

Numb. 26. Thursday, May 25. 1710.

[London; reprinted as Edinburgh 25. Saturday, 27 May 1710]

[Heading as at 28 March, 1710]

I Have often thought (with some Melancholy) upon my Writing this Paper, by which I create me innumerable Enemies on one Hand, and very few Friends on the other — Why I should not lay it down, and talk for one Year or two, wholly upon Matters of Trade, Improvement, the Rise, Extent, Decay, and Means of Increasing our Commerce, making the Nation Rich, the poor easie, and the People happy; the Regulating Manufactures, Employing, rightly distributing and providing for the Poor — The forming general Assurances, and Societies for support of Misery, Age, Accidents, and Incapacity for Labour — Increase of People, Circulation of Money, and Advance of Credit; and a Thousand such useful Subjects, which are so much wanted, so ill handled, and so little understood, that a Man might very well Employ two Ages in the Work, and make it both Profitable and Diverting.

Here I flatter my self, I could please you all — And make my self no more the Object of the Curses and Contempt, either of provok'd and enrag'd Enemies, or ungrateful Friends — But what can any Man do, till you will compose your unhappy Breaches, and join a little more like Christians, in your common Affairs. To what purpose should Men talk of Trading together, when you can hardly think of living together? — What Commerce can there be, where there is no Peace? How should Manufactures be Encourag'd, when honest Men are Discourag'd, and Insulted? How should Industry Thrive, where Rabbles Rule, and Men are in danger every Day, of being plunder'd by the Mobb? This is the thing keeps me so long, from the desireable Subject of Trade, to which I have long since resolv'd, to set apart this Paper.

However, I am just now driven off, from the Debate of publick Matters, and the Confusion which Parties have led us into, and am almost by Force, brought to speak of Trade — It is a very strange height, our Parties are driving Things to, when they come to Embark Trade and Politics, both in one bottom — And now we have some People, who are for dividing Trade into Parties, as well as Religion; and to have *Whig* and *Tory* be the County-Mark, upon our Manufactures.

That the Foundations may be undisputed, and every thing may be clear as I go — I am, to quote the *Post-Boy*, *May* the ...¹ Where the Author tells us (and I must suppose it to be true) in Publick, that the Gentlemen of *Anglesey*, *Denbigh-Shire*, and *Carmarthen*, have enter'd into some Engagements among themselves, not to buy any thing of a *Dissenter*, &c.

I remember but a few Instances of this in the World before, and I shall reckon them up unto you; one is in the Scripture, and that is rather a prediction (perhaps of this) than a History (*Viz.*) in the *Revelation*, Ch. 13. v. 17.

Where none were to buy or sell, but such as had the Mark of the Beast — There was then, something of the same Spirit, in the same Party, which appear'd here, in the latter End of King *Charles II.* when he was under the Influence, and immediate Ministry of his *Popish* Brother, *viz.* That no Man should have a License to keep an Alehouse, or Tavern, but he that would take the Sacrament of the Church of England: And the third Instance that is something like it, was in the blessed Reforming Days of Bishop *Laud*; who having prevail'd upon his Royal Master, to begin his own Ruin, in publishing the Book of Sports, and licensing the Profanation of the Lord's Day — The Declaration for allowing May-poles, Dancing, Cudgel-Playing, &c. on the Lord's Day, has this express exception in it, *viz.* That no *Puritan*, no *Recusant*, *Anglicè* as now no *Dissenter*, might use them, or in short, none that did not come to the Parish Church, should enjoy the priviledge of going to Play when it was done — If any Man question the Truth of this, I refer them to the Book of Sports itself, which I have by me, and will shew it to any Man that desires it.

But this is all by the by, I come now to the new Proposal, of the *High-Church* Men refusing to Trade with the *Dissenters* — And since their Madness has driven them to that Experiment, I cannot but most earnestly intreat them to go on with it, throughout all *England*, nay, I may freely Challenge them to do it — Nay I'd go farther, and tell them frankly, they DARE NOT go about it — That it would ruine their Party; it would drive more People to the Meeting-Houses in one Year, than go now to the Meeting-Houses in all *England*; Mr. *Post Boy* does very well to place this Project a great way off, in *Wales* and *Anglesey*; indeed it is a Piece of *Welch* Policy, and, as I said before, it would ruine them to practise it; so I shall readily make it out.

I presume I need not tell the World that the Principal Body of the *Dissenters*, in *England*, lies among the Trading People of the Nation; Merchandizing and Manufacturing, is generally speaking their Province — If these two are the Original of the Nations Wealth, then it is not very likely they should be the Poorest of the People — Take that by itself.

Those that have made Calculations of the proportion of Numbers, between the *Dissenters*, and the *Church*, in *England*, (as to People) tell us, the *Dissenters* are not above one to eleven, or one to twelve — And I'll not dispute it with them, whether it be a reasonable Calculation or no, let it go so — But I return upon them — Calculate the Trading, Merchandising, Manufacturing, and Shop-keeping part of *England* — and the *Dissenters*, take one place with another, are at least a half; But take in the *Whig* in general, which includes those, who tho' they go to Church, are Men of Charity, Moderation, and Temper, and make one Interest with the *Dissenter*; they will make the whole be in Trade, above eight parts of ten through the whole Nation.

