

FALLACY DETECTED:

I N A

L E T T E R

T O T H E

Rev. Mr. *J O H N W E S L E Y*,

M A S T E R O F A R T S.

W H E R E I N H I S

“Free Thoughts on the State of Public Affairs,”

A N D H I S

“Calm Address to the AMERICANS,”

Are considered and compared.

Simulata Innocentia non est Innocentia; simulata Æquitas non est Æquitas; sed duplicatur Peccatum, in quo est Iniquitas et Simulatio. ST. AUGUSTINE.

And he said, I will go forth, and I will be a lying Spirit in the Mouth of all his Prophets. 1 Kings xxii. 22.

Printed in the Year MDCCLXXV.

[Price S I X - P E N C E.]

ERRATA.—In p. 11, l. 11, for people, read p—t. p. 13, last l. for encomiums, read encomium. p. 19, l. 15, for where, read when. p. 21, l. 12, for awakened, read darkened; l. 14, for heart, read art. p. 22, l. 2, for their, read these. p. 23. l. 2, for easily, read really; l. 12, for disorders. read disorder, and for cause, read cure; l. 19, for oppressor, read oppressors. p. 25, l. 21, for salve, read salvo. p. 27. l. 21, for on, read or. p. 31, l. 23, for readily, read needs. p. 32, l. 8, for a parallel to the cause, read parallel to the case; l. 12, for treachery, read treacheries. p. 38, l. 16, for exemply, read exemplify. p. 40, l. 12, for these, read those; l. 17, for pamphlet, read pamphlets.

FALLACY DETECTED:

I N A

L E T T E R

T O T H E

Rev. Mr. JOHN WESLEY, *Master of Arts.*

Reverend Sir,

YOUR many dark insinuations, and bitter reflections on several respectable characters, may, I hope, warrant any instances of freedom of speech, that may appear in the following pages; wherein the writer would not be understood to oppose his understanding against yours—No, perhaps he would rather decline the unequal match: I only mean to oppose common sense and honesty against your fallacy and false colouring; for what you publish under the notion of *Free Thoughts*, seems to me rather what you artfully endeavour to make others think, than the real thoughts of a man of your abilities.

Your *Calm Address* I look upon in the same light, having moreover this disadvantage, that it stands condemned in your own writings. Both pieces, however, are manifestly

nifestly calculated for the twofold purpose of discrediting the advocates of the people, on the one hand — and “varnishing over the guilt of faithless men,” on the other.

Your *Calm Address to the Americans* appears, in general, to be part the second to your (pretended) *Free Thoughts*, as it enforces the same kind of principles, and breathes the same spirit.

To begin with the first — You declare the present state of public affairs to be a subject both dangerous and mysterious; and yet you, who profess yourself so very ignorant of the matter, seem to treat it with a good deal of freedom. You have taken, indeed, the safe side of the hedge yourself; and therefore may I not suppose, that the seeming apprehensions, in your title-page and elsewhere, must be intended as a bugbear to others, and that you envelope the plainest facts in a formidable secrecy, in order to prepare the way for your bubbles and impositions. “Actions and springs of action, persons and things,” on one side the question, you touch with the utmost tenderness; but spare not the worst imputations and rudest treatment on the other. — That there may be some hidden works of darkness on the side of government, you seem to allow, page 4; but the bringing them to light you very decently put off till doomsday.

In

In what a disingenuous manner do you state the cause of the people's complaints! what a mere machine is your correspondent, over whom you have the same command that a showman has of his puppets, and can make him say just what you please. In p. 4 and 5, you make him talk like a fool at first setting out, that you may expose to ridicule, in his person, every friend of your country; and indeed you take care that he shall never speak too much to the purpose, that you may reserve to yourself a discretionary power to knock him down.

As I find you drawing a fulsome comparison between "tinkers, cobblers, porters, hackney-coachmen, and yourself," give me leave to ask, what tinkers and cobblers you mean—those of the S—te, or those of the rabble; those who buy votes, or those who sell them. You seem to intend the most despicable of the people, and as such, for ought I can see, you may e'en take all these together.

*If either precedence can have,
'Tis only this, the greater knave.*

Use "the privilege of an Englishman" and welcome; but when you make a generous use of it, you will speak your real thoughts, and will have less need of the common-place raillery of the vulgar. You

seem well apprized of the effects of passion, in blinding the understanding; and “an old writer has told us that interest (a gift) will do it also:” you profess yourself clear of both. How you can be induced to act the double-faced part you have taken, without selfish views, is really wonderful!

