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THE political principles of the Bible are simple, distinct, and plain. The sacred writers enter into no niceties, draw no lines of exact demarcation, meet no involved cases of civil casuistry; but, speaking of mankind generally, as alike depraved and unruly, and of governments as the creations of God's providence, they inculcate without qualification, reservation, or restriction, the obvious and indispensable duties of submission, honour, and obedience.

It has been, however, very much the fashion of late to get rid of these unpleasant and "degrading" injunctions, by pleading the change of time and circumstances, and the difference between the laws and system of government under which we are privileged to live, and those of the apostolic days. Now, as to the general duty of obedience, it is obvious that it must apply rather more than less strongly to those who live under a paternal government, than to those who live under a tyrannical one. At the same time we are ready to allow, that the system of freedom which in this country gives to the people a share in the legislature and an influence over the government, renders the submission due from them less implicit and uninquiring, at the same time that it increases the obligation to its cheerful payment.
But although it be conceded, that under a constitution which renders the people a party to their own government, it is lawful and proper for laymen to interest themselves intimately in political concerns, and even, to a certain extent, to participate in political contests,—there is one body of men whom we could ever wish to see taking no other part in these matters, than as moderators, instructors, and peacemakers.

The Ministers of the Gospel must, in the discharge of their duty,—they must, if they will "declare the whole counsel of God," sometimes touch upon those passages of Scripture which inculcate the duties of subjects. While St. Paul, in the days of Nero himself, was led by the Holy Spirit to write, "Submit to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake;" and to pronounce, without hesitation, "He that resisteth the power," tyrannical as it was in the extreme, "resisteth the ordinance of God;" and while similar passages abound in the inspired volume, it cannot be thought consistent with the character of a preacher of the Gospel to maintain an absolute silence on these topics. But there is one rule which, in our opinion, Ministers would do well to follow, and that is, to go no further than the Bible will carry them. The war of parties and factions, the continual struggle of political leaders, the various questions of constitutional casuistry, are subjects which lie beyond this boundary, and with which they would do well not to embroil themselves. The servant of the Lord is exhorted "not to strive," but "to cut off occasion from them which desire occasion;" and assuredly he will find that the bare discharge of his plain duty in these things will expose him to sufficient obloquy and reproach.

Entertaining this view of the subject, it is with sorrow that we observe the republication, under his own immediate sanction, of Mr Hall's "Apology for the Freedom of the Press." This work was first given to the world about thirty years ago, and has been long since forgotten, or remembered only as one of the sins of its author's youth. Since its disappearance, Mr. H. has so much better employed his time and his great talents, that he may now be considered as standing in the very first rank among the Nonconformists of the present day. And is it not a lamentable thing to see such a man stepping forward in the ripeness of his years, and at the height of his well-earned reputation, to obtrude himself on the public in the degraded character of a violent party scribe;—and yet, in what other light can we consider the man who, in so uncalled-for and gratuitous a manner, and at so comparatively peaceful a period, sends into the world, with the sanction of his name, and of his latest corrections, a new edition of such a pamphlet as this?

He indeed states, as an excuse for the republication, that the
term of copy-right being expired, it was no longer in his power to prevent the reprinting of this work. The law, however, is not so; the power of perpetuating its oblivion lay still in his hands. But had he even been correct on this point, where was the necessity for his being an active agent in this re-appearance?

To characterize the tract before us appropriately, we need only observe, that the principal topics discussed by this "Minister of the Gospel" are, the right of public discussion, the propriety of political associations, parliamentary reform, the rights of men, the character of Dissenters, the present discontents. The work is extremely personal, and great bitterness is shown towards the late Bishop Horsley, Mr. Burke, and Mr. Pitt. We shall not imitate Mr. Hall's example by entering into a discussion on the subject of Mr. Pitt's political character; but we should have hoped that the reflection of his undoubted integrity, and of that perfect devotion to his country, which led him to sacrifice even life itself in its service, might have spared him, at the distance of sixteen years from his death, a new volley of bitter reproach from one whose vocation is "the gospel of peace."

As to the character of Bishop Horsley, it is now placed far beyond the reach of his adversaries: and the Christian world will know how to appreciate invectives against such a man, from one who is at the same time the eulogist of Priestley and Price, the Socinians, and of Mary Wolstonecroft, the female libertine and Deist.

Looking, then, upon this work as one, of which a critical analysis would be ill placed in the pages of the Christian Guardian, we shall conclude with a specimen or two of the political creed of Mr. Hall, and of the manner in which he supports it.

He is, then, as far as professed doctrine can make him, plainly and clearly a Radical Reformer. He pleads for "annual parliaments," for universal suffrage, for the unfettered publication of every kind of blasphemy, for the exclusion of the relatives of noblemen from the House of Commons, for the overthrow of all ecclesiastical establishments, and for "the sovereignty of the people." In what part of the sacred volume he has discovered the least sanction for any one of these notions, we are at a loss to imagine.

In fact, the whole pamphlet is an argument in favour of the supremacy and infallibility of the people, and of the necessity of paying the most implicit obedience to the least expression of their will. Now, could these notions have been carried into practice at the time they were written (soon after the Birmingham riots), and could
a legislature have been formed upon Mr. H.’s universal suffrage plan, the necessary and inevitable consequence would have been, that as the feeling of the multitude ran violently against all the friends of the French Revolution.—Mr. H. and most of his fellow-labourers and admirers would have been silenced, banished, or hanged. So much for the effects which might be expected to follow from Mr. Hall’s plan. And as for the principles upon which that plan is founded, we find him broadly stating, in the latter end of this work, with admirable consistency, that “calumny and reproach are usually the lot of distinguished virtue,” and that “the unpopularity of a cause is rather a presumption of its excellence.” Now, if the fact be so, it cannot be for the good of the people that this perpetually erroneous criterion should govern the affairs of the state.

Mr. Hall concludes his prefixed advertisement with the hope “that the reader will recollect, as an excuse for the warmth of his expressions, that the work is an “eulogium on a dead friend;” which is asserting in other words, that the press is enslaved, and its liberty departed. And having written this some years since, he now coolly republishes it after witnessing the acquittals of Hone and Wooller, and while the wretched Carlile is braving every effort that can be made to stop the torrent of blasphemy which has so long issued from his warehouse.

Again, Mr. H. assured us, thirty years since, that we had then “at length arrived at that crisis when nothing but speedy and effectual reform could save us from ruin.” Now, since the first publication of this prediction, we have maintained a contest of long duration with the greatest conqueror of modern times, and have fairly subdued him. We have immensely augmented the extent of our empire, and increased its ratio of population. We have tripled our commerce and our revenue. We have improved, it is to be hoped, the state of our internal population, by the establishment of schools and the increase of places of worship. And we have made some progress in the commencement, at least, of the great work of evangelizing the whole world.

And after all this, Mr. Hall comes forward with much admirable simplicity, to tell us of this wonderful prophecy of his, delivered only the third part of a century since, that without immediate reform in Parliament ruin was then inevitable. Now, it is certain that this same immediate reform has not yet taken place, although one whole generation has passed away since the promulgation of this prediction. Has the dreadful alternative, then, fallen upon us? Have we been crushed by this inevitable ruin?

The present comparatively prosperous and improving circum-
stances of the kingdom answer No! to this question. The general state of the country, the average condition of the great mass of the people, is better, and not worse, than at the time when Mr. Hall first published this direful presage.

If there be any exception to this state of general improvement, it is to be found in the depression of the agricultural interests of the country. But we are told, by those who ought to be judges, that the evils which threaten these classes have arisen from the want of sufficient legislative protection. And do we not know, from the conduct of the mobs of 1815, that a reformed Parliament, a Universal Suffrage Parliament, according to Mr. Hall’s plan, would have withheld even the partial protection which has hitherto been granted, and would have thereby made what is now distress and perplexity, absolute ruin and destruction? So much for the necessity and the effects of reform.

It is with the most painful feelings that we are thus compelled to animadvert upon this uncalled for and altogether unnecessary republication. We repeat, that the general principle upon which we disapprove of it, is, that a Minister of the Gospel will always best consult the interests of his flock and the dignity of his own character, by abstaining from any political discussion which transgresses the bounds prescribed in the Holy Scriptures. Mr. Hall has overstepped these limits, and has plunged into the thickest of the war of violent party politics. He has also chosen, we apprehend, the side which is generally found in most direct opposition to the Scripture injunctions of peace, quietness, and obedience. And as the weight of his character and the authority of his name render error from his pen trebly dangerous, we have felt only the more imperatively called upon to enter our protest against the principles which he has endeavoured to lay down, and to unmask the sophistry of the arguments by which he has attempted to support them.

To the Editor of the Leicester Journal.

SIR,

A violent attack on my character having appeared in your paper a very few weeks since, contained in an extract from a periodical work, entitled The Christian Guardian, I rely on your impartiality for permitting me to repel the accusation through the same
The amount of my offence consists in uttering a new edition of a political pamphlet which made its first appearance many years since, and passed through several editions. This writer says I might have suppressed it; but the contrary is the fact. The term of copy-right is well known to extend to 14 years, after which any one is at liberty to republish a work, without the consent of the author. More than that time had elapsed since the last edition; and as it was at the option of any bookseller to reprint it, so I was assured from various quarters, that whether I consented or not, it would certainly be republished. The only alternative that remained was, either to suffer it to come forth in a form perhaps most incorrect, and mingled with foreign infusions, or to publish it under my own eye, and with such alterations and corrections as the author might deem proper. The latter was preferred, and for this a torrent of invective has issued from the Christian Guardian.

It certainly is very unusual for a writer to suppress his own publications, unless he has recanted the principles they contain. To persevere in doing so, naturally exposes him to the suspicion of either that he has renounced his former opinions, or that he is afraid to avow them;—but neither of these situations is mine: I have changed no principle, and I feel no fear. Why then should I act in such a manner as must render me perpetually liable to either of these imputations? For a considerable time, indeed, after loud and repeated importunities, I declined a compliance with the wishes expressed for republication, from a sincere reluctance to engage in political controversy. By one party, in the meanwhile, it was my fortune to be so unequivocally claimed as a convert, and by the other so assailed with reproaches as an apostate, that I was convinced by experience there was no other way of putting an end to the misrepresentations of both, but to republish the original pamphlet. Had I never written it, the same motives which made me reluctant to reprint, might probably have prevented my writing it; but since there is not a principle in it which I can conscientiously retract, and my silence has occasioned numerous misrepresentations and mistakes, the fair and manly part was doubtless to republish it. An ingenuous mind is not less ashamed of receiving praises it is conscious it has not deserved, than indignant at reproaches which are not merited.
But a Minister of the Gospel, it seems, is on no occasion to meddle with party politics. How exactly this maxim was adhered to at the commencement of the late war, when military banners were consecrated, and the people everywhere summoned to arms

"By pulpit, drum ecclesiastic, 
Beat with fist, instead of a stick"

must be fresh in the recollection of my readers. The men who, in the garb of clergymen, bustle at electioneering meetings, forsooth, are not really such, but merely assume the disguise of that holy order, since it would be uncandid to suppose they can so universally lose sight of what is befitting Ministers of the Gospel. The venerable bench of Bishops who sit in the House of Lords, either attend in silent pomp, without taking any part in the deliberations, or they violate the character of Ministers of the Gospel. We must have been grossly imposed upon by the public prints, which informed us of the Clergy of a whole Archdeaconry, or Diocese, meeting to peti-
tion Parliament against the Catholic Claims, since they could never with one consent, depart so far from the decorum of Ministers of the Gospel.

