



UNIVERSITÄTS-
BIBLIOTHEK
PADERBORN

Universitätsbibliothek Paderborn

The Works Of The Right Honourable Joseph Addison, Esq.

In Four Volumes

Addison, Joseph

London, 1721

No 31. Friday, April 6.

[urn:nbn:de:hbz:466:1-53597](https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:hbz:466:1-53597)

them; and, as these are agreeable to the natural aversion they have for us, are more disadvantageous than the pictures they have drawn of any other people in *Europe*.

N^o 31. *Friday, April 6.*

Omnes homines, P. C. qui de rebus dubiis consultant, ab odio, amicitia, ira, atque misericordia vacuos esse decet.

Caesar apud Sallust.

I Have purposely avoided, during the whole course of this paper, to speak any thing concerning the treatment which is due to such persons as have been concerned in the late rebellion, because I would not seem to irritate justice against those who are under the prosecution of the law, nor incense any of my Readers against unhappy though guilty men. But when we find the proceedings of our government in this particular traduced and misrepresented, it is the duty of every good subject to set them in their proper light.

I am the more prompted to this undertaking by a pamphlet, entitled, *An argument to prove the affections of the people of England to be the best security of the government; humbly offered to the consideration of the patrons of severity, and applyed to the present juncture of affairs.* Had the whole scope of the Author been answerable to his title, he would have only undertaken to prove what every man in his wits is already convinced of. But the drift of the pamphlet is to stir up our compassion towards the rebels, and our indignation against the government. The Author, who knew that such a design as this could not be carried on without a great deal of artifice and sophistry, has puzzled and perplexed his cause, by throwing his thoughts together in such a studied confusion, that upon this account, if upon any, his pamphlet is, as the party have represented it, unanswerable.

The famous Monsieur *Bayle* compares the answering of an immethodical Author to the hunting of a Duck: when you have him full in your sight, and fancy your self within reach of him, he gives you the slip, and becomes

becomes invisible. His argument is lost in such a variety of matter, that you must catch it where you can, as it rises and disappears in the several parts of his discourse.

The writer of this pamphlet could, doubtless, have ranged his thoughts in much better order, if he had pleased: but he knew very well, that error is not to be advanced by perspicuity. In order therefore to answer this pamphlet, I must reduce the substance of it under proper heads; and disembroil the thoughts of the Author, since he did not think fit to do it himself.

In the first place I shall observe, that the terms which the Author makes use of are loose, general, and undefined, as will be shewn in the sequel of this paper; and, what less becomes a fair reasoner, he puts wrong and invidious names on every thing to colour a false way of arguing. He allows that *the rebels indisputably merit to be severely chastised*; that they *deserve it according to law*; and that *if they are punished, they have none to thank but themselves*, (p. 7.) How can a man after such a concession make use sometimes of the word *Cruelty*, but generally of *Revenge*, when he pleads against the exercise of what, according to his own notion, is at the most but rigid justice! Or why are such executions, which, according to his own opinion, are legal, so often to be called *Violences* and *Slaughters*? Not to mention the appellations given to those who do not agree with him in his opinion for clemency, as the *Blood-thirsty*, the *Political Butchers*, *State Chirurgeons*, and the like.

But I shall now speak of that point, which is the great and reigning fallacy of the pamphlet, and runs more or less through every paragraph. His whole argument turns upon this single consideration; Whether the King should exert mercy or justice towards those who have openly appeared in the present rebellion? By mercy he means a general pardon, by justice a general punishment: so that he supposes no other method practicable in this juncture, than either the forgiving all, or the executing all. Thus he puts the question, *Whether it be the interest of the Prince to destroy the rebels by fire, sword, or gibbet?* (p. 4.) And, speaking of the zealots for the government, he tells us, *They think no remedy so good, as to make clear work; and that they declare for the utter extirpation of all who are its enemies in the most minute circumstances: as if amputation were the sole remedy these political butchers could find out for the distempers of a state; or that they thought the only way to make the top flourish, were to lop off the under branches.* (p. 5.) He then speaks of the *Coffee-house politicians*, and the *Casuits in red-coats*; who, he tells us, are

Vol. IV.

