

A

VINDICATION

OF THE

Rev. Mr. WESLEY's

"CALM ADDRESS

TO OUR

AMERICAN COLONIES:"

IN SOME LETTERS

To Mr. CALEB EVANS:

By JOHN FLETCHER, Vicar of Madeley, Salop.

"As free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness; but as the servants of God, honour all men, love the brotherhood, fear God, honour the King.—While they promise you liberty, they themselves are the servants of corruption."

St. Peter.

DUBLIN:

PRINTED FOR W. WHITESTONE, NO. 33, SKINNER-ROW.

MDCCLXXVI.

A

VINDICATION

OF MR. WESLEY'S

CALM ADDRESS, &c.

VIN

CALL

PREFACE.

IT will probably ſeem ſtrange, that Clergymen ſhould meddle with a controverſy, which has hitherto been conſidered as altogether political. But the Reader's ſurpriſe, in this reſpect, will probably ceaſe, if he gives himſelf the trouble to read theſe Letters. He will then ſee, that the American controverſy is cloſely connected with Chriſtianity in general, and with Proteſtantiſm in particular; and that, of conſequence, it is of a *religious*, as well as of a civil nature.

Is it not granted on all ſides, that the goſpel leads to the practice of ſtrict morality? Is it not an important branch of all ſuch morality "to honour and obey the king;"—to extend that honour and obedience (in a ſcriptural and conſtitutional manner) to "all that are put in authority under him,—to ſubmit ourſelves to all our governors;—to order ourſelves lowly and reverently to all our betters;—to hurt no body by word or deed;—and to be true and juſt in all our dealings;" giving every one his due, "tribute to whom tribute is due, and cuſtom to whom cuſtom?" Do we not teach this doctrine to our Children, when we inſtruct them in the firſt principles of Chriſtianity? If divinity, therefore, can caſt light upon the queſtion, which divides Great Britain and her colonies; is it impertinent in divines to hold out the light of their ſcience, and peaceably to uſe what the Apoſtle calls "the word of the ſpirit;" that the material ſword, unjuſtly drawn, by thoſe who are in the wrong, may be ſheathed; and that a ſpeedy end may be put to the effuſion of Chriſtian blood?

Another reaſon influences the author to write upon the queſtion which is now ſo warmly agitated in England,—ſo dreadfully debated in America. Many of the coloniſts are as pious as they are brave: and whilſt their undaunted fortitude makes them ſcorn to bow under an hoſtile arm, which ſhoots the deadly lightning of war; their humble piety may diſpoſe them (or ſome of them) to regard a friendly hand, which holds out an olive branch, a bible, and the articles of religion drawn by their favourite Reformer. Had more care been taken to inform their judgment, and to work upon their conſcience, by addreſſing them, not only as ſubjects, but as free men, brethren, and proteſtants, it is probable that numbers of them, would never have ſo ſtrongly embraced the unſcriptural principles, which now influence their conduct.

Should it be ſaid, that it is too late now, to uſe ſpiritual weapons with the coloniſts: I reply, that this objection bears too hard upon their candour: it can never be too late to hold out plain ſcripture, and ſolid arguments, to judicious Proteſtants. It is only to Papiſts ſtrongly prejudiced, or to thoſe who relapſe into Popiſh obſtinacy, that the light of God's word, and of ſound reaſon, can come too late. Beſides, the miſtakes which have armed the provincials againſt Great Britain, begin to work in the breaſts of many good men among us; witneſs the principles of *Americanus:* now, therefore is the time to keep theſe well-meaning men from going to the ſame extremes, to which the coloniſts are gone: now is the time to prevent others, whoſe judgment is yet cool and ſober, from drinking in errors, by which ſuch numbers are intoxicated.

CON-

CONTENTS.

LETTER I.

The Doctrine of Taxation, maintained by the Author of the Calm Addreſs, is rational, ſcriptural, and conſtitutional.

LETTER II.

The Doctrine of Americanus is highly unconſtitutional, and draws after it a long Train of abſurd conſequences.

LETTER III.

Obſervations on the Origin of Power,—on the high republican Spirit *—on the political Enthuſiaſm of many of the firſt Proteſtants—on the Articles of Religion, by which the later Reformers ſtruck at that Enthuſiaſm—on the Tyranny which attended it—on Slavery—and on the peculiar Liberty of the Subjects of Great Britain ;—the Author's Wiſhes, with reſpect to a ſpeedy Reconciliation with the Coloniſts :—the happy conſequences of ſuch a Reconciliation.

* This was the grand engine whereby Cromwell overturned both the Church and State.

FIRST LETTER.

Rev. Sir,

THANKFUL for the religious and civil liberty which I enjoy as a ſubject of Great Britain ;—perſuaded, that many warm, well meaning men miſtake an unreaſonable oppoſition to the King, and the Miniſter, for true patriotiſm;—ſenſible of the ſad conſequences of national miſunderſtandings;—ardently wiſhing, that all things may be ſo ordered and ſettled upon the beſt and ſureſt foundations (which, if I miſtake not, are reaſon, ſcripture, and our excellent conſtitution) that peace and harmony may for all generations be eſtabliſhed between Great Britain and her flouriſhing Colonies;—and deſirous to inſpire you, Sir, and my diſſatisfied, diſſenting brethren, with the ſame loyal ſentiments, I take the pen to expoſtulate with you about the ſyſtem of politics, which you recommend to the public in your "*Letter to the Rev. Mr. Weſley, occaſioned by his Calm Addreſs to the American Colonies.*"

It is at this time peculiarly needful to throw light upon the queſtion debated between Mr. Weſley and you ; for if you are in the right, the ſovereign is a tyrant, taxing the Coloniſts is *robbery*, and enforcing ſuch taxation by the ſword is murder. We cannot hold up the hands of our ſoldiers by prayer, without committing ſin : nor can they fight with Chriſtian courage, which is inſeparable from a good conſcience, if they ſuſpect that they are ſent to rob good men of their properties, liberties, and lives.

Mr. Wesley asserts, "*That the supreme power in England has a legal right of laying any tax upon the American Colonies, for any end beneficial to the whole empire,—with or* WITHOUT *their consent.*"—And you reply, "*If the Americans are indeed subject to such a power as this, their condition differs not from that of the most abject slaves in the universe.*"

Sir, I venture to assert, that you are mistaken, and that Mr. Wesley's proposition is *rational*, *scriptural*, and *constitutional*. And, promising you to shew in another letter the absurdity of your proposition, I enter upon the proof of my assertion, by an appeal to reason, scripture, and your own letter. In following this method, I shall address you as a man, a divine, and a controvertist. First, as a man:

Does not your mistake spring from your inattention to the nature of civil government? You represent the power, which the king and parliament claim of disposing of some of the money of the Colonists without their consent, as an encroachment upon British liberty; as an unjust, tyrannical pretension;—nay, as a species of "robbery." But, did you never consider, Sir, that in the nature of things, our sovereign [I mean by this word, the king and his parliament, first jointly making laws not contrary to the laws of God, whose supreme dominion must always be submitted to by all created law-givers; and secondly executing the laws which they have made, by imparting to magistrates, and other officers of justice, a sufficient power to put them in force;—did you never consider, I say, that, our sovereign] whether we have a vote for parliament-men or not, has both a *right* and a *power* to dispose not only of our money, but also of our liberty and life; so far as that disposal answers ends agreeable to the law of God, beneficial to the peace of society, and conducive to the general good? If this political doctrine is explained, you will, I am persuaded, assent to it, as an indubitable truth.

Could the sovereign rule and protect us, if he had not this right and this power? I injure your property

property, or what is worſe, your reputation. You ſue me for damages: but, how can the ſovereign act the part of protector of your property and good name, if he cannot command my property, and take from me by force what I unjuſtly detain from you, and what may make you ſatisfaction for the injury done to your character? and ſuppoſe you had wronged me, how could the ſovereign protect me, if he could not diſpoſe of your property without your conſent?

This is exactly the caſe with reſpect to *Liberty*. If you ſtop me on the road, and unjuſtly deprive me of the liberty of going about my buſineſs; can the ſovereign protect me, unleſs he has a right of depriving you of your lawleſs liberty, that I may quietly enjoy my lawful liberty? and does not equity demand, that if I am the petty tyrant, who pretend to the liberty of tar-feathering you, the ſovereign ſhould have the ſame power of protecting you, by binding me to my good behaviour, or by ordering me to the ſtocks or to jail?

This power extends to *life*, as well as liberty. I demand your money or your life. How can the ſovereign ſecure you more effectually than by taking away my life, for having attempted to take yours? By the rule of reciprocation, if you endeavour to take away my life, I cannot be protected, and if you murder me, my blood cannot be properly avenged, unleſs the ſovereign has power to put you to death. Hence it is, that proſecutions for capital offences are carried on in the name of the king, who is the head of the legiſlative power, and who, as he inſiſts [in his capacity of law-giver and protector of his ſubjects] upon the infliction of capital puniſhments, has alſo the royal prerogative of pardoning criminals who are condemned to die.

Come we now to taxes. If the ſovereign rules and protects his ſubjects; and if it is his office to avert the dangers which threaten them, and to ſee that juſtice be done to the oppreſſed; he has his noble, I had almoſt ſaid, his *divine*, buſineſs: and he has a *right* to live by his buſineſs:—yea, to

live

live in a manner which may anſwer to the importance and dignity of his buſineſs. Hence it follows, that he is not only as much entitled to a royal ſuſtenance from his ſubjects, as a ſchoolmaſter is entitled to a ſchoolmaſter's maintenance from his ſcholars; or a miniſter to a paſtoral ſupply from his flock; but that his right is ſo much the more conſpicuous, as his rank is higher than theirs. Now, this royal ſuſtenance chiefly ariſes from cuſtom and taxes. Hence it is evident, that to deny proper taxes to the ſovereign who protects and defends us, is, at leaſt, as groſs an act of injuſtice, as to reap the benefit of a lawyer's ſtudy, a phyſician's attendance, a nurſe's care, and a maſter's inſtructions; and then to cheat them of the emolument which ſuch ſtudy, attendance, care, and inſtructions reaſonably entitle them to. This is not all:

In a great empire, where the ſovereign uſes numerous officers to keep the peace and adminiſter juſtice, there is abſolute need of a great revenue: for the maintenance of thoſe officers and the collecting of this revenue, is the employment of many more. If the ſtate is in danger, from external or internal foes; a ſufficient force, in conſtant readineſs, is abſolutely neceſſary to ſuppreſs ſeditions, quell rebellions, obtain reſtitutions, prevent invaſions, and hinder encroachments. Hence, the need of a navy, an army, a militia. Hence, the need of ſea-ports, docks, fortifications, garriſons, convoys, fleets of obſervation, miniſters at foreign courts, arms, artillery, ammunition, magazines, and warlike ſtores without end;—hence, in ſhort, prodigious expences. Now, as all theſe expences are incurred for the protection, and dignity of the whole empire, do not reaſon and conſcience dictate:—(1.) That all thoſe who ſhare in the protection and dignity of the empire ſhould contribute in due proportion towards defraying the national expence:—(2.) That of conſequence the ſupreme power has an indubitable right of laying moderate taxes upon the ſubjects, for any end beneficial to the whole empire:—(3.) That ſubjects have abſolutely no right to complain of taxation, unleſs

unleſs they are taxed exorbitantly, and without due proportion:—(4.) That if Colonies of ſubjects, ſettled by a grant from the ſovereign within the limits of the empire, have been ſpared in their ſtate of infancy, either to encourage their growth, or becauſe the revenue which might have ariſen from taxing them at firſt, would hardly have defrayed the expence of raiſing taxes; it by no means follows, that, when ſuch Colonies have gathered ſtrength, and are as well able to bear a ſhare in the national burden, as the mother country, they ſhould ſtill be excuſed:—And laſtly, that to ſay, " you ſhall not tax me without my conſent," is as improper a ſpeech from a ſubject to his ſovereign, as to ſay, " you ſhall not protect the empire without my conſent: if I ſteal, you ſhall not ſend me to jail without my conſent: if I raiſe a rebellion, you ſhall not hang me unleſs, I give you leave: you ſhall not diſpoſe of my property without my permiſſion, although (by the bye) I will diſpoſe of the property of my fellow-ſubjects, not only without *their* permiſſion, but alſo in full oppoſition to *your* authority;"—an abſurd, unjuſt diſpoſition this, which too many of the Boſtonian patriots evidenced, when they imperiouſly diſpoſed of the cargo of our ſhips, forcibly threw the goods of our merchants into the ſea, to the amount of many thouſand pounds, and ſet all America in a flame, as ſoon as the ſovereign inſiſted that the port of Boſton ſhould be ſhut up, till the perpetrators of this daring act were delivered to juſtice, or, at leaſt, till ſatisfaction was made to his oppreſſed ſubjects, whoſe ſhips have been boarded in a piratical manner, and whoſe property has been feloniouſly deſtroyed, when they quietly traded under the ſanction of Engliſh laws, and the protection of the Britiſh flag; truſting to the faith of Chriſtians; depending on proteſtant uſage in the harbour of a proteſtant city; expecting brotherly love, or at leaſt common honeſty, from the ſons of pious Engliſhmen; little thinking—but enough of this black ſcene: may it be palliated by a ſpeedy reſtitution, and a laſting repentance!

I hope,

I hope, Sir, that the preceding remarks, which naturally flow from the principles of reaſon and humanity, recommend themſelves to your conſcience; and having thus addreſſed you as a rational creature, I take the liberty to addreſs you next as a *Chriſtian*, —yea, *a preacher* of the Goſpel of Chriſt. As ſuch, you will not wonder at my producing a paſſage or two from the venerable book, which ought to be the rule of our conduct, ſermons, and publications. *Let every ſoul be ſubject to the higher powers. For there is no power but of God: the powers that are, are ordained of God. Whoſoever therefore* [in lawful things] *reſiſteth the power* [which providence calls him to obey] *reſiſteth the ordinance of God: and they that reſiſt, ſhall receive to themſelves condemnation*, &c. *Wherefore ye muſt needs be ſubject not only for wrath, but alſo for conſcience ſake. For, for this cauſe* PAY *you* TRIBUTE [i. e. taxes] &c. RENDER *therefore to all their* DUES: *tribute to whom tribute is* DUE, *cuſtom to whom cuſtom.* Rom. xiii. 1, &c.