Now, Gentlemen, have a care, how you leave off Trading with us — And

take heed, that you make it a National, General Act, and give us leave, to refuse any Commerce with you — And see where you will quickly be — The Quakers have made themselves Rich, but by a General Inclination to Buy and sell with one another; and I can assure the *Dissenters* in general, they have been Losers by the contrary practise, for many years — And you may begin when you please, in order to which, the first Acts you should make should be,

That no *Dissenter* shall Employ any of your Poor in the Country, to Spin, or Knit, or Weave, or Work, in any of the Manufactures.

That the Government should not let any *Dissenter* lend any of their Damn'd Presbyterian Money, to the publick Funds.

That no *Dissenter* should be capable, of having any Stock in the Bank, or in the *East-India*, or *African* Companies, but that if they would have a Bank, they should set up one of their own; and if they would Trade to the *East-Indies*, or to *Africa*, or *Turkey*, they should do it by themselves.

That no *Whig*, or *Dissenter*, should have the Priviledge to Ship any Goods on Board any *High Church* Man's Ship, or to take any of their Goods on board their Ships.

That no *High-Church* Coal, or Salt² should be brought from *New-Castle*, in *Dissenters* Ships; or to put it t'other Way, that no *Dissenters* Ships should be allow'd to take in any *High-Church* Coal, or have the priviledge of bringing them to Town.

But above all, be pleased also to direct, that none of the *High-Church* Parsons should accept of any Contributions, or Subscriptions, in their Parishes; that no Damn'd Presbyterian Money, may be mix't with the Sacred Orthodox Tythes of the Parish — And this is particularly recommended to some of our City Lecturers, and Corporation Curates, who tho' they are every Day cutting the *Dissenters* Throats in the Pulpit, yet if they should leave the *Dissenters* out of the List of their Benefactors, would have but a small Pittance to make the Pot boil — A Thing Mr. — has lately found to his great Conviction, and which has done more to teach his Tongue good Manners, than all the rest of his Education.

I shall in my next, Examin a little the Calculation of the *Whig* Interest in Trade in *England*.

MISCELLANEA

I Must go on a little farther in the Affair of Bread — The Confusions that Affair has put us in, are not so slight as to be neglected; and yet the Occasions of them, are the slightest and most Trivial in the World — And this makes me meddle with it, that if possible, I may shew People a few of their Mistakes, and beat them a little off from the Notions they have so wedded to their Distractions.

If the Debate were now, whether the Bakers may be allow'd by the Magistrates to make their Bread less Weight, than the Standard fixt by Parliament; I should methinks have a very easie Task of it — And should tell the Bakers, do it at your Peril — Tho' I must own there are some Extremities too in this Law, upon the Bakers, which almost brings in the Law forcing the offence first, and then punishing it; and this I shall speak to very quickly.

But the mighty Bustle at present, is the Size of the Loaf — And this the Magistrates insist upon so strictly, that they lay the whole Weight of the Law upon it, as if it was material what Name the Loaf was call'd, provided the Weight agreed with the Table laid down by the Act — Indeed since I was upon this Subject, some of the Justices, especially in *Westminster*, and *Southwark*, have open'd their People's Eyes — By letting us see their own were open; and have allow'd the Bakers, to bake Quartern, Half pecks, &c. as they used to do; only obliging them to the due Weight and Price — And fain would I ask my Lord M—rs Horse if he could speak, to tell me where is the difference to the People, or where the Breach of the Law?

Suppose again the Weight of a Half-peck Loaf to be always the same, and the Price to be rais'd or sunk, as the Price of Corn or Meal rises or falls — Is it not the same thing as keeping the Price always the same, (*Viz.*) *Twelve-pence the Loaf*, &c. and causing the Weight to Increase or Decrease, as the Price of Corn rises or falls? — There is just as much difference in this, as there is in the length of the Ground between *Temple Bar* and *Ludgate*³ — And to make a Law to prescribe one of these, and forbid the other, has just as much signification, as an Act of Parliament to determine which Door of a Church the People should go in at in the Morning, and which in the Afternoon.

I have heard some Bakers say, the Poor are Gainers by the baking Peck and Half-peck Loaves; but as to that, it is not to my purpose, the Argument lies here — That they can be neither Gainers nor Losers if Justice be done, for all proportions are exactly alike; and as the Horsemen say, *Weight for Inches* reduces a Low or Tall Horse to be the same; so a Weight and Price being Calculated exactly, and the due Proportion settled, there can be no manner of difference one Way or other — What can any Man say, in defence of a Magistracy that can be so Blind, and that pretend to bind such Burthens on the People, as the Law gives no Reason, and when they are apply'd to, answer, *Voce Magistri*,⁴ it shall be no otherwise — All I can say to it, is — That to me it seems ridiculous, makes the Magistrate appear what I care not, and indeed need not tell them — And makes wise Men wish the Parliament had not put a thing into their Hands by Law, without making a Law that every Magistrate should go to School, to learn his Horn-Book, before he meddled with it, that he might be qualify'd to judge of it.

There remains two or three hardships upon the Poor, and two or three

upon the Baker, which are the Consequences of this Act, and which I will do my best to reconcile; and if that were done, I think the Noise would begin to cease; I begin with the Baker.