You assert with reason the advantage of a dispassionate calmness; but is not even this capable of abuse?—A scold that has the command of temper will exasperate and weary out successively half a score who are without it. You tell us (page 6) that you would not willingly give pain to those of either side, and in page 7, you seem to keep your temper, only that you may be the more insufferable. You “call no ill names, give no ill words,” and at the same time call your countrymen (at least, those who dare complain) a herd of incorrigible brutes, in a cool form of words, more replete with venom than any used at Billingsgate; but in answer to your affected fears of wrath from those of the court party, I assure you, that in my hearing, some of the most virulent Tories have declared their resolution of becoming your constant hearers.—such an effect had the reading of your Free Thoughts, on those who before held you in contempt.

You

You make your correspondent enquire, “ what is the direct and principal cause of the present public commotions, or amazing ferment among the people, the general discontent of the nation,” and affirm that you “ have heard it affirmed with your own ears, King George ought to be treated as King Charles was.” This is very extraordinary : I don’t believe there was at that time another pair of ears in the nation, that had heard the like. If you did really hear such a speech, you did not however leave it to “ the birds of the air” to tell it ; but like those who violated Mr. Wilkes’s *Escritore*, have put that into the heads of thousands, which before existed no where else, perhaps, but in your own.

I cannot think his M—— much obliged to you for the ludicrous, ironical daubing, wherewith you design to set off his character, any more than your countrymen, for the cool freedom you take in painting them out, as disliking their Prince for his virtues, in doing which you shamefully insult them without using any ill language.

Tho’ virtue in general is becoming to all, and eminently distinguishes great men ;— yet the great desiderata in a Prince are those peculiar virtues of a “ Patriot King,” that are a perpetual source of happiness to himself, and mutual confidence between

him and his people. If the popular writer you hint at, page 8, is made to mean other than this, it must be by an uncandid acceptation of what he has written. But whoever palliates the vices of government, he it is that resembles both *Machiavel* and *Mandeville*; one of whom upholds the knaveries of state—the other pleads for private vices; which last are always best promoted by the former:—And I am sorry your political writings bear so strong a mark of the spirit that actuated both those writers.

Pray which of the pardoned murderers do you mean (page 9)? the ruffians who knocked Mr. Clark on head; was it ever pretended *they* were not wilful murderers? The reason expressly given in the words of the pardon itself, if I remember, was not a want of intention in the convicts to kill, but a new report of surgeons, “that the wound (which kill’d the man) was not mortal: how this “amazing” report was obtained, and by whom, you may recollect. However the laws having vested in the King a power to remit the crime, I believe as good friends of his M——— as yourself have wished that the pardon had been absolute, and that no such incredible reason had been given for it.

What

What you say (page 10) about *Carlton-House*, the K—'s mother, &c. is so trifling and old-womanish as scarce to deserve notice. You know, it is not where, or by whom things are done, but whether they were legally and honourably done, is the point; and this you slyly avoid, I suppose, "for want of information."

You also know very well, that neither the number, nor even the value of the pensions, is the thing so much complained of, as the application of them. You think all pensions "well designed," indeed you do not say designed for the good of the nation; which certainly ought to be the sole view in bestowing the public money; "well designed;" for what? for some end or other no doubt: what do you think is the design of bestowing so much on M—rs of P—, do you think this honourably designed?

Page 11, All you seem to regret is, the bounty conferred on certain persons whom you misrepresent as unworthy, ungrateful, &c. Whereas in truth, such as have received their sovereign's liberality, as the reward of services done their country, will merit still more, by nobly resisting dishonourable measures.

Steadiness and even obstinacy in a good cause will never be objected as a fault, especially

pecially in a K—. But both K— and people have deplored the tragical effects of obstinacy in a bad one.

Page 12. You now come to the “petitions and remonstrances; and because you know where and to whom they have been particularly odious, you conduct yourself accordingly, and by every art of which you are master, jeer, insult and disgrace them; but in vain. Your fallacy and mockery, in this also, avail not. Your Kentish tale, supposing it true, makes little or nothing for you. If not one man in a county knew any more than this, that a dependent majority in the S—te quite destroy the free representation of the people, 'tis enough, if he is satisfied that the petition prays a redress of that grievance. I mention this, both because it is so flagrant and notorious, that none can be ignorant either of the fact or its consequences, and also because it is the source of all other public abuses.

Page 13. The London petition and remonstrance become now more especially the object of your contempt. You join the herd of ministerial bullies full tilt, and forgetting all regard to decency, are not ashamed to introduce the colliers of Newcastle, on purpose to draw a most impudent parallel between them and the Corporation of London; and having endeavoured to sophistificate

phistificate the matter of the London petition into a mystery too deep for their understandings, you proceed to treat their remonstrance as unfairly—you make the King to judge it as intended not so much to inform him, as to inflame the people, when you know it was incapable of being so understood. What the petition manifestly aimed at, as well as the remonstrance, was the ancient undoubted rights of the people, especially a free people. If this were granted the people must be silenced—if refused, by whom are the people inflamed?

Page 15. As to the “idle, shameless tale” as you are pleased to call it, of the royal sneer; if you know it to be false, why don't you say so: if not, why do you mention it at all—unless for mischief?

