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ld by A. Baldwin, in Warwick-Lane. MDCCX.
Perhaps there never was an instance, since our happy Constitution was in being, of such a ferment as we have seen in our Days, raised upon such grounds, and in so critical a time. Perhaps there never was an instance of any sort of men amongst us, (pretending even to the lowest degree of Submission) who have acted such a part, as some amongst us, (who pretend to greater degrees of Obedience than their Neighbours) against a House of Commons by which every thing hath been done for the Publick Good, and every thing necessary to bring down the Common Enemy: first by Rebellious Tumults, and now by
discontented Address to a QUEEN, who hath discovered not the least dislike of the Proceedings of Her Parliament, but a much more hearty Approbation, than their Enemies themselves professed to expect. But my design is not to entertain the Reader with any Reflections but such as offer themselves too plainly to be avoided, in the execution of my present purpose, which is to comment a little upon what seems the Chief Burthen of these terrible Address, which will not yet permit the Nation to subside into Peace and Quietness.

1. Her Majesty's Title to her Crown presents itself first to our View. This the Addressers would gladly appear to have a greater Regard to, than their Neighbours. Some frame their Complements, as if their whole Design were to shew their Zeal against that Title which arises out of the Revolution, and Act of Settlement; and their desire to have it entirely drop'd out of the Annals of this Nation. But a more modest sort of Addressers, (whose Voice is not of the least Moment with their Friends and Allies;) take another Method. They first declare that their Duty suffers them not to
to call in question any Title by which Her Majesty holds her Crown. And then they immediately add, that the very mention of Resistance at this time, under the Best of Queens, ought to be detested and abhor'd. In the former of these Declarations, Her Majesty is supposed to hold her Crown by another Title, besides the Hereditary one: and that can be no other than the Revolution-Title. Now this Revolution-Title cannot be Lawful (with respect to the Queen's possessing the Crown) unless Resistance, in Cases of Extremity, be Lawful. If therefore to this we add the latter of these Declarations, which follows too closely upon it, they may both together be thus paraphras'd. Duty will not suffer us to call in question Your Majesty's Revolution-Title, which is founded upon Resistance: but yet the very mention of Resistance, at this time, tho' absolutely necessary in order to establish that Title, ought to be detested and abhor'd. So that here Her Majesty's Revolution-Title is call'd in question in the same Breath in which it is declar'd contrary to Duty to call it in question, Call'd in question? I wish I could not say, It is abhor'd and detested. And thus perhaps the Contradiction is to be salv'd. For, tho' it may
may be contrary to Duty to call it in question; yet it doth not follow, but that it may be detested and abborr'd, by way of Consequence. This, we see, is the way of treating the Revolution-Title. It is either entirely forgotten and drop'd: or It is consequentially recommended to the Detestation of Her Majesty's subjects. And yet this Revolution-Title is the thing which is to support all our Future Princes, in the Protestant Line.

The Hereditary Title of Her Majesty is the Darling. And this is solely magnified and cried up to the Stars by some. By the most Modest it is said that their Duty will not suffer them to call in question particularly that which is Hereditary; or, Her Majesty's Hereditary Title, as distinct from the Revolution-Title. Now, what can be imagin'd the Reason of this tender regard to one, more than to another, Title, both suppos'd at first by the same Persons unquestionable? Why should one unquestionable be put more out of question, than another? And why should the Hereditary Title, at this time of Day, be pitch'd upon for so great a Favour? Is it because these Gentlemen are all so certain, to a Demonstration, that the Pretender was not the Son of K. James's Queen? Or that
that it doth not so plainly appear that the Crown is fix'd upon the Queen's Head by the late Act of Settlement? Is it, that the Proofs of the former are more evident, than that Act which doth the latter? Or, Is it, that Acts of Parliament, since the Revolution, give only an obscure and doubtful Title? If I may have leave to guess at the true Reasons that guide some Men, I strongly suspect that this good Inclination more particularly to Hereditary Right, ariseth from two things, viz. That tender Regard to the Revolution, and the Memory of the Late King and Queen, which one sort of Men have always express'd; and that Concern for the Protestant Succession in the House of Hanover, for which they are no less famous. For who doth not see, with half an Eye, how great an Honour this Principle of Hereditary Right casts back upon K. William and Qu. Mary, who had none? And what a Strength it gives to all their Acts, particularly that of the Settlement of the Crown? And on the other Hand, He must be Blind that doth not see what Service this must do towards the keeping out all the Popish Line, and establishing that of the Illustrious House of Hanover. Let it but be con-