The first is, what I mention'd above — That the Law seems to make the Offence necessary first, and then punishes it. It is most certain, the design of all Punishment in the Law, is to prevent the Offence; but here the Law prescribes a Punishment, to an Offence, that in the honestest Man in the World, may be unavoidable — Thus a Baker makes his Bread in the Dough, and Weighs it into the Oven — I would be glad to see the Baker that can say, every Loaf shall come out as exactly alike in Weight, as it went in; the difference in heating the Oven, shall unavoidably make one be harder bak'd than another, and Consequently lighter, the further End of the Oven being first set, and last drawn, shall have a difference, the time of Sale will abate in Weight between New and Stale — And yet without any regard to Circumstance, if the Loaf wants but an Ounce, the Baker forfeits, and loses both his Reputation, and his Money.

I shall Search for some Medium here, if possible; for without doubt the Law has some defect in this Article.

Printed for the Author; and sold by *John Baker*, at the *Black Boy* in *Pater-Noster-Row*. 1710.

¹ *the Post-Boy, May the ...*: Copy not seen. The *Observer* of 17-20 May 1710, declaring the plan impracticable, says that if a Dissenter or Papist offered their estates worth 20 years' purchase at 10, Church of England men would buy them, and condemns it as likely to make 'the Trade of the Nation sink'.

² *Salt*: misformed word in original.

³ *Temple Bar and Ludgate*: See the *Review* of 25 May 1710, where Defoe corrects the text in this place.

⁴ *Voce Magistrz*: with magisterial decree.

Numb. 27. Saturday, May 27. 1710.

[London; reprinted as Edinburgh 26. Tuesday, 30 May 1710]

[Heading as at 28 March, 1710]

I Should not have taken up so much of my Time, and my Readers, as to make a whole Paper only upon this Affair of the Bakers, were it not that I think it is a thing very material to the Publick Peace, as well as to the Poor People of the Nation; and that I am willing to dispatch it, also, I think it may be needful, in order to prevent, and disappoint some People, who, *taking hold of every opportunity for the Publick disorder*, have pretended to promise themselves some Room for Mischief from this Trifle.

I think I need not say any more, to prove the Meaning of the Act of Parliament to be *not the strict tying up of the Magistrates*, to one Size or Denomination of our Loaves of Bread, but to one exact Proportion of Weight, and Price in our Bread — Proportion is what brings all the World to a Ballance — *Every thing* bears some Proportion to *every thing*; this makes a Twelve-peny Loaf, or a Half-peck Loaf just the same, both to the Buyer and Seller, call them by what Names you will; and the difference between the several Sizes of Loaves, is just as much, *as I said in my last, had it been Printed right*, as the difference there is in the length of the Ground between *Aldgate* and *Ludgate*, and the length of the Ground between *Ludgate* and *Aldgate*.

This would be the effect of exactly observing the Weight and Price of Bread, set down in the Act of Parliament — But say some, this Weight and Price cannot be so well or exactly stated, as it is done in the City, by the Lord Mayor, and Court of Aldermen, and by the Justices of *Middlesex*; who keeping up to the Letter of the Act, and the Meaning both — Must certainly do the most Justice, and this is the Reason why they resolve to tie the People up to the Sizes of Twelve-peny Bread, &c. and not Half-pecks, &c.

If this were true, I could have indeed nothing to say; and if a *Half-peck* Loaf always of the same Weight, could not be rated *in Price*, as exactly as a *Twelve-peny* Loaf always of the same *Price* may be in *Weight*, the Argument were at an End: But if there is such a thing, as a Scale of Proportion in the World, then this thing cannot be true.

But what shall we say then, if, upon Examining the Assize of Bread publish'd in *London*, and the Assize of Bread publish'd in *Westminster* the very last Week, *both the Price of Corn, and the Time being the same*, the first by the *Twelve-peny Loaf*, the last by the *Half-peck* — it should appear that *the Half-peck Assize, gives the Poor the Advantage* — If this be so, there must be a Fraud or a Fault *some where*; either the Magistrates of the City of *Westminster* have cheated the Bakers, or some Body in *London*, has given leave to the City Bakers to Cheat the Poor; and 'tis not one Farthing difference to me where it lies; let us examine the matter of Fact.

By the Assize of Bread set forth by the Bailiff of *Westminster*, &c. the 16th of *May*, 1710. The Order of which Court I have exactly Printed below, and by which the Loaves of *Peck*, *Half-peck*, &c. are allow'd: *The Weight and Price is thus,*

The Weight of the)			
<i>Half-Peck, Wheaten</i>)	lb.	oz.	dr.
<i>Loaf, being 20 Penny-</i>)	9	40	00
<i>worth of Bread — is</i>)			

By the Assize of Bread set forth in *London*, by Order of the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen, as it is taken from the Bills of Mortality, (and Reprinted in a Paper call'd the *Brittish Mercury*)¹ Dated *May* 17. 1710. being the very last Court Day.

An Eighteen-peny Loaf)	lb.	oz.	dr.
was to weigh of Wheat-)	7	07	03
en Bread —)			
 A Twopeny Wheaten)	0	13	04
Loaf)			
 So that together 20 Peny-)	8	04	07
worth of wheaten Bread is)			

Less than in <i>Westminster</i> —		0	11	01
		9	00	00

The difference is plain,
20 Pennyworth of Wheaten Bread in *Westminster*, by *Peck* and *Half-peck* — is 11 oz. 1 dr. of Weight more than 20 Pennyworth of the same Wheaten Bread in *London*, by the *Twelve-peny Loaf*.