N n n

for

for the utmost rigour that their laws of war or laws of convenience can inspire them with. (p. 5.) Again, *It is represented*, says he, that the rebels deserve the highest punishment the laws can inflict. (p. 7.) And afterwards tells us, *The question is, Whether the government shall shew mercy, or take a Reverend Divine's advice, to slay man and woman, infant and suckling?* (p. 8.) Thus again he tells us, *The friends to severe counsels alledge, that the government ought not to be moved by compassion; and that the law should have its course.* (p. 9.) And in another place puts these words in their mouths, *He may still retain their affection, and yet let the laws have their course in punishing the guilty.* (p. 18.) He goes upon the same supposition in the following passages; *It is impracticable in so general a corruption, to destroy All who are infected; and unless you destroy All, you do nothing to the purpose.* (p. 10.) *Shall our rightful King shew himself less the true father of his people, and afford his pardon to None of those people, who (like King Lear to his daughters) had so great a confidence in his virtue as to give him All.* (p. 25.) I shall only add, that the concluding paragraph, which is worked up with so much artificial horror, goes upon a supposition answerable to the whole tenor of the pamphlet; and implies, that *the impeached Lords* were to be executed without exception or discrimination.

Thus we see what is the Author's idea of that justice against which all his arguments are levelled. If, in the next place, we consider the nature of that clemency which he recommends, we find it to be no less universal and unrestrained.

He declares for a *General Act of Indemnity*, (p. 20.) and tells us, *It is the sense of every dispassionate man of the kingdom, that the rebels may, and ought to be pardoned,* (p. 19.) *One popular Act*, says he, *would even yet retrieve all,* (p. 21.) He declares himself not over-fond of the doctrines of making examples of traitors, (ibid.) And that *the way to prevent things from being brought to an extremity, is to deal mildly with those unfortunate Gentlemen engaged in the rebellion.*

The Reader may now see in how fallacious a manner this writer has stated the controversy: he supposes there are but two methods of treating the rebels; that is, by cutting off every one of them to a man, or pardoning every one of them without distinction. Now if there be a third method between these two extremes, which is on all accounts more eligible than either of them, it is certain that the whole course of his argumentation comes to nothing. Every man of the plainest understanding will easily conclude, that in the case before us, as in most others, we ought

ought to avoid both extremes; that to destroy every rebel would be an excessive severity, and to forgive every one of them an unreasonable weakness. The proper method of proceeding, is that which the Author has purposely omitted: namely, to temper justice with mercy; and, according to the different circumstances that aggravate or alleviate the guilt of the offenders, to restrain the force of the laws, or to let them take their proper course. Punishments are necessary to shew there is justice in a government, and pardons to shew there is mercy; and both together convince the people, that our constitution under a good administration does not only make a difference between the guilty and the innocent, but even among the guilty between such as are more or less criminal.

This middle method, which has been always practised by wise and good governors, has hitherto been made use of by our Sovereign. If, indeed, a stranger, and one who is altogether unacquainted with his Majesty's conduct, should read this pamphlet, he would conclude that every person engaged in the rebellion was to die *by the sword, the halter, or the axe*; nay, that their friends and abettors were involved in the same fate. Would it be possible for him to imagine, that of the several thousands openly taken in arms, and liable to death by the laws of their country, not above forty have yet suffered? how would he be surprized to hear, that, notwithstanding his Majesty's troops have been victorious in every engagement, more of his friends have lost their lives in this rebellion, than of his traitorous subjects; though we add to those who have died by the hand of justice those of them who fell in battle? and yet we find a more popular compassion endeavoured to be raised for the deaths of the guilty, who have brought such calamities on their country, than for the innocent who perished in the defence of it.

This middle method of proceeding, which has been pursued by his Majesty, and is wilfully overlooked by the Author, best answers the ends of government; which is to maintain the safety of the publick by rewards and punishments. It is also incumbent on a Governor, according to the received dictates of religion: which instructs us, *that he beareth not the sword in vain; but ought to be a terror to evil-doers, and a praise to them that do well.* It is likewise in a particular manner the duty of a *British King*, who obliges himself by his Coronation-oath to execute *Justice in Mercy*, that is, to mix them in his administration, and not to exercise either of them to the total exclusion of the other.

