

A
L E T T E R

TO THE

Rev. Mr. JOHN WESLEY,

Occasioned by his CALM ADDRESS
to the *American Colonies.*

By CALEB EVANS, M. A. A

Aut ego fallor,

Aut ego laedor.

*Quæ mea culpa tuam; dixit, carissime, mentem
vertit? Ubi est, quæ cura mei prius esse solebat?*

OVID.

Manet imperterritus ille

Hostem magnanimum opperiens, et mole sua stat.

VIRGIL.

A NEW EDITION.

To which are prefixed,

Some Observations on the Rev. Mr. Wesley's late Reply.

L O N D O N:

Printed for EDWARD and CHARLES DILLY, in the
Poultry; and J. ALMON, in Piccadilly, 1775.

[Price Three-pence, or 2s. 6d. a Dozen.]

2 J. A. 1775



A D V E R T I S E M E N T.

THE principal Arguments of Mr. JOHN WESLEY, in his CALM ADDRESS TO OUR AMERICAN COLONIES, are taken *verbatim, without acknowledgment*, from Dr. SAMUEL JOHNSON'S Pamphlet, entitled, TAXATION IS TYRANNY.

The following Extracts from a Pamphlet, entitled, *Free Thoughts on the present State of Public Affairs*, published in 1770, by Mr. JOHN WESLEY, may suffice to shew the Inconsistency of that Gentleman's Character. In Page 1 of that Treatise, he says, "I am no Politician: Politics lie quite out of my Province." And in Page 14, "I do not defend the Measures which have been taken with regard to America: I doubt whether any Man can defend them, either on the Foot of Law, Equity, or Prudence."

How comes Mr. JOHN WESLEY, who was then no Politician, to commence one now? How comes he now, to appear a Defender of such Measures, as he before admitted to be indefensible?





TO THE

R E A D E R.

THE Rev. Mr. *Wesley*, having prefixed to a new edition of his *Calm Address to the Colonies*, some strictures on my letter to him upon that subject; I am obliged to trespass upon your patience, whilst I lay before you a few observations upon this new part of his performance.

Having been publicly accused of the grossest inconsistency in publishing sentiments upon American affairs, diametrically opposite to those he had before openly avowed; and being convicted of the most palpable forgery, in offering to the world, under his own name, and without the slightest acknowledgment, the work of Dr. *Johnson*; he at length owns, that he did once think differently upon the subject, but that a tract, intitled, “*Taxation no Tyranny*,” gave him new light, and that in order to impart this new light to others, he *extracted the chief arguments from that treatise, and added an application to those whom it most concerns*. But how this forced confession acquits Mr. *Wesley* of the most flagrant want of
candor

candor, to say the least, in not telling the world when he *first* published his Address, that he was once of different sentiments, and giving them the reasons of the *surprizing change* that had been wrought in him, I leave you to judge. As also of his *honesty*, in publishing, as *his own*, what he had pilfered from another, without the slightest apology, till his plagiarism was exposed in the public news-papers.

He tells you, my letter to him is wrote in just such a spirit as he expected. I have heard it found fault with, as being much *too mild*, considering the duplicity of the person to whom it was addressed; and I really think a greater degree of poignancy than I have made use of, would have been highly justifiable. Mr. *Wesley* however was not disappointed; and as to my other readers, they will, I hope, forgive me this wrong.—He next exhibits to his readers the *flowers* strewed in my tract, such as *Contemptible sophistry! Fallacious to the last degree! Childish quirks! Pitiful sophisms!*—but has very prudently declined referring his readers to the pages these flowers adorn, because they would then instantly see that they were flowers of Mr. *Wesley's* own cultivation, and only *presented* to him by *Americanus* as his undoubted property. Consult the Letter, gentle Reader, page 7 and 8, and then say whether I have offered the gentleman any flowers that do not belong to him.—He further tells you my tract is also strewed with *strong assertions* and *florid quotations*, but that all the arguments produced in it may be contained in a *nutshell*.—Mr. *Wesley* is surely the last man in the world that should find fault with mere *assertions*, because he has all his life time made use of them instead of arguments; but whether my letter to him contains any one assertion without offering a proof
of

of it, let the candid reader decide for himself:— the letter is before him. As to the florid *quotations*, I certainly might have saved myself the trouble of telling the reader they were quotations. Mr. *Wesley* has a shorter way. Like him, I might have made them *my own words*, and kept my own counsel, and who knows but I might have passed undetected? Or, if detected, how easy would it have been to have replied, I received new light from these authors myself, and therefore extracted their chief arguments, that I might impart the light, I had received, to others. To be sure, if Mr. *Wesley* had recommended *Johnson's* book which had imparted such light to him, or candidly informed his readers upon his *first* publishing his Address, that it was chiefly extracted from *Johnson's* Treatise, this would not have answered the end of imparting light to others! but the *only way* for him to do this was, it seems, to become a barefaced plagiarist himself. A character, by no means new to him. But my name he makes you believe is *legion*. He is informed, he tells you, by a correspondent in Bristol, that my letter was wrote by two ANABAPTIST MINISTERS, assisted by a GENTLEMAN and a TRADESMAN of the Church of *England*. A goodly company! We must have wrote then, I suppose, about a halfpennyworth a-piece: for the whole performance sells for two pence. But, perhaps, you may wonder why he tells you this marvellous tale, supposing it were true. Why the reason is, that he may cry out, *Anabaptist! Anabaptist!* taking it for granted that none of his people will ever dare to look into the performance of an Anabaptist. To save his correspondent in *Bristol* the trouble of sending Mr. *Wesley* any more of this anabaptistical information, I have prefixed my name to the letter I before published under the
signature

signature of *Americanus*: and do assure you, that no gentleman or tradesman of the church of England, or of any other church in the world, furnished me with any single sentiment contained in it, with a view to it's publication. The facts relative to Mr. *Wesley* himself, I had long been possessed of; and should not have wrote at all, as I verily believe, had it not been to expose the shameful versatility and disingenuity of this artful man, and to prevent, as far as I could, the spread of that mischief his performance might otherwise be productive of.