I need not remind you, Rev. Sir, that our Lord himſelf ſcrupulouſly followed this doctrine; *ſetting us an example that we ſhould follow his ſteps.* For, although no Jew had a repreſentative in the Roman ſenate, although the emperor of Rome had not half the right of taxing the Jews, which our proteſtant king has of taxing the Coloniſts, who are his natural ſubjects; although none of that emperor's predeceſſors had made the Jews a grant of their country; —although, Chriſt could have inſiſted on being exempted, as the Son of God, and the King of Kings; —yea, although he could have pleaded abſolute indigence as the Son of Man; yet, rather than ſet a pattern, which Chriſtians might have abuſed in after-ages, he unveiled his godhead: his omniſcience ſearched the depth of the ſea: his omnipotence inverted the courſe of nature: he called the animal creation to his aſſiſtance, he wrought a miracle to pay his tax: and to whom? to a foreign power——

to

to an heathen prince, to a bloody tyrant ;—to Tiberius, who was the third of the Cæſars.

Nor was our Lord's doctrine leſs loyal than his practice. His words are as ſtrong as thoſe of St. Paul. *The Herodians ſaid to him, Maſter, we know that thou teacheſt the word of God in truth*, &c. *Tell us therefore, what thinkeſt thou? Is it lawful to give tribute to Ceſar, or not? But Jeſus perceived their wickedneſs and ſaid, why tempt ye me, ye hypocrites? ſhew me the tribute-money. And they brought to him a penny. And he ſaid to them, Whoſe is this image and ſuperſcription? they ſaid to him, Ceſar's. Then ſaid he unto them, Render therefore unto Ceſar the things which are Ceſar's.* Matt. xxii. 16, &c.

Permit me, Sir, to clothe this Chriſtian doctrine in language adapted to our controverſy. The Coloniſts aſk you, Shall we pay to the King and Parliament of Great Britain, taxes which they have laid upon us without our conſent? You anſwer, Shew me ſome of your lawful money newly coined, that I may ſee who rules and protects you now. They bring to you a guinea, with a royal head on one ſide, and the Britiſh arms on the other. You ſay to them, whoſe is this image and ſuperſcription? They reply, King George's; and they read this motto, *George III. by the grace of God, King of Great Britain, &c.* Now, Rev. Sir, unleſs you will coin new money, together with a new goſpel, as you regard the word and authority of Jeſus Chriſt, you are bound to anſwer the Coloniſts as he anſwered the Herodians: and in this caſe, inſtead of impoſing upon them the Antinomian paradoxes of your letter, and throwing oyl upon the flame of revolt, you will ſay, Render therefore to George III. as head of the legiſlative, protective power of Great Britain, *the things which are* HIS; that is, pay to him, by his officers, the reaſonable taxes which are laid upon you; for in ſo doing, you only give him HIS DUE. You owe him obedience and taxes, as your ſupreme Governor and Protector. Hence it appears, that Mr. Weſley only unfolds our Lord's doctrine, when he ſays, " The reception of any law draws after it, by a chain

chain which cannot be broken, the neceſſity of admitting taxation." The primary right of taxation is inſeparable from the ſupreme power, and, if our reſpective pariſhes at home, and our Colonies abroad, have a right to ceſs themſelvs, with reſpect to their private expences; it is only a delegated, ſubordinate right, which by no means exempts them from the taxes laid upon them to defray the general expence of the government. And therefore, to pretend that pariſh-rates, and Colony-rates, ought to ſuperſede taxation by the ſovereign in a body political, is as abſurd as to affirm, that the pulſe in the human body ought to ſuperſede the vital motion, or capital beating of the heart.

Having expoſtulated with you, as with a conſcienciouſ man, and a miniſter of the goſpel, permit me, Sir, to addreſs you, thirdly, as a *conſiſtent writer*. You give us to underſtand, that the act of parliament, by which the Colonies are taxed, is an unconſtitutional act; becauſe the colonies, as inheriting the privileges of Britons, cannot be conſtitutionally taxed by a parliament, where they are not allowed to ſend repreſentatives. But do you not in your very letter to Mr. W. overthrow this grand plea? Do you not grant the very truth, on which he reſts his doctrine of the conſtitutional reaſonableneſs of the taxation you repreſent as tyrannical? Undoubtedly you do; for conſidering that many large towns as Brimingham, &c. ſend no repreſentatives to parliament, when the hill called Old Sarum, ſends two; and that myriads of men, who have their fortune in ready money, in goods, in trade, or in the ſtocks, have no right to vote for parliament-men, becauſe they have no freehold; when a poor man, who has a mortgaged freehold on which he ſtarves, has a right to chuſe his repreſentatives:—conſidering this, I ſay, you tell Mr. W. "*In England—the people are by no means equally repreſented.*"

We thank you, Sir, for this conceſſion which (by the bye) you could not help making. You grant then, that the *conſtitution* allows of *unequal repreſentation*; ſince

ſince it allows that ſome towns, and ſome men, ſhall ſend repreſentatives to parliament, when other towns and other men are not permitted to ſend any. Now, Sir, in granting this, you indirectly grant, that Boſton may be conſtitutionally taxed without a peculiar repreſentative, as well as Birmingham; and that the rich merchants of Boſton may be as legally taxed as the rich merchants of Birmingham, who are not entitled to a vote. Now, Sir, if the *Conſtitution* allows of unequal repreſentation; and if the taxation of myriads of men, who ſend no repreſentatives to the houſe of commons, is conſtitutional; I aſk in the name of conſiſtency, why do you repreſent ſuch taxation as *unconſtitutional* with reſpect to the Coloniſts?

You reply: "*This is an acknowledged defect of the conſtitution.*"—So, Sir, your zeal for the conſtitution throws off its maſk at laſt! and you avowedly impeach the conſtitution! Might you not have ſaid at once, The parliament may indeed conſtitutionally tax the Coloniſts; for it taxes millions of Britons who have no vote for parliament-men: but the conſtitution is *defective*; and we patriots, we friends of the conſtitution, will avowedly find fault with the conſtitution, till we can find an opportunity of caſting it into a new mould? And what this mould is, which, I fear, antinomian patriots are getting ready as faſt as they can, and into which they hope to caſt the inflamed minds of the populace, you Sir, help us to gueſs, where you ſay "*It is glaringly evident,*" (*to ſuch good friends of the conſtitution as the antinomian patriots are*)—"*It is glaringly evident, that there is not a man in England, who is able to boil a pot, in ever ſo deſpicable an hovel, but may, if he pleaſes, have a voice in the diſpoſal of his property:*" that is, in laying on or taking off taxes, or (which comes to the ſame) in making and repealing laws. Sir, I would no more encourage a tyrannical monarch, and an oppreſſive parliament than you: but ſuppoſing our mild King was a tyrant, and his parliament conſiſted of three hundred and ninety-nine little tyrants, would it not be better, upon the whole, to be ruled by four hundred tyrants, than to be at the mercy

of four hundred thousand? If you calmly weigh this question, I am persuaded, Sir, that your prejudices will subside, seconding my loyal wishes; remember, Sir, that if you are right as a patriot, you are wrong, not only as a man, and a Christian, but also as a controvertist; and that, whether the constitution is *defective* or not, and whether you can mend it or not, you have granted that *unequal representation* is constitutional, and of consequence that taxation of myriads of Britons in England, and sons of Britons in America, who send no representatives to parliament, is perfectly agreeable to the constitution.

You strengthen your cause by quoting a French and an English judge. As Mr. Wesley has taken particular notice of these quotations in the last edition of his address, I shall only transcribe his answer. You write, " *All the inhabitants*, &c." says Montesquieu, speaking of the English constitution, " ought to have a right of voting at the election of a representative, except such as are so mean as to be deemed to *have no will of their own*."—Nay, [answers Mr. W.] ' if all have a right to vote that *have a will of their own*, certainly this right belongs to every man, woman, and child in England.

One quotation more. Judge Blackstone says, " In a *free state*, *every man* who is supposed to be a *free-agent*, ought in some measure, to be his own governour: therefore one branch at least of the legislative power should reside in *the whole body of the people*."—Mr. Wesley answers, ' But who are *the whole body of the people?* According to him, *every free agent*. Then the argument proves too much; for are not women free-agents? Yea, and poor as well as rich men. According to this argument, there is no *free state* under the sun.'—From these just answers it is evident, that your scheme drives at putting the legislative power into every body's hands that is, at crowning king *Mob*.

To conclude: Upon the force of the preceding arguments I ask, First, Is not the demand of proportionable, moderate taxes, which the Sovereign of Great Britain

Britain has upon our wealthy fellow subjects settled in the British dominions on the continent, both rational, scriptural, and constitutional?—*Rational*, as being founded upon a reasonable, self-evident right, flowing from the nature and fitness of things, and acknowledged by every civilized nation under heaven?—*Scriptural*, as being supported by the explicit commands of St. Paul, and Christ himself?—And, *Constitutional*, since the constitution enjoins, that millions of Britons at home, who have no voice at elections, or are represented by men whom they voted against; and that myriads of Britons *abroad*, whether they are freeholders or not [and some of them are not only freeholders, but members of parliament also] shall be all taxed without their consent?

I flatter myself, Sir, that this appeal to your conscience, your bible, and your *legal* patriotism, will soften your prejudices, and prepare your mind for my next letter. In the mean time I earnestly recommend to your thankful admiration, the excellence of the British government, which equally guards our properties, liberties, and lives, against the tyranny of unjust, arbitrary, or cruel monarchs? and against the ferocity of that Cerberus,—that Hydra—that Briareus—that many-headed monster, a *Mob* of ungrateful, uneasy, restless men, who *despise dominion*;—*speak evil of dignities*;—give to illiberal behaviour, scurrilous insolence, and disloyalty unmasked, the perverted name of *patriotism*;—commit enormities under pretence of redressing grievances; and give the signal of devastation, wherever they erect their standard of lawless liberty. Hoping, Sir, that a panic fear of a virtuous King, a lawful parliament, and a conscientious minister, whose crime is only that of making a constitutional stand against the boisterous overflowings of civil antinomianism; —hoping, I say, that such an absurd fear will never hurry you into groundless discontent and unguarded publications:—intreating you to take no step which may countenance king *Mob*, his merci-

leſs miniſter *Rapine*, and his riotous parliament ſummoned from the " moſt deſpicable hovels;"—requeſting you to exalt our divine Lawgiver, who ſums up his *law of liberty* in theſe precious ſtatutes, *Render to Ceſar the things which are Ceſar's, and to God the things which are God's:—A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another as I have loved you*;—wiſhing you, Sir, all ſpiritual ſucceſs in the goſpel, which ſays, *Submit yourſelf to every ordinance of man for the Lord's ſake: whether it be to the king, as ſupreme; or unto governors, as unto them that are ſent by him for the* PUNISHMENT *of evil doers, and for the* PRAISE *of them that do well*;—ardently praying; that when the governors, generals, and forces, going to America, ſhall land there, our diſobedient fellow ſubjects may be found *doing well*, i. e. penitently ſubmitting themſelves to their ſovereign, that the threatened *puniſhment* may be turned into deſerved *praiſe*;—and begging you would take in good part the freedom of this well-meant expoſtulation, I declare that I am as much in love with *liberty* as with *loyalty*; and that I write an heart-felt truth when I ſubſcribe myſelf,

Rev. Sir,

Your affectionate Fellow-labourer in the Goſpel, a republican by birth and education, and a Subject of Great Britain by love of liberty and free choice.

JOHN FLETCHER.

Madeley,
Nov. 15, 1775.

SECOND LETTER.

Rev. Sir,

I Hope I have proved in my firſt letter, that Mr. Weſley's doctrine of government is rational, ſcriptural, and conſtitutional; and that a right of taxing ſubjects with, or *without* their conſent, is an inſeparable appendage of ſupreme government. I ſhall now attempt to prove, that your doctrine of liberty, and taxation only with our own conſent, is abſurd and unconſtitutional; and that, whilſt you try to break the lawful yoke of civil government laid on the Coloniſts, you doctrinally bind the greateſt part of the Engliſh with chains of the moſt abject ſlavery, and fix a ridiculous charge of robbery on the King and parliament, for taxing ſome millions of Britons who are no more repreſented in parliament, than the foreigners who ſojourn in England, or the Engliſh who live abroad.

Permit me to ſtate the queſtion more particularly than I have done in my former letter. Mr. Weſley thinks, that the Coloniſts are miſtaken, when they conſider themſelves as put on a level with ſlaves, becauſe they are taxed by a parliament in which they have no repreſentatives of their own chuſing: I ſay, *of their own chuſing*, becauſe I apprehend that, as all the freeholders and voting burgeſſes in Great Britain virtually repreſent the commonalty of all the Britiſh Empire (except Ireland; which being a kingdom by itſelf, and no Engliſh colony, coins its own money, and has its peculiar parliament); and as ſuch free-

 holders,

holders, &c. virtually repreſent all that commonalty, whether it be made up of voters or non-voters, of poor men or men of property, of men at home, at ſea, or on the continent: ſo the Houſe of Commons virtually repreſents all the freeholders and voting burgeſſes in Great Britain; whether they voted or not at the laſt election, or whether they voted or not againſt the ſitting members.