consider'd
sider'd, on which Side the Hereditary Right lies, and how particularly this is declar'd unquestionable: and what Tongue can express the happy influence this Principle hath, backward, upon the Validity of the Revolution, and all Acts of Parliament under K. William; and forward, upon the Protestant Succession, the only Hope of the Nation after the Death of Her Majesty? This is the way in which We are now to speak, if We will be in the Fashion, of that Hereditary Right, by which alone the Popish Line have any Claim to a Restoration: and who doth not see from hence the tender Concern of some Men for our present Protestant Establishment?

2. The next Point that offers itself is, the vehement Detestation of Popish-Republican, or Popish and Republican Principles. But here We might have been at some loss, upon what to have fix'd these hard Words, had not some of our Addressers, too Generous to rest in general Accusations, kindly let Us into the certain Meaning of this Cry. *The Doctrine of Resistance of Princes, now maintain'd under Her Majesty's Reign, is the Point. It is this which is declar'd a Popish-Republican Doctrine.* So Unmerciful
ful a Chain'd Epithet for one poor Doctrine! Well; Let us see, however, what can be understood by this. Whether the meaning of this be, that it is a Popish-Popish Doctrine, or a Popish-Protestant Doctrine, is not worth enquiring. This, I think, with the leave of the Learned, that the same Doctrine concerning Resistance (for it is one particular Doctrine, now maintain'd, that is here pointed at) cannot be both Popish and Republican. As far as it is Popish, it is built upon Servitude to the Pope: as far as it is suppos'd Republican, it is built upon the Rights of Mankind. The Popish Doctrine of Resistance cannot be Republican; The Republican cannot be Popish: and consequently the same individual Doctrine cannot be a Popish-Republican Doctrine. We will divide therefore this Chain'd Word, and see in what Sense the Doctrine of Resistance of the Prince. (for to Him only We find it confin'd by those, who understand Meanings best) as now maintain'd, can be call'd, either 1st, Popish, or 2dly Republican.

The Doctrine is this, that it is Lawful for this Nation, to save it self from imminent Ruine, by opposing the Prince, when He manifestly attempts to dissolve the Constitution, and to invade the Privileges of the whole
whole Body of Subjects, against the known Laws of the Land, which He is sworn to preserve and maintain inviolably. The Reasons of mentioning it at this time, will help likewise to shew how entirely Popish it is. And the Reasons are, because our Settlement in the Protestant Succession is founded upon the Nation's having resisted a Popish Prince, and withdrawn their Allegiance from the whole Popish Line; and because we are still fighting against that Power, that would re-establish this Popish Line, by Virtue of Hereditary Right.

In the first place therefore, the whole Body of Addressers, whether Learned, or Unlearned, would do well to name one single Popish Writer, (I say, one single Popish Writer,) who, as a Casuist, or Divine, ever maintain'd this Doctrine, or any thing like it. I say, any thing like it. For, in the next place, it must be noted, that the Popish Doctrine concerning Resistance, and withdrawing Allegiance, is as different from it, as Slavery is from Liberty. For it is nothing but the Doctrine of slavish Subjection to the Pope, viz. that when he pleaseth to declare against any Prince, tho' Governing after the best manner; then the People are obliged to arm against Him, in order to shew
threw themselves Greater Slaves to the Pope. Who is there that cannot see that the one
is founded upon the Rights and Privileges
of Mankind, whether Papists, or Protestants,
whether Heathens, or Christians; and that
the other is founded upon the utmost Ser-
vitude of the poor People to the Pope, and
the utmost Disgrace put upon Humane Na-
ture? The one calculated to support the Li-
berty of the People, the other to make
both Kings and People the Vassals of Rome?
What imaginable Affinity is there between
these two Doctrines? or what imaginable
reason for stiling that Popish, which stands
upon a Foundation diametrically opposite
to, and destructive of, that which is Po-
push? And one might hope that some Men
might be more sparing of the word Popish,
considering how grievous they find it them-
selves, to have any of their darling Cu-
stoms, and Tenets, run down with the Clam-
mour of Popery; whilst they are inwardly
Conscious of their own entire Aversion to
every thing that doth but border upon it?