He pretends to give you a *Specimen* of my arguments: with what fairness and integrity he does it, I appeal to the public, at whose tribunal I stand. This writer (*Americanus*) asserts, says Mr. *Wesley*, twenty times, "He that is taxed without his own consent, that is, without being represented, is a slave." Mr. *Wesley* answers, "No; I have no representative in Parliament, but I am taxed; yet I am no slave. Yea, nine in ten throughout England, &c." He (*Americanus*) replies, "but they may have votes if they will, they may purchase freeholds." "What," says Mr. *Wesley*, "can every man in England purchase a freehold! No, not one in a hundred. But be that as it may, they have no vote now. Yet they are no slaves." Such, reader, is the *Specimen* Mr. *Wesley* exhibits of my arguments, and of his decisive answer to them! Methinks, instead of telling his readers they may be all contained in a *nut-shell*, he should rather have said they were nonentities; for, according to his *Specimen* of them, they subsist only *in vacuo*. But if you will be at the pains to review my arguments, you will find that the purport of them is to prove, — that the *non-represented* in England, if possessed of property enough to purchase 40s a year, freehold, may become, if
they

they please, *represented*: or if they do not, that they are nevertheless secure against the abuse of the power of taxation, because those that *tax* must pay the same tax with the *taxed*; and the *represented* share the burden equally with the *non-represented*. BUT (and here the *whole stress* of the argument lies) that none of these circumstances will apply to the case of the Americans, and that no conclusion therefore can be drawn to justify the taxing them without being represented, from the case of the *non-represented* here. — And now, what think you, Reader, of Mr. *Wesley's* Specimen of my arguments? Does it not prove how unjustly I have strewed my Letter to him with the flowers he speaks of? After this proof of *ingenuity* and *candor*, who will ever dare to charge Mr. *Wesley* with making use of *contemptible sophistry*? Who will doubt his *integrity* in doing what he can, to serve, as he expresses it, *his King and Country*? — My florid quotations are treated just as cavalierly as my own *nutshell arguments*. Nor am I a little proud of the honor Mr. *Wesley* has undesignedly done me, by placing my arguments, as a political writer, upon a level with those of such resplendent characters, as a *Montesquieu* and a *Blackstone*. — The celebrated *Montesquieu* is the *fanciful* *Montesquieu*, Mr. *Wesley* tells us; and because he asserts that “all the inhabitants of England 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* ;” he very cunningly infers, that certainly this right belongs then to every *man, woman, and child* in England! — This doubtless, is to prove how scandalous it is to charge Mr. *Wesley* with making use of *childish quibbles*. — How far the Ladies have *really* a *will of their own*, is a point *Mrs. Wesley* can perhaps better determine, than her husband. But that the English Constitution sup-

poses

poses the wills of the *married Ladies*, with respect to PUBLIC affairs at least, pretty much under the influence of their husbands; (or, if the wills of their husbands be under their influence, it comes to the same) will not be denied. And if the Constitution has made no provision for the exercise of the wills of *old maids*, in voting for parliament men, it is, to be sure, a *fundamental defect*; and upon proper application to the legislature from the *Spinners* of Great Britain, would, no doubt, be remedied! — The answer to Judge *Blackstone* is of the same complexion with that to the fanciful *Montesquieu*; and it seems therefore hardly fair not to honor the Judge with an epithet, as well as *Montesquieu*. Judge *Blackstone* says, in the quotation I made from that great man, that “in a *free state*, every man who is supposed to be a *free agent*, ought to be, in some measure, his own governor.” But, says Mr. *Wesley*, “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.” — Well argued indeed! The Sisters of all this gentleman’s societies, will, it is hoped, wait upon him in a body, with Mrs. *Wesley* at their head, to thank him for thus ably supporting the just rights and franchises of *female nature*! As to the *poor*, they owe him but little for what he has done for them, as they already enjoy the privilege of choosing representatives in a much greater proportion than the rich. — The curious observations of this gentleman upon slavery and liberty; his alterations of sentiment respecting the American Charters, since the first publication of his Address; his leaving out in one part of the *new edition* the *falsehood* he had asserted concerning the Massachusetts Charter, and still retaining it in another; with many other curiosities of a similar nature, I must leave to my
Reader’s

Reader's own animadversion : as it would be an almost endless task to expose all the inconsistencies of this motley writer.