Page 16. Let me tell you again, his M——'s character comes out of your hands with disadvantage and disparagement, you treat it in a manner unbecoming the dignity of the subject. Shall I tell you who they are that have done honour to his Majesty; those, who by a most dutiful application, suppose him to have the wisdom and justice to do his people right, by restoring the purity of the constitution.

As for the ministers, all the comfort you give us is “that our ministers have been, as bad these thirty years,” and “all their
measures

measures you will not defend," but yet apologize even for general warrants, by precedent (page 17) and what you dare not justify, partially and meanly palliate, nay extenuate, even the crime of *Allen's* murder by a softening comparison.

Both the expulsion and incapacitation of Mr. WILKES seem to be acts of violence, consequent upon evidence violently and unlawfully obtained.

You suppose (page 19) that the encroachments on the people's liberties in the case of chusing Members of Parliament are as unlike to be drawn into precedent as the falling of the sky; is it possible you can be so ignorant?

Are not the laws the only guard of our liberties as well as properties? Will your horse be equally safe when the stealing another's is connived at? I shall only observe upon Lord M——'s speech, page 20, That a defence of the measures against Mr. W——, comes with a very ill grace from his Lordship, who had before pronounced the warrant illegal by which his papers had been rifled, from which the matter had been gathered, to form the prosecution, upon which he was expelled.

Page 25. If those who raise this cry, believe what they "say, are they not under the highest infatuation?" they who
pursue

purſue, for private intereſt, ſuch meaſures as muſt inevitably terminate in national ruin, theſe are under the higheſt infatuation indeed. And if the people can think themſelves ſafe under the management of ſuch; they are infatuated too. But what ſhall I ſay of you who tell us, “That we never enjoyed ſuch liberty, civil and religious as at this day.” The freedom of Engliſhmen conſiſts in the freedom of the H— of C—; will you aſſert *that* to be free? ſure you have not the face, tho’ you have the falſhood.

You grant more (page 25) againſt the American buſineſs, than any other meaſures of the miniſtry; and why? becauſe you intend to ſaddle it on Mr. Grenville, but this will hardly do, for allowing that gentleman to be the projector or even the author of an ill-judged meaſure, they only are without excuſe who carried the oppreſſion to ſuch lengths, againſt conviction, reaſon and experience. An unlawful ſtep may be retracted, but to enforce and maintain it is tyranny.

Page 26, you introduce a writer, who undertook a work ſomewhat like waſhing the Ethiopian white. This gentleman moſt ſonorouſly applauds the H. of C. by exalting a mere parade of merit into the higheſt encomiums. When that aſſembly ſhall
do

do their duty by studying the good of those they ought to represent, there will need none of the corrupt tools of power to found their trumpet.

The privilege of P————t was anciently a sort of compensation to gentlemen, who formerly had little else but their pains for the trouble of attending public business. But since P————t work has become so profitable, no thanks if they, on whom the public money is so lavishly bestowed, should, at least, become liable to the payment of their own debts, especially when it is considered that, if any merit can arise from the relinquishing a privilege of exemption, it must be due only to such members of the H— who make no self-advantage of their seats there. If the adopting Mr. Grenville's method of decision about contested elections may have some appearance of popularity in it; yet what can we think of an English H. of C. refusing to limit the number of placemen in their Assembly, and rejecting a bill brought in for that purpose, but that they are resolutely determined to sacrifice their constituents to their own private interest. With the like verbosity of language, the same writer abuses a character that is above the reach of scandal, accuses him of an attempt to extend the controul of the
peers

peers over the representatives of the people. But first let him prove that such an H. of C. deserve that appellation; for had they really been what he calls them, the act, upon which that peer call'd for the interposition of the H. of L. had never pass'd.

Page 29. You now begin to halloo; but hold! you are not out of the wood. Every Reader will see the futility of your imaginary triumph. Your repeated pretences to simplicity and modesty will not serve you, while such a gross partiality and pitiful craft appear in every line. "Hitherto we have gained:" What have you gained? The revival of your old appellation, with the additional name of an uncandid and partial writer.

However, you now pretend to touch upon the real cause, &c. And here one might expect something like coming to the point, for hitherto nothing has appeared but a sort of jeering, interrogatory, ironical throwing of dirt on the one hand; with soothing palliatives and disguises on the other; such delusive double dealing, as procured you, long ago, the gentle name of *Jesuit*, but will never, I believe, get you that of an honest man.

The first and principal spring of this "amazing ferment" (as you slyly call it) you take to be French gold. This new Nothing,

thing, I believe, is all your own; no competitor in this “amazing” invention, for I cannot call it the thought of a man in his senses; nevertheless, I cannot but give you credit for an “amazing” knack of removing the cause of the nation’s grievances to a convenient distance.

Page 30, You take occasion to give Mr. Wilkes a fine specimen of your “unwillingness to give him any pain,”—see your canting profession, page 6.

