

CIRCULATED BY THE  
*East Kent and Canterbury Association.*

---

THE  
REASON OF MAN:

WITH  
STRICTURES

ON  
PAINE'S  
RIGHTS OF MAN,

AND SOME OTHER

OR  
HIS WRITINGS.

---

THE THIRD EDITION.

---

By JOHN JONES,

---

CANTERBURY,  
PRINTED BY SIMMONS, KIRKBY AND JONES.

---

1793.

---

---

To the ASSOCIATIONS for preserving  
LIBERTY and PROPERTY, and for  
defending the CONSTITUTION against  
REPUBLICANS and LEVELLERS.

GENTLEMEN,

I Dedicate the following sheets to you, because in associating for the preservation of Liberty and Property, you very laudably propose, independent of giving your aid to the Civil Magistrate, to circulate such information as may counteract those pernicious opinions which have gone abroad; and which in many instances have impressed the people with very erroneous and fatal notions concerning Government. The exertions of the Magistracy, and the union of those who are attached to the Constitution, will no doubt prevent any immediate evils to the State; but as the poison is in the mind, the mischief

*mischiefs may not be remote,---unless a perseve-  
rance is exerted in counteracting it, equal to  
the malicious industry with which it has been  
infused.--FALSHOOD and PLAUSIBILITY,  
in the garb of Reason, have pervaded every  
recess of the kingdom---they have intruded  
themselves into the barracks of the soldier---  
the manufactory of the artizan---and the  
cottage of the peasant.---REASON herself must  
tread the footsteps of the impostors, to vindicate  
her character and assert her rights.*

*The following pages may display more of the  
writer's zeal than his ability---but he trusts  
they will do good, by the train of thinking they  
may excite in the minds of his readers.*

*Your very humble servant,*

The AUTHOR.

CANTERBURY,

Dec. 21, 1792.

---

---

## REASON of MAN, &c.

---

**A**T a moment when the government of this country is exerting itself in an unusual way, and calling forth all its latent powers to crush that daring spirit of revolt, which not only threatens its existence, but the happiness, the security and the prosperity of the community over which it is appointed to preside, it may not be an unuseful task, to explain in a general point of view, that this vigorous exertion is but a necessary duty, in the present state of the public mind; and how essentially it becomes the province of every man who prefers peace to the horrors of a civil war, and protection to insecurity, to consider the cause of government as the cause of the people, and to make that cause his own.

I am well convinced, that if government, in calling forth its armies, and in bidding the laws assume their most formidable terrors, had the most distant intention of oppressing the people,

or meant to carry into execution any act derogatory to the rights of Englishmen, I might spare myself the trouble of this address—The good sense of the people is no more to be trifled with, without exciting their contempt, than their just privileges are to be invaded, without provoking their resentment.

How then are we to account for that unresisting supineness on the part of a people, avowedly tenacious of their rights—whilst Rebellion (now unmasked) was aiming a deadly, though an indirect blow at the Constitution by which those rights are secured?

The following reasons may elucidate the matter.

A portion of jealousy has always been considered as a necessary ingredient in the patriotism of the people of England.—Our government is a government of confidence, but not of unlimited confidence.—This qualified jealousy, which we cherish as a kind of political virtue, and in a limited degree, is certainly productive of good—may be (as in the present instance) perverted to the very worst of purposes.—As the lover lends a greedy ear to the fabricated tale, which aims at the ruin of himself, whilst it blasts the fame of his mistress—so have we but too credulously attended to the whisper of those, who have basely impeached our government, and  
called

called upon us wholly to withdraw our confidence from it; without considering that the tongue which uttered the calumny, was working our destruction, under the mask of friendship.

It is thus that our patriotism has been undermined, and our veneration for our political institutions has crumbled away; what open violence could never obtain, secret fraud has but too fatally, in some measure, accomplished—Englishmen have encountered foreign and domestic foes, with a spirit and perseverance, which nothing but a good and righteous cause could have inspired—In support of our constitution the soul of the nation has often called forth its energies—difficulties and dangers have only served to strengthen it and give it additional vigour.—*It thrived, like the oak amidst the rude concussion of the storm.*—Yet, in the plenitude of its maturity, we see this constitution defying dangers from without and apparently invulnerable to the assaults of time and accident, nursing in its bosom a viper, which threatens its destruction; and unless by a vigorous effort of the country this monster is cast out; we have been contending for centuries against foreign and domestic enemies, to fall at last by pretended friends—In which case we shall have no apology for our own baseness, treachery and improvidence, but a foolish credulity unworthy a people

who profess to regulate their actions by the dictates of common sense.