The plain state of the case is, not that the Writer is offended at my meddling with politics, but that I have meddled on the wrong side. Had the same mediocrity of talent been exerted in eulogizing the measures of Ministry, his greetings would have been as loud as his invective is bitter. But it was exerted to expose public abuses, to urge the necessity of reform, and lay open the tergiversation of the heaven-born Minster, and Sunday duellist, who, after devoting the day of rest to deeds of blood, has by a strange fatality, obtained a sort of political beatification, *Hinc ille lacrymae.*

Another head of accusation is, that I have censured the character of Bishop Horsley, whose character, the Reviewer tells us, "is far removed beyond my attack,* while I have eulogized Dr. Price and Dr. Priestley, Socinians." To this it is sufficient to reply, that Dr. Price was not a Socinian, but an Arian: he wrote professedly in confutation of Socinianism; and though I disapprove of his religious principles, I feel no hesitation in affirming, in spite of the frantic and unprincipled abuse of Burke, that a more ardent and enlightened friend of his country never lived than that venerable patriarch of freedom. Such were the sentiments of the worshipful Corporation of London, who in token of their esteem, presented him with the freedom of the city, in a golden box;† such

---

* Not accurately quoted.  
† As they did also to Colonel Wardle.
was the judgment of Mr. Pitt, who long professed himself his admirer, and condescended to seek his advice on questions of finance. Dr. Priestley, it is acknowledged, was a Socinian; but it was not under that character that he was eulogised.* It was as the friend of liberty, the victim of intolerance, and the author of some of the most brilliant philosophical discoveries of modern times, for which he was celebrated throughout Europe, and his name enrolled as a member of the most illustrious Institutions, so that my eulogy was but a mere feeble echo of the applause which resounded from every civilized portion of the globe. And are we suddenly fallen back into the darkness and ignorance of the middle ages, during which the spell of a stupid and unfeeling uniformity bound the nations in iron slumbers, that it has become a crime to praise a man for talents which the whole world admired, and for virtues which his enemies confessed, merely† because his religious creed was erroneous? If any thing could sink orthodoxy into contempt, it would be its association with such Gothic barbarity of sentiment—such reptile meanness. What renders the wretched bigotry of the Reviewer the more conspicuous is, that the eulogy in question was written almost immediately after the Birmingham riots, that disgraceful ebullition of popular phrensy, during which a ferocious mob tracked his steps like bloodhounds, demolished his house, destroyed his library and apparatus, and advancing from thence to the destruction of private and public buildings, filled the whole town with terror and dismay. What sort of a Christian Guardian the Reviewer would have proved on that occasion, may be easily inferred, from his passing over these atrocities in silence, while he discharges his malice on their unoffending victim.‡

The maxim, De mortuis nil nisi bonum, admits of exceptions; and as I am vilified for censuring Bishop Horsley, whose character, it is affirmed, “is far removed beyond my attack,” while I praised Priestley, the Socinian, justice compels me to remark, (what the Reviewer probably knows well enough) that in the virtues of private life, Dr. Priestley was as much superior to his antagonist, as he was inferior in the correctness of his speculative theology.

From the principles avowed in the Apology, this writer asserts that it is evident I am to be classed to all intents and purposes with radical reformers. This charge is grounded on my recommendation of annual parliaments and universal suffrage. Now he either

---

* Upon this principle Tom Paine might have claimed a share of Mr. Hall’s eulogiums. If charged with applauding an Infidél, he might again have repeated “It was not under that character that he was eulogised, but as the friend of liberty.”

† This “merely” sounds well from a Minister of the Gospel.

‡ This discharge of malice consisted of three words “Priestley the Socinian.”
knows that Mr. Pitt, in conjunction with the Duke of Richmond, presided at public meetings, in which annual parliaments, and the extension of the right of suffrage to all householders were recommended, or he does not. If he pleads ignorance of the fact, what presumption is it for a man so uninformed to write upon the subject. If he knows it, let me ask, was Mr. Pitt a radical reformer at the time he recommended these measures? If he was I plead guilty to the charge; but if he was not, the recommendation of a similar plan is no evidence of my being a radical. For my own part, I feel the utmost contempt of the charge of radicalism. A radical reformer, if we attend to the import of words, is one that goes to the root of the evil, that proposes not merely to palliate, but to extirpate it. And what is that reform worth, that proposes less? He who labours under an inveterate malady, wishes for a radical cure: he would put little value on a remedy that should mitigate the pain, without reaching the source of the disorder. If the appellation of radical reformer is intended to denote a revolutionist, it is most absurdly applied to the advocate of annual parliaments and universal suffrage, because the first of these measures is merely a revival of the ancient practice, and the latter most consonant to the genius of a free constitution, which pre-supposes the extension of the elective franchise to all who can be presumed to have a will of their own: the exercise of this right, coupled with the practice of voting by ballot, would in my humble opinion, be the best expedient for securing the freedom and tranquility of elections. Be this as it may, a sincere proposal of reform, must differ essentially from the proposal of a revolution. If by styling me a radical reformer, this writer intends to impute revolutionary views, I say it is a calumny and a falsehood; and I challenge him to produce a single sentence from my publications, which sustains such a charge, or which convicts me of hostility to the existing order of things, as consisting of King, Lords and Commons. But if he means, that I am for such a reform as will cut up corruption by the roots, I feel no inclination to disavow it. He wishes, it is evident, to fix the impression that I am hostile to the regal branch of the constitution, but shrinks from making the assertion, and endeavours to convey the venom of his accusations, through the subtle vehicle of a dark and ambiguous phraseology.*

For what purpose, but that of exciting hatred and horror, he has thought fit to couple my name with the mention of Hone and Carlile, it is not easy to conjecture. The blasphemy of their publications is quite as disgusting to me as to himself; but I am at

* To say that a man is a Radical Reformer, that is, one of a large political party, well known and perfectly understood, is to use "the subtle vehicle of a dark and ambiguous phraseology."
a loss to conceive the justness of that reasoning* which would infer that no political corruption however enormous, no mal-administration however flagrant, must be exposed to animadversion, until these men have ceased to exhale their impieties. Let this principle once be admitted, and we shall never want Hones and Carliles in abundance, to remove a shield so easily purchased, and so effectual in the protection of every abuse, might be deemed an infatuation.

"He (the author of the Apology) pleads," says the Reviewer,
"for annual parliaments, for universal suffrage, for the unfettered publication of every kind of blasphemy, for the exclusion of the relatives of Noblemen from the House of Commons, for the overthrow of all ecclesiastical establishments, and for the sovereignty of the people. In what part of the sacred volume," he adds, "he has discovered the least sanction for any one of these notions, we are at a loss to imagine." The fatuity of this remark baffles all description.† For why may I not retort his own language, and say, This author pleads‡ for septennial parliaments, for limited suffrage, for the admission of the relatives of Noblemen to the house of Commons, and for the support of ecclesiastical establishments, but in what part of the sacred volume, he finds the least sanction for them I am at a loss to imagine. But when did I plead for the publication of blasphemy, fettered or unfettered? To plead for the liberty of divulging speculative opinions, is one thing, and to assert the right of uttering blasphemy is another. For blasphemy, which is the speaking contemptuously of God, is not a speculative error, it is an overt act; a crime which no state should tolerate.

In relation to the question of ecclesiastical establishments, since I am challenged to produce any passage from Scripture which sanctions my opposition to them, I beg leave to refer him to our Lord's declaration: "Every plant which my heavenly Father has not planted shall be rooted up." That national churches, or exclusive establishments of religion by the civil magistrate are one of these plants, will not be denied, since nothing of that kind, it is universally allowed, existed during the three first and purest ages of Christianity; and not being authorised by the great Head of the Church, it must, if we believe him, be rooted up. I have used

* If this sentence means, that any such reasoning is to be found in the Review, it is a false imputation—If it does not mean this, it means nothing.
† Had I argued generally, that no political principle ought to be received except it could be found in the Bible, Mr. H. would have had a right to say this. But I did no such thing. The ground I took was, that Ministers would do well to go no further in political warfare, than the Bible seemed to carry them. And I remarked in this place, that Mr. H. had advocated many things for which the Scriptures furnished no warrant, and which, therefore, as a Minister, he would have better avoided.
‡ Not true.
the term great Head of the Church, by way of distinction from
that little Head which the Church of England has invented, and
on which, whether it be a beauty or a deformity in the body of
Christ, the Scriptures are certainly as silent, as on universal
suffrage, and annual parliaments.

It may not be improper in this place to notice a curious
argument which the Reviewer adduces in support of his darling
tenet of passive obedience and non-resistance, from the prevailing
and inherent depravity of human nature. He reminds us that
mankind are represented in Scripture as "alike depraved and
unruly," and from these premises attempts to enforce that interprer-
tation of Scripture which would annihilate the liberties of mankind,
and reduce them without "restriction or reservation" to a passive
submission to their political superiors.—On another occasion I have
sufficiently rescued the sentiments of the inspired writers from such
a detestable imputation, by shewing, that their design is merely to
inculcate the general duty of obedience to government, as the
ordinance of God, while they leave the just bounds of authority,
and the limits of obedience to the regulation and adjustment of
reason and experience;* a task to which they are perfectly adequate.
But how does the depravity of human nature evince the necessity of
passive obedience and non-resistance, unless it is contended that
the ruling part of mankind are not depraved? That mankind are
naturally "depraved and unruly" affords a good argument for the
existence of government itself: but since they are "alike depraved
and unruly," since governors partake of the same corruption as the
people, aggravated too often by the possession of power, which
inflames the passions and corrupts the heart, to allege the
depravity of human nature as a reason for submission to arbitrary
power, involves the absurdity of supposing that the cure of one
degree of wickedness is to be obtained by affording unlimited
licence to a greater.† Retrace the annals of all times and nations,
and you will find in the triumph of despotism, the triumph of
wickedness: you will find that men have been virtuous, noble and
disinterested, just in proportion as they have been free.‡

The Reviewer affects to triumph over me, on account of the

---

* Upon the reason and experience of whom? If of each individual, then we have a
"general duty," laid down in Scripture, and yet left to every man's "reason and experience"
to explain, apply, and restrict according to his good pleasure—an indefinite duty!