Page 16 and 17. Twenty to twenty, and ten against ten, for moral abilities, is the jumbling method you take to give your *Free Thoughts* on our present managers. Pray why did you not give us a cool flourish (page 17) on the character of him who “judged it proper to send a party of soldiers to prevent violence” in *St. George’s-Fields*? No matter, your meekness and impartiality are to come.

Page 31. Another cause you say “covetousness, English gold, hunger after lucrative employments.” Not a word here of those devouring leeches, who share so many millions of the people’s money, not a word of the dirty Mungoes who betray the people for reward, not a word of the public defaulters of unaccounted millions; not a syllable about placemen, pensioners, and hireling S—t—rs: all ex-
culpated

culpated as having no share in the people's wrongs ! The troublers of Israel you will have to be, not those who receive the "English Gold," who pocket the public money, but those who want it ; and these you insinuate to be those who complain, which is in fact, to acquit the criminal and blame the prosecutor. The characters you have drawn page 32 and 33, I pass over for brevity—fake, leaving them to be distributed among your friends. You say "the whole nation sees the state in danger;" 'tis very true, dissipation and corruption will ruin any state, especially under the encouragement of the gown.

They are the worst abusers of the K—, who abuse his people, and corrupt their representatives ; this is the source of jealousies, and bane of mutual confidence between K— and people.

Page 34. The more the people are wronged, the more they will be inflamed, it ever was so, the weakest will know their benefactors from their betrayers.

Page 35. The name of Cromwell, or any other man, will receive advantage from a comparison with the name of a worse : pray in what cases (if there be any) will you allow the people of England to petition their K— without the appellation of mob ? without imputation of epidemic

B

demic

demic madness, or charge of violent outcry.

Notwithstanding your pretty observations about Oliver's times, one may venture to guess which part you would have taken, in those days, tho' doubtless you would have reserved your Free Thoughts till you had known which side was the strongest.

Let all people judge, who is more properly the dealer in magic dust, you or Junius? That writer's meaning is not to be perverted by your sophistry, you hate him for bringing the hidden works of darkness to light, because you will have the nation's wrongs to be unsearchable, least they should be righted.

Page 36 and 37. You say K. G. has no such furious drivers about him as *poor* (dear, you should have said) K. Charles had: pray what sort of drivers do you call those, who drove into *poor* Mr. Wilkes's house and plundered it, who hired ruffians to knock people on head at elections, &c. and as for painting I.—N—, and A---b---p C--nw--ll-s like L-- Strafford and A--b--p Laud, there is not the least doubt, but a man of your cast would like them the better for the resemblance.—
Whatever the opposers of K. C. were, it is easy to see in what company you
would

would have placed them, and how much respected them, especially while they acted as petitioners and remonstrants.

“ Religion you say is out of the question, neither side give themselves the least concern about it.” The general want of reverence for religion, is chiefly owing to the inconsistency of preachers; who are so apt to look one way and row another, one preaching against the gewgaws and luxuries of life, and professing a renunciation of the guise of the world, and by and by turning dotard and voluptuary in his old age, another affecting a cold indifference to marriage and riches, where the event proved, that he only abstained from the first till he could conveniently take in both together; others courting the favour of those in power and justifying the wicked for reward; and doing things which “ few would have believed, had a man declared it unto them.” But to return, a man of your artful character will ever be against a man of candour; no one can wonder at your spleen against Junius; he is your opposite, he exposes the knavery of the times, you palliate and hide the treacheries of the Great, and join the cry of the Tories to insult the petitioning people, whom you are pleased against all decency to stile ignoble, vulgar, beastly herd, mob, tinkers,

tinkers, cobblers, &c. You seem to confess that the requiring tonnage and poundage, the imposing ship-money, star-chamber processes, &c. were real and intolerable grievances. But what would be your thoughts on those very grievances, had they the sanction of a venal S---n---te in the present times; can any of your readers doubt but like the Middlesex election, &c. they would become pretty objects for the diminishing glass of your raillery. Is there a mischievous measure, that you have not justified, or a popular man of any eminence that you have not degraded: how do you gnash your teeth at Mr. Wilkes! and why? but because he was foremost in the opposition to falsehood and public treachery. Tell us, if you can, why the present opposition does not consist of a body of men equal at least, in all respects, to those who opposed the oppressions of C. I. or why Mr. Burke is not as calm and as disinterested too, as Mr. Hampden was; and what is your reason for preferring the patriots of that reign to those of the present, nay for sneering as you do at patriotism itself, in your co-temporaries, as reprobates do at religion, insinuating its professors to be hypocrites? is it not merely because you owe a spite both to patriotism and patriots, and are yourself a Tory.