It is not my intention to discuss the abstract merits of republican government, which is recommended to our imitation; but to prove that, by relinquishing our present constitution, we should part with a positive good, for a more than probable evil.—Though even abstractedly considered, I do not think a republican government has any advantages to make it a matter of choice for a people; unless it is the only asylum to which they can fly from the yoke of an arbitrary and despotic monarchy, where the subject knows no law but the will of the king.

Republican government, which can only exist in its simple state by the principle of equality, can never be congenial to science, or friendly to commerce.—Intellectual superiority must create a distinction on the one hand; and property, the fruit of industry, will give a power and consequence to the possessors, on the other, derogatory to that equality upon which republics are built.—In fact, republican government, in the present state of man, is a farce;—and the conduct of the people acting under it will be a continual violation of its principles.—The distinctions of society will still find “*a local habitation and a name,*” though they may assume a different shape to what they now  
appear

appear in.—*Wisdom, strength, and industry* will still share greater privileges than *folly, imbecility, and idleness*—Power and influence will attach itself to property—Cunning will still outwit credulity; and in short, whatever transformation government may undergo, one part of the community will live by the labour of another.

It appears to me, that republican government must, as it becomes perfect, approximate to a state of nature, because it derives its very essence from equality; and in one sense the republic of France establishes the fact.—The people of that country have uncivilized themselves to all intents and purposes; we can distinguish their conduct from that of an Indian banditti, only in finding different terms applied to the same actions.—The ferocity of the Indian, in the modern republican, assumes the softer appellation of courage; and whilst the Indian openly avows revenge as the motive for sacrificing his defenceless enemies, the more cultivated European republican does the same inhuman act, and dignifies it with the name of patriotism.

In republican governments, whatever the genius of man may invent, or his industry acquire, if it be more than sufficient to satisfy the cravings of nature, is a kind of monopoly

fatal to his system; he is receding from that *happy point* of equality where distinctions lie confounded.—It is a government, where virtue must not be honored, because it puts vice to shame—where industry must not possess property, because it excites the envy of those who are too idle to acquire it; and where the only power which is delegated in the nation is, to stop the complaints of those who have the boldness to say—“ *These things are not right.*”

In reading the Declaration of Rights, and those plausible theories upon which the French republican government is professed to be conducted, we feel a compounded sensation of wonder and indignation.—Our wonder is excited, that, after the experience of ages which has uniformly proved the refractory disposition of human nature, any set of men should frame a declaration of abstract principles, for the government of twenty-four millions of people, which can be only applicable to beings without vice—and our indignation is awakened at finding those principles perverted to the grossest acts of iniquity, plunder and massacre, as never found a parallel under the most despotic and lawless tyranny the world ever witnessed.

We are called upon to pull down our government, in order to establish one more perfect. The criterion of perfection, in the opinion

nion

nion of our reformers, is to be found in France. But it will be wise in us, before we attend to their recommendation, to examine what benefit the nation they refer us to has obtained from their nice-drawn speculations.

The constitution of France offers liberty on the broadest basis—It aims at regenerating human nature by reason—It professes to extinguish the prejudices of other nations by its own liberality of thinking and acting—It imposes no restraint upon the will; but as a free agent, every citizen (a term paramount to all distinctions) is left in complete possession of the Rights of Man, in their broadest signification.

This is its theory—but what is it in practice?

In its operation it has indeed confounded distinctions; but in what other instance has it supported its reputed character? If to regenerate human nature, is to give mankind the ferocity of beasts—If to extinguish prejudices, is to murder, or exile from their families, friends and country, four hundred thousand helpless beings, because they avow a disinclination to relinquish altogether those principles in which they have been brought up and educated—If liberty of speech is to oblige every man who opens his mouth, to applaud a government he cannot approve; or to put him to death for speaking his sentiments—If the liberty of the

press is to be supported by inspectors, who are paid to examine every publication, and to suppress every thing that may tend to awaken the people to a just sense of their hopeless situation—then does France most certainly enjoy those enviable privileges.