The following paragraph is the only remaining one that deserves an answer, and it shall have an effectual and serious one. "The book," says Mr. *Wesley*, "which this writer (*Americanus*) says I so strongly recommended, *I never yet saw with my eyes.*" I reply, the book referred to (see p. 22. of my Letter to Mr. *Wesley*) is intitled, "*An Argument in defence of the exclusive right claimed by the Colonies to tax themselves.*" Now I solemnly declare, this very book was put into *my hands* by a particular friend of mine, as a book Mr. *J. Wesley* had strongly recommended to Mr. *Pine*, one of his own people, upon the subject of American taxation. Mr. *Pine*, (Printer in Wine street *Bristol*) declares, and will make oath if required, that the Rev. *John Wesley*, with *his own hands* put this book into his (Mr. *Pine's*) hands, accompanying it with the strongest recommendations, and requesting him to publish extracts from it, in his *Gazette*, for the information of the public: that in consequence hereof, he (Mr. *Pine*) read this book himself, recommended it as from Mr. *J. Wesley* to many of his friends, and published extracts from it, as desired by Mr. *Wesley*, in his several papers of Sept. 22. 29. and Oct. 6. 1774. and the identical book which he received from Mr. *John Wesley's* own hands, Mr. *Pine* has now in his possession.—The Rev. Mr. *Roquet*, a worthy clergyman of the Church of England, declares, and will make oath if required, that the Rev. *John Wesley* recommended the aforesaid book to him, in consequence of which he purchased and read it; that some time after Mr. *John Wesley* recommended the same book to his brother, the Rev. *Charles Wesley*, at his (Mr. *Roquet's*) house, as a book that would open his eyes,
and

and that in consequence of such recommendation, he (Mr. *Roquet*) immediately produced the said book, and in the presence of the Rev. *John Wesley*, lent it to his brother the Rev. *Charles Wesley*, who took it home with him, and after some time returned it with Mr. *Roquet's* name wrote on the cover in his (Mr. *C. Wesley's*) own hand writing: which identical book is now in my possession, and the title of which exactly corresponds with that which I have given in my Letter to Mr. *John Wesley*.

Mr. *Wesley* further says, “ And the words which he (*Americanus*) says I spoke, never came out of my lips.”—Unless Mr. *Wesley* had more particularly specified the words referred to, it is impossible to give him a direct reply. But that he did speak the *very words* I say he did, in my Letter, or words to that effect, (which was what I affirmed) I do now again aver, upon the *same authority* as I had for asserting that he *recommended* the book which he says he never yet saw with his eyes.—Mr. *Wesley* says, he *really believes* I was *told so*, and thereby acquits me of inventing a tale to asperse his character. But to stand acquitted to him is nothing. It is incumbent upon me to acquit myself and my friends to the public: which I think I have now done; or, if not, am ready, when called upon, yet further to do.

How far these things may give Mr. *Wesley* more light, I cannot say: but if they do not give the public *more light* into his real character, I can only add

Si populus vult decipi, decipiatur.

If the people *will* be deceived, let them be deceived.

BRISTOL,
November 7, 1775.



A L E T T E R

To the Rev. Mr. *JOHN WESLEY.*

REV. SIR,

THE grand question which is now debated, as you justly observe, is this, “Has the English Parliament power to tax the American Colonies? Or rather, has it a *right* to tax the Colonies—for with respect to the *POWER* *judicis est.* Your answer to this question is very extraordinary, indeed; for you not only tell us “that the English Parliament has an *undoubted right to tax all the English colonies,*” (p. 1., of your address) but roundly assert, (p. 21.) that every Sovereign under heaven has a right to tax his subjects, that is, to grant their property, with or *without their consent.*” Which you seem to think you sufficiently explain, by adding, “Our Sovereign has a right to tax me, and all other Englishmen, whether we have votes for Parliament-men or no.”

And can you then mean it, Sir, as any thing but an insult to put such a question to the Americans, as you do (p. 22.) “Am I, or two millions of Englishmen made slaves because we are taxed, *without our own consent?*” Yes, Sir, if you *are* taxed without your own consent, you are slaves. If every man that is taxed *without*

his own consent, is not a slave, wherein consists the difference betwixt slavery and liberty? You say to the Americans, (p. 16.) “What civil liberty can you desire, which you are not already possessed of? Do not you sit, without restraint, every man under his own vine? Do you not, every one, high or low, enjoy the fruit of your labour?” But pray, Sir, how can it be his *own vine*, when another claims a right of taking it from him *without his consent*? Or what man can be assured of enjoying the fruits of his labour, if liable, under the colour of right, to be deprived of it, *without his consent*? *What property have we*, says the immortal LOCKE, *in that which another may by right take when he pleases to himself*? If this be not the very quintessence of slavery, what is?

He must, however, be extremely ignorant of the nature of the English Constitution, who does not know, that the *granting our own property*, and not having it disposed of without our consent, is considered as the very Soul and vital Spirit of it, the grand palladium of British Liberty, and the bulwark of freedom.

“*Spiritus intus alit, totamque infusa per artus*
 “*Mens agitat molem, et magno se corpore miscet.*”

I am sure, Sir, you need not be informed that in *England* the King or *Sovereign* has nothing to do, strictly speaking, in the matter of taxing his subjects; nor the nobility; but *the people alone*, the *Commons*, the representatives of the people; who have ever been so jealous of this fundamental privilege, that no money bills are ever suffered to originate but from themselves, and when framed are never permitted to pass under the least alteration. And it is this power of *the people* which, in our well-balanced constitution, serves as an equipoise
 to

to that power which is lodged in the other branches of the legislature.

“Were the *executive power*, that is the Sovereign, to determine the raising of public money, says the celebrated *Montesquieu*, otherwise than by giving its consent, (and surely you will not call this a *power of taxing*) LIBERTY would be at an end.”—*Spirit of Laws*, B. II. C. 6.