Or it may be, that this Doctrine is
call'd Popish, by a Figure, because it is
not Popish; because it hath been taught
by
by many of the first Reformers, and chief Protestant Writers; or, because it was encourag'd by Q. Elizabeth, and her Convocation and Parliament, in order to bring down the Power of the Papists; or, because it is now maintain'd merely, and solely, to keep out the Popish Line; and is most zealously oppos'd by every Papist in Great Britain, and Ireland. But this Figure hath been long exploded by the Best Criticks. On the other Side, it will be worth noting that the Doctrine of Absolute Unlimited Non-resistance, in the Sense in which any Protestants deny it, is maintain'd by Popish Writers; is now asserted by all the Papists of these Nations; and is that Doctrine by which, as they once hop'd, to have preserv'd the Popish Line upon the Throne, so they now expect to restore it. For Unlimited Non-resistance, back'd with Hereditary Right, is a Weapon, which they value above all the Arms of France. Here therefore a Query ariseth. Which is most truly a Popish Doctrine; that Doctrine concerning a Nation's Right to Resist, when they can't prevent their Ruin without it, which no Popish Casuist teacheth; which many of the most celebrated Reformed Writers have allow'd
allow'd of; which hath banish'd, and now keeps out, Popery from amongst our selves; and which all our own Papists profess to abhor: or that of Absolute Non-resistance, of which all Papists are now most fond, and in which they place their greatest Hopes and Expectations? But by this time to be sure, the Reader must be satisfied how perfectly Popish, the Doctrine, now maintain'd, of Resistance of Princes, is: viz. so perfectly Popish, that it is the Hatred and Aversion of every Papist in the Kingdom.

But We will go to the other Branch, in which the Doctrine of Resistance of Princes, now maintain'd, is declar'd to be a Republican Doctrine. Great Feats are to be done by the help of this Word Republican! We will find out, if it be possible, what the Meaning of the Word is, as it is thus applied. Resistance of our Princes is defended by no one any further than as it is necessary to preserve that Constitution, of which we so much boast, and to hinder this Limited Monarchy from being turn'd into an Absolute one. I hope it cannot be a Mark of a Republican to prefer our own Constitution before that of France or Tur-
key: because this we all profess at least to do. well then; what hath this poor doctrine to do with the republican scheme? is it a republican principle to declare for our constitution as it is now? which must help to preserve it from becoming a republick, on one hand, as well as from changing to an absolute monarchy on the other. a republican with us must be one who prefers the common-wealth-form of government before our own. but what relation is there between the defending resistance, in order to keep our legal constitution; and preferring the republican form before that which we now enjoy? just as much as there is between defending separation from the church of rome, and preferring calvin's discipline and government, before that of the church of england. and the principle of the lawfulness of separation, on the highest accounts, may, with the same right, be call'd a calvinistical, and presbyterian principle; as that of resistance, in cases of extremity, is nicknam'd republican.

and, with the leave of our addressers, nothing is properly republican, but what is so peculiar to that form, as that it cannot
cannot consistently be maintained by any who prefer another before it. Now let us take which Form of Government we please for our Darling; the general Principle of Resistance, in extream Cases, may be held consistently with a love to any of them. If we chuse the Government of one Man without Council, or Parliament: It is not inconsistent at all in any who like this best, to maintain that, should this one Man, against all the Laws of Nature and Reason, undertake to murther and extirpate his Subjects, Resistance would be lawful. I say this as Is consistent with the liking Absolute Monarchy, in the main, better than a Republick, as with the contrary. And therefore the general Principle of Resistance in Cases of Extream Necessity, is as much Monarchical, as it is Republican.