If we look still farther, we shall find the same inconsistencies in their professions and conduct to neighbouring nations, as we find in the theory and practice of their government at home.

Their generals, at the head of armies, march into the neighbouring kingdoms with the most pious professions of fraternity to the people, and avow, that their only object is to rescue them from aristocratical imposition and kingly tyranny—But what do all these professions end in?—The upshot of all this citizenly affection is a monstrous, arbitrary and excessive fine, levied indeed upon their rulers, but which must ultimately come out of the pockets of the industrious tradesman and working mechanic.—Thus whilst the general is employed in enforcing exactions that must empty the pockets of the people, his soldiers are engaged in the brotherly office of reconciling them to their fate, by displaying the sublime advantages which result from equality.

The French generals are no less conspicuous in their professions of liberality, in not wishing  
ing

ing to impose on their conquered towns any other government than what the citizens themselves may adopt from their own free will— There is, however, a *little proviso* made to this, which is—*That if the inhabitants of such conquered places are weak or wicked enough to prefer a kingly government, after being informed of the benefits which must result from a republic—the general will find it necessary to consign such places up to military execution.*

This is the mode of government, and these the principles we are called upon to adopt— This the boasted constitution which professes to light up Europe into revolt, by giving them something *worthy of imitation*—This the promised land of government, flowing with milk and honey, for which an Englishman is to relinquish his own, (affording every advantage in practice, which this gives in theory only;) and his reason—*Oh monstrous audacity!*—is called upon to sanctify the choice. But even admitting that the people of France derived all the practical advantages which the declaration of rights professes to give them; in what respect would these advantages be superior to what we enjoy under the English constitution?

The liberty of speech, and the liberty of the press, are the undoubted privileges of every individual in this country; and he may write  
and

and *speak* to eternity, provided he does not infringe upon the rights of another man; if he does, he exercises a right in violation of a duty: and then, if the injured person calls upon the laws to give him legal redress, the quantum of punishment is proportioned to the magnitude of the offence. The English constitution has not left a man to infer his duties from his rights, but in prescribing his rights it regulates his duties also—and for want of doing this in France, the conduct of the people has been an eternal contradiction to the principles of their government.\*

\* Mr. Paine, in his Rights of Man, says, “ *While the declaration of rights was before the National Assembly, some of its members remarked, that a declaration of rights should be accompanied by a declaration of duties. The observation discovered a mind that reflected; and it only erred by not reflecting enough.—A declaration of rights is, by reciprocity, a declaration of duties also. Whatever is my right as a man, is also the right of another; and it becomes my duty to guarantee, as well as to possess.*”

So says Mr. Paine; but facts have proved that he is altogether wrong—the people in France, have in no one instance inferred their duties from their rights, but have acted as though there were no duties annexed to them —The members of the National Convention, whom he charges with a want of foresight, saw much farther than Mr. Paine—and had their opinions been adopted, those everlasting monuments of disgrace, which the rights and cruelties of man have erected in France, would never have had existence.

The

The people in this country claim, as a privilege, a considerable latitude in criticising the actions of their governors; it is only when this liberty is abused, by making it instrumental in destroying the power which gave it birth and the energy which keeps it alive, that the laws interpose their authority.

For a proof of this, look to the writings which have engrossed the attention of the country for the last two years. A single page of Mr. Paine's book, published in any other country in Europe against its government (France not excepted) would have forfeited him his life; whereas he has been suffered to vend his lucubrations, from the latter end of the year 1790, to the present time; and government has only interposed its power when his disciples actually attempted to realize his doctrines, by acts of open violence.