Page 38. In the days of Ch. I. a handful of people professed “great zeal for the
 “good of their country and were continu-
 “ally declaiming against either real or
 “imaginary grievances (you do not say
 “which of the two). These were soon
 “joined by men eminent for probity as
 “well as understanding ;” surprizing indeed, that wise and honest men should join the complaining party. But the eminence of their understandings, alas! became soon awakened! for in your very next page, we find them so weak as to be led by the nose “by the heart of their
 “leaders” into an aversion for the King. Why don’t you write the honest truth of the matter, which was no other than this: they first complained of “illegal, inequitable and imprudent measures,” at which they were disgusted; and when they found that the K. supported and enforced those measures with others still worse, they were disgusted at him too, as a natural inseparable consequence.

Page 39. Petitions and remonstrances you have animadverted on before. But yet you cannot forbear (page 39) another bitter stroke at them, after your sly manner; and now having mentioned the beheading of Ch. I. you ask, “What man
 “who has the least degree of understanding
 B 3 “ may

“ may not see how surprizingly the paral-
 “ lel holds in all their circumstances; to
 “ be sure you except the amputation.”

Page 40. You now make your oppo-
 nent ask, “ But do not you think it is in
 “ the power of the King, &c.”

It is really pitiful to see, how a man of learning can trifle as you do, and fill up four or five pages with such idle impertinent stuff, as a school-boy would be ashamed of, in the course of which, however, you do not forget again to make sweet mention of Mr. Wilkes and Junius; and then conclude with an appeal, “ does it not then
 “ appear, &c.” In all which you have not mentioned one word of the great, almost the only thing the K. can do (because it is effectually in his power) namely the stopping, abating, or limiting the practice of hiring S--t--rs into Crown Pay, and declaring (especially in the H.) his abhorrence of all such dishonourable practices, and resolution to establish his throne in righteousness and the affections of his people, discountenancing treachery, perjury, and venality in every department of the state. Whether such measures as these would not be more likely to produce the wished effects of peace and happiness to himself and his people, than the sanguinary course you broadly hint at Page 46,
 where

where you may be said pretty fully to strew your spirit, and what you would easily be at.

In short, I think it must be discoverable to every sensible impartial reader, that the thing you pretend in the beginning, namely, the stating the cause of the popular discontent, was farthest of all from your intentions; there is not, in all that you have written, any thing that looks like pointing out either the disorders or the cause; nothing but adulation on the one hand, detraction on the other; uproar, outcry, and madness are the names you give to the petitions and complaints of the people, on whom you bestow the appellations of tinkers, cobblers, colliers, beasts, &c. &c. but on their oppressor and betrayers, not the most gentle rebuke. The great disease the people labour under, as being productive of every other, you know to be the corruption of their S—te; the cure is also manifestly lodged in the Crown; a patriotic King will remove the destructive bait: about neither of these have you said one word, which I think is, of itself, enough to prove your insincerity; you give us, indeed, a new surprizing idea of the relation between the H. of C. and the people, when, in page 41, you compare the Case of the K. dissolving the P—t at
the

the people's request, to that of "the sheep that had given up their Dogs." By what unheard of analogy, you make this comparison, I cannot imagine; or else have you been impeiled for once to speak the truth, and give the people warning? for if they, who were instituted as a guard of the people against the stretch of Royal power, have changed sides, and are become of the King's party, then farewell British liberty, and the Lord have mercy on the people.

Next follow some brief animadversions on your calm address to the Americans.

In page 25 of your "Free Thoughts," are found these words, "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."

In your "Calm Address to the Americans," page 13, appears the following exclamation. "But how is it possible, that the taking this reasonable and legal step, should have set all America in a flame?" Now, to what cause are we to attribute the great change of sentiment implied in the foregoing contradictions? Is it owing to your former ignorance, or latter information; or to any new light that
that

that has been thrown on the argument? Truly, to neither of them—The mystery lies here—When you wrote your (pretended) Free Thoughts on the state of public affairs, the American dispute was too material an object to be omitted—your touching upon it was indispensable—And yet, as the matter then stood, it was very difficult for such a writer as you to speak fairly to the point. It was not then a clear case, whether the measures were to be enforced or retracted.—Under these circumstances, you contrived to take such an equivocal part as might suit with either event.—If G——t should, by retracting, acknowledge them wrong, you had before ascribed “the whole merit” of them to Mr. Grenville.—But if the present ministry should adopt those measures, and resolve to dragoon the colonies into submission, then you can find a salve in the ambiguity of your words, and may plead, that you did but negatively condemn, by saying you would not justify, or defend them, &c. The latter has been the fatal determination of our managers, whereupon you instantly throw off the mask, decide point-blank against the poor Americans, sign your pitiful recantation, and atone for your former mistake, by writing a whole pamphlet against them, and in favour of their ene-
mies.

mies, wherein you assert, that the American colonies are in point of LAW, EQUITY and PRUDENCE, taxable by an English H — of C —, without the right of being represented therein.