But however this may be, It must be own'd that we are oblig'd to those who have let us into the true meaning of the Word Republican, now so much in use. Great Complaints we know, are made of numbers of Republican Books and Pamphlets, spread about! And now
we see what it is that is meant, viz. that there are Writers who presume to defend that Resistance of the Prince which was practised at the Late Revolution. The Revolution is defended: Therefore it is high time to nick-name the Doctrine of Resistance, and to brand it with the Title of Republican. We know therefore now, what some Men mean. To detest Republican Principles, is to detest Revolution Principles: And as no other sort of Republican Principles have been mention'd under the best of Queens, these only must be intended by the mighty Zeal against Republican Principles. And they that can detest Resistance, without detesting the Revolution, and Her Majesty's Revolution-Title, must have good luck at getting rid of Consequences.

But after all, what if this great Cry against Republican Principles should be design'd only as a Singular Respect to our Chief Allies, at this Critical Juncture, when the strictest Union between them and this Nation is of such Importance? or as the highest Token of Gratitude to that Republick which help'd to save Us, when We were devoted to Destruction, by sending over an
an Army and Fleet to our Assistance? But seriously, whatever we might judge from our Armies abroad, One would think, in truth, by some late Addresses at home, that we were now fighting against the States of Holland, and not the Monarch of France. I need say no more. How Republican the Doctrine is, is plain from hence, that it is made use of to keep our Constitution what it is, as different from a Republick, as from an Absolute Monarchy.

To Popish and Republican, some of our Addressers add the Word Antimonomarchical, another hard Word, to give the finishing stroke to this poor Doctrine of Resistance, as now taught. For the explanation of this, it is to be observed, that our Monarchy is not like the Monarchy of France or Morocco, in which the Prince hath the sole Power of making as well as executing Laws; but is a Monarchy, in which tho’ the Prince hath the Executive part in himself, yet He cannot without the concurrence of both Houses of Parliament, make any Laws to oblige the Society. It is to be likewise remembered, that King James made an
attempt upon this Constitution; that he endeavoured to set up his own Will and Pleasure, above the Laws of the Land; and to turn it into the same sort of Monarchy, which he saw, and envied in a Neighbouring Kingdom. Upon this, the wicked Principle of Resistance exerted itself, and hindred this Government from being changed into an Absolute Monarchy, to the Destruction of this whole Nation. The principle therefore of Resistance must be Antimonarchical, that is, contrary to Monarchy, because it interposed, and saved us from Ruine, and from being Slaves, as they are in France, to the Will of one Man. Thus the Revolution was Antimonarchical; because it hindred King James from his design of becoming an Absolute Monarch, and preserved to us the Right of being ruled by Law. And there having been something written and spoken in defence of this Revolution, and what is founded upon it; this is the only proper time for detesting Antimonarchical Principles. Besides, we being engaged in War with the Monarch of France, nothing can be more proper than to detest and abhor those principles, by which Men
Men are led heartily to oppose all Tendency to such a Monarchy as his; and heartily to prefer our own Constitution before it; and freely to offer their Money, and their Lives, in order to keep it out from amongst our selves. And as some Men think fit to express their detestation of these Principles which work'd our Deliverance at Home; so it is very observable, that the farther our great General abroad hath proceeded towards reducing the power of the Absolute Monarch of France, the more out of Favour, and the more detestable he hath sensibly grown to some amongst us.

What then is the result of that Detestation of Popish, Republican, Antimonarchical Principles, express'd by our Adressers? Why, that the Revolution was a Popish-Republican-Antimonarchical-Revolution; that the Principles which defend it are to be detested, as Popish-Republican-Antimonarchical Principles; that the Protestant Succession founded upon that Revolution is an Antimonarchical-Republican-Popish-Protestant-Succession; and that every Step the Duke of Marlborough advances
vances towards humbling the Monarch of France, and securing our Establishment, is upon Popish-Republican-Antimonarchical Grounds. Into this it must resolve it self, if we examine it thoroughly.