With an eye to this virtual repreſentation, which draws after it a paſſive ſubmiſſion to taxation, Mr. W. aſks: "*Am I, and two millions of Engliſhmen,*" who have no right to vote for repreſentatives in parliament, "*made ſlaves becauſe we are taxed without our own conſent?*" You reply: "*Yes, Sir, if you are taxed without your own conſent, you are ſlaves.*" You conſider ſuch taxation as "*The very quinteſſence of ſlavery;*" you declare, that, if the Americans ſubmit to it, "*their condition differs not from that of the moſt abject ſlaves in the univerſe;*" and you inſinuate, that whoever attempts to tax them otherwiſe than by their direct repreſentatives, "*attempts an injury; whoever does it, commits robbery; he throws down the diſtinction between liberty and ſlavery. Taxation and repreſentation* (you mean *direct* repreſentation) *are coeval with, and eſſential to this conſtitution.*" But when you publiſh ſuch aſſertions, which juſtify the armed Coloniſts and repreſent the majority in parliament as a gang of robbers, does not an enthuſiaſtic warmth for lawleſs liberty carry you beyond the bound of calm reflection? And are you aware of the ſtab which you give the conſtitution; and of the inſult which you offer, not only to your ſuperiors, but alſo to millions of your worthy countrymen, whom you abſurdly ſtigmatize as ſome of the *moſt abject ſlaves in the univerſe?*"

Probably not one in five of our huſbandmen, ſailors, ſoldiers, mechanics, day labourers, and hired ſervants, are freeholders or voting burgeſſes. And muſt four out of five, in theſe numerous claſſes of free-born Engliſhmen, wear the badge of the *moſt abject ſlavery*, in compliance with your chimerical notions of liberty? We are not allowed to vote ſo long as we are minors;

and

and muſt alſo all our blooming young men, from ſeventeen years of age to twenty-one, be conſidered as "*moſt abject ſlaves?*" You may ſay, indeed, that they are repreſented by their parents or guardians: but what, if theſe guardians or parents have no vote themſelves? Beſides, if minors can be thus repreſented, why ſhould not our Colonies be repreſented in the ſame manner by the Mother-Country, which has ſo tenderly nurſed, and ſo careſully protected them from their infancy?—To return: If the wives of freeholders are ſuppoſed to vote by their huſbands, what muſt we ſay of thoſe who have buried their huſbands? Have all widows buried their liberty with the partners of their bed?—A freeholder has ſeven children, he leaves his freehold to his eldeſt ſon; and becauſe he cannot leave a freehold to all, will you reproach him as the father of ſix abject ſlaves?—Another freeholder, to pay his debts, is obliged to ſell his freehold, and of conſequence his right of taxing himſelf. Does he ſell his liberty with his freehold, and "*involve himſelf in abſolute ſlavery?*—The general election comes on: a young gentleman wants a few months of the age which the law requires in a voter; and of conſequence he cannot yet chuſe his own repreſentative; muſt he continue *a ſlave* till the next election?—A knight, diſapproved of by moſt voters in the country, offers to repreſent them; they try in vain to get ſome other gentleman to oppoſe him; and the candidate whom they tacitly object to, ſits in the houſe chiefly for want of a competitor. Is their liberty at all affected by this kind of involuntary repreſentation, which draws after it a kind of involuntary taxation?—At the next election, perhaps, the oppoſition runs high between ſeveral candidates: one has [I ſuppoſe] 2000 votes; another, 1900; and a third, 1700. The firſt is elected: two thouſand freeholders are taxed by a repreſentative of their own chuſing, and 3600 voters go home diſappointed of their choice; and having the mortification of being taxed by a man whom they did not vote into parliament; nay, by a man whom they oppoſed with all their might. Their choice is, perhaps,

haps equally frustrated with regard to the other knight of the shire. Now, are these 3600 voters in any degree reduced to a state of slavery, till they can have an opportunity of being represented according to their mind?—Again; a free born Englishman is possessed of a house, which he sets for thirty-eight shillings a year; for want of two shillings more in his yearly income he is no freeholder; and like the Colonists, he is taxed without his consent: is he "*an abject slave*" on this account? Wild patriotism answers in the affirmative, but impartial men smile and say, What! is British liberty so mean a blessing, as to depend upon a couple of shillings? Could a Jew make it turn on an hinge more contemptible than this? O Sir, what a low price does your system indirectly fix upon a jewel, on which you seem to set so immense a value! Once more: during the last election, myriads of Englishmen were abroad, some upon their travels or for their health, and others upon civil, military, or mercantile business: nor had they any more share in the choice of the parliament-men who now tax them, than the American Colonists; and will you aver, Sir, that if all these Englishmen were collected, they might constitutionally reform the constitution, and tax themselves by a congress composed of men who stimulate them to discontent? Will you assert, that such a congress would do well to make laws in opposition to the statutes of the King and parliament? and would you call the members of such a congress loyal subjects, if they raised an army to drive the King's forces out of his own dominions; yea, out of those very provinces, where they held their land by gracious grants of the crown;—where they have acquired their wealth under the protection of the Mother-Country;—and where the Sovereign's forces, which they now endeavour to cut off, have kindly fought their battles?

To come nearer to the point: some years ago, Lord Clive, member for Shrewsbury, went to the East Indies; and Lord Pigot, member for Bridgnorth, is now gone there. Their estates are immensely large; yet

yet in consequence of their leaving England, the former Lord was, and the latter is, taxed without his consent. And will you stand to your absurd doctrine, Sir, and infer, that the burgesses of Shrewsbury were, and that those of Bridgnorth are, reduced to a partial, temporary state of slavery, by the emigration of one of their representatives; and that Lord Clive was, and Lord Pigot now is, an absolute slave; because, in consequence of their emigration, the former was, and the latter is, taxed without his consent? If you say that Lord Clive came back to England, and that Lord Pigot may return, and tax himself, if he pleases; I reply, This is exactly the case with the Colonists: by emigration they are prevented from sharing in the legislative power of the parliament. But let them come back, if they have set their hearts upon legislative honours. The Mother-Country, and the parliament-house, are as open to them, as to any free-born Englishman. They may purchase freeholds, they may be made burgesses of corporate towns, they may be chosen members of the house of commons; and some of them, if I mistake not, sit already there. The Colonists are then on a level, not only with Britons in general, but with all our members of parliament who are abroad. And therefore, to demand superior privileges, is to demand rights which no Britons have, and of which the members of parliament who go out of Great Britain never thought of; our British Nabobs not excepted.

As mountain rises upon mountain among the Alps, so absurdities rise upon absurdities in your system: take some more instances of it. If we believe you, Sir, *he* is an *abject slave*, who is taxed without his consent. Hence follows another absurdity. The day that an additional land-tax is laid to subdue the Colonies, the knights of a large shire are absent: the one, I suppose, is kept from the house by illness, or pleasure; neither votes for the bill. Now, Sir, are they, and the country they represent, made slaves by being taxed without their consent? — If you reply, that thier not op-

oppoſing the bill implies that they conſent to it: I anſwer, The inference is not juſt. I did not oppoſe the laſt murder which was committed in the county, but you would wrong me, if you infer that I conſented to it. Many clergymen will not oppoſe your letter, who nevertheleſs reprobate the doctrine it contains.

But, granting that your inference is juſt, I preſs you cloſer, and point out two knights [ſuppoſe the members for Middleſex] who oppoſe the bill with all their might. And yet the bill paſſes. Now, Sir, if your ſcheme of liberty is right, it follows, that our great patriots, and the little patriots whom they repreſent, are abject ſlaves: for they are evidently taxed, not only againſt their conſent, but againſt their warmeſt oppoſition; ſeeing they are additionally taxed to bring their miſtaken friends to reaſon. How exceſſively abſurd then is your ſcheme, Sir; ſince it not only puts a badge of the moſt abject ſlavery upon all the Britons who are not electors, but alſo upon all the electors and members of parliament, who call themſelves *patriots*, with as much confidence as ſome miſtaken divines call themſelves *orthodox!*

You reply, "In all collective bodies the determinations of the majority of that body, are always conſidered as the determinations of the whole body: and every man who enters into ſociety implicitly conſents it ſhould be ſo." Mr. W. and I, Sir, thank you for this conceſſion. If you and the Coloniſts ſtand to it, *you* will throw down your pen, and *they* their arms. For every body knows that Great Britain and her Colonies make a collective, political body, called the Britiſh empire: and you declare, that, "*in all* ſuch bodies, "*the determinations of the majority are always conſidered as the determinations of the whole body.*" Now, Sir, if you do but allow that Great Britain is the *majority* of the Britiſh empire [and you cannot reaſonably deny it; conſidering the glory, wealth, fame, and invincible navy of the mother-country; together with the grant ſhe made to the Colonies of the large provinces, which they hold under her, as cottagers hold their gardens and habita-

bitations under the lord of the manor, who gave them leave to enclose and build upon a part of the waste within the limits of his jurisdiction]—if you do but allow, I say, that Great Britain is the *majority* of the British empire; according to your own concession, *the determinations* of Great Britain *are* to be *always considered as the determinations of the whole* British empire; *and every* colony "*implicitly consents it should be so.*" But the American Colonies have not only *implicitly* consented it should be so; they have also done it *explicitly*, by humbly thanking the king for their charters, one of the first of which says, in *express terms*, you are exempt from paying taxes to the king for *seven years*; plainly implying, says Mr. W. with great truth, that, after those seven years, they were to pay taxes like other subjects, if the sovereign taxed them: And if the king and parliament has allowed them a longer time, it is absurd and wicked to draw from this indulgence a plea to palliate a notorious breach of trust. As for their last charter, that of Pennsylvania, it says in express terms, that they are liable to taxation by the parliament; and therefore their rising against such taxation is ingratitude, perverseness, and breach of charter, from first to last.

One more remark upon your important concession. If you grant that the minority in parliament has implicitly and passively consented to the measures of the majority, though very much against their will: witness their warm petitions, protestations, remonstrances, &c. do you not abundantly grant this leading proposition to Mr. W.'s Address, in a thousand cases, "*any other than this kind of consent the condition of civil life does not allow?*" Thus [so great is the force of truth!] after all your outcry against your opponent, you yourself lay down his grand principle: You come back to the very point whence he started, and are reduced to the mortifying necessity of maintaining, that our English patriots, so called, are some of the most abject slaves in the universe; or that our American Colonies, are some of the

the moſt unreaſonable Colonies in the world, ſince they take up arms to oppoſe legiſlative power to which they have conſented, not only *implicitly* and *paſſively*, as the minority does to the majority in parliament; but *explicitly* and *actively:* witneſs the charter of the Colony in which the congreſs is aſſembled, and the conſtant ſubmiſſion, which for many years they have paid to the Britiſh laws; ſupreme laws theſe, according to which they have ſuffered their lives, and the liberty of their perſons to be diſpoſed of; though they had no more hand in actually making theſe laws, than the Great Mogul; ſince moſt of them were made before any living Engliſhman drew his firſt breath.

To ſhew that taxation and repreſentation are inſeparable according to the conſtitution, you produce the bare aſſertions of Lord Camden, Lord Chatham, and Monteſquieu, a French author: But permit me to obſerve, Sir, that all the Frenchmen and Engliſh lords in the world, can never overthrow a doctrine which [as I have ſhewn in my firſt letter] ſtands or falls with reaſon, ſcripture, and matter of fact.

If your noble auxiliaries, to whom you join Mr. Locke, mean an *indirect* repreſentation, we readily aſſent to their aſſertion; and we reply, that, in this ſenſe, the taxation of the Coloniſts is not ſeparated from repreſentation: For the Colonies of Great Britain are *indirectly* repreſented by Great Britain, as the children of electors are *indirectly* repreſented by their fathers; as the non-voters at elections are *indirectly* repreſented by the voters; and as the electors who are at ſea, or on the continent, are indirectly repreſented by thoſe who are in the iſland. But if thoſe lords mean a *direct* repreſentation, they are deſired to ſhew how all the myriads of men non-voters in Great Britain, to ſay nothing of minors, widows, maidens, bed-ridden or impriſoned burgeſſes, and abſent freeholders, are *directly* repreſented in the parliament which now taxes them, if [through a variety of inſurmountable objects] they neither did, nor could, vote for a repreſentative at the laſt election.

Till

Till you, Sir, or the lords who patronize your ſyſtem, have removed this difficulty out of the way of your patriotiſm; you will allow us to think, that you deal in irrational, unſcriptural, and unconſtitutional paradoxes, when ſpeaking of taxation and *direct* repreſentation, you ſay, "God has joined them. No Britiſh parliament can ſeparate them: To endeavour to do it, is to ſtab our vitals."

When you have raſhly charged nonſenſe upon God, you may well indirectly charge robbery upon the king: Accordingly your patriotiſm mounts the roſtrum; and makes this convincing ſpeech: "My poſition is this—I repeat it—I will maintain it to my laſt hour: taxation and repreſentation are inſeparable: this poſition is founded on the law of nature; it is more. it is an eternal law of nature:" —I grant it, Sir, if by *nature* you mean the fallen nature of the men *who ſay, With our tongue will we prevail, our lips are our own; who is Lord over us?* Pſ. xii. 4. But you go on: "Whatever is a man's own, is abſolutely his own: no man has a right to take it from him without his conſent, either expreſſed by himſelf or repreſentative." Nay, you grow ſo warm as to ſay: "Whoever attempts to do it," [i. e. agreeably to the context, whoever attempts to tax a man, who has not conſented to the tax, either perſonally or by his direct repreſentative] "attempts an injury; whoever does it," [and the king has done it] commits a robbery."—What a ſpeech! God ſave the king from ſuch ſevere judges as you are!

Nothing can be more falſe, Sir, than the principle on which you found your bold, though indirect indictment: "Whatever is a man's own, is abſolutely *his own*." I do not ſcruple to aſſert, that this principle is deteſtable; as being unſcriptural—*irrational*—and highly unconſtitutional.—[1.] *unſcriptural*: For the ſcriptures teaches us, that God is the firſt and grand proprietor of all things; that *the powers that are, are ordained of him*; and that [for the ends mentioned in my Firſt letter] he delegates his dominion and authority to kings and magiſtrates. Hence it is, that

 both

both in the Old and New Teſtament, thoſe who make and enforce laws, are called *gods*; and that St. Paul declares. *He that reſiſteth the power, reſiſteth the ordinance of God; and they that reſiſt, ſhall receive to themſelves condemnation.* To ſay therefore, that what we have, is *abſolutely* our own, is to ſhake off the yoke of God's ſupreme dominion, and of the delegated dominion of kings, lawgivers and magiſtrates, who are his lieutenants and repreſentatives.

[2.] Your principle is *irrational*: For if "whatever a man has, is *abſolutely* his own;" it follows that non-voters and foreigners, who never conſented to our laws, either perſonally or by appointing their repreſentatives, can never be taxed, impriſoned, or hanged, unleſs they firſt ſign the warrants, by which their property, liberty or life, is legally diſpoſed of. And if to diſpoſe of their property by taxation is robbery; by the ſame rule we may ſay, that to diſpoſe of their liberty and life by legal warrants which they have not endorſed, is inhoſpitable tyranny, and downright murder.

[3.] Your principle is highly *unconſtitutional*. Not one half of the inhabitants of Great Britain have a ſhare in the legiſlative power; nevertheleſs the properties, liberties, and lives of all, are diſpoſed of according to law. The conſtitution allows it.—the conſtitution enjoins it. And yet you tell us, that diſpoſing of the property of non-voters is *unconſtitutional*; and that to lay taxes upon them, is to commit robbery. Now, Sir, if you are right, the government robs 212 families only in my pariſh. With two of my neighbours I have juſt calculated the number of houſekeepers in my little diſtrict: Upon a moderate computation we find 78 freeholders in 290 families. Hence it follows that 212 families out of 290 have no ſhare in legiſlation, either perſonally, or by ſending any repreſentative to parliament. And yet all theſe families are taxed: The maſters of ſome of them, who live upon large farms, for which they pay the land tax, pay more to the government than moſt freeholders. To ſay nothing

thing of the land-tax and highway money, they are all taxed in moſt of the articles which they uſe in houſekeeping. The tea and ſugar they drink in the morning, the ſalt they eat at noon, the candle they burn at night, the ſhoes they wear all the day, are taxed: Their tobacco, ſnuff, gin, ale, and rum, [great articles with too many of them] are all taxed: That according to your unconſtitutional doctrine, they are robbed from morning till night. The freeholders, officers of exciſe, and collectors of taxes, are little robbers; and the king and his parliament, the great robbers. Did ever any patriot pour more contempt upon the conſtitution, than you inadvertently do? If you could proſelyte me to your patriotiſm, Sir, I would no more celebrate the 5th of Nov. as a day of thankſgiving: I would wiſh ſucceſs to any that would venture his neck, in order to blow up the den of thieves, with all the robbers who aſſemble therein.