The Americans' argument, no representation, no taxation, you say "proves too much," and infer that no sort of laws made by an English P — t could in that case bind them.

You tell them, that they have always admitted our statutes, for the punishment of offences, preventing inconveniences, &c. The reception of which has necessitated their admitting taxation; but you cannot rely on your own argument, knowing that property is a peculiar object of parliamentary protection, and that for the vast provinces of America to be taxed by an English H. of C. where they have not a single voice is (in an Englishman's account) little else but to be robbed; the great incentive to injury is gain; money matters are of a special nature. In other affairs, the American and ours may be a common cause; their readiness to accede to the laws of the mother country in general, cannot be deemed a sufficient reason for delivering their purses. Their lives and liberties cannot easily be applied to the support of English luxury, dissipation, and worse purposes; but

but their money may; and the assertion that being taxed without representation, must render their property precarious, is as true as demonstration can make it. Your drawing a parallel between such a case and ours at home, all not being electors, yet equally obliged, with those who are, seems unequal; for our vicinity and likeness of circumstances makes the case common, and the protection much the same as if all voted; non-voters and voters being taxable in the same proportion. But the American provinces, by their distance, and other circumstances, are, especially in matters of property, a distinct community; they therefore cannot be taxed with us, unless they be co-represented; otherwise they are to pay their money without any one to see or to speak for them. The Americans never pretended to any dispensation from obedience, on any degree of independence, not enjoyed by other Englishmen; the privilege, common to Englishmen, is that they shall not be taxed without their consent; which I understand to imply, not that every individual shall have a voice in the choosing of Representatives, but that the people in general shall have an independent body of men of their own delegation, incorporated in the state of the realm, for a security of their

their natural rights as Englishmen, and especially their pecuniary property, none of which can be taken from them without the consent of their Parliament. But you insinuate, that the colonists have forfeited the right of being represented in the British Parliament, having resigned their votes by emigration; pray did you learn this since you wrote your *Free Thoughts*? You tell them also, that “they do inherit all the “privileges which their ancestors had:” Pray were their ancestors ever taxed by an English H. of C. or is not that the peculiar happiness of the present generation? You alledge, that “what their ancestors “did not bring with them, neither they “nor their descendants have acquired.”— But yet it seems their descendants have acquired the blessed (new privilege) of being taxed by a most honourable, virtuous and tender H. of English Representatives, in which there is not one single delegate to represent the vast continent of America.

You say the charters of Pennsylvania expressly, and that of Massachusetts bay, by implication, enjoin taxation by Parliament. But pray (supposing this to be true) is there the least pretence for their being taxed without being represented? or is not rather taxation by a Parliament, where they have no one to speak, a direct contradiction in terms?

terms ? A parliament where they cannot be heard, as to them, being no Parliament at all.

You speak so very reverently of Royal Charters, rest so much upon them, and seem to treat them with such a profound veneration, that I could wish you would favor the public with some of your cool and free animadversions on that GREAT CHARTER, called the Bill of Rights.--- Excuse this digression. All who consider impartially what has been observed, must readily allow, that an English H. of C. taxing the unrepresented Americans, can, in reason, be deemed no other than assessors ; and cannot, with any propriety, be called (as to them) a parliament. But whence then say you is all this hurry and tumult ? Why is America all in an uproar ? My dear sir, I'll tell you why. The Americans think of the measures taken against them just as you did when you published your *Free Thoughts* ; they think their treatment cannot be defended, either on the footing of law, equity or prudence. You pretend "the Americans, a few years ago, were assaulted by enemies, whom they were not able to resist ; that on representing this to their mother country, they were largely assisted." By your stating of the case, one would think the last war was undertaken

undertaken on the account of the colonists, to whom you are now writing; but this also is a fallacious account of the matter; wherein you have confounded the New Settlement of Nova-Scotia with the united colonies; for it was in defence of the former, that the last war was undertaken, with whom your calm address seems to have nothing to do. As to your notion of “a few men in England, who are determined enemies to monarchy,” tho’ you usher it in with a protestation of an unbiassed, unprejudiced, and brotherly love, yet, I doubt not, your fallacy and inveterate malice will be discovered by every ordinary reader; for who does not know, under what fondness of the people, and what prepossession in his favor the present K. came to the crown; to what then can be owing any dislike, but to a disappointment of the hopes they had conceived, that he would restore the health of the constitution by discountenancing the infamous practice of smuggling P—ts, and all other abuses of course. But now so it is, that ever since his accession, corruption and venality have increased, and violences have been committed with a high hand, and when the people complained of whips, they have been answered with scorpions. Moreover, you cannot pretend that commonwealth principles