“Taxation and Representation (says that able Lawyer and truly great man, Lord *Camden*, in his Speech on that Subject) are inseparably united. GOD hath joined them: no British Parliament can separate them: to endeavour to do it, is to stab our vitals.—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 laws of nature; it is more, it is itself an eternal law of nature: for whatever is a man’s own, is absolutely his own; no man hath a right to take it from him without his consent either expressed by himself or his representative; whoever attempts to do it, attempts an *injury*; whoever does it, commits a ROBBERY; he throws down the distinction between LIBERTY and SLAVERY. Taxation and Representation are coeval with, and essential to, this Constitution.” Did this doctrine stand in need of formal proof, it were easy to refer you to a variety of ancient Statutes, which in the most express terms recognize this great principle of the Constitution. In the time of Edward I. 1297, a Statute was made to confirm the great charter, in which it is expressly declared that “*Aids granted to the King shall not be taken for a custom, and shall not be raised BUT BY CONSENT.*” And in the year 1306 — That “*The King or his heirs shall have no aid, without consent of Parliament,*” and

that “ *nothing shall be purveyed to the King’s use, WITHOUT THE OWNER’S CONSENT.*” But you are no stranger, Sir, to these and many other authorities of a like nature, having seen and read them in a performance you once admired, however you must now be supposed to despise it. “ *When the Parliament laid a tax upon the Palatinate of Chester, says Lord Camden in the speech before referred to, and ordered commissioners to collect it there, as commissioners were ordered to collect it in other counties, the Palatinate refused to comply. They addressed the King by petition, setting forth, that the English Parliament had no right to tax them; that they had a Parliament of their own; that they had always taxed themselves, and therefore desired the King to order his commissioners not to proceed. The King received the petition, and he did not declare them either rebellious or seditious, but allowed them their plea, and they taxed themselves. You may see both the petition and the King’s answer in the Records in the Tower.*” “ *There is not, says the same truly noble Peer, a blade of grass, in the most obscure corner of the kingdom, which is not, which was not ever represented, since the constitution began: there is not a blade of grass, which, when taxed, was not taxed by the consent of the proprietor.*”

To overturn all this reasoning, you tell us that you have no freehold, and consequently no vote for a parliament-man; that multitudes besides, are in the same situation; from whence you infer that the Sovereign (and it matters not what meaning you are pleased to affix to this word) has a right to tax his subjects with or without their consent. See p. 21, of your Address.—And can you, Sir, consider this as solid argument,

argument ; would not you yourself, in any other case, look upon it as the most contemptible sophistry ?

Whether you have or have not a freehold, you must either be able to purchase one if you chuse it, or else your property must be so small that it can be of no consequence to you who has the granting it ; especially as they cannot, you know, give away any of your money without at the same time giving much more of their own. Forty shillings a year freehold give an Englishman a voice in the legislature of his country ; and in many parts of the kingdom this privilege is extended to every freeman of a corporate town, to every one that pays the rates to King and poor, and in not a few boroughs to every one that boils a pot. Can it then be pretended with any colour of justice or reason, that in England the Sovereign hath a right to tax his subjects *without their consent*, when it is so glaringly evident that there is not a man in England who is able to boil a pot in ever so despicable a hovel, but may, if he pleases, have a voice in the disposal of his property ? Suppose there were ever so many millions of Englishmen who undervalued their birthright, and did not think it worth their while to exercise it, yet still the right itself would exist, nor could it be said they were taxed *without their consent*, since by not exerting the power the constitution gave them of dissenting, had they been so disposed, they implicitly and to all intents and purposes gave their consent. And to keep up this power in its full vigour, and to transmit it, unimpaired, from generation to generation, you well know, Sir, that parliaments were originally never chosen for more than *one year*, at the expiration of which

term, the people again exercised their right of election, and thereby made it as clearly appear to be *true*, as you are pleased peremptorily to assert (p. 5.) it is *absolutely false*, that "every freeman is governed by laws to which he has consented." It is therefore fallacious to the last degree, and unworthy of a man of integrity and candour, to insinuate, as you are pleased to do, (p. 7.) that the people have "*ceded* to the King and Parliament the power of disposing *without their consent*, of both their lives, liberties, and properties." How is it *without their consent*, when they retain their place in the legislature by their representatives, and no act of Parliament is passed but *with their consent*? By the like mode of reasoning you undertake to prove, (p. 6.) that "when the electors are nearly equally divided, almost half of them must be governed not only *without* but even *against their own consent*." According to which every act of Parliament that meets with any opposition, should not be called an act of *Parliament*, but only an act of *part* of the Parliament, since it was *against the consent* of many of the Members of Parliament. As if every man did not know, that in all collective bodies, the determinations of the *majority* of that body are always considered as the determinations of the *whole body*; and that every man who enters into society implicitly *consents* that it should be so. You may call these childish quirks, Sir, *arguments*; I call them, and so, I believe, will every impartial person call them, mere quibbles. But possibly you think to evade the force of criticism, by what you afterwards observe, (speaking of an implicit *passive* consent to laws made before we were born), namely, "that *any other than this kind of consent*, the condition of civil life does

does not allow." But if it allows of any *kind of consent*, why talk of our being taxed, *without our consent*, and *against our consent*; unless it be with an artful design to enflame your readers' minds against the Americans, because they object to having their money disposed of *without their own consent*, that is, without the consent of their representatives in their provincial Assemblies?

"ALL THE INHABITANTS of the several districts ought to have, says *Montesquieu* speaking of the English Constitution, a right of voting at the election of a Representative, excepting such as are in so mean a situation as to be deemed to have no will of their own."—The *Commons*, says Judge *Blackstone*, in his *Commentaries on the Laws of England*, B. 1. P. 158. consist of *all such men of any property in the kingdom, as have not Seats in the House of Lords*; EVERY ONE of which has a voice in Parliament, either personally or by his representative. In a *free State*, EVERY MAN who is supposed a free agent, ought to be in some measure *his own governor*; and therefore a branch at least of the legislative power should reside in the *whole body of the people*. And this power, when the territories of the state are small and its citizens easily known, should be exercised by the people in their aggregate or collective capacity. But in so large a state as ours is, this would be impossible; it is therefore very wisely contrived, that *the people should do that, by their representatives*, which it is impracticable to perform in person.