You inſinuate that theſe 212 non-voters are "*able to purchaſe a freedom if they chuſe it*," and to become voters for themſelves and their families. But you are miſtaken, Sir, I know my pariſh better than you. Some of the houſekeepers I mention, could not vote on account of their ſex, though they ſhould have twenty eſtates; and moſt of the reſt would find it, through their poverty, much more difficult to purchaſe a freedom than moſt of our American patriots.

You anſwer. If this is the caſe, their "*property muſt be ſo ſmall, that it can be of no conſequence to them who has the granting of it.*" But I argue in a quite contrary manner: For, if my poor pariſhioners have a little of the neceſſaries of life, by every dictate of common ſenſe, it is of the greateſt conſequence to them, not to be *robbed* of that little. Thoſe who have blood to ſpare, may truſt their arm in the hands of almoſt any Surgeon: But thoſe whoſe veins are already drained, are deeply intereſted in the choice of him, who is to let out the precious drops which they can ſo ill part with. The parting with a couple of ſhillings, or the loſing of two days

work in mending the highways, is more to a poor man who has a large family, than the losing of 2000l. is to a man of fortune. Taxes are never felt by the rich; because they pay them out of their superfluous abundance: whereas the poor part with some of the necessaries of life, whenever they part with a penny. Besides, the poor, not being able to buy meat, live chiefly upon bread, which is the cheapest food. They eat a pound of it, where the rich eat an ounce. Therefore, when our wealthy legislators raise the price of bread, by allowing a bounty for the exportation of corn, or by forbidding the exportation, or permitting the distilling of it, they reap the principal benefit, and the poor bear the principal burden. You advance, therefore, a monstrous paradox, when you insinuate, that legislation "can be of no consequence" to the poor: For the capital branch of legislation, which raises or sinks the price of corn, chiefly concerns the lowest class of mankind, by whom corn is chiefly consumed.

This is not all. The legislative power disposes of our life and locomotive liberty, as well as of our property, I have seen some free-born Englishmen, who never had any share in legislation, put in the stocks or sent to jail: I have seen others loaded with irons, ready for transportation; and others with a rope about their neck, ready for the gallows. Now, as the poor are much concerned in the disposal of their locomotive liberty and life, as the rich, do you not betray gross partiality, Sir, when you represent the poor, as persons who may be doomed to *abject slavery*, which your system supposes to be inseparably connected with our having no share in legislation. Indigence and slavery are not naturally connected. The poor Indians are as jealous of their liberty as you. And when the Lacedemonians and the Romans were in the lowest circumstances, they valued their liberty most.

'Tis true, you insinuate that all who cannot purchase a freehold, are not absolutely obliged to remain slaves; because a place in the legislature is a

"pri-

" privilege extended in a few boroughs to every one that boils a pot." But does not this very argument pour freſh contempt upon your notions of ſlavery and liberty? Does it not make Engliſh liberty, or abject ſlavery, to turn upon the boiling, or the not boiling, of a pot? However, ſuppoſing that all who are not able to purchaſe freeholds, could avoid ſlavery by crowding with their families into the few boroughs you mention: which many Coloniſts could do with greater eaſe than thouſands of Britons: Or, ſuppoſing this peculiar privilege were extended to all the pot boilers in Great Britain; would you mend the conſtitution by theſe means? No, you would only avoid one inconveniency by running upon another: For the rich would juſtly complain of a levelling ſcheme, which would allow every ſtarving cottager to have as good a right of granting of their property as they have themſelves.

Again, If Britons, and ſons of Britons, muſt be " *equally repreſented*," with reſpect to the diſpoſal of their property, in order to be free-men; have not the rich a right to make a congreſs, and to enact, that, as the man who has forty ſhillings a year in land, has one vote; ſo he, who has twice forty ſhillings, ſhould have two votes; and he, who has ten thouſand pounds a year, ſhould have five thouſand votes; by which means, he might return himſelf member for any poor borough in the kingdom?—On the other hand, will not the poor have as good a right to riſe in their turn, and to form another congreſs, under pretence, that rich men have but one body, and one life, any more than the poor; and therefore it is unreaſonable, that the rich ſhould have ſo much greater a part in legiſlation than they?—Nor will the miſchief ſtop here: the wiſe and experienced will riſe alſo, and urge it is abſurd that a young man, or a fool, ſhould have as great a ſhare in the legiſlature as a wiſe, aged man; and they will inſiſt on having votes according to their wiſdom and years; nor will their claim be, in my judgment, the moſt unreaſonable.

This is not all: every little market-town, and every ancient village, will inſiſt on ſending two repre-

ſentatives to parliament, as well as Wenlock and Old Sarum. By the rule of proportion, large towns, cities, and populous counties will claim a right of ſending a number of members ſo much greater, as they are larger than Corniſh boroughs, and more populous than Huntingdonſhire. Thus we ſhall have an army of parliament-men, who, like the Poliſh nobility at their diets, will not be able to hear one another ſpeak, and will be more ready to draw the ſword than to make laws. And if ſuch a parliament is to be choſen every year, as you intimate it ſhould, the nation will ſpend half her time in raiſing armies of pot-boilers, to raiſe another army of lawgivers.

From theſe, and many ſuch inconveniences, it appears, Sir, that your ſcheme of *equal repreſentation* is abſurd and impoſſible; and that, before you can bring it to bear, you muſt firſt get all Britons to be equally wiſe, rich, noble, learned, experienced, and diligent: Secondly, you muſt make them all of one ſex and age: and thirdly, you muſt contrive to make them all live in the ſame place, and at the ſame time. If you conſider the difficulty of ſuch a taſk, I flatter myſelf, Sir, that you will be leſs ready to find fault with the conſtitution, and to make the injudicious wiſh for a revolution productive of *equal repreſentation*, that is, of an abſolute impoſſibility. Much leſs will you perſuade, even, patriots, that the King and the majority in parliament "*commit robbery*," and "*ſtab our vitals*," when they tax the Coloniſts, as they do two of their ſubjects in England out of three, that is, without a direct repreſentative.

You try indeed to obviate this difficulty by intimating, that the vaſt body of free-born Engliſhmen, who have no right to chuſe their repreſentatives, or who, through abſence, cannot exerciſe their right, may "conſent to the diſpoſal of their property, becauſe they have always this ſecurity, that thoſe who take an active part in the diſpoſal of their property, muſt at the ſame time diſpoſe of an equal proportion of their own."—Whereas "the American can have no voice in the diſpoſal of his property; and what is worſe, thoſe who are to have the power of diſpoſing of it, are

are under every poſſible temptation to abuſe that power, becauſe every ſhilling they take out of the pocket of an American is ſo much ſaved in their own."

As this is your capital argument, I ſhall give it a full anſwer.—[1.] It is improbable, that our lawgivers would ſave a dirty ſhilling in their pocket, by oppreſſively taking one out of an American's pocket. If I am rightly informed, they are ſo far from abuſing their power in this reſpect, that when they take ſixpence for the uſe of the Government out of an American's pocket, they take ſixteen ſhillings out of their own.—[2.] Our excellent conſtitution obviates your ungenerous ſuſpicion, by ordering, that the legiſlators, who compoſe the lower houſe of the parliament, ſhall all be men of fortune, raiſed by their circumſtances above the felonious trick you ſpeak of.—[3.] You miſtake, when you ſay, that "the American can have no voice in the diſpoſal of his property; for as many of the Coloniſts as chuſe to purchaſe a free-hold in England, may become electors; and as many as have a ſufficient fortune, may become candidates at the next election. You ſpeak, yourſelf, of your "*late American candidate, who was a friend to America.*" If I miſtake not, we have American members in the houſe; and the papers inform us, that —Sayer, Eſq; who is a native of Boſton, claims a ſeat in the parliament; and, if he obtains it, he will not only repreſent his borough, but alſo, in connection with his fellow-members, he will repreſent the commonalty of all the Britiſh empire, except Ireland. Hence it is, that the minority in parliament, though they are not the ſpecial repreſentatives of the Coloniſts, plead their cauſe ſo warmly, even againſt the privileges of the electors, whom they particularly repreſent.—[4.] Suppoſing theſe American members have no eſtates beyond the Atlantic; are there not ſeveral members in both houſes of parliament, who have a large, very large property in America; and who, when they tax the Coloniſts, take far more money out of their own pocket, than they probably do out of the

pocket

pocket of Meſſ. Adams and Handcock?—[5.] If the Coloniſts were afraid of being taxed more heavily than the rule of proportion allows, ſhould they not have humbly requeſted the parliament, that, before they were taxed at all, their jealouſies might be removed by an act drawn up in ſuch a manner as to ſet bounds to their taxes, in proportion to the bounds which are ſet to their commercial privileges? And would not our lawgivers have granted them ſo reaſonable a requeſt? But, to riſe abſolutely againſt all taxation by act of parliament, merely becauſe it is taxation, by the legiſlative power of Great Britain; to deſtroy the property of our fellow-ſubjects, by raiſing riotous mobs againſt them; and to take up arms againſt the Sovereign to defend ſuch proceedings, argues, in my judgment, a temper which you may call patriotiſm, but looks too much like the ſin forbidden in Rom. xiii. 2.—Laſtly, If pleading that our ſuperiors may abuſe their power over us, were a ſufficient reaſon to ſhake off the yoke of lawful authority; all apprentices [though ever ſo well uſed] might directly emancipate themſelves; for they might adopt your argument, and ſay, My maſter indeed uſes me well; but "*he is under every poſſible temptation*" to ſtarve me; ſince every meal which he will ſave in denying me proper food, will be a meal ſaved for himſelf or his own children; and therefore I will cut and carve for myſelf, or I will acknowledge him as a maſter no more.

I ſhall be leſs prolix in my anſwer to the reſt of your arguments. You appeal to the Iriſh, who are taxed by their own parliament: but their caſe is very different from that of the Coloniſts; for Ireland was annexed to the dominions of the King of England, not as a colony, or a kingdom ſubject to England, but as a ſiſter-kingdom; and, as ſuch, ſhe has enjoyed the ſupreme power of making her own laws, and [in part] of coining her own money. This was the caſe in Scotland alſo: and therefore the Scots were allowed to ſend a number of repreſentatives to both houſes of parliament, when the two kingdoms were united into one. Not ſo the Colonies. They never were

on

on a level with England; they never had ſupreme dominion; they were always the ſubjects of the King and parliament of England, who granted them the territories they enjoy; and therefore, for them to demand, in oppoſition to their charters, rights ſuperior to thoſe of the Britons, who ſettle abroad under the protection of Great Britain; and for them to claim the prerogatives of ſiſter-kingdoms, is as great a ſtretch of lawleſs liberty, as for chartered corporations in England, or for the Engliſh ſettled in Minorca, Jamaica, Gibraltar, Bengal, &c. to claim the prerogatives of ſupreme governments, and the privileges of the kingdoms which were joined by mutual agreement to the crown of England.

You likewiſe appeal to the Palatinate of Cheſter, whoſe inhabitants pleaded, "that the Engliſh parliament had no right to tax them; that they had a parliament of their own, &c." But, granting that the parliament of that Palatinate was once as independent on the Engliſh parliament as the Palatinate in Germany, can you, without abſurdity, infer from thence, that the Coloniſts are ſo? Permit me to make you ſenſible of the inconcluſiveneſs of your arguments, by bringing it to light, thus: 'The Palatinate of Cheſter was formerly independent on the parliament of England: they could produce grants or charters to demonſtrate, that they had a parliament of their own, and the prerogative of making their own laws; and therefore the colonies, which have no ſuch grants and charters; the Colonies, which have always been ſubject to the Engliſh parliament;—the Colonies, whoſe grants directly or indirectly mention ſubjection to the Engliſh parliament, ſhall not be ſubject to the Engliſh parliament.' If Mr. W. had advanced ſuch an argument as this, you might have as reaſonably complained, that he deals in "childiſh quirks," as you now do without reaſon; for common ſenſe dictates, that it is abſurd to conclude, that the peculiar privileges enjoyed by the Palatinate of Cheſter, ought to be granted to all the Colonies; as it is to infer,

that

that the peculiar privilege of the houſe of commons belong to every corporation in this kingdom.

To this refutation of your arguments, permit me to add a remark upon your anſwer to Mr. W.'s moſt ſtriking plea. You are ſenſible of the advantage which he has over you, where he appeals to the *expreſs terms* of the charters granted to the Coloniſts. You know, that honeſt men dare not go from their bargain; and that a charter is nothing but a ſolemn bargain committed to writing, whereby the ſovereign makes ſuch and ſuch grants to his ſubjects upon ſuch and ſuch terms; and you know, that if the ſubjects accept the grants, they agree to the terms on which theſe grants are made. Mr. W. ſays, "Remember your laſt charter, that of Pennſylvania, ſays, in *expreſs terms*, you are liable to taxation."—Here, Sir, you ſeem embarraſſed; and, to get off as well as you can, you tell us, that the clauſe of the charter, which Mr. W. appeals to, "was never underſtood to mean a power of internal taxation for the purpoſe of raiſing a revenue; but merely the laying on of ſuch duties, as might be neceſſary ſolely for the regulation of trade." But your miſtake was lately demonſtrated before the houſe of lords, by the teſtimony of governor Penn. Lord Denbigh aſked him at the bar of the houſe, If he was well acquainted with the charter of Pennſylvania? He replied, that "he had read the charter, and was well acquainted with the contents." Lord Denbigh eſked, "If he did not know, there was *a clauſe which ſpecifically ſubjected the colony to taxation by the Britiſh legiſlature?*" and he anſwered, "*He was well appriſed there was ſuch a clauſe.*" Now, Sir, as you are ſo evidently miſtaken in your account of the charter of Pennſylvania; you will permit me to think, that you give us as fabulous an account of the charter of Maſſachuſſett's Bay, when you ſay, you are credibly informed, that the *exemption from taxes for ſeven years*, which was granted to the coloniſts of that province, "had no reference to what we commonly mean by *taxes*, but to" ſomething, which you call "*quit rents.*"—An odd criticiſm

ticiſm this, which I ſhould imitate, if I inſinuated that when the Apoſtle charged us to *pay cuſtom*, he does not mean, that we ſhould pay what we commonly underſtand by cuſtom, but only that tenants ſhould pay their rent. From this ſpecimen, it is eaſy to determine, who have moſt reaſon to complain of "mutilated charters," the patriots, or the parliament.

