nevertheless learnt with grief and astonishment that while the Meeting was so assembled, and when no act of riot or tumult had taken place, the magistrates issued their warrant for the apprehension of certain persons then present, for the execution of which, although no resistance was made on the part of the People or those against whom the warrants were issued, they immediately resorted to the aid of the military, when, without any previous warning of their intention, the Manchester Yeomanry Cavalry suddenly rushing forward, opened a passage through the multitude, furiously attacking by force of arms peaceable and unoffending citizens, whereby great numbers of men, women, and children, and even peace officers, were indiscriminately and wantonly rode over, and many inhumanly sabred and killed.

"We feel ourselves called upon to express to your Royal Highness our strongest indignation at these unprovoked and intemperate proceedings, which we cannot view but as highly disgraceful to the character of Englishmen, and a daring violation of the British Constitution.

"That from your Royal Highness's known and declared attachment to the Constitution and the laws, we feel the most decided conviction that your Royal Highness never could have been induced to express your approval of the conduct of the abettors and perpetrators of these atrocities, had not your Royal confidence been abused by interested and misrepresented statements of these illegal and fatal transactions.

"We humbly submit to your Royal Highness, that at a time when the great body of his Majesty's subjects are suffering under the severest privations, however erroneous may be their ideas as to the means of redress, a kind and conciliating attention to their complaints is equally called for by Policy and Justice; and that depriving them of the means of expressing their grievances by cruelty and despotism, can only tend to increase the present discontents—destroy public confidence in the pure and equal administration of Justice—excite disaffection, and lead to acts of open violence or secret revenge.

"We, therefore, humbly pray, that in order to avert these calamities, to maintain the authority of the law, and to protect the lives and liberties of the subject, your Royal Highness will be graciously pleased to institute an immediate and effectnal inquiry into the outrages that have been committed, and cause the guilty perpetrators thereof to be brought to signal and condign punishment.

Signed, by order of Court,
HENRY WOODTHORPE."

This address Sir, has not exaggerated one item of what really occurred at Manchester, it is a plain and confined statement of fact and honest expression, such as it appears you are little accustomed to receive from those by whom you are surrounded; let us now see what is your answer:

"I receive with feelings of deep regret, this Address and Petition of the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Commons of the City of London, in Common Council assembled.

"At a time when ill-designing and turbulent men are actively engaged in inflaming the minds of their fellow-subjects, and in endeavouring by means the most daring and insidious, to alienate them from their allegiance to his Majesty and the established Constitution of the Realm; it is on the vigilance and conduct of the Magistrates, that the preservation of the public tranquillity must in a great degree depend; and a firm, faithful, and active discharge of their duty cannot but give them the strongest claim to the support and approbation of their Sovereign and their country.

"With the circumstances which preceded the late meeting at Manchester, you must be unacquainted, and of those which attended it you appear to have been incorrectly informed.

"If, however, the laws were violated on that occasion, by those to whom it immediately belonged to assist in the execution of them, the Tribunals of this country are open to afford redress; but to institute an extra-judicial inquiry under such circumstances as the present, would be manifestly inconsistent with the clearest principles of public justice."

Those, Sir, who have been anxious to adhere to yourself and family, have read this answer of your's with much deeper regret than I imagine you received the address with. It has destroyed in their minds all hopes of making you an useful member of the society you preside over. All idea of any further appeal to you on the state of the nation must be abandoned, Your mind is evidently debased and steeled against any effort to ameliorate the condition of the People. Your only ambition appears to be that of a mili-

tary Despot. You have violated the oath of your father, who swore at his coronation, that he would preserve to the People of this country, the benefits of Magna Charta, one article of which expresses that justice shall not be delayed, withheld, or sold. You have denied justice to an injured People. You have countenanced the violation of the Bill of Rights, and the Act of Settlement. It was on the pledge of preserving inviolate those privileges, that those of your family who have preceded you, obtained the crown of this country; and, according to its laws and their provisions, you have forfeited your title to that crown.

I will now pause a moment Sir, and reason on your answer to the citizens of London. By that answer, you have passed the sentence of death on that system which you evince a determination to support. You say, "*At a time when ill-designing and turbulent men are actively engaged in inflaming the minds of their fellow subjects, and in endeavouring, by means the most daring and insidious, to alienate them from their allegiance to his Majesty, and the established Constitution of the realm; it is on the vigilance and conduct of the Magistrates, that the preservation of the public tranquillity must in a great degree depend; and a firm, faithful, and active discharge of their duty cannot but give them the strongest claim to the support and approbation of their Sovereign and their Country.*" The charge of ill-design on the part of any portion of the People must be abandoned; it cannot be substantiated against the advocates of equal representation. Those advocates are become by far the greater part of the People, nay, I may venture to say, all save those who are interested in supporting the abuses of the present system, and who can only obtain a competency in idleness by its continuance, and it follows as a natural consequence, that the majority cannot have any ill designs against the minority or the interest and welfare of their country. If men who are clamorous for a change, because they are perishing with hunger, are the turbulent alluded to, we accept the charge and the character, but that turbulence which becomes mischievous and pernicious to the interest and welfare of the community must be sought after in your cabinet. With respect to the charge of inflaming the minds of our fellow-countrymen (not fellow-subjects, for recollect, Sir, that the People of this country are subject to nothing but the laws that have been justly enacted,) I for one, and perhaps one of those alluded to, am proud of the charge, and feel it a

duty to stir up the oppressed against their oppressors, for in that situation do I conceive the People of this country to be placed, with respect to their rulers, by usurpation; and to express my opinion, that no means can be considered too daring, if prudent, to effect such a laudable purpose. With respect to alienating the minds of the People from Majesty, and the established Constitution, to the first it should be observed, there can be no Majesty where there is no virtue; and to the second, that what you Sir, call the Constitution, is not that which the People wished and intended it to be, when they drove James from the throne. Your next observation, although ambiguous, is not that which can be misunderstood. It is your deliberate approbation of the late conduct of the Magistrates of Manchester, whom you applaud for a firm, faithful, and active discharge of their duty—active indeed! for which you have pledged to them your support and approbation, and that of their country. The approbation of their country!! How could you dare to use this expression, when you knew that the whole country had expressed its indignation at their conduct, and that you were then replying to an expression of that indignation from the citizens of the metropolis? You are lost both to sense and to shame, and have quite separated the sovereign from the country. It is now the duty of the citizens of London, which duty I hope they will perform, to demand one more interview with you, not with a *petition*, but with a REMONSTRANCE, and boldly and openly to tell you, that they will withhold all further support from your Government until all their grievances are redressed.

You next charge the citizens of London with an ignorance of the circumstances which preceded the late meeting at Manchester, and with having been incorrectly informed of those which attended it. Pray, Sir, have you or your Ministers sought any other information than that which has been received from the parties who stand ACCUSED OF MURDER by the whole country? Has one out of many hundred disinterested evidences who witnessed the proceedings without being connected with either party been sought after, or been received when offered, to give a faithful account of the transactions between both parties?—I think I may venture to respond NO! The citizens of London did not attempt to address you on the subject until they were prepared with the most unquestionable evidence and positive authenticity of the case. They were not ignorant either of the circumstances that preceded or attended the late meeting at Man-

chester, and the insolent and false assertion has been justly retorted on.

You next observe, that if the laws of the country have been violated by those who should enforce them, (just as if you were unacquainted with that violation) the tribunals of the country are open. You have taken care, Sir, to fill the seats of justice with servile and time-serving men, and Justice herself has been driven from the country. We cannot appeal to the tribunals of the country, because they are not open to us; for a proof of this, we need only refer to the Lancashire Grand Juries. The Sheriff is appointed by you, Sir, and the Sheriff appoints the Grand Jury. As you are the grand mover, you take care that none shall fill an office of this kind who is likely to thwart your views or disposition. Until we have every part of the Government elected by the voice and pleasure of the People, we cannot expect to find any thing in the character of justice in the country.

To attempt to palliate your offences against the People would be a participation of the criminality. The whole body, of which you are now the ostensible head, is one mass of vicious corruption, and it is become too apparent, that its putrifying effects have reached the head itself. The People are beginning to divide themselves both from their avowed enemies in your Administration, and its adherents, and their false-pretending friends, called the Whigs. They are becoming a distinct body, neither whom nor their leaders are to be corrupted. They have already thrown off their self-styled "natural leaders," and have made the noble resolve to trust them no more. This is a most cheering picture—one that will baffle all the arts and trickery of your Ministers to divide.

It was by the intrigues of the British Cabinet at a time when there was something like energy and ability (however misapplied) to be found in it, supported by British resources, and aided by the treachery and cruelty of a Castlereagh, that the rising spirit of freedom was crushed in Ireland at the close of the last and the beginning of the present century. But where will you look for energy, ability, or resources, to crush the rising spirit of freedom and emancipation in Great Britain? Will the Holy Alliance afford you that aid? Will their armies be at your service? Be it so. I flatter myself you will find, that Britons will rally round but one standard, and not desert nor shrink from it whilst there is a foreign soldier on the soil. Britons have fought, opposed to each other, from the impulse of superstition—

they have fought for and defended the private quarrels between Despots, and have drawn their swords against each other in their own country—but they never yet fought for LIBERTY. The STANDARD OF LIBERTY will now unite all that are worthy of the soil and the name of Man—and vain will be the effort to oppose them.

You have gone quite as far as Charles when he hoisted his standard at Nottingham. The situation of Charles was very different to your's; the press had not then spread its benign influence, nor were the mass of the People much acquainted with politics, or the abstract principles of government. The case is now very different. Almost every labourer in the country knows the essentials of a Government as well, or perhaps better than some of your Ministers. Your answer to the Citizens of London can only be received as a declaration of war; it breathes but one sentiment, that is, "Do what you please, my confidence is not in you, (the People) but in my Army;" and the People, in return, must be aware that they have no longer any hopes of assistance from you, but are left to obtain the necessary reform by their own physical exertions. The Citizens of London have, as I before observed, one further duty to perform with you, they should retort the insult you have offered them, by addressing you with a remonstrance, expressive of their opinion of your conduct, and their determination to take further steps, in consequence of your insolent refusal to listen to their request.

History affords many precedents of Princes placed in your situation, and as many proofs that you are treading a dangerous path. You have convinced every mind open to conviction, that they have nothing further to hope from you. The advocates for Republican Governments may rejoice at the steps you are taking, as the most essential to produce their object. And with all the distresses of the country, I, for one, cannot repine, because I have an idea, that the more aggravated the accumulated evils become, the more good will finally result from them. You have presided over a race of men who, although they never enjoyed liberty in reality, they are sufficiently enlightened to perceive its benefits, they are pursuing their aim with a steady determination that must ultimately succeed. An opportunity has been offered you, Sir, to make yourself eminently useful in rescuing man from his present degraded condition; you have neglected that opportunity, and in so doing you have degraded yourself in the eyes of all good men, and you will finally become, what many Princes have been before you—the victim of misrule.

R. CARLILE.

"*But whilst the fund-holder is supported by the labour of the wretched and miserable artisan and agriculturist.*"

A correspondent has called on us to explain what he has been pleased to term "the above ambiguous extract from No. 2, of the Republican;" and this we hope to do to the gentleman's satisfaction.

The gentleman is, no doubt, aware that the ground and origin of the funding system is what the People call the Borough-mongers' Debt, and what the Borough-mongers call the National Debt. Now making this our premise which we trust is not erroneously founded, we are justified in drawing the conclusion that every individual, whether virtuous or vicious in his private character, who has thrown his property into what are termed the Funds, is in proportion to the amount of the property so deposited, a supporter of the aforesaid Debt, and the baneful effects on the community at large, or, at least, the operative part of them. Now, we are inclined to admit, that many persons, who are sincere friends to liberty, and who are decided advocates for the Reform of the present state of things, yet possessing some little property, they find it more profitable to speculate for the moment, with that property in those falsely termed Funds, than to apply it to any other purpose. And yet they are in a continued apprehension of danger, and can only appease that apprehension by the imagination of finally securing their property in something more substantial. Sufficient warning has, however, been held out to all persons who are not interested in the support of that system which has its basis on the fickle funding system, and which a short time will undoubtedly prove its total decay. However I might lament the distress that certain individuals will inevitably be exposed to, it is a sufficient consolation, that their loss will be the result of a wilful speculation. Now to the point: as the Fundholders, small as well as great, hold their several shares of this supposed debt, it is evident that the necessaries of life, which are so excessively taxed, to meet the interest of this alleged debt of the People, are not to be obtained in sufficient quantity by the wretched and miserable artisan and agriculturist in consequence of one third of the profits of their labour being required to furnish an interest to the imaginary property of the fund-holder.

We beg to assure our correspondent that we have no intention or desire to hold up to execration the industrious

individual who has accumulated a little property, and thrown it with his future hopes and comforts into so dangerous a gulph; we would rather advise such person to rescue his property whilst there is an opportunity, and save himself from that overwhelming grief, which must inevitably be the result of his continuing the hollow title of a fundholder.

We have no wish to hold out false alarms or *ambiguous expressions;* and after the most deliberate reflection on the quoted sentence, we cannot plead guilty to either. Should the Fundholder who has expressed himself the admirer of this publication, with the exception of the above sentence, feel no objection to continue his title, we hope at least that he will possess the fortitude to meet his predicted loss without murmur or reflection.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

I LAST week laid before your readers a picture of the House of Peers, in which the necessary servility of that body is too plainly seen to need explanation. You must, however, allow me a few more remarks on the subject.

And first I must observe, that many of us, perhaps, might be satisfied with the respect and good opinion of our fellow-countrymen, as an ample reward for any services we could render them; but we must endeavour to provide for the different dispositions of men. In America, that dear seat of Republicanism, that emporium of real liberty, which alone offers to the enslaved world an example of a Government, founded as all Governments should be, on the just principle of political equality—in America, I say, much is attached to the title of "Honourable," borne by the servants of the state; and depend on it, men of the soundest reason and the greatest abilities will often be found to covet little distinctions of this nature, provided such be in the gift of the People. But the system of hereditary privileges is replete with injustice to the remainder of the nation, and impolicy to the privileged themselves. The existence of such a system, and of a House of Peers, can only be considered as relics of feudal error; and the Peers themselves, collectively, present nothing to our view but elevation without dignity, power without talent, grandeur without munificence, and opulence without charity.

I intend this week to say something on the ecclesiastical part of our constitution. Church Government, or National Religion, abounds with evils, not the least of which is its tendency to disseminate among the body of the People that indolence which is so distinguishingly its own characteristic; and there are always numbers who would prefer submitting to slavery, on settled terms, rather than persevere in defence of a freedom which is only maintained by incessant toil. The injustice of such an establishment will appear in its pressing equally hard on the professors of all tenets, as on its own, and disabling many altogether. But to the broad principle of its necessity.—In a moral sense, it is quite a non-entity—in a political sense, it militates against the general good of the People—and, in a religious sense, it is equally erroneous with those principles of Popery which it supplanted. "The difference between the rich church dignitary of our day, and the luxurious abbot of former times, consists (says an elegant modern writer) in a few speculative theories, which whether they are or are not consonant with reason, can have no real connection with true religion." And the country is at this moment as much oppressed by the established Clergy, as at the most accursed moment of Popish dominion.

The Druids believed the supreme Deity infinite and immense, and considered that confining his worship to any particular place erected for that purpose, was inconsistent with such glorious attributes; and how absurd soever some of their doctrines were, there was some solidity in this. There is something extremely correct in the idea of the whole universe being the Temple of the Almighty, and the heart of man the only altar of his praise. The eternal laws of Nature are so indelibly impressed on us, that they can never be obliterated. But from the moment we begin to search into the pretended mysteries of religion, we become perplexed, and every attempt to penetrate the maze, staggers our unbelief, makes us sceptics, and seems to throw us back to the first principles; rejecting revelation, and impressing us with the idea that religion is not, in the least, necessary to fix morality and virtue in our breasts.—Therefore, so long only as religion is untainted with any superstition, is it an ornament of our nature, and conduces to happiness and order; but when it becomes contaminated with human power, from that instant does it generate confusion, and become the parent of oppression and misery.

For the support of a Church Government, it is absolutely necessary that superstition should exist; for when Reason is suffered to commence her researches, the acknowledged rights of a clergy, (tythe system and all) tremblingly confess, that no divine patent secures them to their possessors, and avow that their existence is merely owing to the supineness of mankind in placing their consciences under the usurped dominion of priestcraft. In fine, it is perfectly clear, that a church establishment, like that of Great Britain, operates strongly against the spirit, the industry, and the happiness of a free State. And with all these evils, it produces not one real benefit; for we find that with our rich and luxurious Bishops, Archbishops, Deans, and Deacons, our proud and licentious Canons, and Chapters, crime is more frequent and more heinous than ever; and the People of this country not a whit more religious, or moral, than those not pestered by this indolent class of beings. In America, where every religious or philosophical sect is free, it is proved, that comparing the amount of her population with our's, the number of executions is greater in this country in the proportion of 10 to 1. This Atlantic fact speaks volumes. What further proof is, indeed, necessary to assure us, that as to the prevention of vice, our religious expensive establishments are of no avail whatever. The baneful connection which always must exist between Church and King, and which is felt in so many forms, and the immense patronage thrown into the Executive thereby, is so glaring as not to need comment.

That in the event of a change taking place, these remarks may contribute to convince my fellow-countrymen of the mischief of ecclesiastical establishments, is the earnest desire of

Sir, your obedient servant,

46, Speldhurst Street, Burton Crescent. J. A. PARRY.

DECLARATION OF RIGHTS.

I. GOVERNMENT has no rights; it is a delegation from several individuals for the purpose of securing their own. It is therefore just, only so far as it exists by their consent, useful only so far as it operates to their well-being.

II. If these individuals think that the form of Government which they, or their fore-fathers constituted, is ill adapted to produce their happiness, they have a right to change it.

III. Government is devised for the security of rights. The rights of man are liberty, and an equal participation of the commonage of nature.

IV. As the benefit of the governed, is, or ought to be, the origin of Government, no man can have any authority that does not expressly emanate from their will.

V. Though all Governments are not so bad as that of Turkey, yet none are so good as they might be; the majority of every country have a right to perfect their Government, the minority should not disturb them, they ought to secede, and form their own system in their own way.

VI. All have a right to an equal share in the benefits, and burdens of Government. Any disabilities for opinion, imply by their existence, barefaced tyranny on the side of Government, ignorant slavishness on the side of the governed.

VII. The rights of man in the present state of society, are only to be secured by some degree of coercion to be exercised on their violator. The sufferer has a right that the degree of coercion employed be as slight as possible.

VIII. It may be considered as a plain proof of the hollowness of any proposition, if power be used to enforce instead of reason to persuade its admission. Government is never supported by fraud until it cannot be supported by reason.

IX. No man has a right to disturb the public peace, by personally resisting the execution of a law, however bad. He ought to acquiesce, using at the same time the utmost powers of his reason, to promote its repeal.

X. A man must have a right to act in a certain manner before it can be his duty. He may, before he ought.

XI. A man has a right to think as his reason directs, it is a duty he owes to himself to think with freedom, that he may act from conviction.

XII. A man has a right to unrestricted liberty of discussion; falsehood is a scorpion that will sting itself to death.

XIII. A man has not only a right to express his thoughts, but it is his duty to do so.

XIV. No law has a right to discourage the practice of truth. A man ought to speak the truth on every occasion, a duty can never be criminal; what is not criminal cannot be injurious.

XV. Law cannot make what is in its nature virtuous or innocent, to be criminal, any more than it can make what is criminal to be innocent. Government cannot make a law, it can only pronounce that which was law before its organization, viz. the moral result of the imperishable relations of things.

XVI. The present generation cannot bind their posterity. The few cannot promise for the many.

XVII. No man has a right to do an evil thing that good may come.

XVIII. Expediency is inadmissible in morals. Politics are only sound when conducted on principles of morality. They are in fact the morals of nations.

XIX. Man has no right to kill his brother, it is no excuse that he does so in uniform. He only adds the infamy of servitude to the crime of murder.

XX. Man, whatever be his country, has the same rights in one place as another, the rights of universal citizenship.

XXI. The Government of a country ought to be perfectly indifferent to every opinion. Religious differences, the bloodiest and most rancorous of all, spring from partiality.

XXII. A delegation of individuals for the purpose of securing their rights, can have no undelegated power of restraining the expression of their opinion.

XXIII. Belief is involuntary; nothing involuntary is meritorious or reprehensible. A man ought not to be considered worse or better for his belief.

XXIV. A Christian, a Deist, a Turk, and a Jew, have equal rights; they are men and brethren.

XXV. If a person's religious ideas correspond not with your own, love him nevertheless. How different would yours have been, had the chance of birth placed you in Tartary or India.

XXVI. Those who belive that Heaven is, what earth has been, a monopoly in the hands of a favored few, would do well to re-consider their opinion: if we find that it came from their priest or their grandmother, they could not do better than reject it.

XXVII. No man has a right to be respected for any other possessions but those of virtue and talents. Titles are tinsel, power a corruptor, glory a bubble, and excessive wealth, a libel on its possessor.

XXVIII. No man has a right to monopolize more than he can enjoy; what the rich give to the poor, whilst millions are starving, is not a perfect favour, but an imperfect right.

XXIX. Every man has a right to a certain degree of leisure and liberty, because it is his duty to attain a certain degree of knowledge. He may before he ought.

XXX. Sobriety of body and mind is necessary to those who would be free, because, without sobriety a high sense of philanthropy cannot actuate the heart, nor cool and determined courage, execute its dictates.

XXXI. The only use of Government is to repress the vices of man. If man were to-day sinless, to-morrow he would have a right to demand that Government and all its evils should cease.

Man! thou whose rights are here declared, be no longer forgetful of the loftiness of thy destination. Think of thy rights, of

those possessions which will give thee virtue and wisdom, by which thou mayest arrive at happiness and freedom. They are declared to thee by one who knows thy dignity, for every hour does his heart swell with honourable pride in the contemplation of what thou mayest attain; by one who is not forgetful of thy degeneracy, for every moment brings home to him the bitter conviction of what thou art.

Awake!—arise!—or be for ever fallen.

BENEFITS OF THE REVOLUTION IN FRANCE.

Concerning which it is presumed few will disagree.

The abolition of arbitrary and partial imposts.

The abolition of Lettres de Cachet; and all other means by which persons were liable to severe and indefinite punishment without trial or enquiry. The destruction of the Bastile; and of all other places of cruel and inextricable confinement; in which persons, innocent or meritorious, might languish out their lives in extreme suffering and despair; without their imputed crimes, their situation, their life or death, being known to the public, or to any interested in their relief.

The abolition of unknown and unlimited pensions, for no service, or the worst injury to individuals, and crimes the most dangerous against the community.

The extinction of venal hereditary offices of justice.

The surrender of local provincial privileges, incompatible with a general system of national constitution.

The establishment of trial by jury in criminal cases.

The establishment of a representation of the People; full, free, and equalized in a very high degree.

OTHER BRANCHES OF REFORM,

Concerning which, it is presumed, a great part of the consistent Friends of Freedom and of Human Happiness will be agreed.

The encouragement to freedom of enquiry.

The suppression of the summary, arbitrary, and local power of administering justice in confined limits, and not subject to the public eye, exercised by lords of manors.

The suppression of the Game Laws.

The suppression of other partial, arbitrary, and oppressive privileges over the person and property of the People.

The abolition of tythes: and the substitution of the provision for the clergy less discouraging to agricultural improvement; less injurious to the effect of their instructions; and more compatible with peace and good intelligence between them and their parishioners.

The removal of private patronage in the public offices of religious instruction.

The removal of impediments, founded on religious opinion or otherwise, between the capacity, by natural and acquired talents, of serving the state, and the admissibility to its service.

The establishment of a more equitable distribution of property in case of intestacy.

The establishment of societies of peace and conciliation: whereby justice and redress of grievances to their person or property is brought home to the door of every suffering citizen; without expence or delay, or the baneful consequences on the mind and conduct attendant on litigation.

The establishment of domestic tribunals, to prevent indecent, bitter, and in every sense ruinous contests, between near relations.

The practical demonstration that Despotism can have no basis sufficiently firm and ample, against the opinion of an enlightened community and the public will.

Benefits likely to accrue from a Reform in the House of Commons, or properly speaking, a Revolution in the affairs of Great Britain and Ireland.

THE annihilation of the Borough-mongers' Debt, to pay the interest of which takes one third of the profit of every man's labour.

The abolition of tythes, and all other expensive ecclesiastical establishments, the expence of which, to each labourer, might be fairly stated to be another eighth of the profits of his industry.

The deprivation of the authority of the Monarch, to give at his pleasure enormous grants, sinecures, and pensions to the idle, profligate, and worthless part of the community, which at a fair estimate, deprives the labourer of another eigth of the profits of his industry.

The destruction of bribery and corruption, the only means under the present state of things to obtain any share in the legislature, or any of office of state, to the certain exclusion of all good and upright men.

Toleration in matters of religion, and free discussion on all subjects.

The punishment of every public delinquent, who under the present system, finds shelter and encouragement.

The protection of public morals, which are now neglected by the existing authorities, with a hope, that licentiousness may add to the public revenue.

A free and unrestricted commerce, the only safe and sure reward to industry.

The abolition of Excise establishments, and the whole host of tax-collectors, the expence of whom are another eighth of the labour of every man in the country, leaving him scarce a third of the profits of his labour for the support of himself and family. These, Britons, are the benefits to be derived from changing the present system—are they worth contending for?

A COURT TRICK; OR, A STATE PLOT.

Sir Thomas Cook had been Lord Mayor of London. Being very rich, was accused of high treason under the reign of Edward the Fourth, for lending money to Queen Margaret.

The King so concerned himself in this contrivance, as to let Sir Robert Markham know that if the law was too short to make him a traitor, he was Lord Chief Justice of England, and upon the trial he must stretch it till it would reach his purpose; the confession of one Hawkins, that was racked in the Tower, was the only proof against Sir Thomas Cook, who pleaded his own defence. That it was true that Hawkins did desire a loan of a thousand marks upon sufficient security, but he, understanding who the money was for, refused to lend any. The Judge, in charging the jury, told them it did not amount to high treason, and intimated to them, that they should be tender where life was concerned, and exercise a good conscience. The jury found it accordingly. This action disobliged the court, and Sir Robert Markham was put out of the office of Lord Chief Justice next day, upon which he retired to a private life with that satisfaction, that as the king had made him no judge, it was not in his power to make him an unjust one.

N. B. Sir Thomas Cook was Lord Mayor of London in the second year of Edward the Fourth, Anno. 1462: the Sheriffs, William Hampton and Bartholomew James, Esqrs.

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

The Republican.

No. 6. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Oct. 1, 1819. [Price. 2d.

THE CRISIS.—No. III.

Like the river, swoln and rapid with incessant rain, rising beyond its proper level, and by its accumulated force injuring and dilacerating its dikes, comes on the rolling political storm. Each day brings us intelligence of some fresh act of oppression, and, on the other hand, of some further preparation for hostility. The People of England and Scotland are evidently awakening to a sense of duty. They will no longer suffer themselves to be trampled on, and to become the willing victims of despotism. Preparation for resistance is every where making. Resolutions to that effect are nobly avowed. Already, methinks, I am stunned with the thrilling sound of Death or Liberty, emanant from thousands in arms, determined to live or die as freemen. The People have discovered, that they are left to themselves to restore their faded liberties, and, like the mind just freed from the shackles of superstition, which derives a double impulse to virtue, truth, and morality, from the hatred it bears its former character, they are determined no longer to be trifled with by looking up to men of property and prosperity, who should have been ever jealous of an infringement on popular rights. Hail! Liberty, to thee and thy sister, Reason, alone, will I make my invocation—to ye alone will I raise my altar—to ye alone will I consecrate my children—all other worship than your's sinks into insignificance in my mind. In no other temple than your's shall my feet tread, or my knees be bent! It is the knowledge of ye alone that makes man the superior animal of the creation! It is the possession of your essences that alone raises man above the brute! In the comprehension of those essences there is no mystery—simplicity is your handmaid! The benefits which man derives from ye are real—they are not the shadows to the imagination, which are continually flitting before the mind of the bigot—all are pure, substantial, and beneficial! In your absence man is more miserable than any other part of the creation—he is subject to the caprice and the passions of every ruffian who as-

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

comes an authority over him! But I feel at present I must leave the hallowed contemplation of your beatitudes and virtues, and turn to the painful and melancholy state of my country and countrymen! Here, at present, I perceive nothing but misery and oppression, with a hope, that it has not so far debased the minds of the People, but that they present the distant cheering prospect of regeneration.

On the one hand, we see Prince and Ministers, Sinecurists and Pensioners, Borough-mongers and Fundholders, Bishops and Parsons, Judges and Lawyers, preaching up the turbulence and disaffection of the "Lower Orders," the necessity of keeping them down by force, and the dreadful effects of what they are all agreed to call blasphemy and sedition. And what do we see opposed to this host—this phalanx of corruption? The People—the whole People—all those who produce any thing, either by their mental or physical exertions, to the necessaries of life or the comforts of society. It is truly and literally a war between the industrious bees and the idle and consuming drones. It is a war of intellect with the remains of ignorance and superstition.

Cease not, my countrymen, your efforts to establish the throne of Liberty on the base of Reason. Far better would it be to perish in these efforts, than to live in your present degraded condition. Recollect, that you have nothing but life to lose, on the one hand, whilst, on the other, you struggle for those blessings the possession of which can only render life desirable.

The present moment is the most eventful of any that has occurred since this island became inhabited. We see the Powers who have assumed to themselves the government of the country, one day expressing the peaceable disposition of Foreign Powers to this country; the next we find troops every where moving, ships of war commissioning, and the diabolical system of impressing men to fill them actually put in force in a time of alleged peace. The *renowned* Horse Guards, ever since the fatal 16th of August, practising a new sword exercise, under the tuition of some foreign soldier. Whether all these steps are preparatory to an attempt to crush the rising spirit of freedom in this country, or whether the old trick is to be played off, of going into a foreign war for the purpose of drawing the attention of the People from the object they are now pursuing, remains to be seen: but one thing may be safely predicted, that neither the one or the other will have the desired effect.

The resources of the country cannot meet a foreign war. The danger of our liberties is too deeply impressed on the minds of each of their advocates, to suffer any thing to draw their attention from this all-important object. Should this be the object of all the hostile preparation on the part of the Government, we doubt not of its failure. Is it not probable, that something like a foreign war will be gone into for the purpose of increasing the army at home, and thereby hoping to possess the more efficient means of silencing the complaints of the People? There is a something brooding, which, in the words of the Editor of Moore's Almanack, "we must leave to Time to disclose."

Let us now turn to the internal state of the country. The murders which have been lately committed at Manchester at the instigation af the Magistrates, have rendered the town prominent in the cause both of Despotism and Liberty. Those Magisirates are evidently sensible that their lives are forfeited to the offended laws of the country, and are endeavouring to carry every thing with a high hand whilst they continue to receive the thanks and approbation of the Regent and his Ministers. The Magistracy of Manchester have banished Justice from that town, and hold even common decency in contempt. They study to irritate rather than to allay the outraged feelings of the inhabitants. Captain Nadin, and his banditti of Police, are hourly engaged to plunder and ill-use the peaceable inhabitants; whilst every appeal from those repeated assaults to the Magistrates for redress, is treated by them with derision and insult. This state of things cannot continue long—the very soldiers who are compelled now to act at the discretion of any Police-Officer, must soon become disgusted with their conduct. Every man in Manchester who avows his opinions on the necessity of Reform, should never go unarmed—retaliation is become a duty, and revenge an act of justice.

If we travel further north, we find the same glorious spirit of freedom arising. At Carlisle, and its vicinity, the inhabitants are so impressed with the necessity of a preparation for resistance, that they openly meet and go through the military evolutions, and study military tactics. Their neighbours in Scotland have passed many resolutions expressive of their determination to resist every assault and encroachment on their remaining rights and privileges, and their most strenuous efforts to recover those they have lost. At Birmingham, at a late meeting, we find the inhabitants were prepared and determined to resist an attack that was threat-

ened to be made on them. Let us proceed in this way, and we shall find our opponents and oppressors in a short time defenceless. A determined resistance must now be made to every attempt to abridge or to destroy the few privileges that remain to us, as the only means of placing ourselves in a condition to recover those that are lost. It is become a duty incumbent on every individual to make to-day that preparation for defence and resistance his means will admit of—to-morrow might require his aid and assistance. Paine has justly observed, " that to reason with Despots is throwing reason away, the best of argument is a vigorous preparation."

I turn from this subject to another not less important, namely, the good conduct, the sensible discrimination, and the honest determination of the late Middlesex Grand Jury, in throwing out the bills founded on the vague and contemptible charge of blasphemy and sedition. It is a fine lesson to country Grand Juries—it is a praiseworthy contrast to the conduct of the Lancashire Grand Jury. It is to be hoped, that the latter gentlemen may live to see the new age, that they might receive that punishment the violation of their oaths and the obstruction of the cause of justice merits. The gentlemen who composed the last Middlesex Grand Jury are now reaping the applause and approbation of all good and virtuous men. They have conferred a benefit on their country. Their names should be published, that they might receive that approbation and support they are individually entitled to.

Much depends on the conduct of both Grand and Petit Juries as to the acceleration of the cause of Liberty and Reform. Whilst the corrupt existing authorities are compelled to make the last appeal to a Jury to punish the object of their malicious annoyance—and whilst those Juries are fairly and indiscriminately chosen, we have nothing to fear. Juries are daily becoming more sensible of the necessity and the importance of standing between the malignant arm of Despotism and aspiring Liberty, they are the only protection, in a civil point of view, that England has left. Jurymen, do your duty—suffer not yourselves to be biassed from commercial motives, or intimidated by the threats of injury from the existing authorities. The time is near at hand when your names and conduct will find that approbation and applause, as the names of the Jurymen, who, in spite of threats, fines, and actual imprisonments, pronounced the verdict of not Guilty of sedition, on Penn

and Mead. Who now reads that trial without feeling, and expressing his admiration at the firm, and virtuously obstinate conduct of both defendants, and Jurors, and their execration of the opposite, though obstinate conduct of those who presided as Judges in that Court. Jurors, make this your example, and both yourselves and families, will find a lasting approbation, and an honest pride will result from it, oppression will be banished from the country, and liberty and reason resume their Empire.

R. CARLILE.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

IF you think the following *Acrostic* worthy of a place in the pages of the Republican, you will, by inserting them therein, oblige one, who *really* prizes your invaluable work, and hails it as the morning star of freedom; an opinion, which is held by thousands, as well as by your constant reader,

R. SMITH.

No. 2, Rutland Place, Upper
Thames Street, Sept. 28.

B rave Sons of Albion, sleep ye in this hour?
R ouse! and destruction on your tyrants pour!
I nfernal bloodhounds, now new chains prepare,
T hey spread even now for you the fatal snare.
O ff with your fetters, spurn the slavish yoke,
N ow, now, or never can your chains be broke,
S wift then arise, and give the final stroke.

T ry ev'ry effort—like the whirlwind's force,
O r furious lightning, shape your vengeful course.

A t once resolve, to conquer or to die,
R evenge, revenge, let this like thunder fly,
'M idst your firm ranks, and glorious victory
S hall wait your steps, and England shall be free!

The curiosity of the Public has been excited in consequence of a Gold Snuff-Box, brilliantly set with diamonds, having been presented to the Prince Regent in the Isle of Wight, having three verses from the Bible engraven on it, which if we may believe the reports of the Newspapers, produced something like a feeling and reflection in his mind. I may venture to assert, from probabilities, that it must have been a present from some person who is or has been a friend

of the Regent, and who has sufficient discrimination to perceive the danger he has exposed himself to, as it is not likely that any person holding Republican principles would have put themselves to such an expense. A Gentleman has furnished me with the identical inscription, whose respectability leaves me no room to doubt his veracity; it is a copy of the 25th, 26th, and 27th verse of the 21st chapter of the book of Ezekiel, taken from the book called the Bible, which is one of the most treasonable and seditious books that ever appeared in print, and I hope, that in consequence of the selection that has now been made from it, the Attorney General will feel it his duty to file informations against all the publishers and vendors, and even readers of such a book. Mr. Bellamy, who is preparing a new translation of it, which he dedicates to the Regent by permission, will no doubt make it a new thing, and more consonant to the feelings of Royalty. At least he should do what many translators have done, who have been more modest than the authors of the works, leave a blank to all the obscene, voluptuous, false, scandalous, malicious, and seditious passages, and state that they are not fit for public view and young minds, then Mr. Bellamy will make a very thin and convenient volume of it, to what it is at present. The verses are as follows:—

Ver. 25. "And thou, profane, wicked Prince of Israel, whose day is come, when iniquity shall have an end.

26. "Thus saith the Lord God: Remove the diadem, and take off the crown; this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high.

27. "I will overturn, overturn, overturn it, and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is,* and I will give it him."

TO MR. CARLILE.

DEAR SIR,

THE gratitude that you are so justly deserving, and will not fail to receive from me, (as well as from every other unprejudiced, honest, and well-disposed person, who has had the benefit of reading your late invaluable publications), is beyond what the most powerful language can possibly express.

But I am exceedingly sorry to find that there are yet a considerable number of those persons who ought, above all things, to testify the greatest gratitude to you, for your unparalleled exertions to rescue them from tyranny and religious slavery; but who,

* The People's.

in return, are only disposed to manifest their malevolence by endeavouring to suppress your publications, and that thereby the majority of the People may be kept ignorant of their birthright, and their very best interests. However, I am inclined to allow, that there may probably be some excuse for this malignant spirit and brutal stupidity still existing among men.

The world has been so long under the baneful influence of superstition, and taught to reverence the errors of fanaticism, that let truth appear in whatever form it may, mankind have so often opposed it with such energy, that the universal good and happiness it will ultimately produce for the human race, has hitherto been but very triflingly felt. The numerous false systems of religion which have been and are now forced upon the different nations of the world, only serve to barbarize the hearts and enslave and stupify the minds of the People; thus their attention is entirely diverted from the real and only object worthy of adoration, (the God of Nature) whose book of revelation and divine instruction (the universe) is ever open, night and day, to be read, and understood, by every intelligent being.

Until I had the good fortune to read those invaluable works of the ever-memorable Thomas Paine, I was like the greatest part of my fellow-conntrymen, deluded into the practice of worshipping a man (Jesus Christ) instead of the true God; but I must here confess, that I always felt an innate reluctance to embrace the Christian faith; however, this natural unwillingness to believe was, of course, subdued by that abominable thing, Priestcraft, which alone has been the cause of so much misery in various parts of the globe.

Since I embraced that genial religion, Deism, my heart has been continually telling me, that I have great reason to be sincerely thankful to my Creator for having given me an existence; and I can now worship him with love, sincerity, and delight, and I feel consciously sure, that he is an infinitely just, wise, merciful, and a beneficent God. But while I was under the influence of the Christian religion, I never could, and instead of being thankful for my creation, I had ample reason to execrate the day of my birth and so far from the worship of a real Christian being the service of the true God, and *perfect freedom*, it is, in my opinion, nothing less than complete slavery; this I know from terrific experience.

There are many, I doubt not, who merely profess to be Christians, and may live tolerably happy under such a profession; but there is an inconceivable difference between these and those who endeavour by all possible means to live a life equal to their profession. This life of the real Christian I long strove to live, but I found it was unattainable. Therefore, Sir, as I consider that it is through your instrumentality that I have arrived at such a degree of happiness as I now enjoy, (namely, the emancipation of my mind from those slavish fears inseparably connected with the Chris-

tian religion) I beg that you will accept of my most grateful acknowledgment; at the same time, hoping that the ardent and meritorious desire you have hitherto evinced for the good of mankind may never abate until the rays of Truth reach every British subject,

I remain, dear Sir, your most sincere well-wisher,

J. B. SMITH.

St. Mary's Street, Stamford,
September 26, 1819.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

LAST Sunday morning I had occasion to go to Acton, Middlesex, and having arranged the business upon which I went before 12 o'clock, and being at a loss how to consume my leisure time in a strange place, while dinner was preparing, I strolled into the Gospel shop, commonly called the parish-church. The parson, a very young man, soon after mounted the rostrum, and took his text from St. Paul's 2d Epistle to Timothy, chap. iii. ver. 1, "This know, also, that in the last days perilous times shall come;" he then pulled from his pocket a sermon, enveloped in a black cover, which I soon discovered had been ready cut and dried for him to preach by some time-serving *black locust*. He had not proceeded far before I perceived the contents of the sermon were as black as the cover. However, from the awkwardness and bad oratory of the young parson, it was evident, no doubt, to many present besides myself, that he was the preacher only, and not the composer of the discourse, which was remarkable merely for the gross lies and bitter invectives it contained against a man that I and many thousands in this metropolis esteem as a truly virtuous man, need I say *the immortal Paine*. Indeed, it occurred to me at the moment, whether this sermon had not been manufactured (for it smelt very strong of the shop) of the Society for the Suppression of Reason (I beg pardon) *I mean Vice*, and sent round to the country parsons in a similar way as Lord Sidmouth sends *his circulars to the Magistrates*. The preacher began by telling his hearers, that the words of his text applied to the times when the inspired Christian writers ceased to live and propagate Christianity, which were perious times, by reason of the attacks the clergy endured from infiels, who accused the black gentry of that day of promoting the dhristian faith, more to suit their own sordid interests than for the Cvation of mankind. After defending the primitive parsons from salister views, he proceeded to shew that the present times were sin less perious than those spoken of in the text, for that Infinot y had again reared its head in the works of that great leader delit

of the French infidels, Thomas Paine, and others his cotemporaries of the present day (which, by the bye, I thought was having a slap at you). The infidels in question, he said, were endeavouring not merely to upset our sapient Government, but actually trying to dethrone the Almighty. Had it not been for disturbing the congregation, I certainly should have left my pew, and rid my hearing of such cant and balderdash. He next adverted to Reform, which he admitted was a word of a virtuous meaning, but that it was now used by infidels to cloak their real intentions.

If the logic of this wise-acre is admitted as a truism, what infidels must a certain great Black Suppressing Society be, who are always cloaked with apparent virtue, and whose unceasing efforts are employed in effecting a reform amongst the reformed. On the subject of Reform, however, he concluded, that they who wanted such a thing, whether political or theological, meant nothing less than rebellion. He then introduced much irrelevant matter about the French armies and British navies, and summed up his fulsome sermon by appealing to Locke, Bacon, and other eminent men, to support his perversion of truth and defence of despotism.

Sir, I am one of those who think a political Judge and a political Parson two of the most dangerous characters that infest society. And when I see an army of black locusts, whose very subsistence is derived from the vitals of a distressed and starving People, marshal their hypocritical forces in array against the People, and abuse and insult them, and pollute the People's pulpits by becoming the cat's paw of the Ministers, I cannot, as an honest man, suppress the indignation I feel, that a religious vocation should be so shamefully perverted to answer political purposes. To such meddling fellows I would recommend the perusal of the Archbishop of York's Sermon, preached before the Lords, January 30, 1730, page 6, as more appropriate than any thing I can advance in condemnation of clerical interference in State matters. The Archbishop says,

"If, indeed, a preacher should in the pulpit presume to give his judgment about the management of public affairs, or lay down doctrines as from Christ about the forms or models of kingdoms or commonwealths, or to adjust the limits of the prerogative of the Prince, or of the liberties of the subject in our present Government, I say, if a divine should meddle with such matters as these in his sermons, I do not know how he can be excused from the just censure of meddling with things that doth not concern him. This is, indeed, a practising in State matters, and is usurping an office that belongs to another profession, and to men of another character; and I should account it every whit as indecent in a clergyman to take upon him to deal in those points, as it would be for him to determine titles of lands in the pulpit which are in dispute in Westminster Hall."

I am, Sir, your constant reader and admirer,

THOMAS COOKE.

West Street, Soho, Monday Evening,
September 20, 1819.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

J. A. PARRY's Letter in the 4th Number of the REPUBLICAN, induces me to trouble you with a few reflections upon *Hereditary Titles.* I condemn them both as injurious and insulting. Their advocates attempt to defend them upon the general principle of the necessity of distinctions, and upon the ground of their utility in our mixed form of Government.

The principle of necessity I admit, but I deny the application of it, and contend that nature has provided all the distinctions necessary for man in a social state by the diversity of genius, intellect, tastes, and propensities she has implanted in the human species—which must, without the unnatural aid of artificial distinctions, be sufficient to produce a degree of subordination in civil and domestic life, requisite for the purpose of "social order."

Therefore, I consider all artificial distinctions of rank upon general principles as contrary to the laws of nature, and that like other deviations from the plain path of natural justice, they have led to innumerable evils.

With regard to the utility of hereditary distinction, under any form of Government whatever, I hold that a system, the support of which involves the necessity of the existence of hereditary rank, or hereditary offices of any description, or of supporting any set of men out of the purse from whom the public receives no equivalent in any shape, must be radically bad, and calculated to create misery and want, rather than happiness in society.

We all know that the most ancient titles of nobility, were obtained by a set of hired armed cut-throat followers of lawless chieftains, as the price of their services, and modern ones obtained by courtly sycophancy, or a base desertion of popular principles; and even supposing them to have been obtained by the most transcendent merit, they ought not to have descended from the possessors to their heirs! For there cannot be a more monstrous anomaly in civil society than hereditary titles, or hereditary offices. What right can a man have to give my neighbour a patent, by which he and his descendants from generation to generation, are considered as beings of a superior order to me and my descendants?

I agree with you that the "sense of having done a duty, and the private esteem of his fellow-citizens, is all the honour an honest man would wish." But alas, Mr. Editor, we all know the nature of man too well to be ignorant, that many require rewards of a more gross description than innate consciousness—vanity and ambition must be gratified, and the only question that remains is how to press such propensities into the service of the public so as to render the exertions of their possessors useful instead of hurtful.

This object I conceive, may be obtained by a pure representative

and elective system, in which public virtue and utility should alone be the foundation of civil honours and distinctions, *but conferring no exclusive privileges*—and in which the path to the highest pinnacle of civic honour should be open to every citizen.

The legislative science ought to be kept upon a par with other sciences, and with the advanced state of the public intellect and the spirit of the age. Instead of which, while the inventor and improver of the arts and sciences tending to administer to the luxuries of the great, are rewarded and honoured. Men who endeavour to simplify and improve the noblest of all sciences, that of administering to the happiness and comfort of mankind at large, are persecuted and scouted.

But I perceive I shall be led into a subject foreign to the purport of the address if I continue. I shall therefore at present, take my leave, by assuring you that in offering my mite to the "Temple of Reason," I do not flatter myself that I am making any addition of the least value to your "Treasury of Hints," and shall leave it to your judgment to make what use you please of my reflections, as I do not consider them in point of composition, by any means worthy of a place in your paper.

I am, your well wisher,

THOMAS DOBSON.

22, Ossulston Street, Somers Town,
September 21, 1819.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

I HAVE seen lately advertisements for persons willing to join in companies for the purpose of transporting themselves from the country that gave them birth; and I rejoice at it, as a proof that the vile conclave (that offers the means) finds there is still a lingering hope (even in men ready for such a desperate measure) that our country will regain her rights. That hope is, indeed, most ardent in all reflecting minds; in fact, it is become certain, that our Constitution should be renovated, or completely overturned, for the purpose of erecting another, free from the three great defects of the present—Church Government—Hereditary Privilege—and a too extensive Kingly Power.

Before any of our friends should suffer themselves to be entrapped and enticed to desert all that must be most dear and near to them, I would hope, that they will acquaint themselves with the difficulties and miseries they must necessarily plunge themselves into, and consider, that with persevering energy, we may soon be enabled to regain our rights, and share those blessings which Nature intended equally for all her sons. Let them not suppose, that England has passed the meridian of her prosperity, and idly fear, that she must now decline, for a State, if well governed, should be everlasting. The folly of supposing that nations, like

men, have their periods of infancy, manhood, and decrepidity, is allowed by Burke, who on this point thought most correctly, for countries not being subject to the vicissitudes of nature, as man is, must be of continual duration. We find, that those in which the great events of earlier ages took place, are now in the same natural state as they are described to have been then. The Nile has not refused her periodical assistance. The banks of the Euphrates are not less rich. The climate is not less healthy, nor is the land less fertile than in the prosperous days of Egypt and of Babylon, which are now mere land-marks to the traveller in the scenes of their desolation. The air, the seasons, the earth itself remains unchanged. The face of Nature is without real alteration; man, and man alone, seems to have decayed. He has been lulled by wealth into the apathy of indolence, or worn by oppression into the lassitude of despair. Let us beware, then, of these cankering evils; let us profit by the example of these woeful results of despotism, which are strikingly reflected in the histories of Greece and Rome; let us persevere without any relaxation; let us look forward to no other relief than what our own exertions will reward us with—and we must, and shall succeed.

"I consider (says an admired writer) that it is a fixed principle of happiness, that we should always prefer the advantages of nature to those of fortune; and never go in search of that at a distance which we may find in our own bosoms." This sentiment may perhaps recur to the memory of that man who deserts his country, now in the moment of her utmost need; and it will carry with it the bitterest pangs, in some melancholy moment, when in the blank and dreary regions to which he shall have banished himself, he may in anguish reflect, that had he persevered in common with us all, yet but a little longer, he might have spared himself the anxious misery his precarious existence must involve him in, and have slept in peace with his forefathers under that turf which they steeped in their best blood, to render happy and free for such an ungracious posterity. We must be blind, indeed, if we perceive not that the moment is arrived, when the small remnant of our liberties will be totally destroyed, or they will be enlarged to their natural and reasonable extent; that the latter will be the case, we must not flatter ourselves, under the present system of Government. That system is supported solely by the indolence of a portion of the People. Energy is its most dire foe; and to provide fresh matter for our attention, and thus lull us into a fatal security, do they propose emigration. But let us remain firmly at our posts, and prefer rather that our bones should bleach on the plains, which once witnessed the bold freedom of our ancestors, than that they should moulder under an inhospitable soil, to which they can claim no kindred tie.

Every man who would quit his native land to seek a visionary relief, among the barbarous wilds of Africa, contributes his endeavour to rivet the chains of his fellow-countrymen, by withdrawing

that assistance which is due from him; and must deserve the imputation of want of courage to meet the coming struggle, or meet the execration of us all, as a willing tool and victim of those wretches, who seek to depress to the utmost of their power the imperious calls of suffering humanity—and engulph in poverty and distress the great body of the only truly useful classes of society.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. A. PARRY.

Speldhurst Street,
September 20, 1819.

A RECORD OF PERSECUTION,

Dedicated to Lord SIDMOUTH, *Goaler-General, Lieutenant of Police, &c. &c.*

THE most prominent of all the Local Despots, stands Thomas Flood, the Mayor of Exeter, and as I have taken some notice of this "Worthy," I shall now only add what has transpired since; this I shall do by inserting a letter received from the persecuted individual, as follows:

City Prison, Sept. 16, 1819.

SIR,

"The Mayor and Magistrates have now openly declared themselves the enemies of free enquiry, and the liberty of the press. They have thrown off the mask, and appear before the public in their true characters. They have, by threats, extorted from my Sister last week, a promise not to sell for me *any publication whatever*, and all the goods found in the shop they persuaded her to consent to them purchasing, which she did; this was not enough for them, but to aggravate my distress the more while in Prison, they deputed two of their officers to come and inform me of it, and to tender me the money, but I rejected it on such base terms, and sent them back to their employers on the Bench, with my remonstrance against such proceedings. Immediately afterwards they *burnt the whole* of the pamphlets and numbers, before that grand seat of despotism, the Guildhall.

"This morning the Mayor visited the Prison, and sent for me. His Worship, after a little conversation about my sending Mr Cox, (my Solicitor) a note sealed, which he gave me the liberty to do in future, informed me that my trial was to come on the next Sessions, and adverted to the late transaction, when I remonstrated with him against such a rash proceeding as burning the numbers, and observed to him, that I did not know who had ordered them

to be destroyed. He said it was by his own order. I answered that if he had carefully discriminated, he would have found some worthy a place in his library, and that the public would consider it as a rash and daring outrage on the liberty of the press, and an attempt to suppress all free enquiry in this neighbourhood at least. He said he cared not five straws about the public. I observed he might then value the opinion of good men; yes, he replied, that was a different thing, he certainly did. I told him that many good men in the city considered these publications in the light I had represented.

"Was not this act of oppression, an attempt to deprive me of the small assistance I received in Prison from the sale of publications, and an act of injustice to suppress a lawful and meritorious calling, that of a bookseller, which might render me destitute of the means of subsistence hereafter?

"I am, Sir, your most respectfully,

"JAMES TUCKER."

It appears also that every attempt imaginable has been made to annoy Mr. Tucker, whilst in Prison; a letter addressed to his Solicitor, has come into my hands, which describes the taunts, threats, and insults, he has been exposed to by the gaoler and his fellows. The following is an extract.

"MR. GULLY insisted on seeing your signature, and wanted to see the other inclosed with it, or to know if it was a letter from another Person. I did not satisfy him. In the afternoon, Newman came in accompanied with a man who said he was a keeper of a gaol in Cornwall. I was writing, they came over to the table, Newman took up the Dwarf and said he never saw it before. I shut one piece of writing laying on the table, and did not recollect Carlile's letter, he put down the Dwarf, and after looking over the table, seized the letter. I jumped up, and demanded him to give it to me instantly, as it was a communication from you, and a smart altercation ensued; instead of returning it, he handed it to Gully who was present, asking him if he had seen it. I strongly censured him for opening it, which he did, and read it. Whilst I was speaking to Gully, the other two told me to remember that I was in a prison, and, says the Cornish gaoler, 'You do not know what a prison is.' Newman said if he was Gully he would give me a *topper*. I replied he knew better.

"I knew how far I could go, and what my duty was in prison, and I would take care the keeper should do no more than his duty. The Cornish gaoler said he would allow no Attorney to give a piece of writing to his prisoners, even in his presence, and not allow them to see any one without: any letter that did not please him he burnt successively, until the prisoner wrote one that did. I held a spirited conversation with them. Gully said he would not permit

you to receive from me a note sealed, nor me to see you without he was present in future. I told him you knew your duty better than he could inform you, and I should abide by your directions. This morning I requested of him the wax he had taken from me to seal a letter to you, he denied me and said I should not have it this rose to high words; he threatened to confine me in a dark cell, if I were impertinent. I replied I had not been so, but only demanded my rights, and dared him to do it: he said if I were with the Cornish *Bastille* keeper (I cannot call it any thing else) he would double-iron me, and that he really had served poor Hynes* so in Cornwall, and he took his trial in that manner."

It is with pleasure that we relieve the mind from this disgraceful conduct, by adding that Mr. Tucker was bailed by two respectable tradesmen of the City of Exeter, Mr. John Perkins, and Mr. Thomas Merchant, each in 100l., and himself in 200l. And we hope that the Citizens of Exeter will express their approbation of their conduct, by rendering them every support in the way of business.

The Vice Chancellor of the University of Oxford it appears, has been exercising his malevolence towards the agents for political publications in that city. I shall also give the letter of one of the persecuted individuals, as these cases need no comment nor explanation.

"Oxford Castle, Sept. 7, 1819.

"SIR,

"On Monday, the 30th ult., my Father and I were apprehended and taken before the Vice Chancellor, charged on the oaths of Daniel Taunton, Attorney at law, and John Grant, Fishmonger, (two near neighbours) with selling Sherwin's Register, No. 16, denominated by him, a scandalous, wicked, and seditious libel,

* Hynes, the individual alluded to by the Cornish gaoler, is an inhabitant of Plymouth, who has ever since the appearance of Mr. Cobbett's twopenny Register, employed himself by hawking political pamphlets, and local squibs. The man is considered an eccentric by the inhabitants of Plymouth generally. He has, I believe, been imprisoned three months in some gaol in Devonshire, for the sale of some political pamphlets without licence, and on his liberation, returned to his former employment with an undaunted firmness. He was hawking some political pamphlets in Cornwall, and having provided himself with a hawker's licence, considered that his occupation was innocent and harmless. However, at the last Lent Assizes, he had been arrested for selling Sherwin's Political Register, and it appears was double-ironed, and actually put to the bar in that state. The poor fellow pleaded his hawker's licence, as a justification of his conduct, but this availed him nothing, and he was sentenced to six months' imprisonment.

on the Manchester Magistrates, and Yeomanry Cavalry; when my Father, after being five hours in custody, was admitted to bail, and I was committed to the Castle, not wishing to send for my friends to have them interrogated, and insulted, as I observed was the case with my Father's. The People of Oxford are in general so much under the influence of the University, that it is attended with much difficulty to get any one to come forward. My Father, who is in his 72d year, and very infirm, has been discharged from the Clarendon Printing Office, in consequence of this affair, where he had been employed for 35 years past. They have condescended to continue him his pension of five shillings per week, which was granted to him four years ago, with a Proviso that he never more suffers the sale of any political pamphlets under his roof, in consequence of which he must now apply for parochial relief.

"I am, Sir, your humble servant,

"JOHN VINES."

I shall now recur to a case that happened at Deptford on Sunday last. A constable of the name of Crouch enters a public-house, and begins to insult, and even strike the company, one of whom, named Robert Fry, expostulated with him on his improper conduct—when Crouch challenged him with being a Reformer, and a seditious man. Fry replied that he certainly held Republican Principles, and was a well wisher to his country—on this assertion Crouch ventured to take him into custody, and to lock him in the cage. I would recommend his Lordship (Sidmouth) to transfer Crouch to Manchester, as well adapted for an accomplice, and an assistant to Nadin. I cannot finish this article without adverting to the case of Kaye and Saville, who were brought before the *Right* Reverend Mr. Ethelstone, (who read the Riot Act to himself, and set on the Yeomanry Cavalry, on the 16th of August last, to butcher the People) on a charge of being two of those persons who were playing at soldiers, at White Moss, when they were addressed in the following charitable and truly clerical style:

"I believe that you are downright blackguard Reformers. Some of you Reformers ought to be hanged; and some of you are sure to be hanged—the rope is already round your necks; the law has been a great deal too lenient with you. (Addressing the clerk) I will have no bail for this ruffianly crew, unless they have some money."