When these facts are established, the liberty of the subject, as it regards speaking and writing, cannot be called in question—this invaluable privilege is paramount to all others, and is a more substantial blessing to the people, than all the metaphysical rights of our modern reformers combined together—It puts the good sense of the nation in a condition to counteract, or remove, any measure of government that may be, immediately or remotely, prejudicial

cial to the community; and where it exists, no glaring abuse can find reception or countenance in society—It answers every purpose of a declaration of rights (which expedience often obliges a government to violate) by giving the people a power of exposing the plea of necessity, in justification of actions, where the necessity did not exist.—In its operation, it supplies the place of public virtue, and keeps men honest, through fear, who are not honest from a more laudable motive. Every man in power looks upon the liberty of the press with respectful awe; knowing it to be a privilege of the people, “ BOTH MINISTER AND MAGISTRATE HAVE ONLY TO CHOOSE BETWEEN THEIR DUTY AND THEIR REPUTATION.”

Mr. Paine, in his writings, lays it down as a fundamental maxim (and he assumes much merit in having discovered it) that “ *Society is produced by our wants, and Government by our vices.* ”—Yet he would readily involve us in that situation, where the vices of every individual might have full scope, unrestrained by the fear of punishment; for in this situation the kingdom must inevitably be placed between the annihilation of one government and the establishment of another—We must tread upon the ashes of departed protection, and look for future security in those vices which had accomplished its destruction. The

The very principle upon which Mr. Paine argues the necessity of government, proves likewise that government, for the mutual advantage of its members, must retain a strong coercive power—it must possess a power to punish, without fear, the vices which gave it birth; and in the simple exercise of its functions every person of common understanding will see, that the natural rights of man must be continually counteracted. With all its boasted pretensions to superiority over the English, what has the French government done in this respect? Has it not hitherto existed in fear of those vices it was meant to restrain? In the face of open day, and in contempt of their government, have not a number of assassins murdered between ten and fifteen thousand helpless, and in the greater part *innocent*, victims, whilst that government dared not interpose its authority to rescue them from destruction? And from the same disgraceful fear, has not the arm of justice been suspended; and the murderers, glorying in their iniquity, laugh'd at the vengeance that was afraid to strike them? Thus the rights of humanity are violated, the feelings of justice insulted, and every generous sentiment of nature offered up as a sacrifice at the shrine of the *Rights of Man*.

To shew how inconsistent Mr. Paine is with himself, and how contradictory his dogmatical assertions

assertions are with each other, I introduce the following quotation from another part of his works, in which he endeavours to prove, that society derives no advantage from any government whatever. "*There is*" (says Mr. Paine) "*a*  
"*natural aptness in man, and more so in society,*  
"*because it embraces a greater variety of abilities*  
"*to accommodate itself to whatever situation it is*  
"*in. The instant formal government is abolished,*  
"*society begins to act, a general association takes*  
"*place, and common interest produces common se-*  
"*curity.*" If this proposition be true, that common interest, without government, produces common security, how does it agree with his former assertion, that government becomes necessary to restrain the vices of society?—If the former position is admitted, the latter must, consequently, fall to the ground. That society begins to act the moment government is annihilated, I allow; but that it acts to the general interest, or that common security is consulted in its actions, a man must be either wicked or foolish to assert—experience uniformly proves the contrary. Mr. Paine must be sensible, how little the principle of moral rectitude, which perhaps appertains to every man more or less as an individual, operates in a body of people emancipated from the restraint of laws. It is obscured the moment personal security becomes doubtful:

doubtful: it is annihilated when terror takes the place of confidence: it is the GLOW-WORM OF CIVIL LIFE, which diffuses its lustre under the benign influence of a mild government, but retires from the desolating storm of popular commotion.

When a government ceases to act, all the bad propensities of the people immediately break forth. Government is to the passions of mankind, what the banks are to a river: as the latter, by being confined within bounds, gives mankind all its benefits without subjecting them to its terrors: so the restraints of a government render the passions subservient to the good of the community, by calling forth the latent energies of the mind and body, and propelling virtue into action. But remove those wholesome restraints, and the passions immediately become rebels: they sweep away all the sweet charities of life, with the same destructive rage, with which the river tears up vegetation, and desolates the land, when it is once loosened from the boundaries, that nature or art had prescribed for it.