Having ſo long pleaded the cauſe of my Sovereign and my country, I may be allowed to beſtow a few paragraphs upon my friend. You ſay to him "It is fallacious to the laſt degree, and unworthy of a man of integrity and candor to inſinuate, as you are pleaſed to do, that the people have ceded to the king and parliament the power of diſpoſing, without their conſent, of both their lives, liberties, and properties." I ſhall make no remark, Rev. Sir, on the Chriſtian courteſy of this addreſs. We, who paſs for *abject ſlaves*, expect ſuch liberal hints from you *patriots*, and to tell you the truth, we think it an honour to ſhare them with our King, and our Legiſlature. But may not I aſk a few queſtions, which will throw ſome light upon Mr. W.'s remark? When did all the freeholders, who have from fifty to ninety nine pounds a year, conſent to be deprived of the liberty to carry a gun, and to ſhoot a hare on their own land? When did the Quakers conſent to pay tithes, for the non-payment of which their property is forcibly taken from them according to act of parliament, to the amount of ſeveral thouſand pounds a year? When did all the clergy, who lately petitioned the parliament for the repeal of the thirty-nine articles, conſent that the act, which orders ſubſcription to theſe articles, ſhould continue in force? When did all the freeholders in Middleſex conſent to be additionally taxed, in order to inforce the taxation of the Coloniſts? When did all our bluſtering gentlemen conſent to be ſent to the houſe of correction, or to pay five ſhillings, every time they demean themſelves, by prophane curſing or ſwearing? When did all the diſſenters conſent to the law, which obliges them to conform to the church of England, if they will have

places

places under the government? And to ſum up all in one queſtion, When did one half of the Lords, who diſtinguiſh themſelves by their violent oppoſition to the meaſures of the government, conſent that their liberty, eſtate, title, and life, ſhould be forfeited, if they ſhould aſſiſt their fellow patriots, who take up arms againſt the King and parliament? If you give me a ſatisfactory anſwer to theſe queries, I will give you leave to reflect on my friend's integrity, for his aſſertion. But remember, Sir, that, if you fly to the back-door of an *implicit conſent* to make your eſcape, Mr. Weſley, like an honeſt man will meet you face to face; and ſtopping you in the name of conſiſtency, he will demonſtrate that, according to your evaſive doctrine, you, yourſelf, have taxed the Coloniſts, "committed robbery," and "ſtabbed our vitals."

You try another method to overthrow Mr. Weſley's arguments. You object, that, five years ago, he did not defend the meaſures taken with regard to America; "*becauſe he doubted*" whether they were at all defenſible: and you have been informed, that he has ſince repreſented the Americans as "an oppreſſed, injured people;" and has warmly expreſſed his fears, with reſpect to the danger of our liberties. But who could blame Mr. Weſley then; and who can blame him now? Is not a good man bound by his conſcience to judge without partiality, according to the beſt information he has? When Mr. W. heard the clamours of the patriots, ſo called, who inveighed againſt the ſovereign for breach of character; he really thought that they had truth, and the charters of the Coloniſts, on their ſide; and therefore he conſidered the claims of the government upon the Coloniſts as ſubverſive of charter, and conſequently as faithleſs, injurious, and oppreſſive. Nor is it ſurpriſing that, upon ſuch a wrong information, he would have thought our liberties in danger; for if the ſovereign had really violated the charters of the Colonies, he might next have attempted to violate the great Charter of England. But when Mr. W. was better informed; when he found

found that the charters of the Colonies were as much for the ſovereign, as the patriots had inſinuated they were againſt him, Mr. W. would not have acted as a conſcientious man, if he had not altered his mind, according to this important and deciſive information.

But, ſuppoſing I miſtake the reaſon, which has determined Mr. W. to defend the claims of Great Britain: and ſuppoſing you have been rightly informed concerning the change of his political ſentiments; what can you infer from thence, but that he once leaned too much towards your overdoing patriotiſm. He once "doubted" the equity of the ſovereign's claims. His ſtrong patriotiſm gave an haſty preponderance to his doubts; but, his candor having proceeded to a cloſe examination of the queſtion, light has ſprung up; conviction has followed; and he has laid before the public the reſult of his ſecond thoughts, and the arguments which have ſcattered his doubts. For my part, far from thinking the worſe of a rational conviction, becauſe it follows a doubt, and has met with ſome oppoſition in a good man's mind, I am inclined to pay it a greater regard. And, if my friend's warm patriotiſm has been forced to yield to the ſtrength of the arguments contained in his Calm Addreſs, I am thereby encouraged to hope, that your warm patriotiſm, Sir, will not be leſs candid than his; and that you will yield to the arguments contained in this calm Vindication. Should this be the caſe, the publick will ſee in you both, that reaſon and conſcience can, at laſt, perfectly balance patriotiſm and loyalty in the breaſt of a good man.

With reſpect to me, Sir, I had not deeply entered into the merit of the cauſe either way, before I ſaw, Mr. W's Addreſs and your anſwer to it. I contented myſelf to wiſh and pray for peace in general, without inquiring who was right and who wrong. But after an attentive peruſal of your publications, I was fully convinced, that Mr. W.'s doctrine of government and taxation is rational, ſcriptural, and

 conſti-

conſtitutional; and that yours, Sir, draws after it a chain of the moſt abſurd conſequences, has a tendency to promote licentiouſneſs, and is ſubverſive of all the ſcripture-precepts which I have quoted in my firſt letter: And therefore, my reverence for God's word, my duty to the king, my regard for my friend, my love to injured truth, and the conſciouſneſs of the ſweet liberty, which I enjoy under the government, call for this little tribute of my pen. And I pay it ſo much the more chearfully, as few men in the kingdom have had a better opportunity of trying which is moſt eligible—a republican government—or the mild, tempered monarchy of England. I have lived more than twenty years the ſubject of two of the mildeſt republics in Europe: I have been, for above that number of years, the ſubject of your ſovereign's; and, from ſweet experience, I can ſet my ſeal to this clauſe of the King's Speech, at the opening of this ſeſſion of parliament, "To be a ſubject of Great Britain, with all its conſequences, is to be the happieſt ſubject of any civil government in the world." That you, Sir, and all my diſſatisfied fellow ſubjects, may be as ſenſible of this truth as myſelf; and that I may be daily more thankful to God, to the king, and to the parliament, for the religious and civil liberty which we enjoy, is the cordial wiſh of,

Rev. Sir,

Your affectionate fellow-labourer in the Goſpel,

J. F.

THIRD LETTER.

Rev. Sir,

MY wiſhes for your happineſs, and my concern for the public peace, prompt me to try all the means in my power, to remove your prejudices, and to ſtop the ferment raiſed by your miſtakes. Having therefore addreſſed you as a man, a Chriſtian, and a Briton, I ſhall now expoſtulate with you, as a *proteſtant* and a *friend to liberty*.

The diſtinguiſhing character of a *proteſtant*, is to reſt his doctrine upon reaſon and ſcripture. But, upon which of theſe foundations, Sir, do you reſt your doctrine of power? You inſinuate, that the power of Kings aſcends from the people: you blame your opponent for having intimated, that it deſcends from God; and you recommend a levelling ſcheme of equal repreſentation, founded upon a natural, equal right of ſharing in the legiſlative power; a ſcheme this, which preſuppoſes, that one man in ſociety, has naturally as much right to make and repeal laws, as another. Whence it evidently follows, that ſubjects have a right to riſe againſt their Sovereign, whenever they think it proper to make, in connection with their neighbours a decree or law of inſurrection; and that every individual, in conjunction with other individuals, has a ſupreme right to diſpoſe of property and royal honours, whether it be by equalizing ranks and fortunen, or by putting down one king and ſetting up another.

I own to you, Sir, that although this ſcheme would give me a ſignificancy in life which I never dreamed

 of,

of, I dare not embrace it. The vanity of considering myself as a member of the body, which your doctrine represents as the supreme Lawgiver, the Judge of legislators, and the Maker of kings;—this flattering vanity, I say, cannot induce me to renounce the dictates of reason, and the declarations of Scripture.

Reason informs me that the first man was endued with a power to protect and rule mankind; that all men are born in a state of civil society, because no child was ever his own father, his own mother, his own nurse, or his own protector; and that, of consequence, all men were under as strong an obligation of submitting to the first man [in all things agreeable to God's supreme dominion] as the first man was, of submitting to God. If Adam had not sinned and died, to this day he would be, under God, the monarch of all the earth, and all kings would be bound to acknowledge his supreme authority. This divine right of dominion Adam received from God. At his death, he left it behind him; and, even before his death, it began to subdivide itself into every branch of family-government, and national administration. Hence it is, that *the powers that are, are* said to be *ordained of God*; and that magistrates and governors are called *gods* in the Old and New Testament. It appears to me therefore as irrational, to say, that the power of sovereigns comes originally from the people, as to say, that the sanction of the fifth commandment comes originally from man. Nor dare I any more assert, that the people have a natural right to inthrone and dethrone kings, than I dare maintain that children and scholars, have a natural right to bestow or take away paternal and magisterial authority; or that the hands and feet have a natural right to rule the head and heart. I grant that if all the people will rebel against their rightful Sovereign, they are able to depose and destroy him. But arguing from *might* to *right* is the logic of a tyrant, a robber, and a mob; not that of a man, a Christian, and a Protestant. If all the sons of Adam had plotted his destruction, they probably could have effected it: but their

their having a power to ſin, would have been no proof that they had a licence ſo to do. You may call this a "Jacobite doctrine," Sir, but ſuch a name does no more make it unreaſonable, than your calling Mr. Weſley *a ſlave*, deprives him of his liberty.

As this doctrine of power, ſo far as power is, exerciſed in ſubordination to God's ſupreme dominion, is agreeable to reaſon: ſo it is to ſcripture. Search the ſacred records, Sir, and you will ſee, that *they who reſiſt the* above deſcribed *power*, *reſiſt*, not the ordinance of the people, but *the ordinance of God* himſelf, Rom. xiii. 2. Kings, in the ſacred pages, are ſaid to be *the Lord's anointed*, and not the anointed of the people; and the men of God informed us, that *God removeth kings and ſetteth up kings* in his own right, Dan. ii. 21.

I grant, that, when the Lord deſigns to puniſh a nation, or a tyrant, he often ſuffers the people, or ſome ambitious man from among the people, to uſurp his right, and to procure an unlawful coronation. Nor do I deny that, in lawful coronations, the Lord invites the people to fall in with his providential choice; and that, ſometimes, he brings his choice about by means of the people. But the fulleſt concurrence of the people does not deprive him of his divine prerogative. Hence it is, that the Pſalmiſt ſays, *Promotion cometh neither from the eaſt, nor from the weſt, nor yet from the ſouth. And why? God is the* [ſupreme] *Judge: He putteth down one and ſetteth up another*, Pſal. lxxv. 7, 8. This is his inconteſtible right. If the people therefore ſtand in need of a rod of iron, to bruiſe their ſtubborn backs; he may *give them a* [cruel] *king in his anger*, Hoſ. xiii. 11. Or what is ſtill worſe, he may ſuffer them to ſet over themſelves a tyrant, whoſe name is *Legion*; *for* they *are many*. And *Legion* will drive them into a ſea of trouble, as fiercely and as arbitrarily as a certain Legion formerly drove an herd of ſtunt, unruly animals into the ſea of Galilee. May our American brethren never be given over to ſo dreadful a deluſion!

If legiſlative, royal power aſcend from the people, the Lord would not have elected Moſes to be the Lawgiver, and Joſhua to be the Leader of Iſrael, without firſt conſulting the twelve tribes. Nor would he have raiſed them judges afterwards, without previouſly aſking their conſent. Much leſs would he have anointed Saul, David, Jehu, and others, to be kings over Iſrael in ſo arbitrary a manner as he did. To prove your doctrine therefore, you muſt appeal to the right exerciſed by ſome lawleſs *citizens*, mentioned by our Lord, who unjuſtly *hated* their Sovereign, and ſaid, *We will not have this man to reign over us*, Luke xix. 14. And, if you pleaſe, to this precedent you may add the example of thoſe phariſaic fickle patriots, who once inſiſted upon making Chriſt their king, and afterwards, cried, *We will have no king but Ceſar: let Jeſus be crucified.* From the deſigns of ſuch uneaſy religioniſts, ſuch makers and killers of kings, may God deliver the king and his dominions! Let a Theudas, a Barabbas, a Caiphas, make inſurrections againſt Cæſar, and raiſe mobs againſt Chriſt himſelf; but let not pious Chriſtians, who diſſent from the Church of England, diſſent from the prophets and apoſtles, when they ſay, *My ſon, fear thou the Lord, and the King, and meddle not with them that are given to change*, Prov. xxiv. 21. *Submit to the king, as ſupreme.—Fear God: Honour the King:*—Yea *honour him with thy ſubſtance*, by *paying tribute* or taxes, *not only for wrath, but for conſcience ſake*, 1 Pet. ii. 13. &c. Rom. xiii. 5. 6. Prov. iii. 9.

The levelling ſcheme, on which you found your doctrine of a right to equal repreſentation, is the rock upon which rigid republicans perpetually run. Againſt this very rock *many* of the firſt, over-doing proteſtants ſteered their courſe, and daſhed their ark in pieces. They had long groaned under popiſh tyranny; and when the yoke, which had galled them for ages, was broken, they did not know how to contain themſelves. Like a high ſpirited horſe, which takes a mad gallop, and furiouſly leaps over the bounds of his paſture, into which it is turned after a long confinement; they diſdained all reſtraint. Nothing ſhort of *lawleſs proceedings.*

ceedings ſeemed to them to deſerve the name of *liberty*. Becauſe they had ſhaken off the Antichriſtian yoke of eccleſiaſtical tyrants, they concluded, that they had a right to ſhake off the Chriſtian yoke of civil governors. They paid an unjuſt tribute to the Pope no more; and therefore, they would pay juſt taxes to their Sovereigns no longer. In ſhort, they aſſerted that they had as much right in the legiſlature as their legiſlators. They brought on a general election, at which they elected themſelves lawgivers; and, as you may eaſily conceive, one of their firſt laws was, that goods ſhould be common, thus they began, *facere rem publicam*—to make a *republic*, a *commonwealth*, in the fulleſt ſenſe of the word. All things were theirs. They were to call no man maſter upon earth. They were all to be literally kings with Chriſt, and they anointed themſelves to reign with him a thouſand years. This ſcheme could not fail to pleaſe the pot-boilers in Germany, who had nothing to loſe; and it was highly applauded by thoſe who hoped to get more than they had. They roſe therefore in riotous mobs, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. They were to undo all heavy burdens, to break every yoke, to bind kings with chains and nobles with fetters of iron. They actually began their levelling march, headed by ſome well meaning enthuſiaſts, and by ſome deſigning men, who like Cromwell, made their way to ſupreme authority, by ſtriking dreadful blows at all authority. And under pretence of aſſerting *the liberty wherewith Chriſt has made us free*, they committed all the outrages which can be expected from a lawleſs populace, who miſtake licentiouſneſs for freedom.