A few such reverend gentlemen as Mr. Ethelstone, will save us the trouble of endeavouring to annihilate the imposture and superstition they are the supporters of.

R. CARLILE.

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

The Republican.

No. 7. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Oct. 8, 1819. [Price. 2d.

TO THE PUBLIC.

The important moment has at length arrived, when the trials, which have attracted so much of the public attention, and such general curiosity, have been determined on, and before another publication of this work, will be going into. The general expression of feeling that has been displayed on both sides of the question evinces that those trials are looked forward to with a more than usual anxiety. At a moment when Despotism displays its naked, hideous front, and finds the uniform and unqualified support of nearly the whole of the clerical world, which has been always found to be one of its last props, a verdict of Not Guilty, on these important questions will strike it to the ground with the force of an electric fluid, and like a violent whirlwind, tear it up root and branch. The moment has arrived, when Delusion, the encourager, the supporter, the nurse of Tyranny, will rear its lofty head, nodding its destructive influence, or find a shaft that will engulph it in its silent tomb, never more to become a pest to mankind, by envenoming their minds with its deadly poison. The future preservation of this country from all the miseries and curses that can happen to its inhabitants, is delegated to twelve persons, and pendant on the monosyllable *Not*. I feel myself but as an insignificant being at this crisis—the mere instrument with which Despotism in the back-ground is playing its game. I should not even feel anxious for, or value my personal liberty, did I not know, that its preservation by an upright, inflexible, and discriminating Jury, is of the utmost importance in the present eventful moment. A verdict of *Guilty* will be hailed by the Ministers as a cloak and sanction for all their late actions—they will triumph and go on in their destructive career—they will imagine, that an unlimited confidence has been placed in their hands and will have no bounds to their already-frightful oppression. A verdict of *Not Guilty*, will stagger and shake them from their holds, will destroy the remains of ignorance and

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

superstition, and establish the liberty of the press and free discussion with all its genial influence—will give life to the literary and philosophic world, which alone can perfect society—will re-animate the drooping virtue and morality of the country with more than usual health and vigour—will most probably produce that change in the present corrupt system of Government, which otherwise will not be effected without all the horrors of an appeal to force. Humble as my abilities are, and unequal as they are to the task I have to perform, I must crave the indulgence of the Public when I pledge myself, not to relax or to shrink from one point that resolution or perseverance can perform. Every stratagem will be used by my persecutors, and by that portion of the Press which adheres to them, to excite a feeling of prejudice against me. I was informed nearly a month since, that a loyal declaration would be ready for signatures in the city of London, expressive of its abhorrence of seditious and blasphemous publications, about a week or ten days before my trial would take place. This declaration has been made, and however direct it might have been levelled at me, I cannot plead guilty of being its object, but do most heartily concur in its premises, and, consequently, I attended at the London Coffee House, on Ludgate Hill, and placed my name and address to it, which I shall expect to see published with the list of signatures, whilst I perform my duty by giving insertion to the Declaration itself:—

"We, the undersigned Merchants, Bankers, Traders, and others, of London, deem it our imperious duty at this juncture to declare these our deliberate sentiments:—

"We view with abhorrence the machinations of factious and designing men, who, availing themselves of blasphemous publications to sap the foundations of religion, and of inflammatory writings and harangues to sow sedition and treason, take advantage of the present distresses to impose upon the minds of the uninformed, and, under various pretexts, to lead them into measures which would increase these distresses in an incalculable degree by their manifest tendency to anarchy and confusion.

"We have witnessed the existing privations and sufferings of certain classes of our fellow-subjects with feelings of the deepest concern. It is our hope and belief, that these distresses will only prove of a temporary nature, and during their continuance it will be our anxious wish to promote every measure that can tend to alleviate them.

"While we cherish these sentiments of unfeigned commiseration, we declare it to be our firm purpose to resist to the utmost of

our power, all turbulent attempts to overawe the constituted authorities, in full reliance on the efficacy of the laws, the purity of their administration, and the wisdom of the Legislature."

To such sentiments as these no honest man would hesitate to subscribe, but it becomes a question to what part of the community they are applicable. I feel no connection with them. Because I have invariably adhered to the laws; and bad as some of them are, I cannot charge myself with violating any of them since I have arrived at the years of maturity.

Because I have invariably and studiously endeavoured to oppose and counteract the baneful effects of blasphemous publications.

Because I have witnessed the existing privations and sufferings of certain classes of my fellow-countrymen with feelings of the deepest concern.

Because I feel sensible, that all the treasonable and turbulent attempts to subvert the wholesome laws and regulations of the country emanate from the Cabinet.

These are my reasons for placing my signature to this declaration, and I would recommend every man who is prominent as an advocate for Reform to go and do the same.

As many persons and perhaps many of the readers of the Republican are ignorant of the contents of the Age of Reason, and led away by the general clamour of blasphemy against its author, we will give them a specimen of what is the subject of this false and absurd charge.

" Do we want to contemplate his power, we see it in the immensity of the creation. Do we want to contemplate his wisdom? We see it in the unchangeable order by which the incomprehensible whole is governed. Do we want to contemplate his munificence? We see it in the abundance with which he fills the earth. Do we want to contemplate his mercy? We see it in his not withholding that abundance even from the unthankful."

Thus, by searching has Paine found out God, and I call on all the priests of Europe to produce in the same space quotations from all the sermons that ever were published, any thing like this grand and demonstrative proof of the power, wisdom, goodness, and mercy of the Great Proprietor of Nature.

Those are the blasphemers of his name and attributes who first inflict on mankind all the miseries that human nature can endure, and attribute it to an angry, implacable,

"His Writings are indelible proofs of the sincerity and purity of his motives."

A model of the above statue may be had without the transparencies at 14s., with transparencies 25s. Subscribers to pay 5s. in advance to G. Edwards, Artist, 166, Fleet Street.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

YOUR correspondents having gone through the Old and New Testaments, have elucidated the impositions in a most able manner, and have left little or no room for any further remarks.

As the account of Cain and Abel has escaped their notice, I take the liberty of submitting to you some remarks on that head, if you think them worth your notice to insert in the REPUBLICAN or the DEIST. I shall feel myself highly gratified in being instrumental in diffusing some light on the present system for reforming the dogmas of the age.

The Book asserts, that Cain first brought an offering to the Lord, (Gen. iv. and iii.) and the 4th verse says, Abel brought offerings also. But the Lord did not accept of Cain's, but preferred those from Abel—for what reason is not assigned. But in the sequel, it appears, that the Lord purposely set the two brothers at variance by causing a jealousy between them. Could it make any difference to the Deity, the Creator of the universe, of what description the offering was? It appears that they both offered up what they had. This certainly must be a God manufactured by some priest, forgetting the omnipresence of the Almighty, by making it appear, that God did not know where Abel was, but inquires after him like one that is lost. At this time, the Book asserts, there were only four persons in the world, and the omnipresence of the Jewish God missed one, and came like a mortal to look for him.

It is well known what use the Christians make of this subject in support of their religion; this is made the origin of their election and reprobation system, and this ridiculous and immoral tale is one of their strongest proofs for this doctrine. This is the all-powerful God of both Jews and Christians, that could not govern only four persons, but must stir up mischief and discord between two brothers, so as to provoke one to murder the other, and then, like a designing assassin, inquires after Abel as if he knew nothing about it. This is making God after the image of a priest and a demon; they are both synonimous, and according to general opinion, corresponding characters.

If this is the way the world began, by robbery (Gen. iii. 6.) and murder, what can be expected from their posterity? It possibly

may be the pedigree of priestcraft, but it never can be that of philosophy.

Most Christian professors are afraid to read any books but what treat of religion. It is only necessary to say, "this treats on Sacred History," and they think it conveys a knowledge of all the sciences, and every thing that is instructive to mankind.

I have known religious people to say, that it was wicked and presumptuous to look through a telescope at the heavenly bodies. They have said, that it was prying too much into the works of the Almighty, and endeavouring to take the power out of his hands.

This is truly consistent with a Jewish and Christian idea of the Almighty. Yet I am convinced, that the priest will not allow that any body has the power but themselves.

As many of your readers may not have had an opportunity of reading a very old book, called Prideaux's Introduction to the Reading of all Manner of History, I beg leave to inform them, that there exists other accounts of the creation not more ridiculous than the one in the Bible, which proves it to be nothing more than an allegory, and meant as a poetical fiction by the Ancients. A book called *Lepto Genesis*, now very ancient and scarce, says, that Calmana and Dolbora, were Adam's daughters, and became wives to Cain and Abel.

The Manichees have a genealogy of Adam's family, and reckon thirty sons and thirty daughters of Adam.

The Rabbins say, that Adam had more than one wife, and that his first wife was named Lillis, and was the mother of hobgoblins.—*Buxt. Synag.*

The fore-mentioned alludes to a book that was written in the time of the promulgation of Christianity, that charges Matthias, that was chosen in the room of Judas, with the crime of murder and incest, he having fled his country, embraced the Christian system because they preached absolution. And he says in another place, where Paul acknowledges Clement, who was the founder of the Popish religion, his fellow-labourer, and hopes he was not a fellow-labourer in that undertaking.

Your constant reader,

W. DAYE.

Sherborne Lane, Cannon Street.

PREDICTION FROM CIRCUMSTANCES, RATIONAL.

Extract from a Paper published in the "Complete Magazine" for October 1764, on "the causes of the Decline of the French Nation."

THE Parliaments of France are obliged to conceal the strong spirit of Liberty with which they are inflamed under the mask of

loyalty, and of attachment to the Monarchy. They remonstrate with force and elevation against every measure that tends to the prejudice of the provinces they protect. They can go no further; but they await the moment, to strike the blow that shall lay the fabric of despotism in ruins. When this blow is struck, the effects of it will be equal to those of magic. The cottage will be put on a level with the palace; the peasant with the prince. Ranks shall be confounded; titles, distinctions, and birth, shall tumble into an undistinguishable heap of confusion. A new moral creation shall strike the view of an admiring universe; and France, like old Rome, in her first flights to empire, shall appear with the sceptre of universal dominion, bourgeoning in her hands. Out of universal confusion, order shall arise: the *Great* of *Nature's* creating, will assume their places; and the *great* by *title* and accident, will drop despised into the common mass of the People.

AN EXTRACT.

Being a brief view of the Measures by which Nations have been enslaved.

Few men have been desperate enough to attack openly and barefaced the liberties of a free people*—such avowed conspirators can rarely succeed—the attempt would destroy itself. Even when the enterprize is begun, and visible, the end must be hid or denied: thus one nation has been surrendered to another under the fair name of mutual alliance, and commonwealths have been trepanned into slavery by troops raised or increased to defend them, as it was pretended, from slavery.

Such traitors endeavoured first to get their Prince into their possession, and like Sejanus, shut him up in a little island, or made him a prisoner in his court, whilst with full range they devoured his dominions and plundered his subjects. When thus secluded from the access of his friends and the knowledge of his affairs, he must be content with such misrepresentations as they find expedient to give him. False cases were stated to justify wicked counsel—wicked counsel was given to procure unjust order—he was made to mistake his friends for his foes—his foes for his friends, and to believe that his affairs were in the highest prosperity when they were in the greatest distress, and that public matters went on with the greatest harmony when they were in the utmost confusion.

They were even contriving and forming wicked and dangerous projects, to make the people poor, and thousands rich, well knowing that dominion follows property, that where there is wealth and

---

* This was written in 1754. What would the Author have said had he lived in 1819?

power there will be always crowds of servile dependants; and that on the contrary, poverty dejects them and fashions it to slavery, and renders it unequal to any generous undertaking, and incapable of opposing any bold encroachment. They squandered away the public money in wanton presents to minions and their creatures of pleasure or burthen, or in pensions to mercenary and worthless men and women, for vile ends and traitorous purposes.

They engaged their country in ridiculous, expensive fantastical wars, to keep the minds of men in continual hurry and agitation, and under constant fears and alarms, and by such means deprived them both of leisure and inclination to look into public miscarriage! Men on the contrary, instead of such inspection were disposed to fall into all measures offered, seemingly for their defence, and agreed to every wild demand made by those who were betraying them.

When they had served their ends by such wars, or had other motives to make peace they had no view to the public interest. They created parties in the commonwealth, or kept them up where they already were, and by playing them by turns upon each other did rule both.

They would not suffer any men who had once tasted of authority, though personally their enemies, and whose posts they enjoyed to be called to an account for past crimes—though ever so enormous: they would make no such precedents for their own punishments, nor censure treason which they intended to commit, on the contrary, they formed new conspiracies, and invented new fences for their own impunity and protection, and endeavoured to engage such numbers in their guilt as might set themselves above all fear of punishment.

They preferred worthless and wicked men, and would not suffer a man of knowledge or honesty, to come near them, or enjoy a post under them: they disgraced men of virtue, ridiculed virtue itself, and laughed at public spirit; they put men into employments without any regard to the qualifications for such employments, or indeed to any qualifications at all, but as they contributed to their designs and shewed a stupid alacrity to do what they were bid; they would have them be either fools or beggars; either void of capacity to discover their intrigues, or of credit and inclination to disappoint them.

They promoted luxury, idleness, and expense, and a general depravity of manners by their own example, as well as by connivance and public encouragement: this not only devoted men's thoughts from examining their behaviour and politics, but likewise let them loose from all the restraints of public and private virtue; from immorality and excesses they fell into necessity, and from thence into a servile dependence upon power.

In order to this they brought into fashion gaming, drunkenness, gluttony, and profuse and costly dress—they debauched their country with foreign vices, and instruments of vicious plea-

sures, and contrived and encouraged public revels, nightly disguises, and debauched mummeries.

They provoked by all practicable means of oppression the people to disaffection, and then made that disaffection an argument for new oppression, for not trusting them any further, and for keeping up troops; and, in fine, for depriving them of liberties and privileges to which they were entitled by their birth and the laws of their country.

When such measures were taken in countries where the people chose Deputies to represent them, then they endeavoured to bribe the Electors in the choice of their Representatives, in order to get a council of their own creatures; and where they could not succeed with the Electors they endeavoured to corrupt the deputies after they were chosen, with the money given for the public defence; and to draw into the perpetration of their crimes those very men from whom the betrayed people expected the redress of their grievances, and the punishment of those crimes; and when they had thus made the Representatives of the people afraid of the people, and the people afraid of their representatives; then they endeavoured to persuade those deputies to seize the Government to themselves, and not to trust their principals with the power of resenting their treachery and ill usage any longer, and of sending honester and wiser men in their room.

But when they found the Constitution so stubbornly framed that it would still preserve itself and the people's liberties in spite of all villainous contrivances to destroy both; then they resolved that the Constitution itself must be attacked and broken, because it would not bend! They endeavoured under some pretence of public good to alter a balance of Government, and to get it into the sole power of their creatures, and of such who would constantly have an interest distinct from that of the body of the people.*

PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAYS ON GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION.—No. I.

Who first taught souls enslaved, and realms undone,
The enormous faith of many made for one? --
'Twas Superstition lent the tyrant aid,
And gods of conquerors slaves of subjects made.

ESSAY ON MAN.

It becomes those only to speak and write dogmatically who are sure they are never in the wrong. Such persons may venture to assert positively what they desire should be believed, and give them-

* The Borough-mongers and Fundholders.

selves airs and be angry with mankind if ever they presume to doubt their word. But, for myself, I am contented to doubt and to enquire. And this seems the path which Nature has sketched out for man. At least she has granted but to few the power of knowing every thing intuitively; and those few are the priests, more especially those of our own religion, the most ignorant of whom thinks himself abundantly qualified to refute such writers as Bolingbroke, Shaftsbury, Hobbes, Paine, &c. generally without having ever seen or read a page of either of those celebrated authors. Unfortunately I am not one of this privileged order, and of course can know but little without the help of reading and reflexion: however, I must be content with the slender talents Nature has assigned me, and grope along in that path, to which I am confined by my ignorance and unbelief, without envying those more fortunate spirits to whom God has given universal geniuses.

How they have employed their fine talents the world knows too well already; but they have had the art to hide, even from the penetrating world, the meanness of their origin. It is possible we may, in the course of these essays, direct the rays of philosophy on a subject so interesting to human nature, but so humiliating to human understanding. But let not the virtuous and well-meaning priest be alarmed: the pious though ignorant country parson who believes himself to have been singled out by the Divinity for the noble purpose of taking care of his countrymen's souls, can be but little interested in knowing whether the first founders of his order were inspired by heaven or by hell; and, provided his salary be but regularly paid, his tythes duly brought in, in short, provided he enjoy a good share of the loaves and fishes; and to gratify his vanity perceives his church filled on a Sunday with the beau monde of the village, he will never enquire much about the matter.

But this is not the case with the bishops and great dignitaries of the church: they would fain frighten mankind into a belief that they were sent by heaven; and appeal to the many thousands a year which they enjoy as the patent of their commission. I own it is a presumptive proof, when a man receives a pension of twenty or thirty thousand a year from the court, that he is in great favour with the prince, but it may not be the case; the prince may be noble and generous, he may be compassionate, though he despises, the age and weakness of the companion of his youthful follies, and he may drain the coffers of his country just to relieve himself from the importunities of a man whom he knows to deserve rather a halter than a pension. But this is not the manner in which that court bestows its favours from which our grand bishops are supposed to derive their riches. The Deity does not bestow riches on any priest, how deserving soever he may fancy himself, but permits every man to enjoy in peace the wealth which his hypocrisy, his cringing, or his villainy procures him, without giving himself the trouble to pry into a scene where nothing is to be seen but crimes and villainy concealed beneath the well-contrived masks of religion and royalty.

But, however improved the system of priestcraft may be in the present age, in which every system of deception is improved, it is certain that it arose from very small beginnings, though its rise be now enveloped in the darkest mystery; however, it could not have been much posterior to the usurpations of the civil governors, for as soon as tyrants had slaves to govern, they must have felt the necessity of employing the specious and captivating engines of ignorance and superstition. They must have perceived that men are naturally inclined to be afraid of something invisible, since they received injuries from a combination of the elements which they fancied demonstrated an intelligence in their adversary, and were therefore convinced that the most effectual way to keep the people in subjection, was to persuade them that there were invisible powers, that they sometimes condescended to communicate their wishes to certain sage individuals who already began to wear the face of wisdom, or austerity, which is much the same, and which always assists its wearer in enslaving the minds of his fellow creatures, and that these individuals, by their prayers and incantations, could avert the wrath of the gods, which was represented as very terrible that it might have the more effect upon the weak and ignorant minds of an already enslaved people. Thus menaced and alarmed, there was no degree of confidence that the credulous would not place in the conspicuous favourites of heaven, and no degree of obedience they would not pay to the masters and employers of those favourites; and thus Despotism and Religion (or rather Superstition) were established together; history assures us, they have always flourished together; and philosophy teaches us, that they must fall together, and that the day is not far distant.

It may be that monarchy, or despotism, which is but another name for the same thing, is the government best suited to the infancy of society; since men are then ignorant of the nature of laws, government, and morality; and it is but natural to suppose, that some person, even among a crowd of naked savages, would possess more knavishness and capacity than the rest. Such a person, inspired by that insatiable thirst of dominion so natural to man, would undoubtedly employ every means in his power to acquire the supreme command, and that once obtained, endeavour to wheedle his neighbours into a belief that he held a commission from the Deity, and that it would be the height of frenzy and impiety to dispute the commands of heaven. If the people appeared incredulous, the tyrant began to look about for some proof of what he had advanced, and then the priest stepped forward as the friend and interpreter of the gods. He declared to the people that their king was not only commissioned by heaven to govern them, but was actually descended from the gods, and was, perhaps, only the third from Jupiter; that it was the will of heaven they should pay him the most profound veneration, and most unlimited obedience, and that those who presumed to doubt the truth of these assertions, would inevitably

be hated by the gods, and their vines and harvests would be blasted, or destroyed by storms. But, at length, some untractable spirits having dared to disobey, and brave the vengeance of their gods, and finding the threats of the priests to be vain and unfounded, began to laugh at the pious rogues, and the tyrants whom they served. This impious disposition as soon as it discovered itself, terribly alarmed the monarchs and their incendiaries: they perceived that something must be done to prevent such a dangerous spirit, from becoming general, and they began to analyze the human mind to discover all those secret springs which move and govern it. They saw that when debilitated by sickness or old age, man lies terrified at the approach of death, his mind is weak, and willing to repose on any thing that can administer the soothing balm of hope, and lessen his fears; and working upon those two passions, they told him that if he behaved himself peaceably and respectfully towards his masters in this world, the gods would inevitably reward him with happiness and immortality in another. All this was well; and so far they were benefactors to the human race. But mark what followed. Perceiving that man is never so forcibly impelled, as when agitated by his fears, they invented the terrible torments of Tartarus, for guilty disobedient man, and poisoned by that vile accursed trick, the too small portion of human happiness.

Those ideal, though terrifying punishments, once invented, (and they were invented by mendicant wretches, who acted the part of priests and physicians, and attended the beds of the sick and dying) their noble authors became at once the rich and powerful favourites of kings, and living in splendour upon the reward of their ingenuity and their crimes, joined with their masters in laughing at the poor, credulous, cheated people, whom their arts had rendered doubly miserable.

Such, to speak the truth boldly, was the origin of an opinion upon which such a mighty superstructure has been raised; and which, if once taken away, would include in its ruin the whole fabric of sophisticated government, and place man upon the wide and eternal basis of equality.

But when once an opinion has obtained the signature of ages, it becomes venerable, and the vulgar (who are more numerous than is generally imagined) account it the height of impiety to disturb the ancient folly.

Men believe absurdities, nay, even contradictions, without analyzing or finding fault with them, provided they come tricked out in a holy garb; and fancy themselves mighty virtuous if they can but swallow a pill with which the human understanding is disgusted. If you ask any tolerably well-educated man, provided he be not a bishop, if he believe the Deity to be an immutable and just being, if what is vice, and repugnant to nature, now, were the same six thousand years ago, and if he does not think those laws at least ridiculous, if not criminal, which forbid actions that we are

prompted by nature to commit, he will undoubtedly answer in the affirmative. But if he be a Christian, produce an action to illustrate your theory, and the man will instantly be reduced to such a dilemma that he will not know what to say. Let it be incest, a crime denounced by the law and anathematized from the pulpit: tell the lawyer that his code would have been blasphemous and absurd had it been put in force upon the immediate offspring of Adam, who were necessitated to commit that crime at which human nature now shudders; and remind him at the same time that his laws are only a libel upon human nature, and an insult to us all, since we are undoubtedly the offspring of the most abominable incest, if the Bible history, which is fathered upon Moses, be true, and which your lawyer will perhaps pretend to believe; let the most delicate lady reflect, that if she refuse to lie with her brother, she tacitly reproaches our illustrious progenitors, who were not delicate, with an action which it was virtuous in them to perform, and which it is not virtuous in her to abstain from. Let no man henceforth be afraid to lead his sister to the altar; let him not fear the censure of the priest; incest, the most abominable incest, is not a crime, or we must boldly pronounce the Bible to be false.

It will be in vain for some prevaricating bishop, if there is one alive who is not too lazy to write, to tell me that the order of things is changed; that after his first end, which was the propagation of the human species, was served, the Deity for ever prohibiting the unnatural union, and that there are sufficient women in the world for every man to have a wife without being obliged to marry his sister.

If any of the Lords Spiritual (who by the way are not the most spiritual men in the world) should give themselves the trouble to make so silly a reply, to such a galling objection, I should tell his Lordship, that he is a trifler, and does not deserve to be noticed. If he means that what was virtuous, or at least indifferent, six thousand years ago, it becomes vice now, I am much obliged to his Lordship for the information, for at that rate all the virtues in the world will soon become vices; and then we shall have a rare world of it.

It has frequently, indeed, been objected to us, who are the friends and advocates of virtue, in whatever dress she may appear, that mankind seem to have no fixed opinions on the subject; that what is virtue in one country is vice in another, and that in fact virtue is nothing more than a creature of the laws. Among the ancient Sarmatæ it was accounted virtuous to murder all those children who were born with any natural deformity, and all the old men who were past labour. And thus the greatest of all human virtues, humanity was despised as a weakness by the Sarmatian. The Greeks and Romans, it is well known, entertained such an aversion to royalty, that it was permitted for any citizen to kill the man who dared to usurp sovereign authority; nay, he who rid his country

of a king, or tyrant, (the names were synonymous in those days, and some say in our own) was thought to have performed a glorious action, and was uniformly rewarded with the highest encomiums his fellow-citizens could bestow. But what would the world say of the man, who in the present state of things, should boldly step forward and plunge his dagger into the bosom of the oppressor of his country? Would they denominate the action bad, or good? Would they reward it with a halter, or a civic crown? If with the former, would that prove the action to be vicious; if with the latter, virtuous?

To these objections against virtue, I shall only reply:—that 'tis the opinions of men respecting it which vary, not the thing itself.—It was long the opinion of mankind that the little globe they so proudly call their own, was the centre of the universe, and the final cause of its creation—nevertheless their little world turned on its own axis, and revolved round the sun, its primary planet, in spite of their opinion; and continued perhaps to be admired by the inhabitants of Jupiter, as a pretty little planet the Deity had kindly created to amuse their shepherds, and banditti, at night, by its twinkling light. So patriotism, notwithstanding all that has been written and said against it, is still a virtue; and the man who rids his country of a tyrant is a good citizen.

I have heard many well-meaning people enquire, why philosophers, in their attempts to annihilate the power of civil tyrants, should attack religion, that bauble of the human mind, which is become venerable by its antiquity? The reply has been repeated a thousand times—in undermining a castle, do not men always begin by removing the earth and rubbish which conceal, or form, its foundation? Has not religion been a state engine ever since the strong have found it their interest to oppress and defraud the weak and the ignorant? Have not popes, bishops, and kings been in all ages, Atheists and libertines, while the dregs of the people were pious godly fools? Have not the most unbelieving and cruel tyrants been assiduous promoters of ignorance and Bible Societies? Have they not industriously suppressed, and still continue to suppress, all those works which infuse free and noble sentiments into the human mind? And can the Republican who directs all the powers of his mind against the fortress that contains the talisman of Government, be accused of aiming at something foreign to the main design? Is not the unmasking of religious imposture as conducive to the freedom of man, as the unmasking of tyranny itself? Do not the artful hypocrites who govern and oppress nations, appear even more alarmed when religion is attacked, than when the shaft is levelled directly at Despotism itself? This very alarm of theirs is a convincing proof that whoever would liberate the human race must commence by removing its prejudices. Observe the tenacity with which the governing faction grasp this handle of oppression; see with what sanctified faces they lay the foundations of new churches, which must of course be served by new priests, who must be paid by new contributions levied upon a

starving people, who want bread much more than sermons or Bibles: and be convinced, that a sneaking time-serving priest, is as much the enemy of the people, as a tyrannic king.

If this essay should fall into the hands of a religionist, I have not the least doubt but he will turn up his eyes, and commit the writer to the devil. If he be a priest, he will be enfuriated at the bare idea of seeing his hypocrisy unmasked; if a friend and follower of priests, (and of course a dupe) his piety will take the alarm, and he will prophecy, like a celebrated Jew who lived eighteen hundred years ago, that the end of the world is at hand.

However, I must inform my friend the priest, and his enlightened followers, that I intend this essay as an introduction to a series of Remarks on Government, and the conduct and character of priests in all ages, to be inserted in the Republican, when its pages are not occupied by more interesting matter. There will occasionally be introduced many observations on the present politics of the Court of St. James's—the "sang froid" with which it looks on the distresses of the nation; and on the conduct of the Prince relating to the massacre at Manchester.

JULIAN AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN.

54, *Gloucester-Street, Queen Square.*

BRITONS WHO HAVE OFTEN BLED.

BRITONS who have often bled
In the cause that Hampden led,
Welcome to your gory bed,
Or to Victory,
Now's the day, and now's the hour,
See the front of battle lour,
See approach your Tyrant's power,
Chains and slavery!

Who would be a traitor knave?
Who would fill a coward's grave?
Who so base as be a slave?
Traitor, coward, turn and flee!
Who at Liberty's sweet cry
Fredom's sword would raise on high?
Freeman stand, or freeman die,
Hark! your chief cries, "on with me!"

By Oppression's woes and pains,
By your sons in servile chains,
We will drain our dearest veins,
But they shall be free!
Lay your proud oppressors low!
Tyrants fall in every blow!
For the cause of God below,
Is the cause of Liberty!

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

The Republican.

No. 8. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Oct. 15, 1819. [Price. 2d.

TRIAL OF MR. CARLILE.

Wednesday Evening, 9 o'clock

Before this number of the *Republican* is issued to the world, the fate of Mr. Carlile will probably be decided. Whether the verdict of the Jury who are to decide upon his case, shall consign him to a dungeon for the next two or three years, or perhaps for life, or whether it shall restore him to his family, his friends, and his business; in either of these cases, he will carry along with him the greatest satisfaction which an honest man can enjoy,—the consciousness of having done right in the first instance, and of having bravely defended himself in the hour of trial and difficulty. When Socrates was about to be deprived of life, one of his friends expressed to him, his regret that he should *die innocent:* "What," said the sage, "Do you wish that I should *die guilty?*" The greatest consolation which a man can receive, while suffering beneath the iron rod of persecution, is the confidence which results from his injuries being undeserved; and should the verdict of the Jury be given against him, Mr. Carlile will receive this consolation in a great degree. The unprecedented interest and sympathy, which his case has excited, is a proof that *public opinion is with him*, that the mass of the People are the enemies of religious persecution, of intolerance, bigotry, and tyranny. The question with the public, (and it is to be hoped that the Jury will look at it in the same point of view,) is not whether Mr. Carlile is right or wrong in his opinions,

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

but whether he has acted *from a purity of motive*, whether he is a *malicious person;* in short, it is whether or not he has published the *Age of Reason* with a view to corrupt the morals of society. If the parties engaged in the prosecution are unable to prove this, their case cannot be made out, for when there is no *bad intention*, there is *no crime*. It is in vain that a servile tool in the garb of a Judge, declares in the accustomed jargon of the bar and the bench that Christianity is part of the law of the land, for whatever might formerly be the case, Mr. Carlile has proved over and over again, that the Act of Parliament, usually called Mr. Smith's Bill, has completely destroyed the protection which the Christian religion received from the laws of the country. That Mr. Justice Abbott should wish to explain away the application of this statute, is not surprising, when it is considered that the act authorises any person to deny the existence of the Trinity. It is, however, to be hoped, that the Jury will be led away by no such explanation, that they will judge for themselves, and if they do this, there can be no doubt of their immediately pronouncing a verdict of Not Guilty.

The conduct of the Judge, and of the Attorney General, in the proceedings of the two days which have already passed, has been partial and malignant in the extreme. The only mode of defence by which Mr. Carlile could hope to escape the vulture fangs of the law, was by shewing that he had no evil intention in publishing the work, and he could not do this better than by shewing that it contained nothing immoral, and that the objections which Paine makes to the divine origin of the Bible were well founded. This was his *only* defence, and the only one he could have, which was likely to justify his conduct in the eyes of the Jury and the world. He was permitted to read the *Age of Reason* through, but the moment he began to comment upon the various passages of the Bible, he was interrupted by the Judge, who declared that he would not suffer any observations to be made which impugned the divinity of the Christian religion: by means of this sweeping declaration, he deprived Mr. Carlile of the

greater part of his defence, and as the latter very justly observed, shewed a determination to confine him in a dungeon without even the privilege of a hearing.

One of the most arbitrary practices in a trial of this description, is the privilege which the Attorney General is allowed of interrupting the Defendant, when the latter happens to make any observations which may be considered too harsh for the delicate ear of his opponent. During the first day's proceedings, there was no room for the exercise of this tyrannical mode of annoyance, but to day has afforded several opportunities for the harpies of the law to interpose their malignant objections. Whenever Mr. Carlile was entering upon any thing that was likely to shew that he had published nothing but what had been repeatedly published before, without exposing the authors to the notice of the law officers of the crown, nay that several of these authors had actually been pensioners and parasites of the present government, whenever Mr. Carlile was attempting to do this, he was immediately interrupted by the Attorney General, whose appeal was directly answered by a prohibition from the Judge. When we consider the powerful array of learning and talent, that a Defendant has to contend against, when we see three or four of the most dextrous, diligent, and cunning sycophants the bar can produce, selected to oppose him, and to watch for any false or faulty step he may make, for the purpose of throwing him into confusion, it is almost impossible that a fair trial can be expected. Is it not enough that a wily hypocrite, in the character of a Judge should be watching for opportunities to interrupt him and to lead him off his guard, without being exposed to the impertinent intrusion of men who are officially employed to pursue him to destruction? But in the English government every thing is of a piece. Every thing tends towards despotism. The Judge, in what should be a Court of Justice, explains the law as he pleases, which is always on the side of his employers; and if the law is in any case doubtful, instead of allowing a defendant the benefit of the doubt, he turns it against him by giving an opinion,

which opinion is immediately recorded and observed as a solemn legislative decision. In such a state of things it is impossible to look for any thing but tyranny from the bench, and the only chance which a defendant has, is the probability that an honest Jury will set the *dictum* of a wicked Judge at defiance.

The folly of this prosecution is equal to its malignity. The proceedings of the trial will make more Deists than Mr. Carlile would have done by selling the *Age of Reason* during the remainder of his life. Every interruption which he has received, will be considered by the public as a proof that his prosecutors apprehended he was going to say something that was *unanswerable*. Besides which, there is the publicity which will be given to the work by means of the trial; a publicity which will far exceed that of any other work on the same side the question, that ever was written.

In the next number there will be room for making some observations on the result of the trial, a result which will be of more consequence than any event which has ever taken place in the criminal jurisprudence of the country.

W. T. SHERWIN.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

THE great importance which is attached to the depending prosecution against Richard Carlile for publishing Paine's Age of Reason, and the extreme solicitude of the disinterested part of society to the event of his trial, has been strongly manifested; besides the solemn issue which is to be decided, the respective parties to it claim general attention. On the part of the prosecution we see arranged, in hostile attitude, the Government, a great majority of the Clergy of all degrees and of all denominations and sects, the Law in all its branches, from the Chief Justice to the expecting candidate for the bar, many of the Bankers and Merchants, and such of the Nobility who think the People are yet to be humbugged by the

Untired cuckoo note of Church and State.

On the other side is Carlile, a printer, without friends or protectors, except amongst that class of society who are anxious for full and liberal discussion and investigation of the religion of the country as established, not by our Creator, but by act of Parliament.

Paine is designated by those who knew him not, and by those who have not read his works, as a profligate, immoral character, and an Atheist, setting God and man at defiance.

His whole life has been public; in the very front of society in England, America, France, and finally in America, he required and preserved the esteem, the veneration, and the affection of Franklin, Washington, Adams, Hamilton, and of many great political characters and moral writers of this country. His attempted degradation and abased conduct are asserted, after his death, by some interested fanatics and sectarian mountebanks, who are to exist on the destruction of his character, and who have not hitherto produced any testimony to support their calumnies. These infuriated zealots have often been invited to discuss freely the sentiments, the tenets, and conduct of Paine, but they have not accepted the invitation; it is now repeated, and let his enemies support their assertions, or their silence will refute their slanderous calumnies.

It is fair and just to the character of this dead man, that his creed and opinions should be fully known; and, surely, as to his tenets, we may candidly search for them in those works which are calumniated by the charge of impiety, blasphemy, and atheism. Hear him, then, and afterwards read the sermon of Christ on the mountain, so much relied on by Mr. Erskine against Williams, the former printer of Paine's Age of Reason, and against whom a verdict of guilty was obtained twenty-two years ago, when public thinking and free discussion had marched but slowly into society.

Paine says, "I am aware of the difficulties that attend this subject, and from that consideration, I have reserved it to a more advanced period of life. I intended it to be the last offering to my fellow-citizens of all nations, when the purity of my motive could not be questioned, even by those who might disapprove the work.

"I believe in one God, and no more, and I hope for happiness beyond this life.

"I believe the equality of man; and I believe that religious duties consist in doing justice, loving mercy, and endeavouring to make our fellow-creatures happy."

Nothing can be more solemn, simple, just, and beneficent

than this text; it is contained in the precepts and declaration of Christ himself, for it was the religion of Christ. Compare and read, my countrymen, the creed of Paine with the sermon of Christ on the mountain, trust to the evidence of your own senses, the task is obvious and easy, you require not the churchmen, the lawmen, the statesmen to assist you.

The commentaries of Paine, in his Age of Reason, are consistent with this simple and just text, and by slanderers and interested fanatics only you are told otherwise.

The topics which Paine has discussed have been written, printed, and published for above one hundred and fifty years past, and are to be had in every bookseller's shop in London, even in that of Mr. Rivington, one of the Society embodied to suppress their sale, and to prosecute the publishers and sellers, under the title of the Society for the Suppression of Vice.

The writers of these publications containing precisely the same tenets and opinions to be found in Paine, are Lord Bolingbroke, the confidential Minister of our good and pious Queen Anne, Locke, Milton, Hobbes, Chubb, Middleton, Tindal, Collins, Hume, the Secretary of our Ambassador in France, and others of their time, and more recently by Gibbon, who dedicated his work to Lord North, the favourite Minister of our good and venerable King, who himself accepted a splendid copy, which is now in his Majesty's library, and who, so far from prosecuting, or being advised by his Ministers to prosecute, Mr. Gibbon, for the sentiments and opinions, that he appointed him one of the Lords of Trade, with a large salary, and yet, the most liberal minded of our bishops considered the assertions and opinions of Mr. Gibbon so cutting, though polished, and for that very reason, perhaps, the wounds were deeper, that he published a long and augumentative answer; with what success, let the impartial world decide. And the last author on this interesting subject, is the Right Honourable Sir William Drummond, one of his Majesty's most honourable Privy Counsellors, who was our Ambassador at Naples for several years, and most ably and honourably discharged the important duties which at that period called forth his patriotic exertions; and it did not appear to the world, nor to his Majesty's Government, that the profession of tenets and opinions, in concurrence with those in the Age of Reason, and which are to be found in his *academical questions*, and his *Œdipus Judaicus*, at all disqualified him, or diminished his

diplomatic energies from holding his situation, or fulfilling his duty; and so thought his Majesty's Ministers, when they appointed Sir William Drummond a Privy Counsellor, and gave him a pension of two thousand pounds a year, in reward for his able services, and in compensation of the large sums which he had generously expended to promote the interests of his country; and may he long enjoy it, although it may be the lot of Carlile to be imprisoned and ruined for doing precisely the same act; not indeed the writing similar sentiments, for few can rival the classic compositions of Sir William Drummond, but in the printing and publishing only, in which his zeal and sincerity, cannot be questioned, for he printed his last elegant and able work, Œdipus Judaicus, at his own expence, and gratuitously distributed the copies.

Mr. Gibbon and Sir William Drummond have been almost unanswered, and they have been left entirely untouched. Ministers, Priests, and Lawyers, measure well their blows before they strike, they shew prudence in their anger; they very properly leave the question of religious doubt to be settled between the Creator, and the honourable and right honourable sceptics, but the sceptics among the lower orders, now the pious and exemplary operation of burning is exploded, are to be imprisoned, fined, and ruined, and their wives and children thrown upon the dunghill like hogs, as an example to the swinish multitude, there yet remains the constitutional buckler of a British Jury to protect this man from such shameful and unjust oppression, and that Jury ought to know, that Carlile merits their protection even beyond the justice of his case, by an act of liberality and free discussion, which evinced the perfect justice of his opinions. Men were employed at Carlile's door to sell and distribute opinions written by some dissenting Ministers, in answer to Paine's Age of Reason, and written too in that *usual milk of human charities* which belong to those zealous apostles; yet Carlile, so far from wishing to interrupt or annoy these people, invited them within his shop, which they accepted, and actually gave them all his aid, to promote the circulation of his opponents' works.—I fear, if we were to say to the higher orders who now prosecute this man, go thou and do likewise, our solicitation would be vain, but a British public will not fail to mark this strong contrast of liberality in the lower order, and persecution in the higher order.

I remain your constant reader,

Hackney, 12th Oct. 1819. WILLIAM JAMES.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

SEEING that a meeting is called for the suppression of blasphemous and treasonable publications, I fell into these reflections, (thinking no harm myself, I did not suspect others) I said to myself, How "fortunate I am to be born in this enlightened age, when the light of Reason has illuminated all the world, and animated all mankind! What a blessing to find that men can be reasoned into good sense, and come to a right understanding through the medium of the press. Surely," said I, "the Society for Suppression of Vice, in conjunction with the Bible Society, are going to *sell* no more Bibles. No, no! they are now going to give away books of science, and open national seminaries, where twenty or thirty scholars can be educated all at one time in the principal branches of useful knowledge; and instead of publishing religious tracts with the deaths of children that never existed, who they say died with the gloomy weight of Christianity on their tender minds, that hurried them into a decline, and sunk them into their graves." Then I considered that there would be tracts distributed with the element of the sciences, and put into the hands of children to prepare them and make them familiar with them, without the assistance of teachers, and then all the religious tracts, which are a disgrace to the authors and publishers, and degrading to the Almighty, will be set aside, and the tracts of science, morality, and virtue, substituted in their place. Then, I assured myself, of this being the age which the ancients looked for so many ages ago; this was to be the age when all mankind was to become happy. Thanks be to our English nation, the most opulent and learned men of the day, who know the blessing of that divine gift, reason, now they are going to set an example and call for the aid of all the reasoning citizens to assist and encourage the full liberty and exercise of that divine gift, then we shall have better servants, better masters, better parents, better children, and better subjects; and as to myself, I shall be no longer an outcast of society. It is really a fact, that about twenty-five years ago I had a desire to belong to the Freemasons, but being candid in declaring that I considered the Bible to be a human invention, and that I did not believe it to be written by inspiration from God, I was objected to on that reason, and no other. Another time I had a notion of joining the Free-Thinking Christians, when in Cateaton Street, and was objected to for the same reason.

Under these circumstances, I was in full hopes of being, for once in my life, admitted to the society of men of liberality of sentiment; but no, I must still wait with expectation. The time will come that men will not conceal their sentiments, nor be ashamed to own that they are Deists. I then, perhaps, may find an opening into society, where I may declare my sentiments without danger of offending or being set at nought.

I must acknowledge, that I felt myself very much disappointed when I heard this meeting is for the purpose of suppressing all the publications of the present day that are calculated to diffuse reason, good sense, morality, and virtue into the minds of all classes of People, and to stifle that reason that has burst its fetters, and is now about to be imbibed by every rational man, who has a desire to see all mankind happy and comfortable in enjoying the full exercise of their reason. Therefore, under these disappointments, I do assure you that I do not mean to sign that petition.

In respect to Deists, I beg leave to inform you, that I do consider all the authors of science, whether ancient or modern, to be true and real Deists, whatever might be their principles in point of religion, I leave that out of the question. I do contend, that there is no way of exalting our ideas of the Deity but by the study of the sciences; there we see the wisdom and goodness of the Almighty displayed in his works; and all those authors of every science, notwithstanding their being professed Christians, have imperceptibly and undesignedly spread the principles of Deism. This being truly the case, I hope and trust these meetings will also prevent all the scientific works from being spread abroad, for it is the sciences that have opened men's eyes, and brought them to the light of reason, or we should have been priest-ridden more than we are, if it is possible.

Your constant reader,

W. DAYE.

Sherborne Lane, Cannon Street.

P. S. I have heard it maintained, that the lines that go across the shoulders and the back of the ass, never were on that beast before Christ rode him, and that they are the type of Christ's crucifixion. Now, Sir, I beg leave to ask, is that the reason the priest, in baptism, marks the infant with the sign of the cross, to the end, that he may be kept in darkness, and become as ignorant as an ass, in order that the priest may ride him the better?

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

I HOPE your correspondent Mr. J. A. Parry, will not take it amiss if I should differ from him on one very important point in his letter to you of the 20th ult. inserted in your last number; but as discussion is the best means of securing unanimity among the friends to liberty, I need not make any apology for so doing.

He says, "that with persevering energy, we may soon be enabled to regain our rights, and share those blessings, which nature

intended equally for all her sons." The sentence, I confess, is rather ambiguous, and it is therefore very possible I may have mistaken his meaning; but the words, "and share those blessings which *nature intended equally* for all her sons," appear to me to allude to an interference with private property, or rather to an anticipated division of what may be considered by the People a superabundance of landed property, in case the present convulsion should end in raising the People to that importance in the Government of their country, and in the scale of society, which I should think every one who has the least spark of patriotism flowing in his veins must be anxious to witness. If my interpretation of the words be correct, I cannot help regretting that Mr. P. should advocate a measure so much in opposition to that spirit of universal justice which the Reformers themselves boast of as being their anchor. Designs such as these can have no other effect than that of operating as serious objections against their demands, and of compelling the whole of the landed interest, and those in any way connected with them to unite with their oppressors in their unjust warfare; by which means the contest must be such as every man, even the greatest friend to liberty, must dread; whereas by openly declaring that they have no such designs, and which I understood they had done, and by adhering to their maxim of universal justice, sooner or later, the *Gentlemen of England* must see that the only way to secure their own liberty and property is by volunteering their assistance in securing the freedom of those who alone can render their own possessions of any avail to them.

Dr. R. Watson, one of the most steadfast democrats of the day, in his life of Fletcher of Salton, a work that should be in every one's hands, decidedly opposes the absurd notion of the equallization of property. I shall therefore make a few extracts from his valuable work for the consideration of Mr. P., and those of your readers who may have read his letter under the same impression as myself.

"One objection," he says, "to trusting the People with a share of the legislature, is a pretended fear lest they should level all distinctions, and divide private property equally amongst themselves. This objection has no foundation in truth. The house of peers and the legislative bodies of every country, are of different ranks, and possess different shares of property, yet they have equal votes in framing the laws; nor was it ever known that the poorer suggested a plan for equalizing the property of the rich."

"In a Republican army there are no examples of the soldiers complaining, because their pay is inferior to their generals. They are sufficiently happy in the conviction that their courage and patriotism will be rewarded, provided they acquire the good opinion of their countrymen, and that there are no insurmountable obstacles in the way of their promotion."

After alluding to the suffrage of what are called "the Lower Orders," he says, "Were any exclusion to take place, it ought

to be the rich, because property takes care of itself; *but a free People would never violate justice. They would cherish the fraternal principle, and carefully avoid every thing tending to promote envy and strife.*"

"He who is more industrious than his neighbour will consequently enjoy more wealth; and certain pursuits, as they require more application and genius than others, ought to be proportionably rewarded."—"Besides the produce of our own industry and talents, we have a right to the property of our deceased parents and relations, under certain restrictions."

"A great number of well meaning People dread the loss of all property, were the slightest reform to take place. By their obstinacy, or rather want of reflection, they endanger the very wealth which they are so solicitous to preserve, and may occasion a convulsion, which all good men wish to prevent." A little further on he says:—

"In treating of the land, it is necessary to make this distinction, that although the land, in an uncultivated state, is common property, yet *the labour bestowed, in cultivating and improving it, is private property of the most sacred kind. Let private property remain sacred,* and let a tax, equal to what may be supposed its natural value, be levied to defray the expences of Government. The present land tax in Great Britain amounts to about two millions annually, (1798) and although a much smaller sum would be sufficient to defray the expences of a well regulated Government, it could be increased to three millions; and yet all those not possessed of a hundred a year, independent of their daily labour, might be totally exempted."

Begging Mr. Parry's attention to these extracts, provided I should not have mistaken his meaning,

I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

H. COUSINS.

Hackney,
October 4, 1819.

P. S. I should have preferred an anonymous signature, but I perceive that it would be contrary to your regulation.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

RICHARD CARLILE,

ALL hail, intrepid champion of reason and human rights! I see, with great pleasure, that you are animated with enthusiastic ardour in the cause you have espoused by the divine and adorable Trinity, *Truth, Justice,* and *Sympathy,* who comprehend the sum total of virtue. And I remark, with great pleasure, esteem, and reverence, your arrangement of ideas, and your marshalment of the

phalanxes of reason and science, by means of the subpœnas served on our most eminent Ecclesiastics, Astronomers, Chymists, and Students in Ethics and Oriental Literature. Nevertheless, I tremble for your safety, whilst opposed to the bigoted cohorts of despotism and superstition. I fear that the intellectual gloom of the age is too great and nebulated by prejudice to duly appreciate your sentiments and devotion. I am, therefore, ever ready to aspirate my orisons, and in the most humble manner and posture invoke the Soul of the universe to be graciously pleased to enable you to confound and defeat all your opponents, on your approaching trial, by exhibiting them as equally thirsting for your blood and disparaging His being and essence. I most ardently desire that you may be enabled to demonstrate, that the figments of the anonymous authors in the book called "the Bible" have not been written at the periods assigned, nor by those to whom they have been ascribed. I trust that you will be effectually enabled to point out a variety of the antilogical passages abounding in those figments; and that you will satisfactorily demonstrate, that they ought not to be preferred to reason, supported by the irrefragable essence and system of Nature. And that if such men as Abraham, &c., were not exempt from lies, deceit, and perfidy, there ought not to be any confidence placed in the much more fallible mortals who have written their histories. I hope that you will exhibit the infernal Trinity, *Ignorance*, *Error*, and *impious Interest*, in all their odious deformities, because those demons have invented, promulgated, and sanctified systems of falsehood, which they continue to support in defiance of the voice of Nature and Reason, and derogatory to the Deity and of the universe. I hope that you will demonstrate the blasphemous absurdity of denying the coeval existence of matter, motion, and form with the Divinity. I anxiously hope, that you will triumph over all who persecute you for denying that 5823 years is the period of matter and animation; and that you will succeed in pointing out the blasphemous absurdity of inventing and supporting a doctrine which implies that the Deity awoke from his inert slumbers of exclusive existence through an infinite eternity (compared with which millions of billions of trillions of ages, are much less than a drop in the Ocean) and began to be good and beneficient by creating *matter from nothing, and educing motion and animation therefrom.* I hope that you will succeed in exposing to merited contempt and obloquy, all the impious libellers who calumsiously intimate that the Deity was over-reached and defeated in his benevolent purposes in the creation, by a spirit whom he of course had foolishly made without foreseeing the consequence. I trust, that you will demonstrate by analogy and reference to the variety of tribes in the several species of vegetables in the Botanic world, and of Genera in the animal world, that the variations in our species depend not on zones or climates, and has existed prior to the period of the reputed creation, and remain a collateral and corroborative evidence of the

Divine precognitive disapprobation of the falsehoods invented in barbarous times. And that they unite with the discoveries of Geologists and of Zoologists, and with the prejudices of education, with human weakness, and the general consent of mankind, but particularly with the negation of the prolific principle to the production of opposite species (which limits the genera *de neuvò* to the first subjects) in supporting the belief of the being of a God, in defiance of the overwhelming reasons of Mirabeau.

I hope that you will render ridiculous the opinion entertained respecting the immortality of Adam and Eve, (during their ignorant innocence,) by shewing, that the decay and dissolution of identity is a necessary consequence of its use, and that nothing could be more impossible than that "the Garden of Eden" could accommodate them and their posterity even during a few centuries. I hope that you will demonstrate, that there is not an ounce more or less of matter in the universe than at the period of the repufed creation; and that if any of the bodies of the solar system were to gain or to lose, their gravities and motion would be affected, and their economies changed; consequently, that though we may strive to refine, rarify, subtilize, and spiritualize the human soul, we cannot with the utmost strength even of its own aid, form a single conception of it distinct from matter, and are forced to confess, that unless it be matter, it can be nothing, however grievous and mortifying the discovery and infliction may be. Hence it follows, that if a human soul weigh but a single ounce, and the average mortality of our species be only 1 per cent. annually on the population throughout the last 5,800 years, the aggregate weight of the souls of the departed would have long since exhausted our globe, if they were to abandon it for any of the celestial orbs. I hope that you will demonstrate the puerility of the imaginations which could conceive or enforce the idea of such an enormous increase of the aqueous matter of our globe as could possibly deluge it. I hope that you will demonstrate, that it was impossible a vessel, such as the ark is described, should have been sufficient to accommodate a pair of each species (not to say tribes) of the reptiles, insects, birds, and beasts, including the mammoth, and the amphibious animals inhabiting our globe, besides containing stores of soil for those who burrowed, water for the amphibious, (as well as for general use,) grain for the granivorous, herbage for the graminivorous, and flesh for the carnivorous, with numerous separations for defence against the depredations of the latter, and litter for an infinite quantity, and sufficient ventilation to support respiration, (a matter not contemplated by the author, as appears by his account of a single window, which remained closed during the flood), as well as a sufficiency of grooms to attend what, if capacious enough, would be more difficult to cleanse than a thousand Augean stables.

I hope that you will remark the numerous inconsistencies, contradictions, and falsehoods, throughout the remainder of Genesis,

and the books of the Pentateuch, as well as those following them. You may draw a sarcastic comparison between Sampson and our modern hunters, as the latter, with their horses and well-trained packs of hounds, are seldom able to catch more than solitary foxes. But, doubtless, it may be urged, that the 300 foxes caught by Sampson were inspired to present themselves to him, with the motive of being avenged on the Philistines for destroying some of their whelps, and that they were also inspired to combine their devastating traverses through the corn-fields of (not only a few paltry townships, but) whole nations, and that the firebrands were likewise inspired to protract their burning until all the corn of the Philistines was totally consumed. It is, however, to be remarked, that such a destruction must have caused a famine the following year, (although not mentioned by the hagiographer) and by the consequent diminution of game and poultry, must have severely afflicted instead of rewarded those foolish foxes, unless they took refuge amongst their friends in Judea, a circumstance rather doubtful, inasmuch as their posterity would have been suitable attendants to procure game and food for the prophet Elijah, without putting an angel to the trouble of performing such offices. I hope that you will expose the absurdity of the opinion of God's having been born of woman, who nevertheless ceased not to be a virgin although under the coverture of "Joseph the carpenter," let Mystagogues say what they please on the subject. It is to be hoped that you will likewise shew the absurdity of believing that God should have chosen a reprobate, or "a Devil," for the purpose of being by him betrayed, and that it is no less absurd to believe it possible that God, or a part of him, could suffer death, merely for the redemption of mankind, of whom not a quarter per cent. are saved, or preserved from their vices or passions; who (by the concurrent tenets of sects) from the future punishment denounced against them, I hope, that you will be enabled to demonstrate the ignorance and impious zeal of all who presume to make their particular creeds the standard of oral sentiment, and who daringly mock the Divinity whom they pretended to worship with their ironical, or rather virtual taunts of existence and power, by their interposition for the punishment of such as advocate opposite sentiments; and as it may be inferred from their conduct, that they conceive their Divinity to be too impotent to punish such human reptiles, as are at the worst or best only, ignorantly opposed to his will or existence, for which it would seem that these zealots conceive him and his religion to be equally obliged to them. It may be demonstrated that the conduct of such zealots is an impious calumny on God and true religion, by conveying the idea that he is too contemptibly weak to defend the latter, which is so irrational as to need the aid of the secular arm. I hope that you will demonstrate that the modern tyrants are more inhuman than those of the ancients, inasmuch as they fine, confine, and endeavour to destroy all who question the purity of their mythology, whilst

the ancient tyrants only expelled such from their country, as instance the Roman imperial tyrant Augustus, who only banished the poet Ovid for his infidel drollery, or ridicule of the religion of his country by his Metamorphoses. I trust, however, that the modern English and their philosophy will not be disgraced by metaphysic parology, in marking the triumph of opinion and partial interest, instead of reason, justice, and truth. I hope that you will succeed in demonstrating, that all religious persecutions have rendered the authors and abettors odious, have decided the fate of their characters and persuasions, and marked the triumph of the oppressed throughout all the periods of the Heathen, and the different Christian polytheism. Finally, as I am solicitous that we should not owe the eventual triumph of reason and recognition of human rights to your martyrdom or incarceration, I trust that you will demonstrate that the most religious and zealous sects have been generally in all ages and countries the most immoral, inhuman, and cruel, and that the administrators of our Government are so far from being averse to make common cause with "the beloved Ferdinand," that they would freely coalesce with "the Holy Inquisition," in defence of "the faith once delivered to the Saints," and of the title conferred on Henry the Eighth.

If the above address be deemed worthy, it will of course be honoured by insertion in your Republican. Although as an obscure individual, far from desiring notoriety, I would prefer an anonymous signature, if such were not excluded. I conclude with stating, that as I conceive you to be honestly devoted to human happiness, so I subscribe myself, although a stranger,

Your assured friend,
HENRY HATCH.

Birmingham,
October 4, 1819.

ANTICIPATION; OR, ALBION'S REPUBLIC.

A Song.

Tune—*Sprig o' Shalali and Shamrock so green.*

I.

Now breathe we the air wherein feemen can live,
Now taste we all bounties Dame Nature can give,
In Albion's Republic, the isle of the brave.
We've fought for our freedom, our freedom we've won;
No longer we pay for the light of the sun;
Nor banish'd to Afric, in deserts to groan:
The tombs of our fathers shall yet be our own,
In Albion's Republic, the isle of the brave.

II.

Whether Churchmen or Statesmen, our tyrants each one,
To *Hades* have fled, or *Hanover* have gone,
From Albion's Republic, the isle of the brave:
Imagined those Despots, when high was their sway,
That Britons, though patient, would suffer for ay;
That tax, and that tythe, should increasingly flow:
So deem'd they; but freemen in concert cry'd, No:
O'er Albion's Republic, the isle of the brave.

III.

No Courts' costly splendours extinguish our fires;
No lordlings now thrive on the worth of their sires,
In Albion's Republic, the isle of the brave.
No lawn sleeves insult our good sense and our God,
With lectures to kiss Aristocracy's rod;
As if parsons to feed, men were born but to toil
No holy banditti divide now the spoil,
Of Albion's Republic, the isle of the brave.

IV.