It is no difficult matter to detect Mr. Paine's motive, in attempting to prove, that a common bond of interest would effect the security of society, if government did not exist. Mr. Paine well knows, that every man, in this country, has an interest in the welfare of the state;  
and

and however he might lavish his abuse on the government, he never could persuade the people to revolt from it, whilst they retained the conviction that it gave security to their persons and property.—He then comes forward with that miserable farrago of absurdity which I have quoted, to prove, that every individual would be as well protected without a government, as with one.—He might as well attempt to impose on our understandings, by telling us, that a man would experience the same comfortable security against the turbulence of the elements, on a bleak open common, as he could find in a warm house, under the protection of a roof.

It appears to me, that we enjoy all the advantages of an extensive and well regulated liberty, and, founded upon that liberty, a national prosperity that has no example in the world; and every man who reads Mr. Paine's works will see, that in many parts he is more solicitous to prove, that we have obtained and hold these enviable distinctions in what he conceives an improper way, than that we do not really possess them—and if the people of England would be idiots enough to part with every blessing they possess, Thomas Paine would lend his paternal assistance, to restore them again, and establish them upon the Rights of  
Man—

Man—a tenure much more congenial to his mind.

The history of England does indeed prove to us, that the liberties of the people, in this country, have been extorted, at different times, from the hard hand of arbitrary power; but, like pasture land rescued from the usurpation of the ocean, they become more valuable on that account.—It is the only country in Europe, where despotism has not crushed the spirit of the people; the flame of freedom, although it has been smothered at different periods, has never been extinguished; and kings have successively been obliged to confirm certain privileges to the people, which have reduced their own power to the standard of rationality.—These exertions, and these privileges, are treated with contempt by Mr. Paine, because kings have been a party in the contract—But he is yet to learn, that those blessings, which are obtained with difficulty and by slow degrees, are enjoyed with moderation and preserved with fidelity.—Liberty in France is an exotic. It was not of tardy growth, but came upon the kingdom like an inundation. It was too violent for the people to incorporate with any rational system of acting—and it degenerated instantly into licentiousness of the most hideous kind. The Rights of Man engendered

C

the

the liberty, but the Reason of Man never directed it to any good purposes. The Reason of Man, in this country, has always gone hand in hand with his rights. If by his rights he reclaimed a large portion of power, unlawfully usurped, his reason taught him, that, for the interest of himself and his country, he should not grasp the whole; but leave a portion, *a sacred deposit, in the office of king*, to be a check upon any casual abuse of what he claimed for his own use.

If what I have asserted here is fact, and I think no man will deny it—what truth is there in the assertion of Mr. Paine, that the king is a phantom, and the allegiance of the people a blind and stupid obedience?—It is a libel upon the English character.—If the honor or the integrity of an individual is blown upon by the breath of malevolence, he resents the injury with sword and pistols—And yet the character of the country is stigmatized by Mr. Paine in a most unexampled way—its noble and energetic exertions, for centuries, in the cause of freedom, are placed to the account of a blind unmanly weakness—whilst the assassin has received caresses, instead of punishment.—The national character would, indeed, deserve a stigma equally obnoxious, if it did not rouse from its lethargy.

If



tion, the absurdity and wickedness of his other assertions.

The author of the Rights of Man, in several instances, admits in a few words, facts which he has been labouring through pages to prove do not exist—Every kind of distorted argument, and every epithet of abuse has been called forth, to reprobate the principles which pervade the whole government of this country, and to attempt to prove, that the people are in a complete state of mental and bodily slavery ; that the nation is not governed by sense, but by folly ; and what is still worse, that the people pay for the folly which governs them.—This is the sum and substance of the Rights of Man—But how does it agree with the following quotation from the same work—“ *Notwithstanding*  
“ *the taxes of England amount to almost seventeen*  
“ *million a year, said to be for the expences of go-*  
“ *vernment ; it is still evident, that the sense of*  
“ *the nation is left to govern itself ; and does govern*  
“ *itself by magistrates and juries, almost at its own*  
“ *charge, on republican principles.*” —Here the freedom of a republican government is admitted to exist ; which had been stoutly denied before, in order to dissolve the connection between taxation and government—and to throw the greater odium on the former.—Yet, in another part of his work, he says, “ *As to the na-*  
“ *tional*

“ tional debt, however heavy the interest may be in  
 “ taxes; yet, as it serves to keep alive a capital,  
 “ useful to commerce, it balances by its effects a con-  
 “ siderable part of its own weight.” Now to  
 men of plain understandings, who cannot un-  
 twist metaphysical subtilties, this looks like  
 blowing hot and cold with the same breath.—  
 What is it but telling us, that taxes are our de-  
 struction, and our salvation—our bane and an-  
 tidote—that taxation is the most formidable  
 evil in our state—and yet the national debt,  
 from whence those taxes arise, is beneficial to  
 society.