† The Whig Bishop Watson did not allow it to be a "greater." He preferred despotism
to anarchy.—He held "the tyranny of one man to be an intolerable grievance, but the
tyranny of an hundred, to be an hundred times as bad."—

‡ True, most true.—But the real question is, not whether liberty be worth preserving,
but whether it may best be preserved by enforcing a strict obedience to the Laws, or by
leaving that obedience to every man's "reason and experience."
supposed failure of the prediction, that ruin would speedily ensue, unless prevented by reform. "Has this dreadful alternative, he asks, fallen upon us. The present comparatively prosperous and improving circumstances of the kingdom, answers, No. The general state of the country, the average condition of the great mass of the people is better and not worse than at the time when Mr. Hall first published this direful presage."

I am at a loss to reply in suitable terms to a writer who seems to glory in setting truth at defiance. Let me ask the reader whether he thinks there is a single person to be found in the nation, who really believes our condition as a people is improved within the last thirty years. Where is this improvement to be found? Is it in the augmentation of the national debt to three times its former amount, in the accumulated weight of taxes, in the increase of the poor-rates, in the depression of land to less than half of its former value, in the ruin of the agricultural interest, in the thousands and tens of thousands of farmers, who are distressed for rent, and they and their families reduced to beggary? Has this writer already forgotten the recent distress of the manufacturing class, who from failure of employment and the depression of wages, were plunged into despair, while numbers of them quitted their homes, and sought a precarious and scanty relief, by dragging through the country loaded waggons and carts like beasts of burden? Is it in the rapid and portentous multiplication of crimes, by which our prisons are glutted with malefactors? If these are indications of increasing prosperity, we may justly adopt the language of the liturgy, "from such prosperity, good Lord deliver us."

To do the writer justice, he has the grace to admit something like an exception respecting the agricultural interest, though he expresses himself with the diffidence becoming the solution of so difficult a problem. "If any exception, he says, can be found, it is in the agricultural interest;" but, he adds, if those are to be believed, who ought to be judges, this is to be ascribed to the want of legal protection. Now two corn bills have been passed of late years for the express protection of the agriculturist, the last of these in open contempt of the sentiments and wishes of the people. Previous to the passing of these bills, agriculture was in a comparatively flourishing state; since these laws were enacted, it has experienced a depression beyond all example; and in the face

* Is land really depressed to less than half its former value, that is to less than half its value thirty years since.

† The Corn Bill was enacted because Agriculture was not in a "flourishing state." The Edinburgh Review, of February last, says, that "the difficulties with which the occupiers of land have to contend," are "as great" now "as they were in 1814-15," that is before the enactment of the Corn Laws.
of these facts, this writer has the assurance to inform us, that in the opinion of those who ought to be judges, the evil is wholly to be ascribed to the want of legal protection. But who are these highly privileged mortals who are to be implicitly believed, because "they ought to be judges?" If there is any class of persons whose opinion on these questions is intitled to deference and respect, they are undoubtedly political economists; men who have made the sources of national wealth, the principal subject of their enquiry:* and where will he find one from Adam Smith to the present time, who has not reprobated the interference of the legislature with the price of corn; To say nothing of the reasoning of that great philosopher which is unanswerable, common sense will teach us, that laws to raise the price of produce, are unjust and oppressive taxes upon the whole community, for the exclusive benefit of a part. There is a description of men who are accustomed systematically to yield up their understandings to others, who in their view "ought to be judges." It is needless to add that the present writer is evidently of this servum pecess, this tame and passive herd, and that his knowledge of the subject is just what might be expected from one who thinks by proxy. These men forgetting, or affecting to forget that the exercise of power, in whatever hands it is placed, will infallibly degenerate into tyranny, unless it is carefully watched, make it their whole business to screen its abuses, to suppress inquiry, stifle complaint, and inculcate on the people as their only duty, a quiet and implicit submission to the direction of those, who, to speak in the vocabulary of slaves, "ought to be judges."

These are the men by whom the constitution is endangered; these the maxims by which free states are enslaved. If that freedom which is the birthright of Britons is destined to go down to succeeding generations, it must result from the prevalence of an opposite spirit, a lofty enthusiasm, an ardent attachment to liberty, and an incessant jealousy of the tendency of power to enlarge its pretensions, and extend its encroachments.

The Reviewer asserts "that my whole pamphlet is an argument in favour of the supremacy and infallibility of the people, and of the necessity of paying an implicit obedience to the least expression of their will." This, I must assure the reader, is a gross and wilful misrepresentation. In no part of the pamphlet have I pleaded for any such doctrine. All that I have asserted is, that in proportion as the House of Commons is in unison with the people animated by the same sympathies, and affected by the same interests, in the same proportion will it accomplish the design of its functions, as a Representative assembly, and that a reform is absolutely necessary.

* And no two of whom agree in opinion.
in order to restore it* to that conjunction of interests, and of feelings, on which its utility as the popular branch of the legislature depends. The necessity of such an union between the people and their Representatives is manifest from the very meaning of the terms, for it were quite needless for them to be at the pains of choosing men, who in consequence of a foreign bias are prepared to contradict their sentiments and neglect their interests. A House of Commons which should chiefly consist of Court Sycophants and Tyrants, would exhibit nothing more than the mockery of representation. By artfully transferring what I have said of one branch of the legislature to the whole, and presenting even that in an exaggerated form, he has represented me as reducing the government to such an immediate and incessant dependance on the popular will, as never entered my thoughts, and would be utterly incompatible with the genius of a limited monarchy.

Having already trespassed on the patience of my readers, I shall close with one remark on the eulogium pronounced by the reviewer on the character of the late Mr. Pitt. He appears to be extremely shocked with the freedom and severity of my strictures on his conduct, as implying forgetfulness of his singular disinterestedness, and his perfect devotion to his country. As this has become a favourite topic with the admirers of that celebrated minister, it is necessary to remind them, that there are other vices besides the love of money, and other virtues besides that of dying poor.† It may be easily admitted that the ambition which grasps at the direction of an empire, and the pitiful passion for accumulation, were not the inmates of the same bosom. In minds of a superior order, ambition, like Aaron's rod, is quite sufficient to swallow up the whole fry of petty propensities. Far be it from me to wish to withhold an atom of the praise justly due to him. That he devoted much time and a considerable portion of talent to the affairs of his country, is undeniable. The evils which he has brought upon us were not the production of an ordinary mind, nor the work of a day, nor done in sport; but what I contend for is, that to say nothing of his unparalleled apostacy, his devotion to his country, and what was worse, its devotion to him, have been the source of more calamity to this nation than any other event that has befallen it, and that the memory of Pitt will be identified in the recollection of posterity with accumulated taxes, augmented debt, extended pauperism, a debasement and prostration of the public mind, and a system of policy not only hostile to the cause of liberty at home, but prompt and eager to detect and tread out every

* Restore it! Can Mr. Hall tell us when the House of Commons ever evinced a closer conjunction of interests or of feelings, with the People, than at the present moment? If he can, then I say with him, Restore it.—But if he cannot, his fancy of restoration is nonsense.
† A solemn truism, well rounded off.
spark of liberty in Europe; in a word, with all those images of terror and destruction which the name* imports. The enthusiasm with which his character is regarded by a numerous class of his countrymen, will be ascribed by a distant age, to that mysterious infatuation which in the inscrutable counsels of Heaven, is the usual, the destined precursor of the fall of States.

I am, Sir,

Your humble Servant,

ROBERT HALL.

LEICESTER,
February 5th, 1822.

To the Editor of the Leicester Journal.

SIR,

According to the intimation which I last week transmitted to you, I shall now beg a small space in your columns for some remarks on Mr. Hall's Letter relative to the Review of his Apology, which appeared in the Christian Guardian.

Considering, however, that the limits of a weekly journal are necessarily circumscribed, and that it is therefore incumbent on correspondents to condense the matter of their communications within the smallest practicable compass, I shall endeavour to confine myself on this occasion to the facts and arguments brought forward by Mr. Hall;—leaving his rhetorical flourishes, however beautiful his five weeks' labour may have made them, with this one observation—that they are quite beside the matter in dispute.

Any one, indeed, who casts a general glance over Mr. Hall's Letter, will see that by far the greater part of it is occupied with the praise of liberty, and the dispraise of his opponent. To the first I have no manner of objection, except that it has very little connexion with the subject before us. In attachment to freedom I yield to no one, however I may differ from a few theorists, upon the subject of its modes or forms of practicable existence. And of the abuse with which I am personally treated, and the epithets, in the stringing together of which Mr. H. appears to have spent so many weeks, I shall say nothing. The Public will judge between us, without my invoking their decision, and in Mr. Hall's own conscience he is himself already condemned.

* This pun upon the name of Pitt well comports with the magnitude of the subject, and the dignity of the writer.
In the consideration of those few points in Mr. Hall's Letter which appear to call for my remarks, it will, perhaps, be the clearest and most concise method of making myself understood, if I quote, at length, the passages to which I object, and subjoin whatever observations I may have to offer.

To distinguish them, I shall number the paragraphs, and the Remarks will be found under them.

I. "The Writer of the Review says I might have suppressed it, (the Pamphlet), but the contrary is the fact. The term of copyright is well known to extend to fourteen years, after which any one is at liberty to republish a work, without the consent of the Author."

I told Mr. Hall in the Review that he was mistaken on this point, and yet I now find him, six weeks after I gave him this warning, persisting in his error, and charging me with asserting that which is "contrary to fact." What right has he to make this charge, without first ascertaining the truth? And that he has not even sought for the truth, is plain; for he describes the law, not only as it is not, now, but as it never yet was. The statute 54 Geo. III. cap. 156, alters the term of copyright from two fourteen years, which the statute of Queen Anne gave to the Author, to twenty-eight years certain, and then for the remainder of the Author's life.

II. "It is very unusual for a writer to suppress his own publications, unless he has recanted the principles they contain."

To "suppress" a publication, is merely to refrain from ordering it to be reprinted. And instead of being "unusual," this is very commonly done, when no principle is recanted, but when the author judges the occasion to be past, or has thought better of some of the stronger and harsher and more unguarded expressions.

III. "By the one party, it was my fortune to be so unequivocally claimed, as a convert, and by the other, so assailed with reproaches as an apostate, that I was convinced by experience there was no other way of putting an end to the misrepresentations of both, but to republish the original pamphlet."

Here is a man who can find no other way of making his political opinions understood, than that of republishing an old and forgotten pamphlet. He stated with all necessary clearness and decision, his political principles, in a pamphlet which he published some time since in reply to Cobbett. For all useful purposes this
was sufficient; nor can any really honorable or desirable end be answered by adding this second proof to the first declaration.

IV. "But a Minister of the Gospel, it seems, is on no occasion to meddle with party politics. How exactly this maxim was adhered to at the commencement of the late war, when military banners were consecrated, and the people everywhere summoned to arms

*By pulpit, drum ecclesiastic,
*Beat with fist, instead of a stick;*

must be fresh in the recollection of my readers."