But so low are your ideas of the power of *the people*, that you challenge any man living (p. 24.) to produce any instance in all history, wherein *the people* gave the sovereign power to any one, except to *Massaniello of Naples*; and I know of

no reason for your excepting him, unless it was to render, as you might think, the old Whig doctrine of the *Origin of power* being from the people, the more ridiculous. However, in return to your challenge I ask you, Sir, from whence any Sovereign ever received his power or could receive it, but from the people? Except you will come boldly forth and avow the old *jure-divino* doctrine; in which case we shall expect to see the CHARTER of Tyranny under the broad seal of heaven, and to have the miracles wrought in confirmation of its divine original well authenticated. You will not fail at the same time to favour us with the consequences of this doctrine, and to point out to us the man who is OUR KING *de jure*, whoever may be considered as our King *de facto*. Till this is done we shall still consider the *origin of all power*, under God, to be the people, unless you will undertake to shew that one man has more power than a thousand men, and is able to govern them without their own consent, either expressed or implied. What is it, Sir, but a pitiful sophism to deny that any Sovereign, but poor *Massaniello*, ever received his power from the people, because you know of no other instance in which all the people of any particular state or kingdom met together and formally conferred the Sovereign power upon any one. What if only fifty, or twenty of the Electors of the city of Bristol had thought proper to have appeared, and actually given their votes for Members of Parliament at the last Election; would not the rest, by not voting, when they might have done it, be considered as having implicitly consented to the choice made by those who actually did vote? And so in every change of government, the REVOLUTION particularly; was it not the people that, under God,

God, transferred the Sovereign power from King James, to that glorious patron of British liberty, King WILLIAM. The many that were inactive at that juncture, implicitly, or *passively* (if you like that word better) united with those that were active, in bringing about that important event. And however you may play upon the words, and call the use of them “*political cant* ;” *the people, and the people only, are the source of power* ; and when Dr. Smith, in his sermon, (p. 31.) talks therefore of the people’s *resuming* the power into their own hands when not exercised for the common safety, he does not talk of their *resuming*, as you suggest (p. 23.) what they *never had* ; but what they *always had*, and necessarily had, and which no Sovereign on earth could have but by *their consent*. The *army* with us, is a part of *the people*, raised from amongst them, clothed, fed, and paid by them. In the case of *William the Conqueror*, the *Norman people* it is true, were too powerful for the *Saxon or English people*, but how this proves that no Sovereign but *Massaniello* ever received his power from *the people*, you have not yet shewn us. I shall therefore still consider *the people* as the *origin of power*, notwithstanding all you have said to the contrary, both in your present Address to the Colonies, and in your little piece on the *Origin of Power*, published some years ago ; in which, as I remember, under an artful disguise, you have revived the good old Jacobite doctrines of *hereditary, indefeasible, divine right*, and of *passive obedience and non-resistance*.

And as the origin of power is from the people, so no fact can be plainer than that the people of this country never parted with the power of disposing of their own money, but always retained this privilege as a pledge of their constitutional

tionali

tional freedom, and a glorious mark of their distinction from the subjects of an arbitrary government, who not having the disposal of their own money, can be considered in no other light than that of slaves.

And why should we even *wish* to deprive of this privilege, our fellow-subjects in *America*? You yourself acknowledge, that the Colonists have not *forfeited* any of their privileges by emigration; but the sum of your argument, to prove the right of the British Parliament to tax them, is this. The Americans by crossing the sea, have rendered the *exercise* of their right of voting in the Election of Members of Parliament (supposing they had such a right before their emigration) *no longer possible*: but “they have not by abandoning their right in one legislature acquired a right to constitute another; any more than the multitudes in England who have no votes, have a right to erect a parliament for themselves:” they are therefore reduced (this you intimate is the only consequence) from the condition of voters to that of the innumerable multitude here in England who have no votes. See pages 8, 9, 10, of your Address. This is your argument, let us weigh it in the balance of sound impartial reason.

If the Americans by crossing the sea have rendered it *no longer possible* for them to have the disposal of their own money, you cannot surely represent their case as being parallel to that of those in England who have no votes; it is *fundamentally* different. In *England*, though the people are by no means *equally* represented, which is an acknowledged defect in the constitution; yet *every man* that has almost any degree of property *may* acquire a voice in the legislature if he pleases; and if he does not, he *consents* in

fact to what is done by others, and cannot therefore with any propriety be said to have his property disposed of *without his consent*, for he really gives consent. What could he do more if there were a thousand new Parliaments constituted? And he may the more easily be satisfied with *this mode of consenting* to the disposal of his property; because he has always this security, that those who take an *active* part in the disposal of his property, must at the same time dispose of an equal proportion of their own. But not so with the American. If he has, not forty shillings a year, but forty pounds, or forty thousand pounds a year—yet still, if the British Parliament claim the power of taxing him, he can have NO VOICE in the disposal of his property, and which is still worse, those who are to have the power of disposing of it, 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. If the Americans, Sir, are indeed subject to such a power as this, their condition differs not from that of the most *abject slaves* in the universe. If their property may be disposed of *without their consent*, it matters not who disposes of it—the Great MOGUL—the *Grand Monarque*—or the *British Parliament*—they have no longer any property they can call *their own*, they are SLAVES, and the whole of their property lies at the mercy of those who rule over them.