The fact is, the national debt is a national  
 benefit, felt and acknowledged by the country—  
 and, paradoxical as it seems, the country has  
 grown rich and powerful, in proportion as it  
 has increased.—The accumulation of the debt  
 has drawn the money from the pockets of a  
 number of rich individuals, and circulated it  
 through all the members of the community;  
 who, by applying it to trade and commerce,  
 have been enabled not only to pay the an-  
 nual interest of the debt, but to improve their  
 condition in a very essential degree.—If the  
 national debt was annihilated, without being  
 paid off, at this moment, the nation would be

the sufferer—because the people are the creditors.\*

As the chorus of Mr. Burke's book is, Church and State, so the chorus of Mr. Paine's Rights of Man is, CIVIL-LIST; he conjures up more phantoms to alarm the minds of the people, from this magical word, than Milton in the fervor of his imagination, ever invented to people the infernal regions. It is not necessary for me to go through his various evolutions on the civil list. He thinks the office of king of no use to the nation, and, consequently, he would not *ruin the country* in supporting it; or, if the people were determined to retain a veneration for the kingly office, he would piously take care that the person who held it should not grow fat upon it.

“ Convinc'd that in his scheme of state salvation,  
 “ To starve the palace, is to save the nation.”

\* The following note is introduced, from a very ingenious pamphlet, the more clearly to illustrate these observations.—“ Whatever sum of money is owing by one  
 “ member of a family, to another of the same family,  
 “ cannot in any degree add to, or take from the quantity  
 “ of property possessed by the whole family. The same  
 “ remark may be applied to the nation.—Whatever sum  
 “ of money is owing by the community at large, to a part  
 “ of the same community, cannot in any degree increase,  
 “ or diminish, the national capital.”

It

It is easy for a mind possessing a talent for amplification, like Mr. Paine, to magnify a mole-hill into a mountain—the Tremendous-expence of maintaining a kingly government is trumpeted forth with all his farcical solemnity, as if it were criminal in the people not to make themselves really unhappy under it.—When he is tired of skirmishing upon the outworks of abuse, he collects the scattered forces of his vengeance, and returns with redoubled fury upon the bastion of the civil-list; to this Leviathan of iniquity he is determined to stick; *on this began, on this will end his song.*—He sat out, in his Common Sense, with observing, that “*The palaces of kings were built on the ruins of the bowers of Paradise.*”—And he claims the privilege, to whine like a pig over these relicks of lost innocence and simplicity, whenever he thinks fit.

It is necessary the people should know the whole extent of that evil which has put poor Mr. Paine’s mind into mourning for so many years.

The civil-list, by which the monarchy of Great Britain is maintained, amounts to a million a year; which million, if collected as a poll-tax, would not exceed ONE HALFPENNY PER HEAD PER WEEK, taking it for granted that the

the kingdom contains ten millions of inhabitants;\* and, when the proportion now paid by the opulent part of the community is taken into the calculation, it falls considerably short of one halfpenny per head per week, to the labouring class of people. And yet, insignificant as this tax of one halfpenny per week is, Mr. Paine would justify every man in the kingdom in becoming a regicide, to get rid of it. He would involve the kingdom in all the horrors of a civil war; the issue of which God only knows—the extent of the destruction is beyond human calculation.