Where this Error lies I shall not undertake to determine; *Pounds, Ounces, Drams, &c.* in Weight, are the same in *London* as in *Westminster*, I think the *Money does not differ* — Wheaten Bread, in the Sense of the Law, *cannot differ*; nor is the *Westminster* Bread coarser than that in *London*; for even of Wheaten Bread, the Justices in *Westminster* have been so exact, that if it be not the best, they have made the Difference yet greater, by keeping up the Weight, and lowering the Price 2d. in a *Peck*, as follows.

At a Court held for the City and Liberty of *Westminster*, *May* 16.

The Clause relating to Peck, Half-Peck, and Quartern Loaves.

Forasmuch as several of the Inhabitants of this City and Liberty have Petition'd for, and been accustom'd to, for the use of their Families, the sort of Wheaten Bread, made up in Peck, Half-Peck, Quartern, and Half-quartern Loaves; and have found that sort of

Bread more profitable to their Families: And this Court finding no inconvenience therein, doth hereby in pursuance of the said Act of Parliament, License and Allow the making and settling of the said several sorts of Bread, within the said City and Liberty, so as each Peck Loaf of the finest Sort, weighs full Eighteen Pounds, whilst the same is New, and be Sold (for the present) for 3s. 4d. And the Peck, Second Sort, for 3s. 2d. And the Half-Peck, Quartern, and Half-Quartern, proportionably thereto, both in Weight and Price.

Now besides what I have formerly said on this Head, which indeed, without *Consulting any Body*, occur'd to me from the *Reason of the thing*, and purely upon reading the Words of the Act; I am glad to find my Opinion very happily confirm'd, by an *Eminent Lawyer*, whose Judgment no Man will doubt — and whose Opinion, as he was pleas'd to give it under his Hand to some Gentlemen, who thought it worth their while to have their Practise so confirm'd, I have here Publish'd, having it sent me by an unknown Hand, I suppose for that purpose.

I am of Opinion, the Table of the Act was intended, to settle the Price and Weight of all Bread to be bak'd, by the common Bakers, to rise and fall, according to the Price of Corn; and the Bread therein mention'd of Penny, Two-penny, Six-penny, Twelve-penny and Eighteen-penny Loaves, were included only as Instances, for Governing the Magistrates, in setting the Assize, but not to restrain the Bakers from making Loaves of greater or lesser Value, the Weight thereof being according to the Proportion of these Instances; and the Justices of the Peace, may allow the making thereof, and may also allow the making other sorts of Bread than White, Wheaten, and Houshold, settling the Price and Weight accordingly.

Sign'd,

Ed. Northey.²

May 9. 1710.

I think nothing can be plainer — And to justify even this Opinion, as well as all I have said of this Matter, *let any Man but look into the Act* — Can any Man be so Blind as to say, that no sort of Bread is to be made but *White, Wheaten, or Houshold*, when the Act is so plain to the contrary? The Words are these,

No Person or Persons, shall make for Sale, Sell, or expose to Sale, any sort or sorts of Bread, other than the several sorts of Bread herein after mention'd, that is to say White, Wheaten, and Houshold — (Mark this) And such other sort and sorts of Bread, as shall be publickly Licensed, and allow'd, by the said Chief Magistrates, &c.

Again, take the Words of the Act, for the Assize of the Loaves.

And the Assize and Weight of the said Bread, shall be ACCORDING TO (Mark that Word) the Table here after following.

Pray then what is the Meaning of the Word ACCORDING TO? This *According to*, in our Language, does never mean *Literally and Numerically the same*, but *AGREEING WITH*; I am asham'd to think, any Gentlemen who have the Characters this Act mentions, and to whom such Power is given, *as is by*

this Act, should need that any such Explication should be made to them; *without doubt the Act suppos'd* all our Magistrates to be what all our Magistrates *ought to be*, and what I would be glad to hope *they are*, and should be very sorry *if they are not*, I mean Men of Sense, as well as Men of Honesty — For certainly this Law has put the Properties of the Subject, *as well the Baker*, as the Buyer of Bread, more absolutely in the Power of the Magistrate, than has often been done; and this leads me to the Complaint I made before, *viz.* That there seems to be this Hardship upon the Baker in the Act, that it may not in some respect be possible for him to avoid the Offence.

Not the least Room is allow'd for Accidents, not the least Abatement of Circumstances, no Allowance for the Staleness of Bread — *A Dram Weight wanting*, be the Bread New or three Days Stale, hard bak'd or soft, 'tis the same thing; a Dram weight wanting, Entitles the Informer to the Penalty, and leaves the Baker at Mercy.

I confess, it seems to me to have been a little differing from the usual Way of Acts of Parliament, and which I doubt not will be hereafter Regulated — Had the Buyer been oblig'd to see his Bread weigh'd at the Bakers Shop, or the Bakers, who carry their Bread out, been oblig'd to carry Scales with them, and to Weigh their Bread, and upon all deficiency *to have leave to make it up*, either in Bread, or by Abatement of Price — Then it had been but just, if the Baker had sold less Weight than was due, *to punish him severely* — But to fetch a Loaf hot out of the Oven, take it home, keep it two Days, or near three, and then come and say it is not Weight — When at the same time, if it really was Weight from the Oven, it may lose, or if it was not Weight from the Oven, the Baker could not possibly avoid it, and if demanded at the time of Buying, might have made it up; this I say is a hardship, may soon put an end to the Trade of a Baker, and we may have Ovens enough to Lett, in a few Months: But I doubt not some Medium may be found out, to reconcile this, and all other Inconveniencies of this kind, in another Parliament.