Fresh in the recollection of Mr. Hall's readers! Yes, doubtless of his readers. By the way I should recommend him to place these two Hudibrastic lines in the title page of the next edition of his Sermon before the Bristol Volunteers—they would form an excellent motto. Query, What political partisan was Mr. Hall when he preached that sermon—was he a Pittite? Heaven forbid. And yet we have here his own authority for concluding that he could not have delivered that discourse without belonging to some party.

V. "The men who in the garb of Clergymen, bustle at electioneering meetings, forsooth, are not really such. The venerable bench of Bishops, who sit in the House of Peers, either attend in silent pomp, without taking any part in the deliberations, or they violate the character of Ministers of the Gospel." --- "The Clergy of a whole Archdeaconry meeting to petition against the Catholic Claims," &c. &c.

The Catholic Question is not an affair of party politics. The Prelates do not usually take any part in the deliberations of the House of Peers, except when matters of religion or morals are brought under consideration. The party spirit of some few Clergymen does not justify Mr. Hall in like improper conduct. Can he find no better justification of his conduct than is furnished by the faults of those very men whom he designates "spiritual janizaries."

VI. "Another head of accusation is, that I have censured the character of Bishop Horsley, while I have eulogized Dr. Price and Dr. Priestley, Socinians."

It was no "head of accusation" but a passing remark, that while Mr. Hall was extremely bitter against Bishop Horsley, he was "at the same time the eulogist of Priestley and Price the Socinians, and of Mary Wolstonecroft, the female Libertine and Deist."
This latter half of the sentence Mr. Hall omits. He will not defend his praise of this *Apologist for Adultery*. He must therefore be held to have retracted it.

VII. "This Writer asserts that it is evident I am to be classed with Radical Reformers. If he intends thereby to impute to me Revolutionary views, I say it is a calumny and a falsehood. But if he means that I am for such a reform as will cut up corruption by the *roots*, I feel no inclination to disavow it."

In classing Mr. Hall with the Radical Reformers, I neither spoke of him as a *Revolutionist* nor yet as one aiming at "the *roots*." My meaning was simply that which every common reader would suppose it to be, viz., that Mr. Hall had ranged himself with the party calling themselves by that name. I, indeed, did not suppose that I was doing him any honor by applying the term, nor, by his anger, does he seem pleased at it himself. He, however, continues to advocate their principles, and must be content with their association. If he is in bad company, he has no one but himself to thank for it. There appears, however, a strange confusion in Mr. Hall's ideas on this subject. He has no objection to be called a Radical Reformer, provided the idea intended, is that of one desirous "to cut up corruption by the *roots*." But the *roots* implied in the term *radical* must be those of the thing intended to be reformed. Now what is intended to be reformed? Not corruption, but the Government and the Constitution. A Radical Reformer then, if taken thus literally, is one who aims at the *roots*, not of Corruption, but of the Government itself.

VIII. "For what purpose except that of exciting disgust and horror, he has thought fit to couple my name with the mention of Hone and Carlile, it is not easy to conjecture."

Mr. Hall, in his Apology, chose to speak of the Freedom of the Press as *dead*, abolished, and extinct.—I said, that after witnessing the acquittals of Hone and Wooller, and the bravado of Carlile, such language was absurd. To this Mr. Hall could find no reply; and he therefore turns round on me with affected indignation at being "coupled" with the mention of these creatures. I did not "couple" him with them in character, in views, or in any other that could possibly imply a connexion. Does Mr. Hall mean that his name ought not to stand on the same page of a book?

IX. "Why may I not retort his own language, and say, 'This Writer pleads for septennial parliaments, for limited suffrage, &c. &c.'"

For one simple reason,—I pleaded for none of these things.
X. "In reference to Ecclesiastical Establishments, I beg leave to refer to our Lord's declaration—"Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up."

Does Mr. Hall choose to jest upon such subjects? If this will apply to the Established Church, it will equally as well apply to the Baptist Missionary Society.

XI. "But who are these highly privileged mortals, who are to be implicitly believed, because 'they ought to be judges?' The vocabulary of slaves, &c."

When I spoke of "those who ought to be judges," I referred to the whole body of Farmers, who have been for years past ascribing their distress to the want of sufficient protection. This Mr. Hall calls "the vocabulary of slaves."

XII. "Blasphemy is an overt act, a crime no state should tolerate."

In the Apology, Mr. Hall held a different language. At page 4, he says, of publications, "There is no way of separating the precious from the vile, but by tolerating the whole." And again at page 12, "Few who are acquainted with history would wish to see the writings of sceptics or Deists suppressed by law." Now, however, "no state should tolerate" these things. This is well—it is the second retraction I have observed.

XIII. "The Reviewer asserts 'that my whole pamphlet is an argument in favor of the supremacy and infallibility of the people, and of the necessity of paying an implicit obedience to the least expression of their will.' This I must assure the reader, is a gross and wilful representation. In no part of the pamphlet have I pleaded for any such doctrine."

At page 9, of the Apology, are these words, "Government is the creature of the people, and that which they have created, they have surely a right to examine." At page 11, these, "It is absurd to require the people to resign the right of discussing any question that can arise either upon the form or the measures of government, as this would put it for ever out of their power to revoke the trust which they have placed in the hands of their rulers." At page 57.—"The people have always the same right to new model their government, and to set aside their rulers." At page 59. "The sovereignty of the people is the polar star which will conduct us safe over the ocean of political debate and speculation." And at page 108. "The Majesty of the People must lift itself up."
Mr. Hall now asserts that I have "represented him as reducing the Government to such an immediate and incessant dependance on the popular will, as never entered his thoughts." Of his thoughts I know nothing; but of the expressions quoted above from his own book I will say that they do "reduce the Government to such an immediate and incessant dependance on the popular will" as would, in practice, be utterly ruinous. If however he repents of them, I have no objection to receive this, his third retractation.

I have now, Sir, briefly noticed, and I trust overturned, every position taken by Mr. Hall in his Letter, with the exception of two, which I have reserved for more extended consideration;—the one on the state of the nation—the other, on the character of Mr. Pitt.

In my Review of Mr. Hall's Apology, I quoted one of the prophecies which are so thickly scattered over its pages, and in which he foretold, only thirty years since, that "without immediate reform, ruin was then inevitable." I remarked that nearly the third part of a century had passed away, within which period we had gone through a contest of unparalleled length and exertion, and still it did not appear that this immediate and inevitable ruin had yet arrived; on the contrary, the country was actually in a better state at the present moment than at the time when Mr. Hall first promulgated this gypsy prophecy.

Mr. H. answers to this, "that he is at a loss how to reply"—and I can so far believe him; but when he adds that his difficulty is, how to apply suitable terms to one who seems "to glory in setting truth at defiance"—I find, that in default of an argument, he has recourse to hard words, the usual resource of the beaten party.

But he asks, "Is there a single person to be found in the nation who really believes our condition as a people improved within the last thirty years?"—I will produce him a few.

Mr. Maberly, an eminent Member of Parliament, a Landholder and a Financier, in a speech against Ministers, which he made in the House of Commons on the 1st of June, 1821, used the following expressions:—"He was by no means disposed to take a gloomy view of the state of things. A nation which could supply a revenue of sixty millions yearly—which had added to its capital six hundred millions sterling within the last twenty years—which had spared besides, vast sums for the construction of roads, bridges, canals, &c. for the re-erection of decayed towns, and the creation of villages in before unfrequented places—which, in fine, had renovated kingdoms.—Such a country, so mighty in
its efforts, so comprehensive in its resources, could not be considered in a situation which should lead us to despond.

Mr. Ricardo, also, another Member of the Opposition, and an eminent political Economist, declared it to be his opinion, in a speech made in the House of Commons on the 18th ult., "that the country was in a state of great prosperity, and its prospects peculiarly encouraging."

Mr. Whitmore, a great Landed Proprietor, and the seconder of Lord John Russell's motion for reform, also said in the House, on the 21st ult., "that he had no hesitation in avowing his opinion, that with all the disadvantages under which the landed interest laboured, their situation had been greatly ameliorated when compared with 1792."

And Mr. Tierney himself, the Leader of the Opposition, said on the same day, that "he was willing to allow, without being restrained by any political or party bias, that the country was, generally, in a state of growing prosperity."

Here, then, I have shewn Mr. Hall, not one, but four eminent individuals, all leaders among his own party, and all agreeing in my position; that the state of the country has improved and is improving. Will Mr. Hall tell these gentlemen, that they "seem to glory in setting truth at defiance."

For my own part, however, I did not rest my assertion upon so slight a ground as the opinion of any individuals. I know, and Mr. Hall ought to have known, that the consumption of the comforts and luxuries of life is now nearly double the consumption of 1792—a fact, the existence of which is perfectly incompatible with the idea of increased poverty and distress. Of tea, for instance, the import in 1792 was 13,000,000 lb. In 1819 the import was 23,000,000 lb. The consumption of wine had also increased in a nearly similar proportion.

I have dwelt at some length on this point, because I conceive that the conclusion to be drawn from it is equally irresistible and important—namely, that the system, and form, and practice of government, under which the country is thus advancing in prosperity and comfort, cannot need any very extensive alteration, or demand any general and radical reform.

We now arrive, in the last place, at the consideration of the character of Mr. Pitt. Of this great man, I am a sincere, but not an indiscriminate admirer—A follower I am not at all. In defence of his duel, to which Mr. Hall alludes in a manner which certainly has an
appearance of mean malignity, I shall say nothing. There are, however, endless shades of distinction in human criminality, and it is but justice to remark, that Mr. Pitt was the acceptor, and not the giver of the challenge—the refusal of which would have drawn with it, as a necessary consequence, the loss of power, consideration, and character, and would have reduced him from being the first man in the kingdom, to the situation of the most despised. The discharge, also of his pistol in the air, proved the absence of any criminal intention. Mr. Fox, I believe, fought a duel under circumstances of far less temptation; and yet Mr. Fox is still "illustrious" in the eyes of Mr. Hall.

The great and leading charge, however, which Mr. Hall brings against Mr. Pitt, is that of "tergiversation" and "unparalleled apostacy"—and this charge, if I rightly understand it, is grounded upon the support which he gave, at one period, to the question of reform, and the opposition with which he met it at another. Let us look at the facts of the case.

Mr. Pitt entered parliament at an age when most youths are under tuition. He brought with him the common, vague, and schoolboy notions of theoretic purity of representation, and of fancied corruption; and accordingly we find him, at the age of about twenty one, gravely standing up in the legislature, and proposing to it the reception of his plan of reform. I freely confess that I know of no other act of his whole life, so open to ridicule as this appears to be. His sincerity, however, has, I believe, never been questioned.

Foiled in this instance, we find him a very few months after, advocating the same principles, and in the same manner. Mr. Fox was now prime minister, and he was defeated by an increased majority. Becoming himself Premier in the year 1784, he again supported the question, although agitation at a moment which appeared to him unadvisable.