And is this, Sir, a *necessary consequence* of their becoming Colonists? And did they fly from persecution here, brave the terrors of the seas, and transplant themselves into an American wilderness, to obtain the poor consolation of being *necessarily* involved in slavery, from the very circumstances of their situation? Who

can

can soberly entertain such a thought? No, Sir, their support under all the fatigues they bore, was the hope of enjoying unmolested the sweets of liberty, or, as you express it, of *sitting every man under his own vine.* “They left their native country, says Mr. Hutchinson, with the strongest assurances, that they and their posterity, should enjoy the privileges of free and natural-born English subjects.” “The Americans,” as Lord Chatham expresses it, “are the SONS, not the BASTARDS, of England.” “The forefathers of the Americans, to use the words of Lord Camden, did not leave their native country, and subject themselves to every danger and distress, to be reduced to a state of SLAVERY. They did not give up their rights: they looked for protection, not for CHAINS from their Mother Country.”

But you insist upon it, that by crossing the sea, though they did not *give up* nor *forfeit* any of their rights, they rendered the exercise of some of them *no longer possible.* True, it is *no longer possible*, that they should vote for Members of the British Parliament; consequently *no longer possible* they should be *represented* in the British Parliament, and therefore *no longer possible*—that the British Parliament should dispose of their property, *without their consent*, by their own representatives in their respective houses of assembly,—without involving them in *absolute slavery.*

And *must* they be SLAVES? is it *no longer possible* that they should exercise the right of FREEMEN, that they should have Parliaments or Assemblies of their own, and grant their own money by their representatives as we do by ours here; because the Atlantic ocean rolls betwixt us and them? You say, they have no right to
constitute.

constitute another legislature; but why then were they from the very beginning of their existence permitted to form a legislative body, the *effigies parva*, as Mr. *Hutchinson* styles it, of the mother state? “The COMMONS of *America*, Sir, represented in their several assemblies, (to use the expressions of Lord *Chatham*) have ever been in possession of the exercise of this their constitutional right, of giving and granting their OWN MONEY. They would have been SLAVES if they had not enjoyed it. The idea of a virtual representation of *America* in this house, (says his Lordship, who was then a Commoner) is the most contemptible idea that ever entered into the head of man. It does not deserve a serious refutation.”

But if the Colonists contend for the exercise of this right of granting their own money, you assert (p. 20.) in your usual dogmatic style, “they contend for neither more nor less than independency.” And immediately add, “Why then do they talk of their *rightful Sovereign*? They acknowledge no Sovereign at all.” To which I answer, in the words of the judicious and truly dispassionate author of *An Argument in Defence of the Colonies*, &c. p. 112.

“We need not, says this author, go so far back as the act of union to find a people that will not allow the *supreme legislature* of *Great Britain*, to alter a *single letter* in a law to tax them; and yet are no more independent than the people of the Colonies. IRELAND is subject to the same Sovereign as *America*. The people in *Ireland* choose their own representatives, so do the people in the Colonies. The people in *Ireland* are taxed by their own representatives, so have the people in the Colonies been ever since their first settlement. The crown appoints the
Lord

Lord Lieutenant of *Ireland*—the crown appoints the Governors of the Colonies. The Lord Lieutenant calls the meeting of the legislative body in *Ireland*. In the Colonies, the Governor calls an Assembly when he thinks proper, and adjourns, prorogues and dissolves it at his pleasure. The Irish Acts, are sent over to be allowed (not by the British Parliament, but) *by the crown*. The acts of the Colonies are the same. The representatives chosen by the people of *Ireland*, will suffer no duties to be collected from the people, but such as they grant themselves. And the representatives chosen by the people in the Colonies *claim the same right.*"

Why then do you not ask the Irish, "Why they talk of their rightful Sovereign," and tell them "they acknowledge no sovereign at all"—because they claim a right of granting their own money? Your argument holds as good with respect to *Ireland*, as ever it can with respect to the Colonies: and why the *Colonists* should not be permitted to have the disposal of their own money as well as the *Irish* of theirs, without supposing they contend for *independency*, (which they solemnly disclaim) and without being told they acknowledge *no Sovereign at all*; I am sure it is past the art even of Mr. *Wesley's* logic to shew us: As much as it is for the Middlesex Justices (see their late curious Address,) to shew us how the Colonies are courting the King *to accept of ABSOLUTE POWER*, by claiming it as their undoubted right to dispose of their own property by their own representatives. These Justices seem to have mistaken the claims of the Colonies, for the powers *actually granted and accepted* by the *Quebec Bill*.

But you intimate to us, that the Colonists have *implicitly engaged* to submit to the taxation of
the

the British Parliament, by the very letter as well as spirit of their *charters*. But how does this appear; The Colonists with one voice declare the contrary, in the most express and solemn manner. And Mr. *Hutchinson*, one of their late Governors, (who will not be suspected of partiality to them,) declares, as I have before observed (see the preface to his history of *Massachusetts-Bay*, published 1760.) “*They left their native country with the STRONGEST ASSURANCES that they and THEIR POSTERITY should enjoy the privileges of free and natural born English subjects.*” But how could they enjoy these privileges, if the first and fairest of them all, the right of *granting their own money*, was to be no longer enjoyed by them? How could they enjoy the privileges of Englishmen, if by their charters they were to be slaves? How could they enjoy the privilege of *freedom*, if from the very nature of *subordinate government*, as you suggest, p. 11, they are necessarily involved in slavery?