Mean Time, I see nothing in all the difficulties before us, and that have occasion'd so much Clamour, if the Magistrates will but use the Authority they have, to let the Bakers make such size of Bread, as the People desire, have been used to, understand, and as really are most to the Advantage of their Families — If this may not be had, we must have Patience till another Parliament, when the same Authority that has made this Law, may better explain it.

And so much for the Bakers.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Bartlett of *Goodman's-Fields* [as at 15 April 1710]

Printed for the Author; and sold by *John Baker*, at the *Black Boy* in *Pater-Noster-Row*. 1710.

¹ *a Paper call'd the British Mercury*: not seen.

² *Ed. Northey*: Sir Edward Northey (1652-1723), MP for Tiverton in Devon in 1710-22, and attorney-general in 1701-7, 1710-18. He was engaged as prosecutor in John Tutchin's trial in 1704.

Copyright

Numb. 28. Tuesday, May 30. 1710.

[London; reprinted as Edinburgh 27. Thursday, 1 June 1710]

[Heading as at 28 March, 1710]

I Have been diverted from the useful Subject I was upon, by a little matter of Trade, and have another to speak to, in this Paper, and then shall go on, where I leave off — Yet I must say something to a Matter, that some say I left too hastily.

I went through the *Doctrine of Hereditary Right*, as it affects the present Settlement of the Crown — I have given my Judgment of it, as I will at any time Answer to our Law, and am ready to suffer for, and defend it.

I come now to *the Doctrine of Resistance*, a thing the High-Flying Party run so madly upon, and are so Zealously hot against, that nothing but *Resisting* them, will Answer them — 'Tis to no purpose to tell them of the Revolution, all the publick Acts, even of the Church of *England* Clergy against King *James*, will not convince them; nay, they will have it, that even in the very Act of *Resistance*, they practised *Non-Resistance* to King *James* — They will not allow, that Inviting in a Foreign Army, was a Breach of *Non-Resistance* — When the People of *England* join'd that Foreign Army at *Exeter*, March'd among the Troops, Listed new Regiments, Advanc'd against King *James* and his Army at *Salisbury*, and Fought his Troops at *Wincanton*, and *Reading* — This was no Breach of *Non-Resistance*; the Nobility, Gentry, Clergy, and Commons of *England*, Rise in Arms under the Lord *Delamere*, in *Lancashire*, and his Grace the Duke of *Leeds*, in *Yorkshire*, and joining all together, with a vast Concourse of other Noble Persons, Rendevouzed at *Nottingham*, and there in Arms, profess'd and declar'd their Resolution, to oppose the Tyrannical Invasions of their Prince — Here they Listed Men, form'd Troops, and prepar'd for a Civil War — No question all agreeable to, and squar'd by the constant Practice, of the best Members of the Church of *England*, in the *Doctrine of Non-Resistance*.

When their King drawing his Forces together, to Suppress this Rebellion; for such no doubt it was, *if Non-Resistance be a Duty*, in the highest Degree — How did all Men, that had a Sense of *English* Liberty and of the Native Right of the Subject, with the danger of overturning our Constitution — forsake him, and go over, join with the Foreign Army — Raise the Militia, and get what Forces they could together, in order no doubt, to submit to him again; and yield to the Irresistible Sacred, Force, of the Heavenly *Doctrine of Non-Resistance*.

Among these we need not repeat, that his late Highness the Prince of *Danemark*, the present Duke of *Marlborough*, and above all, his Lordship the Right Reverend Bishop of *London*; and as by a Certificate I gave you, in Review N^o 25 Her present Majesty, whose going away, is justly call'd there, Escaping from the Hands of her Enemies — And to defend whom, against her

said Enemies, tho' these Enemies were the Party adhering to the King, Her Majesty's Father — The Militia was summon'd to meet at *Warwick* — And to bring with them Musquets, with every Man fourteen Charges of Powder and Ball, the better and more effectually to put in practice, the most Heavenly, most Church of *England* Doctrine of *Non-Resistance*.

When their King, Terrify'd by the Universal Resistance of the Nation, or by Secret Reflections, *be that as it will*, fled away to *France* — These all concurr'd *Church of England and all*, to set his Resisting Invader upon the Throne, and in order to preserve him there, rais'd great Armies, Levyed prodigious Taxes, and when the said King *James* return'd into his own Dominions (*Ireland*) again, and drawing together an Army, possess'd himself of all the said Kingdom of *Ireland*, the small City of *London-Derry* excepted — They, the Church of *England*, Nation of *England*, sent over a Church of *England* Army, Furnish'd, Rais'd, Paid, and Employ'd, by a Church of *England* Parliament, Commanded wholly by Church of *England* Officers, *for none you know may have Comissions but Members of the Church* — These Landed in *Ireland*, Fought King *James* at the *Boyn*, *Shot at him*, did their endeavour *to kill*, and put him to Death — And as intentionally did put him to Death, as ever the Rebels in 1648, did his Father; and by this Force, *they Routed him*, Defeated his Forces, took from him that Kingdom, and drove him a Second Time, to save himself by flight into *France* — And all this to prove the more undeniably, that the Church of *England* ever adhered to the Great Doctrine of NON-RESISTANCE, and that Resisting the Sovereign, may not be practised upon any presence whatsoever.