In respect to the blind and superstitious obedience, which the kingly power, according to Mr. Paine, claims from the people, I know of none. The obedience of Englishmen originates in a far nobler principle. It is the obedience of rational beings, towards a power they have created, or acknowledged, and whose support they deem essential to the welfare of the community. Englishmen discriminate between the office and the man who fills it; the kingly

\* When the ingenious Mr. HOWLETT wrote on population, he estimated the number of inhabitants at nine millions; this was in the year 1781. A variety of causes will justify the supposition, that since that period they have increased to ten millions—which number, at one halfpenny per week, will amount to one million and eighty-three thousand per annum, a sum exceeding that of the civil-list.

office,

office, as the repository of their rights, has their steady and uniform veneration ; but they measure their affection for their king, by the justice with which he discharges the duties appertaining to it. The splendor which surrounds the throne is the splendor of the nation, concentrated in a point ; the money which goes to support it, eventually returns again into the pockets from whence it came.

These sentiments have been so long and so generally felt in England, that it would require an apology for introducing them, had not such indefatigable pains been taken to place to the account of our folly, what has been in fact and in truth the result of our reason and our virtue. Let any man take a retrospect of the motives upon which his attachment to the English constitution has been built, and then candidly ask himself, whether they are blameable, or praise worthy ! The constitution of England combines all the wisdom of past ages, with the abilities of the present, to give it effect—every succeeding generation purifies it of some errors, and consigns it more complete and perfect to posterity. The governments established upon the principles of our modern reformers, reject all the wisdom of past ages ; but it is a maxim founded in truth, that *“ those who never  
“ looked back to their ancestors, will never look for-  
“ ward*

“ward to posterity.” There is a selfishness in their principles as destructive to the present happiness of the community, as it will be fatal to the future. Where their speculations have been put in practice, succeeding generations will come into existence, only to read a catalogue of their crimes; which must be further extended by themselves, unless they take better examples to regulate their conduct.

In this period of Revolutions, it should not be forgotten, that the republics of France and America were not governments of choice, but of necessity. The benefits of a limited monarchy, were what the people in both countries wished to obtain—but their wishes were defeated. In the latter, by the ill-judged policy of those who professed to be their friends; in the former, by a desperate faction of men, who, in the annihilation of kingly power, saw a ready road to their own elevation.—America, by being denied the most essential benefits of a limited monarchy, sunk into republicanism more from motives of revenge than from choice.—France, in giving a power to a body of people to legalize her monarchy, created a faction, as a check upon that power, which has pulled down every barrier between the absolute tyranny of the monarch, and the unbounded licentiousness of the mob.—A republic has, consequently, been forced upon the people, The

The question, therefore, with us amounts to this—Shall we retain that excellent form of government which we possess, and which those two kingdoms have in vain attempted to establish?—or shall we take that as a choice, which they have adopted as an evil?—If common reason is to regulate our opinions and our actions, this question carries its answer along with it. Those to whom it is not satisfactory, and who vainly suppose, that the levelling system of equality is calculated to afford any happiness to society, let them look to France—the scene requires no minute detail—the great body of people are driven by the hard impulse of necessity, either to plunder or to starve.—The National Convention are alternately employed in reading details of *foreign conquest* and *domestic misery*; of towns subdued by the arms of the republic, and revolted provinces starving for want of bread.—What satisfaction does the citizen and the labouring man derive from the meretricious parade of victory, whilst discord and famine are stalking their streets?

These being incontrovertible facts, the line which reason, duty and policy points out to us is clear and direct. We have a government to defend, and a prosperity to maintain—unequaled and unexampled in the annals of history.—A general union through the kingdom  
is

is the only means of effectually securing both.  
—The man who dissents from it, is an enemy to his country.

It is folly to suppose, that one particular description of persons will suffer more than another by an overthrow of our government; the GENTLEMAN, the MERCHANT, the FARMER, the TRADESMAN, the MECHANIC, and the LABOURER, must be involved in one common ruin.—There is a chain of connection through the whole of our community, that renders it impossible for one part to suffer, without the evil extending to the whole. If the gentleman loses his property, neither the manufacturer nor the tradesman can find a consumption for their articles; and, of course, the means of an honest livelihood for the mechanic and the labourer are done away.—To the farmer, the mischief will be equally serious. In a popular commotion, the very fences of his fields will, according to the Rights of Man, be considered as *bulwarks of aristocracy*, and no longer mark the limits of his property.—He may deposit the grain, but he will not reap the harvest.

F I N I S.