This miſchief had begun in the church. Some of the German reformers had, at times, ſpoken ſo unguardedly of the ceremonial law of Moſes, which St. Paul abſolutely diſcards, as to pour contempt upon the moral law of Chriſt, which the Apoſtle ſtrongly enforce. Luther himſelf, in his zeal for ſalvation without works, had been ready to burn the epiſtle of St. James, becauſe it ſpeaks honourably of Chriſt's

royal

royal law, by which Chriſtians ſhall ſtand or fall when they ſhall be *judged* (that is, juſtified or condemned) *according to their works*. When warm men had been taught to bid defiance to God's law, as well as to ſin and Satan; what wonder was it, if ſome of them went beyond their teachers, and began to infer, that, as they were made free from the law of God, ſo they were made free from the law of the land. The tranſition from eccleſiaſtical to civil antinomianiſm, is eaſy and obvious: for, as he that reverences the law of God, will naturally reverence the commandments of the King; ſo he that thinks himſelf free from the law of the Lord, will hardly think himſelf bound by the ſtatutes of his Sovereign.

This republican, mobbing ſpirit, after having toſſed Germany, began to agitate England. Permit me, Sir, to tranſcribe ſome paſſages from Biſhop Burnet's Hiſtory of the Reformation. They refer to my ſubject, and will throw much light upon it. 'At this time there were many Anabaptiſts in ſeveral parts of England. They were generally Germans, whom the revolutions there had forced to change their ſeats. Upon Luther's firſt preaching in Germany, there aroſe many, who, building on ſome of his principles, carried things much farther than he did.'—Here the hiſtorian candidly obſerves, that, although theſe men were all called *Anabaptiſts*, becauſe they agreed to explode the baptiſm of infants, they were not all of the ſame temper. Some, ſays he, 'were called the gentle or moderate Anabaptiſts. But others—denied almoſt all the principles of the Chriſtian doctrine, and were men of fierce and barbarous tempers. They had broke out into a general revolt over Germany, and raiſed the war called *The ruſtic war* and poſſeſſing themſelves of Munſter, made one of their teachers, John of Leyden, their king, under the title of King of the new Jeruſalem.'

'There was another ſort of people, of whom all the good men in that age made great complaints. Some there were called *goſpellers*, or readers of the goſpel, who were a ſcandal to the doctrine they profeſſed, &c.

I do

I do not find any thing objected to them, as to their belief, ſave only that the doctrine of Predeſtination, having been generally taught by the Reformers, many of this ſect began to make ſtrange inferences from it, reckoning, that ſince every thing was decreed, and the decrees of God could not be fruſtrated, therefore men were to leave themſelves to be carried by the decrees. This drew ſome into great impiety of life, &c.—One of the ill effects of the diſſoluteneſs of people's manners broke out violently this ſummer (1549,) occaſioned by the incloſing of lands. While the monaſteries ſtood, there were great numbers of people maintained about theſe houſes, &c. But now the number of the people increaſed much; marriage being univerſally allowed. They had alſo more time than formerly, by the abrogation of many holidays, and the putting down of proceſſions and pilgrimages; ſo that as the numbers encreaſed; they had more time than they knew how to beſtow.'

The Hiſtorian tells us next, how the Popiſh prieſts availed themſelves of theſe favourable circumſtances, to raiſe a dreadful rebellion in Devonſhire; and then he goes on thus:—" When this commotion was grown to a head, the men of Norfolk roſe—being led by one *Ket*, a Tanner. Theſe pretended nothing of religion, but only to ſuppreſs and deſtroy the Gentry, and to *raiſe the Commons*, and to *put new counſellors about the King*. They increaſed mightily, and became twenty thouſand ſtrong, but had no order or diſcipline, and committed many horrid outrages.—Ket aſſumed to himſelf the power of judicature, and under an old oak, called from thence *the oak of the Reformation*, did ſuch juſtice as might be expected from ſuch a judge, in ſuch a camp.—When the news of this riſing came into Yorkſhire, the commons there roſe alſo; being further encouraged by a prophecy, that there ſhould be no king nor nobility in England; that the kingdom was to be ruled by four governors, choſen by the commons, who ſhould hold a parliament, in commotion, to begin at the ſouth and north-ſeas. They, at their firſt riſing, fired

fired beacons, and ſo gathered the country, *as if it had been for the defence* of the coaſt, and meeting with two gentlemen, with two others with them, they, without any provocation, murdered them, and left their naked bodies unburied. At the ſame time that England was in this commotion, the news came that the French king had ſent a great army into the territory of Boulogne; ſo that the government was put to moſt extraordinary ſtraits. There was a faſt proclaimed in and about London. Cranmer preached on the faſt day at court.—He chiefly lamented the ſcandal given by many who pretended a zeal for religion, but uſed that for a cloak to diſguiſe their other vices. He ſet before them the freſh example of Germany, where people generally loved to hear the goſpel, but had not amended their lives upon it; for which God had now, after many years forbearance, brought them under a ſevere ſcourge.' Hiſtor. of the Ref. Book i. part ii. Ed. 2. p. 110—118.

From this quotation it appears, that the wild, republican ſpirit which animated *Ket* and his army, worked in thoſe days juſt as *licentious* patriotiſm works in ours. *Ket*, the great patriot, would redreſs grievances. He *raiſed the commons*, under pretence of *putting new counſellors about the king* He got the mob together *as if it had been for the defence of the coaſt*, or of public liberty. But his real deſign was probably to be one of the *four governors choſen by the commons*, who were to make an end of the *king and nobility in England*, and to turn the monarchy into a republic. As for modeſt *John of Leyden*, he got more than the name of *Protector*; for he was actually proclaimed king. This ſort of republican patriotiſm leads therefore to honour, though this honour, like that of the German and Engliſh levellers frequently ends in ſhame.

The wildneſs of this high republican ſpirit having fixed a foul blot on the reformation in Germany; the latter reformers, to throw off the ſhame, and to obviate the miſchief of this deluſion, took particular

cular notice of it in their confeſſions of faith. Tho' you diſſent from the church of England, Sir, yet as, it is preſumed, you pay a deference to what are called her doctrinal Articles, permit me to tranſcribe a part of the 38th, which is levelled at the levelling pot-boilers of Germany, and at the dupes of Ket, who had taken upon him to diſpoſe of property under *The Oak of Reformation* in England. "The riches and goods of Chriſtians are not common, as touching the right, title, and poſſeſſion of the ſame; as certain Anabaptiſts do falſely boaſt."

Calvin himſelf, though a ſtrong republican, was frightened at the rapid progreſs of this civil enthuſiaſm. Hence it is, that when he drew up a confeſſion of faith for the reformed churches of France and Geneva, he beſtowed the two laſt articles of it upon the error which our American brethren and you, Sir, are running headlong into. As you are probably a perfect ſtranger to theſe articles, I ſhall faithfully tranſcribe them from my French Common-prayer book.

'ART. XXXIX. We believe that *God* will have the world to be governed by laws and civil powers, that the lawleſs inclinations of men may be curbed. And therefore *he* has eſtabliſhed kingdoms and republics, and other ſorts of government [ſome hereditary and ſome otherwiſe] together with whatſoever belongs to judicature. And *he* will be acknowledged the *author* of government. To this end *he* has put the ſword in the hand of rulers to puniſh, not only the ſins which are committed againſt the commandments of the ſecond table; but alſo thoſe which are committed againſt the precepts of the firſt table. We ought then, not only to bear, for his ſake, that rule ſhould have dominion over us; but it is alſo our bounden duty to honour them, and to eſteem them worthy of all reverence; conſidering them as *God's* lieutenants and officers, which *he* has commiſſioned to execute a lawful and holy commiſſion.'

ART.

ART. XL. 'We maintain therefore, that we are *bound* to obey their laws and ſtatutes, to *pay tribute*, *taxes*, and *other duties*, and to bear the yoke of obedience freely, and with good will; though they ſhould be unbelievers; provided the ſupreme dominion of God be preſerved in its full extent. And therefore, we *deteſt the men*' [he means republican levellers] 'who reject ſuperiorities, introduce community and confuſion of property, and overthrow the order of juſtice.'

Sir, you are a Calviniſt. You follow the French reformer when he teaches the abſolute reprobation, and unavoidable damnation, of myriads of poor creatures yet unborn: Oh! forſake him not, when he follows Chriſt and teaches that God [not the people] is to be acknowledged the author of power and government, and that we are bound to bear chearfully for his ſake, the yoke of ſcriptural ſubjection to our governors. Repreſent no more this honourable, divine yoke as abject ſlavery. And, inſtead of inſinuating that the king and parliament are robbers becauſe they lay a moderate tax upon their American ſubjects; help Mr. W. to undeceive thoſe, whom the uneaſy levellers of the day work up to almoſt as high a degree of republican wildneſs, as John of Leyden and Ket worked up the German and Engliſh mobs two or three hundred years ago. So will you ſhew yourſelf a true miniſter of the prince of peace, and a wiſe proteſtant, who like Cranmer and Calvin, ought equally to level his doctrine at a tyrant and a mob; and to pour like contempt upon the republican vanity of a tanner who aſſumes the dignity of law-giver under *the Oak of Reformation*, and upon the imperial pride of a monk, who from St. Peter's humble chair, pompouſly holds out his foot, to meet the adoration of proſtrate princes.

Be intreated, Sir, to rectify your falſe notions of liberty. The liberty of Chriſtians, and Britons, does not conſiſt in bearing no yoke; but in bearing a yoke made eaſy by a gracious Saviour and a gra-

cious

cious ſovereign. A John of Leyden may promiſe to make us firſt lawleſs, then legiſlators, and kings, and, by his deluſive promiſes, he may raiſe us to—a fool's paradiſe, if not to—the gallows. But a true deliverer and a good governor ſays to our reſtleſs, [antinomians] ſpirits, *Come unto me, and I will give you reſt. For my yoke is* EASY *and my* BURDEN *is* LIGHT. We can have no reſt in the church, but under Chriſt's *eaſy yoke*; no reſt in the ſtate, but under the *eaſy yoke* of our rightful ſovereign. To aim at breaking this yoke, becauſe we have ſome objection to the miniſter or the king, is as great a piece of folly, as for the crew of a ſhip to aim at cutting the rigging and deſtroying the rudder of the ſhip in which they ſail, becauſe they have a pique againſt the pilot or the captain. Suppoſe they ſhould be ſo unhappily fortunate as to ſucceed, what will they gain by their ſucceſs? Will they be better able to bear the toſſing of the next ſtorm? Will they not be at the mercy of every wave;—the ſport of every blaſt;—ready to be daſhed againſt every rock?

I am ſo fully convinced of the truth and importance of Calvin's two laſt articles of religion, that, though I have for years checked his errors, if I had the wings of the lightning, and a voice like thunder, I would this inſtant, ſhoot myſelf acroſs the Atlantick, and preach his loyal doctrine to our deluded brethren.

A ſeed of the error of the republican Anabaptiſts has remained in England ever ſince the Reformation; and the fiery zeal of ſome Independents, and later Anabaptiſts was the chief ladder, by which artful Cromwell climbed to the height of ſupreme power, under pretence of forming a common-wealth. That you may not charge me with miſrepreſentation, I ſhall draw my proof from the Rev. Mr. Baxter's life, written by himſelf. His teſtimony is worth that of twenty other authors, becauſe he had few equals in his time for piety, wiſdom, moderation, abundant labours, and miniſterial ſucceſs; and becauſe he was an eye-witneſs of many things which

 he

he relates; having been chaplain to a regiment of horſe in Cromwell's army; a place this, which he accepted chiefly with an intention to oppoſe by his preaching the headſtrong republican ſpirit of thoſe men, who, after having taken up arms with a deſign to redreſs grievances and oppoſe arbitrary power, bore them with an intention of putting down hierarchy and monarchy together. Baxter failed in his attempt, partly through the forbidding coldneſs, with which Cromwell looked upon him, and partly by a ſevere fit of ſickneſs, which obliged him to leave the army when his moderation was moſt wanting there. The following extract is taken from a folio volume printed in London 1696, intitled "*Reliquæ Baxterianæ*, or *Mr. Baxter's Narrative of the moſt memorable Paſſages of his Life and Times.*"

Page 26. Having told us, that what haſtened on the war, on the ſide of the Parliament, was *(1.)* "*The people's indiſcretion* that adhered to them: *(2.)* The imprudence and violence of ſome members in the houſe, who went too high, &c."

He explains what he means by *the people's indiſcretion* thus:——"Some were yet more indiſcreet: the remnant of the old Separatiſts and Anabaptiſts in London was then very ſmall, and ſcarce conſiderable; but they were enough to ſtir up the younger ſort of religious people to ſpeak too vehemently—againſt the biſhops and the church—and all that was againſt their minds.—Theſe ſtirred up the apprentices to join with them in petitions, and to go in great numbers to preſent them: As they went they met with ſome of the biſhops in their coaches going to the houſe, and (as is uſual with the paſſionate and indiſcreet, when they are in great companies) they too much forgot civility and cried, *no biſhops*.—P. 27. When at laſt the king forſook the city, theſe tumults were the principal cauſe alledged by him, as if he himſelf had not been ſafe" [*in the midſt of theſe mobbing petitioners*] "Thus raſh attempts of headſtrong people do work againſt the good ends which they themſelves intend.—*Overdoing*

is

is the ordinary way of *undoing*. And ſome members of the houſe did cheriſh theſe diſorders; and becauſe the ſubjects have liberty to petition, they made uſe of this liberty in a diſorderly way.—Some particular members concurred with the deſires of the imprudent reformers, who were for no leſs than the utter extirpation of the biſhops and Liturgy.—Thoſe members, &c. did much encourage the petitioners, who, in a diſorderly manner, laboured to effect it.,'

Page 39. " I make no doubt but the headineſs and raſhneſs of the younger unexperienced ſort of religious people, made many parliament men and miniſters overgo themſelves, to keep pace with thoſe hotſpur's; no doubt but much indiſcretion appeared, and worſe than indiſcretion, in the tumultuous petitioners, and much ſin was committed in the diſhonouring of the king, and provocation of him.—But theſe things came principally from the ſectarian ſpirit, which blew the coals among fooliſh apprentices: And as the ſectaries increaſed, ſo did this inſolence increaſe."