And is it not a sad Testimony, of a Judgment seizing the People of this Nation, that these Things should have no Power to Convince them? — Is it not an Evidence, that Heaven for some peculiar Punishment, has given these Men over — And left them to strong Delusion, that they may believe a Lie? — Would any Man that had seen the Temper of this People, in the Time of the late King *James*, when the Church was in real Danger, and a high Commission of State-Miners¹ Erected, who were furnish'd with Tools to dig under her real Foundations; when as to Property, Men would have given one half of their Estates, to have secur'd the other — When *Church* and *Dissenter* join'd heartily to pull down the *Popish Babel*, that was built upon our Liberties; and Nature shone with a Light of Conviction into all your Understandings, Teaching you, that Nations were not tamely to give up their Laws, Religion, and Estates, to the Arbitrary ruinous Projects of a Tyrant? Would any Man, I say, that had ever seen this believe it possible, without a Judicial Infatuation, that the same People should reassume their Blindness, and rise up again for Bondage? — Never since the Children of *Israel*, who were fed by Miracle from Heaven, demanded to go back to make Brick without Straw, and to

feed on Onions and Garlick; was any Nation in the World so sordidly and unaccountably bewitch'd.

Well might her Majesty bid you all be quiet, and do your own Business; for surely Men that have no Eyes to see their Destruction, ought not to assume the Leading themselves, or one another; such must run into every Ditch, and plunge themselves into every Gulph.

There is no Question, and one would think it needs no Explication, that Obedience to just Princes, is our Debt to God, and the Nature of the Government — And he that Resists a Righteous Sovereign, in the just Execution of the Legal Power, resists the Ordinance of God, and they that so Resist, receive to themselves Damnation, &c. But that this should be extended to prevent the Subjects defending themselves, against unjust and Tyrannical Invasions of the Law, Right, and Constitution of the Government, is such an Absurdity, as requires no Answer at all, and is nobly distinguish'd in the Declaration of the Nobility, Gentry, &c. Assembled at *Nottingham*, 1686, where the just difference between Resisting a just Prince, and Resisting an Arbitrary Tyrant, is unanswerably Stated.

To say as our Party now would fain bring in, that this Doctrine renders her Majesty's Crown precarious, is an Impudent Suggestion upon her Majesty; as if there were real Occasion to suppose her Majesty, who has made the Laws the strict and unbroken Rule of her Government, should deviate from the Religious Observance of that essential Part of Government, and become a Tyrant.

To say, that because it is utterly Illegal to Resist her Majesty, a Mild, Merciful, and Just Queen, who governs according to Law, Preserves, and Nourishes the Constitution, and is a true Parent to her People; under whom Religion flourishes, Vertue is Encouraged, Liberty preserv'd, Justice Supported, and Legal Right kept Sacred; that therefore if an Incarnate Devil should succeed, and Reign by all the Violences and furious Injuries, of an Enraged Monster; we must equally Subject our selves, and equally abhor Resist Him, as her present Majesty: This would be such incongruous Nonsense, such absurd, stupid, and unaccountable a way of speaking — As I hope *English Men* will never understand, and much less submit to.

*To say such Kings, Lord Rule by thee,
Is most prodigious Blasphemy:
If such Kings are by God appointed,
The Devil may be the Lords Anointed.²*

MISCELLANEA

Tho' Breaking the Law, and putting a Contempt upon Acts of Parliament, be now the National Distemper of this Country — Our Parliaments being

more immediately concern'd in making, than in executing our Laws; and the Magistrate, God knows, remiss enough; yet I cannot but offer a Thought or two, to some of our People, who are running Headlong upon the Edge of the Law, so lately made, and so firmly Guarded with Penalties, and Forfeitures, that I know none more — And this is the Act prohibiting Lotteries.³

I am no Informer, nor am I one of those that would restore my Fortune and Family at the Price of ruining others — But I would put some People in Mind, that when they lay themselves open to Forfeitures and Penalties, which the Law gives every needy Informer a Right to; they will have no Body to blame but themselves, if they find themselves involv'd in Labyrinths, that they will come badly out of; and if some be to be found, who commencing Prosecutions against them, from however bad Principles of their own; yet it may not be in the Power of the honest Lawyer, or best Judge, to deliver them.

This caution I thought might be useful, both to some that have set up little Lotteries in the Town, and some that have been but too forward to Encourage them, both which are liable to the Law — And even now lye at the Mercy, of any Man that wants Money, and desires to get it by Informing — I shall let them see more of it hereafter; but if Mischief befalls them, I hope they will remember they had fair Warning, by one that does it not to prompt, but to prevent the Dammage that may follow.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Whereas Many Persons, that for some Months [as at 13 May 1710]

Printed for the Author; and sold by *John Baker*, at the *Black Boy* in *Pater-Noster-Row*. 1710.

¹ *a high Commission of State-Miners*: In 1686 James II created a Court of High Commission answerable to the sovereign which was to exercise control over civil and religious matters. It ceased to function in 1688. The original court of the same name instituted during the Reformation had been dissolved by parliament in 1641.