In the year 1785, however, he made another and a last effort in a parliament most enthusiastically attached to him, and at the moment of his highest popularity. He again brought forward the subject in a most temperate and conciliatory manner—urged it with all the power of his eloquence, and pressed its adoption with all the weight of his official influence. He was a third time baffled by a majority of nearly a hundred. Is it any wonder that he desisted from so apparently hopeless a task?

In the course of the eight following years, many events occurred which might well make every advocate for innovation pause. The
experiment of reform was tried in a neighbouring country, and
anarchy and ruin proved the result.

When, therefore, the subject was again agitated, and that in
a manner the most mischievous, Mr. Pitt declared in the House of
Commons, that he believed the country went along with him in the
sentiment that "this was not the time for hazardous experiments"
—The country did fully coincide with him in this opinion.

For thus avoiding the question, and for discouraging all
attempts to agitate it, Mr. Pitt is charged by Mr. Hall with deser-
tion of his principles, with tergiversation, with the most unpar-
alleled apostacy; as though, upon the supposition, that Mr. Pitt
had entirely changed his opinions on this one point, such a change,
however gradual, was a thing perfectly infamous and unheard of.
No change of his own personal circumstances could have produced
the alteration. He was minister both when he advocated and when
he discouraged the question.

If, however, not even the lapse of years, not even the lessons
of experience, not even the total change of the national predicament,
are to be allowed to produce the slightest alteration in any one of
the opinions of a statesman—how high an estimate must be formed
of that man, in whose train this punctilious and scrupulous writer
is to be found. Mr. Fox, an admirer and follower of whom Mr. Hall
professes himself to be, must surely have been a model of perfect
consistency, singleness of mind, and uprightness of conduct. Change
or variation of principle must have been to him perfectly unknown.

Let us once more recur to facts, and take his portrait from
the faithful page of history.

But perhaps this may be a disagreeable method to Mr. Hall.
He may call it malicious to refer to the famous coalition, in which
Mr. Fox took to his heart and confidence the man, whom, but a
few weeks before, he had pledged himself to bring to the scaffold;
and seated himself most complacently on the treasury bench by the
side of that very Lord North, with whom he had just before been
"afraid to trust himself in the same room." The execrations
which he heaped upon the property tax are well known, and equally
so his doubling that impost the instant he had gained the power of
doing so. Nor is his tender advice to the people forgotten, that
"if they could not afford to live on the first floor, they might try to
live in the garret."

It may be thought, however, more candid and fair towards his
character, if we try his consistency on some more abstract and less
personal question, in which, founded on eternal truth, and unaltered by any variation of circumstances, we might at least expect to meet with an equal steadiness of belief and support.

What were his sentiments then, on the character of the House of Commons, as an actual and just representation of the people?

In 1771 we find him using the following expressions, (see his speeches, 6 vol. Svo.) "If the people are really dissatisfied, how am I to ascertain the reality of that dissatisfaction.—I must freely confess that I know no other way than that of consulting this House. Here are the people represented, and here is their voice expressed."

But in 1782 he was of a different opinion,—"that the voice of the people was not to be collected from the votes of that House was plain." How is this inconsistency to be reconciled. Could it be that he was in office in 1771, and out in 1782?

There is however another and more important question, by which he may be tried. Did he argue that the House had a right to oppose and control the voice of the people; or that the peoples' decision was conclusive, and their authority paramount?

In 1771, being then in office, Mr Fox declared in the House of Commons, that he "paid no regard whatever to the voice of the people." He urged the House, "not to humour the wayward whims of a misled multitude."

In 1780, being then out of office, he asserted that "the voice of the people was constitutional and conclusive, and paramount to that of the parliament."

In 1784, he had just been driven from office by Mr. Pitt, but expected by commanding a majority in the House of Commons, to force his way again into the cabinet. He now therefore held, that "the voice of the people (which was in favor of his opponent) did not always claim obedience, and that they ought then to be opposed, by the wisdom of parliament."

In 1793, being the Leader of the Opposition, his doctrine was, "that the sovereignty of the people was paramount to all other laws;" and that "the people were the legitimate sovereigns in every community."

So that he positively advocated, at four different times,—twice the affirmative, and twice the negative, of the same question: and that, too, on a subject of primary importance and of
elementary simplicity. But his opinion, we must remark, on
every occasion coincided with his interest. When he could com-
mand a majority in the House of Commons, then that House
possessed the paramount authority. But when he was outvoted
or out of office, then the people had a right to destroy the House, or
to do whatever else they might take a fancy to do.

Is not this a disgusting spectacle? Does it not recall to our
minds the language of Mr. Hall?—"There are two eras particu-
larly marked in the calendar of statesmen—the one the period they
are in the ministry—and the other when they are out, which have
a very different effect on their sentiments and their reasoning." 
But when we observe that this language applies most literally and
exactly to Mr. Hall's own political idol, how are we to bear that he
should exclaim with such virtuous indignation against the apostacy
of Mr. Pitt, who changed, or appeared to change but once, that
once being rather a change of judgment, as to time and mode,
than of principle, and being evidently uninfluenced by any
personal or party considerations.

Is this Mr. Hall's justice and candour, and consistency, that
one man shall be held up as an unparalleled apostate, merely
because in the course of eight years he has grown less warm in the
support of a particular point,—while another shall revolve back-
wards and forwards in defiance of the very name of principle, and
yet be denominated an illustrious patriot.

Of the real character and results of what has been generally
called "the Pitt system," I am neither called upon, nor inclined,
to enter into any detailed discussion. But I must maintain that
Mr. Hall has no right whatever to heap upon the name and memory
of Mr. Pitt, the execrations with which his letter is concluded.
Upon his own principles, no one is justified in charging upon Mr.
Pitt, the disasters which he may conceive to have followed his
counsels. For it is allowed by Mr. Hall, and is perfectly notori-
ous, that the people of England, or a great majority of them,
sanctioned and approved the late war, and all its concomitants.
The "devotion of the nation" to Mr. Pitt, and the "enthusiasm"
with which he was supported, are lamented by Mr. Hall. But,
however he may think them worthy of lamentation, he ought to
remember, that, in the Apology he has argued, that the will of
the majority is the highest law, and most complete and paramount
authority. "This right," he says "may be exercised caprici-
ously and absurdly, but yet no human power can have any
pretensions to intercept its exercise." And again, he says, that
if a people choose to continue under tyranny, "the attempt of
individuals to force improvements upon them, is a presumption
that merits the severest punishment." While, therefore, he allows the plans of Mr. Pitt to have been sanctioned by the approval of the people, he can have no right to charge those plans, as crimes, upon him individually.

It was my intention here to have concluded, but I cannot refrain from offering one or two remarks upon Mr. Hall's theory of Obedience. It is mischievous without being consistent,—simple in appearance, and yet impossible to be either understood or practised.

It is mischievous.—For it tells a man of a "general duty" of obedience, the limits of which are left to the adjustment of his own reason and experience." It tells him, "you are commanded, it is true, to honour the King; but how far you are to carry this honour, is left entirely to your own feelings and inclination. You owe just so much obedience, as in the exercise of your own reason, you shall think fit to pay, and no more."

May not the man answer,—"A very convenient doctrine, this—I like it extremely.—And it will, I should suppose, apply equally well to the first part of the sentence, which commands me to fear God.

It is inconsistent.—For while much of Mr. Hall's language may be interpreted in the above manner, there are also sentences which speak as positively, passice obedience and non-resistance, as any that ever came under my notice. "For any particular number of persons to set themselves by force to oppose the established practice of the state," even though that practice be the grossest despotism—is, says he, "a plain violation of the laws of morality." And again, as I just now quoted, "if, in the worst state of political society, a people have not sufficient wisdom and courage to correct its evils, and assert their liberty, the attempt of individuals to force improvements upon them, is a presumption which merits the severest punishment."

So that, according to this writer, although a people have, as he asserts, a perfect right at all times to cashier their governors, and to change the whole form of their government, yet for any particular number of individuals to commence such a revolution, would be a crime of the highest magnitude. The whole people must simultaneously rise, for whoever first begins the opposition to the established order of things, is "a violator of the laws of morality."

Now Mr. Hall is perfectly aware that no people, nor any majority of a people, ever did thus simultaneously rise, or ever
His doctrine, therefore, if brought at all into practice, must
directly contradict and condemn itself, and be highly mischievous.

Regretting the haste with which I have been compelled to
draw up this letter, and the inaccuracies of style consequent
upon it,

I remain, Sir,

Your's, &c.

THE WRITER OF THE REVIEW.

P. S.—Since I concluded the above I have learnt a fact which
furnishes a strong illustration of the real character of Mr. Hall's
politics.

A professedly Radical weekly publication, called The Black
Dwarf, and edited by that same Wooller who is now suffering the
penalty of his seditious practices in Warwick gaol, has made Mr.
Hall's letter the leading article in last Wednesday's number, under
the title of "a vindication of Radical Reform, by the Rev.
Robert Hall."

When I denominated Mr. Hall, not in scorn, but as a fair
description of his political principles—a Radical Reformer—he
charged me with "slander and falsehood." I trust he will allow
the Radicals themselves some knowledge of their own principles.
They are at least sane enough to know a friend when they meet
with one.

I do not wish to make Mr. Hall accountable for this republica-
tion. I cannot suppose him to be ambitious of the honour of
writing for the Black Dwarf. All I contend for, is, that this
adoption of him as a coadjutor and advocate, is at least a proof of
his principles being, as I stated them, clearly and decidedly those
of Radical Reform, and of the party calling themselves by that
name.

But what an association is this, for the great name of Robert
Hall. To be bedaubed with applause and claimed as an associate
and fellow-worker, by Thomas Jonathan Wooller, the Editor of
the Black Dwarf; to be reprinted after all his "disgust at the
blasphemous parodies of Hone," in the very same number with
a profane parody on the Scripture itself; to become one of the oracles of "the Northern Union;" and to share in the fame of orator Hunt.

My aim in this controversy has been twofold, to give the public a just understanding of Mr. Hall's politics, and to inflict a moderate chastisement for his delinquency. Both these ends are attained. After the patronage of the Black Dwarf—after being proclaimed "the vindicator of Radical Reform"—no one can, I should suppose, misunderstand him.

While the degradation of character consequent on his late unfortunate proceedings has gone far beyond my wishes or expectations, and can only excite my sincere regret.

To the Editor of the Leicester Chronicle.

SIR,

As a friend of Mr. Hall, permit me to claim a place in your paper for a brief reply to the fresh matter brought forward by "the Writer of the Review," in the Leicester Journal of the 8th instant. Mr. Hall would feel himself degraded by contending for the last word with such an opponent, but his assertions must not pass unnoted.