Well; But whether the Doctrine be Popish-Antimonarchical-Republican, or Popish only, or Republican only; or neither; yet the very mention of the Doctrine of Resistance of Princes, at this time, under the best of Queens, ought to be detested, and abhor'd. This is the plain Voice of some, and consequently the Intent of others of our Addressing Brethren, that the very mention of Resistance of the Prince alone, at this time, is to be detested. This is going farther than the Doctor's Council, at the late Trial: nay, or than the good Doctor himself, who stuck not to the old English Non-resistance due to the Prince only, but endeavoured to interpret Supreme Powers to signify the whole Legislative. But now we are to be brought back again to the Old Doctrine: And we are taught what is truly to be understood by Supreme Powers, when it is fit to speak out.
Stable Revolution! Feeble Support of our Establishment! Unhappy Establishment! that what supports it must not be spoken of, in order to support it! Unfortunate Revolution-Title! sometimes not to be question'd, sometimes to be abhorr'd! Unhappy House of Commons, to fall under the Lash of so many Modest Addressers! No longer dare to chew your Heads in the Cause of Liberty. And O ye Managers, worthy of the utmost Abhorrence! take Shame to your selves. And O Sir S—n, once the Darling of the Party, and call'd forth by its universal Voice to defend the Doctrine of Absolute Non-Resistance, for Thee so shamefully to betray it; not only to mention Resistance of the Prince, (which alone is detestable) but to own it Lawful and Honourable, in such Cases as that of the Revolution! Unpardonable! were it not, that the Fidelity of thy Heart is known! But Blessed in the mean while, must the Case of a whole Nation be! when the mention of Resistance in extream Cases, is to be detested, under the Best of Governours, tho' made use of solely to support the Title of the Best: And
And under the Worst, We all know it impossible, without suffering for it.

But let us a little think upon the Matter. What? Is it detestable to say, in this Reign, that the Revolution, without which this Reign had never been, was Lawful? Is it detestable to affirm, at this time, that it was nobly done of some of our Addressers, to associate Heart and Hand, in defence of the Prince of Orange, who was afraid of no one but K. James and his Adherents? Is it an horrible thing to tell Her Majesty, that Her Conduct was justifiable at that time, and Her Title now Glorious? Is it detestable for a House of Commons to exert themselves for the Liberties of the Nation, and to assure our Good Queen, that they are entirely satisfy’d in Her Title, and the present Establishment, and ready to defend them against all their Enemies? If these things be so; it is high time to detest the Revolution, and the Exclusion of Hereditary Right; and to repent in Dust and Ashes.

I would
I would to God there were no appearances amongst us more detestable. To swear to a Government, and yet publicly damn it's Foundation. To abjure the Right Line; and yet to cry up Hereditary Right. To detest the very mention of Resistance under an Establishment, which owes it's being to Resistance. These to be sure, are commendable, and worthy things: and will ever be accounted the Glory of great part of this Nation. But in the mean while, there are those who are weak enough to think that the Condemnation of Resistance in all possible Cases, under an Establishment which is founded upon Resistance, might as becomingly have been detested: And that the mention of Hereditary Right being unquestionable, may be as consistently abhor'd by those who have abjur'd the Hereditary Right of many, and sworn Fidelity to a Protestant Succession, wholly destitute of Hereditary Right.
3. From all this we may judge what some Men mean by Loyalty, of which they speak so much. One would be apt to imagine it to be something for the Benefit of the present Establishment. But alas! It is nothing but the bare, tho' violent, Profession of Unlimited Non-resistance, and Hereditary Right. Excellent Loyalty to an Establishment begun upon Resistance, and to be continued only by excluding Hereditary Right!