But if we consider the arguments which this Author gives for clemency, from the good effects it would produce, we shall find, that they

hold true only when applied to such a mercy as serves rather to mitigate than exclude justice. The excellence of that unlimited clemency which the Author contends for, is recommended by the following arguments.

First, That it endears a Prince to his people. This he descants on in several parts of his book. *Clemency will endear his person to the nation; and then they will neither have the Power nor Will to disturb him.* (p. 8.) *Was there ever a cruel Prince, that was not hated by his subjects?* (p. 24.) *A merciful good-natured disposition is of all others the most amiable quality, and in Princes always attended with a popular love,* (p. 18.)

It is certain, that such a popular love will always rise towards a good Prince, who exercises such a mercy as I have before described, which is consistent with the safety of the constitution, and the good of his Kingdom. But if it be thrown away at random, it loses its virtue, lessens the esteem and authority of a Prince, and cannot long recommend him, even to the weakest of his subjects, who will find all the effects of cruelty in such an ill-grounded compassion. It was a famous saying of *William Rufus*, and is quoted to his honour by historians: "Whosoever spares perjured men, robbers, plunderers and traitors, deprives all good men of their peace and quietness, and lays a foundation of innumerable mischiefs to the virtuous and innocent."

Another argument for unlimited clemency, is, that it shews a courageous temper: *Clemency is likewise an argument of fearlessness; whereas cruelty not only betrays a weak, abject, depraved spirit, but also is for the most part a certain sign of cowardice.* (p. 19.) — *He had a truly great soul, and such will always disclaim the coward's virtue, which is Fear; and the consequence of it, which is Revenge.* (p. 27.) This Panegyrick on clemency, when it is governed by reason, is likewise very right; but it may so happen, that the putting of laws in execution against traitors to their country may be the argument of fearlessness, when our Governors are told that they dare not do it; and such methods may be made use of to extort pardons, as would make it look like cowardice to grant them. In this last case the Author should have remembered his own words, that *then only mercy is meritorious when it is voluntary, and not extorted by the necessity of affairs,* (p. 13.) Besides, the Author should have considered, that another argument which he makes use of for his clemency, are the resentments that may arise from the execution of a rebel: an argument adapted to a cowardly, not a fearless temper.

This

This he infers from the disposition of *the friends, well-wishers, or associates of the sufferers*, (p. 4.) *Resentment will inflame some; in others compassion will, by degrees, rise into resentment. This will naturally beget a disposition to overturn what they dislike, and then there will want only a fair opportunity*, (p. 12.) This argument, like most of the others, pleads equally for malefactors of all kinds, whom the government can never bring to justice, without disobliging their friends, well-wishers, or associates. But, I believe, if the Author would converse with any friend, well-wisher, or associate of these sufferers, he would find them rather deterred from their practices by their sufferings, than disposed to rise in a new rebellion to revenge them. A government must be in a very weak and melancholy condition, that is not armed with a sufficient power for its own defence against the resentment of its enemies, and is afraid of being overturned if it does justice on those who attempt it. But I am afraid the main reason, why these friends, well-wishers and associates are against punishing any of the rebels, is that which must be an argument with every wise Governor for doing justice upon some of them; namely, that it is a likely means to come at the bottom of this conspiracy, and to detect those who have been the private abettors of it, and who are still at work in the same design; if we give credit to the suggestions of our malecontents themselves, who labour to make us believe that there is still life in this wicked project.

I am wonderfully surprized to see another argument made use of for a general pardon, which might have been urged more properly for a general execution. The words are these; *The generality will never be brought to believe, but that those who suffer only for treason have very hard measure, nor can you with all your severity undeceive them of their error.* If the generality of the *English* have such a favourable opinion of treason, nothing can so well cure them of an error so fatal to their country as the punishment of those who are guilty of it. It is evident, that a general impunity would confirm them in such an opinion: for the vulgar will never be brought to believe, that there is a crime where they see no penalty. As it is certain no error can be more destructive to the very Being of government than this, a proper remedy ought to be applied to it; and I would ask this author, Whether upon this occasion, *The doctrine of making examples of traitors* be not very seasonable; though he declares himself *not over-fond of it.* The way to awaken men's minds to the sense of this guilt, is to let them see, by the sufferings of some who have incurred it, how heinous a crime it is in the eye of the law.