No. 1. The Reviewer asserts, that Mr. Hall had "not even sought for the truth" relative to the law of copyright. This insinuation is worthy of the writer. Mr. Hall, of course, consulted his bookseller; and had his bookseller misled him on the point, one would have imagined that common candour would hold the Author excused. But Mr. Hall has not been misinformed. The Act has not a retrospective bearing on any books which had been published fourteen years; and therefore cannot apply to a work published in 1794, the copyright of which had expired six years before the passing of the Act. The terms of the clause relating to the authors of books already published, then living, are: "Be it farther enacted, that if the author of any book or books which shall not have been published fourteen years at the time of passing this act, shall be living at the said time, &c." In the previous statute, 41 Geo. cap. cvii, all books "heretofore"
published, are excluded from the benefit of the Act. And now, Sir, I ask in return, What right has this Reviewer to reiterate his charge without first ascertaining the truth?

Nos. II and III require no notice, except as illustrating the cool impudence of this anonymous libeller in daring to tell a man of Mr. Hall's character, that no "honourable end" could be answered by his permitting the republication of the work in question. —The Reply to Cobbett did not supersede in any point of view, the proof which was required, that Mr. Hall had not deviated from his early political principles, as asserted in his masterly Apology.

No. IV. Mr. Hall never preached before the Bristol Volunteers. He did, indeed, at the close of a fast sermon, endeavour to rouse the people, under the immediate alarm of invasion, to prepare for the defence of their native soil. The sermon was composed under the impression of the impending danger.—Under such circumstances, the duty of the Minister of the Gospel is involved in no perplexity. The lawfulness of an armed defence has, it is true, been questioned by the respectable Society of Friends.—But even if it admits of being made a question in morals, it is no question at all in politics. + To represent that sermon as implicating "party politics," is an absurdity. The Reviewer knows, that many persons who, with Mr. Hall, conscientiously deprecated the crusade against the French, in its beginning, were the first to lay aside every party feeling in the prospect of national danger. If to draw the sword in defence of one's country, implies an approbation of the counsels which have precipitated it into danger, then Mr. Hall was inconsistent. Few persons, however, except this Writer, would honour a man the less for so noble an inconsistency. Never does Mr. Hall betray less of the partizan than in that eloquent sermon, in which he voluntarily divested himself of all his private opinions as to the original authors of the impending danger. And this one act of Mr. Hall's is to cover, forsooth, the multitude of sins chargeable on the priestly abettors of aggressive war, the consecrators of military banners, who, in the true spirit of Peter the Hermit, degraded the pulpit by preaching up a crusade against French principles. † The whole course of Mr. Hall's ministerial labours is in contrast

---

* That is, the plain and full declaration of principles, contained in the Reply to Cobbett, left it still necessary that he should furnish "proof," that he really was, what he professed himself to be!—And this is the way in which Mr. Hall is treated by his friends!

† It was not made a question. —The real question proposed, was, how Mr. Hall could condemn others for an act, the commission of which he had shared with them.

‡ If this "one act," which was in truth, "the preaching up a crusade against French principles" to an extent never exceeded—if this one act be justifiable, as indeed it was, then the whole multitude of similar acts committed by the Clergy, are also justifiable.
with the conduct of such men. And the Reviewer cannot be so blind as not to perceive, though he is not honest enough to allow the distinction.

No. V. Mr. Hall does not need shelter himself behind "a few clergymen" If he did, it were worthwhile to suggest, as a reading more in unison with the fact, "the majority of clergymen."

No. VI. If we term this Reviewer a prevaricator, it is "only a passing remark;" not a "head of accusation." The epithets "ingenious" and "eloquent," the slight praise incidentally bestowed on Mary Woolstonecroft, Mr. Hall has certainly seen no reason to retract. Her work referred to was both; and at the time that the "Apology" appeared, she was not an adultress. But, against the school of Godwin and Wolstonecroft, Mr. Hall has directed all his eloquence in his masterly sermon on Infidelity. The want of candour betrayed by the Reviewer in not noticing this fact, is of a piece with his persisting in his mistake respecting Dr. Price.*

No. VII. The Reviewer confesses that he applied the term Radical to Mr. Hall, not to do him honour,—in other words for the purpose of fastening on him an obnoxious and opprobrious appellation. It was, in fact, one of the dirty artifices by which a party writer seeks to degrade his opponent. That Mr. Hall had ranged himself with the party calling themselves Radicals, is a pure falsehood. Mr. Hall's "Apology" was published before such a use of the word Radical was ever thought of. If that party have adopted any of his principles, he has not adopted theirs. Mr. Hall, if he is a Radical, he is a Radical of the same school as Granville Sharp, and others of the most virtuous patriots. With the defence of his and their sentiments on these points, I have no concern.† The Reviewer's intention was defamation, and therefore he preferred abuse to argument.

Nos. VIII and XII. I class these together because the Reviewer would insinuate that Mr. Hall has "retracted" something which he had advanced in defence of blasphemy. Does the Reviewer know what blasphemy is? It should seem not. Blasphemy is speaking contumeliously of God—"an overt act no state should

* This "slight praise," as it is termed, is not confined to one or two expressions.—It is a general tribute of unqualified applause, conveyed in language so inflated as to become almost hyperbolical.—The "fact" of Mr. Hall's having on a different occasion written against this woman, would, if adduced at all, have only furnished another example of his inconsistency.

† This anxiety to disclaim any participation in the principles of the man whom he professes to defend, is alike honorable and complimentary to both parties, to Mr. H. and his worthy defencer.
tolerate." Are all sceptics and Deists blasphemers? Were Gibbon, and Bolinbrooke, and Pope all guilty of blasphemy? If they were, I say with Mr. Hall, that there is no way of separating the precious from the vile, in such cases, compatible with the freedom of the press. But the honesty of the Writer is most conspicuous in representing Mr. Hall as speaking of the freedom of the press as "dead," after the acquittal of Hone and Wooller, when he knew that the expression was used in the year 1794. That the sarcasm has not become literal fact,* is owing to the lenity and firmness of juries, not to the inclination of Government.

No. IX. By ridiculing the idea of Reform, the Reviewer must be considered as virtually pleading for these things.

No. X. Here the Reviewer is mistaken, Mr. Hall does not joke. He believes that the establishment is an Anti-Christian institution. The Baptist Missionary Society is not.

No. XI. The Reviewer's sagacity is most conspicuous in the explanation of his former meaning. Mr. Hall evidently understood him as speaking of the Ministers. The Farmers are, it seems, the best judges of the cause and the remedy of agricultural distress. And precious judges they are! Witness Mr. Webbe Hall and other agriculturists, who have made themselves the laughing stocks of the House of Commons.

No. XIII. The Writer's gross and wilful misrepresentation under this head, remains without the shadow of palliation. Not one of the expressions cited from Mr. Hall's pamphlet will for a moment sustain the terms of the indictment. So far from "overturning" Mr. Hall's positions, the Reviewer does not attempt to oppose a single argument to any one of them; but merely delivers his oracular opinion, that the principles Mr. Hall contends for, would reduce the Government to a ruinous state of dependence on the popular will. Either he does not understand these principles, or he wilfully misrepresents their tendency, by charging on them absurd and ideal consequences.

The state of the nation is a topic too important and too com-

---

* Mr. II. had spoken of a certain fact as having taken place—His defender proceeds to show why it has not since taken place—why this fact has not become a fact!

† I had charged Mr. Hall with advocating "the Sovereignty of the People." He denied the fact. I therefore cited certain passages in proof of the charge. Let the Reader refer to them. As to "argument," and "overturning," it is needless where my opponent is only anxious to disavow the plain meaning of his own expressions,
licated to be flippantly touched upon. It is not my object to defend Mr. Hall’s opinions, but his veracity and his consistency against this unprovoked and dastardly attack of a sculking libeller. I would only remark, that not one of the passages which are cited, supplies, in my view, an effective contradiction to Mr. Hall’s statement. The Parliamentary debates on the Poor Laws, and the language held at all the great County Meetings, would furnish abundant evidence of precisely an opposite bearing. No competent political writer would have referred to the increased consumption of tea as a proof of increased prosperity. The substitution of tea, among the lower classes, for animal food, milk, and beer, is well known to have taken place to a great extent, and this partly as the effect of the pressure of the times.

The consumption of wine is still further from being a sign of general prosperity. Foreign wines, during the reign of high prices, found their way into use among the Farmers. They have in the middle classes of society been extensively substituted for malt liquor. There has been an increased consumption among the higher classes, as the natural effect of the progress of luxury. The consumption of luxuries among the rich has increased, and what does this prove? That the condition of the people at large has improved? Far from it.*

And now, Sir, for the head and front of Mr. Hall’s offending—the true cause of this unprovoked—personal attack on a man whose talents, and piety, and unblemished life, one would think, might have protected him even from the unspiring malice of a Tory partizan. He has dared dispute the immaculate character of the “Heaven-born Minster and Sunday duellist.” I verily believe but for this, this Christian Guardian would never have come out of his watchbox to spring his rattle. Bishop Horsley might have been censured, and Dr. Priestley eulogized by Mr. Hall with perfect impunity, had he not called in question the claims of Pitt to the Apotheosis which has been awarded him. The Reviewer says, he will not defend his fighting a duel; but in the next breath he does defend it, and in a way which “certainly has the appearance” of participating in his idol’s contempt of the obligations of religion. Mr. Pitt had “no criminal intention,”—none in profaning the Lord’s day by an act partaking at once of the guilt of murder and suicide! To have refused the challenge would, we are told, as “a necessary consequence,” have entailed “the loss of power, consideration, and character” and “have reduced him to the situation of the most

---

*In a country like this the rich and poor must prosper together.—The consumption of comforts and luxurys—which may be ascertained, is rejected as a proof—and I am referred to the consumption of necessaries, which cannot be known.
despised man in the kingdom! Of course then he was right: he yielded only to necessity. Nay, to have done otherwise, would have been unworthy of the first Minister of a Christian Country! His character, so says this Christian Guardian, would have been lowered, blighted, had he acted as a man who feared God would have done. But his Reviewer well knows that no such consequence would have ensued. Had Pitt refused to stake his life on the course of a bullet, it would not have lowered him an inch in the eyes of the worshippers of power. No; it would not have been imputed to cowardice. It would have evinced genuine moral courage. It would have been an unequivocal mark of that true greatness of mind which was wanting in his brilliant but specious character; and it would have formed one bright spot in his life to which his reverend and right reverend panegyrists would now be glad to point as a religious action, or at least as some indication of religious principle.

Mr. Fox was not, Sir, I admit, politically consistent; and he was far, very far from virtuous. But was he not “illustrious?” He was inconsistent, but he was not an apostate. If he “dodged about” he did not pass at once from the zenith to the nadir; like him who, from being the champion of freedom and reform, became the representative and idol of the Tories. But Mr. Fox, though justly entitled to rank as a patriot, is not an object of political idolatry. His political errors and his moral delinquencies, how much soever they tarnish his fame, were innoxious as it respects his country. Those of Mr. Pitt are embalmed in the admiration of a party; and it is this which gives them still an importance. They had a fatal bearing on our national interests while he lived, and they continue by this means to exert that baleful influence still.