4. When that which hath hitherto been call'd the Toleration is to be touched upon, a New Dialect is to be made use of. Some seem to be for the Legal Indulgence to Consciences truly Scrupulous. Others are more Cautious, and go no further than to say that they do by no means presume to disapprove of that Legal Impunity (something below Indulgence) which is allowed to Consciences truly Tender. And a great favour it is that there is any thing espoused by this Republican House of Commons, which they do not openly detest! But how faint the Expression is? And what Words
Words are here chosen to evidence their Zeal for the Toleration? For Her Majesty hath always call'd it the Toleration: and so did the Honourable House of Commons. One would think this were the Reason why some Men are now become afraid of the Word; and have chang'd it for something, which serves a purpose better. They do by no means presume to disapprove. Who could possibly chuse this Form of Expression, that heartily approves of a thing? The Queen declares She will inviolably maintain the Toleration. All that some can bring themselves to say, is, that they do not presume to disapprove of the Legal Impunity, allowed to Consciences truly Tender. See the Difference of the two Forms of Expression: The Zeal of the one, and the Coldness of the other.

5. In the last place, the Burthen of the Song, the main End of these Addresses, is the Dissolution or Determination of the present House of Commons, that hath shewn so ungrateful a Sense of Publrick Liberty. To this end, Her Majesty is assur'd that the utmost Care shall be us'd
us'd to chuse such Representatives in Parliament as will inviably maintain Her Majesty's just Prerogative, the Succession in the Illustrious House of Hanover, the Rights of the Church, and the Liberties of the Subject. And who, that knows anything of the Behaviour of these Gentlemen, can doubt of their Zeal for these four Particulars? Poor King William, (not to speak of her Majesty) sufficiently experienced their Zeal for the Prerogative; which hath always, indeed, exerted it self, in their constant Endeavours to limit it, ever since it was most likely to be employ'd for the good of the People. The Illustrious House of Hanover needs no new Proofs of their Affection. Their Cry for Hereditary Right, and exalting it above all other Titles, is sufficient Demonstration of their inviolable firmness to that Family. The Rights of this Episcopal Church, of which the Queen is Head, have experienced their regards. It could be nothing but their Love to it that hath mov'd them and their Friends, to adhere to those Presbyters, who claim Coordinate Powers with their Bishops, and an Exemption from the Royal Supremacy. And as for the
the Liberties of the Subject, who can give greater Demonstrations of their Concern for them, than those who have ever maintain'd the unlawfulness of Resistance, should the Prince entirely swallow them up? Unlimited Submission, Absolute Passive Obedience, Hereditary Right, are only other words for the Liberties of the Subject, the Late Revolution, and the Protestant Succession! Nor can any one, who knows the World, make the least doubt, that those who are truly the Representatives of this part of the Nation, will ever give the same Proofs of their regard to the Prerogative, the House of Hanover, the Church, and the Nation; which they have hitherto given.

But, if they be serious in this part of their Addresses, and if a steady regard to these four Particulars, be the Touchstone, may not Her Majesty take as great Satisfaction in Her present House of Commons, as in any they can choose for Her, all but themselves being Judges? What part of Her Prerogative have they invaded? Or in what hath their Zeal for Her Honour and
and Service come behind that of those who have opposed them? What could they have done more for the House of Hanover, than they have, by that late Noble Struggle for the Principles of the Revolution, and the Act of Settlement, by which alone that Illustrious Family can reign? What one Injury have they done to the Established Church, unless it by defending what fav'd it from Ruin? And then for the Liberties of the Subject; how great and zealous hath been their Contest, as if their own Lives had been at Stake, and their own Happiness had depended only upon that of the Publick? They are willing and desirous, therefore, that these, which their Enemies have laid down, should be the Marks to judge by: And they fear to be outdone, least of all, by those who have laid them down.

I shall not add any more Comments. It might be ask'd, whether Hereditary Right stuck to, and Hereditary Right abjured, mean one and the same thing: whether most of our Addressers had not heard of the passing the French Lines, and the unspeakable dif-
disappointment of the Common Enemy; or whether they thought it ominous, and foreboding of Evil. But these, and several other Points, I leave to others. One thing I know, without asking, that our Present Establishment, the Protestant Succession, and the Cause of our Allies abroad, are infinitely indebted to them for such Address.