The

The foregoing answer may be applied likewise to another argument of the same nature. *If the faction be as numerous as is pretended; if the spirit has spread itself over the whole kingdom; if it has mixed with the mass of the people; then certainly all bloody measures will but whet men the more for revenge.* If justice inflicted on a few of the flagrant criminals, with mercy extended to the multitude, may be called *bloody measures*, they are without doubt absolutely necessary, in case the spirit of faction be thus spread among the mass of the people; who will readily conclude, that if open rebellion goes unpunished, every degree of faction which leads to it must be altogether innocent.

I am come now to another argument for pardoning all the rebels, which is, that it would inspire them all with gratitude, and reduce them to their allegiance. *It is truly heroick to overcome the hearts of one's enemies; and when it is compassed, the undertaking is truly politick.* (p. 8.) *He has now a fair opportunity of conquering more enemies by one act of clemency, than the most successful General will be able to do in many campaigns.* (p. 9.) *Are there not infinite numbers who would become most dutiful upon any fair invitation, upon the least appearance of grace?* (p. 13.) *Which of the rebels could be ungrateful enough to resist or abuse goodness exemplified in practice, as well as extolled in theory?* (p. 20.) Has not his Majesty then shewn the least appearance of grace in that generous forgiveness which he has already extended to such great numbers of his rebellious subjects, who must have died by the laws of their country, had not his mercy interposed in their behalf? But if the Author means (as he doth, through this whole pamphlet by the like expressions) an universal forgiveness, no unprejudiced man can be of his opinion, that it would have had this good effect. We may see how little the conversion of rebels is to be depended on, when we observe that several of the leaders in this rebellion were men who had been pardoned for practices of the same nature: and that most of those who have suffered, have avowed their perseverance in their rebellious principles, when they spoke their minds at the place of execution, notwithstanding their professions to the contrary while they solicited forgiveness. Besides, were pardon extended indifferently to all, which of them would think himself under any particular obligation? Whereas by that prudent discrimination which his Majesty has made between the offenders of different degrees, he naturally obliges those whom he has considered with so much tenderness, and distinguished as the most proper objects of mercy. In short, those who are pardoned would not have known the value of grace, if none had felt the effects of justice. I

I must not omit another reason which the Author makes use of against punishments; *Because, he says, those very means, or the apprehensions of them, have brought things to the pass in which they are, and consequently will reduce them from bad to worse,* (p. 10.) And afterwards, *This growth of disaffection is in a great measure owing to the groundless jealousies men entertained of the present administration, as if they were to expect nothing but cruelty under it.* If our Author would have spoken out, and have applied these effects to the real cause, he could ascribe this change of affections among the people to nothing else but the change of the Ministry: for we find that a great many persons lost their loyalty with their places; and that their friends have ever since made use of the most base methods to infuse those groundless discontents into the minds of the common people, which have brought so many of them to the brink of destruction, and proved so detrimental to their fellow-subjects. However, this proceeding has shewn how dangerous it would have been for his Majesty to have continued in their places of trust a set of men, some of whom have since actually joined with the Pretender to his crown: while others may be justly suspected never to have been faithful to him in their hearts, or, at least, whose principles are precarious, and visibly conducted by their interest. In a word, if the removal of these persons from their posts has produced such popular commotions, the continuance of them might have produced something much more fatal to their King and country, and have brought about that revolution, which has now been in vain attempted. The condition of a *British* King would be very poor indeed, should a party of his subjects threaten him with a rebellion upon his bringing malefactors to justice, or upon his refusing to employ those whom he dares not trust.

I shall only mention another Argument against the punishment of any of the Rebels, whose executions he represents as very shocking to the people, because they are their *countrymen*, (p. 12.) And again, *The quality of the sufferers, their alliances, their characters, their being Englishmen, with a thousand other circumstances, will contribute to breed more ill blood than all the State-chirurgeons can possibly let out,* (p. 12.) The impeached Lords likewise, in the last paragraph of the Pamphlet, are recommended to our pity, because they are our *Countrymen*. By this way of reasoning, no man that is a Gentleman, or born within the three seas, should be subject to capital punishment. Besides, who can be guilty of rebellion that are not our *Countrymen*? As for the endearing name of *Englishmen*, which he bestows upon every one of the criminals, he should consider,

consider, that a man deservedly cuts himself off from the affections as well as the privileges of that community, which he endeavours to subvert.