Mr. Hall’s theory of obedience puzzles, it seems, this clear headed critic. For this Mr. Hall is not responsible; I shall not therefore undertake his defence. I wish only to point out the sagacity of the Reviewer’s concluding remark, that, in as much as that theory contradicts and condemns itself, it must be highly mischievous! Now when a writer contradicts and condemns himself, one would be led to think that he could not do much mischief. And for this very reason I anticipate less mischief from this Reviewer’s attack than otherwise might be produced by misrepresentations so malignant as those he has indulged in. But, with regard to the theory of obedience, it may perhaps assist him to understand the subject a little better, if I transcribe a short passage from a periodical journal which will not be suspected of either Whiggism or Heterodoxy. In No. XXXII of the British Review occurs the following passage:

“It would be our duty, therefore, as individuals to obey every
lawful injunction of the recognised ruler, even though he should disapprove all his measures, and at the very moment we were exerting ourselves in every possible way which the laws of the country might authorise, to induce him to change them. Such at least is our view of divine right and passive obedience: a view which gives full scope for the exercise of the public voice, even to the extent of changing the fundamental principles of the constitution, while it binds each individual in his personal capacity, to submit to the existing civil authority as the ordinance of God, and to confine his "resistance" where he thinks "resistance" his duty, within the prescribed laws of the community, which are binding upon him till changed by public consent. The expediency of altering them, has nothing to do with the question of obeying them."

Without pledging Mr. Hall to a perfect agreement with these sentiments, I apprehend they will not be found to differ very widely from those which he has expressed on the subject, except that he has not gone quite so far. And now, Sir, one word more to this Reviewer, on parting. He has the insolence to affirm, that in Mr. Hall's own conscience he is himself already condemned. If he knew any thing of Mr. Hall's feelings on the subject, he uttered a wilful falsehood. If he did not he was guilty of hypocritical presumption. In the same spirit of irreligious flippancy he made free to term the deliberate and consistent opinions of a man whose reach of mind he is unable to fathom, "the sins of his youth."

If party spirit has not utterly seared his conscience, the time will come when he will deeply repent having lent himself to the unworthy purpose of vilifying an individual whom no man of sense or taste would speak of without admiration, no man of piety without affectionate reverence. The Christian Guardian is probably by this time heartily ashamed of its ally, and Cobbett is smiling to find himself seconded by so unexpected a coadjutor. Let me advise this writer to desist from reviewing and keep to his craft.

I am, Sir,

Yours, &c.

E. E.
At this period a letter signed W. W. appeared in a paper called the Leicester Chronicle. — As however the writer declined entering into the general subject, and merely indulged in two or three desultory remarks, it does not seem necessary to interrupt the argument by introducing more than the few sentences which are noticed in the next Letter:

"Mr. Hall, it seems, permitted five or six weeks to elapse before he published his reply to the tirade directed against him, and hence the vanity of the Reviewer has excited him to something like a delirious ecstacy: — this man should remember, that whatever Mr. Hall writes, is destined to live, and to exert an abiding influence, and should therefore be carefully composed. But can this Writer, with all his presumption, seriously imagine that Mr. H. was diverted from his numerous engagements, and sedulously employed during five weeks, in crushing his miserable abortion!"

"Let this secret assassin come forth from his hiding place, (and whenever he will do so, I will cease to be anonymous) and then let him dare to insinuate that Mr. Hall advocates what his own conscience condemns."

To the Editor of the Leicester Journal.

SIR,

I owe to you some apology for the length to which this controversy has extended. You will believe me, that I never anticipated all this protracted contention from a short and moderate article in the Christian Guardian.

No man, certainly, had ever greater cause than Mr. Hall to exclaim, "save me from my friends." — The rather malapropos eulogium of his new ally, the Black Dwarf, was lately noticed. And now, in the person of your correspondent E. E., I know not whether to recognize a friend the most indiscreet, or an enemy the most insidious.

But why has Mr. Hall, if he considers his character implicated, left it in the hands of this chance medley advocate? Why, indeed, does he at all combat by proxy?
"He would feel himself," we are told, "degraded by contending for the last word with such an opponent." And degraded he doubtless would be, by contending "for the last word," with any opponent. If, however, he had the advantage of contending for Truth and Justice, he would find himself no more degraded by a second notice, even of such an opponent, than by a first.

Since, however, Mr. Hall declines the combat,—or rather, as I have been otherwise informed,—since his friends have interposed, and out of pure pity and compassion for the unfortunate object of his wrath, have forced him from the field,—let us look at the redoubtable E. E. who so gallantly steps into his place.

That I have been, throughout this contention, perfectly aware of the immeasurable advantage which Mr. Hall possesses over me, in mental power, and dialectic skill, I trust no one will doubt. But a mighty logician may sometimes condescend to espouse a sophism,—and a great rhetorician to adorn a mis-statement. And, bearing this in mind, I have never felt the slightest apprehension as to the result of the present contest; because I have been well assured of possessing the advantage, in temper, in facts, and in arguments. When, therefore, I find a new antagonist advancing, I enquire first, what reinforcement he has brought to these three points.

Let us examine, then, first, this gentleman's temper, secondly, his facts, in the next place, his arguments, and in the last, his friendship.

TEMPER.

I cannot look upon this as a trifling point, especially in a Christian Minister, and "his friends." The Baptists, too, are strict disciplinarians, and cannot fail to remember the apostolic injunction respecting a railer,—"with such an one, not even to eat." It was therefore matter of sincere regret to me, to find Mr. Hall descending to impute "malice," "slander," "falsehood," "venom," "reptile meanness," &c. His friend E. E., however, brings to his assistance, not a better temper, but a more abusive tongue. If Mr. Hall was content with forgetting the "harmlessness of the dove"—his coadjutor appears to have distorted the text, and to have emulated the harmlessness of the serpent. I am now, "an anonymous libeller," guilty of "unsparing malice," "cool impudence," "hypocritical presumption," "irreligious flippency," "abuse," "defamation," "vilification," &c.

What is that so powerfully excites the vituperative energies of
these gentlemen? What is it that has so irritated, so galled them? I said, it is true, that Mr. Hall was a Radical Reformer;—but he says of me, that I am guilty of falsehood, malignity, and reptile meanness, and yet I am perfectly unruffled.—And why? Because I have given to the public, facts without epithets, and feel secure of the result. My antagonists, on the contrary, put forth nothing but epithets without facts, and it is no wonder that they are agitated with fear and vexation.

I remember once being present at the detection of a manifest piece of deceit in a trusted servant. The criminal, much irritated, chose to fly into a rage, and was by no means sparing of abuse. His employer, one of the Society of Friends, coolly remarked, "Verily, friend, thou art warm.—An innocent man has no need of passion.—I shall leave thee for the present, and would recommend thee to sit down and try to determine, which has been most to blame;—thee, in committing this fault, or I, in discovering it."

FACTS.

I.—As to Mr. Hall's power, by the law of copyright, to continue the suppression of the Apology,—It is amusing, and yet lamentable, to see how men will go on writing letter after letter for nearly three months, without ever taking the trouble to ascertain the facts, upon which they are, all this time, hazarding assertion after assertion, and committing blunder after blunder.

By the Act 54 Geo. III. cap. 156, which I now have before me, it is enacted, that "Whereas by the former Acts, every author held the copyright of his work for fourteen years certain, and if living at the expiration of that term, for fourteen years longer—that, from the passing of this Act, (1814,) the first term should be extended to twenty-eight years certain—and the second, to the whole remainder of the author's life." And the Act goes on "that if the author of any book already published, shall be living at the end of twenty-eight years (the old term of copyright), he also, shall for the remainder of his life have the sole right of publishing the same." So that, by the old law, the copyright of the Apology would extend to twenty-eight years, which term expires this year. But by the Act of 1814, it is further continued to the remainder of the author's life. But E. E. says that "the Act has not a retrospective bearing upon any books which had been published fourteen years, and therefore cannot apply to a work published in 1794, the copyright of which had expired six years before the passing of this Act." Now I reply that both these assertions are contrary to fact. The Act does apply to books published fourteen years before—and the copyright of the Apology
had not expired. I am willing to rest my whole credit upon these assertions; any one who can lay his hand upon the Statutes for that year, can detect me if I am wrong, and I invite investigation.—If I have misrepresented the Act in any degree, both E. E. and Mr. Hall shall have from me whatever apology they may require.

So much for the first fact brought forward by this writer.

II. "Mr. Hall never preached before the Bristol Volunteers. After rubbing my eyes, and looking a second and a third time at this sentence, I requested a friend to call upon Mr. Hall's publisher, and to ask most literally for the "Sermon before the Bristol Volunteers." Without a moment's hesitation or doubt, the Fast Sermon of 1803 was handed to him. So that Mr. Hall's publisher appears to know something of it, if E. E. does not.

On turning over the leaves of this eloquent production, I observed the following expressions, the meaning of which is not at all ambiguous:

"Go then, ye defenders of your country, accompanied with every auspicious omen, advance with alacrity into the field, where God himself musters the hosts to war."—"While you are engaged in the field, &c."—"Should you fall in this struggle, &c. you will have the satisfaction of having performed your part."

"But the word "volunteer" does not stand in the title-page of this sermon." Is not this wretched quibbling?

The fact I brought forward was this, that Mr. Hall, in charging the Clergy of the Establishment with partizanship, in "summoning the people to arms,"

"With pulpit, drum ecclesiastic
Beat with fist, instead of a stick;"

used language which exactly applied to his own case, and which, not upon my assumption, but on his own shewing, stamped him for a partizan of Mr. Pitt.

His "friend" E. E.'s reply to this, is a quibble about the title-page of the above quoted sermon.

III. I alluded, in the Review, to Mr. Hall's applause of Priestly and Wolstonecroft. That gentleman chose to enter into a long defence of his eulogium on Priestly, but refused to say a word for Mary Wolstonecroft. He even cut my sentence in half, for the
purpose of avoiding all mention of her name. I then said, "if Mr. Hall will not defend, he must be held to have retracted." No, says E. E., "Mr. Hall has certainly seen no reason to retract his "praise" of this woman."—Why then, I ask, did he so studiously avoid all allusion to her?—I repeat my assertion, that he who declines to defend one particular point, while he does defend others, may fairly be held to have abandoned that point.

IV. "At the time the Apology appeared, she was not an adulter-
ness." At the time the Apology re-appeared, she was. E. E. knows full well that the whole of my argument has been levelled against this new publication.—And what has "the time when it first appeared" to do with this question?

V. But I am again told of "its first appearance,"—"before the term of Radical was applied to politics; and am assured that the assertion "that Mr. Hall had ranged himself with the party calling themselves Radicals" is a "pure falsehood."