“The charter of *Pennsylvania*, you tell us, has a clause admitting in express terms, taxation by Parliament. And, if such a clause be not inserted in other charters, it must be omitted, you observe, as not necessary; because it is manifestly implied in the very nature of subordinate government: all countries which are subject to laws, being liable to taxes.” (To make your argument hold good here, you should have added, *without representatives*: for the Colonists have *always* been taxed, only it has been by *their* representatives.)

“It is true, you further observe, the first settlers in *Massachusetts-Bay*, were promised an *exemption from taxes for seven years*. But, say you immediately,

immediately, does not this very exemption imply, that they were to pay them afterwards?"

To all this I reply, that as to the exemption from *taxes* for seven years promised to the Massachusetts colony, I am credibly informed: it has no reference at all to what we commonly mean by *taxes*, but *quit-rents* for the land occupied by them; an exemption from the payment of which for a certain number of years is commonly granted to the first settlers in every new colony. Were we to suppose it to refer to an exemption from parliamentary taxation, we might well ask you, Sir, upon your own principles, what right had *the King* to promise by Charter, that *the Parliament* should not tax them for seven years? If, as you say, the Parliament always had this power of taxation over the Colonies, *the King* could not promise any more than you or I could, that the Parliament should not exercise this power for seven years.—And with respect to *Pennsylvania*, whatever construction the clause you refer to may bear, that it was *never understood* to mean what you suppose, 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, is evident from this simple fact: *No such taxation was imposed upon the Colonies till the fatal æra of the stamp-act; and it was then universally reprobated by the Colonists as an innovation and a fundamental breach of their chartered, as well as inherent rights.*

And may we not ask with wonder, If Parliament always possessed this power of taxing the Colonies, or however judged it consistent with the spirit of the English Constitution to exercise this power, why did they uniformly through a course of perhaps one hundred and fifty years, permit the Colonists to tax themselves, by their

OWN

own Representatives, in their own Assemblies? And having been so long *in possession* of this right of granting their own money, have they ever forfeited it by an abuse of it? Not surely in the late war; for though this war was *not undertaken*, as you assert, on their account but in defence of the new plantation of *Nova-Scotia*; (the inhabitants of which have no concern in the present dispute,) yet it is well known to all the world, that the Colonists exerted themselves in this war even *beyond their power*, so that the King and Parliament judged it reasonable to make **LARGE REIMBURSEMENTS** to them at the close of the war. “They themselves, as *Dr. Smith* expresses it in his truly patriotic Sermon; (p. 201) testified on our behalf, that in all things we not only did our part but *more* than our part for the common good, and they dismissed us home loaded with silver and with gold, in recompence for our extraordinary services.” A fact this, which ministerial writers *never attend to*, but *cannot deny*. And yet you are pleased to talk of the *Mother Country’s* desiring to be *reimbursed* for some part of the large expence she had been at in the late war, and that to this end she laid a small tax on one of her colonies.” I wish Sir, you would discover more fairness and ingenuity in your representations.

Besides, do we not possess a **MONOPOLY** of the American trade; and is there not hereby an *immense revenue* secured to us? “When I had the honor of serving his Majesty, (says Mr. Pitt, now Lord Chatham,) I availed myself of the means of information which I derived from my office: I **SPEAK THEREFORE FROM KNOWLEDGE**. My materials were good. I was at pains to *collect*, to *digest*, to *consider* them; and I will be bold to affirm, that the profit to Great-Britain from the trade of the Colonies, through
all

all its branches, is TWO MILLIONS A YEAR. This is the fund that carried you triumphantly through the last war. The estates that were rented at two thousand pounds a year, threescore years ago, are at three thousand pounds at present. Those estates sold then from fifteen to eighteen years purchase; the same may be sold now for thirty. YOU OWE THIS TO AMERICA. THIS IS THE PRICE AMERICA PAYS YOU FOR HER PROTECTION.

Upon the whole, Sir, I cannot express my sentiments on this subject more fully, or more decisively, than in the words of the author of "The Defence of the Colonies," &c. before quoted, which are (p. 91, 92.) as follows.

"If the people in America are *taxed* and not *represented*, their rights as subjects under the English constitution are as clearly invaded as they were in the case of the *ship-money*; and the province of *Massachusetts-Bay* now stands in the same situation, in behalf of the rights of the people of *America*, as Mr. *John Hamden* did for all the people of England in the last century. I am as much for the obedience of the people in America, as I can be against their illegal oppression. I would wish to be as far from wilfully shutting my eyes, and thinking all the people of the colonies faultless, as I would be to give up my reason, and believe those *incapable of mistake*, who exclaim so much against them. I am equally afraid of being misled in the mists that are raised by violence or interest on either side of the question. I contend not for men's prejudices. It is the rights only of my fellow-subjects in *America* that I mean to defend: and those rights, not such as are of vague and uncertain interpretation, but such as the English constitution makes the *unalterable property* of every man that lives

lives under the protection of its laws. And if the people of *England, Scotland, Ireland, or America* are ever to be taxed *without* having, or the possibility of having, *any choice* in those that impose the taxes upon them, they are no longer the subjects, but the *slaves* of government. Our constitution as established by the laws, is utterly repugnant to every attempt to divide the *right of taxation* from the *privilege of representation*. And could any pretence ever justify the separation of those rights with *a part of the subjects*, the same reasons would hold good *with the whole*. These rights are so essential to our constitution, that they make a part of the rules, by which the *legislature itself is bound* to walk. And it can no more take away the provision, the constitution has made for the security of **THE PEOPLE'S PROPERTY**, than it can **THE PRIVILEGES OF THE PEERS**, or **THE KNOWN PREROGATIVE OF THE CROWN.**"

Your account of the **ORIGINAL CAUSE** of all our disputes and disturbances about American affairs, is curious.