² *To say ... Lords Anointed*: Defoe quotes from Andrew Marvell's 'History of Insipids, a Lampoon' (1676), compressing stanzas 25 and 26 (lines 145-56) into four lines. The original runs:

That false rapacious Wolf of *France*,
The Scourge of *Europe*, and its Curse,
Who at his Subjects cry, does dance,
And study how to make them worse.
To say such Kings, Lord, rule by thee,
Were most prodigious Blasphemy.

Such know no Law but their own Lust,
Their Subjects Substance, and their Blood,
They count it Tribute due and just,

Still spent and spilt for Subjects good.
If such Kings are by God appointed,
The D— may be the L— Anointed.

³ *the Act prohibiting Lotteries*: On 9 November 1709 an Order in Council had reaffirmed the Act of Parliament suppressing lotteries of the tenth year of King William's reign, which had fallen into contempt. The Order singled out 'many Lotteries in several Places in this Kingdom, in Imitation of the said Royal Oak Lottery, called Roly-Poly, and ABC, and other Lotteries for Goods, Lands and Mony, called Sales by Lots, contrary to the said Act'. By these, it went on, the managers 'unjustly and fraudulently got to themselves great Sums of Money from the Children and Servants of several Gentlemen, Traders and Merchants, and from other unwary Persons, which tends to the utter Ruin and Impoverishment of many Families' (Boyer, *History*, 9, p. 254).

Copyright

Numb. 29. Thursday, June 1. 1710.

[London; reprinted as Edinburgh 28. Saturday, 3 June 1710]

[Heading as at 28 March, 1710]

I Broke off the Subject of *Constitution-Right* in a former, to speak to a needful, *tho' meaner Affair*, relating to Trade — I mean that of the Bakers.

But the main thing now on the Stage of publick Debate, is of too much Consequence to be laid down: I have (*if I may be Judge*) stated the wretched Pretences and vile Absurdity, of the present Clamouring Party, advancing the Chimera of *Hereditary Right*, as THE Title, by which her Majesty came to the Crown; I have declar'd my self on this Head with freedom, and without fear of the Frowns, or Faces of any Man — And I Thank God, *in this Cause*, I know not how to be afraid; an *English-Man that has his Senses*, cannot be afraid to declare what the Law justifies, and determines.

I am told of, and very much threatned with *Presentments* and *Prosecutions*, which they say are preparing against this Paper, and its so much *hated Author* — Indeed I know not how soon Power may oppress Law, and Justice be taken Captive by the Party, and so Freedom of Speech may be taken away, with our other Liberties — And therefore *'tis a Time to speak*, while Truth has the Protection of a just Government, and while the Laws retain their due Sovereignty — I am far from prompting Prosecutions, or despising Courts of Justice; but Party-Prosecutions I cannot show any respect to. And *what is it* makes the Party so diligent, to find occasion against this Author, and if possible to stop his Mouth? The Thing is very plain; *Come, Gentlemen*, If you dare hold your Face to your new Doctrine — Proceed legally — And BEGIN when you please, *behold*, I give you a fair Challenge — And again, repeat the Crime, that you may not want Room to build upon — If what I am going to say, which is the Sum of what I have already said, is *against Law* — Or if *my speaking it*, is against any Legal Restraint — if the Laws do not say the same Thing, or do any where *forbid me* to say it — Present this Paper for a Nuisance, and Indict the Author, and let him be punish'd at your Pleasure; but if otherwise, PRESENT THE LAWS, declare them, as indeed they are, YOUR NUISANCE, and Indict the Parliament, for They are the Speakers in this Paper, *and not I*.

The Maxims I Advance, and which I offer to Vindicate *by the Laws*, and by *proof of Fact*, are as follow: And for these Truths I am ready to be Sacrificed *when you please* — Or when packt Juries can bring it to pass.

1. To assert, *as in the Sermons, Addresses, and Pamphlets of the High Party is asserted*, That her Majesty's Right to the Crown of these Kingdoms, is Hereditary, and not by Parliamentary Limitation — Is ILLEGAL, a *Reproach* upon her Majesty, an *Affront* to the Constitution, a *Bullying* the Parliament, a Treasonable Conspiracy against her Majesty's Crown and Dignity, and a *Wicked*

Villanous Attempt upon her Majesty's Person, in order to expose her as an Usurper, and an Invader of the Right of her own Father — It being evident, that upon *the Demise of the late King William* of Glorious Memory, *her Majesty had been declared Queen by Vertue of the same Parliamentary Settlement*; 1 Gulielm. & Mariæ, cap 36. *tho' her Royal Father, the Late King James, had been then alive* — Let the Party present this at the *Old Baily*, at their Peril.

2. *To assert* the utter Illegality of *Resistance of the Sovereign, on any pretence whatsoever*, is a Treasonable Conspiracy against the Fundamental Being of the present happy Establishment, in which the Parliament of *England*, the Church of *England*, the present Queen, and God himself, most happily concurr'd; OWNED the Principle of Resistance, *Justified* it by Practice, and *Blessed* it with Success; by which *happy Resistance*, Popery and Tyranny were effectually *Deposed*, their growing Power *Overthrown*, their Abettors and Instruments, *Scattered* and *Abdicated*; and this Nation happily restored, to the blessed Establishment of the Revolution — *By which Resistance*, Her present Majesty Reigns: The Parliaments of *England* and *Scotland, and now of Britain*, made a Claim of their Rights, and *enjoy them to this Day*; by *which Resistance*, and concurring with which, the Church of *England* is restored to a *safe and flourishing Condition*; and is in danger only from those *False Brethren*, who would bring her to espouse that very Principle, *the disowning which* has been her Preservation — And would cause her to drink *that Poison*, which should make her *Vomit up* all her Temporal Privileges and Security.