With Sydney and Hampden, those heroes repose,
Who died in the cause, and to joy turned the woes
Of Albion's Republic, the isle of the brave.
Far nobler to die for our dear native land,
With our country's regrets, 'midst a patriot band,
Than die like a fool for a knave or a sot;
Such victims no more the fair annals shall blot,
Of Albion's Republic, the isle of the brave.

V.

Then join hand in hand with a cheerful accord,
Our God is our Bishop, the law is our Lord,
In Albion's Republic, the isle of the brave:
Our toils but enliven, our spirits still soar,
Our eyes beam with pleasure, which ne'er beamed before;
Our hearts dance with gladness, our homes smile with love,
And Heaven itself is but one step above
Fair Albion's Republic, the isle of the brave.

R Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

The Republican.

No. 9. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Oct. 22, 1819. [Price. 2d.

A LETTER TO SIR CHARLES ABBOTT, KNT.

Lord Chief Justice of the Court of King's Bench,

On his conduct in that Court on the 13th, 14th, and 15th days of October instant.

King's Bench Prison, Oct. 20, 1819.

My Lord,

I presume that each of us in a less disturbed moment are better prepared to re-argue and re-consider the proceedings of that court in which you preside, and which you converted from a Court of Justice to a Court of Inquisition, during that mockery of justice and of trial, in which you, my Lord, in concert with the Law-Officers of the Crown, and a predetermined Jury, conspired to deny me a defence or justification of my conduct and motives. Considering the Court in the character of a Holy Inquisition, not in its literal acceptation, which means only to inquire into and to examine, but in its common acceptation, such as we speak and think of that in Spain, I shall proceed to inquire,

1st. Whether your conduct was the result of a belief that the book you so pertinaciously held under your robe was of a sacred character?

2dly. Whether you were not the political instrument, used against your will, for the protection of the clergy and the 6,000,000l. per annum they draw from the pockets of the People; as a necessary influence and a wicked instrument in the hands of a corrupt Government?

3dly. Whether the interests of mankind will be protected by protecting the alleged sacred character of that book?

4thly. Which of us had the best of the argument on the point of law relative to the book called the Holy Bible, and the Christian religion?

And lastly, What will be the ultimate effect of the dis-

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

cussion on those subjects raised by the *Attorney-General* and the *Vice Society*, with their *legal debauchee*?*

In answer to the first inquiry, whether your conduct was the result of a belief that the book you so pertinaciously held under your robe was of a sacred character, I would observe, that before you had attempted to have taken that book under your protection, you should have asked yourself the following questions: "Will my shielding (by the authority I hold in this court) this book from examination be received as a proof of its sacred character, or excite doubts that would otherwise never have existed? Will the resistance to every effort of the Defendant to examine it after he has publicly denounced it a falsehood, and expressed his conviction that he had no other defence of his good intention than to shew the truth and moral tendency of his own publication, by exposing the falsehood and immoral tendency of that to which it was opposed, and of which it professed to be an investigation, add to or remove those doubts? Will my expressing a firm belief in this book as a divine revelation be believed, when I display a fear to allow even a humble bookseller to examine it in justification of his attack upon it as an immoral work?" Truth, my Lord, is very simple, and is most frequently found in men of simple and uneducated minds. There is but one axiom on which truth can be placed, and on that I rested my whole defence, which alarmed your Lordship and your yelping bantlings, the Law-Officers of the Crown, and called forth from your united efforts, aided by the predetermination of the Jury, an interposition which denied me a defence. The axiom I allude to is this—that there is but one mode of defending the truth, which is by shewing that that which it is opposed to, is falsehood. This, my Lord, you are well aware was the mode of defence I had taken, you had time to deliberate and to reflect on the force and validity of this defence, and the charge that I made against you in the court, and which I am now bold to repeat after the most mature deliberation, namely, that a concert had been entered into after the first adjournment of the Court before it again resumed its sitting, to use every effort to coun-

* The open profligacy and debauchery of this man is such, that with a knowledge of his possessing more abilities than any of those now on the bench, our *virtuous ministers* have been ashamed to elevate him to that situation. We know their scruples are not trifling!!!

teract or finally to determine not to hear that mode of defence. This, my Lord, was your reason for shielding the book as a sacred book—the same motive has hitherto actuated the Brahmins of India to protect and shelter their Veda—the priests of Heliopolis their rites and mysteries—the Persians their Zendavesta—the Mufti their Koran—and the Jews and Christians the books called the Old and New Testament. The very reflection that this pretended word of the JUDGE OF ALL THINGS should require the protection of a human judge in a Court of Law, will make more infidels to your sacred book than the most severe and rigorous examination I could have given it, and the most wanton attack that could possibly be made upon it. If that "firm belief" your Lordship avowed had been in that book as a divine revelation, you would have gained credit for that assertion, by holding it up to my examination or any other person's examination. If I could avow a firm belief in that book as a divine revelation, I would challenge the Age of Reason, The Principles of Nature, or any other book to investigate it, and attack it in any shape whatever. The fear you have displayed, my Lord, is a proof not of your "firm belief" in it as divine, but of your hypocrisy in pretending to believe that which your better judgment and private knowledge condemns. But if your Lordship be sufficiently weak in mind and intellect really to believe, I would refer you to the following chapters: Genesis xiv. xviii. xix. xxx. xxxiv. xxxv. xxxviii. and xxxxix., Leviticus xv., Numbers xxv., Deuteronomy xxii. and xxiii., Judges xvi. and xix., 1 Samuel xxv., 2 Samuel xi. xiii. and xiv., The Song of Solomon i. to viii., Ezekiel iv. xiv. xxii. and xxiii., Hosea i. ii. and iii., Epistle of Paul to the Romans, chap. i. verses 25, 26, 27 and 28. Read these chapters, my Lord, before you come into Court to make any observation on the propriety of setting aside or confirming the verdict, you have so dishonestly and disreputably obtained against me: ask yourself whether the book that contains such Chapters as these, is a fit book to put into the hands of your children, or your domestics, or even into the hands of your Lady.

I think, my Lord, I have sufficiently shewn that your pertinacity did not proceed from a veneration of the book, but from a sense of its falsehood and a dread of its exposure; not that you as an individual could have been injured by that exposure, but from the fear that the false and corrupt system to which you have sworn attachment, and from which you have never deviat-

ed, would, by a general knowledge of the origin and character of that book, speedily fall to the ground.

I shall now proceed to the second enquiry,—whether you were not the political instrument, used against your will, for the protection of the Clergy, and the six millions *per annum* they draw from the pockets of the people, as a necessary influence, and a wicked instrument in the hands of a corrupt Government.

That you were the political instrument, I venture to assert from the knowledge, that you have invariably opposed its being brought into the Court of King's Bench for decision, from the commencement of the business of filing the Information down to the time of the *mock trial.* I am aware, that you actually maintained your objections in a correspondence with Lord Castlereagh in the spring of the present year. However, convinced as you might have been of the rotten ground on which my prosecutors stood, if the question had been fairly argued, and if there had been a TRIAL, which I contend there has not been, you were at length compelled to give way, as the general knowledge which the Theological Writings of Mr. Paine had diffused of the fabulous nature of that book, which has so long been held sacred, and which has so long served the purposes of the Clergy in draining the produce arising from the industry of the labourer, was calculated to overwhelm in a short time all the clamours of the interested Clergy, and to have produced a general contempt and derision towards any individual, that should have been hardy enough to have stood up, and to have spoken in the name of the Deity, promising rewards or punishments to those who should accede to or deviate from his instructions. You, my Lord, need not be told that the Clergy are a strong though a corrupt prop to the present system of Government, neither need you be told, that if that prop be taken away the Government would not exist in its present corrupt and wicked state three months without the aid of the Clergy. Religion was not the object for protection, the thing is laughed at among the higher circle of society, and those who make a show of respect towards it consider it necessary only as an example to those whom they think are looking up to them for precept. It is for this reason that we hear that the Regent attended such and such a place of worship, or that prayers were read at home by some Chaplain or his favourite, the "Dandy Bishop." We, the people of England, all know that the Regent would rather spend an hour over his bottle, or with his favourite

lass, than be exposed to the dull ceremony of a continual repetition of the same prayers. It is for just the same reason that your Lordship and your brother Judges go on the first Sunday of every Term to St. Paul's Church, and afterwards to a banquet with the Lord Mayor. I will pledge myself that the reflection produced by the sermon of the Lord Mayor's Chaplain is soon exploded by the viands and wine put on his Lordship's table. It is the outward show only that is considered necessary to be observed, but, my Lord, those classes of society to whom you would wish those examples to be made, are no longer to be duped by such shallow artifices: they have read and judged for themselves, and when they find that the book on which your supposed faith is established is not to be pryed into, they will think with a late Archbishop of Canterbury (Tillotson) "that if it is too good to be examined, it is too bad to be believed." I trust that I have here made it appear, that it is the weighty influence the Government hold with an established clergy that has called forth this persecution against the Age of Reason, and not from any respect or reverence for religion considered in the abstract.

I shall now proceed with the third query. Whether the interest of mankind will be frustrated by protecting the alleged sacred character of that book? This may be answered in a few words, on the ground, that truth needs neither the flowers of eloquence nor the blandishments of art for its advocate. Many men with weak minds and good hearts have, I believe, been sincere when they have asserted, that it is necessary to keep up some pious fraud. But I would say, "Why is it necessary?" It can produce no other effect than to keep the minds of those who have some little belief in these "pious frauds" in continual doubt; it puts the mind of man, as it were, under the effects of a disease; it is never healthful, it is at one time in the heat of fever or phrenzy, at another chilled with cold despair. Truth only can give health to the mind of man; truth only can give it serenity; the real interests of mankind cannot be founded on any other basis than truth. It is by mysterious books and mysterious doctrines that mankind have been kept in that distracted and unnatural state, from the present time up to the earliest period in history. I trust, my Lord, that the time is near at hand, when they will throw aside mysterious and unintelligible books, or *books not fit to be examined*, and take their lessons from Nature only.

The fourth question is with regard to the law of the case.

Your Lordship insisted by assertion only, and not by argument, that Christianity was part and parcel of the law of the land, meaning the common law. I replied, that if it ever was part of the common law, it had been superseded by the statute law, and the only answer to my reply was, "I do not sit here to answer particular questions"—"the Court cannot be replied to"—or, "I have already given my opinion." I shall first inquire on what ground your assertion rests, that Christianity is part of the common law. Whether that which is called common law did not exist—before Christianity existed in this country. I am not aware exactly at what period the person called St. Austin preached under the oak to the Saxon King and Queen, having no book of reference to the date by me, but this I know that the vague thing called the constitution in this country, is alledged to have had its origin prior to that date, and consequently the religion which existed in the country prior to the arrival of Christianity must then have been part of the common law of the land, and Christianity itself became an innovation on that part of the common law. This, my Lord, as the Attorney-General would say, is taking up your own mode of argument, and now where are you my Lord? The first prating from the bench about Christianity being part and parcel of the law of the land, was by Sir Matthew Hale about 150 years since, whereas Christianity has been known in this country above a 1000. If your Lordship will give this a thought again, you will find it a specious mode of reasoning; for a dictum will not do for the present age, at least it disgraces the judicial character to make an assertion that no one believes. Sir Matthew Hale thought that he was administering the law of the land, when he caused the poor old woman to be burnt as a witch, as much as when he asserted that Christianity was a part of that law: his ideas were as valid and as worthy of respect in one instance as in the other. Christianity and witchcraft have the same origin and about the same foundation, and your Lordship should not protect the one and discard the other. I hesitate not to assert that if your Lordship cannot find better argument to support in the next term the common law part of this case, you will lose your character as an honest judge and lawyer. With respect to the statute law, I take the 53 of George the Third as my shield, and the argument and assertion I have used is such that your Lordship and the Attorney-General could not meet on fair and rational ground. When your Lordship repeated that Christianity was the law of the land, I asked

whether you meant Christianity independent of the Trinity? "The Court cannot answer questions." We shall hear by and bye that the Court like the Pope is infallible. That its infallibility is part of the law of the land. That to doubt it will be an offence against the laws, and merits punishment. I insist that the statute allows the impugning of Christianity, which means to embattle, to attack, to destroy Christianity if you can by argument; because if you take away the Trinity, which is admitted even by Christians to be the only sacred part of it, you leave it a system to be followed at the pleasure of man similar to that of Confucius or Zoroaster. Should it be necessary, it is my determination to carry this point of law, to our noble and hereditary legislators.

The effect of the discussion that has been raised on this subject, I am sure, will be ultimately conducive to the interests and welfare of mankind. Truth solicits exposure, falsehood dreads it. Ridley and Latimer said, when at the stake, that they should that day kindle a blaze that would never be extinguished; their assertion proved true, as it was applicable only to the Protestant interest as opposed to the Catholic. Your Lordship, with the Law-Officers of the Crown, and the Vice Society, with their legal debauchee, have kindled a flame that will never be extinguished, by your endeavour to crush by the most foul and illegal means.

Yours until the next Term,

RICHARD CARLILE.

R. Carlile begs to inform his friends the Deists of the metropolis, that he is now confined in the King's Bench Prison for the want of three persons as bail, one in £400. and two in £200; one in £400. being ready. He hopes that the cause of Deism will not long remain under this stigma. As the enemies of Deism, the supporters of falsehood and superstition no doubt flatter themselves that they have crushed it by confining its humble though most forward advocate, R. Carlile solicits from the public the names of those who are willing to have them published in approbation of his conduct: as he flatters himself that the open avowal of sentiment is at this moment of the utmost importance, he will publish them from time to time. A subscription is not the object so much as the real name and address of the party subscribing. The name without money will be as thankfully received as the name with money. R. C. has the pleasure to say, that the manner in which a

gentleman has expressed his feelings on the occasion, has been a consolation that far exceeds any pain that the most tedious imprisonment would occasion. Agreeable to the request of the gentleman, his name and address is inserted.

Alexander and Jane Morrison, 5, Duke's Row, Tavistock Square	£10	10	0
Antichristian	5	0	0

TO THE READERS OF THE REPUBLICAN.

The mock Trials of Mr. Carlile will be published in sheets, at two-pence each; it will be a complete report of the proceedings of the 4 days, and will comprise near 40 sheets. The first sheet is ready for delivery; the publication will proceed as rapidly as possible. A sheet containing title page and prefatory matter, will be published as early as possible.

TO MR. CARLILE.

DEAR SIR,

MY gratitude, for the *real* and *lasting* benefits I have received through your meritorious exertions, as a publisher, impels me to communicate my sentiments to you. It is not myself, that I supremely love, but it is the God of nature, my country, and my country's friends.

I am ready and willing to exercise every faculty of my mind, for the good of the People; and if necessary, I will use all my physical powers, and even bleed, and die for the cause of liberty.

That man does not deserve to enjoy freedom, who will not struggle, nor make any sacrifice to obtain it.

I am sorry to say that my feelings of late, have been severely wounded by hearing a person possessing unbounded patriotism, and such a superior mind as *you* most unquestionably do; and it must be extremely painful for every reasonable and honest person, to hear such a valuable character defamed, and called an "audacious villain;" but this is the way your name is made use of in this dark, superstitious, and stupidly slavish part of the country. The only reason (when I ask) these stupid and ungrateful beings, can assign for their base conduct towards you, is your having had the praiseworthy boldness to write letters to the Prince Regent, and told him with manly freedom, his faults; and what is the duty of

a Prince. The whole nation has had but too good a proof that he stood in great need of *your remonstrance and instruction.* I leave it to the honest and wise part of the community, to determine whether the term "audacious villain," may not be more justly applied to the Prince himself than to you. For has he not publicly and unfeelingly returned his thanks (such as they are) to a brutal set of cowardly murderers, contrary to the feelings and requests of nine-tenths of his subjects, and thereby incurred their just indignation?

Now is it possible that any rational being can consider such short-sighted, vile, and inhuman conduct becoming or admissible in a Prince?

Before we can reasonably affix a notion of value to any thing, or our interests and affections can justly be engaged by any person, we must necessarily be sensible of such thing or person, possessing some degree of excellence, or superiority, worthy of our esteem or affections. It is to every British subject a question of great importance (though not difficult of solution.) whether the Prince Regent, or any part of the family, the Duke of Sussex excepted, ever merited the affections of the People of this country. On the other hand admitting that he were ever so good, and worthy the esteem of every human being, what need could there be for him, or what service could or would he render the country as a king; for kings are useless, though dreadfully expensive beings to any country, and particularly so to this; and there should not exist any such thing as king in an *enlightened nation.*

No hereditary power, honour, right, or title, can possibly be consistent with nature and strict justice. It is contrary to all reason and justice, that a son or any branch of a family should have the honour or emolument continued to them, that were merited and received by the father, for the good he had rendered his country. Every person has a natural right to be rewarded in proportion to the service he may render his country, but this should not be exceeded.

That detestable and unjust law which gives the oldest son the sole possession of his father's estate, has been the utter ruin of thousands of families, while on the other hand, it has involved a few in unreasonable wealth, and unlimited power; and caused some to live in *splendid depravity.*

It is contrary to equity that there should be any such thing as real property; this has been the ruin of many honest and benevolent tradesmen who have unfortunately been in the habit of giving credit to persons possessing large estates but no personal property.

Every person ought, according to strict justice. to be able to dispose of his own property as he pleases. No son or daughter has any more right to a greater share of the parent's fortune than another, except from virtue and superior merit; and it is unquestionably the duty of every parent who has a fortune to distribute, to attend to, and reward such virtue and merit in due proportion to

their deserts. But I am fearful you will consider me as running too far from the subject with which I commenced this letter. However I think it will serve in some degree to prove the necessity of a change in almost all our present existing laws.

Undue power, priestcraft, superstition, and the great and unnatural inequality of mankind, are the principal causes of all the dissatisfaction and misery which now exist in the world. It may be said that there always did exist an inequality among mankind, and it most unquestionably must ever be so, but it should only be an inequality consistent with pure justice, but this kind of inequality at this time is totally unknown; and under the present state of things, virtue and true merit have no reward except that of the individual's conscience.

Look into the established system of religion in this country, do we not there find, that almost all those that rank high in the church (I mean those that have rich livings, and fat benefices given to them,) are men possessing neither virtue, honesty, piety, or abilities; but who are continually feasting themselves upon enormous sums of money extorted from the industrious part of the community; and what is it that these worthless reverends do for all this money? I think it is pretty evident nothing more than preach up those abominable (but which they call glorious) systems of oppression, which have nearly brought the whole nation to destruction; and the church system must be altered before the country can possibly be in a happy or flourishing condition.

Before the People can be blest with, and cordially receive, a perfect Government, and a pure and equitable code of laws, they must reject the Bible as being the word of the true God; and also totally disbelieve the divinity of Christ. For while they are inflexible in the Christian faith there is no possibility of establishing equitable laws; or even acting in a private way justly towards each other; for by the doctrines of the Bible and New Testament, nature is subverted, and where nature is destroyed no perfection can possibly remain.

I was in my youthful days taught to read the Bible, and I continued to read and reverence it more than twenty years; and was as tenacious of it and the Christian religion as any one could be, except at some few short intervals, when the reason that nature had given me was allowed to act; but priestcraft had carefully provided a sufficiently powerful enemy to defeat the efforts of this divine light of nature, until I had the courage to read the "Deist" and Paine's "Age of Reason." And I do most affectionately entreat all my fellow-countrymen to throw far from them that book which scarcely contains any thing but *blasphemy*, *profaneness*, *lies*, and *unequalled absurdities;* and instead of the Bible, I would above all things have them read attentively: the "Age of Reason," and the "Deist," which are books replete with perspicuous truth.

According to the doctrines of the Bible, no crime can be looked

upon with half the blackness, and horror, that the natural conscience of man describes it. For in that book the most atrocious murders are palliated, and in many instances considered as the very essence of the service of the true God.

It is the Bible and such books that have degraded and made men far worse than the most hateful part of the brute creation.

Far degenerated is that man from the purity of his nature, and bad indeed in heart, who can only be restrained from doing that which is contrary to moral rectitude and justice, but by the fear of a future existence.

Nature has implanted in the human breast the purest principles of virtue and justice; and the tenderest feelings of compassion and love to each other. It has been false systems of religion alone that have caused such degeneracy in the human race; and which now so powerfully militate against the happiness of mankind.

I remain, dear Sir,

Your most sincere well-wisher,

Westgate, Peterborough; J. B. SMITH.
October 10th, 1819.

P. S. On reading over this letter, I am sorry to find that I have not expressed my thoughts in a better manner, but as they came forth, so I wrote them; and as I believe they are all facts, you are at liberty to do just what you please with them. The desire I feel to see my country in freedom and happiness is equal to your own; but I want abilities and language to express my feelings properly. I believe I am the only person in this city, or even neighbourhood, who has boldly and openly spoke in favour of the People, and Reform; and have thereby got the ill-will of hundreds, and many have done me considerable injury in the way of my business, both here and at Stamford. However, if I can by any exertion or sacrifice, render you or my country the least service, I shall consider myself tenfold rewarded for all my pains.

I have hopes, that by the struggle, we may gain a Republican Government, which is the only one that can be considered naturally good and perfect.

TO MR. CARLILE.

DEAR SIR,

THE right of free discussion upon *every subject* whatever—or in other words, the right of publishing our opinions upon every matter or occasion, is a subject which has occasionally occupied my attention for now upwards of forty years. Upon this subject I believe there is not much difference in our way of thinking. But I absolutely deny what I think I have seen you admit, that any Jury whatever has a right to take cognizance of, much less to decide upon the rectitude and propriety of *opinions* altogether. A jury may say what *their* opinion is upon any speculative question or subject, though this would be extra-judicial and imperti-

nent: but such opinion, if it did not convince me that my judgment was erroneous, could not be expected to make any change in my views as to such question or subject, and ought not to be followed by any other consequences. The folly and injustice of twelve men deciding on the quality of an opinion upon any subject whatever will be easily illustrated. Suppose an able defence of Christianity was arraigned as a libel, and the author brought before an English jury—he would be soon and honourably acquitted. Let the same defence and the same author be tried by a jury of Mahometans at Constantinople, and he would be punished with death. In like manner, let a Deist or Republican be tried for the publication of his opinions by a jury of twelve priest-ridden and passive-obedience fellows, and what chance would he have of either justice or fair play? In all this sort of cases, if trials must be had, surely the same mode of proceeding should be adopted which is employed in the case of foreigners when accused of and tried for crimes, viz. the jury should be one-half foreigners, Deists, or Republicans, as the case may be. But you may be *compelled* to go before a jury for the publication of your opinions, and as this will probably be the case soon, I wish very much to assist you in your defence.

In shaping this the most advantageously for you, I will endeavour to submit my notions in the way of aphorisms; and the text, or touch-stone, by which every axiom, whether pro or con, shall be tried, is one which every body admits to be true, and which I never met with one person who had the impudence to deny, viz. "That as you wish that every one should do unto yourself, so ought you to do unto them."

Having premised this, I go on to say, that the right of thinking is given by his Maker to every human being, and cannot be taken from him by any power under heaven. But as this right of thinking would be of no value without the right and power of speaking, the two must be considered as forming one right only.

This right must, of course, belong to all human beings equally, for either every man has this right or no man has it. This right, too, is retained, and can never be surrendered, under every form of Government, and under all circumstances in which man can be placed, whether in a state of nature or in a state of society. To suppose the contrary would lead to every thing absurd, an Act of Parliament is passed, which the persons enacting it consider as proper at the time. In a while some of its provisions are felt, and found to operate injuriously: and how is a repeal to be accomplished, if those who see and feel this injurious operation were not at liberty to point out the defects and mischievous tendency of such provisions, and to suggest a remedy? Besides, where is the man of any party who does not act, yes, really act upon this principle? Again; there is no man who can hold an opinion which he believes to be *wrong*. He *must* believe it to be right; and believing it to be *right*, he must believe it to be *useful;* and be-

eving it to be right and useful, it *becomes his duty* to propagate and maintain it. And can it possibly be right, that a man should be punished or punishable for doing that which he conscientiously feels it to be his duty to do? Can any man feel it right or desire to be punished for the maintenance of an opinion, the establishment of which he thinks would be beneficial to himself and to society at large? Impossible. And how, then, can he feel it right to punish or persecute any other person who may be acting under a similar influence—with the same views and from the same motives? And is it in the nineteenth century that these questions require to be asked?

It would be easy to shew that opinions, merely as such, never can prove injurious to any society or government legitimately constituted: that numbers cannot alter the nature of things; that majorities cannot make black white, or white black; and that as to matters of opinion purely, they have no right to interfere at all. But I have not leisure to enlarge upon the subject much more at present. The great mistake seems to be committed by those who are called our legislators not well understanding the science of legislation. They are a great deal too officious. Instead of confining their attention to matters of *general concernment*, they are frequently nibbling at those rights which individuals do not surrender when entering into society, and with which even society itself has no right to intermeddle. A legislature for instance, would have as much right to say whether I shall have tea or coffee to my breakfast,—whether I shall wear woollen or cotton hose, as it has to say how I shall worship my Creator, or what I shall or shall not believe. In short if a Jury or a legislature do not think as I do upon any given subject, we should agree to differ. These gentlemen, claim and exercise the right of thinking individually for themselves; and surely they cannot think it right to punish or to censure me for exercising the same privilege. Would this be doing by me as they would wish to be done unto? In fact, I know of no opinion, excepting one which can be deemed seditious; and even this, supposing a Government to be fairly and legitimately constituted, I think we might safely treat with silence and contempt. When a nation is fairly and fully called upon to exercise its sovereignty in the formation of a government and when the general will has been fairly and fully ascertained upon the important subject, I should hold it to be very culpable for any individual to assert that such general will ought not to decide, or ought not to meet *practically* with *universal* support. There can be no society or association for any purpose where the *few* will not consent to be governed by the *many* in all matters of general concernment. Yet, while I thus claim the practical support of every individual in all *measures* of general concernment and which have been previously determined upon by the general will; I still hold every individual to be at liberty to urge any argument or opinion which he may think it necessary to bring forward in opposition to any

measure which he shall disapprove of, as injurious or improper. But I must here conclude.

Most sincerely wishing you a glorious victory upon your approaching trial, and a safe deliverance from those hypocritical scoundrels ycleped the "Vice Society."

I remain, dear Sir,

Ashton-under-line, near Manchester, October 3, 1819. Your sincere friend, JAMES OGDEN, Surgeon

---

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

I SHOULD not have troubled you at this period, did I not conceive that a few observations in answer to Mr. Cousins, are called for from me. Now I beg to put this question, to every reader of this letter, to which he alludes, *Do you consider that the meaning of the words, "those blessings which nature intended equally for all her sons" conveys the slightest allusion to landed, or any other property?* I am convinced that without torture, they only carry with them an idea of universal, civil, and religious liberty; and the free enjoyment of the produce of labour, exempt from the claims of a *corrupt* government, and a *national* clergy. This I can assure Mr. C. and all your readers, was my meaning; and I wish other men, would like him honestly come forward, and call for explanation whenever any thing like ambiguity appears in the conduct, or statements of the reformers. That seems to me the best method by which our views and intentions may be better known: for as the more able friends to reform, from certain causes are deterred from becoming the more prominent in the cause, it is left to those who, with honest and pure motives, are nevertheless less capable perhaps, of expounding and proposing their sentiments. I am inclined to think, that Mr. C. is a person of landed property, and I am sure we shall hail his accession to our cause, with great satisfaction; and pledge ourselves that private property, under all circumstances, must be held sacred in "that spirit of universal justice, which we boast as our anchor." I hope, and trust, that Mr. C., myself, and all we Reformers, have the same end in view; and the method he has chosen of promoting unanimity, is the only one calculated to succeed, and bring us to the possession of our object, "Political and Religious Equality."

Justice is what the Reformers want. Justice is what they are entitled to, and Justice they will have, for when men are acquainted with their natural rights, when they see that we are all subject to the same passions; it is morally impossible, that they can suffer a power, founded only on fraud, and injustice, to usurp their best blessings, and deprive them of what is peculiarly their own.

"The fever throbbing in the tyrant's veins
In quick strong language, tells the daring wretch
That he is mortal, like the poorest slave
Who wears his chain,"----------

I have already endeavoured to shew the injustice, mischief, and danger, necessarily attendant on church government, and hereditary privilege; and I feel certain that reform in our representation will alone remove their evils. All our grievances may be traced to the want of that reform. The want of reform, to the progress of abuse, and the progress of abuse, to some defect in our constitution in not preventing it. Here then is the matter brought to issue, and it only remains to decide in what part this defect lies. It must be certain it cannot rest with the People themselves, for they have at no period since the conquest, and introduction of feudal law, had their full share in the legislature of their country. They have only partially succeeded, in the attempts made by them, from that period down to the revolution of 1688, to regain the freedom of their Saxon ancestors. Perhaps at the time of the revolution, the three branches of our constitution, had more nearly equalized their moral and physical power, than at any former period, but since that, the knowledge of the People has so rapidly advanced, and its progress has been so great, as would have left the best monarchical government, that could possibly exist, far, very far behind. Instead of considering how to remedy this *evil*, by an advance as nearly equal on their own parts, they impolitically have been attempting to oppose and suppress, all efforts to enlighten the People. But all *their* efforts have been vain. Knowledge has triumphantly overcome all the obstacles that despotism could interpose; and has now reached an eminence, that affords a clear prospect of the intricate maze from which the People have begun to emerge, and displays to their minds, the land of milk and honey, so long the object of their hopes. The disseminating rays of literature, have at length penetrated the dark recesses of obscurity, and cast its flame of elucidation, on the errors of former times.

The framers of our constitution, saw that as all the physical or *real* power was on the part of the People, it would only be possible to balance it by conferring a corresponding weight of moral or *fictitious* power on the other branches. It was necessary that a very particular respect should be impressed on the minds of the People, with regard to the moral power, with which the executive and lords, were invested; and to have continued the three powers in the equal balance in which they thus appeared, it would have been necessary that the People should be continually kept in that ignorance, in which they then were: for if once by the light afforded by general knowledge, they could discover through the flimsy veil, in which these *moral rights* were wrapped, the discovery would necessarily prove fatal to the existence of those rights. Information did, however, spread rapidly, in spite of the *indirect* efforts by governments to prevent it. And to meet the power which knowledge thus

gave the People, the successive governments of this country, have so progressively encroached on our constitution, (that very constitution on which they depend, and which gave them existence) as to leave but little of it to us.

The period seems now to have arrived, when we shall sink into a military despotism, or rise to liberty immortal. If the former, our evils will, like a body of combustibles, be only more compressed, to take a wider range when they do explode. The moment will come, when grievances will be redressed by force; and utter destruction will be the probable consequence of withholding our rights from us. Every thing that then presents abuse, or needs reform, will meet *ample* attention. If we have now ceased to be politically free, a nation accustomed to freedom, must soon prove that a general sense of oppression, is not to be dissipated by force. The embers of former liberty, though shaded by tyranny, will shed a horrid glare on the enormities of that tyranny, and at some seasonable opportunity, impulsively burst forth, with all its consequent terrors. When Britons are thus driven to extremes, they may perhaps perceive that *some* of their institutions, are incapable of keeping pace with the wisdom of the People. They have long shewn themselves too slow, conscious perhaps, that every step weakens their moral power. These institutions may probably fall on the same principle, that destroyed the feudal system: and a government may yet be established, which being a government of the People, and the People only, will ever advance with them, unclogged with the prejudices of former times.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

J. A. PARRY.

Speldhurst Street.

WINDSOR POLITICS.

Lines composed on the occasion of His Royal Highness the Prince Regent being seen standing betwixt the coffins of Henry VIII., and Charles I., in the Royal Vault at Windsor.

Famed for contemptuous breach of sacred ties,
By headless Charles, see heartless Henry lies:
Between them stands another scepter'd *thing*,
It moves,—it reigns,—in all but name—a *King*;
Charles to his People—Henry to his wife,
In him the double tyrant starts to life;
Justice and death have mixed their dust in vain,
The royal vampires start to breathe again;
How shall we trust to tombs? Since these disgorge
The blood and dust of both—to mould a George.

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

The Republican.

No. 10. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Oct. 29, 1819. [Price. 2d.

A LETTER TO SIR ROBERT GIFFORD,

His Majesty's Attorney-General,

On the Mock Trial of the Editor in the Court of King's Bench on the 12th, 13th, and 14th of October.

King's Bench Prison, October 27, 1819.

Sir,

In addressing you in your official character as Attorney-General of England, I shall be under the necessity in this letter of bringing forward many instances of private conduct and character, which under any other circumstances than those in which I stand related to you, might fairly be considered neither generous nor manly. But when a man who has been the avowed advocate of Deistical opinions, and the most extended Political liberty, even to Republicanism—when such has been the open and determined avowal of such opinions, that others, meaning equally as well, and approaching near to those opinions, are compelled to shun him as violent in disposition, and in the necessary proposed measures to attain the object in view, I say when such a man as this can sacrifice his favourite, and sternly defended opinions to the shrine of Despotism and Corruption, for the paltry emolument of the moment, and acquiesce in all, and become the instrument in every act of oppression and persecution emanating from Despotism and Corruption, even to a profession of acting *conscientiously* in the discharge of what he calls a duty. I say, when we find such a man as this, we hesitate not to pronounce him an apostate to his faith, a renegade to principle, a traitor to his former conviction of truth, a dissembler in practice, and a hypocrite in reality, "possessing only a base desire for filthy lucre." Such a man is *Sir Robert Gifford, Knt. His Sacred Majesty's Attorney-General!* The consequent to to this assertion should be a narrative of corroborating circumstances: to this I shall now proceed.

I ventured and repeated the assertion during my *mock trial*, that you, Sir Robert, had openly avowed yourself a

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

Deist prior to your elevation as a Law-Officer of the Crown. I say a Deist, because the Unitarian, as opposed to the Trinitarian, is a Deist, believing in one God, in opposition to those who believe in three Gods or more, for it is vain for the Trinitarian to speak of his triune God, or, as Bishop Patrick attempted to convince his hearers of this doctrine, by exhibiting to their view a blade of three-leafed grass, when in the next breath they represent God the Son sitting at the right hand of God the Father, on a distinct throne, and God the Holy Ghost waiting to dispatch their orders and messages, or to fill with the Holy Spirit such of the human race as the whims and caprice of God the Father and God the Son might suggest. I am aware, Sir Robert, that these expressions will shock the minds of the unreflecting Trinitarians, and make them exclaim, "A horrid blasphemy!" but I, the writer, and you, the person addressed, being believers in one God only, can smile at such absurdities, however offensive they may be to the minds of others.

I think, Sir Robert, it must be admitted, that a Unitarian is a Deist, in the same sense as the followers of Confucius are Deists; and taking this for granted, and that you are a Deist, though now hypocritically disguised, which I think I can make plainly appear from the following circumstances:

First, That during your residence in Exeter, you, with all your family, were regular attendants at the Unitarian Chapel, in Southgate Street, and that you supported it by your subscription.

Secondly, That it was at the moment you were elevated to the Solicitor-Generalship, that you quitted the Unitarians in London and sent your family to the Established Church.

Thirdly, That you actually continued your annual subscription to the Unitarian Charity School in Exeter, and that it was since your appointment to the Attorney-Generalship that you sent £20 to that institution, requesting the Secretary to erase your name as an annual subscriber.

The last, And I expect to you the most impressive circumstance, is, that you paid your addresses to a young lady of fortune, and that the only objection to you on the part of the lady's friends was that you held deistical opinions or opinions in opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity.

A gentleman from the West of England, offered to attest this fact as evidence in the Court, had my defence not been interrupted and suppressed by a coalition. A gentleman, that was and is quite a stranger to me, but who is willing to prove the assertion should it ever become necessary.

It was from a knowledge of these circumstances that induced me to say, "that whatever might be the professions of the Attorney-General, I might give the hand of fellowship to Sir Robert Gifford." It was this expression that drew from you the affected assertion, "that you did not know whether the Defendant merited your contempt or your pity, but that you felt disposed to grant him your pity." That Defendant neither values your contempt, nor wishes for your pity; he is impressed with gratitude for the benefit he has received, and the importance you and your predecessor Sir Samuel Shepherd have elevated him to; an elevation from which he smiles at you, and dares your grasp to withdraw him.

At present, Sir Robert, I feel myself beyond your reach, and I cannot better elucidate this proposition than by recording an anecdote which happened in the front of my shop in Fleet-street during the last week. A well-dressed man was mixed with the crowd before the window and gave vent to his feelings as follows. "Ah! Paine is now in hell, and Carlile will soon follow him." A shrewder man, but not so well dressed, immediately retorted, "not quite so soon, you will find Carlile like a cabbage, if you take off his head there will be a hundred sprouts from him." As I shall have the pleasure at least of another combat with you in Westminster Hall, I shall abstain from any further observations here, but hope whatever opinions the Attorney-General may find it necessary to assume, that Sir Robert Gifford will again leave that office a Deist, or if you please a Unitarian.

Your's gratefully,
RICHARD CARLILE.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN DR. RUDGE AND MR. CARLILE,

On the Subject of his MOCK TRIALS *and the* HOLY SCRIPTURES.

DR. RUDGE TO MR. CARLILE.

Dr. RUDGE trusts that Mr. Carlile will disapprove neither of the motives by which the present letter has been dictated, nor of the temper in which it has been written.

From the account of the late trial for the re-publication of the "Age of Reason," Mr. Carlile is reported to have said, in the course of his defence, that to the views and sentiments, promulgated in that work, he fully subscribed.

Remote from the mind of Dr. Rudge is the intention of offering the slightest personal offence to any man: and he, therefore, sincerely hopes he shall not be thought to mean any thing disrespectful to Mr. Carlile, if he ventures to ask, whether this is the deliberate conviction of his mind, to which he has been brought by a calm and patient, a deep and conscientious study of the Holy Scriptures, whether he has collated with care, and compared with judgment the different parts and passages of the sacred volume, and whether, in this investigation, which has had truth for its only object, he has at all times consulted the best authorities, and has availed himself of the labours and views which the most enlightened and least prejudiced of the children of men have taken of such subjects, and exercised in such pursuits? What, for instance, has been the result of the cool and dispassionate enquiries of such men as Sir Isaac Newton, Mr. Locke, Sir William Jones, and others of the same order of intellect, of the same mental calibre, and of the same profound and cautious habits of inquiry and reflection? Of these masters in Israel, it is surely no reproach to any man to acknowledge that he was once the scholar—it is putting no restraint upon the natural liberty and free agency of any man to say—"Well: it has been by such men, that I have been taught how to employ my reason, and exercise my judgment—how to reason aright of this, and how to judge well of that subject—how to distinguish right from wrong, and how to separate from truth the dross of falsehood and error."

Before any deliberate opinion be formed and expressed of the Holy Scriptures, the above course should be adopted: and unless it has been observed, in an amiable temper of mind, and with a disposition only to investigate and attain the truth, as it is in God, and in the revelation of his word, the competency of any man to be a judge of such matters, may fairly and honestly be questioned. Dr. Rudge hopes, therefore, that he may, without offence, submit these suggestions to Mr. Carlile's calm and private consideration, and offer this advice, that with the temper and disposition to which Dr. Rudge has above alluded, he would sit down and read Dr.

Lardner's great work, "the Credibility of the Gospel History," and also Dr. Paley's "Evidences of Christianity," works, which Dr. Rudge more particularly recommends as having more perhaps than any other theological publications he has read in the course of his studies, produced conviction in his mind, and faith "in the truth as it is in Jesus."

Limehouse, Oct. 18, 1819.

R. CARLILE TO DR. RUDGE.

R. CARLILE begs to assure Dr. Rudge that he approves both of the motive and the temper of his letter as far as its internal evidence speaks.

Agreeable to the report of his *interrupted defence*, he hesitates not to say that he fully subscribes to the views and sentiments promulgated in the Theological Works of Mr. Paine, with the exception he made in the course of his *mock trial*, namely, his dissent from "Paine's Private Thoughts on a Future State."

In answer to the inquiry of Dr. Rudge whether this is the deliberate conviction of his mind after a calm and patient, a deep and conscientious study of the *Holy Scriptures*, after a careful and judicious comparison of different parts and passages of the *sacred volume*, and after consulting the best authorities such as Sir Isaac Newton, Locke, and Sir William Jones, he begs to assure Dr. Rudge with all the sincerity with which man can commune with his fellow, that his conviction is the result—first, of a calm and conscientious examination of the book alluded to, with a comparison of all its supposed bearings and connections;—and secondly of a consultation of all those authorities which Dr. Rudge allege to be as many proofs of the contrary. When he enquires after the writings of Sir Isaac Newton, and finds that those which were the productions of the most vigorous part of his life were purely deistical, and actually kept from the public view at the Earl of Portsmouth's house, and are not to be seen without the consent of the Bishop of London, a guardian to the Earl in consequence of his imbecility, he cannot be content to take as the real sentiments of Sir Isaac Newton, the few observations and essays he made to explain that which is called prophecy and revelation in the book called the Bible, at a time when his faculties might fairly be presumed to have been impaired. Again, when he finds that Locke was actually expelled from the University of Oxford for his Anti-Christian principles and tenets, he cannot consent to consider Locke as a genuine authority in defence of Christianity, merely because in a few instances he spoke favourably of its moral effect and influence on mankind, perhaps to conciliate some friend, and to lessen the calumny and prejudice which we know to have existed against him, equal even to that that has been attempted to be raised against R. Carlile himself.

R. C. has been informed that the statute the 9th and 10th of Wil-

liam and Mary, entitled "An act for the more effectually suppressing Blasphemy and Prophaneness," was actually aimed at Locke, and intended to put a stop to the progress and effect of his writings, which he thinks, with the exception before made, were strictly and purely of a Deistical tendency. With respect to Sir William Jones, R. Carlile is not aware of any other authority or defence of the Bible and Christian religion he has left us, save the manuscript sentence left in the leaf of his own Bible, which he believes to have been to this effect—that independent of its divinity, it contained a code of morals of the purest nature and not to be exceeded in any other work. R. Carlile agrees with Sir William Jones so far, but when it is insisted on as a Revelation from God, and the voice of God speaking to man, R. Carlile has, as well as the moral, examined the immoral part, and finds it inconsistent with his ideas of the Deity. R. Carlile presumes he need not quote any passages to support this opinion, but is inclined to think that Dr. Rudge will not deny that there are any immoral parts in the book. R. Carlile has never read either Dr. Lardner's Credibility of the Gospel History, nor Dr. Paley's Evidences of Christianity, neither has Dr. Rudge intimated to R. Carlile whether he has ever read the Theological Writings of Paine. He therefore begs Dr. Rudge to favour him with the acceptance of a copy, and also, if agreeable, in return with the loan of those two Evidences of Christianity, as from the peculiar situation of R. Carlile, and the expence he has been exposed to, he cannot afford to purchase them. R. Carlile pledges the strictest care and integrity in returning them, and would wish an interchange of opinion, Dr. Rudge on the Works of Paine, and R. Carlile on the Evidences of Christianity, at any given period. R. Carlile hopes that should an interchange of opinions on the hostile works be consented to on the part of Dr. Rudge, that the mere sonorous expressions of "Holy Scriptures," "Sacred Volume,"—"Masters in Israel,"—"The truth, as it is in God and in the Revelation of his Word,"—"and faith in the truth, as it is in Jesus" are not to be taken or given as admissions as necessary to "separate from truth the dross of falsehood and errors" in the light in which Dr. Rudge has addressed his

Humble Servant,
R. CARLILE.

King's Bench Prison,
Wednesday Evening, Oct. 20, 1819.

P. S. R. C. had closed his answer to Dr. Rudge last evening, and considered all the queries satisfactorily answered, but on reading the *Morning Chronicle* of this morning, he finds a letter, which he considers to be a case in point, on which R. C. wishes to make a few observations, although he fears they will lead him into much more matter of dispute than was first intended to have been introduced in this answer, R. C. having much on his mind at this moment, which he is anxious to give vent to, and trusts to

the patience of Dr. Rudge to read and judge of it. The letter alluded to is addressed to the Editor, and signed R. J. and refers to the opinions of Sir William Jones as relates to the Bible and the person of Jesus. Sir William is, by an extract from his *Life and Letters*, (mark, Sir, his *Life and Letters* which, at least, are but second-hand to us) made to say, "I, who cannot help believing the divinity of the Messiah, from the undisputed antiquity and manifest completion of many prophecies, especially those of Isaiah, in the only person recorded by history, to whom they are applicable, am obliged, of course, to believe the sanctity of the venerable books, to which that sacred person refers as genuine: but it is not the truth of our national religion, as such, that I have at heart—it is truth itself."

What must be the importance of a book, of which it may be truly said, "If the book is not true, the religion which we profess is false!"

"No person in the history of the Jews, before or after Jesus, coincides with their account, except Jesus: therefore, Jesus was the subject of their writings, which are consequently inspired, and he a person of an extraordinary nature—he is the Messiah. If this be just reasoning, we may believe his miracles, and must obey his law." R. C. will not here attempt, by references or quotations, to refute the first and third paragraphs, but would refer Dr. Rudge to the Third Part of the Age of Reason, where it has an ample and complete refutation, and where he thinks Dr. Rudge will find that the reasoning attributed to, but which R. C. cannot believe to be Sir William Jones's, (when he knows how easy it is for a dishonest Editor to interpolate) is not just, and consequently we are not called on to believe the miracles, or to obey any other law than that which is consistent with the law of Nature, as verified in the moral welfare of mankind.

With respect to the second paragraph, R. C. is impressed with the importance of the book called the Bible, in its too general acceptation, but strip it of its veil of mystery, and its imaginary divinity, and the greater portion of that book, when read as another book is read, will be found to merit only the contempt of mankind. Admitting that the three paragraphs quoted as above to have been the sentiments of Sir William Jones (which, under my admiration of the general character of that great man, I cannot believe to be his) the assertion is very weak, the reasoning the most lame and inconclusive that R. C. ever met with, and were evidently (if true) the production of an impaired mind. If a further proof of this assertion be necessary, we have it in another paragraph, quoted from the same publication, namely, his *Life and Letters*, which, R.C. presumes were edited after his death, it as follows:—"If difficulties occur, and we are asked, 'How can they be solved?' we may safely say, 'We do not know,' yet we may truly be, and justly called Christians." Shade of Sir William Jones! could such sophistry and delusion as this have ever contaminated that lustre which was wont to accompany thy name and

writings? No! I will not give credence to it—it must have been the sentiment of some dishonest Editor palmed on thy mind, as a stain to thy undeviating brilliance and rectitude.

But R. C. wishes to set aside all fiction and imagination, and to reason on the known and generally admitted talents and principles of Sir Wm. Jones. He was the perfect mind, his political principles were opposed to the existing Government because he saw it founded in error and wickedness. That Government could not endure the attacks of so virtuous an opponent, and some means must be taken to get rid of them. Sir William was appointed (through fear and not through love) to the Chief Justiceship of one of the provinces in the East Indies; here a field was pointed out to him for research into the history and antiquity of that people; here that compound of all that was great and good, was absorbed in contemplating a mass of absurdity, and the benefits which his native country might have derived from his talents and integrity at home, were destroyed by the subtle influence of a wicked and corrupt Government. Accompanying this is the 9th No. of the Republican containing a Letter to Sir Charles Abbot, and to which only does R. C. wish to call Dr. Rudge's attention, as a fair exposition of the late conflict, the present situation of R. C., and the question at issue.

Thursday, Oct. 21, 1819.

DR. RUDGE TO R. CARLILE.

Dr. Rudge has sent his servant with Dr. Paley's "View of the Evidences of Christianity." He would have been as happy to have forwarded, at the same time, Dr. Lardner's "Credibility of the Gospel History," but he laments to say that it is a Work with which his library is not at present enriched. The copy of his works, which he read, belonged to the library of the College in Oxford, of which he was formerly a member; and beyond the voluminous extracts which he made at the time, he has none of the Doctor's works in his possession. Frequent references will be found in the "Evidences," which are in fact but an abstract and compilation from Dr. Lardner's great work, but rendered infinitely interesting, attractive, and original, even by the mode in which it has been done. Dr. Lardner's works comprise eleven or twelve octavo volumes, and are very expensive.

Dr. Rudge, in soliciting Mr. Carlile's attention to Dr. Paley's "View of the Evidences of Christianity," is actuated by the purest motives by which the conduct of one fellow-creature towards another can be influenced. He observes, that if truth be proposed as the only object of this investigation, and any pursuit without that object must be vain and worthless. The mind should be free and unbiassed, and Mr. Carlile should sit down to the inquiry with the temper and disposition suggested in Dr. Rudge's former letter: otherwise no good result, so far at least, as the interests of truth are concerned, can be expected. Now it is proba-

ble that some prejudices may have been imbibed; as indeed where is the individual without them? Dr. Rudge earnestly hopes, therefore, that they may be wholly removed, in this instance; and that the "Evidences" may be read and considered with a mind, not one avenue to which is closed against conviction by pre-conceived opinions, or past modes and habits of thinking. When thoroughly weighed and examined, Dr. Rudge will thank Mr. Carlile to return the two volumes, as they were given by a valued friend, and form part of a set of Dr. Paley's works.

One great source of prejudice, by which Dr. Rudge conceives that the free investigation of truth has been impeded, has arisen from some objectionable passages to be found in parts of the Scripture, particularly of the Old Testament, from which this inference has been drawn, that, because these *parts*, which refer especially to the history and abominations of the Jews, are exceptionable and offensive, in their record to decency and good morals, the *whole*, therefore, should be rejected as the Word of God! Now surely this is a very unfair and irrational way of treating the Scriptures, and would not be tolerated in the discussion of any other point, and the examination and adjustment of any other subject. Is Dr. Rudge's mind to be less sensible of the light and beauty of the sun, because some specks have been discovered in that glorious luminary? or, is he, therefore, to infer that, because they exist, it is not the workmanship of his God?

With respect to the opinions, said to have been avowed at one time, and contradicted at another, by Sir Isaac Newton and others, they affect not, or ought not to affect the inquiry into the truth of the Scriptures, whether they are, or are not the word of God. They only prove, supposing the account to be correct, the inconsistency, and hypocrisy of these great men; and should operate as a caution against another source of prejudice, from which few are exempt, that which arises from paying too great a deference and respect to the *dicta* of eminent and distinguished men. Man is but man in his best estate, and free, neither in the exercise of his intellect, nor in the conduct of his life, from a strange mixture of greatness, littleness on the one hand, and of rectitude and imbecility on the other.

Dr. Rudge has read the work of which Mr. C. has inclosed a copy, and for which he thanks him; but it is many years since. He is well acquainted with the writings of Deistical authors. The time was when he found reason to follow the course which he recommends Mr. Carlile to pursue. He examined and thought for himself. He read and weighed the objections of the infidel, and the answers of the believer. But, perhaps, more than any thing else, the character of Jesus, and the benevolent object of his mission, brought near to that conclusion, under the comfort and influence of which he is bound at all times to pray, that every one of his fellow creatures, was altogether such as he is in the measure of their faith; and that he evidenced himself to be in the rectitude of his conduct, and the consistency of his life,—a Christian,

Dr. R. has taken the liberty of enclosing a little work he published some time since, in which Mr. Carlile will observe how far his notions extend on the Trinity. A believer in the Mission of Jesus Christ cannot but be a believer in that doctrine, at least in the tenor in which it is there understood. Separated from the ambiguous and mystical terms in which it is obscured, it ceases to be that outrage on the reason of mankind, so often insisted on. Perhaps, after all, nothing could be more unhappy than the selection of the term, and which has engendered more strife than the doctrine itself. There is *one* God, his Son and prophet Jesus Christ, and the power of both dwelling in the hearts of the good, the spirit—this is the only creed of the rational and wise, the Trinity in which they believe.

Limehouse, Oct. 25, 1819.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

THERE are many people that suppose themselves Christians, merely by reading the Bible, and not having read any other book, and, through a mistake, have imbibed a prejudice against Deism. They think that a Deist is a monster out of human shape; they think he has no ideas of moral justice; they think a Deist can neither act, speak, nor feel like other men; they consider him an infidel and a character that ought not to be associated with: in short, they think a Deist cannot have a good qualification belonging to him.

If they would read and judge for themselves, and not be guided too much by the artifices of their designing priests, they will find by reading ancient history, that Deism is the most ancient religion.

Those nations which are falsely called heathens and idolaters, were all Deists; there never was a nation in the world that called themselves idolaters or heathens, it is only a name of reproach from the Jewish nations because they differed in their form of worshipping the Deity.

To support the truth of which, I will introduce some quotations from the ancients:—

"The celestial powers serve thee: hell itself is subservient to thee; the universe moves under thy hands; thou treadest Tartarus under thy feet; the stars answer to thy call, the seasons return at thy orders, the elements obey thee."—*Egyptians.*

"Tread in the paths of Justice; adore the sole Master of the universe; he is one; to him all beings owe their existence; he acts in them, and by them, but has never been seen by mortal eyes."—*Verses of Orpheus.*

"I am all that has been, all that is, and all that will be, and no mortal has drawn aside my veil."—*Thebeans.*

"Immortal God, grant us the things thou think we stand in need of, and of which we are not unworthy."

I could quote a great many more from the Chaldeans, Greeks,

&c., but this is sufficient to any candid and rational man to prove that men with such sublime notions could not address themselves to stocks and stones.

Deism is not only the most ancient religion, but it is the most universal at this present time. The vast empire of China, the most accomplished and the most virtuous empire in the world, are all Deists, the population of which is estimated at 333 millions of souls—the same that produced a Confucius, who has given the most sublime ideas of the Almighty which the human mind can conceive, without any pretensions to revelation.

There is not, nor cannot be, a religion, without calling in the aid of Deism. The Turks hold very exalted ideas of the Deity. Mahomet says, God holds his existence of himself, and by whom all others exist, who neither engenders nor is engendered, and to whom there is nothing that bears resemblance through the whole extent of being.

Even the Christian religion has Deism in it, notwithstanding their contempt for Deism. It must be allowed that the Christian religion has more Manism in it than any other, yet theirs is tempered with Deism in spite of all their prejudices.

Deism still goes on further, for the whole world is full of Deism, all nature is Deism, Deism extends itself further than the most sublime imaginations of the human mind can comprehend. Voltaire says the Deity has created millions of worlds, among which there is not one that resembles another, this immense variety is the effects of his immense power; there are not two leaves among the trees of the earth, nor two globes in the unlimited expanse of the Heavens, that are exactly similar, and all we see in this little atom in which we are born, ought to be considered in its proper place, according to the immutable decrees of him who comprehends all.

He also says in another place, God has placed before our eyes that book of truths, which if man would study—the truths he discovers are his own, he nourishes and exalts his soul, he lives in peace, and fears nothing from man.

Paine says that man cannot make principles, he can only discover them. Man cannot invent any thing that is eternal and immutable, and the scientific principles he employs for this purpose must and are of necessity as eternal and immutable as the laws by which the heavenly bodies move.

Thus it is evident that man cannot invent a machine, mill, engine, nor any thing else, without first of all submitting to pure and true Deism.

I dont know what the Christian world may say to this, when they find themselves involuntarily forced into Deism, they no doubt will feel themselves alarmed to think they are obliged to acknowledge what they have so long held in contempt; this shews the necessity of their reading for themselves, to become acquainted with that which they have so long been ignorant of.

Shoreditch. D. SHORT.

P. S. I would recommend the reading of a work of an Ancient History, from the beginning of time, there they will read of the drowning of an army in the sea like the Egyptians; also the sacrifice of a son like Abraham. They will also read of Hermes, whom Christ is a counterpart, and all this they will find was written centuries before Moses. It is not a work of one author, it is a compilation of different authors, not Rollin nor Mavor.

PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAYS ON GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION.—No. II.

Who first taught souls enslaved and realms undone
Th' enormous faith of many made for one?---
'Twas Superstition lent the Tyrant aid;
And gods of conquerors, slaves of subjects made.

ESSAY ON MAN.

In an age like the present, when mankind have made such immense advances in the path of science and philosophy, one is ashamed to see his country disgraced by such scenes of hypocrisy and villainy as those we have been witness to during the last two months. What, in the name of honour or humanity, could have induced Christians to assume such a fiendlike character as that they have exhibited to the world during the trial of Mr. Carlile! a man whose private character none of the dastards dare impeach! Why have they laid aside the mild morality of Jesus, to assume that of Nero or Caligula? Can Christianity support its authority by no other means than fines and imprisonment? Cannot the Bishops enjoy their immense revenues, and permit a few philosophic spirits to communicate their ideas to each other in peace? Cannot the clergy revile and defame Zoroaster, Confucius, Mahomet, &c., without immuring those liberal minds in jails and dungeons who do not choose to be the authors of such calumnies? Cannot they tell the world that it is impossible a Society of Atheists should exist; but that nevertheless the literate, Mandarins, and Emperors of the Chinese, have always been Atheists, and nothing else, ever since the world began; without cutting the man's throat who is not able to assent to a contradiction so absurd? Cannot they make their followers believe that it is the duty of every good Christian to present them with the tenth of all he possesses, though himself, his wife and family, should perish through want; and that if he refuse to comply with their holy desire to possess his property, he and his wife and children will be damned to all eternity? Was the Society for the Suppression of Vice, instituted from motives of piety or policy? Did Jesus Christ recommend or command the institution of such a society? Did he ever counsel his disciples to be meek and gentle so long as they were without power, but to throw off the mask at once when they obtained it,

and to commence the most furious persecutions against every human being who should not be of their opinion ?

Such, however, has been the case. For upwards of forty years the disciples of Jesus, half Jews, half Christians, were so humble or so insignificant, that they were utterly unknown to the world; and no historian prior to the time of Vespasian has deigned to make mention of them. Neither Josephus, nor Philo, have ever written a word about them; (for mankind are now convinced that the passage in Josephus which relates to Jesus is a palpable forgery:)—the reason is plain. None of the primitive Christians were remarkable for genius, riches, or power; the sect was formed of the dregs of the Jewish people; and speaking the same language, abstaining from the same meats, and frequently circumcised like them, they were constantly mistaken by the Romans for Jews. In fact, it is not to be wondered at, that the Romans in all the pride which conquest and glory inspires, should neglect to make themselves acquainted with the history or tenets of a sect, which took its rise among the rabble in one of the most obscure corners of their empire. Indeed, had they been so inclined, it was no easy task to discover what the tenets of the Christians were at the early period I am speaking of. Gnostics, Ebionites, Marcionites, Carpocrations, Valentinians, Cainites, &c. already divided the infant church, and reviled, libelled, lampooned, and anathematized each other with all the charity in the world.