These are the several arguments which appear in different forms and expressions through this whole pamphlet, and under which every one that is urged in it may be reduced. There is indeed another set of them, derived from the example and authority of great persons, which the Author produces in favour of his own scheme. These are *William the Conqueror*, *Henry the Fourth of France*, our late King *William*, King *Solomon*, and the *Pretender*. If a man were disposed to draw arguments for severity out of history, how many instances might one find of it among the greatest Princes of every nation? but as different Princes may act very laudably by different methods in different conjunctures, I cannot think this a conclusive way of reasoning. However, let us examine this set of arguments, and we shall find them no less defective than those above-mentioned.

One of the greatest of our English Monarchs, says our Author, was *William the Conqueror*; and he was the greater, because he put to death only one person of quality that we read of, and him after repeated treacheries; yet he was a foreigner, had power sufficient, and did not want provocations to have been more bloody. (p. 27.) This person of quality was the Earl *Waltheof*, who being overtaken with wine, engaged in a conspiracy against this Monarch, but repenting of it the next morning, repaired to the King who was then in *Normandy*, and discovered the whole matter. Notwithstanding which, he was beheaded upon the defeat of the conspiracy, for having but thus far tampered in it. And as for the rest of the conspirators, who rose in an actual rebellion, the King used them with the utmost rigour, he cut off the hands of some, put out the eyes of others, some were hanged upon gibbets, and those who fared the best, were sent into banishment. There are indeed the most dreadful examples of severity in this reign: though it must be confessed, that, after the manner of those times, the nobility generally escaped with their lives, though multitudes of them were punished with banishment, perpetual imprisonment, forfeitures, and other great severities: while the poor people, who had been deluded by these their ring-leaders, were executed with the utmost rigour. A partiality which I believe no Commoner of *England* will ever think to be either just or reasonable.

The next instance is *Henry the Fourth of France*, who (says our Author) so handsomely expressed his tenderness for his people, when, at signing

signing the treaty of Vervins, he said, That by one dash of his pen he had overcome more enemies, than he could ever be able to do with his sword. Would not an ordinary reader think that this treaty of *Vervins* was a treaty between *Henry* the Fourth, and a party of his subjects? for otherwise how can it have a place in the present argument? But instead of that it was a treaty between *France* and *Spain*; so that the speech expressed an equal tenderness to the *Spaniards* and *French*; as multitudes of either nation must have fallen in that war, had it continued longer. As for this King's treatment of conspirators, (though he is quoted thrice in the pamphlet as an example of clemency) you have an eminent instance of it in his behaviour to the *Mareschal de Biron*, who had been his old faithful servant, and had contributed more than any one to his advancement to the throne. This *Mareschal*, upon some discontent, was entered into a conspiracy against his Master, and refusing to open the whole secret to the King, he was sent to the *Bastile*, and there beheaded, notwithstanding he sought for mercy with great importunities, and in the most moving manner. There are other instances in this King's reign, who notwithstanding was remarkable for his clemency, of rebels and conspirators who were hanged, beheaded, or broken alive on the wheel.

The late King *William* was not disturbed by any rebellion from those who had once submitted to him. But we know he treated the persons concerned in the Assassination-plot as so horrid a conspiracy deserved. As for the saying which this Author imputes to that Monarch, it being a piece of secret history, one doth not know when it was spoken, or what it alluded to, unless the Author had been more particular in the account of it.

The Author proceeds in the next place to no less an authority, than that of *Solomon*: *Among all the general observations of the wisest Princes we know of, I think there is none holds more universally than, Mercy and truth preserve a King, and his throne is established in mercy.* (p. 18.) If we compare the different sayings of this wise King, which relate to the conduct of Princes, we cannot question but that he means by this mercy, that kind of it, which is consistent with reason and government, and by which we hope to see his Majesty's throne established. But our Author should consider that the same wise man has said in another place, that "An evil man seeketh rebellion, therefore a cruel messenger shall be sent against him." Accordingly his practice was agreeable to his proverb: no Prince having ever given a greater testimony of his abhorrence to undertakings of this treasonable nature. For he dispatched

such a cruel messenger as is here mentioned to those who had been engaged in a rebellion many years before he himself was on the throne, and even to his elder brother, upon the bare suspicion that he was projecting so wicked an enterprize.