Page 50, 51. " When the court news-book told the world of the ſwarms of Anabaptiſts in our armies, we thought it had been a mere lie, becauſe it was not ſo with us.—But when I came to the army, among Cromwell's ſoldiers, I found a new face of things, which I never dreamt of: I heard the plotting heads very hot upon that, which intimated their intention to ſubvert both church and ſtate. Independency and anabaptiſtry were moſt prevalent. —A few proud ſelf-conceited, hot-headed ſectaries had got into the higheſt places; and were Cromwell's chief favourites, and by their very heat and activity bore down the reſt, or carried them along with them, and were the ſoul of the army, though much fewer in number than the reſt; being indeed not one in twenty throughout the army; their ſtrength being in the generals, &c. I perceived that they took the king for a tyrant, and an enemy, and really intended abſolutely to maſter him, or to ruin him.—They ſaid, what were the lords of England,

 but

but William the Conqueror's colonels; or the barons, but his majors? or the knights, but his captains? *Per fas aut nefas*, by law or without it, they were resolved to take down—all that did withstand their way. The most honoured the Separatists, Anabaptists, and Antinomians; but Cromwell and his council took on them to join themselves to no party, but to be, for the *liberty* of all."

Page 53. "My life among them (Cromwell's soldiers) was a daily contending against seducers.—I found that many honest men of weak judgments, &c. had been seduced into a disputing vein, and made it too much of their religion to talk for this opinion or for that; sometimes for state-democracy, and sometimes for church-democracy.—I was almost always, when I had opportunity, disputing with one or another of them; sometimes for our civil-government, and sometimes for church-government: sometimes for infant-baptism; and often against antinomianism, and the contrary extreme. But their most frequent and vehement disputes were for liberty of conscience, as they called it; that is, that—every man might not only *hold*, but *preach* and do, in matters of religion, what he pleased, &c—Because I perceived that it was a few men that bore the bell, that did all the hurt among them, I acquainted myself with those men, and I found that they were men that had been in London, hatched up among the old Separatists, &c.

Page 56, 57. "I found that if the army had but had ministers enough that would have done but such a little as I did, all their plot might have been broken, and king, parliament, and religion might have been preserved. Therefore I sent abroad to get some more ministers among them, but I could get none. *Saltmarsh* and *Dell* were the two great preachers at the head-quarters.—When any troop or company was to be disposed of—he [Cromwell] was sure to put a sectary in the place; and when the brunt of the war was over, he looked not so much at their valour as at their opinions: so that by degrees he had headed the greatest part of the army with

with Anabaptists, Antinomians, &c. and all these he tied together by the point of *liberty* of conscience, which was the common interest in which they did unite.—Yet did he not openly profess what opinion he was of himself; but the most that he said for any, was anabaptism and antinomianism, which he usually seemed to own.—He would not dispute (with me) at all, but he would in good discourse very fluently pour out himself in the extolling of *free-grace.*"

Page 58. " I called the ministers again together who had voted me into the army; I told them that the forsaking of the army by old ministers, and the neglect of supplying their places by others, had undone us;—that the active sectaries were the smallest part of the army among the common soldiers, but Cromwell had lately put so many of them into superior command, and their industry was so much greater than others, that they were like to have their will: That whatever obedience they pretended, I doubted not but they would pull down all that stood in their way, in state and church, both king, parliament, and ministers, and set up themselves. I told them that for this little that I have done" [*in opposing the high republican spirit*] " I have ventured my life. —The wars being now ended, I was confident they would shortly shew their purposes, and set up for themselves."

Page 59, &c. Baxter tells us that, when the royalists were all killed or scattered, and the king himself taken prisoner, Cromwell began to serve the parliament as he had done the king; availing himself of the absolute power he had over the army, by the influence of the hot-headed sectaries whom he had promoted; some of whom were called *Agitators*; and as they now stood in his way to the supreme power, he began to serve them in their turn as he had served the king and the parliament. Take Baxter's own words. " When Cromwell had taught his *Agitators* to govern, and could not easily unteach it them again, there arose a party, who adhered to the principles of their *agree-*

ment of the people," [upon the high republican plan] " which ſuited not with his deſigns: And to make them odious, he denominated them *Levellers*, as if they intended to * level men of all qualities and eſtates,—At laſt they rendezvous at Burford to make head againſt him. But Cromwell had preſently his brother Deſborough, and ſome other regiments, ready to ſurpriſe them there in their quarters, before they could get their numbers together: So that above 1500 being ſcattered and taken, and ſome ſlain, the Levellers' war was cruſhed in the egg."

Page 64. " The kingdom being thus taken out of the way, Cromwell takes on him to be for a commonwealth (but all in order to the ſecurity of the good people) till he had removed the other impediments which were yet to be removed; ſo that the rump" [that is the reſt of the houſe of commons, whom Cromwell ſtill allowed to ſit, after he had turned out the members who diſpleaſed him moſt] " preſently drew up a form of engagement, to be put upon all men, viz. [I *do promiſe to be true and faithful to the commonwealth, as it is now eſtabliſhed without a king, or houſe of lords.*] So we muſt take the rump for an eſtabliſhed common wealth, and promiſe fidelity to them."

In the following pages, Baxter tells us how Cromwell put down the rump at laſt, and, p. 74, he gives this account of the manner in which he farther laid aſide his truſty friends the Anabaptiſts, who had done him ſo much ſervice. " The ſectarian party

---

* Query, Did Cromwell abſolutely wrong them when he ſaid this? Is it not probable that ſome of them leaned to the levelling principles of the headſtrong Anabaptiſts? Was it not when the Anabaptiſts were moſt in favour, that England ſaw a church without biſhops, a parliament without lords, and a king without a head? And were not theſe ſome important ſteps taken towards levelling anabaptiſtry; though Cromwell's ambition prevented republicans and levellers from proceeding any farther, as Baxter ſoon obſerves!

party in his army and elſewhere, he [Cromwell] chiefly truſted to and pleaſed, till, by the people's ſubmiſſion and quietneſs, he thought himſelf well ſettled; and then he began to undermine them, and by degrees to work them out: And though he had ſo often ſpoke for the Anabaptiſts, now he findeth them ſo heady, and ſo much againſt any ſettled government, and ſo ſet upon the promoting of their way and party, that he does not only begin to blame their unruliness, but alſo deſigneth to ſettle himſelf in the people's favour by ſuppreſſing them. In Ireland they were grown ſo high, that the ſoldiers were, many of them rebaptized as the way to preferment; and thoſe that oppoſed them, they cruſhed with much uncharitable fierceneſs. To ſuppreſs theſe, he ſent thither his ſon Henry Cromwell, who ſo diſcountenanced the Anabaptiſts, as yet to deal civilly with them, repreſſing their inſolencies;—and major general Ludlow, who headed the Anabaptiſts in Ireland was fain to draw in his head. In England Cromwell connived at his old friend Harriſon, while he made himſelf the head of the Anabaptiſts and fanatics here, till he ſaw it would be an acceptable thing to the Nation to ſuppreſs him, and then he does it eaſily in a trice, and maketh him contemptible, who but yeſterday thought himſelf not much below him."

From this ſhort account of the reign of the Rump, and the craft of Cromwell, it is evident, that the high, republican ſpirit, and the injudicious zeal of ſectaries, eſpecially of the Anabaptiſts and the Antinomians, were the chief means, by which that ambitious man aſcended the ſeat of ſupreme power. And I wiſh, Sir, that your injudicious, well-meant zeal, may not prove a ſpur, or a ſaddle to ſome ambitious, falſe patriots, who under pretence of mounting the great horſe *Liberty*, to fight our battles, and deliver us from what you call "abject ſlavery," will ride over us with as little ceremony as Cromwell did over King Charles, the parliament, and the rump.

Before I take my leave of Baxter, permit me to tranſcribe what he ſays concerning the *origin of power*:

I ac-

I accidentally find it in turning over his book for the preceding quotations; and his judgment, which exactly coincides with mine, confirms me, in the sentiments which I have expressed in the beginning of this letter.

Page 41. " For the parliament's cause the principal writing was, *Observations* written by Mr. Parker, a lawyer: but I remember some principles, which, I think he misapplied, viz. That the King is *singulis major*, but *universis minor*, (superior to every one of his subjects, but inferior to the collective body of all;] that he *receiveth his power from the people*, &c. For I doubt not to prove, that his power is so immediately from God, as that there is no recipient between God and him, to convey it to him; only, as the King [by his charter] maketh him a Mayor or Bailiff whom the corporation chuses; So God, [by his law, as an instrument] conveyeth power to that person, or family, whom the people consent to; and their consent is but a *conditio sine qua non*; and not any proof that they are the fountain of power, or that ever the governing power was in them; and therefore, for my part, I am satisfied, that all politics err, who tell us of a *Majestas realis* in the people, as distinct from the *Majestas personalis* in the governors. And though it be true, that *quo ad naturalem bonitatem*, &c. [with respect to natural goodness, &c,] the king is *universi minor* [inferior to the whole body of his subjects]—yet as to *governing power* [which is the thing in question] the king is, as to the people *universis major*, as well as *singulis*,—[superior to the whole body of his subjects, as well as to every one of them] For if the parliament had any legislative power, it cannot be as they are the body of the people, &c. but it is as the constitution twisteth them into the government. For, if once legislation [the chief act of government] be denied to be any part of government at all, and affirmed to belong to the people as such, who are no governors, *all government will thereby be overthrown.*"

If Baxter be right here [and I believe you cannot prove him to be wrong] is it not evident, Sir, that when you

you insinuate, every one, who is a *free agent* or has *a will of his own*, or *boils a pot*, ought to have a place in the legislature, before he can be properly subjected to taxation, and, of consequence, to the laws, you countenance one of the most dangerous principles of the levelling Anabaptists?—a principle *whereby all government may be overthrown* by those, who know how to draw just consequences from false premisses.

To return:

You say, Sir, that your opponent is a slave, because he chearfully submits to taxation without having a direct representative in parliament. But who is the greatest slave; Mr. Wesley, or the tools of lawless patriotism? Have we not seen these dupes turned by their error, not only into despicable slaves, but into a new species of domestic animals? Have we not seen them worked up to such a pitch of delusion, as to refuse, with leonine fierceness, the easy, honourable yoke of their Sovereign's authority, and to account it an honour to take the place of coach-horses, and to draw, with asinine meanness, the chariots of their new triumphators?

What ranks have they regarded, when they have poured themselves along by thousands in our streets? Have they paid any respect to our noblemen? Have they reverenced the king himself? Nay, have they not gloried in their tyrannical contempt of his sceptre and person? Have they not treated him, as a well-bred gentleman would be ashamed to treat his groom? Have they not followed him with scurrilous hissings, when he rode with a pomp becoming the first Legislator in the kingdom? And to add the poignancy of contrast to their serpentine sport, have they not filled the sky with shouts of applause, when they have graced the popular triumphs of his avowed opposers? What press has not groaned under the invectives, which their imperious tribunes have cast upon the legislative power? What periodical paper has not been soiled with the unjust sarcastic blots, which these plebeian dictators have fixed upon the minister who pilots us through the rocks, which they throw in the way of our

our peace and prosperity? Because the parliament would not be carried away by the torrent of their boisterous oratory, has not that venerable body been insulted, hectored, bullied? Have they not attempted to lord it over the King himself? Have they not insisted on his sitting on the throne, that when he appeared in the greatest height of royal dignity, they might appear his superiors, and pour upon his anointed head the indecent floods of their lordly remonstrances? Have they not sharpened their tongues like swords, and their pens like spears, sportively to wound him through the side of his minister? And have not those who have done it with the greatest boldness, been preposterously cried up as the greatest patriots? In short, has not taxing subjects, vindicating the legislative power, protecting our merchants, and making a stand against the impetuous overflowings of popular rage in St. George's fields and in Boston—has not, I say, this commendable holding of the reins of government, been represented as tyranny—felony—robbery—murder?

If these men dare to take such astonishing liberties with their Sovereign, how will they treat their fellow-subjects, how will they handle you and me, should they be suffered to step into the Sovereign's place? If the king in the midst of his guards, can but just keep them from treading his honour in the dust; what will they not be able to do to us, who refuse to *go with them to the same excess of riot?* How shall we escape, if we fall into the power of their guards—their armies of pot-boilers? Those Tritons, who have turned themselves into * *beasts*, to draw the chariots of their semi-

* The servants of God may sometimes be allowed to make use of strong metaphors. David speaks of "the BEASTS of the people," who refuse to bring pieces of silver, or to pay taxes to their lawful Sovereign. And St. Paul says, that he "fought with BEASTS at Ephesus," because he narrowly escaped being torn in pieces by the mob there. If the Reader will see an admirable picture of the beasts, with which the apostle fought, and to which our over-doing patriots endeavour to give the power, I do not refer him so much to Rev. xvii. 13. as to Acts xix. 28, &c. where he will find a masterly description of a mob.

gods,

gods, will probably endeavour to turn us into *birds*, to make us adorn the triumphs of their goddeſſes, *Licentiouſneſs*, and *Antinomian Liberty*; and we ſhall poſſibly think ourſelves well off, if we come out of their hands ſtript of our money, watch, and clothes; and covered with tar, feathers, and infamy.