But still they kept their hands from each other; and a seasonable persecution from the Emperors tended to unite the heterogeneous members of this divine religion. Not that we believe in half the persecutions the church has pretended to sustain, nor in half the number of martyrs which are said to have suffered for the faith. The good fathers of those days indulged themselves with romancing a little at times, when it suited their purposes, that is, when they wanted to impress their hearers or readers with a due horror for the established religion of the State; for you are to observe, that the primitive Christians constantly declaimed against the established religion of the country, till they had roused the indignation of the tolerant Pagans; and then charged the Emperors with cruelty and oppression.

This conduct of theirs sometimes drew upon them a real persecution; and there is no doubt but some of the more furious of their demagogues were hanged as an edifying example for the rest. But we do not once read of a Christian's being persecuted merely as such, that is, for holding those opinions which were *then* thought to constitute Christianity. I say *then*, because the opinions of the church have undergone some changes since the period we are speaking of.

In the year 303, the Emperor Galerius caused the cathedral church of Nicomedia, which the Christians had erected in front of the imperial palace, to be demolished. A Christian, whom we must acknowledge to have been at least imprudent, publicly tore

down the edict of the Emperor. The man was punished as he deserved. A few days afterwards the Emperor's palace was set on fire—the Christians were suspected. Still none of the sect were condemned to death: the edict simply ordered their temples to be destroyed, and that every Christian should be deprived of all civil and military honours.

This, to men who professed to despise all worldly distinctions, was no punishment at all—yet this is the most terrible persecution the church ever sustained. 'Tis true, we read of a Theban legion, which had been transported from Asia into Gaul, in order to suppress a rebellion which had been suppressed a whole year previous to that period, that were cut off to a man in passing the Alps, when their commander is represented to have stood in the utmost need of their services. But this massacre does not exactly agree with the assertion of Eusebius. "The profound peace and liberty which we enjoy," says he, "have caused us to fall into effeminacy and luxury." But the profound ignorance of the Christians, in the ages which succeeded, is sufficient apology for these ridiculous tales—it is no apology for their cruelties.

The moment Constantine, that compound of baseness, barbarity, and hypocrisy, ascended the throne, Christianity was publicly protected. 'Twas then, and then only, that the Christians appeared in their true character. The Pagans, Manicheans, and even their progenitors, the Jews, were persecuted with the most relentless cruelty; and the Roman empire, now become the theatre of theological controversy, exhibited such scenes of bloodshed and ferocity, that one may even doubt whether human nature could be capable of such excesses.

During the existence of the religion of Numa, no philosopher, with the exception of those driven out of Rome by Domitian, was ever persecuted for his opinions. Men always have, and always will entertain strange notions of a religion which must be supported by persecution. They will not be persuaded that it is divine, while its ministers or disciples deprive their fellow citizens of their liberty, because they entertain more worthy notions of the Deity than themselves. They will wish that the world still worshipped Jupiter and Minerva; since while they did so they were tolerant and humane. No bookseller, that we hear of, was ever imprisoned at Athens, or at Rome, for publishing the writings of Plato, or of Cicero; yet those philosophers laughed at the superstition of the People, and ridiculed their Gods. And in England, a country which prides itself upon its liberal notions on religion, where men are told to their faces that they are free, where Christianity and free toleration are daily preached, a bookseller, has been arrested, tried, and condemned to I know not how many years imprisonment, for printing and publishing a work purely philosophical. I hope he will not be assassinated in prison! Superstition has had its martyrs; I fear philosophy is about to be honoured with a few. But, oh! how callous must be the hearts of

those men, who could coolly condemn their fellow citizen to a dungeon, because he is not of the same faith as them! Because he has attempted to emancipate the human mind from the tyranny of opinion, and dared to assert that every citizen ought to judge for himself in matters of faith.

But has Carlile been sacrificed to religious prejudices, or to despotism? Is he the victim of his zeal for philosophy, or for the cause of Freedom? Ought his name to be more dear to the philosopher, or to the patriot? These are questions which admit of some discussion.

If the Society for the Suppression of Vice be not a mass of hypocrites, their motive for prosecuting Carlile must be a religious one; they must wish to put down by force those opinions which they suppose are inimical to Christianity; but this is a tacit confession that they fear to have their religion examined; that they suppose it will not stand the test. But if this society, which seems to merit the appellation of the British Inquisition, be nothing more than the tool of a faction, by which it wishes to crush the free spirit of inquiry, then Carlile may be said to be imprisoned for his patriotism. And it is more than probable, that when the English nation shall attain that liberty, with the shadow of which it has so long been amused, it will gather up the ashes of this patriot, inclose them in an urn of gold, and shed many a tear over the spot where they are laid.

Surely the friends of Freedom will not think these pages which are consecrated to a virtuous and unfortunate individual, unworthy their attention; especially as it is now the "goût" of all the hireling journalists to rail at, and abuse him.

P. S. We do not usually give ourselves the trouble to peruse all the "betises" with which the rabble of scribblers inundate the town; the man who can find no better employment must have an understanding contemptible as their own; but having taken "Bell's Weekly Messenger" into our hand, by mere chance, our attention was attracted by its more than ordinary stupidity and ignorance. In a part of it, which the Editor has ludicrously styled "The Politics of Europe," the Editor has undertaken to defend the Bible, at the expence of humanity and common sense. In the first few lines our pious Editor, instead of entertaining us with "the Politics of Europe," has thought fit to libel Mr. Carlile, and to call him an "ignorant and unhappy man."

After hearing Mr. Bell assert, "that the Bible was written at least 1,200 years before any other book or record," let the reader judge whether he or Mr. Carlile be the most ignorant. Has the pious and learned editor never read of Sanconiathan, the Zendavesta, or the Veidam, more ancient than Moses? or of the Shasta, still more ancient? Does he mean to say that Moses lived 1,200 years before Homer and Orpheus? or, if he really is so ignorant, can he hope to impose upon the good sense of the English nation by such "sottises?" But ignorance is ever presuming.

But let us hear the opinions of the writers of a Public Journal, of a man, too, who presumes to make those opinions public, in the nineteenth century, on the nature of the human soul, and on the relative duties of man. "But let us remember, that we all hold our lives only as the gift of God, and that we have no claim whatever in right to them,—that he made us for his own service and honour, and through those means, for our own ultimate happiness; and that when we abuse these gifts (the gifts of life,) and degrade and brutify (observe the eloquence of the language) the divine image in our bodies (Mr. Editor Bell believes our bodies to be the image of God's body) and souls, our own reason, a thing of the same general nature with the Divine mind itself, teaches us that there is no inconsistency with the attributes of such a Being, that he should cut us off; or, if we use the figurative language of the Holy Scriptures, that he should repent that he had made man, when they had become so abominable in his sight." Let us divest these sentiments of Mr. Editor Bell's eloquence, and see how they will look in plain English. "Let us remember, my dear brethren, "that we did not make curselves; and that if we had never been "born we could not in justice grumble at God for not making us "—he made us for his own honour and service; (and consequently "we are not at all obliged to him) but if nevertheless we dare to "enjoy life in our own way, he will certainly send us to the Devil— "that is, if we brutify our bodies, which are the image of God's "body, and our souls, which are undoubtedly the image of God's "soul. Nay, more than that, my dear brethren, you are to know "that our reason, our own dear reason, (which it is nevertheless "the height of impiety to listen to) is exactly of the same nature "with the Deity itself—(a vile scribbler of the same nature with "God! 'O Tempora, O Mores!') All this premised, still it is no "way inconsistent with the character of the Divine Being, to cut "us off, who are of the same nature with himself, and to be quite "savage with himself that he had made so vile an animal as man!"

If this vile cant is not the height of impiety and ignorance, I am totally unable to comprehend what is. How long will this man continue to tell us that the Bible is the most ancient book in the world by 1.200 years! How long will he declaim about the immortal fruits and flowers of Aaron's rod, which are long since dead! How long will he pester the world with the metamorphosis of an Egyptian Magus's rod into a serpent! We would be obliged to him if he could tell us where he learned to call the Egyptian Conjurors by the name of Magi; and to refrain till he is better acquainted with history, to call such a man as Carlile ignorant.

JULIAN AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN.

Gloucester Street,
Queen Square.

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

The Republican.

No. 11. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Nov. 5, 1819. [Price 2d.

A LETTER

TO

Charles Wood, Abchurch Lane,
Robert Hutchinson, Clements Lane,
John Hanson, Crooked Lane,
George Harvey, Lawrence Lane,
Arthur Chichester Allen, Ironmonger Lane.
John Wilson, Queen Street,
Richard Chambers, Dove Court,
William Parker, John Street,
} Merchants.
Robert Plant, Haberdasher, Portsoken Ward,
George Coutts, Baker, Farringdon Ward Within,
John Triggey, Chair Maker, ditto. ditto. ditto.
Matthew Hollyer, Glazier, ditto. ditto. ditto.

The Jurors who tried the Information filed by His Majesty's Attorney-General, against the Theological Works of Thomas Paine, and who returned as their Verdict—GUILTY.

King's Bench Prison, November 3, 1819.

Gentlemen,

I, as the Defendant in that important *mockery of trial*, feel it a duty I owe to myself and to my country, to make public every thing that comes to my knowledge relating to those proceedings, the result of which I feel satisfied will produce a more lasting impression on the public mind, and more real benefits to mankind in general than any other proceeding that ever occurred in a Court of Law. As you have felt it your duty, or your interest to consign me over to the *tender mercies* of my Persecutors, and as I am quite sensible into what hands I have fallen, I feel justified in seizing this opportunity to make known to the public my reasons for calling you (in a Letter addressed to Chief Justice Abbott) a PREDETERMINED JURY. This is one of the most serious charges that can possibly be brought against

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

twelve men sitting in a Jury box, who have sworn *well and truly to try*, and the whole charge that it became you to try in my case, was whether I had published the Theological Works of Thomas Paine, with a malicious intent, or an intention to injure the morals and welfare of the People of this Country. Whether you did try this question as you had sworn to try, I shall proceed to enquire.

It is no doubt fresh in the memory of each of you, Gentlemen, that I advanced a charge against one of you, as having asserted previous to his coming into the Jury box, that he would vote for giving that *rascal, Carlile*, five years, imprisonment on bread and water; you all affected amazement at the assertion, and I did not understand until I saw it in the papers the next morning, that you called for the name. I mentioned to you that I had just received the communication in the Court, and that if I found it to be a fact it would serve me as a ground to move for a new trial if it became necessary. The individuals who heard the assertion have since been pointed out to me, but I am not yet aware that any of them will stand forward to make an affidavit of the fact, although in shrinking from doing this they make themselves partakers of the crime. As an affidavit of the fact is the only thing under the present circumstances that would be attended to in the Court of King's Bench, and as I cannot yet depend upon the resolution of any one of the individuals who heard the assertion to make the affidavit, I shall proceed to narrate the particulars as they occurred to me during the proceedings of the Mock Trial. The intelligence had reached my friends on Monday the 11th October, that William Parker, of John Street, had in public company asserted that he had never been on a Jury before, but that he was now summoned and should certainly attend for the purpose of convicting Carlile, that he would cut the rascal's ears off, that he would hang him without trial—and several expressions of a similar nature, accompanied with language so disgraceful that I should be sorry to pollute these pages with the repetition of it. Some of these expressions were made at Lloyd's Coffee House. Being in Town but a few hours on Monday, and leaving it before night for my residence at Blackheath, this information did not reach me until the Tuesday morning, and then knowing that it would be of no use to object to Mr. Parker without an affidavit of the fact, I suffered him to be sworn without interruption. Repeated information on the same subject came to hand during the mockery of trial; the first by letter was as follows:

SIR,

I wrote to you yesterday, but as I trusted the delivery of it to one of those emissaries of that prototype of Midas, the Lord Mayor, I am by no means certain you received it; the following are its contents: that an individual sitting in judgment upon you, by name William Parker, of John Street, publicly declared, and that too after he knew he was elected jury-man, "that he would be damned but he would hang that rascal Carlile: at all events, he should vote for a five years' imprisonment on bread and water." With impressions of this kind, added to strong prejudice, can he deliver a just verdict? I sincerely wish you may obtain justice,

and am Sir,

Your's, &c.

Thursday Morning, October 14th, 1819. A FRIEND TO JUSTICE.

The persons who heard Mr. Parker make use of those expressions, with many others, were Thomas Edwards, esq. Coleman-street, —— Lutyens, esq. James Work, esq. Samuel Shaw, esq. Subscriber's to Lloyd's Coffee Room.

The following letter was received at Fleet-street the same day, and if true, is a strong proof that the Gentleman alluded to must have had communication with other persons on the subject of the Mock Trial during the adjournment of the court, in defiance of the law, the recommendation of the Judge, and the sacred character of a Juror.

SIR,

George Coutts, a Baker, in Farringdon Ward, a Juryman on *your* trial, has had the audacity, and I may truly say, villainy, to declare publicly, that if it is possible, he will bring you in "GUILTY." I communicate this to you in order that you may if you think proper, put the question to him in Court, whether he has or has not declared the above.

Wishing you success through your arduous struggle,

I remain,

Your obedient servant,

AN ENEMY TO CORRUPTION AND TYRANNY.

Thursday Morning, Oct. 14th, 1819.

The next piece of information made on the subject was to some friends of mine, who were sitting at the Baptist's Head Coffee House; it was as follows:

Mr. French, Watch Maker, Sweeting's Alley, can prove that Mr. A. C. Allen, previous to Mr. Carlile's trial, made use of expressions of this kind. "Mr. Hunt, Carlile, and others ought to be hung. I wish the Manchester Magistrates had killed 30,000 of the People."

By subsequent information I have learnt that Mr. George Harvey of Lawrence-lane, made a similar expression of his determination to convict, in the shop of Mr. Hickson, Stationer, King-street, Cheapside. I am not much surprised at this, when I find there is a family connection with this gentleman and Sir George Hill, the tool and understrapper of Lord Castlereagh. I have been further informed that Mr. Triggey, chair-maker, made a similar avowal in public company, at the sign of the Three Pigeons, in the neighbourhood of Newgate street. So that it appears out of the twelve gentlemen, five of you had avowed a determination before coming into court, to convict. This, Gentlemen, is a strong proof that the question brought before the court and you as Jurors, was not a question cognizable before any human tribunal, and if you had acted the part and characters of honest men, you would have declared to the court your incompetency to decide. I have not the smallest doubt but that you will live long enough to regret the part you have taken in this business. I have a consolation in the hope that I shall live to see Civil Liberty established on the wreck of the Established Priesthood; they can never exist together, and in the same country. I have no objection to the existence of Christianity, if its existence can be supported by argument, without the aid of the secular arm; nor to the existence of the priests, if they would be content to take that only which their hearers might be pleased to allow them. What I object to is, that we are compelled to subscribe to certain opinions, and in many cases actually compelled, for convenience, to act and speak hypocritically, and that we are compelled to support a set of men in idleness, whose conduct in the aggregate is extremely immoral and reprehensible, and whose opinions or doctrines we condemn as erroneous. That country cannot be called free, where this is the case, and I for one will never cease to use my exertions as an individual, to establish perfect freedom on all points. I am at present under thirty years of age, in good health, and if I do not meet death by the poison cup, the hand of the assassin, or by some more refined, yet more cruel mode of torture, which we know to be practised in some of our *Country Bastilles*, I have no fear of surviving your sentence, Gentlemen, (for all I have to suffer is at your hands) and of meeting you again perhaps on a similar occasion, with an open and undaunted front. I have never regretted but one thing that occurred on my *mock trial*, that is, that I should have paid that deference to twelve men,

several of whom I knew to be predetermined, as to submit to drop my intended defence, because they were weak enough to pronounce it improper, from the influence of a *wily* and *subtle Judge*, goaded by a set of *legal gamblers*, who had every thing at stake, as well as myself, on the result of the trial. Time, that great innovator, will, I have no doubt, find a substitute both for Christianity and the Bible, that is holy according to law; and such is the present rapid declension from those two absurdities, that I doubt not but some of you, who might have acted conscientiously, will live to regret and feel ashamed of the punishment you have inflicted upon him, who rather pities your blindness than condemns your prejudices.

I have now to apply myself to one of your body, who, I think, has acted more inconsistent, and has more to answer for than all the rest; because I think I can make it plainly appear, that he has given as his verdict what was contrary to his conscience, and the evidence adduced before him. The person I allude to is Mr. John Wilson, of Queen Street. This Gentleman, if his open avowal of opinion on matters of religion were consistent with his private feelings, was opposed to at least ten of his fellow Jurors, or should-be Jurors. From the mouth of many Gentlemen who have been intimate and on friendly terms with Mr. Wilson for many years, I have been informed that he holds the same opinions on matters of religion with myself; that he holds the Book called the Bible in the same view—that he left a sick-bed for the purpose of adhering to that opinion as a Juror, and, strange to say, that he was found, in the language of his friend Paine, "neither bold enough to be honest, nor honest enough to be bold." But to proceed further—how can Mr. Wilson reconcile to what he calls his verdict (and what is not improbable will destroy its victim, if not exactly in life, in health and property) his subsequent observations, "that he had no doubt of the sincerity of the heart of Carlile: that he believed him to act from the most conscientious conviction; from a conviction that he (Wilson) believed Carlile would have maintained and defended, if it had led him to the scaffold!!!" What blind fatality could have induced Mr. Wilson thus to have perjured himself by pronouncing me Guilty? Did not his conscience sting him when the officer of the court inquired, "Is the verdict of guilty the verdict of you all?" Did not that internal monitor respond, No? 'Tis done. The victim of your verdict is still happy—nothing can destroy that happiness whilst he

sees his wife and family comfortably provided for, or as comfortable as the separation will admit of. He rejoices in what he has done, and if at liberty to-morrow, would go and do the same thing again. Have you, Gentlemen, acted upon your oaths?—that oath which the Attorney-General endeavoured to impress so strongly on your minds—that oath by which you promised well and truly to try? Has it appeared that at least six of you twelve Gentlemen had any dread of perjury? Did you protect me, the defendant, in my defence, or did you unite with the Court and Law-Officers to deny me a hearing? Did you judge of the law, the Judge's common law, and my statute law? Did you resent that insult to your understandings, as well as violation of the law, when you sent for the statutes to examine, after your retirement, when the law says, " that you as Jurors should hold no communication with any individual until your verdict be agreed on," when, instead of receiving the statutes agreeable to your request, you suffered yourselves to be brought back into Court, and to receive an address of a quarter of an hour from a venal Judge, when the law says, " that you, the Jury, shall judge of the law as well as of the fact?" Have you acted upon your oaths? Have you done your duty as Jurors to the victim of your verdict?

RICHARD CARLILE.

The following Subscriptions have been received towards defraying the Expences incurred by R. Carlile, and as expressive of approbation of his Conduct.

	£.	s.	d.
Alexander and Jane Morrison	10	10	0
Antichristian	5	0	0
A Stranger, (name unknown)	0	5	0
James Wilkinson	1	1	0
S. Smith, an enemy to Religious Persecution	2	2	0
J. Stewart, an enemy to Religious Persecution	1	1	0
Thomas Whitworth, 142, Fetter Lane	1	0	0
Richard Matland, Lynn, Norfolk	1	0	0
J. M'Arthur	0	5	0
John Shipley	0	5	0
Nine Believers in one God only	0	5	6
James and William Sharman, 4, Rhood's Well, Limehouse, Cordwainers	0	5	0
William Clark, Webber Street, Blackfriars Road	0	2	6
William Atersley	0	2	0
William Matthews	0	2	6

Thomas Read, Ironmonger Row, Broker..... 0 5 0
James Tabor, 145, High Holborn, a Believer in one just and true God, and nothing more..... 0 5 0

N. B. The names which have been received as expressive of their approbation are too voluminous for these pages, they will therefore be shortly published in separate sheets as appendages to the Report of the Mock Trials: the sums of money subscribed will also in future be noticed in the same manner.

THE FOLLOWING LETTER ON SUPERSTITION,

Addressed to the People of England, by the Right Hon. William Pitt, (afterwards Earl of Chatham,) the most illustrious Minister of the British Empire, was first printed in the London Journal in 1733; *and is a strong proof of what this Celebrated Man thought of Christianity.*

"Pure Religion and undefiled before God and the Father, is this; to visit the Fatherless and Widows in their afflictions, and to keep one's self unspotted from the World."

GENTLEMEN, whoever takes a view of the World, will find, that what the greatest part of mankind have agreed to call religion, has been only some outward exercise esteemed sufficient to work a reconciliation with God. It has moved them to build temples, flay victims, offer up sacrifices, to fast and feast, to petition and thank, to laugh and cry, to sing and sigh by turns: but it has not yet been found sufficient to induce them to break off an amour, to make restitution of ill-gotten wealth, or to bring the passions and appetites to a reasonable subjection. Differ as much as they may in opinion, concerning what they ought to believe, or after what manner they are to serve God as they call it, yet they all agree in gratifying their appetites. The same passion reigns eternally in all countries and in all ages, Jew and Mahometan, the Christian and the Pagan, the Tartar and the Indian, all kinds of men who differ in almost every thing else, universally agree with regard to their passions: if there be any difference among them it is this, that the more superstitious they are, always the more vicious; and the more they believe, the less they practice. This is a melancholy consideration to a good mind; it is a truth, and certainly above all things, worth our while to enquire into. We will therefore probe the wounds, and search to the bottom; we will lay the axe to the root of the tree, and shew you the true reason why men go on in sinning and repenting, and sinning again through the whole course of their lives; and the reason is, because they have been taught, most wickedly taught, that religion and virtue are two things ab-

solutely distinct; that the deficiency of the one might be supplied by the sufficiency of the other; and that what you want in virtue, you must make up in religion. But this religion, so dishonourable to God, and so pernicious to men, is worse than Atheism, for Atheism, though it takes away one great motive to support virtue in distress, yet it furnishes no man with arguments to be vicious; but superstition, or what the world means by religion, is the greatest possible encouragement to vice, by setting up something as religion, which shall atone and commute for the want of virtue. This is establishing iniquity by a law, the highest law; by authority, the highest authority; that of God himself. We complain of the vices of the world, and of the wickedness of men, without searching into the true cause. It is not because they are wicked by nature, for that is both false and impious; but because, to serve the purposes of their pretended soul savers, they have been carefully taught that they are wicked by nature, and cannot help continuing so. It would have been impossible for men to have been both religious and vicious, had religion been made to consist wherein alone it does consist; and had they been always taught that true religion is the practice of virtue in obedience to the will of God, who presides over all things, and will finally make every man happy who does his duty.

This single opinion in religion, that all things are so well made by the Deity, that virtue is its own reward, and that happiness will ever arise from acting according to the reason of things, or that God, ever wise and good, will provide some extraordinary happiness for those who suffer for virtue's sake, is enough to support a man under all difficulties, to keep him steady to his duty, and to enable him to stand as firm as a rock, amidst all the charms of applause, profit, and honour. But this religion of reason, which all men are capable of, has been neglected and condemned, and another set up, the natural consequences of which have puzzled men's understandings, and debauched their morals, more than all the lewd poets and atheistical philosophers that ever infested the world; for instead of being taught that religion consists in action, or obedience to the eternal moral law of God, we have been most gravely and venerably told that it consists in the belief of certain opinions, which we could form no idea of, or which were contrary to the clear perceptions of our minds, or which had no tendency to make us either wiser or better, or which is much worse, had a manifest tendency to make us wicked and immoral. And this belief, this impious belief arising from imposition on one side, and from want of examination on the other; has been called by the sacred name of religion, whereas real and genuine religion consists in knowledge and obedience. We know there is a God, and we know his will, which is, that we should do all the good we can; and we are assured from his perfections, that we shall find our own good in so doing.

And what would we have more? are we after such enquiry, and

in an age full of liberty, children still? and cannot we be quiet unless we have holy romances, sacred fables, and traditionary tales to amuse us in an idle hour, and to give rest to our souls, when our follies and vices will not suffer us to rest?

You have been taught indeed, that right belief or orthodoxy, will, like charity, cover a multitude of sins; but be not deceived, belief of, or mere assent to the truth of propositions upon evidence is not a virtue, nor unbelief a vice: faith is not a voluntary act, it does not depend upon the will: every man must believe or disbelieve, whether he will or not, according as evidence appears to him. If, therefore, men, however dignified or distinguished, command us to believe, they are guilty of the highest folly and absurdity because it is out of our power, but if they command us to believe, and annex rewards to belief, and severe penalties to unbelief, then are they most wicked and immoral, because they annex rewards and punishments to what is involuntary, and therefore neither rewardable or punishable. It appears then very plainly unreasonable and unjust to command us to believe any doctrine, good or bad, wise or unwise, but, when men command us to believe opinions, which have not only no tendency to promote virtue, but which are allowed to commute or atone for the want of it, then are they arrived at the utmost pitch of impiety, then is their iniquity full; then have they finished the misery, and completed the destruction of poor mortal man, by betraying the interest of virtue, they have undermined and sapped the foundation of all human happiness: and how treacherously and dreadfully have they betrayed it! A gift, well applied, the chattering of some unintelligible sounds called creeds; an unfeigned assent and consent to whatever the church enjoins, religious worship and consecrated feasts; repenting on a death-bed; pardons rightly sued out; and absolution authoritatively given, have done more towards making and continuing men vicious than all the natural passions and infidelity put together, for infidelity can only take away the supernatural rewards of virtue; but these superstitious opinions and practices, have not only turned the scene, and made men lose sight of the natural rewards of it, but have induced them to think, that were there no hereafter, vice would be preferable to virtue, and that they increase in happiness as they increase in wickedness: and this they have been taught in several religious discourses and sermons, delivered by men whose authority was never doubted, particularly by a late Rev. prelate, I mean Bishop Atterbury, in his sermon on these words, "If in this life only be hope, then we are of all men most miserable," where vice and faith ride most lovingly and triumphantly together. But these doctrines of the natural excellency of vice, the efficacy of a right belief, the dignity of atonements and propitiations have, beside depriving us of the native beauty and charms of honesty, and thus cruelly stabbing virtue to the heart, raised and diffused among men a certain unnatural passion, which we shall call religious hatred; a hatred

constant, deep-rooted, and immortal. All other passions rise and fall, die and revive again, but this of religious and pious hatred rises and grows every day stronger upon the mind as we grow more religious, because we hate for God's sake, and for the sake of those poor souls too, who have the misfortune not to believe as we do, and can we in so good a cause hate too much? the more thoroughly we hate, the better we are; and the more mischief we do to the bodies and estates of those Infidels and Hereticks, the more do we shew our love to God. This is religious zeal, and this has been called divinity, but remember the only true divinity is humanity. W. PITT.

TO MR. CARLILE.

DEAR SIR,

No man who values the freedom of the press, or liberty of conscience, can view with indifference the recent endeavours of the creatures of the present corrupt system, to abolish the one, and fetter the other in their proceedings against you, Sir. Indeed it has been the practice of those whose religious or political faith, has been founded upon established principles, however absurd, not only to shrink from the test of truth, and to stigmatize and calumniate all who differ from them with every foul abuse and opprobrious epithet, but to embrace every opportunity of persecuting them "even unto death." "Is not this the carpenter's son?" "Can any good thing come out of Narazeth?" "This man is a blasphemer, and is mad, why hear ye him?" "Crucify him, crucify him," were the cries of the priest, the despot, the bigot, and the interested against that great Reformer of Church and State, whom the very same men worship at the present day as the great Creator of the Universe, that are raising a similar hue and cry against yourself, Sir, for the like conduct. You are represented as a traitor, an infidel, and a blasphemer; and as such have been persecuted and hunted down by the scribes and pharisees of 1819, but like the great Reformer to whom I have above alluded; you stand undaunted, unshaken against all their puny and malignant efforts and their contemptible threats.

"Thou shall love thine enemies." "Thou shalt return blessings for railing." "Thou shalt do good to them that revile and persecute you," are the commands of him upon whom your persecutors profess to believe as the "God of their fathers," and whose precepts they pretend to practise. How far they may be considered to be the sincere followers of their great master and lawgiver, is clearly made known in their conduct toward you, Sir—let it suffice to say that their consummate hypocrisy can only be exceeded by their diabolical malignity. It is somewhat curious that amongst other charges equally absurd, it is said that "the opinions of such men (priests, despots, &c.) are not to be insulted,"

and that "their characters are not to be vilified." With respect to the latter allegation, I have only to ask whether any thing can be a vilification of character that is affirmed of the upholders of the present system? And with respect to the former allegation, I should wish to be informed what is meant by insult offered to opinions. Is it, Sir, daring to differ from these Christian politicians, and to express the reasons of such dissent, or is it the refraining from manifesting the same forbearance towards their *opinions* and *practices* as has been shewn toward their venerable *personages?* But who ever heard of charity for *opinions?* And who would preach such a doctrine but those that believed they stood in need of it? No! If an opinion be submitted for the assent or belief of any individual, let it be fairly discussed, and if it be found too absurd for general admission, let it be exposed to all the contempt and ridicule it merits, however sanctioned by Act of Parliament, or supported by the rich and powerful: but if it be one that tends to enlighten the minds, or to ameliorate the condition of our fellow-men—who but the priest and the despot, will be found to oppose the philanthropic individual who exerts himself for the general weal? It is said that you are "a traitor." Certainly you have spoken most severely against corruption, and have held up those whom you considered to be the cause of the People's calamities, to the just execration and abhorrence of every honourable mind. May England contain millions of such traitors! By the same *respectable* authority you are said to be an *infidel.* This I suppose is because you have conscientiously stated your disbelief in a book that every impartial Christian, as well as every Deist, must admit not only contains what must necessarily implicate the moral attributes of the Deity, but the grossest absurdities, the most horrid blasphemies.

By the same party, Sir, you are also termed a *blasphemer.*

This arises, no doubt, from your opposition to a creed maintained by law, (and which maintains so many in luxurious idleness) abounding in absurdity and the most palpable contradiction.

To shew how far the Deist is deserving the epithets of infidel and blasphemer, so liberally bestowed upon him, I shall select a few passages from the book in which all who are Christians profess to believe as being a divinely inspired revelation.

"Before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me; I, even I, am the Lord, and besides me, there is no Saviour."—"Is there a God besides me? Yea, there is no God; I know not any." The language of the Almighty, and the belief of every Deist.

"Hear O Israel! The Lord our God is ONE Lord," and "Thou shalt have NO OTHER GOD but HIM."—The language of Moses and the belief of every Deist. "Hear O Israel! The Lord our God is ONE Lord," and "HIM only shalt thou serve."—"Why callest thou ME good,* there is none good but ONE, that is God."

* The Greek word of which this is a translation signifies *perfect.*

—" The true worshippers worship the Father ONLY." " For my Father is GREATER than I."—The language of Christ and the belief of every Deist. Who could believe that had heard and read the dogmas of the present day, that the above was Scripture language? But let us proceed a little farther and compare the above with the doctrine and belief of the Trinitarian Christian, for the ridiculing of which you have been termed a blasphemer!!!

" Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith; which faith, except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly. And the Catholic Faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity, neither confounding the persons nor dividing the substance. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty: and yet there are not three Almighties, but one Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and yet there are not three Gods, but one God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son is Lord, and the Holy Ghost is Lord, and yet there are not three Lords but one Lord. For like as we are compelled by CHRISTIAN VERITY to acknowledge EVERY PERSON BY HIMSELF to be GOD and LORD so, so are we forbidden by the CATHOLIC RELIGION to say there be THREE Gods or THREE Lords!!!

" Furthermore it is necessary to everlasting salvation, (and to arrive at the *honours* and emoluments of church and state) to believe *rightly* the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ the SON of God, is GOD and MAN. God of the *substance* of the Father, *begotten* BEFORE the world: and man, of the substance of his mother, born IN the world; PERFECT GOD and PERFECT MAN, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting. Equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching his manhood.

" This is the Catholic Faith, which except a man believe faithfully he cannot be saved!!!"

Such is the language of an African monk, and such is the professed belief of the established priesthood of the present day, but the abomination of every reasonable man and Deist.

" Judge ye, says Christ, even of yourselves, what is right," and one of his apostles says " Prove all things."

The Deist is said to be an infidel although he believes in the existence of one infinite and immutable Being: and a blasphemer, although the name of the Deity is never used or thought on by him, but with feelings of the most heartfelt love, gratitude, and reverence for all the benefits received at his hand. " Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain," is a commandment never coolly and deliberately broken by the Deist. Can as much be said by the Trinitarian Christian? Is the sacred and

awful name of the Triune Deity as hallowed as it ought to be? Is it at all times spoken with reverence, and never but upon proper occasions? What would be said of the Deist were he to call a street or a set of men by the great name of ALMIGHTY GOD? Yet we have a TRINITY COLLEGE, a TRINITY CHURCH, a TRINITY HOUSE, a TRINITY CORPORATION, and a TRINITY LANE!!!

> "Oh! judgment, thou art fled to brutish hearts,
> And men have lost their reason."

Trusting, much injured and respected Sir, that the above will stimulate those who differ from us to a candid examination of what is proposed for their belief, and that it may enable them to perceive that the epithets used towards you by your persecutors, may with more justice be retorted upon them, I subscribe myself

Yours most devotedly

T. WHITWORTH.

142, *Fetter Lane, Fleet Street.*

BIBLE ANECDOTE.

AT the time Bonaparte was at peace with *all* the great powers of Europe, and this country, consequently happily engaged in a just and necessary war with *them all*, one of the Christian Missionaries, (whether of the Parliamentary Established Church, or whether belonging to one of the more pious tribes of the hundred sects of seceders from that holy church I know not), having arrived at China, and obtained an audience of one of the chief Mandarins, requested (after a suitable preface) his acceptance of a very elegantly bound Bible, assuring the Mandarin the study of this book, would not only promote peace and good will, but also produce friendship and brotherly love betwixt the two nations. The honest Mandarin, with a look of ineffable contempt, put back the book with a countenance that almost petrified this pious ambassador from the land of holiness, and with a dignified hue assured this pious vender of holiness, that such a book could be of no use to him or his countrymen, for although it was stated to produce peace and good will, the actual situation of our country, England proved it was of no efficacy or avail there, where war was eternally raging, and when at this moment all the peaceable nations of Europe trading hence were shut out from the ports of China by the British men of war. "No, no," says the Mandarin, "you do not practise, what you say that book inculcates, I am, therefore, satisfied you are *not* to be believed, when you assure us you believe in such a book, and what ignorant blockheads you must take us Chinese to be, to suppose you can make us believe that which by the whole conduct of your lives gives the lie direct to your professions. Go *back* to your own country and tell them to stay at home, and cultivate the *arts of peace* as we do in China, instead of travelling

about conspiring against the peace and happiness of quiet inoffensive nations, who travel not from home as you do, to persuade us to abjure the faith of our forefathers, and instead of which you would inoculate us with the pious and holy principles of those chosen people of the Lord, who are eternally quarrelling, making war upon, and murdering each other." The poor crest-fallen missionary let fall his pious pate, and like Hamlet's ghost, suddenly disappeared with his Holy Bible.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

ON referring to the chapters of the Old and New Testament, stated in your REPUBLICAN of last Friday, I was astonished at the abominable and filthy stories contained in them. Although I have frequently read the Bible and Testament, I was not acquainted with half the indecent tales they contain; as a father, I shall consider it my duty to prevent my children reading a book so full of disgusting and immoral biography. You may, if you please, insert my name in your list as an admirer of your inflexible courage in the cause of Reason and Truth. Had my means been equal to my wishes, I would have accompanied this with a more useful acknowledgment of my approbation of your conduct.

I remain your well-wisher,

WILLIAM AINGER.

56, Banner Square,
Oct. 25, 1819.

A HYMN.

WHILE others sing a Triune God,
Of three in one, and one in three,
In Reason's temple we have trod,
And sing alone a Deity.

We sing the Great Creator's praise,
Who hung the starry worlds on high,
Whose wisdom shines through all his ways,
Whose goodness is for ever nigh.

While others sing a changing God.
And make his love and wrath their theme,
In Reason's temple we have trod,
And sing a God that's e'er the same.

E'en let them sing a dying God,
And to his blood for shelter fly;
In Reason's temple we have trod,
And say, a God could never die.

Yet, when they sing the atoning blood
  Of him who knew himself no sin,
We ask, (though long their faith has stood)
  Could Reason e'er such faith begin?

Though bold fanatics sing aloud
  Of love from God to them alone,
And deal damnation to the crowd;
  A God so partial we disown.

Then list, ye sad unhappy souls,
  With hopes of Heaven—and fears of Hell,
The knell of superstition tolls,
  'Tis Reason tolls her passing knell.

ODE TO REASON.

REASON divine! thou gift of Heaven,
The greatest gift that e'er was given,
In human hearts resume thy throne,
Let all to thee subjection own.
To search for wisdom, be our pride,
And thou! O thou! our only guide;
Aided by thee, our breasts shall burn
With indignation just, and spurn
At all the slavish fearful fools
Of priests, as well as priestly tools;
Nor dread the scepter'd tyrant's frown;
(For tyrants, Reason's sons disown.)
With perseverance strong we'll grow,
And like a river onward flow,
Whose steady course obstructions brave,
Until it meets great Ocean's wave.

For long have priests, devoid of shame,
Abused—nay, spurned thy sacred name,
Their *triple Gods*, these Gods but *one*,
Their *married Virgin* and her son;
How *snakes* could speak, and asses too,
What wond'rous feats some fish could do,
Could swallow *prophets*, and could bring
The *cash* for *taxes* to a King!
How Moses over Egypt's land,
Dispersed the frogs by his command;
How *fleas* and *lice* came at his call,
And plagued Egyptians one and all,
How *coat* and *shoes*, for forty year,
Though always *worn*—did never wear.

How General Joshua *stopt* the sun,
Until his men the battle won.
How gates and bulwarks kissed the ground,
When nought but *horns* and *trumpets* sound.
How *Endor's witch* could raise the *dead*,
And make heroic Saul afraid.
How Babylon's king, with pride so full,
Became at last a *lusty bull!*
And thus for seven long years remained
E'er he again his shape regained;
(What pity Kings of modern days
Could not be sent as long to graze.)
How God bid one go eat his bread,
Bespread with t—d in butter's stead,
But when at this his heart did spurn,
Cow's *dung*, God said, would serve the turn.

Such foolish, childish tales as these,
A barbarous race of men might please,
But sure such tales can never claim
From Reason's sons, of truth the name;
Nor can the philosophic eye
Discern in them aught but a lie.
Though raging priests aloud proclaim,
Damnation, Hell, and endless flame,
To every son of man who dare
But doubt what they solemnly swear;
The God of Nature says not so,
He ne'er can doom a man to woe
For disbelieving, when he's told,
That silver is as yellow's gold;
And sure where common sense prevails,
As foolish are those Bible tales.

Fair Reason needs no aids like these,
Her simple rules are rules of ease.
To view the universe around,
That work of wisdom most profound!
The varying seasons as they go,
The summer's heat—the winter's snow,
These—these the mighty God proclaim,
These cry aloud his mighty name;
These teach us equal love to shew
To wipe the tear of human woe;
To give misfortune quick relief,
To cheer the heart oppress'd with grief:
In short—do every good we can
To all our brethren—fellow-man.

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

The Republican.

No. 12. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Nov. 12, 1819. [Price 2d.

CRISIS.—No. IV.

The preparatory din of war goes on—armed associations are openly avowed—every countenance carries a hostile feature—the crisis must be near. Let us, then, enquire what is the duty at the present moment of those who have resolved to fight in defence of their liberty and laws, their lives and property. When an enemy is at hand, and likely to fall on us, when we know that we have not given that enemy any just cause for commencing hostilities against us, the first act of the honest and courageous mind, would be the means of defence; those prepared, he would say, "The cause for which I am attacked, is an unjust cause, the cause for which I am about to defend myself is just. I will therefore defend myself whilst I have strength, and if I am overpowered, and must fall a victim, I will sell my life as dear as possible, and die the death of the virtuous and the brave." I would anxiously impress this feeling on the minds of my oppressed countrymen, because I really believe that the time is near at hand when they must resolve to act on the defensive. Armed associations are every where entering into; for what? For the avowed purpose of defending things as they are and likely to be. Then a co-operation becomes necessary on the part of every free mind and lover of liberty, to whom I would say, "Go thou, take arms, and learn their use likewise; form yourselves into armed associations; let every meeting to practise be open and previously avowed; there is no law that you will offend by doing this, provided you do nothing in secret." When the volunteer associations took place in this country, in consequence of the threatened invasion, the seventh days, otherwise called Sundays, were well employed in training to the use of arms in bodies, as it is a day when the ordinary occupations are not generally followed in this country; embrace that opportunity, you have no time to mis-spend, you must be on the alert, or your enemies will be beforehand with you; although they are not numerically equal to you, they will endeavour to terrify and disunite you. If you cannot conveniently join those bodies

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

that are likely to be furnished with arms by the Tax-collectors and consumers, if you cannot obtain arms by the subscriptions that are entered into for that purpose, follow the advice of Luke, sell your garment rather than be without a sword, or some other weapon of defence; the time is not far distant when a weapon of defence will be more desirable than the garment. Painful as such a crisis is to contemplate, to prepare for it is a virtue. Criminal as the result of this state of things may be, they are not chargeable on you the People; ye are goaded to desperation and madness by oppression, and now your oppressors have made your burdens intolerable, and have left you almost bloodless, they would finish their career by making you lifeless by military execution. That arch fiend and curse of mankind, Castlereagh, is plotting the same scenes of blood and cruelty in this country, as he lately enjoyed in Ireland; nothing but union, co-operation, and determination on the part of the People to die fighting in their defence, if necessary, can stay his merciless hand. The miseries of their countrymen are a feast to such men as Castlereagh and Canning. They can treat with ribaldry and sarcasm the pangs of hunger, and the pale shiverings of the naked. Their pleasures increase in proportion with the increase of their country's wretchedness.

Public meetings are become more than ever important, they should be determinedly periodical and simultaneous in all parts of the country; those who advise the contrary are guided by an impulse of the fear of their expected attendance, and not from a sense of the impropriety. They attempt to argue that meetings at this moment will afford a pretext to a wicked administration to pursue harsh and *unconstitutional* measures, The administration will pursue those measures without any other pretext or pretence than they have already found. It is more than probable that those measures will be instantly put in force on the meeting of the Boroughmongers' tools, and nothing but a prepared and determined resistance on the part of the People can or will counteract their present avowed intentions. The People must resolve to act instantly and simultaneously the moment they find the attempt to suspend the Habeas Corpus is made, or the abridgement of the present laws relating to public meetings, or the present arrangement with the press is altered. These are the three important things to be looked after. If the People lose the slight privileges they enjoy from those objects at present, they will no longer be a Peo-

ple, but slaves by charter. Virtue and courage are the two requisites on the part of the People; their enemies will goad their mercenaries to desperation by intoxication, misrepresentation, or holding out to them the hope of plunder. A handful of brave and virtuous men have been known to counteract the movements of a large army. Liberty or Death must be the watch-word, and to conquer or die, should be engraven on the mind and heart of every man. Revolutions have frequently taken place, but the object to be gained was never before of half the importance as the present. If the People of this country can shake off the locusts that have eaten their way into the body politic, one of the most sublime eras that the mind of man can contemplate would follow. Such is the extent of political information among all the operative classes in this country, so different is it from any former period, that one of the most pure and correct systems of Government would follow a convulsion, that any society could live under. None but the virtuous and good would continue more than a year in any office, and so much under the controul of the People would be the vicious, that they would shrink from the stimulus of their own passions. Then whilst we have objects of such magnitude in view, they should stimulate us to virtue and to courage. Let us, then, cherish a hope that our affairs are not irretrievable; magnanimity performs wonders—pusillanimity is its own canker-worm. Virtue and bravery have stimulated republicans in all ages—look at the colonies of America aided by "Common Sense," and the "Crisis;"—look at republican France—look at republican Rome—look at republican Greece. Monarchy is the parent of vice, Republicanism of virtue. These are experimental facts, the knowledge of which have been dearly purchased by mankind in general.

That portion of the People of this country who advocate a change in the system of Government, have nothing to fear; their whole conduct should be candid and open; let every preparation be made both in arms and training, but let that preparation be made openly. A civil war is evidently the intention of the Regent and his Ministers; they publicly avow it; they have no hopes of continuing the present oppressive system but by military force and execution, and the *ultima ratio regum* is shortly to be put in practice.

The laws of the country are become a mere dead letter; if an oppressed individual, or one who is obnoxious to the advocates of the present system, appeals to them to resent

an assault or robbery committed on him, he is treated with derision and contempt by those who pretend to sit and administer the laws and justice. There is nothing in reality in the country, neither liberty, property, nor laws. Prepare for the change—prepare for the convulsion that is necessary to produce that change—be prepared for the worst, an attempt to establish in this country a military despotism. We have a Prince, who, though not a soldier himself, is like a child, very fond of gaudy, military trappings, and is so partial to the military habit, as often to wear it when on magisterial duties; the whole of his Court is strictly military, and there is no doubt but his frenzied dreams are military. Then, under such a state of things as this, is it not the duty of every honest citizen to seek weapons of defence, and to learn the use of them?—I say, yes; it is become a duty, and to neglect it will be a crime.

RICHARD CARLILE.

King's Bench Prison,
Nov. 8, 1819.

A Servant Girl, who is happy she escaped the pressing times of King David, as described in the four first verses of the 1st chapter of the 1st book of Kings, those of Solomon, who pressed every female that was fair, and came in his way, and those of Hosea, when the Lord commanded him to choose a wife from amongst the prostitutes of the city, Hosea, chap. i. ii. & iii. prays God save Carlile, and subscribes a Shilling.

The singularity of the above has induced us to give insertion to it in this distinct manner; it was received and valued as that teacher of Deism (Jesus) valued the widow's mite.—Editor.

The receipt of £1. from J. S. of Cambridge is acknowledged.

R. CARLILE TO DR. RUDGE.

King's Bench Prison, Oct. 28, 1819.

R. Carlile acknowledges the receipt of Dr. Paley's "Evidences of Christianity" by the hand of Dr. Rudge's servant, of which he will take particular care, and return them as early as possible. R. Carlile is pleased to find that Dr. Rudge is candid enough to admit that there are parts of the Bible objectionable and offensive to decency and good morals. Dr. Rudge should recollect that it is for the mere publication of such an opinion that R. Carlile is likely to suffer a heavy imprisonment and a fine, which is suggested on one side and threatened on the other, to deprive him of all that

he possesses, save a fond family, and a good conscience. R. Carlile is surprised, that after such an admission as the above, Dr. Rudge can persist in calling it the Word of God, and still more so, when he ventures to liken the objectionable parts of this book to the spots in the sun. God of Nature! what an insult to the reflecting mind, that a scene of debauchery, cruelty, and wickedness contained in a book, the evident work of man without thy aid, should be compared to any portion of thy works, and this too, by one who is distinguished with the title of a Doctor in Divinity!—Be my theme the continued opposition to such sentiments as these. R. Carlile thinks that Dr. Rudge has made the most unfortunate comparison he could have hit upon. R. Carlile is still further surprised, that Dr. Rudge should so soon abandon Sir Isaac Newton and others, as authorities for the Bible being of divine origin, to charge them with "inconsistency and hypocrisy," and to hold-out a caution, that "too much deference should not be paid to the opinions of great men." Dr. Rudge appears, by the conclusion of his last letter, to be still firm in his faith; and R. Carlile assures Dr. Rudge, that he still remains firm in his former belief. R. Carlile has read Dr. Rudge's Address to a Parishioner, and begs to observe, that Dr. Rudge's opinion of the Trinity is far above his comprehension.

DR. RUDGE TO R. CARLILE.

Dr. Rudge presents his compliments to Mr. Carlile, and he has to acknowledge the receipt of his letter of this day.

In continuing this correspondence, Dr. R. has to regret that he was unable to express himself with a clearness sufficient to have prevented the misrepresentation of his meaning, which appears in Mr. Carlile's favour of this day's date.

Dr. Rudge observed upon two prejudices which often proved, in his mind, fatal to the investigation and establisment of truth. One was, that men were oftentimes led, from certain objectionable passages, to denounce the *whole* of the Bible, and reject it as the word of God. He inferred that this was an unfair practice. He continues to think so: but he has found it invariably to be the case in all the conversations he has had with Deists.

Another prejudice to which he referred, was that which arises from taking as law, the dicta of some great man, and attaching an extravagant degree of importance, and infallibility to them. All men are liable to err in matters of judgment and conduct. Mr. Paine as well as all who have written and lived before him. Their opinions and sayings oftentimes tincture the mind with prejudice, and prevent the search of truth. Mr. Carlile had expressed some unfavourable sentiments respecting Sir Isaac Newton, and Mr. Locke; that on one time they had written in favour, and at another in disparagement of the truths of Christianity. Without at all entering into the inquiry, whether this was true or false,

as it respected these great men, but at the same time without abandoning his own opinions which had been formed from an intimate acquaintance with their writings, Dr. R. thought it better to express himself in the manner in which he did, than repeat the suggestions which he offered in his first letter, more especially as there appeared to exist in Mr. C.'s mind a prejudice both against Sir Isaac Newton and Mr. Locke. Dr. R.'s object was, that Mr. Carlile should sit down to the Examination of the "Evidences of Christianity," neither swayed by the opinions, nor prejudiced against the conduct and principles of any man—neither against the principles of Mr. Locke and Sir Isaac, on the one hand, nor by the opinions of Mr. Paine on the other; and he still sincerely hopes that this will be the case.

Dr. R. is neither surprised, nor offended by the latter part of Mr. C.'s letter. He appealed to Mr. Carlile, that he commenced this correspondence in a good spirit, and he shall conduct it with good temper. Dr. R. dislikes controversy of any kind; and should, in these private communications between him and Mr. Carlile any thing drop from his pen of a seemingly harsh or repulsive nature, he hopes he will forgive him. Nothing is farther from his intention.

Limehouse,
October 28, 1819.

Mr. Carlile.

Dr. R. hopes the perusal of the enclosed will not be uninteresting.

R. CARLILE TO DR. RUDGE.

King's Bench Prison, Nov. 5th, 1819.

R. Carlile has to acknowledge the receipt of Dr. Rudge's letter, dated the 28th ult. accompanied with the Memoirs of John Vartie. In respect to the letter, R. Carlile has perused and reperused it, and cannot find a single point to answer, he will therefore close this correspondence, with making a few observations on the Memoir of John Vartie, and Paley's Evidences of Christianity. R. Carlile cannot perceive Dr. Rudge's object in sending him the memoir of the unfortunate Vartie, who alledges he became an infidel from reading novels and other light works. R. Carlile assures Dr. Rudge, that the reading of novels had not made him an infidel to Christianity, for he has invariably objected to any novels being read by any of his family, over whom he has had any controul. Nothing can reflect higher credit on the cause of Deism, than to observe that a true and sincere Deist has never yet been brought to the gallows. Search the Old Bailey Calendars, search all the records of executions under the law, and Dr. Rudge will find that the victims have invariably been Christians. The Christian finds encouragement to vice, because even a death-bed repentance promises him salvation and future happiness. The Deist, who believes in nothing

of this kind, places himself under a continual moral restraint, and regulates well his passions.

With respect to the Evidences of Christianity, by Paley, R. Carlile finds nothing conclusive or satisfactory in them. His preparatory considerations are mere quibbles on Hume's Essay on Miracles, an essay which contains irrefragable proofs of the fallacy of believing in supernatural events or miracles. His five first chapters are attempted arguments in favour of the Christian religion, drawn from the martyrdoms of the early Christians. Martyrdom proves nothing (says Diderot), but that the martyrs are the weakest party. When Constantine made the Christian religion the religion of the state, and when Christianity reared her destructive head, the same firmness and resolution was displayed by those who were martyrs to a dissent from any of its established rules; the same constancy has been displayed by martyrs in all ages, Catholic or Protestant, Christian, Jew, or Pagan. Let Dr. Rudge turn his attention to the superstitious rites and victims paid to Jugernaut and other Deities in the Eastern world: have we not lately heard that the most excruciating tortures have been voluntarily endured by certain devotees, which, in the opinion of R. Carlile, far exceeds the constancy of the martyred Christians, because the former was voluntary, the latter forced? Should the hag Superstition again demand victims of Philosophy and Deism, they will readily be found. R. Carlile has no hesitation in saying, that should that opinion which has lately been charged on him as blasphemy in the next session of parliament be made punishable with the faggot and stake, he would persevere in promulgating them; so strong is his conviction of their truth. In the sixth chapter of Paley's first volume, page 105, is an assertion which has staggered R. Carlile, and has induced him to throw away Paley as a dishonest man, and unworthy of further notice: it is thus.—"*That the original story was miraculous* (alluding to the birth, life, death, and resurrection of Jesus,) *is very fairly also inferred from the miraculous powers which were laid claim to by the Christians of succeeding ages. If the accounts of these miracles be true, it was a continuation of the same powers; if they be false, it was an imitation, I will not say, of what had been wrought, but of what had been reported to have been wrought by those who preceded them. That imitation should follow reality; fiction should be grafted upon truth; that, if miracles were performed at first, miracles should be pretended afterwards, agrees so well with the ordinary course of human affairs, that we can have no great difficulty in believing it. The contrary supposition is very improbable, namely, that miracles should be pretended to by the followers of the apostles and first emissaries of the religion, when none were pretended to, either in their own persons or that of their masters, by those apostles and emissaries themselves.*" This is one of the most sophistical, *petitio principii* modes of reasoning that can be met with, and yet this is a sample of the whole of Paley's Evidences of Christianity.

The argument of Paley is simply this:—rather than disbelieve the miracles said to have been performed by Jesus and his disciples, I would believe all the miracles said to have been performed by Roman and other Christian priests in all ages; or, in other language, he says it is a proof that the first were actually performed, because the latter pretended to them. This may satisfy the credulity of Christians, but not the philosopher and the Deist.

The above paragraph needs no further comment nor exposition; it must strike the dullest capacity, and is a strong proof of the fact of an observation said to have been made by Paley, when told that his conscience could not support certain arguments he had been using, he replied "*that he could not afford to keep a conscience.*" The whole of the first volume is a tedious repetition of similar absurdities, and nothing argues more strongly the total want of evidence to support the dogmas of the Christian religion, than the innumerable volumes that have been written to support it. Was the Christian religion founded on an atom of truth, half a dozen pages would be quite sufficient to display it; it would not need to be defended in such a variety of ways, independent of force and falsehood. Not one demonstrable truth can be brought to support it. Truth needs not the sophistical arguments of a Paley, nor the flowery metaphors of Charles Phillips; simplicity is its handmaid, it has no connection with laboured, false, and abstruse modes of reasoning. Paley has done all that can be done for the Christian religion; he has done all that ingenuity and ability could do for it; he has not convinced any man that is capable of reasoning, and the Christian religion remains what it was before Paley wrote, founded in error, falsehood, and credulity. There are two points on which all controversy of this description should hinge. Has there been a written revelation from God to man or not? Do the human race stand in need of a Savionr and Mediator to intervene between man and his Maker? Of the first question, R. Carlile can find no substantial proofs, but many in contradiction of it: of the second he cannot perceive the necessity, because he believes the Deity to be omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient. Whether Dr. Rudge will consider that R. Carlile has fairly conducted the correspondence, he does not pretend to say; he has done it to the best of his ability, and with the strictest sense of rectitude. The reason R. Carlile has thought proper to publish this correspondence is, that he felt it incumbent on him in his present situation to seize every opportunity of making known to the public his motives and conduct;—he courts the strictest examination, and determines to persevere in the same path he has lately trod, whilst the *merciful Christians*, into whose hands he has fallen, will allow him the use of pen, ink, aud paper, and a free communication with the public. Dr. Rudge, perhaps, will still think that R. Carlile retains the prejudice of human reason. Reason and real conviction can never arise from prejudices, which

Paine beautifully describes as the spider that spins its web on the mind.

Diderot has well described the priestly conflict with reason in the following words. "Bewildered in an immense forest during the night, and having only one small torch for my guide, a stranger approaches and thus addresses me:—'Friend, blow out thy light, if thou wouldst make sure of the right path.'" This stranger was a priest.

TO MR. RICHARD CARLILE.

My Dear Sir,

I hope you will excuse the liberty I take in addressing you. Seeing it was your intention to endeavour to prove in a court of justice the Bible to be a forgery, I could not resist the opportunity of soliciting your attention to the enclosed small volume by Dr. Chalmers, on the subject which has been a means of confirming my own belief of its genuineness—and perhaps may also be of use, to shew you that Christians have at least strong grounds for considering it an inspired volume.

May you yet be led to seek salvation through the merits of that Saviour, so clearly revealed in those Scriptures, you at present reject, but which have been the means of conferring happiness on thousands of our fellow-creatures.

I remain, my dear Sir,
Your sincere well-wisher,
WILLIAM CARLILE.

4, Durham Place East,
Hackney Road.

TO MR. WILLIAM CARLILE.

King's Bench Prison, Oct. 18, 1819.

My Dear Sir,

I have the honour as well as the satisfaction to acknowledge the receipt of a letter, with a volume of Chalmers' Evidences and Authority of the Christian Religion as a Divine Revelation, for which I return you my sincere thanks.

In return, also, I have sent you a copy of Paine's Theological Works, with this pledge, that if you will do justice to your reason, and examine it, I will in return give you my opinion on the Evidences of Chalmers, and shall be most happy to receive yours on the Theological Works of Thomas Paine.

I beg to assure you, that I feel a consolation that raises me superior to all my persecution, arising from a consciousness that the moral welfare of man has been my only object. It appears to me, also, that you are impressed with what I call a similar virtue.