principles were ever dreamt of in the nation, 'till the tyranny and "intolerable grievances" of a certain reign had forced the people to have recourse to some remedy or other; and then so little relish had they, radically, for that form of government, that they embraced the first opportunity to throw it off again in favor of monarchy. You know also, that the very same people, who dislike the present S. had no dislike at all to his Royal G. F. who was also a K--g; whence it follows, that your idle question, about hating the K--g for his office, is mere fallacy but the truth is (and you know it) that the object of hatred is neither the K--g nor his office, but the misconduct, the perjury and treachery of those in power. Moreover 'tis plain enough to be seen, that under the chimerical notion of republicans, you here point at the very same characters you have taken so much pains to blacken in your pretended Free Thoughts; and now you will readily have them to be haters of the K--g and of Kingly Government, underminers of Royalty, determined Republicans, and what not; which is somewhat like dressing them in bearskins, in order to get them baited: but the gall of bitterness is too gross throughout your political performances not to be seen and felt, so that your poison is
 become

become its own antidote. After all your tender professions and calm pretences, public treachery, abuse of office, and prostitution of honor, are the things that rouse and inflame a people. "Art thou he that troubled blest Israel," was a canting question formerly; and the answer was, I am not he, but thou art; this is a parallel to the cause in hand; for you will have it that not the crime of wickedness in high places, but they who declare against it, do inflame the people. Thus you palliate the treachery of the great, and inveigh against those who expose them; you enhance the evil of the times, and strengthen the hands of the people's betrayers, all in your power: 'tis such as you that widen the breach 'twixt England and the colonies, by justifying the innovations that created it. 'Tis such as you that pour oil on the flame, by acquitting those guilty knaves who kindled it, and opposing, under a variety of pretences, all the measures of amendment: So that tho' all his Majesty's subjects, on this and t'other side the water (all, I mean, who are not cheated and amused by such artful men as you) wish to see a stop put to public abuses, and right to take place. Yet "tyrannical, "inequitable" and imprudent measures are more and more enforced, and none can tell where the mischief will end. The Tories
hope

hope it will end in a total overthrow of the Americans : if this should be effected, they trust the people will be every where so miserably crestfallen, that they should be able with or without foreign assistance, entirely to destroy the rights and liberties of the subject, especially while the p — t and the army are so conveniently lodged in the power of the crown. The present state of government in this nation, is *corruptio optimi*; an unhappy perversion of the best system in the world. In its genuine state, when the S — e is free and independent, all is constitutional, all complaints cease, (but those of the Jacobites) no murmur is heard, all goes well : but when the S — e is corrupt, all is out of course, jealousies follow, abuses encrease, the people are betrayed, the worst of tyrannies take place, and compleat slavery is in the rear ; an universal curse that can be exceeded by nothing, unless it be that depravity of spirit which is capable of bearing it. --- --But my dear Sir, after all the vehement outcry against the Americans, what more would you have of them, what greater proof of their loyalty and affection than they gave in the last war ? after which, to replace the disproportion of their contributions, we paid them back four hundred thousand pounds. — You ask, “ what civil liberty the Americans can have

C

more

more than they now enjoy?" You certainly mock them in the cruellest manner, while they labour under the oppression of sword and famine, and the *civil* treatment of horse, foot, and dragoons; and all this for resisting the iron rod of a despotic Tory Ministry: a comfortable sitting this, "every one under his own vine!" You ask them, Do they not, high and low, every one enjoy the fruit of his Labor? If they do, I wish they may so continue; 'tis much more than their brethren of old England do, where more than * 9-10ths of their earnings (it has been proved) are devoured by taxes. The Americans cannot be suspected of a wish to be independent of England: but if they can keep clear of its wrongs and oppressions, they are in the right of it; and I wish them good luck. No government under heaven is more despotic than a Tory Government: no subjects are more tyrannically governed than those of a Tory Ministry. If any one doubt of this, let him look back to the times of Charles the First and James the Second, if our own times are not sufficient: this is so obvious that none but a *Cobler* in politicks can overlook it.—You now pretend to sigh over poor

* See Mr. Shebbeare's letters to the people of England, written before his annual pension of hush money was settled.

America, and O ! what convulsions must she feel, &c. The Americans have considered the case, and weighed it like Britons : they have experienced of old, the cruelty of their Tory enemies, and they have felt of late the tender mercies of their Tory Friends, and upon the whole have concluded, that nothing can be worse or more unworthy of free subjects than a servile submission to their tyranny.

“ Brethren, open your eyes ! come to yourselves ! be no longer the dupes of designing men.” Whoever your designing men, your Ahithophels may be, the measures seem to resemble those of Rehoboam. I wish the alienation of all the American tribes may not be the consequence of such “ legal, equitable, and prudent” management.