You tell us with a grave face that *you make no doubt* (p. 14.) but that *a few men in England*, who are determined enemies to monarchy, are the *original cause* of the present breach between England and her Colonies. That these good men *cordially hate* the King, at least his office; and are in hopes of overturning the government, and erecting their grand idol, their dear commonwealth, upon the ruins of it. You doubt (p. 18.) whether any of the *Americans* are in the secret. The designing men, the *Abitophels* are in England."

But the Americans, Sir, if we may judge of their dispositions, by that of the *Pennsylvanian Farmer*, will not thank you for your compliment. "It has been said in Great-Britain," says this *Cato of America*, (see his Essay, p. 26.) "that Lord
Chatham

Chatlam, Lord *Camden*, and some other great men have taught the colonies to despise her authority. But it is as little true, as the multitude of invectives vented against the colonies. The constant practice in these publications, is to confound facts and dates, and then to rail. It should be remembered, that the opposition in America to the stamp-act was *fully formed*, and the congress held at *New-York*; before it was known on the Continent, that our cause was espoused by ANY MAN OF NOTE at home."

The opposition to the measures of the ministry respecting America, you will have it, however, is owing to these bad men, these *King-baters* you are so intimate with. For it seems; though they have let but *few* into the secret, the Rev. Mr. *Wesley* is one of that chosen few. Well; Sir, this serves to explain a matter which, I assure you, till now, puzzled me not a little.

All the world knows, that in your "*Free Thoughts on Public Affairs*," published 1770, you were pleased to say, (p. 14.) "*I do not defend the measures taken with regard to AMERICA, I doubt whether ANY MAN can defend them, either on the foot of LAW, EQUITY, or PRUDENCE.*" And it is well known, that you recommended the book I have repeatedly quoted in this letter, intitled; "*An Argument in defence of the exclusive right claimed by the colonies to tax themselves,*" as a performance that would convince any impartial person of the justice of the American cause. It is moreover well known, that at the time of our late election, and many times since, you expressed yourself very warmly in different companies, and upon different occasions, in favour of the Americans, affirming that they were, in your opinion, an "*oppressed, injured people;*" that if they submitted to taxation by our Parliament, they "*must*
be

be either FOOLS or KNAVES;" that they would then be *enslaved*, and if they were once enslaved, *Ireland* would follow next, and then *England*. That you wished well to our late American candidate, *because he was a friend to America*; and when addressing the electors of your own society, told them, with no small degree of vehemence, that now was the time for them to exert themselves if they wished to continue a free people; or words to that effect. — Now really, Sir, I thought you had been *in earnest*, and meant as you said, when you expressed yourself in this manner, and have taken pleasure in assuring many persons who were not over-well affected to you, that you was a hearty friend to civil and religious liberty. I beg pardon for misrepresenting you, Sir. I perceive now, that all your design was to get into the confidence of these bad men, these *King-haters* you talk of, and so by a *pious fraud* to blow up their abominable schemes. I perceive now, that, when you said the *Americans* were an *oppressed and injured people*, you meant the very reverse. When you said, that, if they submitted to parliamentary taxation, they would be *enslaved*, and must be either *fools* or *knaves*, you meant no such thing; but that "they would still have *all the liberty* they could desire, and might still rejoice in the common rights of FREEMEN (p. 16, and 22, of your Address) and sit without restraint, *every man under his own vine*." — And yet perhaps, I am still mistaken in your meaning; for your next publication may be as much in *favour* of the Americans as the present is against them, and possibly you may disclose to our view *another set of Mitophels*, who are plotting the destruction of the present royal family, by first endeavouring to push on the ministry to the exercise of arbitrary power, and when it is become indifferent to the people what King rules over them, then, by the revival

B of

of the good old doctrine of *hereditary indefeasible* right, making a grand effort for the restoration of the banished family of the STUARTS, of *blessed memory*.

Quo teneam vultus mutantem Protea nodo?

For my own part, I am in no secret. I love, I honor the King, have been taught from my very infancy to venerate him almost to idolatry, and am ready cheerfully to sacrifice my fortune and my life, in defence of his Royal Person, and the Constitution, of which he is the guardian. I love and honor *all good men*, all men of real principle and INTEGRITY, however they may differ from me in political or religious sentiments; nor can any wish glow in my heart more fervently, than that which I have long panted to see accomplished, which is — That a permanent peace and reconciliation may speedily take place betwixt us and our American Colonies, upon an honorable, constitutional basis; and that our beloved Sovereign GEORGE the Third, may long live to sway the sceptre over an *united, harmonious, free* people.

Hoping, Sir, for the sake of the multitudes that follow you, that you will be more *steady and consistent* as a *Divine*, than, I am sure, you are as a *Politician*; and that, when you publish again upon politics, you will not, under the idea of a *Calm Address to the Colonies*, (the inhabitants of which will probably *never see* your Address,) endeavour to inflame the minds of the people here against their American Brethren; (already sufficiently exposed, surely, to the resentment of their Rulers,) but that you will write in a strain more becoming a minister of the Prince of PEACE, — I subscribe myself,

Reverend Sir, your sincere Well wisher,

And humble Servant,

BRISTOL,
Oct. 2. 1775.

CALEB EVANS.