Wishing you a life of health and happiness, and that you may escape the fang of all persecutors on matters of religion,

I subscribe myself,

An affectionate fellow-creature,

RICHARD CARLILE.

Mr. William Carlile.

MR. RICHARD CARLILE.

My Dear Sir,

I had the pleasure of receiving your Letter of the 18th ult., with a copy of Paine's Theological Works—at the same time mentioning that if I gave you my opinion of them, you would in return give yours on Chalmers' Evidences of the Christian Revelation.

In the hope of Chalmers being instrumental to your eternal happiness, I examined Paine's Theological Works. They are the writings of a very able man, and if his works were perused only by humble Christians who were disposed to examine the Bible for themselves, with prayer to God for a spirit of understanding, and compare his writings with it, I should not fear the result; they might then, perhaps, be rather beneficial than otherwise, as they contain the objections not only of himself, but many who were before him; and it is well to have all objections fairly canvassed, that our faith may be more deeply rooted.

But unfortunately his works may pass into the hands of those who will gladly believe them to be true without such examination, and also into the hands of the rising generation, who are not able to judge for themselves, and who imbibing his principles may all their life-time walk in darkness without attaining true holiness, but subject to the power of an evil spirit; for although Mr. Paine may hold Satan in derision, his influence over our minds is very powerful, and may easily be known by any one who can examine his own heart.

I do not say they may not also fall into the hands of some who may conscientiously believe them to be true, and circulate them in the hopes of being useful to their fellow-creatures, because you state that the moral welfare of man is your only object in their promulgation. I can only assure you, that I feel truly sorry our opinions should be so much at variance on a subject of such immense importance as the salvation of our immortal souls; according to my ideas, the Bible is written by men inspired by God to shew us the way to heaven, which to me appears clear and simple.

We have only to pray to him for his holy spirit to guide us, which he will readily grant, and then come with humble confidence, trusting in the merits of our Saviour to redeem us, for we have sinned against him, and he will accept us, and when we leave this world we shall be removed to Heaven, there to enjoy eternal blessedness.

I no more doubt the truths contained in the Bible than I doubt my own existence. I see the fall of man clearly stated, and when I examine my own heart I find it is but two true. I read in the Bible that if the Israelites forsake their God, they shall be scattered among all People, and among these nations they shall find no ease; and it is even so at the present moment. Were it necessary I might give you many other instances of its predictions being fulfilled. But I acknowledge, at the same time, that there are many passages in the Scriptures that I do not at present fully comprehend, and with our limited capacities I do not wonder that it should be so.

Being much occupied in business, I beg to apologize for not answering your letter sooner, as I wished to finish Paine's Works before I answered it. My opinion of Paine himself, corresponds exactly with what it is said he expressed before he died, that if ever the Devil had an agent he was one. With a proud spirit he could not bear to depend on the merits of another for acceptance with God, which is the case with thousands at the present day. The same spirit of pride is in each of us, and it is by the assistance of the Spirit of God alone that we are enabled to overcome it.

I would again most earnestly beseech you to solicit that assistance, which he has promised to those that ask in faith; and although you have been a means of raising the standard of infidelity higher than it has stood for many years, you may yet be made an instrument in the hand of Him who created us, of shewing those poor unfortunate beings who have renounced their Bible, the utter impossibility of mere human reason leading them to true happiness.

A time is rapidly approaching when we shall all stand before the judgment seat of God to answer for our actions here: there is an awful responsibility attending us, if we are the means of bringing eternal misery on our fellow-creatures: examine well your motives, let not the hope of gain induce you to send poison among the People. "What shall it profit you, if you gain the whole world and lose your soul."

Believe me, I have no intention of hurting your feelings, but I feel keenly for those deluded creatures who may be led astray by devices of Satan, who is still as "a raging lion, seeking whom he may devour."

I remain, your sincere well-wisher,

WILLIAM CARLILE.

4, Durham Place East, Hackney Road.
November 1, 1819.

R. CARLILE TO WILLIAM CARLILE.

DEAR SIR, King's Bench Prison, Nov. 5th, 1819.

I HAVE the pleasure to acknowledge the receipt of your second Letter, dated the 1st inst. You commence with stating, that with

a hope of Chalmers being instrumental to my eternal happiness, you examined Paine's Theological Works, making that examination appear to be a condescension on your part. In the course of your examination you have discovered that they are the writings of a very able man, had you added very honest also, you would have combined our opinions of him. You imply some fear of the result of the contest, when you say, were the two books, (meaning the Age of Reason, and the Bible,) perused by humble Christians only, with prayer to God for a spirit of understanding: what sort of Christians the humble ones are I have never yet discovered; I find them generally haughty, arrogant, and self-assuming. They will not venture an argument with an opponent, without he consents to make admissions on the outset of the validity of their doctrines and faith.

The objections of Mr. Paine and other Deists you admit should be fairly canvassed, that your faith may be more deeply rooted. If you are sincere in this assertion, you would enter your protest against the silencing of those objections by the strong arm of distorted law. Those objections having never been answered by any other means, makes me bold to say, they are unanswerable.

Respecting such publications falling into the hands of the rising generation, I hesitate not to say, that I deem it imprudent and injurious to impress any system of faith or religious opinions on the minds of youth until they arrive at an age when they possess a judgment of those things, convinced as I am, that morality might be inculcated without the aid of superstitious, or if you please, religious notions. You speak of Mr. Paine's derision of the influence of Satan, as improper, and say, it might be easily known by any one who could examine his own heart. You, Sir, I doubt not, pity those persons in the Eastern and other parts of the world, who worship both the good and evil spirit with the same terror and feeling; yet to the impartial and unprejudiced observer, the belief of the Christian in a partial God, and the Devil, whom they equally dread and fear, is the same as the belief of the Persian, Indian, or any other in the good and evil spirits.

The man or woman who believes in the real, personal, or spiritual existence of Satan or the Devil, is in my opinion, not one remove in intellect from the idiot. The idiot, by a system of training, might be made useful, and the believers in the Devil are mere human automatons. They can have no possible reflection or contemplation of the works of the creation and of nature. They treat with a wicked contumely, that only superiority they enjoy beyond their fellow animal, and degradingly call it mere human reason. They possess the faculty of speech, but they make no better use of it than the dog of his barking, or the ass of his braying.

Your ideas of the Bible, of Heaven, and of a redeeming Saviour, are read and received by me as the vagaries of a frenzied brain, and as I have before mentioned, that I believe in nothing of the kind, I could wish you had spared yourself the trouble of repeating

them; however, I have no enmity towards you for believing in them, on the other hand, I feel a pity which is by no means inferior to the zeal which you have shewn to make me a convert to your wild notions—notions that cannot be defended by reason or argument.

In another sentence you observe, that you believe what was alleged to have been spoken by Paine: namely, that if ever the Devil had an agent on earth, he (Paine) was one. I am not a little surprised to hear this from one who says he has read the Theological writings of Paine. If you had read those writings with a candid and unprejudiced mind, you would have learned from them, that their author believed in no such a Deity as the Devil, and consequently could never have used the expression in any other way than a joke or a sarcasm. This in no wise can confine your belief—believe and tremble if you like it. I believe without fear or trembling—I have no fear of offending the Deity I contemplate, nor of being exposed to the wiles of any other than the LEGAL DEVILS. Even in a prison, I live under all the consolation the human mind can enjoy, free from pain both in mind and body, without any fear even of the future.

With regard to that spirit of pride you speak of, as existing in each of us, it ill corresponds with your former assertions of "humble Christians," but rather more with my observation on them. Rochefoucault has well defined the pride of man or of human nature when he says, "The pride of all men is alike, it differs only in the means and manner of shewing it." Your idea of seeking the assistance of the spirit of God to overcome it, is a piece of fanaticism mingled with hypocrisy.

You say I have raised the standard of infidelity higher than it has been for many years. The standard I have raised, I swear never to desert. I will live or die in its defence.

I have examined well my motives and the probable result of them. I am still convinced that I am doing that which is right and good, and that which is calculated to ameliorate the present degraded condition of man. I have an object superior even to gain in view. It could not be gain that induced me to republish the Parodies of Mr. Hone, after a prosecution had been commenced against him, and he had thought proper to discontinue the sale, and in consequence of discontinuing the sale, the government had dropt their intention to prosecute their informations against him any further: I saw this, and determined that a publication so simple and harmless should not be put down because a false and clamorous charge had been brought against it by a wicked and corrupt government. I republished the Parodies, and was immediately arrested for it; I requested my wife to continue the sale, which she did; I was imprisoned in this prison for eighteen weeks, at an expence and loss of £50—I suffered all the punishment—fortune threw the benefits into the hands of Mr. Hone. He was not the object aimed at then to wreak their vengeance on, he was the first publisher; a

prosecution had been previously commenced against him; although suspended, the law officers of the crown could not possibly pass over that prosecution to get at me. Mr. Hone was thrice acquitted, which led to my liberation without trial, although the Attorney-General had a fourth information against me, independent of those that were similar to Mr. Hone's. I certainly published the Theological Works of Paine under different circumstances, but where is the man that would put the gain of 2 or £300 into the scale against so many years imprisonment? I had a much nobler motive than gain, or any thing that stimulates the mercenary mind. I felt convinced of the frauds and impostures of the religious establishments of this and other countries. I felt that civil liberty can never exist in the same country with an established priesthood, and feeling this, and approving and admiring the sentiments contained in the writings of Paine, I resolved to publish them at all hazards.

Without taking any further notice of Satan, whom your strive to elevate into importance, I shall take a brief view of Chalmers' and other alleged Evidences of Christianity. The Christians call the objections of the Deists to their religion stale, always the same, never any thing new advanced. The same thing might be said by the Deist to the supposed Evidences of Christianity, they are one and indivisible, something like their Trinity. The lives and writings of the fathers of the Christian Church, are the only class that leads us to any thing in the shape of an evidence, as no cotemporary authors have taken the least notice of the person of Jesus. Those very men who have since been canonized, and who are prayed to by Christians as a species of inferior deities, present the most disgusting picture of biography that ever disgraced the page of history. It was not until I had pondered over the pages of Eusebius, Socrates Scholasticus, and Evagrius, for many days in search after the Evidences of Christianity, (for if there are no evidences to be found in those writers, they are to be found no where else,) that I felt disgusted with the bickerings, jealousies, and priest-like characters of those fathers of the Christian Church. The more I sought its evidences, the more I became disgusted with the fraud, and from that moment resolved to spend my whole life in endeavouring to expose and annihilate it. Such is my firm conviction of the truths of those publications I have sent forth to the world, that I have no fear, if the supporters of bigotry and superstition would accept the challenge, that I could annihilate the belief in the Christian religion as of divine origin in this country, within seven years, and this too by a fair and honest sale of pamphlets and other publications, and not follow the paltry system of propping my opinions by the gratuitous circulation of MILLIONS of tracts, such as are circulated by the deceitful and hypocritical Christians. Depend on it, Sir, that it is too late now to attempt to support the fraud. The advice of Cardinal Woolsey should have been followed, when he told the Clergy that if they did not put down the printing press, it would put down them: it is now too

late. The Christian religion is at least suspected of being a fraud in England, it is laughed at in France, and an English barrister has asserted in one of our courts of law, that every enlightened mind in Europe was an infidel to it. The present rotten fabric of Church and State will fall together, and the representative system of government rise like a Phœnix from its ashes. I have stated before that no cotemporary authors have taken the least notice of the circumstances said to have taken place at his birth, or during his life-time. A similar tale exists in India of the birth of a Saviour, whose mother was a virgin betrothed to a carpenter, and every paltry and ridiculous tale in the Old and New Testament might be traced to have originated in Hindostan and other parts of the East. The very fathers of the Christian Church, from the date of the commencement of the Christian era, down to the time of Constantine, differ widely as to the time of the birth and life of their Deity. The following data having been furnished me by a correspondent from Hull, appears to be strictly applicable to this part of my letter, I shall therefore insert it.

"With regard to there being such a character as Jesus Christ, there is much reason to doubt. No cotemporary author, Roman, Greek, or Jew, ever so much as making mention of him, nor the star in Bethlehem, nor the journey into Egypt, nor the immaculate conception, nor the massacre under Herod, nor the crucifixion, nor the trial and prior imprisonment of Paul, who with his master did all in their power to produce a revolution and overturn the state. Would the History of England, or of any other country be silent on such a subject? No! There was no want of historians in that day to commemorate such events, had they taken place in A. U. C. 751 or 2, the date assigned for Christ's birth. At what period those things related of Christ and his apostles were trumped up, I do not pretend to know, but this I know, that the most learned commentators upon history have been greatly perplexed for want of authorities on so sublime a subject; even Dionysius Petavius in his Rationarum Temporum, to whom the learned world are much indebted for the pains he has taken to facilitate the student in history, by the laborious arrangement of his Epitome as to cotemporary characters and events, could find nothing to grace his page. In his first mention of Christ he opens thus, (as you will see on referring to his work) "In the year of Christ 14, the Emperor Augustus died at Nolæ in Campania, aged 76." This is the sum total of his early history of Christ, (if a blank may be called a history), what he has to say further on the subject is taken from what is vulgarly called the New Testament, i. e. that Christ was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered a voluntary death for the sins of mankind, that he rose again on the third day, and on the fortieth ascended into heaven, as witnessed by the eyes of his disciples."

"As to what Pliny the younger says in his Letter to Trajan respecting a sect denominating themselves Christians, it makes nothing out to the purpose. From what Pliny writes the Emperor

respecting the Christians and their tenets, it may be fairly inferred that he never heard of any such profession before, Pliny being at that time on a mission in a distant province. Trajan's reply being to this effect—"Forbear to maltreat them on account of their strange profession (they being citizens of Rome) except they be accused by fanatics, of a wish to overturn the religion of the state, in that case you are bound to persecute them, for the Gods must not be blasphemed with impunity; at least, we must make it appear that we do not connive at such an enormity, let our opinions be what they may. I say, in that case, you are bound to persecute." This is the first and only mention made of Christians by any early profane author, within 80 years of what is assigned for the birth of Christ; what Pliny says is the demagogues strong hold! they cling to it as to a world of light.

"Now for a few of the opinions of the fathers (they may well be called fathers!) and other respectable authorities. Some say Christ was born in A. U. C. 751 or 2, (as I said before). Onuphrius and Pererius say he was born in the latter end of December, 752. Sixtus of Sienna places Christ's birth with Ann. Mund. 3962. Torniel in 4051.* Talents says Christ died on the 25th of December, 4079 of the Julian period. Yet others say it was on the third of April, and pretend to prove it by the wonderful eclipse mentioned in St. Luke, which wonderful event was most wonderfully omitted by the rest of the Saints. Clements and Tertullian say he was crucified at 30 years of age; common opinion is, that he was 33. Yet St. Irenæus, a father who lived nearer the time specified than either of the other authors, says he was between 40 and 50."

"The Christians who make their epoch the birth of Christ, and as settled by act of parliament, to have taken place Ann. Mund. 3962, did not begin to use that computation till after the year 600, and perhaps in antipathy to the Hygera of Mahomet in 617, who have their Sabbath on the Friday, in contradiction to both Jews and Christians, and the Christians adopted Sundays no doubt for the same reason."

I must now draw this letter to a close. As it is likely to finish the correspondence between us on this subject, I have been more explicit than I might otherwise have been. Not being personally known to each other, although of the same name, I shall not expect to see or hear any thing further from you, unless you change your belief from Polytheism to Deism.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

Mr. William Carlile, RICHARD CARLILE.

4, *Durham Place East, Hackney.*

* The Greeks differ from the Latins 1500 years, and the Muscovites hold that Christ's birth took place A. M. 5508, always beginning their year on the first of September.

R. Carlile, Printer, 55, Fleet Street, London.

The Republican.

No. 13. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Nov. 19, 1819. [Price 2d.

A LETTER

TO

Sir CHARLES ABBOTT, Knt. Sir JOHN BAILEY, Knt. Sir G. S. HOLROYD, Knt. and Sir WILLIAM DRAPER BEST, Knt.

Judges of His Majesty's Court of King's Bench, on their Conduct on the 12th day of November instant.

King's Bench Prison, Nov. 14, 1819.

My Lords,

Determining to continue the practical part of the liberty of the press whilst I have the means, I seize this opportunity (perhaps the last for a time) to appeal to public opinion against your decision and your conduct towards me. I have no doubt in my own mind, and it must have been visible to every one who witnessed your conduct on Friday last, that you had rehearsed and arranged the part that each should play in taking the most summary mode to get rid of me, before you came into Court. I shall proceed to give a brief recapitulation of your conduct on that occasion. Chief Justice Abbott began his part by observing, that there was no difficulty in understanding the meaning of a charge of blasphemy. This, of course, was a very convenient and high-sounding word to answer an extra-judicial and dishonest purpose. An honest man, possessing common sense, would never bring the charge of blasphemy in its literal acceptation against any other man, because the charge implies a certain something against something indefinite; therefore, according to the admitted maxims of English law, before a charge could be substantiated against any man of committing an offence, it is necessary to shew that some other person has been injured. In this case no such thing has been done, and, consequently, no offence has been committed, unless the Star Chamber conduct is again to be adopted, which, should it be found practicable, your Lordships would be found worthy members, and well adapt-

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke-street, Smithfield.

ed for it. Mr. Justice Best is the next object of attention, who observed, that my course was most improper, because I said that all the translations from the Hebrew Bible varied, and that if any were the word or revealed will of God, it must be the original. In consequence of such observations being improper in a court of law, according to Mr. Justice Best's doctrine, and should I be imprisoned for such improper conduct, I will shortly cause to be published a literal translation of the Hebrew Bible, with a fair and honest commentary, which I am assured will be found to be more disgracefully obscene than any thing which has yet appeared in the English language. Mr. Justice Bailey observed, that Christianity is the law of the land*, and the Bible is the foundation of Christianity; therefore, the Bible must be the foundation of the English law, and it is much to be regret-

* The following correspondence which has reached me anonymously, is quite in point, I shall therefore insert it as a note: it is headed thus—" Concerning a Nonsensical Proposition."

In the assertion that " Christianity is part and parcel of the law of England," there is a strange imprecision, not very honourable to the understanding of Coke, who devised, or of the judges, who echo this dictate. Law is a rule of action sanctioned by rewards and punishments which the magistrate can award; but the rewards and punishments which attach to a belief or disbelief of Christianity, are inapplicable by any human tribunal. Christianity is undefinable; it may, without absurdity, be termed the law of God, the law of heaven; but it cannot be the law of a particular state. The religion of the magistrate, however, can be the law of a particular land; and specific penalties may be enacted for impugning it, as specific salaries are assigned for defending it. But the religion of the magistrate can never be common law; it necessarily reposes on particular statutes. Now our statutes recognize several religions of the magistrate, Polytheism in Hindostan, Popery in Canada, Lutherism in England, Calvinism in Scotland, and in the Dutch colonies of Guyana, Judaism, which is there no impediment to office. Privy-counsellors at home have been allowed to profess Atheism without being struck out of the list. The Mahometan and the Parsee enjoy under the government of Calcutta the liberty of publicly inculcating their sacred books and articles of faith. Why is the Deist to be deprived of a privilege conceded to every superstition? The Age of Reason is a truly pious book. If Ram Mohun Roy should happen to consider the punishment of Mr. Carlile as a proof of the essential intolerance of Christianity, and that wherever Christians are the strongest, they will forcibly suppress all hostile argument, he may, perhaps, determine to resume the profession of Bramanism, and thus excite an alarm in the established priesthood of India, which may pluck from our

ted that the English law should have so weak a foundation, and that such a foundation should be defended by the administrators of justice in the present state of society. Mr. Justice Bailey further observed, that it was utterly impossible, according to any rule of law, that such a publication as the Age of Reason, which, whatever may be urged to the contrary by bigoted or ignorant fanatics, is a book replete with the purest piety, could be allowed to be defended in that court. My next attempt was to shew your Lordships that Christianity could not be defined, and this I stated my intention was to have done on the trial, by examining the leaders of the different Christian sectaries, each of whom your Lordships are well aware would have given a different description of the Christian faith, as essential to their salvation. Now if Christianity cannot be defined, and if the statute law tolerates it in a variety of shapes, and in every shape, provided it be called Christian, it cannot be a part of the common law of the land: it is not a part of it. The common law must be strictly definite and of immemorial usage. Christianity is but the innovation of the day. Christianity might fairly be said to have been at the time of its introduction, a violation of part of the common law, or the religious rites and ceremonies of the Druids, who were murdered and extirpated at the instigation of the Christian priests. Whoever was present in the court, or reads the proceedings as reported in the papers of the day, must be forcibly struck with the fear of your Lordships to have the question argued as to what is Christianity, or which of the various books called the Bible is the word of God. Depend on it, my Lords, that you are supporting a rotten cause, and the more you attempt to protect it, the speedier will be its downfall, and the more will your judicial characters be disgraced. With respect to Chief Justice Abbott's calling back the Jury from their retirement, it was an evident proof of his fear that they, the Jury, would put their own construction on the statutes they had sent for. It was most assuredly extra-judicial, and a proof of corrupt partiality. Neither

---

sway sixty millions of subjects. On the reputation of the government for religious equity principally depends the allegiance of the most valuable of our foreign possessions. How careful then our statesmen ought to be of letting their judges pamper the jealous passions of a lazy clergy, who, instead of refuting the books of their adversaries, content themselves with applying the war-whoop of blasphemy, and then to proceed to pull in pieces the prosperity of those who cannot swear to their thirty-nine articles.

of your Lordships had any more knowledge of the abstract opinions on which Christianity has been founded, and the varied acceptation of it in the present day, than so many bigoted old women. Mr. Justice Holroyd, (whom I feel some little pity for, and shall therefore say but little of him,) however, prated about libel and blasphemy being offences at common law: this vague assertion may answer the purpose of oppression, but is laughed at by every man who exercises his reason, and who is capable of defining words, and distinguishing words of sound and words of meaning. Mr. Justice Best could not think that the Lord Chief Justice could be incorrect.—No! to be sure not, and that for any one to think so was one of the inconveniencies arising to the court of a defendant not employing counsel, and compelling the court to listen to such absurdities. The attempt to justify the libel was ridiculous, by saying that Paine had written the truth.

As well might a man, who had committed murder, say to the Court, that murder is no crime. So, Mr. Justice Best, you think that blasphemy and murder are synonymous: you might have some reasons for endeavouring to palliate murder, I have none: therefore, what you have called blasphemy, and an offence against the laws, I shall not hesitate to commit every day; but murder I know cannot be committed without injuring my fellow-creature. With respect to employing counsel, I recollect that Colonel Despard employed Counsel, and there is a prevalent opinion that his life was bargained for by his Counsel with his prosecutors. The "breathless haste" in which Chief Justice Abbot endeavoured to get rid of the case, was most disgraceful to a person in his situation, having fancied that his own single and arbitrary opinion was sufficient to reject the application, in the most summary manner he refused the rule, and cried out, "Let the defendant be remanded," when Mr. Justice Bailey took his Lordship by the sleeve and seemed to say Stay, my Lord, I have not yet given my opinion. Your threat, my Lords to file a criminal information against Mrs. Carlile cannot change my course, sorry as I am that I cannot take the responsibility, and the consequent pains and penalties on myself; I am satisfied that my wife possesses sufficient virtue and good sense, to realize my wishes and to pursue my directions, and those are, that she should proceed in the usual manner as I have done, and suppress nothing.

I am, my Lords,
Your Lordships' most devoted,
RICHARD CARLILE.

King's Bench Prison, Nov. 16.

P. S. On retiring from the Court this day, I found a new apartment ready for me in the Prison, namely, the Strong Room, in which I find myself locked up, and no one allowed to see me but in the presence of the Turnkey. This, my Lords, you are well aware is a novel species of treatment in this Prison, as many persons who have been placed in the situation in which I now stand, and who have been committed to the custody of the Marshal of this Prison, before it be convenient to remove them to the place of destination, have ever been treated as prisoners for debt. Why this exception in my case? Because Christianity is in danger, or the corruptions of it are in danger. With respect to the sentence, I am not disappointed, as I was well aware into what hands I had fallen; it is a specimen of that persecuting spirit that has existed in all ages, since mankind have made professions of religion. Whether the imprisonment had been a month or the three years in Dorchester Gaol, the injustice would be the same; whether the fine had been £1 or the £1500, the robbery is equally disgraceful.

Six o'clock, P. M.

I have just learned that the Sheriff's Officer has taken possession of my house, and shut up the shop; the warrant was in the name of the King, and signed by Mr. Sheriff Rothwell. This is truly *à la Bourbon.* I calculate that my stock is worth to me, if fairly sold in the shop, £2,000; and I suppose that the harpies of the law will not leave a tittle of it. I have resolved that these proceedings shall not stop here; the whole of it has been a gross perversion of the law. I have no hesitation in saying, that it has left an indelible stain on your Lordships, the Prosecutors, and the Juries.—I seize this opportunity of publicly making my acknowledgment of the able, honest, and decisive manner in which Mr. Denman moved the Court in arrest of judgment, and have only to regret that his appeal was made to minds so deeply prejudiced, or evidently influenced by some other authority, as those of your Lordships.

TO THE PUBLIC.

The shop in Fleet Street being shut up, will occasion some little disappointment and inconvenience. The *Republican* after this week will be published by my friend, Mr. St. John,

and the place of publication will be announced as early as possible. All communications addressed to the Editor, to be left at 10, Duke Street, West Smithfield, will be immediately attended to.

R. CARLILE.

Subscriptions received since our last Publication.

	£.	s.	d.
J. Chapman, an admirer of the immortal mind of Mr. Paine	0	10	0
John James Brayfield, of Camberwell, a friend to the candid Deist, Richard Carlile, and an enemy to perfidious persecuting priests, also to villainous vindictive lawyers	0	10	0
Andrew M'Cormack, 3, East Street, Hoxton	1	0	0
Alexander Fife, 61, Gravel Lane, Blackfriars Road	1	0	0
Thomas Jones, a believer in one God, and an enemy to persecution	0	2	6

A LETTER TO CHARLES PHILLIPS, ESQ.

On his Speech delivered at the Seventh Anniversary of the City of London Auxiliary Bible Society.

SIR,

THERE is but one reason which could induce me to notice your fine speech of Thursday last—the noble pleasure I feel in endeavouring to promote the public good; but that one is powerful, and impels me to oppose my feeble powers to the overwhelming torrent of your eloquence. I do not possess those bold creative powers of fancy; that dazzling splendour of imagination; that fierce ungovernable fire, with which Nature has blessed you, and which sometimes hurry you far beyond your depth into the ocean of fiction and error—but it is perhaps fortunate that Nature has denied me such brilliant and dangerous talents, since we see how miserably they may be misemployed by a mind so cultivated, so enlightened as yours. As an equivalent, however, she has granted me a cool, dispassionate mind, prone to doubt, to examine, to analyze, and to be particularly cautious in judging opinions and principles; especially when they appear decked out in the flowery, rhapsodical, and (to speak the truth freely) nonsensical language of declamation.

You begin by making a parade of your country, and of coming forward in her name, to express the opinions of a great body of her children. I despise national prejudice, Sir, as much as you do

the "cant of bigotry;" but I cannot help reminding you, that your countrymen have seldom been celebrated for their extreme attachment to the orthodox faith. But to the subject. "When we see the omens which are every day arising—when we see the Scriptures audaciously ridiculed—when in this Christian monarchy (you probably mean despotism) the den of the Republican and the Deist yawns for the unwary in your most public thoroughfare—when marts are ostentatiously opened where the moral poison may be purchased, whose subtle venom enters the very soul—when infidelity has become an article of commerce, and man's perdition may be cheapened at the stall of every pedlar, no friend of society should continue silent." All this, Sir, is extremely fine, except the "cheapening of perdition," and "the pedlar's stall." But let us examine the plain, naked sentiments, when divested of the magic mantle of eloquence, and we shall find that, like a half-naked, half-clad prostitute, sneaking, on a cold December morning, out of a brothel, they are dreary, cold, and wretched. And the reason is plain—they are not the sentiments of your heart, but a set of factitious, sophisticated ones, calculated, as you imagine, to suit the taste of the times. The reception they have met with may possibly undeceive you. Had you, in your too famous speech, spoken nothing but what your enlightened understanding dictated and your heart approved—"Indeed, my Lord, (you would have said) when we see philosophy beginning to scatter her bright rays among the People—when we see Reason oppose itself to Fable and Folly—when in this land, which once was free, we behold a few ungovernable spirits audacious enough to lament their loss of liberty, and talk of other means of recovering it than whining and canting about the Constitution—when philosophers will enter into a discussion of the equal rights which naturally belong to man, in spite of the thundering proclamations which bid them wear their chains in peace—when men are not ashamed to assert the purity, exculpate the honour of the Deity, and publish and defend the pure principles of the religion of Nature—it is the duty of every friend of despotism and bigotry to snatch up the dagger or the pen, to destroy the lives, or murder the reputation of the children of Philosophy and Nature." These, Sir, are the expressions you ought to have used—these are the words which express your meaning clearly.

After thus displaying your great alarm for the safety of Christianity and Royalty (and you seem to think their fates are very intimately connected) you throw aside the mask of mildness and moderation, (as if even the very acting of it were troublesome to you) and assume the character, if it be not your natural one, of a literary, oratorical assassin: you ransack the dark and dismal caverns of your half-bewildered brain, for appropriate terms of abuse to vomit forth against the Republicans, and sink at once, from the mighty orator, into the libellous lampooning sophist. Then you

preach, in true Methodistical cant, about "the anchor of your faith," and "the horrid blasphemies of the philosophers:" about "Gods, charters, murky pigeon-holes, and creedless, lawless, infuriated regicides!" Who, in the name of common sense, do you call regicides, after having declaimed, and ranted, and rhapsodized so much about the Hampdens, the Sydneys, and the Russels? Do you imagine your pompous, rhetorical, unmeaning nonsense can mislead the understanding of a bold, inquiring nation? Do you persuade yourself that you can wheedle an enlightened and philosophic People into an affection for the very superstition which has enslaved them? Or have you the vanity to suppose that a mere rhetorical flourish of yours can retard the irresistible progress of Philosophy and Freedom? If such are your sentiments, Sir, permit me to undeceive you. The People, who do not understand nonsense, admire your fine language, and despise your principles: —they are not ignorant of the spring which has put you into such a mighty bustle; and induced you to advocate the cause of superstition and tyranny—they perceive the serpent peep out from beneath the flower, and laugh at, while they avoid, the treacherous bait. Could you but hear the laughs and sneers of the People, whose good sense you have insulted, you would hide your head behind the immense sleeve of some parson's cassock to conceal your chagrin—you would curse the sordid motive which impelled you to fawn, and cant, and rave, and rhapsodize, at the Auxiliary Bible Society—and if one solitary, isolated feeling of honest shame still linger in your soul, you would be sorry for having so indecently exulted over the ruined fortunes of a brave and unfortunate man. But you are fond of paradox, and of appearing, at least, inexplicable—for after having called Carlile a self-convicted wretch, you talk of humbling him into an evidence of the very spirit he spurned! Are you not ashamed of your own vile cant and hypocrisy? Do you think the meanest understanding can be cheated into a belief of your sincerity, at the very moment you are drivelling forth the blackest poison of calumny? No, Sir; you make a wrong estimate of the understanding of the English nation: they are not the asses you take them for.

You next proceed to prophesy what would be the state of this country should the friends of freedom ultimately prevail; and you draw a picture worthy of the pencil that sketched it. "Nothing but time and apathy are wanting (you say) to change this healthful land into a charnel-house, where murder, anarchy, prostitution, and the whole hell-brood of infidelity, will quaff the hearts blood of the consecrated and the noble." Is this sense, or nonsense; or sophisticated Aristocratical bombast? Has freedom necessarily those horrid chimeras in her train? Are hypocritical, fawning, perjured, murderous hirelings, the peculiar growth of a Republican soil? or, were there more brothels, and fawning orators in Republican Rome, than in the capital of "this Christian

monarchy?" Were the Socrates', the Ciceros, the Brutuses, the Trajans, the Antonines, and the Julians, (those great infidels of antiquity) less virtuous than Charles Phillips?

I shall pass over your Sectarian cant about Providence being "neither dead nor sleeping," and ask you if you have never heard of any other Deistical temple than that of Fleet-street; or of any infidels but Paine and Palmer? Have you never heard the names of Herbert, Hobbes, Shaftsbury, Bolingbroke, Pope, Garth, or Halley? never of Montesquieu, Boulainvilliers, Boyle, Condorcet, Mirabeau, Diderot, Helvetius, or Voltaire? Never of our great persecuted, injured Byron? Yes, you quibbling sophist, you know them well, but you dared not draw a comparison between them, and your Milton and Bacon, a gloomy fanatic, and a sycophant courtier. But I am astonished at the effrontery with which you confound Locke and Newton with the vile mob of rabble-enthusiasts who make up the mass of Christians. Where did you learn that Newton or Locke were Christians, till interest, weakness, or absolute dotage, had annihilated those talents which had once distinguished them from the world! Newton, in the poor, decrepit dotage of eighty, writing a Commentary on the Revelations, was no more that Newton who had made discoveries in nature, that dashed the Mosaic, or rather Jewish, system of the world to atoms. As for the "prescient Bacon," I do not dispute about his religion. That

"Wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind"---

would profess any which could bring money into his pocket. But be his religion what it may, it is extremely probable, that, with all his prescience, he could not foresee the contempt with which Pope, and posterity would treat his memory.—In Bacon we never admire the Man, but the Author.

But to come a little nearer "your own business and bosom;" let us see what changes, time, and a few adventitious circumstances, have been able to make in your sentiments.

"When the pride of rulers (say you, in a publication of no very ancient date*) so predominates that the cries of injury are unheard, or, if they are heard, unheeded; when assumed privilege usurps the garb of law, and law shrinks from the punishment of injustice; then, the Monarch's crime becomes the insurgent's justification, and the feeling which respects it, is not submission but servitude."——"The providence which places one man on a throne implants the patriot ardour in another; the very voice which gives the sacred trust to Majesty, calls loudly on the People to redeem it if abused."——"Both the Bishop and the General, though so different in their pursuits, find their common origin in the vices of the world. At all events, it is not policy in the priest to

* The Loves of Celestine and St. Aubert.

quarrel with the soldier, to whose pious efforts he is indebted for so many fees and so many converts."

To prove how strangely and unaccountably your sentiments are altered with respect to Mr. Paine, I will take the liberty to transcribe more than a page of your interesting novel. Speaking of the victims of the French Directory you say :—

"Among these there was one whom I could not help viewing with peculiar admiration, because, by the sole power of a surprizing genius, he had surmounted the disadvantages of birth and the difficulties of fortune. It was the celebrated Thomas Paine, a man, who, (no matter what may be the difference of opinion as to his principles) must ever remain a proud example of mind unpatronized and unsupported, eclipsing the factitious beams of rank, and wealth, and pedigree. I never saw him in his captivity, nor heard the revilings with which he has been since assailed, without cursing in my heart that ungenerous feeling which, cold to the necessities of genius, is clamorous in the publication of its defects.

"Ye great ones of his nation! ye pretended moralists! so forward now to cast your interested indignation upon the memory of Paine, where were you in the day of his adversity! which of you, to assist his infant merit, would diminish even the surplus of your debaucheries! where was the fostering hand to train his mind to virtue! where the mitred charity! the practical religion! Consistent declaimers, rail on :—what, though his genius was the gift of heaven—his heart the altar of friendship! what, though wit and eloquence, and anecdote, flowed freely from his tongue, while conviction made his voice her messenger! what, though thrones trembled, and prejudice fled, and freedom came at his command! —he dared to question the creed which you, believing, contradicted, and to despise the rank, which you, boasting of, debased!!"

I apprehend, Sir, when you wrote the above panegyric on Paine, you had not sufficient "prescience" to foresee that you should ever make your memorable Speech before the Bible Society, in which you appear in the unequivocal character of a Political Renegade. But every thing human is changeable: and Charles Phillips, who ten years ago, was the champion of civil and religious liberty, is become the tool of a desperate fanatic faction.

J. A. ST. JOHN.

P. S. I hope you mean shortly to regale the public with another Oration, for the shallow-ones to admire, and for the wits and infidels to laugh at, and for some better writer than me to reply to.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

A LETTER TO DR. RUDGE, OF LIMEHOUSE, RELATIVE TO HIS CORRESPONDENCE WITH MR. CARLILE.

REVEREND SIR,

IN the 10th number of "The Republican," I find two letters which you have addressed to Mr. Carlile. For an humble individual like myself, to animadvert on the sentiments contained in them, proceeding as they do from so consequential a source, to some persons, perhaps, might seem presumption; but, Sir, the days are gone by, in which reason, bowed beneath the overwhelming weight which the sound of a name, and that which is falsely called learning, contrived to heap upon it. In you I view, (I am sorry to say it) not the enlightened philosopher, but a mere Christian of the common cast; not the man who dares to assume the prerogative of the free exertion of his mental faculties, but the deluded victim of a childish superstition; in fine, I perceive in you the same deficiency that is common to all your brethren, I mean the want of a firm foundation on which to build your arguments. The Christian logician, like the unwary architect that builds a massive structure on unsolid ground, may decorate his work at his pleasure, but as it has not truth to rest upon, it falls like this fabric, into a mighty ruin, a monument of the folly of him who reared it.

But to commence in reality. I admire your generosity in lending Mr. Carlile "Paley's Evidences of Christianity," (though some persons, perhaps, might sneeringly assert, that the loan was not so valuable, since a copy of it may be purchased any evening at Mr. Tegg's sale in Cheapside, for three shillings and six-pence,) it was a Christian-like action, and the motive which led to it, partook also of the same conscientious spirit; for you supposed that the perusal of this formidable work would convert one of the most confirmed Deists in Europe to your belief. But, Sir, if you had such a notion, it argues but little in favour of your judgment; can he, who has once read the works and imbibed the sublime sentiments of the Deistical philosophers, ever after condescend to go through the drudgery of reading the volumes in question, filled as they are with the most tedious, trivial, and inconclusive arguments, and which, after the most patient and attentive perusal, prove nothing more than this: that it is not absolutely impossible, but that Christianity may be founded on truth. But as much as this may be proved of any religion, no matter what, for who shall attempt to demonstrate in an equally convincing manner as Euclid demonstrates his positions, that Mahomet was not a prophet sent from God?

Who can forbear to smile, when you talk about the free and unbiassed state the mind should be in, when it attempts to investigate the subject of Christianity? Such cant is now become too

common to be endured; it really means nothing but this: that a person who sits down to the task of examining the evidences in favour of the Bible, should go to it with a predisposition to believe it, and then, according to Bishop Watson and other profound writers like him, much may be done; though still, not without the blessed aid of the Holy Spirit! But your advice to Mr. Carlile, as respects this matter, really appears to me in a very simple light, for the Scriptures have no need, at this day, to be examined at all; they have already passed the fiery ordeal, though not without being partially consumed; they have already been weighed in the balance of reason, and found deficient.

But cannot the Deist retort your arguments, in putting the question to Christians, whether they have examined the writings on the other side, with all that cool and deliberate attention they deserve? The thing speaks for itself, they have not; their narrow and ignoble sentiments prove, beyond all doubt, that they are even fearful of using that degree of mental energy, which in this case is necessary: nay, some Christians carry their absurdity to such a pitch, that so far from presuming to freely investigate the word of God, they think that even our prying into the wondrous works displayed in the universe, is an impiety; and would conceive themselves greatly culpable, were they to behold, through a telescope, those glorious and stupendous bodies which revolve in the regions of space.

You conceive, that because there are some objectional parts in the Bible, we should not on that account reject the whole; but this ridiculous and worn-out argument, like that which Christians urge in favour of miracles, has no need of being refuted at this present day; still, as you seem to be ignorant of its futility, I will offer an observation upon it. When we find in a book, professing to be the word of the Deity, accounts that we are convinced are false, we have no longer the shade of an evidence to believe that any of those which are of a supernatural cast are authentic; for if one account is a forgery, why, in the name of common sense, should not another be the same? Yet, still, I admit there is a line of distinction to be drawn; those events which are according to the common and ordinary course of nature, we have no reason to doubt of, neither is it of importance to us whether such be genuine or not.

In alluding to Sir Isaac Newton, Locke, &c. you intimate, that their change of sentiments, in respect to Deism and Christianity, ought not to affect that which is true, and only prove the inconsistency and hypocrisy of these men, and should operate as a preventative to our paying an indiscriminate deference to a name, merely because it may be a distinguished one. I here perfectly agree with you, for, most undoubtedly, a superstructure that is reared upon a name, however that name may be exalted, must prove a weak and baseless fabric. But when you make this confession, you certainly forget what you have said in your first letter,

since you there intimate, that we should pay a deference to the above persons, "and others of the same order of intellect, of the same mental calibre," and whom you distinguish by the elegant appellation of "Masters in Israel." But this is the consistency of Christians, and it originates intirely from the want of a true principle.

In returning thanks to Mr. Carlile, for the copy of "The Age of Reason," you acknowledge it to be many years since you read it, but that you are well acquainted with Deistical writings. Permit me, however, to doubt the truth of this latter assertion; a person who, for many years, has ceased to practise any particular thing, can have but little acquaintance with it, and this position will more particularly apply to intellectual matters; since those, who like yourself, remain satisfied with what they have long ago acquired, are of course quite excluded from those advantages which are to be derived from the continual progress of intellectual improvement. But I am well aware, from experience, that the tenets of Christianity are exactly calculated to produce this apathy of mind, and that they excite a sentiment of pity, or rather contempt, in Christians towards these philosophers who would leave no subject uninvestigated. Pope, I know, has said, "The man despises the boy, the philosopher the man, and the Christian all." But Pope spent the greater part of his life in rhyming, and therefore he may be excused for not having been aware, that the philosopher despises the Christian in his turn, and not only so, but looks down upon him from an elevation which the mental ken of the mere Christian is inadequate to reach.

You say, you examined and thought for yourself; so has Mr. Carlile—so have I—so did the greater part of our philosophers—and so do the chief of the literati in Europe; and yet, the conclusions drawn are quite in opposition to your own. To insinuate that Mr. Carlile is not competent to judge of the merits of Christianity, is, indeed, assuming a vanity in yourself, that must excite the smile of every unbiassed person. The fact is, that no one party, in the estimation of another one, is competent to judge of their opinion, and a Mandarin, or Bramin, has as much right to call your competency in question, as you have theirs; but Deists, however they may have this conceit in common with all others, yet cannot be upbraided on that account with the charge of illiberality, since they loudly avow their wish to bring their every sentiment to the test of reason.

You give us your notions of the Trinity, but, alas! what a falling off is here! Why, Sir, you have annihilated two persons in the Godhead, and have left us only God the Father. (THE GOD OF NATURE I presume.) This confession of yours will certainly subject you to the reproaches of most of your "fellow-labourers in the vineyard;" they will maintain you not to be a true Christian; nay, they will lavish upon you the opprobrious appellation of a Deist; but, never mind, Sir, I am content to participate with you

the vile calumny of these insignificant revilers; and if, like me, you but truly acknowledge, and properly revere, that exalted Being, which Deism would teach us does exist, who framed the mighty fabric of the universe, and whose Providence extends over millions of habitable worlds, you may still preserve your sense of rectitude unshaken, nor need you be affected by such paltry scoffers.

I now, reverend Sir, take my leave, and would recommend to your serious (I wish I might say impartial) consideration, the following emphatical lines:—

"The Heavens above, the Earth below,
One great benign Creator show;
Blest revelation! unconfin'd,
And legible to all mankind;
Not given to a paltry few,
But shed o'er all, like heaven's rich dew:
Who partial paint the Power supreme,
Our universal Sire blaspheme."

Edward Street, Blackfriars Road, D. HARRISON.
Nov. 1st, 1819.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

A CARD TO MR. CARLILE, PUBLISHER OF PAINE'S AGE OF REASON.

SIR,

AGREEABLE to your requisition in the REPUBLICAN, No. 9, I without reserve say, that I think your conduct in publishing merits the approbation of every honest man. For to oppose the prejudice of ages, when that prejudice is inimical to the happiness of mankind, detecting the fallacy of received opinions, and to ameliorate the human mind, is the noblest effort of philosophical employment.

JOHN JAMES BRAYFIELD.

63, Southampton Street, Camberwell,
November 2, 1819.

THE MOCK TRIAL.

A PARODY.—BY J. J. BRAYFIELD.

A TRIAL founded on a mystery,
A plot begotten by the sire of lies,
And nurs'd to full-grown *Treason* by the care
Of fost'ring lawyers, that can extract
Fines out of looks, and Death from double meanings.

I heard the deep-mouthed pack, they scented blood
From the first starting, and pursued their view
With the law-music of long-winded calumny.

Well I remember one among the tribe,
A base *Apostate*, skilled in parallels
And dark comparisons of wond'rous likeness:
Who in a speech of venal eloquence
Mustered up all the crimes since *Woolston*'s time,
To put in balance with this unjust charge,
And made e'en *Cataline* a saint to *Carlile*.
The *Parasite* so much o'er-played his part,
I could have hugged him, praised the sophistic lies
Hot from his faithless tongue. He was the same
Who started from the question in debate,
And when corrected by a calm rebuke,
Used all the threats that malice could suggest,
And rancorously forced *Atheist* down
The mild Defendant's throat, who fearless said:—

"I am no *Courtier*, no false-tongued Priest,
Nor am I a mean, fawning Dog of State,
To lick and kiss the hand that buffets me.
Preach fear to corrupted *Legislators*,
When civil uproar threatens a reprisal
On their cursed greedy gatherings of extortion.
Bid the projecting *Politician* fear
When all his springs are wound up to the height;
And if one motion fails, the whole machine
Sinks, and destroys the *Builder* in its ruins.
Talk fear to *Hypocrites*, to *Manchester Murderers*,
To a profligate Prince, who his subjects scorns;
To Priests and Cowards—but name it not with Virtue.
Fear is the tax that conscience pays to Guilt,
And yet unspotted Innocence may fall
The sacrifice of cunning and revenge;
Witness my Mock Trial for Blasphemy."

Thus 'tis; the course and fashion of the times,
When prejudices and aversion work
Those the *Priests* contemn are *Atheists* call'd.
Now it is a term, a bug-bear word,
The Villain's engine, and the Vulgar's terror.
The man who thinks and judges for himself,
Unswayed by aged follies, reverend errors,
Grown holy by traditionary dullness
Of school-authority, he is an *Atheist*.
The Man who hating idle noise, preserves
A pure religion seated in his soul,
He is a silent, dumb, dissembling *Atheist*.

O Priest-begotten Tyranny! what waste
Thy cruel hands make in this fair creation,
Treating Heaven's image, in thy fellow-creature,
Worse than the savage beast, or grazing herd!

THE PROGRESS OF REASON.

To dissipate all prejudicial sway,
And clear a passage for eternal day,
Pure light to give the intellectual blind,
And drive all dull eclipses from the mind,
Is Reason's part; for this her rays extend
Through every rank, man's comforter and friend:
And while each base idea she refines,
In every beam immortal radiance shines.
How shrinks each despot from the generous light
That breaks the blackness of the mental night!
With owls and bats they share the murky sway,
And basely sicken at the face of day,
That bids the flag of freedom be unfurled,
And gives protection to a wakening world!
Darkness is theirs; in that, supreme they reign,
On nature's face a despicable stain;
And thoughtless profligacy, dead to shame,
Sanctions their infamy and shares the blame.
Ere long, conviction, with a viper's sting,
One dreadful truth will to their bosoms bring.
Reason, her light, without restraint, imparts
To such as live with freedom at their hearts;
Warm throbs the bosom which their flames inspire,
Slow beats the pulse wherever they expire.
They teach us, that the rulers of the realm,
(Though, by false power, they justice overwhelm)
Are but the transient regents of an hour,
In fine, subservient to the People's power;
Theirs the expence, and theirs should be the choice,
The final judgment, and decisive voice.
This truth, a voice of thunder may make known,
And all its lightnings flash about the throne.

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke-street, Smithfield.

The Republican.

No. 14. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Nov. 26, 1819. [Price 2d.

A LETTER TO HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE REGENT,

On his most gracious Speech, delivered at the opening of Parliament.

"For forms of Government let fools contest:
Whate'er is best administered, is best."

Pope.

Sir,

In addressing myself to you, I am actuated but by one motive—a love of liberty and independence—in the cause of which I am ready to draw the pen or the sword; or, if need be, to bleed and die on the scaffold. England, at this moment, presents a desolating, terrible spectacle—a spectacle that is calculated to awaken feelings of apprehension and alarm in the most cool, and in the most ambitious bosoms. All around us we behold nothing but pale and meagre countenances agitated by discontent and distress. Every heart palpitates with anxiety; and every eye looks forward with fearful distrust to the opening of that Parliament, whose decisions may fix, or destroy for ever, the liberties of the English People. I have just received your Speech. After expressing a becoming concern for His Majesty's "lamented indisposition," and regretting the necessity you are under of calling the Parliament together at this period of the year, you advert to the "seditious practices," which you say have been long prevalent in some of the manufacturing districts of the country. It is strange, very strange, that we should never hear a word of those seditious practices, except in the Ministerial papers. But

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke-street, Smithfield.

your Highness may have other modes of becoming acquainted with the evil practices of your subjects than those which are open to every body: you may have a method of discovering sedition in embryo, while slowly forming in the discontented head of some poor creature, where politics and sedition have more than they can do to keep out the thoughts of hunger. But when you have discovered it, do not be angry with the man; nor ascribe that to a rebellious disposition, which arises only for want of bread. But still I am at a loss to know where the sedition your Royal Highness speaks of has been able to conceal itself, so as to escape the most inquisitive researches of the whole nation—for surely you can never call the peaceable meetings of your peaceful subjects by so harsh a name—nor hint that those meetings are incompatible with the public tranquillity, since nothing was ever more tranquilly conducted. I have the misfortune, too, to be utterly ignorant where that spirit manifests itself which your Highness says, is "utterly hostile to the Constitution of this kingdom, and which aims, not only at the change of those political institutions which have hitherto constituted the pride and security of this country, but at the subversion of the rights of property, and of all order in society." This, may it please your Royal Highness, is a delicious *morceau* of Royal eloquence—but nothing more. The sentiment is fine—the words neatly put together—what a pity it should not be true! There is no such thing in existence, Sir, as the "SPIRIT" you speak of. The English nation, far from wishing their Constitution destroyed, desire nothing with greater earnestness and sincerity than that that Constitution should be acted up to, and obeyed. As to the security, &c., which it is said certain political institutions have procured us, your Royal Highness will, perhaps, permit us to be a little sceptical on that head; since we find to our cost, that even our "glorious Constitution" itself cannot "SECURE" us against religious persecution. But when I read of our manufacturing gentry wishing to subvert the rights of property, and all order in society, a grin, a Sardonyc grin, perhaps, forces itself upon

my countenance, since we all know that it is the interest of every one to respect the rights of property, and preserve the order of society.

In addressing yourself to the House of Commons, you say, that—" The necessity of affording protection to the lives and property of his Majesty's loyal subjects, (as witness the protection afforded by the military to the loyal inhabitants of Manchester) has compelled me to make some addition to our military force: but I have no doubt, (you seem well acquainted with the thoughts of the Members) you will be of opinion, that the arrangements for this purpose have been effected in the manner likely to be the least burdensome to the Country." Now if the House of Commons were a free, uncorrupted body of men, I am inclined to think they would doubt the truth of your Royal Highness's assertion altogether. They would suspect you had some bad advisers at bottom; and would discuss the matter freely and fearlessly before they permitted their Country to be awed by a standing army. Believe me, Sir, England, at this moment, stands in more need of bread than bayonets—more in need of a just and fair representation in Parliament, than of a standing Army; and those who tell your Royal Highness otherwise, are both your enemies and the enemies of the Nation.

Passing over the affair of the great standing Army as cautiously and gently as possible, you assure the Commons that the State of the Revenue, which you confess has undergone some little fluctuation since the close of the last Session of Parliament, appears to be again in a course of progressive improvement. If this be a proof of the improvement of the state of Society in England, I hope it may be true.

I hope your Royal Highness will take into consideration the miserable condition of that part of your Subjects who are called Deists, or Infidels. The Doctors of the Established Church attack them with a good deal of fury, prove, by invincible arguments no doubt, the truth of the Chris-

tian Religion, and defy their philosophic adversaries to disprove what they say. If the poor Infidel, however, should be unwary enough to accept the challenge, and reply, though in the most guarded manner, to the contumely of the Priests—the latter immediately raise a cry that the Church and State are in danger; and, fearing to meet their adversaries in the open field of controversy, call in the aid of His Majesty's Attorney-General, who in those cases, is the best arguer in the world, and the matter ends by the Infidel's being fined, imprisoned, and forbidden to write.

Praying that your Royal Highness may take this into consideration,

I remain,

Your Royal Highness's loving Subject,

JULIAN AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN.

REPUBLICAN IDEAS.

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH OF VOLTAIRE.

Supposed to have been written by a Citizen of Geneva.

---

1. DESPOTISM is the chastisement of the bad conduct of men. If a Nation suffer itself to be domineered over by one or more of its citizens, it is for this plain reason—it has neither the courage nor the ability to govern itself.

2. A society of men governed in an arbitrary manner, perfectly resembles a herd of cattle yoked for the service of their master. He feeds them that they may be in a condition to labour: he administers physic to them when sick, because it is in health alone that they can be of service to him; he fattens, in order to devour them; he cuts the skin of one into thongs to bind another to the plough.

3. Nations have been thus subjugated, either by a politic ambitious citizen who has taken advantage of their weakness and of their divisions; or by a Robber called a Conqueror, who, with other robbers, seized upon their lands, killed those who resisted; and made slaves of the few effeminates to whom he granted life.

4. This robber, who deserved to be broken upon a wheel, has sometimes commanded altars to be erected to him. The enslaved People have beheld, in the children of this robber, a race of gods; they have regarded the examination of their authority as blasphemy, and considered every effort to obtain their liberty as sacrilege.

5. The most absurd of despotisms, the most humiliating for human nature, the most contradictory, the most fatal, is that of priests; and of all sacerdotal Empires, without contradiction, that of Christian priests is the most criminal. It is an outrage done to our Holy Gospel; since Jesus Christ has repeated in twenty places: "there shall be neither first, nor last among you; my kingdom is not of this world; the son of man is not come to be obeyed, but to obey," &c.

6. Therefore when our Bishop, constituted to obey, and not to be obeyed; constituted to be the comfort and support of the poor, and not the destroyer of their property; in fine, created to teach and not to govern, has dared, in a time of anarchy, to intitle himself prince of that city, of which he was only the pastor; he is plainly guilty of tyranny and rebellion.

7. Thus the Bishops of Rome, who first gave this fatal example, rendered at once their Government and their sect odious to the half of Europe; thus many German Bishops became the oppressors of that People whose fathers and instructors they ought to have been.

8. Why is it in the nature of man to have greater detestation for those whose fawning knavery has wheedled him into subjection, than for those who have conquered and enslaved him by the force of arms? It is because those who conquered him in the field were possessed of courage at least, while those who deceived him were characterized only by cowardice and baseness. We hate, but we cannot help esteeming, the courage of a conqueror; while hatred and contempt are the portion of knavery; and hatred joined with contempt will stimulate men to throw off every yoke.

9. When we have destroyed in our city a part of popish superstitions, as the adoration of dead bodies, the tax of crimes, the insult offered to the Almighty by compounding for those sins, the punishing of which the Deity has reserved to himself, and many other inventions which brutify human nature, when, breaking the yoke of these monstrous errors, we have banished the popish Bishop who dared to speak to us in the style of a master, we have done nothing more than resume those rights of reason and liberty of which we had been deprived.

10. We have resumed likewise the municipal Government, nearly such as it was under the Romans, and we have strengthened and adorned it by that liberty which we have purchased with our blood. We do not acknowledge that odious and humiliating distinction of nobles and plebeians, which originally signified nothing else than lords and slaves. Born equal, we have remained so; and we have bestowed dignities, that is to say, public employment, upon those who appeared to us most proper to sustain them.

11. We have created priests to be the moral preceptors of our children, in which character only we consider them as intitled to respect. These preceptors ought to be remunerated and revered; but they should pretend to no jurisdiction, no inspection, no honour; in no case should they assume an equality with the magistracy. An ecclesiastical assembly that should presume to make a citizen bow before it, would act the part of a pedant who corrects children, or of a tyrant who punishes slaves.

12. To pronounce the words "Civil and Ecclesiastical Government," is an insult to reason and the laws. We ought to say, Civil Government, and Ecclesiastical Rules: and none of those rules ought to be constituted except by the civil power.

13. Civil Government is the will of all, executed by one or many, in virtue of those laws which all have enacted.

14. Those laws which properly constitute Government, are all made against ambition; men have always endeavoured to erect a dike against that torrent that would otherwise inundate the world. Thus in republics, the first laws regulate the rights of each body of the State; thus Kings swear at their coronation to preserve the rights and privileges of their subjects. The King of Denmark is the only sovereign of Europe, whom the laws themselves have made superior to the laws. The States assembled in 1660, declared him absolute arbiter of all. It seems the States foresaw that Denmark would be blessed with just and wise Kings for more than a century. Perhaps in the succession of ages they will find it necessary to alter this law.

15. The theologians have pretended that the Popes, by divine right, possess the same power over all the world which the Danish monarch possesses over one little corner of it—but they were theologians. The universe has hissed aloud, and the capitol has murmured from its basis, to see the monk Hildebrand dictating *en maitre* in the sanctuary of the laws, where the Catos, the Scipios, and the Ciceros, were content to speak the language of simple citizens.

THE COURT OF SATURN:

A Political Tale.

ADDRESSED TO THE ENGLISH PEOPLE.