If you are the well-wisher you pretend, represent the madness of the present inflammatory measures to those in power ; ~~those~~ who, to augment the present resources of their extravagance, forfeit their oaths and honour, abuse their power, distress the colonies, stab our trade, and enforce their unlawful, inequitable, and imprudent measures with the sword. Let these shew pity, if they have any, if their hearts be not, as formerly, harder than the nether millstone ; those who made an ignoble peace with the

nation's enemies, and have now begun an inhuman war with their own people. — Spare your entreaties of the Americans, who do their duty to themselves and their posterity; and lift up your voice like a trumpet, to shew the baneful effects of wicked example in the higher classes, from whence it overspreads the land. But this is no part of your task; you are not like to become obnoxious for your plain-dealing with those in power; nor, like Micaiah, to be hated for *having no good to say concerning those who have sold themselves to do wickedly*: nay, what you disapproved in your Free Thoughts, namely the measures relative to the colonies, you resolve, upon second thoughts, to vindicate in your Calm Address; and then, under the mask of pity and compassion, consign the noble spirited Americans to the utmost rigour of tory despotism and cruelty. You know what spirit it is that dictates the parasitical addresses now in vogue; yet not a syllable from you against them! not the most distant hint, the least misgiving, or apprehension, either from the tenor or tendency of them! altho' you see all the Tories, Jacobites, and Papists in the kingdom flocking to sign them. It is remarkable, as well as alarming, to see how universally the Roman Catholics approve and applaud the present measures and managers! they
are

are always consistent and uniform in the main point, and can sign a panegyric on the parliaments of our times, upon the same principle that prompted their predecessors to blow up that of 1605; nor can there be any doubt, but the name of Guy Faux, were he living, would appear among the rest.

The fidelity, moderation, and humanity of these three classes of his Majesty's dutiful and loving subjects, are so amply recorded in the annals of England, Scotland and Ireland, that I shall forbear at present to enlarge thereon, the rather as I observe so large a body of the clergy in their interest and especially yourself, for whom I have not a little veneration. The "few Republicans" you mention page 14, seem to be creatures entirely of your own manufacture to serve a purpose—imaginary, ideal non-entities—having no existence but in a sly, malicious invention. But suppose there was in the whole Kingdom, one man of republican principles, (which is much to be doubted) nay, suppose a large body of such to exist, pray will not even you allow, that such a party were as good friends to royalty, as a body of Tories, Jacobites and Papists can be to the revolution, the Brunswick succession, or a limited monarchy?—But although your sham republican be a fictitious
phantom,

phantom, the same cannot be said of the others, for they alas have ever been both seen and felt, heard and understood, the real pest and calamity of the whole realm.— In the whining conclusion of your Address, you tell the Americans, “ The real ground “ of all our (not their) Calamities, never “ will or can be thoroughly removed, ’till “ we fear God and honour the King.”--- Your meaning is well understood, but let me observe, that where the fear of God presides, the honour done the King will chiefly consist in a faithful obedience to the laws that give him authority, and not in the flummery of a fulsome address — The history of Ch. I. will exemplify that the Betrayer and the Parasite have been united in more instances than that of *Judas*. — Those who *have the fear of God before their eyes*, will *renounce*, (not vindicate) *the hidden Things of dishonesty*, faithfully admonish their fellow subjects, and dutifully petition their King against them, and much more against flagrant and notorious abuses. The fore-mentioned Prophet had power, wealth and numbers, yea the whole Clergy against him, and yet he was right. — He, no doubt, feared God, and honoured the regal office, and yet was no flatterer of him who bore it.

As for your observations on Dr. Smith’s sermon, shall pass them unnoticed, except
in

in one instance; p. 21, where you again shew your principles, by asserting, That “every Sovereign under heaven (and consequently our own) has a right to tax his subjects or grant their property “with or without their consent;” which monstrous doctrine, however it may go down in the present, would have endangered, in any other reign since the institution of parliaments, the ears, if not the life of its author.---That excellent discourse being now extant, is a sufficient vindication of itself, and a full refutation of your remarks thereon. Thus I have briefly endeavoured, where you have not done it yourself, to strip off your mask and set you in a proper light; in doing which, if you think me chargeable with any severe reflections, I seem to have a right to plead your example, and hope you will attribute any such passages to my fondness of copying after so great an original.

JUNIO LUS.

P. S. A letter in the Gloucester Journal, from the Rev. Dr. TUCKER, wherein he complains of a surreptitious use the Bristol Addressers have made of his name, by affixing it, without his consent, to their late address to the King, puts me in mind, that you have taken a great deal of pains in your “Free Thoughts” to make the petitions
of

of the people appear contemptible; but like the true stalking horse of a party, are totally silent, as to the unwearied endeavours and various methods employed, both to suppress them, and also to conjure up and procure addresses of adulation in their stead, although you cannot be ignorant, that all the engines, both of tyranny and subtlety, threatening and delusion, have been set to work for that two-fold miserable purpose, by the tools of power all over the kingdom. So that these petitions which have been presented, are only such as the fore-mentioned wretches could not find means to stifle and defeat. The brevity of my reply to this, as well as many other passages in your pamphlet may serve to shew my backwardness in recrimination, and *unwillingness to give you pain.*

F I N I S.