How the example of the Pretender came into this argument, I am at a loss to find out. *The Pretender declared a general pardon to All: and shall our rightful King shew himself less the true father of his people, and afford his pardon to none, &c.* (p. 25.) The Pretender's general pardon was to a people who were not in his power; and had he ever reduced them under it, it was only promised to such as immediately joined with him for the recovery of what he called his right. It was such a general pardon as would have been consistent with the execution of more than nine parts in ten of the kingdom.

There is but one more historical argument, which is drawn from King *Philip's* treatment of the *Catalans*. *I think it would not be unseasonable for some men to recollect what their own notions were of the treatment of the Catalans; how many declamations were made on the barbarity used towards them by King Philip, &c.* (p. 29.) If the Author remembers, these declamations, as he calls them, were not made so much on the barbarity used towards them by King *Philip*, as on the barbarity used towards them by the *English* government. King *Philip* might have some colour for treating them as Rebels, but we ought to have regarded them as Allies; and were obliged, by all the ties of honour, conscience, and publick faith, to have sheltered them from those sufferings, which were brought upon them by a firm and inviolable adherence to our interest. However, none can draw into a parallel the cruelties which have been inflicted on that unhappy people, with those few instances of severity which our government has been obliged to exert towards the *British* rebels. I say, no man would make such a parallel, unless his mind be so blinded with passion and prejudice, as to assert, in the language of this pamphlet, *That no instances can be produced of the least lenity under the present administration from the hour it commenced to this day,* (p. 20.) with other astonishing reflections of the same nature, which are contradicted by such innumerable matters of fact, that it would be an affront to a reader's understanding to endeavour to confute them. But to return to the *Catalans*; *During the whole course of the war,* says the Author, *which ever of them submitted to discretion, were received to mercy,* (p. 22.) This is so far from being truly related, that in the beginning of the war, they were executed without mercy. But when, in conjunction with their Allies, they became superior

to King *Philip's* party in strength, and extended their conquests up to the very gates of *Madrid*, it cannot be supposed the *Spanish* Court would be so infatuated as to persist in their first severities, against an enemy that could make such terrible reprisals. However, when this reason of state ceased, how dreadful was the havock made among this brave, but unhappy people! The whole kingdom, without any distinction to the many thousands of its innocent inhabitants, was stript of its immunities, and reduced to a state of slavery. *Barcelona* was filled with executions; and all the patriots of their antient liberties either beheaded, stowed in dungeons, or condemned to work in the mines of *America*.

God be thanked, we have a King who punishes with reluctance, and is averse to such cruelties as were used among the *Catalans*, as much as to those practised on the persons concerned in *Monmouth's* rebellion. Our Author indeed condemns these *Western* assizes in King *James's* reign, (p. 26.) And it would be well if all those who still adhere to the cause of that unfortunate King, and are clamorous at the proceedings of his present Majesty, would remember, that notwithstanding that rebellion fell very much short of this both in the number and strength of the rebels, and had no tendency either to destroy the national religion, to introduce an arbitrary government, or to subject us to a foreign power; not only the chief of the rebels was beheaded, but even a Lady, who had only harboured one of the offenders in her house, was in her extreme old age put to the same kind of death: that about two hundred and thirty were hanged, drawn, and quartered, and their limbs dispersed through several parts of the country, and set up as spectacles of terror to their fellow-subjects. It would be too tedious a work to run through the numberless fines, imprisonments, corporal punishments, and transportations, which were then likewise practised as wholesome severities.

We have now seen how fallaciously the Author has stated the cause he has undertaken, by supposing that nothing but unlimited mercy, or unlimited punishment, are the methods that can be made use of in our present treatment of the rebels: that he has omitted the middle way of proceeding between these two extremes: that this middle way is the method in which his Majesty, like all other wise and good Kings, has chosen to proceed: that it is agreeable to the nature of Government, Religion, and our *British* Constitution: and that every argument which the Author has produced from reason and example, would have been a true one, had it been urged for that restrained clemency which his Majesty has exercised: but is a false one, when applied to such a general, undistinguishing mercy as the Author would recommend.