In very remote antiquity Saturn reigned over a part of that country which afterwards received the general name of Greece. He was what might have been called a very good sort of a King, that is, he had no great abilities, either for the conducting of an army on a conquering or plundering

expedition abroad, or for the ordering and directing of the affairs of Government at home. But this was no very great inconvenience to any class of his subjects; he was docile and manageable; and thus when any of his Ministers had conceived a *penchant* for a part of the dominions of any neighbouring State, they had only to persuade the good old King that it was the interest of the nation to expend a few millions in a war with the said State, in order to humble their fancied enemy, and keep the nation in a kind of floating equilibrium between poverty and riches. Saturn immediately acceded to the proposal; and thus a respectable troop of generals, recruiting-serjeants, army and navy chaplains, agents, contractors, foreign and domestic spies, messengers, couriers, and admirals, were brought into play at once; and every one of the gang opened his mouth in praise of the gracious monarch by whose judicious conduct he was enabled to live an idle life. It is true, much of the wealth of the nation inevitably flowed into foreign channels, and the industrious peasantry were frequently reduced to starvation; but these petty considerations were not of sufficient weight to deter the monarch from following the sublime plans of his Ministers. The turbulent, the proud, the avaricious, the cruel, and the daring, find it their interest to promote and encourage war; and as the greater part of mankind is comprehended in one or the other of those classes, so the majority of every nation delight in blood and slaughter. During this monarch's reign a very memorable event occurred in that part of the world. One of the neighbouring nations having for ages suffered the despotic and wanton cruelty of a long race of tyrants, conceived the glorious project of living without any other master than the laws. The great nation arose in one mighty and irresistible mass—it demanded its liberty in a voice that ascended to heaven, and shook and unsettled the throne of every tyrant upon earth—the tyrant was instantly annihilated, and the nation was declared free! But surrounded by slaves and despots, they were threatened on every side, they were told that no people could live without a King, notwithstanding they themselves were a proud monument of the falsehood of the assertion—the nations took arms to deprive them of that liberty they adored—but unintimidated by the fulminating decrees of Despotism, they threw down the gauntlet, and appeared in arms, ready to dispute their freedom with the tyrants of the world. Saturn himself beheld with apathy this great political convulsion that shook the universe; but his Ministers were frightened to death. They

spared no expence to draw over to their party a certain orator, who was the Demosthenes of that day in every thing but integrity, whose splendid powers of description were well calculated to mislead a credulous, well-meaning people, and a still more credulous King, and they succeeded in prevailing on the cheated, bewildered nation to declare war against the children of Liberty. They did more. In order to destroy a few bold, well-meaning subjects, whose honest candour they had reason to dread, they terrified old Saturn with the phantom of a plot, which their wicked imaginations had created, and sowed so much distrust into the minds of their fellow-citizens, "that it was not altogether safe in that plotting age to ask what it was o'clock, since no one knew but some over-sage coxcomb might from that most wicked question cause you to be apprehended for a Jesuit, as having some treacherous conspiracy to execute, at such an hour, that made you so inquisitive about the time of the day."*

However, Saturn and his Ministers sent out a Fleet, and transported armies into the land of Freedom—and they were annihilated to a man; while the credulous People were amused with Gazettes Extraordinary, announcing triumphs and victories. More taxes were exacted, more fleets, more armies equipped; Royal Generals were sent into the field, and outwitted, defeated, and disgraced! Furious with chagrin and disappointment, the vicious Ministry of the good old King could think of no way to revenge their disgrace but by publishing falsehoods about the Government whose wisdom they hated in vain, and caricutures of the Generals who had conquered their armies. Mean and futile revenge! But it amused an ignorant populace—and they determined the populace should remain ignorant: for one of Saturn's favourite Declaimers laid a tax upon the papyrus on which the ancients wrote their books.

At length they were obliged to make peace with the free country; but the wound their pride had received still rankled at their heart, and they secretly determined to seize every opportunity which offered itself to annoy their noble, philosophical adversary.—Such is the picture of the reign of Saturn.

Amongst the numerous children of Saturn there was a Son called Jupiter, who beheld with envy and discontent the long reign of his father. He had been flattered into a belief that he possessed an immense capacity, and all the

* Charles Blount. Preface to Philostratus's life of Apollonius Tyranæ.

virtues and talents that constitute a great prince. His youth had been spent in the most lawless riot and debauchery; which gave the Nation vast room to hope to find in him, what Titus and Trajan afterwards were, the model of a perfect King. With these fallacious prospects before them, the Nation beheld with joy their ancient Sovereign stripped of the insignia of Royalty, and descend from the throne into a second minority! They beheld his graceless son wield the sceptre with a hand enervated by luxury—play with the pretty bauble for a few minutes—then, finding it too weighty, or too rough for his effeminate grasp—he threw it down on the arena amongst his vulture-like followers, who set up the war-whoop at the sight, and retired to the couch of Venus, to enjoy the sweets, no matter who supported the weight, of much envied, miserable Royalty.

Under the reign of this Prince mankind made hasty strides towards liberty. They perceived the feeble hands that directed the vast engine of the State were inadequate to the task—they saw the immense sums of money which were torn from the very vitals of the Country to support the prodigality and profusion of the court—they saw religion degenerate into a State trick, by which the Ministry attempted to crush the free spirit of enquiry—they saw knaves and coxcombs in possession of every situation of honour and every place of profit—and they determined to take their affairs into their own hands, and to go on in future without a Ministry, and without a King.

J. A. ST. JOHN.

THE following inscription was made out three years ago on a cannon, near which the *ashes* of President Bradshaw were lodged, on the top of a high hill near Martha Bay, Jamaica, to avoid the rage exhibited against the regicides at the Restoration :—

Stranger!
Ere thou pass, contemplate this cannon,
Nor regardless be told,
That near its base lies deposited the dust of
JOHN BRADSHAW,
Who, nobly superior to all selfish regards,
Despising alike the pageantry of Courtly splendour,
The blast of Calumny, and the terrors of Royal vengeance,
Presided in the illustrious band of heroes and patriots,
Who fairly and openly adjudged
Charles Stuart,
Tyrant of England,

To a public and exemplary death,
Thereby presenting to the amazed world,
And transmitting, down through applauding ages,
The most glorious example
Of unshaken virtue, love of freedom, and impartial justice,
Ever exhibited on the blood-stained theatre of human action.
O, Reader!
Pass not on till thou hast blessed his memory,
And ever, ever remember,
THAT REBELLION TO TYRANTS IS OBEDIENCE TO GOD.

SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR MR. CARLILE.

The following Letter has been received from Nottingham:

Nottingham, Nov. 18, 1819.

SIR,

AT a Free and Easy Society, held at my house on Thursday evening, a few friends of freedom, reading the heavy sentence of our old friend, Carlile, a motion was made by one of the company to raise a subscription for him. I am happy to inform you, that the sum of *Ten Pounds Twelve Shillings and Sixpence* was raised. I have no doubt but it will be followed by other houses in the town. They will thank you to inform Mr. C. what has been done, and to send me word if I must remit the money, or put it into Mr. Fellows's Bank, as I have no doubt there will be more raised.

I remain, dear Sir, yours, &c.

CHARLES HEALD.

Golden Fleece, Low Pavement.

A Free Inquiry, and the Brave..... £.1 0 0

TO MR. CARLILE.

November 6, 1819.

MY DEAR SIR,

THE tocsin of fanaticism has sounded an alarm, and the war-whoop of bloodshed, persecution, and murder, is once more raised by the satellites of "the whore of Babylon" against all who are bold enough to think for themselves, and to attend to the dictates of nature and of reason. In the disgusting flattery, the palpable falsehoods, the coarse and vulgar abuse of the Irish Barrister on Thursday last, we have only heard the echo of the doctrines and sentiments of those, who are the supporters of every thing that is oppressive to mankind and degrading to human nature. Had not

this man in the most dastardly manner taken advantage of your present situation, not only to insult and traduce you, Sir; but to implore, under the cloke of sympathy for his fellow-men, all who were on the side of your persecutors to use every means in their power to crush you, and those who dared to think and act in concert with you; I would have passed over his silly effusions, his unfounded calumnies, with the contempt they merited; and have permitted him to enjoy unmolested his *honourable* triumph over an oppressed and fettered individual. Did it depend on this man, and some of those he had the *honour* of addressing upon the subject connected with the Bible, and the religion founded upon it, Smithfield would again be lighted up, and the free enquirer after truth would again be immolated at the shrine of the Christian's God: but thanks to the spirit of truth that is gone forth into the world, and whose progress is neither to be checked nor retarded by the sophistry, whining cant, and malignant efforts of its enemies.

"I despise as much as any man," says this consistent babbler, "the whine of bigotry—I will go as far any man for rational liberty; but I will not depose my God to deify the infidel, or tear in pieces the Charter of the State, and grope for a Constitution amongst the murky pigeon-holes of every creedless, lawless, infuriated regicide." That a barrister, such for instance as Mr. Phillips, "wonld not depose his God to deify the infidel," or *any one else*; or "tear in pieces the Charter of the State" on any account whatever, not even from motives of emolument or worldly aggrandisement, may perhaps be accredited; but who will believe, after candidly perusing the truly eloquent speech which gained him so much applause from his civic Majesty, and the admirers of his reign, that "he despises as much as any man the *whine of bigotry*," or that "he will go as far as any man for *rational liberty?*" I must confess that I am wholly at a loss to understand this Gentleman's elegant metaphorical language when he talks about "groping for a Constitution amongst the murky pigeon-holes of every creedless, lawless, infuriated rigicide." No doubt it occurred to his mind whilst rumaging amongst some old briefs in the corners of his apartments for a piece of paper upon which to write his precious composition; but I must also add, that if we were to judge of the "creedless, lawless infidel" by his practice, and of "the infuriated regicide" by his intolerant and murderous spirit, I should naturally have concluded that instead of alluding to you, Sir, and those who profess and act upon the same pure and philanthropic principles, this man was addressing the actors and approvers of the scenes at Birmingham towards Priestley, and at Manchester towards the Reformers; judge then of my surprise and indignation when I found that this man's calumnies were directed to you, Sir, and when I heard him state "that on your memorable trial at Guildhall, you were withering hour after hour with the most horrid blasphemies, surrounded by the votaries of every sect, and the heads of every faith—the Christian Archbishop, the Jewish Rab-

bi, the men most eminent for their *purity* and learning, whom you had purposely collected to hear your infidel ridicule of *all they reverenced*—when he saw you raise the Holy Bible in one hand, and the Age of Reason in the other, as it were confronting the Almighty with a rebel-worm, till the *pious Judge grew pale*, and the *patient Jury* interposed, and you (or, as he is pleased to style you, "the self-convicted wretch,") after having raved away all your original impiety, was reduced into a mere machine for the re-production of the ribald blasphemies of others"—"I could not help exclaiming" adds this pious and liberal-minded Christian, "Infatuated man! if all your impracticable madness could be realized what would you give us in exchange for our *establishments?* What would you substitute for that *august tribunal?* for whom would you displace that *independent Judge*, and that *impartial Jury?* or would you really burn the Gospel, and erase the statutes, for the dreadful equivalent of the crucifix and the guillotine? Indeed if I were asked for a *practical panegyric* on our Constitution, I would adduce the very trial of that criminal; and if the legal annals of any country upon earth furnished an instance, not merely of *such justice*, but of *such patience, such forbearance*, such *almost culpable indulgence*, I would concede to him the triumph. I hope too in what I say, I shall not be considered as forsaking that *illustrious example*. I hope I am above an insult on any man in his situation (Is not this sheer hypocrisy, is it not the whine of bigotry?) *perhaps*, had I the power I would follow the example further than I ought (of oppression no doubt, Mr. Cantwell) *perhaps* I would even humble him into an evidence of the very spirit he spurned (as there would be little probability of success, Mr. Barrister, I need not exclaim Heaven forbid!) and as our *creed* was *reviled* in his person, and *vindicated in his conviction*, so I would give it its noblest triumph in his sentence, and *merely* consign him to the *punishment of its mercy*." I say when I heard such language as the above, I scarcely knew which to execrate most, his fulsome adulation, "his whine of bigotry," his despicable calumnies, or his endeavours to suppress every thing like "*rational* liberty." As to the *noble triumph* which this champion of error and of Christianity would confer upon his creed in *merely* consigning you to *the punishment of its mercy*,* I am too fearful that it will receive it by sending you to the Spanish Inquisition that you may be converted to "the faith," and then roasted or baked alive, that you may escape the danger of relapsing into the same damnable heresies; or, perhaps, in consideration of your family, or, what is more probable, from fear of so dangerous an experi-

* Christian mercy is said to be extended to a man who differs from the Holy Mother Church when he is burned or flayed alive, or when he is prosecuted and imprisoned for several years, or, perhaps, for life far away from his nearest and dearest connections.

ment) they may be induced to exercise their mercy (towards themselves) by immuring you *only for life* in some Country Bastille. But not to take up your valuable room by commenting at large upon all the unmanly calumnies of this Gentleman, I shall dismiss this letter with two other quotations only from his *celebrated* Speech.

After conceding that Christianity *may be false*, or, in his own words, that "*it may, indeed, be nothing but delusion*," he consoles himself with the negative satisfaction, that "he errs with the disciples of philosophy and of virtue—with men who drank deep at the fountain of human knowledge, but who dissolved not the pearl of their salvation in the draught." Better and better, Mr. Phillips; but are you really sincere when you say that it is a consolation to "err with Locke, whose pure philosophy taught him to adore its source; whose warm love of genuine liberty was never chilled into rebellion with its Author—with Newton, whose war-like spirit, shooting athwart the darkness of the sphere, too soon to re-ascend to the home of his nativity—with Franklin, the playmate of the lightning, the philosopher of liberty, whose electric touch thrilled through the hemisphere? With men like *these*, my Lord, (the Barrister would have been more correct had he said, 'with men like *you*, my Lord,') I shall remain in error; nor shall I desert those errors even for the *drunken death-bed of a Paine*, or the delirious war-whoop of *the surviving fiends*, who would erect their altar on the ruins of society." What, in the name of every thing that is consistent, are we to suppose from the selection of the above great men, that the religious opinions of the Barrister are? And I am naturally led to ask this question, because for broaching similar opinions to those held by these truly excellent and dignified characters, he has loaded you with the foulest epithets that a man could possibly lay his tongue to. Locke and Newton were, if not Deists, certainly Unitarians; and Franklin was a confirmed Deist—but I had almost forgotten that Barristers can at any time, to answer a purpose, take both sides of a question; and that Mr. Phillips is not behindhand with the fraternity, is, I think, clearly proved in the following declaration against the Deists:—"In my opinion, it is difficult to say whether their tenets are more *ludicrous* or more *detestable*." Now, my dear Sir, most unfortunate for this Gentleman, this turns out to be a most unhappy expression of his spleen, especially as a Right Reverend Father* in God (Watson) states, that "*there is nothing in Deism but what is in Christianity*"—and Deists are very willing to admit, that "there is much in Christianity that is not in Deism." But as assertion is at all times

---

* "Call ye no man Father on earth," says Christ, "for one is your Father in heaven." Yet Catholics have their Popes, Papas, or Fathers, and Protestants their *Fathers in God*.

equivalent to assertion, and as Deists, with honest indignation, repel the unfounded calumnies charged upon them by this "honourable man," it may be as well to compare the leading tenets of the religion which this man advocates with those professed by the Deist, that a correct judgment may be formed as to which are *most ludicrous*, and which are *most detestable*.

The Trinitarian Christian, then, (and it is only from the Trinitarian Christian that the Deist experiences insult and persecution!) believes, or professes to believe in the individuality, and, consequently, in the indivisibility of his God; yet he states that this God is composed or made up of three distinct persons, each of whom, taken separately, is Almighty God! He believes, or professes to believe, that these three persons are co-eternal and co-equal; yet he also affirms that the Son was begotten* of the Father, and the Holy Ghost proceeded from both. He believes his God to be just and immutable, yet he also says that his wrath was kindled into love by the sacrifice of his only begotten Son, his equal; and whom he suffered to be put to the most cruel and disgraceful death that it was possible for the worst of malefactors to experience, and that too after he had received the grossest insults and indecencies from the very beings he had created!! Yet we are still gravely informed that the Father and the Son are but one God; that the *sender* and the *sent* are one and the same Being; that the God who suffered and died (God to suffer and die!!!) is one and the same Deity with him to whom the sacrifice of his life was made†!!!) The Trinitarian Christian also believes that his God is infinitely just and merciful towards his creatures; yet he adds, that from all eternity millions and millions of the offspring of mankind were doomed to everlasting tortures for no other crime than that of not being born of those who had been selected from the great mass for the enjoyment of eternal bliss! But let us turn from this disgusting picture, this horrible libel upon infinite wisdom and goodness, to the tenets of the Deist, and which cannot be given in a better form than in the language of an elegant writer upon this subject:—

"Deism declares to intelligent man the existence of one perfect God, Creator and Preserver of the Universe; that the laws by which he governs the world are like himself, immutable, and, of

---

* The disgusting construction put upon this word, which simply signifies *selected* or *chosen* from a number of other objects, reminds one of the heathen story of Jupiter and Semelè, and the consequent production of Bacchus from Jupiter's thigh.

† If Jesus Christ were really and truly Almighty God, equal with the Father, had he not an equal right to require the same satisfaction for the sins of a guilty world as the Father? for if they be one God, possessing the same mind and will, they must be equally offended at the same crimes.

course, that violations of these laws, or miraculous interference in the movements of nature, must be necessarily excluded from the grand system of universal existence; that the creation is justly entitled to the adoration of every intellectual being throughout the regions of infinite space; and that he alone is entitled to it, having no co-partners who have a right to share with him the homage of the intelligent world. Deism also declares that the practice of a pure, natural, and uncorrupted virtue, is the essential duty, and constitutes the highest dignity of man; that the powers of man are competent to all the great purposes of human existence; that science, virtue, and happiness, are the great objects which ought to awaken the mental energies and draw forth the moral affections of the human race.

"These are some of the outlines," adds this excellent author, "of pure Deism, which Christian superstition so dreadfully abhors, and whose votaries she would willingly consign to endless torture. But it is built upon a substantial foundation, and will triumphantly diffuse happiness among the nations of the earth for ages after Christian superstition and fanaticism have ceased to spread desolation and carnage through the fair creation of God."

Now, my dear Sir, what unprejudiced and candid inquirer after truth will, upon the perusal of the above Christian tenets, (without taking into account the horrible, torturous murders of millions of our fellow-men to this worse than Pagan system) consider Deists as deserving the *gentlemanly* and *Christian-like* epithets of "Bacchanals of orgies,"—"venom-breathing brood,"—"hell brood of infidelity,"—"infuriate regicides," or that they are guilty of dealing out "ribald blasphemy,"—"infectious venom," or that their doctrines tend to "change this healthful land into a charnel-house, where murder, anarchy, and prostitution, will quaff the heart's blood of the *consecrated* and the *noble*."* But taking it into consideration, Sir, that the man, who has not scrupled to prostitute his talents to the worst of purposes, is a Barrister and a bigoted Christian, it would be useless to impress upon his mind the necessity of acting according to the golden Republican rule, "Do unto ALL men as you would have them do unto you." I shall therefore conclude by subscribing myself, with every sentiment of the most heartfelt regard, and trusting that you may not experience the "punishment of Christian mercy,"

Yours most respectfully,

T. WHITWORTH.

142, Fetter Lane, Fleet Street.

---

* The Bishops Bonner and Laud were the *consecrated;* and Harry the Eighth (the first villain whom the priests dignified with the title of "Defender of the Faith,") and Judge Jefferys were the *noble* of their day.

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke-street, Smithfield.

The Republican.

No. 15. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Dec. 3, 1819. [Price. 2d.

CRISIS.—No. V.

It might be said without presumption, or without the fear of false predictions, or of contradiction, that the Crisis has arrived. That Crisis, when it is become the duty of Britons to protect their rights, and endeavour to obtain a salutary change, or reformation, or revolution, (if it will please the Borough-mongers better,) in the existing form of the Government. It is a most important Crisis, and requires all the virtue as well as all the courage of the age to meet it. Britons, the time is now come when the chains which have for a long time been thrown round you, and to which you are almost tacitly habituated, must be shaken off, or rivetted with additional fetters. There is no alternative.

At the time I write this, I am not aware that any application has been yet made to the House of Commons to suspend the *Habeas Corpus Act*, but from what has passed on the first and second night of debate, I think there can be little doubt but it will be so. We find the Ministers have avowed to make no concession in point of Reform, therefore if they do not suspend the *Habeas Corpus Act*, they will do nothing to preserve their own places a few months longer. I fear they know too well the ground they stand on to neglect to do this.

It is now probable that this will be the last article written under the above head in this publication, as I am informed from good authority that the Government are determined to put this paper down because of its title. Howbeit, no effort on my part shall be wanting to keep it up; I shall, there-

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke-street, Smithfield.

fore, take it altogether out of the hands of Mrs. Carlile, whose present situation will not admit of her being continually harrassed as she has lately been, and give it up to a friend in whom I have some confidence, and for whom I would entreat that generous and liberal support I have myself received, and for which I shall at all times feel grateful, and study to merit by my subsequent conduct; and I now pledge myself to my injured and fellow-suffering Countrymen, that they may at any time when necessary, command my life, which in that cause of which I have been one of the humblest advocates, I value as little as I have valued my personal liberty. I shall conclude this article, which may be my first and last from this prison by addressing my fair country-women.

It was my intention to have addressed you in a separate letter, and which I considered your importance in the political scale of society merited, but the fear of disappointment induces me to seize the present opportunity. It has afforded me much gratification to find thousands of you, such as I personally witnessed at Manchester, coming forward at public Meetings presenting the Cap of Liberty, and making an address publicly to your husbands, relatives, sweethearts, and friends. I am sensible, and I am aware that you are sensible, that under an opposite state of things to the affairs of this Country, the proper place of women would be their fire-sides, but in the present state of things it is a proof of extraordinary virtue to see a female sensible of the degraded state of her family, and the cause of that degradation; to see that female exposing her fair form to the pressure of public Meetings, and encountering many difficulties to evince an ardour and a determination to assist in a struggle for a change. You have been reviled by a certain portion of the Newspaper Press, and have been called "vile," "profligate," and "vicious;" but it must be no small consolation to you to know, that the most *debased prostitute* in this Country is that part of the Newspaper Press that has reviled and calumniated you. When you attended Bible and Missionary

Societies to uproot the systems of religion, and perturb the peaceable minds of the People of other Countries, when you lent yourself for the purpose of going from house to house to collect pence, and old clothes to support those societies; you were never then told about staying at home, or neglecting your families; no, to be sure, you were then forwarding the work of Corruption, you were then making a scourge for yourselves; but when you open your eyes and see your error, and turn from this foolish path, you are then to be branded as profligate and vicious, for doing that which nothing but virtue herself could stimulate to do. As I am certain that it could be no common degree of virtue that called you into the field of politics, so on the other hand, I feel sure that you are not to be driven from it by calumny, or slander. Continue to stand forward—as matrons encourage your husbands and sons—as maidens your sweethearts, to do their duty in this Crisis of their country's fate. Your appearance, and taking a part in the cause will prevent much confusion. The hearts of your children and relatives in array will yearn to behold you opposed to them; your weight, therefore, in the political scale becomes of much more importance than you are generally aware of. I doubt not but that it was the activity and general appearance of the French women that induced the military to side with them, and which you may judge prevented much bloodshed in that Country that would otherwise have occurred. France, although in her present degraded condition, feels great benefits from her Revolution, the peasantry are much better situated than the peasantry of this Country, they are leaving us quite in the back ground in point of civil and religious liberty. You may there see that the horrors which attended the French Revolution, and dreadful indeed they were, such as I think we have no fear of witnessing in this Country, are not to be put in competition with the benefits the Nation has derived from it. Do not be alarmed therefore at the sound of revolution—revolutions become essential to all countries at stated periods.

RICHARD CARLILE.

Dorchester Gaol,
Nov. 27, 1819.

SONG.

Tune—"*Roncesvalles.*"

BRITONS, from this fatal slumber,
  Rouse, your country succour craves!
Woes beset you without number,
  Rouse! nor crawl a race of slaves.

Hark! the voice of Freedom calls you,
  For your dearest rights to stand!
Lest worse ills than these befall you,
  Drive your tyrants from the land.

Will you yield to die with hunger?
  Shall the dungeon hide each head?
Shall the scoundrel Borough-monger
  Rob you of your hard-earn'd bread?

Once Columbia's mighty People
  Pined in fetters tight as we,
But, resolved base power to cripple,
  Won the blessing, Liberty.

Let bold Cromwell's name inspire ye,
  Emulate his glorious worth;
Let these bright examples fire ye,
  Drive your despots from the earth.

Let not villain threats confound ye,
  Fear not gaols nor gibbets dire;
Lo! your infants starving round ye,
  Vengeance deep their cries inspire.

Brave, in Freedom's cause to perish
  Mean, of plagues or want at home;
Then the generous impulse cherish,
  Freedom, or a glorious doom.

W. L.

TO MR. RICHARD CARLILE, NEWTON BUSHEL, DEVON.

Dorchester Gaol, Nov. 24th, 1819.

DEAR SIR,

FREED from the bustle of politics, polemics, and business, and consigned to a less painful state of bondage, I have found a little time for reflection and the recollection of former friends: amongst those of Devonshire, I find that you stand high on the list, and should you still remain an Unitarian, I presume, that you will not object to read a letter from one, who retains a respect for you, although he stands proudly boasting of being *convicted of infidelity to the Christian religion.* Methinks I hear you demand, "Your reasons for disbelief, Sir?" They are, because I believe, that the great First Cause or the supreme and all influencing Power, which we call God, is omnipotent and all-sufficient, and needs no mediator to intercede with him and his creatures; and again, because I have satisfied my own mind, that every species of religion that has existed and been practised on the base of the earth, has been the invention, fraud, and imposture of priests, supported by Monarchical Governments as a necessary instrument to enslave the minds and bodies of their subjects, and has tended to destroy the reason and blind the understandings of all mankind wherever it has been predominant.

You further demand, "Where is your substitute?" I say, there needs none. Morality and virtue should be the common study of man, and history informs us, that they never were united with religion but that the ratio of the increase or decrease of the former, has been ever in opposition to that of the latter. Moral virtue is sufficient for man to practise through life, both for his own happiness and that of his fellow—religion has ever made him wretched. Taught by priests, that it is his duty to neglect his temporal affairs, or those that relate to the well-being of his body, and apply himself to the preservation of that phantom which they call his soul, man has continued in misery and

unhappiness, the dupe of his own imagination, and the wild and wicked vagaries of religion. Man has no soul that is immortal; the mind of man can scarcely be said to be immortal, because experience has taught us, that the wreck of ages might annihilate it—he is an animal with a peculiar gift —the gift of speech, which secures to him a peculiar faculty of thought and idea; and this has been satisfactorily proved by Professor Lawrence to arise from a peculiar organization differing from every other animal. I cannot mention the name of Lawrence, without regretting, that he should have suffered his mind to be buffetted from the path of truth by the sycophants of the same profession, backed by an alarmed clergy, and to have suppressed that most interesting of all books his Physiological Lectures. It is another proof of the destructive influence of a corrupt and wicked clergy on the well-being of society.

That man has no soul, or no immortal part, may be proved to demonstration. We see the course of all the animal and vegetable creation, we see that it perishes, and again amalgamates with the common mass of matter; we see that one course or generation contains the seed for the next—it produces and perishes: and so on from generation to generation to all eternity. Matter itself is imperishable, and wherever matter exists, vegetation and animation will exist also. It is the vanity and arrogance of man in attempting to account for and reach the first cause that has produced so many idle stories and creeds, which have distracted and destroyed the fairer part of the creation on this orb. Cease, then, to reach at impossibilities, and study that thou canst comprehend. The book of nature is the only book of genuine truth—there you cannot be deceived. To call a written book the word of God, and for man to believe it so, is amongst the first causes of the wretchedness and misery of mankind—let us read the book of nature as the only word of God, and we shall not err. I do not expect that this letter will be altogether agreeable to you, as I recollect in your last, you referred me to something you called the Gospel for

future salvation. Whether or not you have a mind capable of pinning its faith on a book, is best known to yourself, but should it be so, I can only consider it with *Rochefoucault*, who says of women, and men with the minds of women, that "they become religious when nature has decreed them unfit for gallantry and coquetry." I write with freedom to you, and claim from you the same indulgence as you have at all times claimed from the society you have mixed in, namely, to speak out freely. I well recollect your being in company with Mr. Cox, of Exeter, and by way of sarcasm, toasting "those things called Christians;" the toast was introduced by Mr. Cox, and heartily coincided in by you. I being then young and inconsiderate, looked on both of you as mad or wicked men, and felt ashamed of the company I had fallen into; but now, Sir, I respond the sentiment, and wish you and Mr. Cox to pity those things called Christians.

I write this letter more for your amusement and my own pastime than with any intent to perturb that serenity of mind which I hope you enjoy in your retirement; sorry should I be if it gave you a moment's uneasiness. I have resolved to follow that truly philosophic maxim of Epicurus, to seek all the pleasure that this life can possibly afford, I know nothing that can be so agreeable to old age as a peaceful retirement with the partner both of your pleasures and sorrows, such as I know you possess. If I could, for a moment, think that you were not at ease as to what becomes of the vital part when it is extinct in the body, I would solicit from you a correspondence on that subject, but at present I have a much higher opinion of you. When I consider the general contempt in which you have invariably held the outward line of conduct observed by mankind, when I consider the rectitude of principle and precision of conduct that has at all times been manifest even in those vagaries you were wont to amuse yourself and your neighbours with, I cannot imagine that you would suffer your mind to be made uneasy by any religious and hypocritical jargon, or unintelligible creeds. Hoping, therefore, that you are quite

at ease on these subjects, and that you have a competency to meet the few wants of nature during the few years you may calculate on remaining in your present state, with the satisfaction that your partner will not be left unprovided for, I shall cease to trouble you with any more ideas of my own, unless it should be your request—in the mean time, I have chalked out a path in which I intend to move through life, resolved to turn neither to the right nor to the left, heedless of either the clamours or the contempt of mankind.

I am, Sir,

Yours respectfully,

RICHARD CARLILE.

PHILOSOPHICAL ESSAYS ON GOVERNMENT AND RELIGION.—No. III.

"Most men, like carriers' horses, follow one another in a track, where if the fore-horses goes wrong, all the rest succeed him in his error; not considering that he who comes behind, may take an advantage to avoid that pit, which those that went before are fallen into."

Charles Blount.---Life of Apollonius Tyranæus.

"All wise princes, till they were overborn with faction, or solicited by peevish persons, gave toleration to differing Sects, whose opinions did not disturb the public interest. And the experience which Christendom hath had in this last age is argument enough, that toleration of differing opinions is so far from disturbing the public peace, or destroying the interest of princes and Commonwealths, that it advantages the public, and secures peace; because there is not so much as the pretence of religion left to such persons to contend for, it being already indulged to them."

Ibid. Ibidem.

MANKIND are generally so attached to the customs of their ancestors that they respect even their very follies; and the man who is bold enough to expose the gross mistakes, absurdities, and contradictions which age have rendered venerable, will be sure at the same time to expose himself to the insults of ignorant People, and to the persecution of arbitrary power. This consideration, however, has but little weight with the man who has devoted his life to the study

of philosophy: he is prepared to meet the resentment of the ignorant, and the spite and malice of the unmasked hypocrite; he will neither shrink from danger, nor plunge headlong into it—he is unchangeable as the Truth he rests upon. I intend these observations as a preface to a short dissertation on Nobility and Aristocratical Government. "The word *Noble* did not originally signify a title which conferred any rights, and was not hereditary. NOBILITAS, among the Romans, signified that which is EMINENT, REMARKABLE; and not a distinct order of Citizens."*—Things have altered strangely since the time of the Romans. The Nobility, all over Europe, are now a distinct order of Citizens, have rights, titles, and privileges peculiar to themselves; and are, in fact, the men who govern all. In every country they assume a haughty repelling air, and treat with contempt the wise, the patriotic, and the brave, if they be not distinguished in the world for something more than mere virtue. A Nobleman will seldom condescend to read any thing which has been written by a Plebeian: a man who was born to no title is not likely to think or write with any dignity; he has always something about him which reminds one of his low birth; and in fact his very language and phraseology prove him to be one of the People. This is the cant of Nobility: and if one may judge of the language and phraseology of the Great, by the few specimens we have had of Royal and Noble authors, we may fairly conclude, with a very few exceptions, that there is an immense difference between those who are impelled to scribble by *ennui* or spleen, and those whose pens are guided by wisdom, and who are induced to lay their mature thoughts before the world by patriotism, or a love of fame. It is the same in every thing else. The rich and great have the reputation of wisdom, because they have money enough to bribe those into their service who really possess it, and who, not being much in the favour of fortune, are obliged to prostitute those talents to the service of a wealthy master, which, were they independent, and their choice consequently free, would reflect honour on the age, and country that produced them.

In this train of reflections the absurdity of hereditary Nobility is a striking feature. It is a very trite, but a very

* Voltaire. Essai sur Les Mœurs. tom. iii. p. 417.

true remark, that virtue is not hereditary. This being granted, does it not appear very ridiculous that a certain train of titles, rights, and privileges, which have been granted to a worthy man for his great abilities, or public virtues, should descend to his worthless son who possesses neither the one nor the other? But say these titles, rights, &c. are bestowed by the monarch; and that he is the best judge what a man's merits may be to whom he grants such signal favours. Granted: he may be best able to judge of the exact quantity of virtue with which a courtier's character ought to be seasoned—but what may be virtuous and deserving in a monarch's eyes, may be criminal, and deserving a halter in those of the People—virtue is generally measured by its degree of utility in the estimation of the person who judges. A man may be extremely useful, or agreeable to a king, in promoting his pleasures, smoothing, and giving a fair face to his vices, flattering his humours and caprices, and palliating or excusing his crimes. But this complying disposition, though it may procure its possessor a patent of Nobility, is far from being beneficial to the Nation, which generally pays more respect to home-spun manly virtue, than to the polished insiduous manners of a courtier—the latter being generally the mask of vice—the former neither wearing nor requiring a mask.—But that we may fortify our sage maxims by authority, I will adduce that of one of the greatest men that Europe ever produced to shew that virtue has little or nothing to do in a monarchical Government.

"Virtue is not the principle of a monarchical Government. In monarchies, policy always endeavours to attain its end with the least virtue possible. Ambition in effeminacy, meanness mingled with pride, the desire of procuring riches without labour, aversion for truth, flattery, treason, perfidy, a contempt of all duties, a dread of the princes' virtues, with a proper degree of confidence on his weakness, but above all the perpetual ridicule with which virtue is attacked, are, I believe, the characteristics of the greater part of courtiers, in every age and country. Now it is very unfortunate that the Great men of every country should be knaves, and the Plebeians honest men—so that if by chance one honest man should be found among the People, it is the advice of the Cardinal de Richelieu that he ought not to be employed—so true it is, that virtue is not the moving spring of monarchy."*

* Montesquieu, Esprit des Lois.

This character of Nobility was not drawn by an envious Plebeian; it was sketched by a French Baron; by a president of one of the Parliaments of France; by one who had every opportunity of becoming acquainted with courtiers, and an hereditary nobility—yet who would have painted them in more detestable colours—or more to the life! Yet this is the order of men who have in all countries lorded it over the human race—these are the men who have riveted the chains of the People, and then insulted them in their humiliation: who have supported monarchy while it authorized their feudal tyranny, or overwhelmed it when it could no longer suffer their insolence. Hereditary Nobility is an insult to human nature: it supposes one part of the human race to be essentially superior to the other from generation to generation—and the institution has condemned thousands of worthy men to labour unceasingly, for the support of a few effeminate, unfeeling wretches. And this is not all. Should some superior spirit arise among the People, whose penetrating mind could perceive the respect and deference which nature whispered were its due—should its eccentric splendour attract the attention of all around it—should it begin to acquire riches and fame and power, and use them with moderation—should his fellow-citizens begin to look upon the patriot as their natural leader—the jealous Nobility immediately interpose; blast his reputation, crush his hopes, and extinguish for ever the blazing torch that might have enlightened a world!

Such are the few desultory observations I have to offer at present on hereditary Nobility. I now turn to the Governments in which these patricians dominate—to a disgusting picture, 'tis true; but to one that deserves to be sketched by the pencil of a Voltaire, or a Montesquieu.

After the defeat of the Helots, the Lacedæmonians were a nation of nobles; and the Helots were the prototypes of all the labouring slaves of succeeding ages. Those poor wretches were doomed to incessant toil, to robbery, insult, and every species of wretchedness, while their unfeeling lords were occupied in games, exercises, or war. Every day brought with it its peculiar train of miseries,—the bright soul-cheering Sun, that awakens all Nature to festivity and joy, was, to the perpetual Slave, only the gloomy harbinger of wretchedness. He saw nothing lovely in nature: the gay, animated, sportive picture which she presents to man in those beautiful climes, was to him a dreary uninteresting blank. All that was beautiful, and all that was engaging

around him became tasteless or detestable—the groves, the streams, the cascade, or the lively landscape—were unadmired—in every scene the image of his tyrannic master was before him, and his soul sickened at the sight. It was only in the gloom of night that he could fancy himself free; because the impenetrable shadows that surrounded him, veiled his emaciated form from the eyes of his Lord—and he became fond of darkness—his mind assimilated itself to the terrific drapery that surrounded it—and he became ferocious. Irritated by oppression, and habituated to feelings of revenge, the unhappy slave awaited the moment when indulgent nature should afford him an opportunity of retaliation, and of once more asserting those rights of which he had been so cruelly deprived. The moment arrives—an earthquake, that threatened the dissolution of the world, shook the kingdom of Laconia to pieces—cities were buried—mountains hurled from their foundations—rivers forced out of their beds—every thing presented the prospect of a world in ruins. Where were the oppressed injured Slaves at this awful moment? In arms! for the recovery of their liberty, and for the revenging of their wrongs! And their rage was terrible. War shook her horrid banners over the country just trembling at the devastations of nature—the affrighted tyrants took arms—appeared in the field—and perceived they were not a match for the nation they had enslaved—they call the Athenians to their aid, and by their united efforts reduce the unfortunate Helots to their ancient slavery.

But this insurrection of the slaves taught them a lesson. They perceived that man is naturally fond of liberty, that he will always attempt to regain it, if it has been wrested from his grasp, and that he is never so brave as when fighting in its cause: and to prevent the renewal of a conflict in which they found there was much uncertainty and danger, they adopted a savage custom to thin the number of the enslaved, and hunted them through the country like wild beasts.

This was the first Aristocratical Government of which any thing certain is known: and it is an excellent specimen of that sort of Government. Athens was generally free; and was perhaps the only city in the world that ever was so. And it is an incontestible argument that they were happier than their neighbours, that they were always envied by all the world. The birth-place, the cradle, the grave of liberty, was likewise the Temple of Genius, and the asylum of Science and Philosophy. Every thing flourished beneath the laurels of liberty—Athens, the single city of Athens, has

produced more artists, poets, patriots, orators, sages, and legislators, than all the world beside.—What a glorious triumph for Democracy.

Rome, from the expulsion of the Tarquins to the battle of Phillippi, which put an end to Roman liberty, was always wavering between patrician tyranny and a democracy—sometimes the people were free, and sometimes they were slaves. Generally the patricians charged the friends of the people with sedition, and contrived to murder them. They did so in the case of the Gracchi, the greatest patriots that Rome ever produced, and in many other instances that might be collected from the Roman history. In the latter years of the republic, the Government was a military tyranny, which was at length transformed into an absolute monarchy, not at all worse than the other.

Venice is the next state that displayed any thing like a love of liberty: but at Venice the people were always slaves, and the haughty aristocracy alone were free. It is in vain that we designate a Government Republican, unless the people govern, either immediately, or by their representatives; an aristocracy is worse than absolute monarchy, for the plain reason, that fifty tyrants are worse than one. Besides, it is not absolutely impossible but the monarch may be a virtuous man, though it is very unlikely; but that all the nobles engaged in an aristocratical Government should be good men, is what no man in his senses will expect—and one tainted sheep will spoil a whole flock.

As to the small republics of Italy, they are too inconsiderable to arrest our attention—directly or indirectly they were all enslaved. An hereditary nobility was the bane of their happiness; they could never get rid of their counts, and dukes, and popes, and cardinals—a popish country can never be truly free. The eventful history of France is little interesting till within a few years of the Revolution; one is disgusted with the unceasing repetition of those persecutions, massacres, and crimes that characterize a monarchical Government—one can see little to admire even in their great Henry, or greater Louis—all is hypocrisy, and massacre, and Atheism. But after the Revolution, what a change!—in the stead of persecution, and ignorance, and anarchy, we behold toleration, and science, and order spring up. The French people were truly regenerated; their follies evaporated; their character changed; and for a few years they tasted that freedom which can alone render a nation happy.

The other nations of Europe are centuries behind the French in science and civilization: but the thunder of the Revolution has awakened them from their lethargy—they have ever since been inquiring into the causes of their misfortunes—they are determined to think for themselves. Among the foremost of these nations is Great Britain. The spirit of freedom is gone abroad—intolerance and persecution are deprecated and abhorred—and liberty is the order of the day.

It is the general opinion that our Parliament intends to restrain the liberty of the press within very narrow limits, and to deprive us altogether of the right or privilege of discussing political subjects—they are in the right to do so, if they can; and the English nation deserves to be enslaved to eternity if it suffer them. The Government has already shewn its intolerant spirit in the condemnation of Carlile, and we may expect to be prohibited from thinking next. I am sure they have as much right to imprison us for thinking, as for speaking what we think—language ought to be as free as thought, and thought as the very air we breathe. How is any man sure he thinks more correctly than I do? Has he the majority on his side? That proves nothing. When the moon is eclipsed, the whole Tartar nation is in great consternation, believing the Devil about to run away with her—and should some sage arise at the time and contradict the popular belief, he would certainly be in the right, and yet he would get his brains knocked out for being so. It is the same in every other country—whoever believes as the rest of the nation does, is respected as a good citizen, let the national belief be ever so absurd—and whoever is bold enough to tell a nation that believes contradictions, that it is ridiculous for believing them, will be sure to be hanged for his pains.

Society is held together by a very singular cement, made up of wisdom, prejudice, and superstition—the muck which the masons mix with the mortar, destined to cement the walls of a palace, is as necessary as the fine marble pillars to the completion of the whole design, and is concealed by more showy materials when the palace is finished: but the mud-gatherer would be very ridiculous if he were to pretend that mud alone was necessary to build a palace. In like manner superstition may perhaps be necessary in society; prejudices may have their utility; but the dealer in prejudice and superstition should never take it into his head that he is the only person in the world that does any good;

much less ought he to persecute and massacre the man who is more enlightened or more honest than himself. He ought to be convinced that legislators, philosophers, and statesmen, who cannot believe his superstitious tales, are quite as necessary as himself to the well-being of society, and he ought to learn toleration and mildness.

Above all, a prince or a statesman should beware how he delegates his power to a priest; he should beware how he is made the tool of a religious faction; he ought to perceive that diversity of opinion is the support of Government, since those who busy themselves much about the affairs of the next world, generally neglect the one they live in. Whether this be policy or not on their part is a question—but it is certainly politic in a prince to let them quarrel on, as long as they do it in a civil manner, that is, as long as they use only words, for when the spiritualists come to blows, it is time for the prince or magistrate to interpose.

But while men conduct themselves peaceably, I cannot conceive what right the Government has to meddle with their faith. If I chose to worship an *onion*, as was the case with the Egyptians, or the female *pudendum*, like the Ansarians of Syria, according to the account of M. Volney, I cannot see who has a right to quarrel with me, much less cut my throat because I choose to worship a strange god. A man has perhaps a right to reason with me; to tell me my god is a very ridiculous one, and totally unable to assist me out of any of my difficulties—but I may retort, and tell him as much of his own god, worship what he may; I might say that those who pretend to have a more rational faith are not a whit wiser than me, and, for aught I know, those who have no faith at all may be the wisest. The man might think me a fool, and wisely go about his business, and in the obstinacy of my superstition I might think him one—but should either of us take it into his head to prosecute the other in a court of law for not believing the same absurdities, he would be worse than ridiculous—he would be detestable.

JULIAN AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN.

SUBSCRIPTION FOR MR. CARLILE.

From W. W. W. W. as a small tribute to R. Carlile (wishing it were ten thousand times as much) for his manly intrepidity in the cause of truth and good sense against the tyranny of fanaticism.
November 27, 1819. £.1 0 0

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

In answer to J. B.'s letter of the 27th of this month, I have to inform him, that on Wednesday next will be published, Price Sixpence, Number I. of a New Work, entitled "LIBERTY; or, THE RIGHTS OF NATIONS;" by JULIAN AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN. In this work the author enters deeply into the question relating to the being and nature of the Deity—The immortality of the soul—The antiquity of the world; with the opinions of the ancient Egyptians, Greeks, and Romans on its formation—On the Athenian, Lacedemonian, and Roman Republics; with a dissertation on the spirit of government in Greece, and remarks on the rise and power of the Macedonian Empire, and on the characters of Philip and Alexander. The author has introduced his hero to the acquaintance of the greatest characters of the French Revolution, and given a sketch of the motives and principles which swayed and governed them. He has endeavoured to present the world with a correct picture of the great Count Mirabeau, Condorcet, Diderot, D'Alembert, &c., and to unveil the secret springs which produced the French Revolution.

The work will be published in Weekly Numbers, and be elegantly printed, on good paper. Printed for the Author, and sold by T. Davison, 10, Duke Street, Smithfield; and C. Johns, 222, Little Queen Street, Holborn; and all Booksellers.

EDITOR.

P. S. Also very shortly will be published, THE WREATH OF FREEDOM; being a Collection of Songs in favour of Public Liberty.

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke-street, Smithfield.

The Republican.

No. 16. Vol. I.] London, Friday, Dec. 10, 1819. [Price. 2d.

A LETTER TO LORD CASTLEREAGH,

On the Bill which he has brought into the House of Commons to annihilate the Liberty of the Press.

My Lord,

You have brought into the House one of the strangest, most unconstitutional bills that has ever been read there. You have openly and wantonly attacked the liberties of your country; you have dared to propose transportation as the punishment of what you, and two or three despots, are pleased to call Libels, and you seem to hope that you will be allowed to do so with impunity! Heaven grant that you may be disappointed. If your bill pass, I do not hesitate to say, that this kingdom, once the proudest monument of liberty, will be changed into a dreary dungeon of despotism! You attempt to tear up by the root, the fairest, most beautiful plant that the hand of Liberty ever fostered—you attempt to poison the purest fountain which God and Nature have opened to the human race—and you do all this under pretence of *securing* the freedom of the English Nation! Immortal God! what mask will not a hypocrite wear! "If the present state of things continue," you say, "it will be impossible for the country long to resist the mass of crime and seductive reasoning issued from the press." My Lord! you mistake the matter—the sentence ought to run thus:—"if the present distresses of the country be not in some measure alleviated, if the grievances of which the nation complains so loudly, be not speedily redressed, if Britons, while sinking under the weight of

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke-street, Smithfield.

taxation, be not allowed to say that the burden is greater than they are able to bear, it will be impossible for the People long to resist the evidence so forcibly conveyed to the heart by every sense and every feeling of man!" But you tell us that you only mean to apply your sage observations to *treasonable* and *blasphemous* publications—a most excellent doctrine, indeed, my Lord. What a blessing to the country, that so *pious* and *honest* a man has *slipped* into the ministry! but will you allow me to comment, and paraphrase a little on this lovely text of yours; which means, if you will candidly confess the truth, that you only intend to apply your observations to those pamphlets, in which your conduct and the conduct of your fellow-labourers in your Lord's vineyard, has been discussed with a freedom and familiarity that has stung your conscience (if you have one), and offended your aristocratical pride (of which you have certainly a good share). My gracious, and most learned Lord, I hope this does not look like a libel—if it does, what an excellent opportunity of revenge it will afford your Lordship.

But to the point—Your colleague, Lord Sidmouth, has acknowledged, (for who can deny it?) that much danger exists; you, and all the rest of the ministry, know it to be true; and yet you go on proposing violent measures, and bringing bills into the House which are a libel upon human nature! What, in the name of heaven, has inspired you with this desperate frenzy? What demon has impelled you to throw down the gauntlet, and bid defiance to the good sense of the English People? Your impudence in reading such a Bill in an English House of Commons, calls to my memory the effrontery of Catiline, who dared to appear in the Roman Senate House after his nefarious design had been in part discovered. And, my Lord, I would remind you of the fate of Catiline, and of the convulsions which his death gave birth to. The fine statue of Liberty, whose likeness is engraven on every Briton's heart, which our venerable ancestors imagined they were consecrating to eter-

nity, which has been adorned and admired by the great and the wise of every age; around whose base patriots and heroes have rallied, and fought, and bled; which nations have envied, and despots opposed in vain—is now opposed to you, my Lord; and you are determined to overthrow it! But before you attempt to push this mighty statue from its base, I would have you pause—I would have you survey it carefully—observe on which side it leans—lest, in the hurry of your intemperate zeal, you give it a wrong impulse and pull down the mighty mass in thunder about your own heads, and bury yourself and all that assist you in irrevocable ruin.

This, my Lord, is not what *may* happen; it *must* and *will* happen, if you persist in robbing us of our rights; and it is the undoubted right of every Englishman to express his sentiments freely, when those sentiments are conformable to the eternal order of things; that is, when they are not opposed to justice and equity. You perhaps are offended at the freedom with which I deprecate the woes of despotism, with which I pry into the conduct of ministers, and censure that conduct when I think it wrong. But, my Lord, this is precisely what I ought to do; this is my duty, this is what the nation expects of me, and this is what I will do, till despotism be destroyed, or till the heart that now beats high in the cause of Freedom, shall cease its throbbings on the scaffold.

But, my Lord, I am no incendiary; I would excite no one to acts of violence; I write no blasphemy; I publish no sedition:—all I want is truth, and liberty, and justice; and who does not see that we now stand in need of the promulgation of truth? of the re-establishment of liberty; of the impartial administration of justice? every body sees it, my Lord, and sees it with regret. But perhaps you will tell me, that some people stand so high, they are out of the reach of justice and the laws. A melancholy consideration, my Lord; but it may perhaps be true. On this subject I will venture to ask your Lordship a few questions.

Should a citizen of a free state, by plotting, and scheming, and cruelty, contrive to render himself absolute, so perfectly absolute, that his fellow citizens beheld him with terror, and were unable to put their laws in force against him, what are the citizens to do? are they to sit tamely by, and see him rob them of their rights, insult them in their miseries, and triumph over their wretchedness and despair? or are they to take arms to vindicate their claims to humanity, to protect their wives from insult, and their children from slavery? would the laws of nature authorize them to meet him in the field? or, if their forces were too small, to dispatch him in the best manner they were able? These, my Lord, are great and important questions, and perfectly worthy your most serious consideration. * * * *

Mr. Tierney, a man whom your Lordship cannot pretend to despise, has already announced to the nation that the grounds for the proposed measures were the Papers presented to the House by your Lordship, and that a more garbled, mutilated account of the transactions which they professed to detail, had never been submitted to the House. "Your Lordship has asserted," says Mr. Tierney, "that the main body of the nation is sound and loyal; and also that the nation is flourishing internally, and that the only exception to the countries which supported our commerce is America." Certainly, if these representations are to be believed in opposition to the evidences of our own senses, the country ought to be in a very happy condition; but as if the People were become blind and perverse, it turns out that not only 10,000 soldiers are to be placed over them, but that those soldiers are to be backed by statutes hitherto unknown; and after all this, they are to be assured that their condition is fortunate, and their finances flourishing!

In answer to all this, what did your Lordship reply? Nothing; you confessed that there was much distress in the country, but you thought it was very much exaggerated. A very poor answer to the slashing attack of your opponent. Something better might fairly have been expected from

such an expert quibbler as you—but such is the fate of man: all his vanity and all his impudence sometimes forsake him when he stands most in need of them.

I must now entreat your Lordship's attention while I say a few words on your attempt to put down all public meetings. What meetings do you think will ever take place, if they are to be under the restrictions mentioned in the Bill? Who will ever wish to assemble if they must never hear any other orator than the parish priest? Who will venture to stand in a crowd where nothing but spies and informers are to be seen, lurking about to report every word he may utter; while the reporters for the public journals are necessarily excluded, as no man dare remain in a meeting more than a quarter of an hour, when it is out of his own parish, unless he has an inclination to see Botany Bay?

This is a strange doctrine to preach to Englishmen, my Lord, and a doctrine that they cannot hear without horror and detestation. Who would believe, that in the nineteenth century, in an era, when even the People begin to think philosophically, sentiments so full of tyranny and despotism should be broached in an English House of Commons? Yet this is the fact, and the nation seems terrified at your audacity. But do not presume too much upon the passive character of the People: there are insults and outrages which they will not suffer tamely; and you do not know but that this prohibition to meet in a public manner may be among the number. If one may credit history, the right of assembling publicly is one of the first principles of the British Constitution; and if you will believe me, my Lord, to take away that right is to destroy the Constitution altogether. And when you have destroyed the Constitution, what do you mean to give the People in the stead of it? A military despotism? or a Republic? or a monstrous mixture and compound of every species of Government? It is possible you are not yet determined on that head; so that perhaps it would be impolite to ask you any more

questions about it. A military despotism would perhaps be the government *after your own heart;* but then the People, who may take it into their heads that they will be consulted on these affairs, may not admire that species of misrule—and as to a Republic, it is very probable that you detest the name; since I am told that even the very title of this publication has alarmed some of the newly initiated. I know it has not alarmed you—that would be impossible; veterans are seldom frightened at squibs. However, though its title may have an alarming signification in the estimation of a corrupt and vitiated administration, it would be perfectly harmless in the opinion of a government that respected the RES PUBLICA which it is said to signify.

It has been my fate to peruse within these last few days such a mass of detestable nonsense, wherein this paper and its former editor have been abused in such an ignorant spiteful manner, that it almost disgusted me with politics, since such a mob of ridiculous scribblers presume to meddle with it. Some of them are perhaps men of fortune; and such are sure to fall upon poor scribblers without mercy, tell them they write in a garret, &c. not considering that good sense has sometimes been written in a garret, and the most despicable nonsense in fine chambers of state. But the real secret is, they find those poor garreteers, whom they abuse in such an unchristian manner, to be in the right, and they cannot bear the reflection that poor men should think more correctly than themselves. I do not tell your Lordship this, because I in the least suspect you of patronizing such ignorant scribblers, but because I would advise you to disclaim them when they insinuate such an infamous falsehood, and to punish them for libellers if they dare to persist. I could write a great deal more, but I fear I have already trespassed too much on your Lordship's patience and *good-nature*, and therefore conclude by wishing you may one day or another meet the reward you richly deserve.

I remain, with the most profound respect,

Your Lordship's most affectionate fellow-citizen,

JULIAN AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

I HAVE enclosed the sum of £1. 1s. in behalf of Mr. Carlile, and should you think the few observations accompanying it, worthy of insertion you are at liberty do what you think proper with the same.

R. S.

As you would that men should do unto you, do you also unto them, is the only religion of the Deists; and indeed if acted upon by all mankind, there would be no necessity for the millions who are supported to deceive the weak, and mislead the superstitious. Want and poverty could no longer have existence, but universal happiness and contentment would be diffused amongst every species of the creation. Charity instead of persecution—Love instead of hatred and revenge—in short the fierce torrents of vice and immorality, we should then see converted into bright and lucid streams of virtue and benevolence. It is necessary to shew their attachment that men should act agreeable to their professions, and this cannot be done better than by relieving the necessities of the distressed. In breaking the iron arm of persecution, by yielding consolation to the oppressed, and endeavouring by every exertion to dispel the gloom and despondency that invariably hang around the unhappy inmates of a prison. I would ask Deists, the great professors of this golden rule of life, if they will let pass unnoticed an opportunity of shewing their distinguished adherence to its principle, by deserting an individual the organ of their opinions—one who has subjected himself to be cast, weighed down by manacles, amidst the horrors of a loathsome jail? or will they not rather shew their devoted zeal in maintaining it by coming forward in a period of dismay, and helping the fatherless children and *widow*, whose means of existence has been cut off by the arms of power and oppression? They should recollect the eyes of all mankind are cast upon their proceedings, anxiously awaiting the establishment of their claims, as the supporters of so sublime a maxim, which has been raised as the guide and standard for their directions. Can it be forgotten when the recent persecution of the Protestants by the Catholics in France occurred, that the benevolence of the *Christian* character was shewn by their lending pecuniary aid to their unfortunate brethren, *aliens* by birth, and made *enemies* of each other by the unjust systems of corrupt administrators; and can they, possessing the recollection of these occurences, withhold *their* assistance from a being who has most nobly and disinterestedly published what he considered truth, and opinions with which they entirely coincide?

But why appeal to Deists *alone?* where are the devoted followers of *Jesus*—where exist the pillars of *piety* and *religion*, the believers in Christ? Do they forget it was the *rule* of their great master to *love his* enemies, to do *good* to them that *hated* him, and to lend assistance to his adversaries, with a hope of being rewarded by the justice of his God? Are all these practices of Jesus lost, and has Christianity degenerated into nothing but a *name*. If these things are thought good, and not acted upon by believers; then might those who deny its truth, justly exclaim in the language of the founder of the Christian religion, "Woe unto you hypocrites, ye pay tithes of mint, anise, and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, *mercy*, and faith."

Let it be recollected, it is in a country professing *Christianity* that long imprisonment, and heavy fines have been imposed on one who differs from the established religion of the land, and as no hope can be entertained, that the period of imprisonment will be shortened, so nothing else can wipe the stain of so unjust a proceeding but by *Christians*, as well as Deists contributing to the payment of the fine, therefore I would advise Deists for the sake of their character, and Christians for the maintenance of their religion, to contribute each their mite for the abatement of the misery of a fellow-creature.

ROBERT STAMP,

Goldsmith Street.

REFLECTIONS ON LAWFUL THEOLOGY,

Written after hearing a popular pulpit Orator, with Christian liberality, dispensing his "Anathemas Maranathas."