They have already given us tokens of what we may expect from their lawleſs patriotiſm, ſhould it prevail every where as it has done in ſome places. Not to mention the King's officers, who have eſcaped with the utmoſt danger of their life in Boſton:—not to dwell upon the caſe of Mr. Chriſtie, a rich Britiſh merchant, whom the provincial congreſs of Maryland is reported to have fined and baniſhed for ever, for writing a confidential, guarded letter to a friend, which contained nothing improper:—not to mention, I ſay, theſe, and the like tyrannical proceedings in America; have not thoſe, who live under the immediate protection of the Sovereign in London, felt the iron ſceptre of King mob? Has not that tyrant, who, with his hundred arms, threw our goods into the ſea in ſight of Boſton—has not that many-headed tyrant, I ſay, deſtroyed that part of our houſes in London, which the miſſile implements of impotent rage could break in pieces? And, as if it had not been enough to attack and injure us in our ſhips and * houſes; have

* It is not in London and Boſton only, that this tyrannical ſpirit breaks out. It probably makes its appearance in moſt American cities. Philadelphia is the ſeat of religious liberty and brotherly love no more. Perſecuting tyranny and fierce inſolence, openly patrol in the once free and peaceful city. One of my pariſhioners, who went to ſettle there, ſends his friends word, that the day on which a faſt was kept to obtain ſucceſs upon the arms of the Provincials; his windows were broken by the mob, becauſe his religious principles did not permit him to faſt on ſuch an occaſion, and becauſe he quietly taught his ſcholars to read the ſcriptures. A vociferous mob has no ears, though it has arms and tongues more than enough; or elſe the pacific ſufferer might have made his godly perſecutors aſhamed of their devotions, by ſetting

have they not deprived us of our locomotive liberty? Have they not insolently stopped us in the streets, and on the highway? Have they not taken a temporary possession of our coaches and doors, to mark them with their insulting numbers, and with the names of their principal agents? Have they not wantonly stigmatized our back, and chalked us out for laughing-stocks? Have they not lifted their hands against the peers of the realm? Have they not, without judge or jury, burned one of them in sarcastic effigy? Have they not insulted the prime minister in sight of the senate-house? Have they not mobbed the first magistrate of the city of London in the mansion-house; and almost mobbed the king himself in his own palace? And all this, under pretence of *liberty!* O Sir, if this is the beginning of liberty, how dreadful will be the end! Is not the tyrannical Scylla, upon whom you so eagerly push us, more dreadful than even the Charibdis, from which you fancy we are in so great danger? What unprejudiced citizen would not prefer the light yoke of the present government, to the ponderous yoke of such anarchy? And what undesigning Britons will not [upon second thoughts] chuse to honour King *George*, rather than to tremble and fall down before King *mob?*

Should you do these observations justice, I hope, Sir, you will see, that, to overdo, in *constitutional* doctrines,

---

setting his scholars to read, Is. lviii. 4. "Behold, ye fast for strife and debate, and to smite with the fist of wickedness; ye shall not fast as ye do this day, to make your voice to be heard on high. Is it such a fast that I have chosen?" This text might have suited the solemnity; unless the following had been judged still more proper: "Rebuke the company of the spearmen, the multitude of the bulls, with the calves of the people, till every one submit himself with pieces of silver: scatter thou the people that delight in war," Psal. lxviii. 30. My late parishioner was not the only one, who was injured on that memorable day, among others, a quiet friend who ventured to open his china shop, is said to have his goods broken by the new king for that offence, to the amount of many pounds.

is

is as dangerous to the ſtate as to overdo in *evangelical* doctrines, is perilous to the *church*. If we miſs the medium of wiſdom and moderation, it little matters whether we miſs it, by going out of the way on the right hand, or on the left: it does not ſignify, which of the two we countenance in the church;—Phariſaiſm, or Antinomianiſm: it is indifferent which of the two we ſet up in the ſtate;—an arbitrary king, or an arbitrary mob. Nay, I repeat it; of the two political extremes, the latter is ſo much worſe than the former, as it is more dreadful to be under the dominion of *millions* of lawleſs tyrants, whom you may meet every where, and who inflame, ſkreen, and hide one another; than to be under the dominion of one lawleſs tyrant, who can be but in one place; and who ſtands ſo expoſed to public view, that he cannot, without folly, hope to conceal his enormities.

But thanks be to divine Providence, and to the wiſdom of our anceſtors, our conſtitution (*defective* as you repreſent it) diſplays the happy medium between the high, monarchical extreme; and the high, republican extreme. Hence it is, that our liberties are alternately ſtruck at, on the right hand, by lawleſs kings; and on the left, by lawleſs mobs. But the balance is wiſely kept by the two houſes of parliament, whoſe moſt important and delicate buſineſs is [if I miſtake not] to hinder the ſcale of the king from unconſtitutionally outweighing that of the people, as arbitrary monarchs could wiſh; and to prevent the ſcale of the people from making that of the king kick the beam; as tyrannical mobs deſire. The preſent king follows the laws, as his royal anceſtors have done before him. He takes no capital ſtep without his parliament; and therefore, at preſent, we are under no danger on his ſide. But I cannot ſay this of the people: they are inflamed by deſigning or enthuſiaſtical republicans: they avowedly break the laws: they glory in doing it: they take up arms againſt the King and parliament: they commit outrages. Therefore all our danger is, at preſent, from king *Mob*;

 and

and this danger is ſo much the greater, as *ſome* diſſenters among us, who were quiet in the late reign, and thought themſelves happy under the protection of the toleration-act, grow reſtleſs, begin openly to countenance their diſſatisfied brethren in America, and make it a point of conſcience to foment diviſions in the kingdom. Whether they do it merely from a brotherly regard to the Coloniſts, who chiefly worſhip God according to the diſſenting plan; or whether they hope, that a revolution on the continent, would be naturally productive of a revolution in England; that a revolution in the ſtate here, would draw after it a revolution in the church; and that, if the church of England was once ſhaken, the diſſenting churches among us might raiſe themſelves upon her ruins: whether, I ſay, there is ſomething of this under the cry of *ſlavery* and *robbery* that you ſet up, is a deep queſtion, which you, Sir, and ſome of your *warm* admirers, can determine far better than I.

It is the cuſtom of moſt controvertiſts, to raiſe a variety of objections againſt the ſyſtem of their opponents, whilſt they overlook the greateſt difficulties which attend their own ſyſtem. Leſt you ſhould think, Sir, that I follow this diſingennous method, I will now anſwer the grand queſtion which you propoſe to Mr. Weſley. "If every man who is taxed without his conſent is not a ſlave, wherein conſiſts the difference between ſlavery and liberty?"

If you mean by a ſlave, one who is bought with money, as the Negroes are by the Coloniſts; your queſtion is unwiſe, for every body knows, that ſuch ſlaves, having nothing at all, can never be taxed. When they work, their maſters receive the wages; when they bear children, they bear them for their maſters: their own body is the property of another, Since therefore they have no property, to talk of their being taxed with, or without their conſent, is abſurd.

But if, by a *ſlave*, you mean a ſubject oppreſſed by a tyrannical Sovereign; I reply that the difference between ſuch ſlaves and the ſubjects of Great-

Britain,

Britain, who have no ſhare in the legiſlation, is prodigious. A ſlave [in this ſenſe of the word] is not only taxed as happy ſubjects are; but he is taxed without proportion, without judgment, and without mercy. The taxes laid on him, are ſo many and ſo heavy, that he can hardly bear the burden, ſuppoſing he does not quick ſink under it.—If he diſſents from the eſtabliſhed mode of worſhip, he cannot ſerve God according to his conſcience, without being diſturbed and inſulted by a prophane populace, who are countenanced and encouraged by perſecuting magiſtrates. Nay, it is well, if he is not proſecuted, fined, impriſoned, or put to death.—If he is committed to jail, he can never be bailed out on any occaſion.—If he is ſent to priſon ever ſo unjuſtly, he can recover no damages for falſe impriſonment.—If he is wronged of his property, in a variety of caſes, at the peril of his life, he dares not complain.—If he is maliciouſly robbed of his good name, he cannot recover it by law, together with ſuitable damages.—If his bed is defiled, he can get no ſatisfaction for that capital injury.—His houſe can be forcibly entered into at any time.—He is obliged to work ſo long for the Sovereign gratis, that he cannot mind his own buſineſs.—If he is wantonly ſtruck by a great man, there is no law for him; and the wiſeſt thing which he can do, is to ſay nothing.—If he is murdered, little or no notice is taken of it: a plebeian aſſaſſin can eaſily make his eſcape; and noboby dares proſecute a noble murderer.—If he freely ſpeaks his mind, either upon religious ſubjects, or political affairs, he is ſummoned before an eccleſiaſtical or civil inquiſitor; and it is well if he eſcapes with the reprimand, which a chief magiſtrate in a mild republic gave to a gentleman of my acquaintance, who modeſtly hinted at a method of redreſſing an avowed grievance. "Who has appointed you, Sir, a teacher of your Sovereigns? They know their buſineſs. Learn to know your own."—But what is worſt of all, if he is capitally accuſed, his accuſers are per-

haps his judge and jury. He is put in a dungeon, without knowing why:—his witneſſes are not ſuffered to ſpeak for him:—he is kept ſo long on the rack, that perhaps he is obliged to turn falſe accuſer againſt himſelf. He is tried ſecretly. His fortune, and life, lie poſſibly at the mercy of two or three judges only. Nay, he may fall a ſacrifice to the prejudice, caprice, envy, hatred, or hurry of one ſingle man.—Being tried by his peers, or by twelve of his fellow-citizens is an invaluable bleſſing, of which he has not the leaſt idea.

Not ſo the happy ſubjects of Great Britain. Whether they have a freehold or not, they all enjoy this advantage; and, if the law is put in force, they are partakers of all the branches of religious and civil liberty, which are oppoſed to the above deſcribed branches of hard vaſſalage. And, (what is moſt wonderful) the poor enjoy theſe bleſſings as well as the rich: the plebeian ſhares them with the nobleman. Hence it is, that the ſubjects of Great Britain are the *freeſt ſubjects* of thoſe in any civil government in the world. And hence it appears, that when you aſſert, there is no difference between having no ſhare in legiſlation, and being an abſolute ſlave, you diſplay an amazing anacquaintedneſs with the civil governments of Europe;—you betray an aſtoniſhing want of gratitude to God and the Sovereign, for the religious and civil liberty which we enjoy;—and you verify the obſervation of an ingenious foreigner, who has lately written upon the Britiſh conſtitution, and who ſays, "The bleſſings of liberty are ſo familiar to the Engliſh, that they neither reliſh nor know them. They may, in this reſpect, be compared to the children of princes, who, being born and educated in a palace, are ſo accuſtomed to its elegance and grandeur, and ſo unacquainted with the ſordidneſs of cottages and gloomineſs of dungeons; that they never heighten their happineſs, and excite their gratitude, by comparing the bleſſings they enjoy, with the hardſhips that others endure."

Juſt

Juſt as this compariſon may be with reſpect to you, Sir, it can however hardly ſuit the caſe of many of the Coloniſts. Some of them, alas! know too well what tyranny and cruel ſervitude are. When poor naked, bleeding ſlaves, ready to expire under the repeated ſtrokes of a cutting whip, are obliged to keep in their groans, and to ſtifle their ſighs, for fear of raiſing the cruelty of their tyrants to an higher pich of fierceneſs:—When this is the caſe, I ſay; of all the men upon earth, it leaſt becomes the hard maſters—the domeſtic ſovereigns of theſe poor creatures, to complain of the mild government they are under, and to ſcream tyranny! ſlavery! robbery! murder! And why?—Truly, becauſe ſome of them are enjoined to pay taxes, about thirty times lighter than thoſe which millions of their fellow ſubjects, who have no vote, cheerfully pay in England; becauſe the parliament will not ſuffer them to deſtroy with impunity the property of our merchants; and becauſe the king will not have the collectors of the public revenues to be in continual danger of being murdered among them. O partiality, how high is thy glaring throne; and how many are thy warm votaries in America, and thy ſanguine advocates in England!

I ſhall eſteem myſelf happy, Sir, if this check to licentiouſneſs recommends itſelf to your conſcience as a Proteſtant; and to your candor as a well-wiſher to the cauſe of *true* liberty. Think not that the plainneſs, with which I have addreſſed you, ſprings from malice or diſreſpect. Though I have bluntly attacked your errors, I ſincerely love and honour you as an enemy to tyranny, and a [miſtaken] aſſertor of Britiſh liberty. Therefore whilſt I blame your dangerous performance, I gladly do juſtice to your good meaning; and I cordially join you, where you expreſs a loyal ardent wiſh, that a ſpeedy reconciliation may take place between us and our Colonies, upon an honourable, conſtitutional baſis, and

that

that our beloved ſovereign may long live to ſway the ſceptre over a free people; provided you do not mean by a "*free people*," tumultuous mobbing people, making liberty to conſiſt in refuſing to pay taxes, and in giving to the ſcriptural yoke of civil government, the opprobrious name of "abject ſlavery."

Should you accuſe me, Sir, as you do Mr. Weſley, of "inflaming the minds of the people here againſt our American brethren;" you will do me as much injuſtice as you do to my friend. Our only deſign is to promote a proper obedience to thoſe parts of the goſpel of peace, which enjoins us a due ſubjection to our ſuperiors; and to enforce the articles of religion, which the laſt reformers drew up, to keep overdoing proteſtants from the enthuſiaſm of wild republicans. Far from being prejudiced againſt the Coloniſts, I feel a deep concern for their ſpiritual and temporal welfare. Yea, ſuch is my partiality to them, and my fear of a greater effuſion of the blood of Britons, and ſons of Britons, that I even wiſh the government would make the eaſy yoke, of which they cauſeleſsly complain, eaſier ſtill; by granting them ſome privileges, denied not only to millions of Britons here, but alſo to the members of parliament, and to the king's own brothers, who whilſt they are out of England, are all taxed without being conſulted. I humbly wiſh that our legiſlators would condeſcend to conſult with the Coloniſts, about the taxes which ſuit their country and circumſtances beſt. And as Britiſh ſenators know how to pity the prejudices of mankind, eſpecially the prejudices of ſons of Britons, with reſpect to the precious bleſſing of liberty; I wiſh that the king and parliament would extend their greateſt mercy to ſubjects, who have been hurried out of the way of loyalty, chiefly for their inattention to the bleſſings which they enjoy, and by the deluſive hopes, with which, it is to be feared, ſome of our own countrymen have raſhly flattered and artfully ſeduced them.

them.—In a word, I ardently wiſh, that [upon the return of the Coloniſts to their duty] the government would bind them to their mother-country, both by the ſilken cords of pardoning love, and by the ſilver bands of ſome prerogatives, which may convince them, that Great Britain conſiders them, not only as ſubjects, but alſo as younger brothers.

Such kindneſs, together with the ſcourge of a civil war, which they ſo ſeverely feel already, would probably attach them to the parent ſtate for ever. Should this be the caſe, how great will be the joy of thoſe, who properly value the bleſſings of peace and order! And how full the diſappointment of the demon of diſcord, who envies us the ſingular bleſſings which we enjoy! Great Britain and America will then become the fixed, and unrivalled ſeats of truth, arts, ſcience and commerce. They will collect the treaſures of the Old and New world. They will play in each others hands the wealth of the univerſe. And joined together, they will be more than a match for all their combined enemies. So ſhall genuine proteſtantiſm, ſober liberty, uninterrupted peace, and growing proſperity, conſpire to crown the richeſt Iſland, and the fineſt continent in the world, Happy—for ever happy will they be, if their riches and grandeur do not corrupt and intoxicate them; and if civil and religious frenzy never hinder them more, from paying an humble regard to our Lord's important precept, *Render to Ceſar, the things which are Ceſar's; and to God, the things which are God's.* That you, Sir, I, and all our fellow-labourers in the goſpel, may faithfully practiſe, and zealouſly preach this neglected part of the doctrine of Chriſt;—that our warmeſt zeal for liberty may always be tempered by a due ſenſe of what we owe to our governors;—and that our warmeſt loyalty to the king, may always be attended with a proper conſciouſneſs of what we owe to God, to our fellow-citizens, and to poſterity; are the

Chriſtian

Christian constitutional prayers, which I ardently offer to the King of kings, and in which I invite you to join,

Rev. Sir,

Your affectionate brother,

and obedient Servant,

J. F.

THE END.