O o o 2

Having

Having thus answered that which is the main drift and design of this pamphlet, I shall touch upon those other parts of it, which are interwoven with the arguments, to put men out of humour with the present government.

And here we may observe, that it is our Author's method to suppose matters of fact which are not in being, and afterwards to descant upon them. As he is very sensible that the cause will not bear the test of reason, he has indeed every where chosen rather topicks for declamation than argument. Thus he entertains us with a laboured invective against a standing army. But what has this to do in the present case? I suppose he would not advise his Majesty to disband his forces while there is an army of rebels in his dominions. I cannot imagine he would think the affections of the people of *England* a security of the government in such a juncture, were it not at the same time defended with a sufficient body of troops. No Prince has ever given a greater instance of his inclinations to rule without a standing army, if we consider, that upon the very first news of the defeat of the rebels, he declared to both Houses of Parliament, that he had put an immediate stop to the levies which he had begun to raise at their request, and that he would not make use of the power which they had entrusted him with, unless any new preparations of the enemy should make it necessary for our defence. This speech was received with the greatest gratitude by both Houses; and it is said, that in the House of Commons a very candid and honourable Gentleman (who generally votes with the minority) declared, that he had not heard so gracious a speech from the throne for many years last past.

In another place, he supposes that the government has not endeavoured to gain the applause of the vulgar, by doing something for the church; and very gravely makes excuses for this their pretended neglect. What greater instances could his Majesty have given of his love to the church of *England*, than those he has exhibited by his most solemn declarations; by his daily example; and by his promotions of the most eminent among the Clergy to such vacancies as have happened in his reign? To which we must add, for the honour of his government in this particular, that it has done more for the advantage of the Clergy, than those, who are the most zealous for their interest, could have expected in so short a time; which will farther appear, if we reflect upon the valuable and royal donative to one of our Universities, and the provision made for those who are to officiate in the fifty new Churches. His Majesty is, indeed, a Prince of too much magnanimity and truth, to make use of the name of the
Church

Church for drawing his people into any thing that may be prejudicial to them; for what our Author says, to this purpose, redounds as much to the honour of the present administration, as to the disgrace of others. *Nay, I wish with all my soul they had stooped a little ad captum vulgi, to take in those shallow fluttering hearts, which are to be caught by any thing baited with the name of Church, (p. 11.)*

Again; the Author asks, *Whether terror is to become the only national principle?* with other questions of the same nature: and in several parts of his book, harangues very plentifully against such a notion. Where he talks in generals upon this topic, there is no question but every *Whig* and *Tory* in the kingdom perfectly agrees with him in what he says. But if he would insinuate, as he seems to do in several places, that there should be no impressions of awe upon the mind of a subject, and that a government should not create terror in those who are disposed to do ill, as well as encourage those that do their duty: in short, if he is for an entire exclusion of that principle of fear which is supposed to have some influence in every law, he opposes himself to the form of every government in the world, and to the common sense of mankind.

The artifice of this Author in starting objections to the friends of the government, and the foolish answers which he supposes they return to them, is so very visible, that every one sees they are designed rather to divert his reader, than to instruct him.

I have now examined this whole pamphlet, which, indeed, is written with a great deal of art, and as much argument as the cause would bear: and after having stated the true notion of Clemency, Mercy, Compassion, Good-nature, Humanity, or whatever else it may be called, so far as it is consistent with wisdom, and the good of mankind, or, in other words, so far as it is a moral virtue, I shall readily concur with the Author in the highest panegyrics that he has bestowed upon it. As likewise, I heartily join with him in every thing he has said against justice, if it includes, as his pamphlet supposes, the extirpation of every criminal, and is not exercised with a much greater mixture of clemency than rigour. Mercy, in the true sense of the word, is that virtue by which a Prince approaches nearest to him, whom he represents; and whilst he is neither remiss nor extreme to animadvert upon those who offend him, that Logic will hold true of him which is applied to the great Judge of all the earth; *With thee there is mercy, therefore shalt thou be feared.*

Monday,