WITH confidence which party lore inspires,
The *zealot* mounts the throne of the Creator,
And deals damnation in a future state,
To all who doubts *his* dogmas while on earth!
Good, better, best, let oxthodoxy be,
But vehement declamation nothing proves:
Opinions cannot make and unmake facts,
Even Bible proof can't fix this earth on pillars,
Far less prove contradictions to be true.
The moral may be good, that man's last breath
Wafts him into the PRESENCE of his God,
To witness what his living notions were;
But if it be a doctrine which implies
The ABSENCE of the Deity on earth,

Men may at least be left, each for himself,
To form his own opinions, and maintain them.
If men now live, and move, and have their being
IN an omniscient, omnipresent God,
Can they dwell NEARER in another planet,
However distant from our native globe?
What proof can be adduced for the opinion,
That when men cease to live, and move, and be,
Their something—nothing, nobody knows what,
With new-born instinct, or magnetic charm,
Through boundless ether wing their trackless way,
Quick as the twinkling of the smartest eye,
To the celestial mansions of the blessed,
Where dwells the presence of the Omnipresent,
In light so pure, and atmosphere transparent,
That *minus* eyes, the invisible is seen!
The saved to roam on their parole of honour,
The damned, sent thence, to durance vile in limbo,
To wait the assize of an assembled world?
But it were well, if lawyers left the priests
To punish sceptic libellers of ghosts,
By ghostly penance in a ghostly state.
Had Carlile's judge and jurors but considered
That he from priests dissented not one point
More than they did from him, they would have spurned
The more than human task, the impious farce
Of propping truth divine by human law!
Man is not competent to punish mind,
'Tis God's prerogative alone to judge
The motives which govern a man's opinions:
Society requires a mutual pledge
Of liberty from each, for general good;
But overt action only own its rules,
Opinion scouts all human legislation.
The most unheedful of the passing scenes,
Must have observed, amid the war of creeds,
The Spain-like arguments of English saints:
As if the livings of tithe-lifting priests,
The secular rewards of legal faith,
And Bible Quixotes, vending bales of Bibles,
Were not a match for one poor, plain Berean,
Who, in obedience to the Christian code,
Searched for himself, that he might all things prove,
And hold fast only that which he found good:
That such an one should be esteemed a sun
Whose beams of reason would eclipse the Bible,
As Sol eclipses Luna at noon-day,
Implies a foul suspicion of that book,

Unworthy of the origin assigned it:
It savours of a public, plain admission
That all the host of priests and mitred heads
Shrunk, self-condemned, unequal to the task,
Till armed with the brute-argument of force!
Good souls! their Maker must be in their debt,
For this their pious aid in time of need!
Their friend, the Devil, must be also grateful
For Devil's duty done to Dick Carlile!
Admitting that the Age of Reason's nonsense,
And the whole Bible a consistent book
Of well-attested, heaven-born truths sublime,
Since faith and doubt depend on no man's will,
But as the evidence to him appears,
Belief's no merit, unbelief no crime.
Did Deity shew favour to the few
Who style themselves his favourites on earth
Were they exempted from the ills of life,
The losses, crosses, which perplex the mind,
The thousand pains, and sicknesses, and death,
Which level all,—were saints from these exempt,
None would be doubters, all would be believers,
The substitution-system would prevail,
Without the aid of poverty's last penny,
Till the grim tyrant death, with all his train
Of life-harassing, peace-destroying ills,
Would vanish like the mist before the sun.
But facts are stubborn witnesses of facts,
The faithful and the faithless share alike—
Each stands alike in his own room and stead—
Each for himself enjoys, and lives, and dies!
Can man by proxy eat, or drink, or sleep?
Can man by proxy suffer or enjoy?
Where lives the man whose faith hath stretch'd life's span,
Beyond the verge of healthful nature's bounds?
The reveries of the fancy may amuse,
But true philosophy keeps pace with knowledge:
Facts must be facts, opinion cannot change
Our present state, nor influence our future.—
Place-hunting Counsellors may rant and rave,
And vomit Phillippics to gull the crowd,
May laud the faith indigenous to the soil
Where popery, priests, pigs, and potatoes thrive;
But this side of the water, childish things,
Are giving place to manly, common sense.
Statesmen, for statesmen's ends, may priests support,
As state theology supports the state;
Plain truth no favour asks from courts or kings,
But justice measured by the golden rule:

The sun requires no attorney's rude blast
To blow out gas-lights lest he be outshone!
True lovers of the Bible must lament
The insidious attempt to prove it false,
As if pure gold should dread the chemists test.

THOMAS SEARCH.

Paisley, 22nd Nov. 1819.

TO MR. RICHARD CARLILE.

"In primisque hominis est propria *veri* inquisitio atque investigatio
CIC. *De Officiis.*

SIR,

MY pecuniary means will not admit of contributing largely towards the restitution of that property, which I confidentially, however, trust, public justice, as an atonement for your undeserved punishment, will eventually restore to you tenfold! When I inform you, that, like yourself, I am a conscientious *Deist*, you will justly calculate upon that *characteristic* love of truth, liberality of sentiment, sincerity, and benevolence, through which the professors of pure *Deism* stand contrasted with the pride, selfishness, rancour, and intolerance of the great majority of those who denominate themselves "*Christians.*"

My reverential respect for *Trial by Jury*, the only remaining pillar of the boasted liberties of the British Nation, precludes me from any further comment on the verdicts lately pronounced against you, than what is conveyed in my most sincere and ardent prayer, *that the proverbial chicanery, and loose morals of expectant crown lawyers, may, for the last time*, have so far triumphed over justice and reason!! Never again, may twelve British jurors be found to countenance a proposition so revoltingly wicked, dangerous, and absurd, as the confounding, *Christian doctrines*, with those immutable and incontrovertible principles of justice, which can alone be recognized, through *universal consent*, as the foundation of *common*, or *natural*, in contradistinction to *statute*.

Good heavens! what a precious code of laws the publicists of Europe would have digested for mankind, if they had studied Ethics in the endless contradictions and absurdities of *Trinitarian* and other Christian, *creeds*; and if illustration of *belief* is to be sought in the *practice* of believers, we may turn for an appropriate specimen to *Christian* Yeomanry Cavalry, and *Christian* magistrates, sanctioned by the high approbation of *Christian* ministers, in the name of our most *Christian* Prince Regent; and finally approved and ratified by decisive *Christian* majorities of

both houses of Parliament! ! The Prince has only one alternative---let him dismiss his imbecile advisers, or make up his mind to exhibit the British name and character to the scorn and derision of all the enlightened part of the civilized world!!

Alas, England! how art thou fallen! From taking the lead in the pursuit of *truth*, the foundation of all useful knowledge, and, according to the high authority I have quoted in my motto, the first and most important duty of mankind; behold her, this once renowned England, in her *dotage*, attempting to arrest the progress of the human mind, and extinguish the *light of heaven! !*

I request your acceptance of £5. and also avail myself of this opportunity to enclose £5. in behalf of the victims of the *law breakers* at Manchester; not doubting the willingness of the patriotic Editor of this paper,* to forward each sum accordingly. With best wishes for the health, and future prosperity of yourself and family, believe me your sincere friend,

T.

London,
1st December.

To the Editor of the REPUBLICAN.

ON THE LIBERTY OF THE PRESS.

WITHOUT the Liberty of the Press, the public authority can neither be enlightened, or responsible; and if this liberty has, like all human things, any inconveniencies, it may be said that, like the lance of Achilles, it heals all the wounds it has caused.

This liberty is even more necessary in Monarchies than in Republics, because there is always found round every throne, even those on which the best kings are seated, a crowd of courtiers, which prevents the voice of the upright from penetrating to the monarch. It is indeed, the only channel by which the latter can be informed of the public opinion, which, sooner or later, causes a terrible explosion, whenever, instead of manifesting itself by a noble and frank opposition, it ferments in silent darkness. In some countries, attempts have been made to regulate the Press, but it was found impossible to regulate without distroying it; for, it is not more possible to punish thoughts before they are produced, than actions before they are committed. The operations of the tribunal alone can repress the abuse of both one and the other.

In matters of religion, no book which can be answered, ought to be prosecuted; nor can you find any honour in such prosecution, no more than you can shew charity in obtaining it. A minister of *truth* begging the aid of *worldly* penalties, in a dispute about

* These subscriptions and this letter were received by the Editor of "*Wooler's Gazette.*"

spirituals, makes a poor, a strange, and a scandalous figure. Such conduct can only suit worldly designs, and betrays, if not the weakness of his cause, at least his inability to defend it. To oppose force to just reasoning is unjust. To answer false reasoning by force, is foolish and unnecessary. A bad cause is quickly refuted; a good cause easily defended. Christianity, though it can bear much severity and violence, can never exercise, nor warrant any.

The Christian name never was more abused, than when prostituted to justify rigour and *violence*; punishments for opinion, might indeed be of *ecclesiastical*, but it never could be of Christian origin.

JOHN S. SIDNEY.

Inner Temple,
Nov. 24th, 1819.

REPUBLICAN IDEAS.

Translated from the French of De Voltaire.

(*Supposed to have been written by a Citizen of Geneva,*)

BY JULIAN AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN.

(Continued from a former Number.)

XVI.

THOSE laws which concern distributive justice, properly called jurisprudence, have every where been found insufficient, equivocal, uncertain; because those in power, have always been more occupied with their own particular interest, than with that of the public. In the twelve great tribunals of France, there are twelve different species of jurisprudence. What is true in Arragon, became false in Castille; what is just on the banks of the Danube, is unjust on those of the Elba. The Roman laws themselves, which are daily invoked in all our tribunals, were sometimes contradictory.

XVII.

When a law is obscure, it is necessary that it should be explained by the whole body of the people, because all are supposed to have been concerned in its promulgation; unless the people have delegated that power to a certain number of citizens chosen expressly for the purpose.

XVIII.

When the times are sensibly changed, there are laws which ought also to be changed. Thus, when Triptolemus taught the Athenians the use of the plough, they found it necessary to abolish that part of their police which related to the gathering of acorns. In those times, when the academies of Europe were composed of nothing but priests, when they only possessed the jargon of science, it was thought proper that nobody but a priest should choose the professors of the sciences—it was the police of the acorns: but at present, when the laws are enlightened, the civil power ought to resume its right of distributing chairs and professorships.

XIX.

That law which permits a citizen to be imprisoned without a previous information, and without even the formality of law, would be barely tolerable in times of confusion and war; it would be unjust and tyrannical in time of peace.

XX.

A sumptuary law, which is good in a republic that is poor and void of the arts, becomes absurd, when the city has arrived at industry and opulence. It deprives the artist of the proper gain which this wealth would procure him; it is to prohibit those who have made fortunes, from their natural right of enjoying them; it is to extinguish all industry and at once to turn the rich and the poor.

XXI.

The laws should no more regulate the splendid habits of the rich, than the rags of the poor. * Both being equally citizens, ought to be equally free. Let every man eat, dress, and sleep, as well as he can.—If you prohibit the rich man eating woodcocks, you rob the poor one, who maintains his family upon the produce of his game which he sells to the rich. If the rich man were not permitted to ornament

* Perhaps Voltaire may be right in asserting that fashion ought not to be under the control of power. But excessive luxury in dress, indicates a corrupt and vitiated state of society, and is one of the first aberrations from the simplicity of nature, that demands a revolution in manners.

EDITOR.

his house, hundreds of artists would be ruined. The rich citizen, who humiliates his poor neighbour by his pride, enriches him by that same pride, much more than he humiliates him.* Poverty should labour for opulence, in order that it may one day be equally opulent.

XXII.

A Roman law, that should have commanded Lucullus to contract his expences, would in effect have commanded him to become richer, to the end that his grandson might purchase the Republic.

XXIII.

Sumptuary laws can be agreeable only to the lazy indigent man, who is proud and jealous, too idle to labour himself, and too envious to permit his more fortunate neighbour to enjoy the fruit of his labour in peace.

XXIV.

If a republic, formed in time of religious wars, chose to drive out of its territories those sects which disturb the public peace, it may perhaps be thought to act wisely, since it considers itself as surrounded by persons infected with the plague which it wishes to keep out of his dominions. But when those times of confusion are over, when toleration is become the reigning dogma of every honest man in Europe, is it not a ridiculous piece of barbarity, to demand of every man who comes to establish himself and carry his riches into the country, "My good Sir, of what religion are you?"—Gold and silver, talents and industry, are of no particular religion.

XXV.

In a republic worthy of the name, every citizen has an undoubted right to publish his opinions. He ought to be allowed to write with as much freedom as he speaks: false

---

* This is perhaps one of the least defensible ideas of Voltaire. A man can never be compensated by money for the insults of overbearing pride; a wounded spirit can never be reconciled to the pride that insults it; nor can the cottager, dissemble all he can, be very content to pine in want, while he witnesses the luxury of his princely neighbours: and Goldsmith was *very* just when he reckoned it among the greatest blessings of a Republican cottager that he saw

No contiguous palace rear its head,
To shame the meanness of his humble shed. EDITOR.

opinions propagated in writing ought to be punished in the same manner as absurdities in conversation, that is, by being laughed at and despised. Such is the law of England, a monarchical country, it is true, but where men are free more than elsewhere, because they are more enlightened.*

XXVI.

Of all republics, the smallest would seem to be the most happy, when its liberty is insured by its situation, and when it is the interest of all its neighbours to preserve that liberty. Motion, it would seem, ought to be more easy and uniform in a small than in a large machine, of which the springs are more complicated, and where the more violent friction interrupts the play of the machine. But as pride finds its way into the head of every man, the fury of commanding one's equals is the predominate passion of the human mind, as by having a more intimate knowledge of each other, ambitious citizens only hate each other the more; it sometimes happens that a small state undergoes more revolutions than a large one.

XXVII.

What remedy can we find for this evil?—Reason, which will in the end be heard, when the voice of the passions shall be tired with its continued exertions. Then the two parties will recede a little in their pretensions for fear of worse—but time is necessary for all things.

XXVIII.

In a small republic the people seems to demand more attention than in a large one, because it is much easier to make one thousand people attend to reason than forty thousand. Thus, there would be much danger in attempting to govern Venice, which has so long sustained the attacks of the Ottoman empire, than Saint Marino, which never conquered any thing but a mill which it was soon obliged to give up.

---

*This was perhaps true in Voltaire's day, but things have altered since. EDITOR.

(*To be continued.*)

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke Street, Smithfield.

The Republican.

No. 17, Vol. I.] London, Friday, Dec. 17, 1819. [Price, 2d.

A LETTER

TO THE

OPPOSITION LORDS OF THE PRESENT PARLIAMENT.

From the bottom of my soul I hate
Despotic kings, and ministers of state.

Swift.

My Lords,

The voice of the bold but untitled citizen is seldom attended to amidst the clamour of faction, or the roar of anarchy. Nothing but the terrific clarion of ambition can make itself heard—nothing is felt but the irresistible impulse of power—the advocates of liberty, and truth, and justice, are thrust into the back ground, while the blood-stained tools of despotism rush upon the stage. What can be a more heart-rending sight, my lords, than a nation which has once been free, trembling at the nod of a tyrant? while myriads of his mercenary and villainous troops traverse the country, insult and massacre the peaceable inhabitants, and stand prepared to commit any atrocity which their masters may command? Oh! 'tis a spectacle horrid and detestable in the extreme—a spectacle that awakens every martial feeling in the soul of the patriot, that nerves his arm to prepare for the conflict, in which he is to combat for all those rights and all those privileges which are dear to the human heart—which entitle him to the proud appellation of a free citizen; to the rights of humanity; to every thing that is valuable, and great, and noble in man. Ah! my lords! can *you blame us* for clinging round those sacred rights—our household gods! Can *you* look on with *apathy* while *we* are deprived of our *dear-bought, adored* LIBERTY? Can you behold us *pale* and *melancholy*, weeping near the dying embers of our dreary fire-sides, over some small portion of

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke-street, Smithfield.

the statue of liberty, which we had the courage to preserve, when the colossal mass itself was dashed to pieces by the barbarous sacrilegious axe of despotism; *can* you behold this, my lords, and your hearts not sicken at the sight? No; though rich and powerful, and far removed from those distresses which gradually sink your fellow-citizens to the grave, you are still MEN—*still* ENGLISHMEN—and the FRIENDS OF FREEDOM! And should the ministry actually abridge the liberties of the English nation, my lords, the *only* course you can pursue with honour is, to *impeach them for high treason*, and secede from the house. This, my lords, is not a rash or visionary scheme; it is the clear dictates of a steady reflecting mind—of a mind that places all its happiness in the enjoyment of civil and religious liberty, and which would spurn existence itself, were its exertions confined by the bloody mace of despotism.

Earl Grey, one of the most honourable of your members, has laid it down as an axiom, that "*where* great discontent prevails, *there* likewise must have been great misgovernment." This is a truth, my lords, that deserves to be written in letters of gold, and what immediately follows is *nearly* as excellent: "there were no people so ferocious, (said the noble lord,) and least of all could such a character be attributed to the *people* of England, as to turn on their benefactors, tear to pieces all authority, and destroy even the means of their own security. If, however, the *people* were seen to act in any respect like this, must it not have proceeded from the operation of great distress and severe sufferings?" Yes, my lords, and the suffering must be extreme that can ever induce the peaceable inhabitants of this country to take up arms against their oppressors. 'Tis vain to imagine that seditious writers, or seditious speakers can excite the people to rebellion when they have bread to eat, and the liberty to eat that bread in peace: *the people are not fond of civil war;* they dread its consequences, and deprecate its woes: but *only so long as they have bread*—when that period is at an end, they think that nothing more terrible can befall them, even amidst the horrors of civil war; and they will be sure to know when they are in a *state of starvation*, whether public orators, or political writers, tell them so or not. You must be very sensible of these truths, my lords, and the ministry, stupid as it is, cannot be ignorant of them. But

they shut their eyes, and will not behold the truth; they know that the more enlightened the people are, the more impatient of servitude they will be, and they single out the man who instructs them for destruction, under pretence of punishing *libellers;* but the trick is too stale to succeed much longer; mankind are not so blind but that they can distinguish their friends from their foes. Tyrants may rail at free-thinking, call a republican a rebel, and a philosopher an atheist, but the people will always think *that* government the *best* which procures them the greatest portion of liberty, and those opinions and principles the most pure whose professors are the least tainted with the vice of *persecution.*

My sentiments on religion are very free—on government, still freer; but my principles are such as I can defend without subjecting myself to the imputation of irreligion or rebellion; the man who believes in one God, cannot be irreligious, and a man who is the enlightened advocate of liberty, cannot be a rebel. Coolly and impartially reviewing the subject, how can the government accuse us of blasphemy or sedition; how can they say we are wanting to plunge the country into all the woes of anarchy, when we labour to impress the public mind with the respect which is due to the sage, the patriot, and the hero? But if we pay no respect to knavery, however high it may stand, if we do not bow down before *vice* and *imbecillity*, WHATEVER TITLE IT MAY WEAR, it is because nature has not taught us to play the hypocrite, or to *affect* to reverence those characters which we despise.

Much has been said, and much may yet be said, by those who have more words than ideas, about the illegality of popular meetings. The Earl of Carysfort, adverting to the Manchester meeting of the 16th of August, where the people were massacred by the yeomanry cavalry, asks—"Was it possible that it could be lawful for men to meet in such enormous numbers, and in a threatening manner, as on that occasion, and that a proceeding could be lawful which goes to defeat all the ends for which men enter into society?" I know not whether the noble earl has, or has not weighed, with the precision becoming a statesman, the real motives which impel men to enter into society; but this I know, that if he has, he talks very ridiculously and vaguely about them. I will quote his own words:—"Men (says he)

entered into society for the purpose of *leaving the protection of their rights* to PUBLIC AUTHORITIES instituted for that purpose, and not to "the adjudication of themselves."

"Fine words—I wonder where you stole 'em!"

Swift.

My lords, were you not obliged to hold your sides while the Bœotian nobleman was talking this fine logic to you? were you not very much inclined to laugh; did ever your politeness put a more provoking restraint upon your inclination than at that moment? To hear a gentleman, a nobleman, a statesman, talk of men entering into society "for the purpose of *leaving* the protection of their rights" to any "*constituted authorities*" whatever, is so supremely ludicrous, that it would have forced a smile upon the face even of Trophonius himself, though at the very moment he was coming out of his cave. But if his lordship is really ignorant of the motives which induced men to enter into society, at first, I will take upon me, ignorant as I am, to instruct him. Men entered into society that, by uniting their strength, they might be able to resist the attacks of savage and ferocious animals by which they were surrounded. When many of these societies were formed, they found it necessary in *one clan* to guard against the attacks of its neighbour, more injurious, and more sanguinary, than those of the most savage beasts. This cemented the union which chance had formed. When peace succeeded to the horrors of war, men of calm and mild natures wore off by degrees the asperity of the martial character, and sunk into the agriculturist and the peaceful citizen. But as there always will be some villains amongst the best of men, it was found necessary that the *general will* should be made known with regard to certain actions, which were, when disapproved by the society, denominated crimes. The man who possessed the clearest understanding and the most unblemished character was chosen by the people to be the arbiter of their quarrels. The man who was most expert at making up private quarrels, must be the most proper to conciliate a neighbouring clan, with whom they might be by chance at variance—he was constituted the representative of the people, and endued with the power of making peace or war. He executed his commission to their satisfaction—they intrust him with all their public affairs. He is unequal to the task; but as every

human being is fond of power, he would not refuse the *honour*, but determined to associate with himself those about him whom he observed to be the most docile and expert." Such is the origin of society—where we see that men, far from entering into society for the purpose of giving up their rights, only did so for the obviation of some physical evil which they could not otherwise avoid—and such is the origin of tyrants and their ministers.

In addition to this most curious doctrine on the origin of society, his lordship assured the house that the present times were different from the civil wars, when there *was a claim of arbitrary power in the crown*, and a contest on the part of the people *for the recovery of ancient rights and liberties*. Those liberties were now well understood, and he was convinced that none were ever more attached to those principles than the *illustrious* royal family under whose auspices we live. The king undertakes to administer justice in mercy, and so mild has been his reign, that in the performance of this duty, numerous cases have occured in which mercy may be thought to have been carried too far. What would have been said at the time of the REVOLUTION, by the judges of that day, had a grand jury been abused in public libels, as the grand jury of Lancashire have been treated *for doing their duty*.

The noble earl acknowledges, though rather unwillingly, that we understand what our liberties are—he is right; we do understand what liberty means, in spite of him and his co-partners, who wish to deprive us of our only mode of information. But how, in the name of humanity, could you, my lords, sit down patiently while such a doctrine as this was preached to you? How could you hear him pronounce that mercy had been carried too far, and not interrupt him in his impious harangue? Ah! my lords, you are too tame; you only display half of the patriot's character; you *suffer* when you ought *to act;* you daily hear the majesty of the people insulted; you hear them sneered at; you see their petitions scorned, their remonstrances slighted, their miseries disregarded—and yet you do not step forward and espouse their cause warmly! What, my lords, can have caused this indifference, this criminal apathy, this *more than christian patience?* I fear, that the scare-crow set up by the supporters of despotism, has alarmed even you. I fear that the idea that the people have imbibed the Quixotic doctrine of an equality

of property, has found its way into your minds. But if such are your fears, if such are your apprehensions, my lords, I believe I may venture to assure you, that your fears and apprehensions are perfectly unfounded. The people want nothing but a fair and equal representation; and a government whose expenses are as contracted as possible, and whether you call it an *Oligarchy*, an *Aristocracy*, a *Monarchy*, or a *Republic*, it will not matter to them, they will not quarrel about words; they want liberty, AND LIBERTY THEY WILL HAVE, *cost them what it may.*

Some of the members of your august assembly have appeared offended that the popular leaders should be *poor* and *ignorant*—my lords, it is not their fault, that the *tax-gatherer* has eat up their small estates, and reduced them to beggary. But that they are *ignorant*, may admit of some doubt. At all events they seem very sensible of their misfortunes; and they seem capable of bewailing them rather eloquently. Men who can perceive at a glance the extent of their misfortunes, penetrate into their most distant causes, trace the tortuous mazes of their oppressors' track, and point out the proper and equal remedy with the utmost precision, cannot be very ignorant; they cannot be the despicable demagogues they have been represented to be.

My lords, you possess learning, and genius, and fortune—add but to those fine qualities the virtues of a patriot; come forward and shield the people from oppression, they will be grateful, they will bless your names, and future ages shall record with pleasure the praises of a Grey, a Holland, and an Erskine.

I remain, my lords,

With the most profound respect,

Your Lordships' Fellow-Citizen,

JULIAN AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN.

CORRESPONDENCE between Mr. MAULE and Mr. CARLILE.

Dorchester Gaol, Nov. 24, 1819.

SIR,

In consequence of the seizure of all my property in Fleet Street, and the total stop put to my business, I am under the necessity of applying to you for support during my imprisonment, trusting that you will make this application known in the proper quarter.

I am, Sir,

George Maule, Esq. Your obedient Servant,
Solicitor to the Treasury. RICHARD CARLILE.

Lincoln's Inn, Dec. 8, 1819.

SIR,

I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 24th ult. applying to me for support during your imprisonment, which I communicated to the proper quarter pursuant to your request.

I have now to acquaint you, that there does not appear to be any ground upon which your application can properly be complied with.

I am, Sir,

Mr. Richard Carlile, Your obedient, humble Servant,
Dorchester Gaol. GEORGE MAULE.

Dorchester Gaol, Dec. 14, 1819.

SIR,

I have received your answer to my application for support during my imprisonment, wherein you state, that there does not appear to be any ground upon which that application can properly be complied with. I will repeat to you more explicitly what I consider proper grounds for a compliance with that request. I am found guilty of publishing what you and your employers call a blasphemous libel, if any other person can define what a *blasphemous libel* is. The judges of the holy tribunal sentence me to three years' imprisonment, and mulct me in the sum of £1500. A

writ of *levari facias*, (which was never issued in a case of libel before,) is here immediately issued, which I have no doubt was ready signed and dried before the sentence was passed, as Mr. Sheriff Rothwell, and Mr. Turner, the under-sheriff, were actually in court waiting to receive it as soon as the judge had uttered his sentence; every tittle of my property, to the amount of £2000 if fairly sold in the shop, is seized, the shop shut up, and a business which at the time of its stopping was producing an average profit of £50 per week, is entirely put a stop to. Here sir, you have not only seized my property, but you have taken possession of the house, and prevented my family from proceeding in the same or any other business, and we are left to perish for what you and your coadjutors care, for want of the necessaries of life. Nothing can afford a stronger proof of the servility of the judges of the holy tribunal, alias Court of King's Bench, to the present administration, than my case; it must be visible to the dullest capacity, that they were directed in their sentence both as to imprisonment and fine. So, sir, you perceive, and I doubt not intended, that it should be so, that I am not only imprisoned for three years, but am to a certainty imprisoned as long as the present system of government continues, as you have not only obtained the infliction of a heavy fine, but at the same time have taken steps to prevent the payment of that fine, with an ultimate intention of keeping me in prison whilst your employers can keep their places. I know you sufficiently to expect that you will smile at my observations and present condition, but let me beg leave to predict, that like PRYNNE, BASTWICK, BURTON, LILBURNE and LEIGHTON, in the time of Charles the First, I shall obtain a reversal of the judgment against me, and the full amount of all damages I shall sustain either in person or property, and preserve my ears to the bargain. These are the grounds I have to remind you of, which I conceive would be sufficient if justice or humanity were in the question.

I am, Sir,

George Maule, Esq. Your obedient Servant,

Soliciter to the Treasury. RICHARD CARLILE.

IN THE KING'S BENCH,

THE KING *against* RICHARD CARLILE, *on an* INFORMATION *for* LIBEL.

Richard Carlile, the defendant above named, maketh oath and saith, that this Information was filed in this Court against this deponent by his Majesty's late Attorney General, Sir Samuel Shepherd, Knight, charging him with having maliciously published a blasphemous libel, entitled the Theological Works of Thomas Paine; that on the twelfth day of October last, this Information was called on for trial and prosecuted by his Majesty's present Attorney General, Sir Robert Gifford, Knight, before the Lord Chief Justice of this court and a special jury. That deponent verily believes the proceedings in the course of this trial were irregular, and not according to law, and that the verdict, which was a verdict of guilty, was hereby contaminated.

And saith, that deponent, before the jury were sworn for this trial, protested against the authority of this Court to try the charge of blasphemy, inasmuch as there was no law applicable to the case, and that it was no offence against the laws of this country, there being no person defamed, or even charged on the record to be defamed, which deponent believes to be necessary to support the charge of libel agreeable to the laws of this country; and saith, that the strongest charge in the aforesaid information was, that this deponent had incurred the "high displeasure of Almighty God," no proof of which was offered to the court or jury, by the said Attorney General.

And saith, that during this trial the Court was twice adjourned, namely, on the evenings of the twelfth and thirteenth days of October aforesaid, and that the jurors did separate without the consent of this deponent, which was contrary to the laws of this country, and to the great injury of this deponent. And saith, that the jurors in this case were not nominated agreeably to the rule of this Court and the statute in that case made and provided, both of which ordain that forty eight free and lawful men should be nominated, whereas John Phillips, late of Cullum Street, Merchant, who was nominated as one of this deponent's jurors, and left on the list when reduced to twenty four, had been dead upwards of one and near two years.

And saith, that deponent has been informed and verily believes, that William Aldersey, of Token-house Yard, Mer-

chant, who also remained as one of the twenty-four jurors on this information, was never summoned to attend, by which this deponent was deprived of the benefit of two special jurors.

And saith, that deponent in the course of his trial was prevented by the undue interposition of the Lord Chief Justice, in making his defence, and proving to the jury, that this deponent's intention was good, (and not wicked and malicious as charged in the information;) by shewing the truth and moral tendency of the book, which this deponent admitted to have published. And saith, that on the second day of the trial, whenever this deponent introduced any thing that was a true and good defence, he was interrupted, and whilst he proceeded on matter that was not strictly relevant he was allowed to proceed, and the Court remained silent.

And saith, that this deponent had subpœnaed several eminent men, amongst others the Archbishop of Canterbury, the High Priest of the Jews, and the Astronomer Royal, with the most eminent men in each christian sect, to shew to the jury, that christianity could not be part of the law of the land, as christianity could not possibly be defined, and that no man could possibly say what it really was, without finding his opinions opposed by some other person. And that the Chief Justice of this Court denied this deponent the benefit of these important evidences, and continued to urge to the jury that christianity was part of the law of the land, and refusing to say to what species of christianity his lordship alluded, and silencing every request of that nature on the part of this deponent. And further saith, that contrary to the law of this country, which makes the jury judges of the law as well as of the fact, when the jury having retired for some time to consider their verdict, they (the jury) did send into Court requesting that two statutes, which deponent had referred to, should be sent to them, the Lord Chief Justice did hesitate to send the statutes agreeable to the request of the jury, and ordered the jury to be brought back into court, before his lordship allowed them to see the statutes required, when his lordship renewed his address to them for several minutes, which deponent verily believes was to his great injury, and not a just exposition of the law, nor required in this case, as the information was not founded on any statute.

RICHARD CARLILE.

Sworn in open Court,
this 9th day of November, 1819.

REASONS OF A DEIST,

Why no Punishment should be Inflicted:

MY LORDS,

Called upon at this time to answer if I have any reasons to offer why judgment should not be passed against me,

Permit me, my lords, to reply, that I have been guilty of no crime; no crime, at least, for which, consistently with the principles of justice, I ought to be made answerable before a human tribunal.

I cannot now hope to set aside the verdict, which *I believe* to have been wrongfully given against me; but as yet the evil is not complete; I have suffered unjust imprisonment; but by your judgment, at this time, some amends may be made for the injustice I have sustained. I have been found guilty of publishing Paine's Age of Reason. I contend, my lords, that in so doing there is no crime.

I fear you think otherwise, bear with me while I state the grounds of my opinion.

My lords, justice is invariably the same, she does not change with time, she does not falter with alarm; she stands above the clouds, and with steady hand holds the balances, while storms and tempests play beneath her feet; and kingdoms and empires, which regard not her decrees, perish beneath her frown. Pause, my lords, before you consign me to a dungeon, or cast me forth to poverty and undeserved disgrace.

The objects of justice are the punishment of crimes and the reformation of the offender; in this we agree; but surely, I need not remind your lordships, that it is the *intention* which makes the crime. The distinctions between *murder*, *manslaughter*, *justifiable homicide*, and *accidental killing*, are well known, and have often been explained by your lordships; they are the principles of our revered common law, of that common law, under which you tell me I have been tried; apply these principles to the case of libel; your lordships *have applied them*. Upon every action for damages your lordships *have applied* them; you *have given* the principles of the common law, and of justice, full sway; you have told the jury, that if the matter be *true* it is *no libel*; you have told them that if it be false, but communicated with a good intention, there is no case for damages. *Falsehood* and *evil intent* united, are the only reasons for damages.

Apply the same principles, my lords, to the act with which I am charged.

It is the publication of a book stated to be scandalous and untrue. It does not respect the characters of individuals. Its scandal, or its untruth, can be known only by discussion: I have published it that it may be discussed; this prosecution is an attempt to put a stop to this discussion; it is an attempt to stop the progress of *truth*.

You have rightly told me, my lords, that the truth of the book which I have published cannot be tried by this Court. It is removed far beyond the reach of such tribunals. The decision of a jury cannot be final in such a case. The intention only remains for your consideration.

Upon this, my lords, I feel *entitled* to an immediate discharge. Not a particle of evidence has been produced to prove that I published Paine's Age of Reason with an *evil intent*. If then, my lords, you will allow that *I believe* this book to be *true*, that *I believe* it to be *important truth*, you must declare me *innocent*; you must declare me not only innocent, but worthy your praise; I have in my humble sphere endeavoured to promote the cause of *truth*. I claim this at your hands.

The nature of the subject can make no difference; it is only as you can charge *me* with having *wilfully* and *maliciously* circulated *falsehood*, that, in this case, I am a proper object of human punishment; and since no evil intention has been *proved* against me, in the sacred name of justice I demand to *be set free*.

I have one more topic to urge upon your lordships, and I have done. It is not because my opinions are *contrary* to your own, that they are therefore *wrong*. It is not because *you may think* them subversive of all human society, that they *deserve* to be *punished*; you will not *say so*; do not, my lords, act as if you *thought it*. A man may hold the doctrines of the right of resistance to established goverments; of the want of obligation in an oath; of the falsehood of the scriptures; or the non-existence of a future state; and yet remain a loyal and obedient subject; he may be a man of his word; a humble worshipper of God, and regular in the discharge of all his duties as a man and a citizen; if, my lords, you could punish such a man for *his opinions* or the publication of his opinions, you would have beheaded a Russell; burned the martyrs; and poisoned a Socrates. You will tell

me, perhaps, that the *manner* in which the subjects you deem sacred have been discussed is objected to. You will say, that serious subjects have been assailed with low and vulgar ridicule; and that such a mode of attack upon such subjects is not to be tolerated.

Answer me, my lords, does not this remark indicate a weakness in your cause? Does it not intimate that you dread lest christianity should suffer in the conflict? And yet you say, that yours is the cause of truth.

MY LORDS,

"Great is truth and will prevail."

All that I demand is, a free and a fair trial for it; a trial in which the odds shall be less unequal than at present, a dungeon and a mitre.

Beware, my lords, how you hinder the progress of truth, by artificial mounds of your erection, and by limiting its flow, are found supporting errors, and disseminating moral danger, and moral death.

Truth will prevail, and the multitude of antient prejudices heaped against it, the more omnipotent will it appear. The gathering waters may be put within the mountains, but when they sufficiently accumulate; they will force themselves a passage and rush down upon the plain. If my opinions are of men, they must come to nought, but take heed, my lords, lest haply ye be found fighting against God.

My lords, if christianity be true, this prosecution is a libel upon its *truth*; the individuals who have prosecuted me, have misunderstood its nature; they seem to have supposed, that like the religion of Mahomet, it may be propogated by force; they have forgotten, that it is said, of that Jesus whom they call its author, that he declared "my kingdom is not of this world;" that when one of his disciples drew his sword and smote one that was sent to apprehend him, and cut off his ear, in defence of that kingdom, that he commanded, "put up thy sword, into its place, for they that take the sword, shall perish by the sword." They seem to have forgotten that their apostle Paul has said, "the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds." My lords, is this true? Are these the principles of christianity? What can be more opposed to its propagation and defence by *force*, by *dungeons*, and by *fines*.

My lords, I am a Briton, and if, as it is boasted, Christianity is part and parcel of the common law of the land, I claim my interest in the protection it may chance to afford.—Shew, my lords, that it contains the principles you profess. The individuals who have promoted this prosecution call the Inquisition, Antichristian;—they see the mote which is in their brother's eye, but consider not the beam that is in their own eye. They forget that under what they call a brighter day, they are antichristian too; and that to the utmost of their power they display, *this day*, the spirit which would kindle the flames of Smithfield; and illuminate our minds by the burning bodies of our brethren.

My lords, if you refuse to allow me full credit for the purity of my intentions, you will, at this day, give your sanction to the unjust crucifixion of him whom you call Master and Lord; and declare that you have no regard to the principles of Eternal Justice. If, my lords, you consign me to a dungeon, or load me with fines, you will practically proclaim that you believe *Jesus* to be a *cheat*, and *Saint Paul* to be a *liar*.

Therefore, my lords, expect, that if you *act* upon the principles of Justice or Religion, you will command me *to be set free*.

In arrest and in bar, therefore, of the judgment of this Court, without intending any personal disrespect to the several judges composing the same, I utterly deny, that I am in any degree amenable or accountable to this court or to any human tribunal, for any opinions on theological subjects, for publishing which, I have been unjustly convicted by a jury as matter of criminal libel; contrary to all the definitions of libel, to be found in the records of the laws of England. I also utterly deny the competency and authority of this court and jury, before whom it was pretended to try such questions; and if this court, without the sanction of any statute law, and in defiance of that reason, justice, and common sense, on which the common law of England is founded, choose to continue to assert itself to be a tribunal of the nature of the abhorred inquisition of Spain, and Portugal, and persist in passing a vindictive sentence against me; then it remains for me to submit with the fortitude of a martyr

to such injustice and cruelty, and, as my last resource, to protest in the name of the injured laws and constitution of my country, against the whole of these oppressive proceedings, in the sixteen following reasons.

1. Because, no man can in justice be made criminally answerable for mere abstract opinions, which result from the honest convictions of his reason.

2. Because, the publication of opinions on abstract, scientific, and speculative subjects, is no criminal libel, breach of the peace, or social crime; but is a duty which every honest man is bound to perform, that if true they may be adopted, and if false may be refuted.

3. Because, no opinions can be exceptions to the preceding rule, for if it be said that certain doctrines are from God, and ought therefore not to be disputed, it is evident that doctrines which emanate from an all-powerful deity, cannot be shaken or overturned by man, and therefore the publication of any adverse opinions of man, must necessarily be harmless.

4. Because, it is evident, that the employment of the force of law, which implies the civil and military power of the state, to maintain opinions, affords a demonstrative proof, that those who resort to this weapon, well know their opinions to be false, are conscious that they are not upheld by God, and feel that they cannot be defended by reason, and will not be supported by the irrisistible and omnipotent power of God.

5. Because, on matters of religion there can be no standard of truth, but human reason, or the alledged operations of the spirit of God, and conviction is the result of either or both; and this result, as a natural or supernatural effect, is a question between a man and his own powers of reason or between a man and his God, and not cognizable by any other man, or by any human tribunal.

6. Because, the very attempt making on this occasion to render a court of law, or mere human tribunal, the standard of theological opinions, has led to all the wicked, bloody, and disgraceful martyrdoms, which stain the pages of history; and at which, every succeeding age blushes for the errors, absurdities, and crimes, of the preceding age.

7. Because, if the present erroneous, persecuting

vindictive, and intolerant proceedings were to lead to the cruel punishment of my body, the proceedings of this court and all concerned in them, would be viewed by sensible, just, and liberal men in this age, and by all men in future ages, with the same abhorrence as we hold the courts of Inquisition, and all the courts of tyrants and barbarous times, in which similar martyrdoms have been perpetrated.

8. Because, it is not only wicked and blasphemous, but absurd and unjust, for any man to set up his opinion as a standard of theological faith for any other man; I have avowed myself a Deist, or a believer in one eternal and omnipotent God, and in the social principles, that virtue is its own reward; a belief in which I feel with due reverence, and a principle which I endeavour to practice in all the relations of life; and I solemnly call on all other men, and on those composing this tribunal, whatever be their faith, as they respect the power and competency of God to affect all mens' minds with all desirable truth, not to be parties in this persecution, or in any vindictive punishment.

9. Because, it has been invariably found, that where the mind has had its free exercise, mankind have founded different points of faith on the same system of religion; and that such variation arises from the varied dispositions of men, and argues strongly the absurdity of restraint, or of legislating on matters of opinion.

(To be Continued.)

SUBSCRIPTION for MRS. CARLILE.

These are the times to try men's souls.

A Meeting will be held in the course of a few days for the purpose of appointing a general meeting in order to promote a subscription for the benefit of Mrs. Carlile and three young children; all her property having been seized by the crown for Mr. Carlile's fine, at a time too when Mrs. C. was far advanced in a state of pregnancy.

In the mean time subscriptions will be most thankfully received by Mr. Fisher, at the Statesman office, 194, Strand; by Mr. Davison, publisher of the Republican, Duke street, Smithfield; or by Mrs. Carlile, 55, Fleet street, (*private door.*)

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke street, Smithfield.

The Republican.

No 18, Vol. I.] London, Friday, Dec. 24, 1819. [Price, 2d.

A LETTER

TO THE

OPPOSITION MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

From the bottom of my soul I hate
Despotic kings, and ministers of state.

Swift.

Gentlemen,

Think, when you read this letter, that you are addressed by the whole body of the English People;—think that you behold them thronged around the door of the House of Commons, and calling upon you to preserve their rights from invasion, and their persons from insult;—behold them withered by the blast of famine, still preserving all that dignity which Nature has attached to humanity, when it is not sullied by disgraceful vices; be touched by their calamity, and expose yourselves to the danger of being hurried to the BRITISH BASTILE, in defence of your Country's Rights. Surely men like you cannot dread the solitude of a dungeon; you cannot dread the reflection of a peaceful and virtuous mind—they are pleasing, Gentlemen; and equally so when enjoyed in a dungeon as in a palace,—independent minds spurn the base apprehensions which have been excited by the commencement of the reign of terror, and persist in the steady course their firm and enlightened souls have sketched out. They will turn neither to the right hand or to the left, though destruction rear its horrid front before them, and threatens to devour them at every step they advance; they feel that they are Men, and are determined to act with a firmness becoming the manly character,—they are not to be

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke-street, Smithfield.

frightened by sedition nor libel bills; they perceive in the east the dawn of a glorious day, and till the Sun of Liberty shine upon them in all its noon-day splendour, they will not be satisfied.

Perhaps you now have it in your power to make England a flourishing, or miserable country, for centuries to come—you have not only our destiny in your hands, but that of our children's children, who will have occasion to bless or curse your name, in proportion as you behave with firmness in this eventful crisis, or basely recede from your duty. There is no middle course—you must either side with the people, and take part in their wrongs and injuries, or with their oppressors, and consent to share the spoils of an unhappy miserable nation,—and judge, with an unbiassed mind, which is likely to procure you most honor; judge which is most calculated to hand down your names with respect and veneration to posterity—which is the most likely to cover you with glory, or overwhelm you with the black waves of infamy. Ah! my right honourable fellow-citizens, if you value your fame, which is dear to every honest man, if you wish to hand down to your children a name unsullied by corruption or by vice; if you are ambitious of the title of Patriot, draw aside the veil which now obscures your character, and appear to the world, either as the unequivocal assertors of your country's rights, or as the open and unabashed advocates of arbitrary power. I hope, for the honor of the English nation, for your own, for that of humanity, that you will choose the former of these two paths: you cannot hesitate as to the cause on whose side virtue stands; the characters in which her decisions are written are so plain, "that he who runs may read them."

Earl Grosvenor has already asserted, that "if the wishes of the people were fairly met and considered, if their claims were attended to, instead of being opposed by measures of a tyrannical nature, the whole mass of the population would be conciliated, not even excepting those Radicals of whom ministers appeared to be so much afraid. What were the people to think when they saw governments alarmed at the diffusion of knowledge, and hostile to those systematic exercises in schools and

villages, the best adapted to the improvement of the strength and spirit of mankind?"

Nothing can be more true than the assertion of the noble lord in the former part of the paragraph which I have cited: there are vast numbers of Englishmen who would be content with a moderate reform; they do not expect that the petty frauds and little impositions of the government should be done away with; they merely want a reduction of the taxes, the displacing, or *otherwise disposing*, of some of the most obnoxious among the ministry, and the disbanding of the army, whose very existence they are well aware is inimical to the cause of freedom. But there are others, I am convinced, who would be satisfied with nothing short of a REVOLUTION—they consider the State as an old ship too crazy to repair, or not worth mending; and they would set another afloat in its stead, better capable of weathering the storms of the ocean, and better calculated to afford comfort and security to the passengers. But it is possible that gentle measures might win even these over to the cause of monarchy; for they are not the most irrational of the community; and, however they may have been misrepresented, not the most rebellious. There are many, however, whom no measures can soften, no concessions conciliate—they have been injured, and nothing short of revenge will satisfy them: they must see their oppressors laid low, before they can feel the pleasures of existence—the consciousness of *being* becomes irksome to man, when he knows that the *continuance* of that *being* is at the mercy of his most bitter enemies. These are the bold original spirits who think in a manner peculiar to themselves; they do not borrow fine phrases from the rhetorical sophists of the house of commons—they do not make long speeches about the excellency of a constitution which is now no more; or call upon heaven to grant them that liberty which they are convinced their own exertions can alone procure them; they compare their physical force with that of their opponents, and the result does not seem to discourage them. These, my most honourable fellow-citizens, are the men from whose exertions the friends of arbitrary power have every thing to fear; these are the "turbulent spirits," who are, as a certain writer has

remarked, in every country, the authors and actors of a revolution."

In the latter part of the paragraph which I have cited from the speech of Earl Grosvenor, he very properly inquires, what must be the opinions of the people when their governors appear so alarmed at the diffusion of knowledge? I reply, that they will always consider that government which attempts to repress the efforts of the human mind, as the most absurd, as well as the most base of tyrannies; and will never be satisfied till all the promoters of such a diabolical plan are brought to the punishment they deserve. What can be more provokingly ridiculous, then an attempt to persuade mankind that they are still children, that they do not know their own interests, that they must be excessively taxed in order to be happy, that *sinecurists* and *placemen* are the nation's best friends, and that those are ignorant despicable demagogues who attempt to drive away the veil of prejudice from the eyes of the public. Yet this has been done—is still done every day, and will always be the mode as long as the boroughmongor faction shall retain the ascendancy in this country. You have attempted, but very feebly, to stem the almost overwhelming torrent of corruption, which has made a vast progress towards turning this fine country into a desert wilderness; you have opposed, but opposed in such a manner, that the nation is in great doubt as to the sincerity of your professions, the despotic measures proposed by the ministry; and it is only the dread of public vengeance, and not your lukewarm opposition, which has arrested them in their career of iniquity. The nation is now completely writhed—the people have neither money, credit, nor friends,—they look around them and behold nothing but famine and oppression staring them in the face—they behold the men to whom they have been accustomed to look up for instruction and protection forsake them in their misfortunes—they perceive that they must be their own deliverers, if they hope to be delivered; they will no longer be duped by pretty speakers, nor silly schemes of economy; they have long experienced all the inconveniences of monarchy, with few or none of its blessings, and appear determined to obtain a reform in one way or another. Orators may declaim, and statesman plod, and tyrants threaten; but the people are invincible—to be completely conquered they must be exterminated; there is no alternative. And who is

to exterminate them? who can say to the people, we will govern you in spite of yourselves; we will tax you as much as we please, we will maintain as many sinecurists, and soldiers, and priests, and parish officers, as suit our purposes, at your expence, and you must not dare to murmur, whether you believe the priest, or think the soldier necessary! Who can say this, and not dread the vengeance of an enraged people? and should they once take arms in defence of their freedom, who is to oppose them, who is to stay their irresistible fury? The army! but the army is composed of the people; and have wives, and daughters, and fathers and children among them! and who could point his sabre against his father's breast? whose heart is so steeled against soft feelings of humanity, as not be moved by the shriek of beauty, or the wild agonizing screams of woe? who could behold his wife or mother kneel before him and intreat him to spare his country, or plunge his dagger in her breast, and not rather be crucified than disobey the impulse of nature? what soldiers, brave, generous, and gallant as they are, could behold such sights and remain deaf to the call of patriotism? There are no such men in existence, and least of all are there such among the people. But should such things happen—should laws, and government, and society itself, be torn up by the roots, and dashed to its original anarchical elements, who would be guilty of the crime? the people or their oppressors? the poor miserable injured slaves, or their haughty unfeeling lords? Your own hearts will decide.

Wishing you may become more desirous of the characters of patriots, and still more worthy of the gratitude and thanks of the nation,

I remain,

Your most affectionate Fellow-Citizen,

JULIAN AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN.

Yealson Bridge, Plymouth, December 10, 1819.

Mr. CARLILE,

SIR,

The arbitrary conduct of the law officers of the crown who presided at your trial, has excited in me the strongest feelings of disgust and abhorrence. Previous to your tria I

anticipated the pleasure of having my scruples removed, or my doubts confirmed, by the powerful arguments that would be advanced on that momentous occasion But alas! the supporters of christianity have nothing but dungeon proof to offer, and henceforward I renounce *the Christian faith.* I heartily sympathize with you on the unjust, cruel and unmerited punishment you are sentenced to bear, and if I can render you any service, you have only to say in what manner, and my utmost abilities shall be exerted in your behalf. I beg to subscribe myself,

Sir,

Your sincere friend,

JOSEPH ARTHUR.

Mr. CARLILE,

SIR,

A few friends of mine, who are conscious of the purity of your motives, in publishing *the Age of Reason, &c.* and viewing with indignation the severity of your sentence, and wishing to be instrumental in endeavouring to ameliorate your unparalleled sufferings for the defence of your own opinions, take this means of expressing their opinion, that the enormous fine levied against you might be easily raised by weekly contributions of one penny, as the number required to pay £1500 in three years, at 1*d.* per week, is only 2308, and we feel confident, that the admirers of your conduct are certainly three times that number; should the above plan meet your approbation, we hereby declare our resolution to commence our subscriptions immediately, and the money shall be delivered monthly to the person or persons appointed by you to receive the same.

Hoping that you will give notice either public or private, at as early a date as possible,

I remain, in behalf of several friends,

Your humble Servant,

P. CHRISTIE.

No. 2, George Street, Grosvenor Square,
Wednesday, Nov. 17.

TO MR. CARLILE.

SIR,

From the circumstance of your being the champion of modern *Deists*, and from what I have read of "The Republican," it occurs to me that you are led to consider the advocates for scripture revelation, *one and all*, as *your* irreconcilable foes, and the determined enemies to *civil liberty*;

and are ready to implicate them, without exception, in all the trickery, intrigue, and delusion which has been practised upon mankind under the mask of *religion*; from this supposition I am induced (on behalf of others as well as myself) to bear my testimony against a conclusion so unwarrantable. Be assured that, even in *my* narrow circle of acquaintance, I can vouch for many, who though directly opposed to you in *theology*, are yet at no variance with you in politics. It is my firm opinion, calculating by local comparison, that three-fourths of that part of the religious community commonly called Dissenters, are to be ranked amongst the advocates of parliamentary reform. *They*, equally with you, agree on the necessity of not merely a *reform*, but a *radical* one. *They* too are aware of the corrupt system of administration in this country: and, in unison with *you*, *they* are convinced that the order of society may be preserved, and the welfare of a community secured, without the interposition of those useless beings who have so long been the idols of slaves and crouching minions; and who, were it not for their *royal* titles, and enormous salaries, would have nothing to distinguish them from the rest of mankind, but their profligacy, tyranny, and fraud. The self-evident axiom, that "*all men are born with equal right*" strikes *their* minds as forcibly perhaps as it does *yours*

With respect to those publications for which you have been arraigned in a court of justice, I would take this opportunity to remark, that though they are a direct and bold attack on what I *hold dear*, I am not in the least disposed to question what you have affirmed as the motives by which you were actuated in their publicity; much less would I join with a pompous Irish barrister, in stigmatizing you with epithets disgraceful to the christian name. Not more decided and inflexible are *you* in your deistical sentiments than *I* am on the side of christianity; yet would I express my abhorrence of every *species of persecution* for opinions, religious or political. The *rights* of thinking is coextensive with the *power* of thinking; and the best way to come at the truth is by open and fair discussion. I cannot, therefore, but view the recent legal proceedings against you as incompatible with every principle of justice and genuine religion; nor do I think any man accountable to a human tribunal for publishing his thoughts on any subject, however repugnant

to my own, or however opposite they may be to the creeds and establishments of prejudiced lawyers and bigoted priests. It appears to me, that you are marked out by these rigid adherents to church and state, on some *other* account than that of being a *blasphemer*. The severity of your punishment seems to indicate this. The cause of Christianity, I am persuaded, has not been, in the least, promoted by the pretended zeal of your judicial antagonists; nor does the book they profess to venerate as the word of God, sanction their uncharitable measures. If Deism is to be suppressed, let it be done by legitimate argument, and the collision of logical debate; and let those who are so much alarmed at its diffusion, and who are afraid, in proportion to its prevalence, their profits and preferments are at stake, take it upon them to arrest its progress by means more honourable and more consistent with their dignified character and profession, than those of civil coercion. Let some of our beneficed bishops work for their pay in the discharge of their responsibility, and use their efforts to stop the deleterious current of which they so much complain.

Before I dismiss my remarks (though I have already avowed my belief in that which *Deism* is designed to *subvert*,) I beg leave to acknowledge myself indebted, both to you and Mr. Paine, for much light on the subject of *Governments*. Indeed it seems to me, "the Rights of Man" displays a depth of intellect, and original thought, rarely to be equalled, and never to be excelled. But in connection with this point I have to solicit your attention to a question, which to me (and all who are of similar views with myself) is a matter of importance: namely, on the supposition that you were to realize your wishes in seeing a *republican government* established in this country, would you consider christianity (I do not mean under the form of a national church) so inimical to the stability of that government, as to plead its interdiction by law to be necessary? In other words, would the plan of government you would propose, be hostile to the free circulation of the book called the bible, and to the privilege of adhering to the diversified tenets of religion, and forms of worship, which at present distinguish sects and parties?

I have been led to make this enquiry from observing certain expressions of yours, in the Republican, with respect to the total anhihilation of Christianity; and therefore should

be glad if you will, with this paper, insert your reply the first opportunity.

I am sorry you have made it a rule to admit no fictious signatures, and consequently must subscribe myself,

R. MILLS.

5, *Marchmont Street, Russell Square.*

To Mr. WHITAKER of Bedford Square.

SIR,

I thank you for the sum you were kind enough to contribute toward paying Mr. Carlile's fine; but as the pages of the Republican ought by no means to be devoted to theology, still less to polemical divinity, I decline the honor of answering your long letter on the Truth of Christianity. I shall however observe, that the passages you have quoted from Suetonius, and Tacitus, and the letter of Pliny's which you refer to, are nothing at all to the purpose; and have no weight whatever with a man who wishes to think for himself.

I remain,

Your most obedient humble servant,

JULIAN AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN.

December 15*th*,
1819.

ADDRESS

To the English People on the Attempts which have been made to Abridge their Liberties.

FELLOW CITIZENS!

THIS is no time for doubt or suspicion; 'tis certain the ministry have shown to the world their intention of making you all Slaves—they have proposed bills in both houses of parliament which were intended to feel, as it were, how far you would suffer them to go; to try whether you were the bold enlightened men which republican writers have represented you to be: in short,

to observe, by the manner in which you expressed your feeling at their arbitrary measures, whether you were to be duped into slavery or determined to be free. This is evidently their intention, it carries its character on its face; the motives which induced them to proceed in this manner are not sufficiently concealed, but that your good sense can easily penetrate the flimsy veil, and detect the tyrants in their intricate and tortuous path. But I conjure you by all that is sacred, and all that is venerable and dear to man; by our sufferings, which are unparalleled in the annals of the world; by that constitution, which our ancestors held in so much veneration; by the feelings of every honest mind, not to become a race of tame and despicable slaves! If they they insult you, bear it with patience; if they tax you excessively to support their extravagance, petition to have your burdens lessened and your wants attended to; if they place in their service a whole army of priests, which they command you to pay, hesitate; but if once they openly and wantonly attack your rights; if once they indicate an intention to make slaves of you; if they shall despise your petitions and violate the constitution, act the reverse, and do not submit till you have obtained a free government; and an honest administration.

This is not advising acts of violence—this is not sedition, nor any thing like it, it is what the British constitution allows, and the laws of God and man approve. No man has an understanding so stupid as not to know that liberty is natural to man, and perfectly inalienable: slaves and tyrants are monsters, which God and nature never intended should exist, they are violations of his sacred laws, which plainly point out the liberty and equality of men: they are not to be interpolated, misconstrued, or sophisticated: they are engraven on the heart of every human being, still more on that of every Briton; and they cannot be totally obliterated without tearing that heart to pieces.

In every country and in every age, what has been the issue of a conflict between a nation and its *would be tyrants?* who have succeeded in the end, the men of public liberty, or the base unprincipled despot? Does not history teach, philosophy demonstrate, and wisdom declare their decisions just, that the people will always prevail in the end? That tyrants, with all their glittering shew, are mere pageants, the work of an hour, and the sport of fortune? When he reclines on his bed of state, which has been fabricated out of the misery of

his subjects, is the tyrant happy? Are his reflexions calm and undisturbed? Does he sleep in peace? No; he is never at peace. And is such a situation so much to be desired? Will man for ever sacrifice conscience, and fame, and happiness, to be in possession of such splendid misery? Will he never be convinced that the honest and equal citizen is happier than the guilty monarch, or his more guilty minions? Will he never be convinced that 'tis the citizen of a free state who can can alone be happy? And that freedom can never be purchased too dearly.