3. To deny, That the *Dissenters in England* are Established by a Legal Toleration — Is to deny what the Parliament and the Queen have Declar'd and Recogniz'd — What has in her Majesty's Speeches from the Throne, and in several Acts of Parliament, been called a Toleration, and in the very Act itself, is called a *Permission* and *Allowance* — And is a meer Quibbling upon a Word, in order Maliciously to defeat the true Intent and Meaning of the Parliament — And to Introduce the old High-Church Practice, of Plunder and Persecution.

4. That to endeavour to *lessen* or *overthrow* the said Toleration, is a Treacherous Contrivance against the Liberties and Properties of the *Dissenters*, and against their CAPITULATED RIGHT to the said Toleration, included in the Memorial to the Prince of *Orange*; and *on the Conditions whereof*, the *Dissenters* join'd in Inviting over the Prince of *Orange*, and in all the subsequent Parts of the Revolution — *Besides all which*, it is a vile and abominable Suggestion against her Majesty, as capable of Breaking her Royal Word given to the Nation, to preserve the said Toleration INVOLABLY.

5. *To Assert*, That Non-Resistance has been the Practice of the Church of *England* — is to LYE against the Truth, to Contradict Matter of Fact — And is *Confronted* by the Memorial of the *English* Clergy, in Conjunction with the

Nobility and Gentry, *Inviting over the Prince of Orange*, the late Immortal King *William*, to Assist them, in RESISTING the Popish Invasions of their *Anointed King* — In the Clergy of the Church swearing Allegiance to the same King, while their *Resisted Monarch* was alive, and in paying Taxes towards *Resisting and making a War, against* their said *Anointed King*, while he was actually in *his own Dominions*, fighting against that very RESISTANCE.

6. All those Persons, whether of the Nobility, Gentry, Clergy, Magistracy, or whatsoever Rank or Degree they bear in this Nation, who having *sworn Allegiance*, &c. to her present Majesty; and taken *the Abjuration, with the other Oaths* mention'd in the several Acts of Parliament, *for Security of the Person and Government of the Queen, and Extinguishing the hopes of the Pretender*, &c. and yet have join'd in, and defended the said Tenets and Assertions; *are as far as they have so Acted, Join'd in, and Defended* — Making *Secret War* against the Constitution; *and as far as in them lies, Overthrowing the Establishment, Deposing and Exposing* her Majesty; and are Intentionally *Traytors* to the present Government, *Enemies* to the Protestant Religion, *Betrayers* of their Country, *Underminers* of the Church of *England*, and *Encouragers* of the Pretender.

If I have Printed the Names of these Men with Abbreviations, Dashes, or Initial Letters: If I have Couched their Characters under Allegories, Similies, Allusions &c. it is owing to the Preservation due to the innocent Printers, Publishers and Dispersers of this Paper, who may be perplex'd with vexatious Suits, and frivolous Presentments; and may be put to needless and oppressive Expences by the Iniquity of the Times, giving a litigious Party too much Advantage to oppress Men without Crimes.

But if the Gentlemen I mean, think themselves aggriev'd by me, let them come fairly to the Bar of Justice, and put it to the Issue, Whether any of the Maxims *I have laid down as before*, ARE or ARE NOT LAW and TRUTH, supported by the Constitution, and standing on the same Foundation with all our Liberties — I will then Impeach them, to their Teeth, and stand by it — That they are guilty of Treason against the *English* Government; Guilty of Insulting and Affronting the Parliament; Guilty of Assisting the Pretender, Her Majesty's ABHORR'D RIVAL, and the most contemptible Disturber of the publick Tranquility.

I'll appear to their Faces, and tell them BY NAME, they are breaking their Oaths Fighting for the Interest they have Abjur'd, Abjuring that Resistance they have Practised, — and being *Gorg'd with Liberty*, are Betraying their native Country and Posterity, into the most vile and abominable Slavery.

To Present the *Review* for *Dashes* and *dark Expressions*,¹ which must come to a meer Tryal of *Innuendoes!* This is trifling, and is a Lightning without Thunder, a Flash without a Bullet, a meer *Brutum Fulmen* — that may scare those that do not understand it, or have not been us'd to it — But if you will come

to the Touch, *here is Matter to Indict and Prosecute upon* — Begin thus, Gentlemen, when you Please; and if you will but come to the Tryal, whether the Fact be Treason, or no. You shall not want the Names of the Traytors: I'll tell you at length, who I mean by *A's* — and *B's* — and *C's* great Horses, Princes, &c. For Truth fears no Faces — And till you will do this — *The Review*, I doubt, will continue to be *your Nuisance*; tho' ten Thousand Presentments were to be made against it.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

Bartlett of *Goodman's-Fields* [as at 15 April 1710]

Whereas Many Persons, that for some Months [as at 13 May 1710]

Printed for the Author; and sold for *John Baker*, at the *Black Boy* in *Pater-Noster-Row*. 1710.

¹ *Present the Review for Dasbes and dark Expressions*: This refers back to 25 October 1708 (volume 6), when Defoe in Scotland had commented on his enemies' attempts in London to close down the *Review* by legal action. See vol 6, Introduction, p. xvi.

Copyright