Let the people of England keep these reflexions in mind, let them remember that to be flourishing or happy they must be free—that is, have no masterbut the laws—and that they will never be free until they shall be permitted to think as they please, and to express those thoughts without fear of *transportation* or *banishment*. I hope that that day is not far distant, and my hope is founded on the knowledge of which the people are in possession; they cannot now be cheated into slavery without knowing how or by whom; to be enslaved they must first be conquered, or nearly exterminated, either by famine or the sword; both are the arms of despotism and both have frequently been employed to enslave nations; and of the two famine is the most destructive, perhaps, and the most effectual; but not the most certain: it often excites men to acts of patriotism of which they never would have had the most distant idea, had they been fortunate and well-fed; and this consideration has frequently induced tyrants to distribute corn and the necessaries of life to their famished people. Wishing you to reflect on these things,

I remain,

Your Fellow-Citizen,

J. A. ST. JOHN.

REPUBLICAN IDEAS.

Translated from the French of De Voltaire.

(Supposed to have been written by a Citizen of Geneva.)

By Julian Augustus St. John.

(Continued from a former Number)

XXIX.

It appears very strange that the author of the social contract should take it into his head to say, that all the English people ought to sit in parliament, and that it ceases to be free when all its rights consist in being represented in parliament by its deputies. Did he wish that three million citizens should assemble to give their vote in Westminster? Do the Swedish peasants appear any other way than by their deputies? (4)

XXX.

It is said in the same work, that *monarchy* seems only to accord with a powerful and wealthy nation, *aristocracy* with one that is moderately rich, and *democracy* to poor and petty states. But in the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries, the Venetians were the only rich people in Europe: yet Venice never has been, and never will be a monarchy. The Roman republic was immensely rich from the time of Scipio to that of Cæsar. The republic of Lucca is very small, and very poor, and yet is an *aristocracy*. Athens, the most opulent, ingenious, and magnificent city in the ancient world, was a *democratic* state. There are very rich citizens among us; and our government is a *jumble* of aristocracy and democracy—thus we shall find it necessary to distrust those general rules which exist only in the brain of certain writers.

* * * * * * * *

(4) Voltaire seems to have written this article merely out of opposition to Rousseau; and his ideas do not seem to have been very clear on this head.

L.

It is perhaps necessary that there should exist two parties in a republic, because one will watch the other; and men have great need of inspectors. It is not so shameful as might be believed, that a republic requires mediators; it proves, I confess, that there is much obstinacy on both sides, but it likewise proves that there is also much spirit, much knowledge, and great sagacity, in interpreting the different senses of the law; 'tis then that arbiters are required, who may unfold the mystery of the disputed laws, who may alter them should the exigences of the state require it, and who may foresee as much as possible the changes which time will render necessary. It has been repeateda thousand times, that authority has always a tendency to increase, and the people to complain; that we ought not to credit all its representations, nor reject them altogether; that liberty and power equally demand some restraint; that the balance ought to be held in equilibrium: but where is the point on which to set the ballance? who shall fix it? the accomplishment of this would be the master-piece of impartiality and policy.

LI.

Men are all born equal; but a poor *Barbary slave* does not even suspect the existence of this truth. (5)

LII.

This equality does not consist in the annihilation of subordination: we are all equal men, but not equal members of society. All the natural rights of man belong equally to the Sultan and the Bostange: both ought to dispose, with equal power, of their persons, families, and estates.—Men are all essentially equal, though they are different characters on the scene of life.

---

(5) The expression "*bourgeois de Maroc*," which I have translated "*Barbary Slave*," literally means "*a commoner of Morocco*"—but as the common people always were slaves *in those countries*, I thought I might be allowed the expression: it applied most exquisitely to the common people of our own country a few years ago; but, thank heaven! they are now sensible of their rights; they think, they reason, and they are determined to be imposed upon no longer.

EDITOR.

LIII.

Which is the best government? is a question which is eternally agitated. If this question were put to a minister, or his deputy, they would undoubtedly reply in favour of absolute power; if to a baron, he would prefer that in which barons partake the legislative power. The bishop would say as much: the citizen would wish, and with reason, that his will should be consulted, and the agriculturist would not be forgotten. The best government seems to be, that in which every condition is equally protected by the laws.

LIV.

A republican is always more attached to his country than the subject of a monarch to his; for this plain reason, a man always loves his own interest better than the interest of his master.

LV.

What is the love of one's country? A compound of prejudices and self love, which public interest has made the greatest of all possible virtues. In a republic, the words *public good* make a profound impression on the heart.

LVI.

When the haughty lord of some superb castle, or the rich and powerful citizen, complains of the woes which absolute power inflicts on the humble peasant, do not believe them sincere. People never sincerely complain of evils which they they do not feel. The rich citizens, and titled gentlemen, rarely hate the person of the sovereign, unless in the convulsions of civil war. 'Tis absolute power in the fourth or fifth hand that they hate; 'tis the antichamber of a commissioner, or a secretary, which causes murmurs; it is because the ambitious man has received a rebuff from an insolent valet in the palace, that he sighs over his desolated country.

N. B. This applies to a grumbling aristocracy.

(To be continued.)

REASONS OF A DEIST,

Why no Punishment should be Inflicted;

(*Continued from page* 272.)

10. Because, in the absence of all positive law, and even of any reference to any law in the information, I could not conceive when I caused the Age of Reason to be reprinted, that I violated any law; and I therefore consider, that I have been tried as upon an *ex post facto* law, made for the occasion; and for the purpose of gratifying a vindictive and immoral spirited persecution.

11. Because, the very assumption of a pretended common law, on which these proceedings have been founded; is no other, than the law of prejudice, malice, and persecution, inherent in the minds of wicked and unjust men in all ages, and it is the very same law, and has the same sources as the pretended law, under which Socrates was poisoned, and Jesus crucified.

12. Because, the unshackled right of free discussion, and of publishing truth on all subjects useful and interesting to Society, is the great bulwark of civil and religious liberty; and is a fundamental right, and undoubted part of the common laws of Englishmen; which, without limitation or condition, ought to be maintained and asserted by every English tribunal, which feels and duly respects the value of truth and liberty.

13. Because, if this right were subject to any restriction or limitation, as far as regards subjects and questions of general interest; it would be altogether useless; for the publication of error often leads to the detection of truth, and error is always harmless; because, whilst free enquiry and discussion are allowed, it can easily be refuted.

14. Because, if the opinions of persons in authority were admitted as standards of truth, just as the opinions of the prosecutors, the Attorney General, and the Court, are on this occasion assured as standards of truth, we might at this day, by parity of reasoning, have been still involved in the darkness of pagan worship of Druidical Rites, of Roman Mythology, and of Popish Superstition; all of which, have successively been standards of truth among the very same authorities in former ages, but were destroyed by the very persons who have conferred

power on this court, which is bound therefore not to countenance any further persecution, for mere opinion.

15. Because, in every Christian country in Europe, the utmost latitude of free opinion has been practised with impunity; particularly in France, Holland, Switzerland, and Prussia; even under the despotic sway of the Bourbons, the writiugs of Voltaire, Diderot, d'Alembert, Rousseau, Volney, and others, were freely published, and obtained for their authors, honours and renown, and for their publishers, extensive patronage and immense fortunes; and it would be an inexplicable parodox, if in the face of such examples, the free press of England were visited with pains and penalties, and those who exercise it, outraged by cruel persecutions and vindictive punishments.

16. Because, the issue of these proceedings does not involve a mere decision in regard to truth or falsehood, or a mere affirmation, whether the re-publication of Mr. Paine's Age of Reason was, or was not, according to law, but its issue superadds to the decission, a vindictive and perhaps a cruel punishment, for an act, in which I verily believe I was rendering service to truth and morals, against which I discovered no prohibition in the written laws of England, and in which I was sanctioned by the professions of Christianity, and by the jurisprudence of other Christians nations. For these and many other reasons, which I forbear to adduce, I conceive I have not rendered myself obnoxious to any punishment of this Court. I therefore call on this Court, that its sense of justice will induce it to order my immediate liberation from the confinement, in which, by its authority, I have been, for one month, unjustly detained.

CORRESPONDENT.

In answer to the letter of "A Freeethinker," I have to inform him, that No. 15. of the Deist will be published on Saturday next, and that the Republican will continue to be published, though on a larger size.

The Editor.

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke street, Smithfield.

The Republican.

No. 19, Vol. I.] London, Friday, Dec. 31, 1819. [Price, 2d.

AN APPEAL TO THE FRIENDS OF FREEDOM.

Thy shrine in some religious wood,
O soul enforcing goddess, stood!
Where oft the painted native's feet
Were wont thy form celestial meet:
Though now with *hopeless* toil we trace
Time's backward rolls *to find its place!*

Collins's Ode to Liberty.

Fellow Citizens!

You are thrown upon the theatre of the world in an era, when the principles of public liberty are better understood than they have been at any former period: when the very peasant, whose toils and whose miseries are incessant, can think and reason as well, perhaps, as his proud masters; when the dark and petrifying clouds of superstition, which have long clouded the mental horizon, are beginning to disperse; and when philosophy, that has for ages been confined to the closets of the learned, has found its way among the people.

But what will all this mental illumination avail, if the man who thinks and acts with the dignity which superior knowledge inspires, is to be at the disposal of a silly fox-hunter, who, born to an estate of ten thousand a year, has been thought a proper person to represent a part of the English nation in parliament? Why is a giddy boy, whose head perhaps nature never meant to be the receptacle of one steady thought, placed over the heads of millions of thinking men, who could persuade him, were they so inclined, that the House of Commons was an

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke-street, Smithfield.

assembly of sage senators, and honest lawgivers, for any thing he could say to the contrary? Why are debauched princes, and unprincipled ministers, permitted to squander the treasures of nations in the most detestable debauchery, reclining on costly couches in more costly pavilions, while the honest obscure citizen is pining away an unhappy life in want and solitude? Why are the people despised, and their wants and miseries disregarded? Will their petitions never be attended to, till those terrible passions, which now slumber, are awakened, whose irresistible fury will bear every thing before it like a torrent? Must they be for ever irritated, injured, oppressed? Must they be for ever treated with disdain, till they are roused to vengeance; when every thing must bow, or be annihilated before them? It wants no extraordinary sagacity to reply to these questions.

In every country the first dawnings of a revolution are concealed by thick clouds; and the more obscure the atmosphere at first appears, the brighter will be the day that is to succeed it. Every effort will undoubtedly be used by the friends of arbitrary power, to impede the progress of knowledge; they will endeavour, by increasing its price, to put it out of the reach of the poor. But it is now too late: the poor Republican, who has but one shilling in the world, will cheerfully part with half of it, to be possessed of the only book whose principles are congenial to his mind; and when he is seated by his fire-side, will think himself still happy that he has been taught to lay out his money in the acquisition of knowledge, rather than in purchasing those vile liquors which he had, perhaps, been accustomed to drink, which would ruin his understanding, destroy his domestic peace, and increase the revenue of that system he wishes to see destroyed. Thus the ministry will perceive their most violent and unconstitutional attempts to arrest science in its career, prove abortive; and they will be

embarrassed to discover what mode to adopt next. Fines and imprisonment have failed—stamping and banishment will likewise fail, to awe the unconquerable mind. There is nothing left but death!—and to that they must resort, if they wish to destroy the prolific germ of philosophy in England. But let them look at France—the Encyclopedists commenced their plan under every unfavourable auspice—persecution, defamation, banishment, were resorted to, in order to deter philosophy from diffusing the principles of knowledge. What was the result?—Philosophy triumphed; and the thrones and altars which stood in its way were levelled with the ground. Society was new modelled: the proud insensible baron was reduced to an equality with his peasant slave—the bishop now turned atheist, in hope of preserving some distinction in the new system of things, was ranked with the lay-man, over whom he had long tyrannized, and obliged to sit in the national assembly among reduced dukes, lords, renegade priests, mechanics, and bold fortunate peasants, who owed every thing to their genius and intrepidity. Ambition pervaded every rank in society; and the head that had been accustomed to bend over the stubborn glebe, now glittered with the insignia of power: 'twas virtue, or its resemblance, that bore away the palm in every contest; and he who was fortunate, was so in no other proportion than as he was bold, eloquent, or politic. The road to honour, that for seventeen centuries had been closed against plebeian virtue, was now opened to every body: magistrates, soldiers, and senators, arose from the common people, and astonished all Europe with a brilliant display of talent and audacity: and the men who thus succeeded, were not mere fortunate mortals thrown upon the theatre of public life by chance or accident, but great original minds, who forced their way through the anarchical chaos that surrounded them, to fame, and dignity, and riches. This

was a grand and terrible revolution, and it was accelerated by the stupid tyrants who foolishly attempted, with their feeble hands, to stop the play of the resistless engine. And may every tyrant succeed in the same manner!

No nation can be enslaved, the manners of which have not been corrupted. There is nothing which a tyrant dreads so much as a virtuous thinking people; and there is no length he will not go to corrupt their manners. The conduct of Charles the First, who lost his head for his insolence, is a demonstration of the truth of what I assert. He was so convinced that the English people could not be subdued, while there remained a vestige of morality or virtue in their character, that he attempted, and persisted in his design with the utmost obstinacy, to subvert their principles, and debauch their minds, before he displayed the grand project of annihilating their liberties. It is no matter whether the Christian religion be true or false; or whether keeping of the sabbath, (that is, behaving on that day with a more than common degree of steadiness and sobriety) be a merit or a crime; when the one is believed by the nation, it ought to be respected by the prince; and when the other has been consecrated by the laws of one's country, to behave with more than ordinary caution on that day, is not to pay respect to superstition, but to the laws. I speak this the more boldly, because I am not afraid of being thought *too religious;* my sentiments on that head are tolerably well-known to the public, and because I would impress it on the public mind, that philosophy and republicanism are no enemies to morality, or to any means which may lead to advance its interests.

In the age of Charles the First, the sabbath day was accounted holy by the common people; and was not despised or thought unnecessary by many enlightened minds who thought but little of its holiness; they looked upon it, not only as a day set apart for rest, but as an

institution which tended to promote virtue and morality. I will subjoin in a note * the sentiments of an enlightened anonymous writer on this subject, which appears to have been those of all thinking men of that day. The book from which they are extracted is curious, and, I believe, not very generally known. These prejudices were to the people what philosophy is to the sage, and he who attempted to apply to gaming and vice the only few moments which their hard lot had put at the disposal of his subjects, was a base villain, whose memory ought to be held up to eternal detestation.

The society for the Suppression of Vice would have been very impolitic, had they lived in the reign of Charles the First, to have assumed a title so opposite to the views of the sovereign. A society for the promotion of vice, would have been thought much better of in

---

* "The court being now determined to be restrained by no laws, either human or divine, and wanting to render the common and lower class of people more ignorant and profane, that they might succeed the more easily in their favourite design of molding our church to a nearer resemblance to that of Rome (as Ludlow expresses it) they published a book of sports and pastimes, to be practised on *Sundays;* and all ministers, who refused to read this impious book, were *imprisoned* and *suspended.* It is sad to recount, says Dr. Fuller, what grief and distraction was occasioned by this declaration, in the hearts of all honest men; for this sabbath breaking gave great offence to the people in general, and was a vast increase to the puritan party, who cried out against it as a national sin. The good, the pious, the most religious King Charles, was so intent on the publication of this famous book, that, to hasten it, he wrote the following order or warrant to Laud.

Charles Rex,

Canterbury; See that our declaration concerning *recreations* on the *Lord's-day,* after evening service, be printed.

This was afterwards produced by Laud in his defence.

Letter to a Clergyman on his sermon preached on the 30th of January, by a Lover of Truth." Lond. 1746."

that corrupt age—Oh! what a blessing it is to be born under the benign auspices of a pious and temperate prince! whose loving kindness provides us with a merciful and benevolent attorney-general, whose whole business it is to see that we do not go astray into the harsh and rugged paths which philosophy and truth have maliciously traced out for us: should we foolishly persist in believing the evidences of our deceitful senses, which every body knows were given us by the Almighty for the express purpose of leading us into error, after the good attorney-general has warned us by an ex-officio, that we ought not to believe that two and one are three, he will kindly take us by the hand, and having regaled our ears with his fatherly advice in the most bewitching strain of eloquence, will treat us with a few years' residence at one of his master's country seats at Dorchester, or Gloucester, or Maidstone, &c. where are a vast number of polite valets, who will not permit you to go to bed without first bolting you up with the utmost care *to keep out thieves, &c.* or to walk out alone, though in the very garden of the villa, lest some mischievous rogue should pick your pockets. Ah! my dear countrymen, these are blessings peculiar to the age we live in!

Besides, so kindly do they now watch over our religious sentiments, were we ever so heathenishly inclined, we shall not be permitted to go to the devil our own way. We must have a priest to pray for the salvation of our souls, whether we will or no; at all events, we must pay for one, and as few people chose to pay for what they never make use of, people will go to church to hear what their spiritual guides, whom they pay so exorbitantly, have to say that can merit such respect as is *seemingly* paid them. I say, *seemingly*, because, if I am not much mistaken, the very princes who make tools of them despise them in their hearts. However, this has been the fashion from the earliest ages, and as the world

is always tolerably well stocked with dupes, there is little doubt but priestcraft will long continue to be a profitable trade. Prophets, hierophants, and oracle-mongers, have always had their votaries, though the number has sadly diminished in those countries where the natives have given themselves up to the study of nature, and of man; and there will always remain some weak minds who will be afraid to think for themselves, and who will gladly repair to the cave of the hierophant, to know the will, or to deprecate the wrath of heaven. But the number is daily decreasing; doubt and infidelity are gathering force, and rapidly communicating from breast to breast, like an electrical shock; men who yesterday were firm believers in Christianity, to day are sceptics, to-morrow will be infidels. The mode which the government has adopted for the suppression of infidelity is only calculated to give it a wider circulation; for many silly people will read a book that has been prohibited, merely because they imagine they ought not to read it, or because they suppose it must contain something very profound, and very dangerous, before their wise governors would think of hiding it from them. Be this as it may, it is now too late to think of stopping the progress of infidelity: the doctrine of Spinoza, disguised in every shape, has been swallowed by the people with the utmost avidity; they have become atheists, without suspecting whither they were led; they have rejected the hypothesis of the spiritualists, and adopted that of their opponents, without being better acquainted with matter than they were with spirit; but this does not matter, they are infidels, and that is sufficient. Every thing now bows before the sceptre of unbelief; and the Christian doctors shrink from the task of refuting their adversaries in a most strange manner; they seem tacitly to confess that their system is indefensible; they retire from the field of disputation, which was always the field of glory, and

abandon their unfinished trophies to the foe. While they are under the influence of this panic, it is perhaps ungenerous in me to attack them, but hoping they may recover their courage, I here throw down the gauntlet, and candidly declare, without fear or temerity, that, if the clergy will set aside the aid of the civil power, so that I may engage with them upon an equality, I will stand forward as the advocate of pure monotheism, will overthrow every other system that may be opposed to it, even though the Archbishop of Canterbury himself should be the advocate of that system, and will prove that every thing which goes beyond natural religion, is injurious or indifferent to mankind.

Hoping from my soul that the clergy may accept this challenge, and thus give me an opportunity of defending publicly the liberty of thinking on matters of religion,

I remain,

Your most affectionate Fellow-Citizen,

JULIAN AUGUSTUS ST. JOHN.

SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR Mr. CARLILE.

SUBSCRIPTION received by Mr. Carlile in the King's Bench Prison, but omitted in the insertions in consequence of his hasty removal.

A few Mechanics..... 19s 3d

Subscribed by a few well wishers, of Civil and Religious Liberty, at Crayford..... 11s 0d

PHILOSOPHICAL QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO THE DEITY.

Never presume to make a God appear,
But for a business worthy of a God.

Roscommon.

JOB says, "canst thou by searching find out God?—canst, thou find out the Almighty to perfection."

Put these questions to a philosopher, he will feel himself somewhat embarrassed; yet there is not a priest in the present day, from a bishop to a field-preacher, but what would answer them without the least hesitation; they have nothing more to do than to turn to the bible, which proves all things necessary for a priest. They have only to look at Genesis, chap. 6. ver. 3. There the Lord says, my spirit shall not always strive against man, for that he also is flesh.

Here he is described at once to be flesh and blood like unto man; the same chapter also informs us that he had sons that were flesh and blood also, and fell in love with the daughters of men, and they bare children unto them, and they become mighty men, which were of old, men of renown.

The story then goes on and says that the Lord repented that he had made man, and makes up his mind to drown the whole world; nothing is mentioned of the corruption of mankind until this commerce of the sons of God. I dont know how far it may be consistent with the moral justice of God in the eyes of a Christian, but if we may be allowed human reasoning, the sons of God ought to have been drowned, lest they should run astray again in the new world. If we could believe this childish story to be true, we might infer that they have, as this new world is as corrupt as the old one.

To finish this immoral tale, it is necessary to refer to a very ancient book, said to be the book of Enoch, where we find the names of the giants, their leaders, &c.

Semiaxas their prince said to them, I fear that you will not have courage to accomplish such a design, and I alone shall remain charged with the crime. Upon which all answered, let us bind ourselves by an oath, to execute

our design, and may we be accursed if we fail therein. They then joined together in an oath and in making imprecations.

They were 200 in number, they set out together at the time of Jared, and went up to the mountain which is called Hermonim, on account of their oath.

The names of their leaders are as follows; Semiaxas, Atarculph, Arakel, Parmar, Thausel, Samiel, Tiriel, and Sumiel.

These and the rest took themselves wives in the year 1170 from the creation of the world, this commerce produced three kinds of men, the Giants, Naphilim, &c.

It is true that the bible does not contain this quotation, but it manifestly sanctions it in the chapter alluded to, which appears, as it stands in the bible, to be only a fragment, thus it is evident the bible supports the doctrine of Polytheism, the Unity, and Trinity of God; this book we are expected to believe, notwithstanding all these contradictions. It is enough to say that the priest says it is true, and we ought not to examine for ourselves, for when the priest speaks, reason must be silent; and when the church speaks the philosopher must be silent also.

We might suppose that the priests of all ages and countries studied how they should degrade the Almighty; they seem to have studied to outdo each other, in making him the most ridiculous character that the human mind can suggest.

Look into the history of what nation you will, you will find the same propensity amongst all the priests. The sect of Laotze, say his mother became pregnant by a junction of heaven and earth, and was pregnant fourscore years with him, he was born with white hair and promulgated his doctrine on a black cow.

The God Fo, had a white elephant for his father, and promises immortal life.

Sammono-codom came down to fly a kite among the Siamese, and Camis went from the moon to visit Japan.

These are the impositions of designing priests, to keep mankind in darkness and slavery; these are the people that are to be kept in idleness, and live on the vitals of their fellow creatures, to preach up these idle tales.

To deny them, you would have been in danger of your life; not to believe them is blasphemy; but to invent them and promulgate them is divine, because they were invented

by priests. Can there be any-thing more degrading to the Almighty than these blasphemous tales, yet such is the weakness of the human mind, that while it suffers itself to be priest-ridden, it never attempts to exercise its own reason, it gives implicit belief to every thing that comes from the mouth of a priest, and would take the life of any one that would oppose their credulity.

The covetousness of the priests at the time of the Lacedemonians was so great, that Lycurgus made a law that every one should serve the gods with as little expense as possible, alledging for a reason, that the service of the gods would be intermitted, for he feared if religion should be expensive, that the divine worship out of covetuousness of some, and the poverty of others, would be neglected.

D. FRIEND.

Kingsland.

P. S. Simonides being asked by Dionysius, what God was, desired a day's time to consider of it before he made reply; when the day was expired he desired two days, and afterwards, instead of returning his answer, demanded still double the time to consider of it. This great philosopher, the more he contemplated the nature of the Deity, found that he waded but the more out of his depth, and that he lost himself in the thought, instead of finding an end of it.

TO MRS. CARLILE.

DEAR MADAM,

I should recommend that your designs be put in practice immediately after the second meeting and subscription, (mentioned in the Republican of Saturday last,) as the public have the late diabolical transactions fresh in their memory, and delay will perhaps exhaust your means; but as a matter of common precaution (in case it should have slipt your observation,) previous to your resuming business, it may be advisable for you to take the opinion of your friends and some able solicitor, (perhaps that honorable gentleman Mr. Pearson, would have no objection to give you his) whether your name being exhibited as proprietor, would not serve as a pretext for a second plundering, as part of your husband's fine.

I beg your acceptance of the enclosed five shillings, and when circumstances will permit, you may rely on my puisne aid.

I am, dear Madam,

Your well wisher,

December 24, 1819. Q. R. S.

TO MRS. CARLILE.

MADAM,

Had there existed in this country any number of persons *truly* animated with the *spirit* and *feelings* of the amiable founder of the Christian faith, neither your husband, nor his ruined family, could long have remained in the state of forlorn misery, to which I fear you are now reduced.

Your salvation not only in this world, but the next, must ere now have roused every true believer in Jesus to hold out the olive-branch of *peace* and *charity* as the best and only means of convincing you and yours that *truth* and *humanity* were the grand pillars of our Church and State, but alas! how few in this great metropolis can boast of any thing, beyond the name of Christians?

All I have to say for myself is, that I am a man, and in that humble capacity alone, now beg your acceptance of the enclosed one pound note, which with equal pleasure I would encrease to a thousand, were it in my power to devote such a sum to any other purpose than my own support, and the maintenance of numerous relatives, and dependents, in my domestic circle.

I am a decided foe to every species of persecution, and shall ever continue, so far as self-preservation will admit, the firm friend and sincere well-wisher of every honest victim to hypocritical power, which I conceive Mr. Carlile, yourself, and his innocent little ones all are.—Be of good cheer—you may live to see better days, when people will not be afraid of telling their names as your friends.

Yours faithfully,

A FELLOW-CREATURE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE REPUBLICAN.

Glasgow, Dec. 22, 1819.

DEAR SIR,

I have to inform you that both my wife and I were served with an indictment on Monday last to stand our trial before the lords Justiciary at Edinburgh on the 6th of January next, for circulating or causing to be circulated seditious and blasphemous publications. The ones fixed upon, and from which large extracts are taken, were the Republican, Nos. 12 and 13, especially No. 12; the Dwarf, Nos. 41 and 44, especially No. 41, and a copy of Paine's Age of Reason. So that whatever may be the issue, we will be put to an immense deal of trouble and expense, which I am not able to bear, besides it is generally allowed here I need have little hope from a Scotch jury. I wish you could on receipt of this

apply to Messrs, Cobbett and Wooler, and request them, if they thought they could give me any assistance in this affair, to do it, either by writing to me, or any other way they could do.

A. MARSHALL.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE REPUBLICAN.

The Christian has no more natural right to punish the Deist, than the Deist to punish the Christian.

Fox.

Dec. 27, 1819.

SIR,

In your paper of the 24th inst. is a letter from a Mr. Christie, proposing to raise the fine so arbitrarily levied on Mr. Carlile by weekly subscriptions, at one penny per week, which I think a very eligible plan, and to which I give my most cordial assent. He states the number to be 2308 of subscribers wanted, and as Mr. Carlile stated on his trial, he had sold 3000 copies of Mr. Thomas Paine's Theological Works, which is a greater number of subscribers than wanted, we may readily suppose that the purchasers of that invaluable work, will not scruple to subscribe their pence, to alleviate the sufferings of a man and a friend, who has so boldly stood forward to oppose superstition and priestcraft, and but for whose intrepidity I should never have been in possession of so valuable a work. I shall look forward for the proposed plan with some impatience.

Though Mr. Paine's Theological Works (in a printed form,) have been suppressed, it appears to me they may be disseminated in another manner, as (I believe there is no law to suppress written copies of any work.) My plan is the following,—If each of the purchasers would agree to write a copy to give to his friend, and believe me I would not hesitate to set about to write it immediately, though it appears an arduous task—there would be 3000 copies at once, they in their turn might write another copy, to give to their friends, &c. Or it might be printed as Sir William Drummond's Œdipus Judaicus was.

Should you think the above worth insertion in your valuable paper, by so doing you will much oblige one who is a true Paineite.

I am, sir, with respect, yours truly,

T. R. BAYLEY POTTS.

Brick Lane, Whitechapel.

FOR THE REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

Fear which is entertained by children if placed in darkness, prevents their attempting to judge of the nature of surrounding objects, or of sounds, but this gradually wears off as strength of mind increases;—so the mists of superstition and the prejudices of religion disperse, as the dawn of manhood opens forth; then is it that doubts will present themselves of absurdities held up for our veneration as sublime and unquestionable. Spontaneously our attention becomes earnest to any apparent attempt at explaining the profound enigmas, or to remove religious inconsistencies, but every pretender to clear unintelligible doctrine fails; they talk us away from the subject, or when arrived in the midst of multiplied difficulties make a desperate plunge to extricate themselves by insisting upon faith, (the only recourse left,) which we, although reason yields reluctantly, endeavour to digest according to the doctor's prescription; till aroused, (as I amongst numerous others find myself) from a stupor, a religious mania, *reason* now exerts its sway, and I behold things as they are, I find myself in possession of thought; the senses have now scope to exercise their powers; *astonishment fills* me *that* I *should have dreamt so long*. To *clear manly publications*, which *of late have been issued forth*, am I indebted for the release of my reason from the fetters of bigotry. I am not surprised that priestcraft should dread the circulation of such home conviction, for they would soon be deserted, their spell would cease, and the power of these formidable genii would then be annihilated. They delude into delusion, persuading the remaining fanatics that Deist is synonymous with devil, that nothing is too atrocious for a Deist to perform, whose language forsooth is too impure to be repeated. Well they know the ground taken to be firm, and truth incontrovertible, as such silence they wish to obtain, by suppressing such opinions, and condemning the propagators unheard, but "truth will out and shame the devil."

Chelsea, Nov. 1, 1819. H. MORHALL.

LETTER TO THE

PROSECUTORS OF RICHARD CARLILE.

The first point which strikes the mind is, the impolicy of these prosecutions, even on the statement of the prosecutors. They lament the circulation of certain works as fatal to morality and government, and yet they effectually disperse them in all directions, quicken curiosity, cull the most offensive passages, and proclaim them in hundreds of newspapers, and multiplied in a hundred thousand publications.

Then mark the professions of the attorney-general, he by no means wishes to interfere with the liberty of the press. If so why prosecute Mr. Carlile? and mark, especially in his reply, he declares he will prosecute to the best of his ability all authors who impugn religion, "being convinced conscientiously, that religion could not exist without government, and that government could not subsist without the establishment of religion." Yet government subsists in America and there is no public accuser, Paine's and Palmer's horrible blasphemy is published, and there is no Sir William Gifford to denounce their impiety. But why prosecute now, if to attaint the liberty of the press be not the ultimate design of the government? Tyrants, as lawyers and ministers are, they must know that inquiry cannot be ended by a verdict of twelve men. They must conjecture somewhat of the temper of the public mind. The Quarterly Review's critique on Gisborne's Natural Theology, afforded them a hint. Can they be unaware of the many literary men who have made free with the Eleusinian mysteries? have they no intercourse with society? no cognizance of notorious occurrences? have they not heard that a gentleman of great commercial wealth, having lately expressed his deep dissatisfaction with religion, amidst a large and respectable assemblage in the London Tavern, was cheered by the audience. It cannot be to serve religion that such prosecutions are entertained, considering the state of the intelligence of the community, they must add activity to discussion. The crown lawyers began with religion in order to succeed against liberty, the prosecutions for sedition are to come, and both of course follow methodically the Manchester massacre and its approval. Look to the con-

federacy in the continent against the press, our goverment is leagued with sovereigns of the holy alliance, and our law officers and Sidmouth with his circular authorize justices to prejudge by a second-sighted sagacity all works of the press, and to imprison printers, publishers, itinerant venders, and bill-stickers. Yet the attorney-general repeats his respect for a free press, as Domitian who always, says the historian, prefaced his most atrocious judgment with professions of clemency.

The attorney-general in his accusation insisted that the jury, as they had taken the oath, were bound to find Carlile guilty—such was the liberality of the advocate. But the topic pressed and only one that was enforced was, that the *law* said Christianity was part of the *law* of the land. It was also said religion must be refuted in *general* though different sects may contravene different parts of it, this the attorney-general and the judge both stated. That is, each person may argue away a part of it, but no one must combine their objections into one argument.

Now, what law states that Christianity is not to be refuted? the common law, not a printed document express and authentic to which jurors may refer, but a traditionary report founded on the dicta of judges and the commentaries of lawyers. Thus W. Gifford referred to Sir Vicary Gibbs, he to Mr. Erskine, he again to Lord Hale, and should the infatuation continue, Sir W. Gifford will be quoted with honor, as he has done his predecessors, and as usual the common law, which by its vagueness affords latitude to judges and profit to lawyers, will share with judges and crown lawyers the praises of the prosecutor.

(To be continued.)

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke street, Smithfield.

The Republican.

No. 20, Vol. I.] London, Friday, Jan. 7, 1820. [Price, 2d.

LETTER TO DR. RUDGE.

Dorchester Gaol, December 25th, 1819

SIR,

I have no doubt but your good sense will excuse a Republican and a Deist, in not using the epithet "*Reverend*" in addressing you.

I have to acknowledge the receipt of a copy of Soame Jenyns' "View of the internal evidence of the Christian religion," on the Monday prior to my being taken before the holy tribunal, to receive the sentence of 3 years imprisonment, and a fine of £1500, for publishing my doubts, and the doubts of others, of the truth of the divinity of the Christian religion. The fine and imprisonment would have been a trifle, if it had been put in execution agreeable to the law of the country and former practice. I say it would have been a trifle, in comparison, to the other grievances I have been placed under. Will you not, Sir, as a minister of the Christian religion, sign and publish your protest against it, when I inform you, that the agents of the government have seized every tittle of my property and shut up my shop, and thereby debarred my wife from the means of supporting her imprisoned husband, herself, and three infant children? When I tell you, that if they had given me notice, that they must have the fine instantly, I could have made arrangements for paying it before the time, that they offer to sell any of the property? What can be a stronger proof of the inability of the advocates of the Christian religion to defend the truth of its divinity by argument, than that I am writing to you, Sir, from

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke street, Smithfield.

Dorchester gaol, in answer to your endeavour to convince me that I am in error, and that my persecutors have taken a step to ruin me? Every honest and disinterested christian would enter his protest against such treatment, and feel a shame to think, that that religion which he believes to be divine, should be enforced and supported by such means. The harsh and unusually severe treatment that I met with at the King's Bench prison after the sentence was passed, prevented me taking the copy of the aforementioned work to my present gaol, (or I might call it my goal, as it is a place of rest and improvement that I have long had in view,) but some unknown friend in London has happily supplied the deficiency by sending me another copy, and I shall now proceed, (having accounted for the delay) to give you my opinion of it, first as a whole, then in parts.

Taking the "View of the internal evidence of the Christian religion," by Soame Jenyns, as a whole, I can only compare it with Sir Thomas More's Utopia, Harrington's Oceana, or Hume's Common Wealth; it draws the Christian character from the moral precepts of the New Testament, and holds it up to view as an internal evidence of the divinity of the Christian religion. But where, let me ask you, Sir, are to be found the men or women who regulate their passions and conduct by the moral precepts of the New Testament? I have mingled with professing Christians of every sect, and I never yet met with either. I admit, that some of the precepts of the New Testament are good, and some are quite inconsistent, similar to each of those works I have mentioned above. But this is no proof of its divinity, even if there was nothing exceptionable to be found in the New Testament, and that it was a perfect system of morals. You might as well contend for the reality of those names, places, and circumstances which John Bunyan describes in his "wild and visionary work" (since wild and visionary are become fashionable

words in a certain place, I may venture here to use them). The light of philosophy had just began to dawn on a few minds in England, when Sir Thomas More wrote his Utopia. He no doubt, although a courtier, had discernment enough to see, that mankind were in an unnatural state, and giving scope to that feeling, he produced a work on which, it is probable, he had entertained an idea, that some future society would act. The age was pregnant with systems of government, when Harrington produced his Oceana; and Hume, who was externally a pensioned courtier, had an idea, that the then state of society could not continue, and he turned his mind to describe one that he thought would be more natural and beneficial. The same thing might be said of the New Testament. It is nothing more than a compilation of morals, taught by different philosophers, mixed up with no small degree of mystery and inconsistency. What moral, sir, can you point out to me in the New Testament, that I cannot refer you to its author who existed prior to the alleged existence of Jesus *christos*, or Jesus the anointed? I am willing to admit with Soame Jenyns, Dr. Rudge, or any other person, that the New Testament contains a compilation of morals, but in no instance original.

I shall now proceed to take this small work to pieces, which it appears Christians prize much? Judge Bailey referred me to it, when before the holy tribunal: as it is divided into propositions, I shall take them in the same manner. At the outset, or in the introduction to the work, Soame Jenyns has proved himself at least a prudent man, as he does not mean to draw any arguments from those phantoms, the prophecies of the Old Testament, or the miracles of the New, but from "the internal evidence, arising from that excellence, and those clear marks of supernatural interposition, which are so conspicuous in the religion itself." We shall now see what all those high-sounding terms mean. A further proof of his cautious

prudence is to be found in page 6 of the introduction, it is as follows; "what pure Christianity is, divested of all its ornaments, appendages, and corruption, I pretend not to say; but what it is not, I will venture to affirm, which is, that it is not the offspring of fraud or fiction: such, on a superficial view, I know it must appear to every man of good sense, whose sense has been altogether employed on other subjects; but if any one will give himself the trouble to examine it with accuracy and candor, he will plainly see, that however fraud and fiction may have grown up with it, yet it never could have been grafted on the same stock, nor planted by the same hand." This, Mr. Soame Jenyns, is half an admission, that the Christian religion is founded on those principles.

PROPOSITION 1st,—Is a mere assertion, that such a book as the New Testament does now exist, and that the persons therein mentioned did exist at the time specified, and that such circumstances as are therein related, did so occur. The only reasons assigned for this assertion are that, as an alleged piece of history, it is as likely to be true as any other piece of history.

I will give a specimen of his argument and make the necessary observations on it. "It would not be difficult to prove, that these books were written soon after those extraordinary events, which are the subjects of them; as we find them quoted and referred to by an uninterrupted succession of writers, from those to the present times; nor would it be less easy to show that the truth of all those events, miracles only excepted, can no more be reasonably questioned, than the truth of any other facts recorded in any history whatever: as there can be no more reason to doubt that there existed such a person as Jesus Christ, speaking, acting, and suffering in such a manner as is there described, than that there were such men as Tiberius, Herod, or Pontius Pilate, his cotemporaries; or to suspect that Peter, Paul, and James, were not the authors of those epistles, to which their names are

affixed, than that Cicero and Pliny did not write those which are ascribed to them. It might also be made appear, that these books having been wrote by various persons at different times, and in distant places, could not possibly have been the work of a single impostor, nor of a fraudulent combination, being all stamped with the same marks of a uniform originality in their very frame and composition." I have quoted the whole of the paragraph, because I am inclined for nothing but fair play. In the first place, there is not any proof that the books which compose the New Testament were written within the first 200 years of the Christian era; secondly, that there is much doubt about the existence of such a person as Jesus is described to be in the New Testament, as Josephus, who was the most accurate historian of that age, and who lived just within that time, and at that place, that he might have taken notice of such a person; and who as an historian was bound to notice such a circumstance, does not give us any account of such a person as Jesus is described to be, or that such a person was put to death for preaching new doctrines in opposition to the then system of religion. Historians have invariably noticed all the different sects that are distinguished by name or manners in all ages, and Josephus has not failed to mention all the sects of his day, and amongst others, even the sect called Christians, but yet he has not said a word about Jesus being the author of that sect. I am aware that there is an interpolation which alludes to him, but no one would in the present day venture to deny, that the few lines which mention the name of Jesus, were an interpolation, no not even in a convocation of Christian priests. That a sect called Christians existed 1700 years since is admitted, but we have not the slightest ground for assertion and belief, that the epistles which are to be found in the New Testament were written before that time, nor any given time within the second century. Had not Constantine the Roman emperor found

it convenient to make a state engine of the christian religion, the belief of its divinity would have soon become extinct, or have lurked only in those holes and corners whence it originated. As societies of Christians were formed at an early period, it is very probable, that delegates passed from one to another, and that they might write epistles to each other, but it is well known to you, sir, that there were hundreds of those gospels and epistles about before the councils of Nice and Laodicea, and that, prior to those councils, a certain number of scribes were employed to make an arrangement and a compilation of the leading points of faith out of the mass of the epistles and gospels then in being; and that this compilation, which now forms the New Testament, (with the exception of a few interpolations, which it has been found necessary to add since, to make a connection of it) was voted to be the true gospel by a majority of these councils, just as the Parliament of England vote their laws. It has been asserted, that Luke's gospel had not a majority of votes as genuine, but that it was subsequently intruded as such. For several centuries those books were confined to the pope and a few of the clergy, and were not considered necessary to be circulated as a proof of the divinity of their religion. Thousands of Christian priests for centuries continued to preach, perform the mass, absolve their followers from sins for a sum of money, and practice all the rights of the then Christian religion without ever having seen a copy of the Old and New Testament, or knowing a sentence that it contained: they did every thing by rote, and felt the importance of their religion in proportion as it administered to their sensualities. It was the glorious invention of printing, that first occasioned the circulation of what is called the holy scriptures: their truth and validity began to be suspected about 250 years since by Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Thomas More, Sir Francis, afterwards Lord

Bacon, and others, who formed themselves into a society for philosophical researches, and assumed the title of free-thinkers.

The spirit of free-thinking has gone on increasing, with the increasing knowledge of mankind, and before the close of the present century there is a probability of its extinguishing the Christian religion. Since its truth has been called in question, thousands and tens of thousands of volumes have been written to prop it, and every species of cruelty has been practised on those who oppose it; but it daily loses ground, and its interested advocates become more bitter and malignant, as they become more alarmed for its safety. I have said, and I repeat it, "give me the free exercise of thepress for seven years, and I would annihilate it in this country." But to return to Soame Jenyns, who half admits my former assertion, that a few scribes were employed to make a compilation or arrangement from the mass of absurdity and nonsense that was circulating, and which created a general schism, as to which was true, and which was false, in those days, I quote the following paragraph: "whether these books were wrote by the authors whose names are prefixed to them, whether they have been enlarged, diminished, or any way corrupted by the artifice or ignorance of translators, or transcribers, whether in the historical parts the writers were instructed by a perpetual, a partial, or by any inspiration at all; whether in the religious and moral parts, they received their doctrines from a divine influence, or from the instructions and conversation of their master; whether in their facts or sentiments there is always the most exact agreement, or whether in both they sometimes differ from each other; whether they are in any case mistaken, or always infallible, or ever pretended to be so, I shall not here dispute: let the Deist avail himself of all these doubts

and difficulties, and decide them in conformity to his own opinions, I shall not contend, because they affect not my argument: all that I assert is a plain fact, which cannot be denied, that such writings do now exist." Admitted: I am not acquainted either with the history or private character of Soame Jenyns. I have read his treatise on the "Origin of Evil," I have from that formed a very low opinion of his philosophical knowledge; that he was an infidel to the divinity of Jesus I have no doubt in my own mind, and think I shall make it plainly appear from the internal evidence of the little volume before me.

I now proceed to his second proposition, which he describes as "not quite so simple as the former," and which is this: "that from this book may be extracted a system of religion entirely new, both with regard to the object, and the doctrines, not only infinitely superior to, but totally unlike every thing, which had ever before entered into the mind of man: I say extracted, because all the doctrines of this religion having been delivered at various times, and on various occasions, and here only historically recorded, no uniform or regular system of theology is here to be found; and better perhaps it had been, if less labour had been employed by the learned, to bend and twist these divine materials into the polished forms of human systems, to which they never will submit, and for which they were never intended by their great author." Here is an admission, that nothing new or original can be found in the New Testament, but a skilful compilation of what morals were taught and had previously existed, and a further admission, that it is better adapted to be received as a code of morals, than to be bent to form an established religion for different states of society, to which Soame Jenyns says it will never submit without distortion.

In the early part of this proposition, allusion is made to that grand place of retreat for christians, after life becomes extinct in the body, called heaven; where or

what sort of a place this is, I shall not stop to enquire; every christian paints it agreeably to his own distempered imagination, and I have no doubt, sir, but that you have an idea and opinion of heaven. It comes to me only in the shape of a sensual idea, and I shall leave the contemplation of it to sensualists, for whom only it is fit: having resolved myself, that human reason (which christian priests so much despise, because they find it continually clashing with their interests) should reject every thing as fraud and fiction, that cannot be reconciled to or found consistent with human reason. On this ground I reject the idea of a future state, and cannot but regret that Paine should have disgraced his pages with a fanatical superstition on this subject, which has scarcely been paralleled by the vagaries of Johanna Southcott.

In another part of this proposition I find the following passages; alluding to the Christian religion, he says: "No other has so fully declared the necessity of wickedness and punishment, yet so effectually instructed individuals to resist the one, and to escape the other: no other has ever pretended to give any account of the depravity of man, or to point out any remedy for it: no other has ventured to declare the unpardonable nature of sin without the influence of a mediatorial interposition, and a vicarious atonement from the sufferings of a superior being." How can the "necessity of wickedness and punishment" in the affairs of human life, be reconciled with the omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence of an all-merciful creator of all things? This doctrine might have answered the purpose of those priests who were in the habit of taking fees for indulgences and absolutions; but the necessity of it can be accounted for in no other way. It is from this absurd idea, that the various sectarians who dissent from the established church, in this country, inculcate the necessity of a degraded humiliation; that all human beings must conceive themselves the greatest and worst of sinners, before they become fit subjects to par-

take of the grace of God. Oh, monstrous idea! tending to nothing but the destruction of human happiness.

This sentence is in itself an absurdity; it first represents the Christian religion as declaring the necessity of sin, and then its unpardonable nature without the mediation of one part of the godhead with the other, and that one part of the godhead is obliged to submit to the suffering of temporary death, to appease the anger of the superior part; whilst in other parts of this anomalous religion were taught, that the three parts of the godhead are coequal and coeternal, and threatened us with eternal punishment and damnation if we do not believe this. Ridiculous! not worthy of comment.

The next paragraph, I find, is worthy of comment: it is this: "Some indeed there are, who, by perverting the established signification of words, (which they call explaining) have ventured to expunge all these doctrines out of the scriptures, for no other reason then that they are not able to comprehend them; and argue thus:—The scriptures are the word of God; in his word no propositions, contradictory to reason, can have a place; these propositions are contradictory to reason, and therefore they are not there: but if these bold assertors would claim any regard, they should reverse their argument, and say,—These doctrines make a part, and a material part of the scriptures; they are contradictory to reason; no propositions contradictory to reason can be a part of the word of God, and therefore neither the scriptures, nor the pretended revelation contained in them, can be derived from him. This would be an argument worthy of rational and candid Deists, and demand a respectful attention; but when men pretend to disprove facts by reasoning, they have no right to expect an answer." If Soame Jenyns had lived to the present day, he would have found, that these bold assertors had risen up, that rational and candid Deists had used the arguments he alludes to, and what is the respectful attention they have found,—Why ruin and a dungeon! Blush, Christians, to think that your re-

ligion cannot be defended by other means. The conclusion of this proposition is a panegyric on Jesus, his alleged sayings, and the Christian religion; in which Mr. Soame Jenyns has by the light of his imagination preferred it to the system of Plato or any other philosopher, and concludes with the following sentence: "These are all plain facts too glaring to be contradicted, and therefore, whatever we may think of the authority of these books, the relations which they contain, or the inspiration of their authors, of these facts no man, who has eyes to read, or ears to hear, can entertain a doubt; because there is the book, and in it is this religion." Mr. Soame Jenyns might have added, and if any person calls the one or the other in question, a fine and a dungeon shall be his reward.

The third and last proposition, although a very long one, contains but a very few observations, but what have been already noticed. In this proposition, valour, patriotism, and friendship, are condemned as heathenish and fictitious virtues, whilst the imaginary Christian virtues, so called, forbearance, meekness, and passive courage, are extolled as if they really did exist among Christians. The whole of this proposition is a strong ground of my assertion on the work as a whole, that Mr. Soame Jenyns had drawn a picture of the Christian religion that never did exist, that never will exist; and he ventures to say, that those who pride themselves on valour, patriotism, and friendship, cannot possibly be admitted into heaven; not that they are undeserving of this high honor, but incapacitated for want of the Christian virtues: he has these words: "A profligate may be a Christian, though a bad one, because he may be overpowered by passions and temptations, and his actions may contradict his principles; but a man, whose ruling principle is honour, however virtuous he may be, cannot be a Christian, because he erects a standard of duty, and deliberately adheres to it, diametrically opposite to the whole tenour of that religion." Let who will pride himself on the title of a Christian, I shall ever disdain the name and the connection.

The remainder of this volume is carried on under the head of "Conclusion," which is in a great measure a repetition and enlargement of the three propositions. There is one thing which has occurred to me in noticing this little work, and that is, that Mr. Soame Jenyns has not noticed or mentioned the popular notion of hell, that essential in the Christian religion, that necessary companion to heaven. Hell is frequently noticed in the New Testament, and cannot fairly be omitted by any defender of the Christian religion as founded on that book. Mr. Soame Jenyns is not the man to make proselytes to the Christian religion. Christian converts are only to be made by terror, and not by persuasion or argument.

(To be continued.)

CHINESE CHRISTIAN,

An Anecdote.

This monstrous brute could be affable to none but his soldiers, with whom he would converse and carouse with great familiarity. He put the king of Ching-tu-fu of the metropolis of Se-chwn to death, though he was a prince of the last Chinese dynasty; and wherever he conquered he governed with such a tyrannic sway, that if any man committed a fault, though ever so small, he caused him and all the people that lived in the same place to be put to death. He caused 5000 eunuchs to be murdered, because one of them refused to give him the title of emperor. A little after, he caused double the number of literati, whom he pretended to consult about some affairs, to be likewise butchered, on pretence that they, by their sophistry and subtleties, stirred up the people to rebel. Being about to depart from Ching-tu-fu, he ordered all the inhabitants to be led out of the city in chains, and to be massacred in the fields, to the number of 60,000, and did not leave that province till he had burnt its capital, and several other considrable cities. He was no less cruel to his own troops, ordering them to kill their wives because they were an incumbrance in time of war, and set the example by cutting the throats of 300 of his own, reserving only 20 to wait on the 3 queens. As he pretended

to be a great friend to Christianity, he boasted to some of the missionaries that he had destroyed 20,000 Bonzes, on account of one of that order having raised a persecution against them, telling some of those fathers, that the Lord of heaven had sent him to punish those miscreants, who had intended to take away their lives. The same author adds, that he professed such a veneration for the law of Christ, that he promised, when he came to be Emperor, to erect a magnificent temple to God, for this he hath been represented by a late ingenious writer as a person of Jewish extraction, for claiming a commission from God for all the murders and villainies which he committed.

LETTER TO THE

PROSECUTORS OF RICHARD CARLILE.

(Continued from page 304)

The common law is praised for its antiquity. How far this quality adds to its credit on this occasion may be learned by the knowledge, that when Constantine made Christianity a state appendage, bishops were prominent agents of royalty—that in our own country the bishop presided with the sheriff in the county courts, and that churchmen were frequently supreme judges in Westminster Hall. Thus we see why extra Christianity became, by common law, part of the law of the land. And mark, I pray you, the kindly nature of this common law; it was so ductile in the hands of power, that it was wise and salutary alike when acting for Papists, or for Protestants, or for Puritans. It killed to day in God's name, and divinely avenged by murder the assassination of yesterday. The common law was a great enemy to witches and sorcerers, and long after the reformation many witches were burned by its authority, and we should continue—not to burn them, but to prosecute them, and imprison them, and fine them, if any order in the state were to receive stipends in furtherance of that faith. Witchery has been withdrawn tardidly from our murderous code by a statute. The higher the antiquity of the common law in respect to supernatural sanctions is carried, the more intensely are ignorance and barbarity brought against civilized society and the improvements of science.

This common law, which originated when the bible was locked up in unknown languages more effectually to prevent

all enquiry, is now employed to stifle also inquiry, and the same reason is given now as formerly—the good of the ignorant, the benefit of the people. Sir R. Gifford says, such productions cannot affect *the divinity of religion, cannot undermine the religious principles of reasonable thinking men, but they may* (he said) *lessen the faith and undermine the principles of those who have not leisure, or are unwilling to dive into the evidences of Christianity, and particularly that part of the community to whom religion is of the utmost importance, not only for their temporal, but their eternal welfare: I mean the common people. It was for their protection that the prosecution was instituted, to preserve their morals, &c.* Wonderful affection! Ministers regard the morals of the people! witness the lotteries, the gin-shops, ale-houses. Ministers regard the temporal welfare of the people. Aye, and exemplify their kindness by the corn laws, and the last three millions imposed on the necessaries of life. Sir R. Gifford, if you and your employers love the people if you regard religion and morality, and would have them believed and practised, you must pursue a different course. The people, your beloved people, care little for arguments about mysteries, they are prone to credulity, they think little of Moses and Mahomet, but they begin to think that religion and morality cannot influence very powerfully stipendiary lawyers, who argue vehemently on either side for a guinea—particularly him who was a whig and became a tory, who was a unitarian and became they know not what. The people do not dive into mysteries truly, but they feel that while their wages have lessened, the salaries of ministers, and princes have increased. They hear that religion requires special kindness to the poor—yet the ministers of that religion exact a pittance from the destitute; these very men who declare at consecration to the higher offices that they are called to the ministry by the holy ghost to preach a religion not of this world, are notoriously worldly, time-serving, ambitious, insatiable, greedy as the grave, and so negligent of their duty, that considerably more than half of the benificed clergy in England are strangers to their charge. These are the *practical* arguments against the truth of religion which affect the people, which deprave their morals and infect them pestilentially. The people feel that the system is a cheat, a combination to rob them under various pretences secular and

episcopal of their liberties, and the fruits of their industry. The London clergy subscribed and promoted the distribution of bibles, psalters, &c. but they petitioned for an increase of salary, and who on the disclosure of these griping pluralists, could doubt their intention in distributing bibles; it had no source but selfishness, and sordidness, and imposture. This is the evil; not Paine's or Palmer's tracts. There are no prosecutions in France against Mirabaud, nor Volney, nor Parny, nor their publishers, nor, as I have said, in America; Paine and Palmer have been repeatedly published in the United States, and yet the crime committed in England equals and exceeds all those committed in both France and America.

The more that these productions are investigated, the more perverse they will appear, as many of the leading men who sanction them also authorize attempts against the religions of other countries—but then christianity is so moralizing! and yet the Rev. James Bryce in a sermon preached in Calcutta, March 1818, says, "I appeal to every one who hears me, if the christianized Hindu is not a term of reproach alike with the native and European population of the country." These insidious attempts against national creeds by men who will not admit reasoning against the state religion in England, are excessive and prodigious. The Esquimaux are to be christianized; and the Quarterly Review cannot refrain from mentioning, that "Saccheous who said 'Elephant more sense me,' was unaffectedly pious, and being early instructed in the christian faith, continued to derive support and consolation from this source to the last hour of his life." Hindoos, Esquimaux, Chinese, are to be christianized—their language has been studied principally for that purpose, and missionaries hang on the frontiers of the Chinese empire to obtrude their books and smuggle these opinions into that country, contrary to the decrees of a legitimate monarch. Yet these same persons prosecute for what they call crimes against the national religion, while they establish treasuries, educate professors of languages, hire apostles to unsettle the faith of a people incomparably superior to their own in numbers if not in virtue, and these fanatics rage against all others of a different persuasion from themselves for wishing to promulgate their opinions at home; for they alone must be right, and should monopolize all zeal and all sincerity.

We come now to the immediate result of these prosecutions, a verdict has been gained for the crown,—that is,

the judge told the jury that the truth of religion is not to be questioned by common law, and they believed him as he believed it, and Carlile was found guilty. What then! the verdict in no way directly or indirectly proves or presumed to prove the truth of the subject in debate.—

'The court awards it, and the law doth give it.'

But thus the prosecution does prove that a million conferred on religion to build new churches, that 100,000 granted annually to the poorer clergy by parliament, that fifty thousand bishops, priests, or deacons, who receive millions by tithes, &c. no, nor the dispersion of millions of bibles and religious tracts, are sufficient to defend the establishment against Paine, and Palmer, and Carlile; nay, that the word of God revealed miraculously, and upheld by standing miracles, so they say, is menaced by one who was a staymaker, by a second who dictated in blindness, by a third who is a printer and publisher. Then are these men whom you pity, despise, and traduce, mightier in a court of law than Satan and all his host in Milton's poetry. You consider them at once pigmies and giants, and while you hold them lower then reptiles, you, by talking of dissolution of society in consequence of these productions, recal the memory of the mighty who threatens with the centre to confound the poles. Go on, let silence reign, consecrate the sins of the clergy, and continue to substitute the common law for common sense. By these achievements you shall not learn the march of the public mind, nor the means of accommodating antiquated institutions to the progressive improvement of opinions, till you are overwhelmed. It is the fate of all your tribe, for infatuation precedes perdition.

Dublin, Oct. 26. 1819. SEMPER IDEM.

To the Editor of the Republican.

Sir, You will I doubt not favour me, by inserting the following reference to a work now in the press, and which will be ready for delivery on the 15th instant, entitled, AN APOLOGY, FOR DEISM OR A REFUTATION OF MODERN CHRISTIANITY, in reply to the several letters and enquiries, I have received from A. B. C.—Q. D.—G. H.—A. B and a *Christian*, respecting the nature of correspondence with Mr. Carlile, the belief and tenets of a Deist, and his reasons for dissent from estab ished opinions, which will greatly oblige your most obedient servant, T. WHITWORTH,

142, *Fetter-Lane.*

Printed and Published by T. Davison, 10, Duke-street, Smithfield.