Of the "first appearance" of this pamphlet I shall say no-
thing; and of the purity of falsehood as little. But on the character of this late new publication of a forgotten Apology for Universal Suffrage and Annual Parliaments, I must prefer the opinion of the Black Dwarf to that of E. E. The Editor of that most Christian and Loyal Miscellany must be considered to have some knowledge of Radical principles, and he has deliberately adjudged Mr. Hall to be a "vindicator of Radical Reform." From his abode in Warwick Gaol, he re-echoes Mr. Hall's aspirations for "the ruins of all establishments," and is happy to agree in his opinion that "the French Revolution is the most splendid event recorded in the annals of history."

VI. My "honesty," I am told, "is most conspicuous," in represen-
ting Mr. Hall as speaking of the freedom of the press as dead, after the acquittal of Hone and Wooller, when I knew that the expression was used in the year 1794."

My words were "Mr. Hall coolly republishes this expres-
sion after witnessing the acquittals of Hone, &c." I must, in charity, suppose, that E. E. has never read the Review, to which he applies such free language. If he has, what am I to think of his "honesty" in thus misrepresenting me?"

VII. "The farmers are, it seems, the best judges of the cause and remedy of agricultural distress." E. E. certainly cannot have read the Review, which he thus constantly misquotes and misre-

resents. I never said that the farmers are, or are not, the best
judges—I said, that, from the circumstances in which they are placed, "they ought to be judges" of this subject. Will E. E. differ from me here.

But I am next boldly charged with "gross and wilful misrepresentations."—When, where, and how, E. E. disdains to inform us. This charge is left, like many others, of malice, slander, and falsehood, to support itself, without the assistance of a single iota of proof.

VIII "The parliamentary debates," I am told, "would furnish abundant evidence" in contradiction of the authorities I brought forward, on the state of the nation.—"Would furnish!" Then why does not E. E. show us some of them. I brought proofs, and he answers by assertions. I gave him the evidence itself, and he tells us that it might be contradicted.

IX. We have assertions, again, and nothing else, relative to Mr. Fox's character. I shewed that Mr. Pitt's change, if change it is to be called, was gradual, and perceivable only after a lapse of eight years. I proved also, from Mr. Fox's own mouth, that his change of opinion, on fundamental questions, was absolute, as from black to white, and that in the course of three years.

I am now told by this E. E. that, "if inconsistent, Fox was not an apostate—he did not pass at once from the zenith to the nadir, like Pitt."

This is all very well, if E. E. likes to say it; and better still, if he can contrive to believe it. One would think, however, that before such belief could be possible, it would be necessary to get rid of the facts and proofs which I brought forward; which E. E. does not even attempt to do. And those facts and proofs shewed, that to "pass at once from the zenith to the nadir" was a common occurrence with Fox, but with Pitt, unknown.

ARGUMENTS.

Under this head I purpose to notice the logical display of Mr. Hall's new advocate.

I. "The Reviewer confesses that he applied the term Radical to Mr. Hall, not to do him honour—in other words, for the purpose of fastening on him an opprobrious appellation."

I said that I did not apply the term to do Mr. Hall honour, but as a just description of his political character—ergo, I con-
fessed a malicious intention. Whatever is not an intended compliment, is, "in other words," studied defamation.—What logic and what candour of interpretation.

II. I am said to have "insinuated" that Mr. Hall had retracted his doctrine of the freedom of the press. I insinuated nothing. I stated plainly the contradiction which I found. E. E. makes a desperate effort to confuse the question with interrogatories, and ifs. But it will not do. A man who is determined to affirm that "there is no way of separating the precious from the vile, in the cases of deistical publications, compatible with the freedom of the press; and who in the same breath declares that "blasphemy must not be tolerated," will be understood to argue that the freedom of the press ought to be abolished.—This is the plain result of his own positions. To separate, or single out, blasphemous publications for suppression, is destructive of the freedom of the press; and yet the state must not tolerate them;" therefore, they must be suppressed at the expense of the freedom of the press.

I do not believe that Mr. Hall himself would ever have avowed these two contradictory positions in the same breath. His friend, E. E., however, resolutely determines to defend them both, and has consequently involved himself in an absurdity.

III. "By ridiculing the idea of reform, the Reviewer must be considered as virtually pleading for these things." As Mr. Hall is to be proved right, it follows that if I cannot be proved wrong, I "must be considered" so.

He who disapproves of universal suffrage and annual parliaments "must be considered as pleading" for septennial parliaments and the whole borough system. By this convenient method the whole body of advocates for triennial parliaments and moderate Reform, are argued out of existence at a stroke.

IV. Mr. Hall brought forward the text "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up," as an argument against establishments. I remarked, that he must have been jesting on the subject. No, says E. E. "Mr. Hall does not joke, he believes that the establishment is anti-christian." I know it, but why does he bring forward to prove it anti-christian, a text which cannot apply to it at all, until its anti-christian nature is first proved.

V. "The Reviewer says, that he will not defend Mr. Pitt's duel, but in the next breath he does defend it."
I did not defend it. My words were, that there were "endless shades in human criminality," and that it was but justice to remark some palliative circumstances." This is called defending the duel.

The "criminal intention" of which I acquit Mr. Pitt, was that of taking the life of his antagonist. The discharge of his pistol in the air, proved, if any thing could, the absence of any wish to shed blood.

I say again that Mr. Pitt was under a far stronger temptation than most duellists. E. E. knows well enough that he could never have entered the House of Commons, and faced those who panted to insult him, after the refusal of a challenge.

But I do not say, with E. E. that "he was right and yielded only to necessity." I say that he was wrong, but not more so than the "illustrious" Fox, the man whose eulogy occupied a large portion of the time at a late meeting of protestant dissenters.

VI. "Mr. Fox," we are told, "is not an object of political idolatry." He is now, comparatively, but little regarded, and even his faults "are innoxious as respects his country." Mr. Pitt, on the contrary, is "embalmed in the admiration of a party," and his name continues to exert an "influence over the national interests."

Mr. Pitt, then, it would seem, is to be defamed, because he is remembered with admiration, while his rival is forgotten. What kind of feeling is this? Can envy be known amongst the "friends" of Mr. Hall.

VII. E. E. cannot conceive how a self contradictory doctrine can be mischievous. I will inform him. Tell an uneducated man, one, for instance, of the readers of Mr. Hall in the Black Dwarf, that the people of whom he is one, have a right to overturn their government, and "set aside their rulers" whenever they please; he understands you, and his pride is gratified by the principle you inculcate. You may then add, if you will, the qualification, that, "for any particular number of persons to set themselves against the established practice of a state, is a violation of the laws of morality," and you perplex him for a time. He soon finds out, however, that if these two doctrines do not entirely contradict each other, at least, the second practically nullifies the first. He therefore dismisses this second from his mind as irrational, or incomprehensible; while he retains and cherishes the revolutionary principle.

VIII. With the extract from the British Review, I entirely agree. But I cannot help feeling amazed at the understanding of that
individual who can affirm, that the sentiments of Mr. Hall differ little from it, "except that he has not gone so far."

The British Reviewer confines allowable resistance "within the prescribed laws of the community." Mr. Hall denies that the right of resistance as vested in the people generally, has any limits whatever.

The British Reviewer calls for implicit obedience to every lawful command of the Ruler, only allowing every legal means to be used "to induce that Ruler to change his measures. Mr. Hall's plan is, that the people should if it please them, change the Ruler himself.

This is what E. E. calls "not going quite so far."

FRIENDSHIP.

The conduct of E. E. towards his "friend" Mr. Hall is so singular, that he deserves particular notice; and the more so from the manner and air of intimacy which he assumes. He writes as one authorised. "Mr. Hall would feel," &c.—"Mr. Hall consulted his bookseller," &c. If he really be a sincere friend, he is certainly the most unfortunate advocate that I ever met with; but the appearances much more resemble treachery. Observe one or two circumstances.

I. Mr. Hall brought forward the preaching of Sermons on the late war and the threatened invasion, as an act of partizanship of which the Clergy were frequently guilty.—Now E. E. tells us that the Fast sermon of 1803 was intended "to rouse the people," and yet that "to represent it as implicating party politics is an absurdity." Let it be observed that the absurdity of representing sermons of this nature as acts of partizanship, is not mine but Mr. Hall's. It is he, and he only, that has so represented them. It is he, and he only, to whom this charge of absurdity can apply.

II. "Never," adds E. E. "does Mr. Hall betray less of the partizan than in that eloquent Sermon." Here is a friend, who first denies that Mr. Hall is ever a partizan, and then talks of the degrees in which he betrays that fault—now more, now less.

III. "It is not my object to defend Mr. Hall's opinions" (call you this backing your friend) "but his veracity and his consistency."

Here it, ye real friends of Mr. Hall, hear it averred by one
who claims the honor of his friendship—that his character for veracity itself was absolutely endangered by "a scurking libeller," and could only be rescued from peril by a volunteer defender, equally scurking, and more libellons. Delicate, indeed, must be the texture of that reputation which is to be thus lost or thus preserved. And most exquisite the compliment rendered him by his friend, in thus speaking of his veracity, as a questionable and controvertible subject.

This E. E. let it be observed, has asserted "the thing which is not" in charging me with having attacked Mr. Hall's veracity. I was not so foolish. Indeed I believe that the mere idea of such a thing was never entertained by any individual except this E. E. This "friend," whose "affectionate reverence" has thus characteristically displayed itself.

IV. In Mr. Hall's letter he applied to me language, in the use of which it is impossible to justify him. He imputed to me without the least ground—falsehood, venom, malignity, and slander. Now I could not suppose that Mr. Hall had forgotten, that even an Archangel when contending with the Father of lies himself—"brought not a railing accusation against him." Nor could I doubt but that in a cooler moment, his conscience would condemn this unwarrantable asperity, and his wish be that he had never indulged in it.

His friend E. E., however, calls this charitable supposition, "insolence;" and avers that "if I knew any thing of Mr. Hall's feelings on the subject, I uttered a wilful falsehood." A most friendly act this, to come before the public, and assert, as from actual knowledge, that a Minister of the Gospel of Repentance, scorns to practise the humbling doctrine which he preaches. That he suffers, not one sun, but many, "to go down on his wrath"—clings to and cherishes the worst feelings of a sinful nature—assumes a privilege which archangels disclaim—judges and condemns most uncharitably, a fellow-creature—and then spurns at the very idea of the admonitions of conscience, or the warning of that silent, but powerful monitor. I need scarcely say that I totally disbelieve the assertions of this false, or foolish friend. The picture of pride or obstinacy—of resentful and obdurate feelings which he draws, and under which he writes the name of Mr. Hall; is one in which it is impossible to trace the slightest resemblance. It is one at which Mr. Hall must shudder, and from which he must shrink with abhorrence.

I shall here leave this writer, and his notable defence of "his friend." A defence containing, on the one hand, nothing
but naked opinions, unsupported assertions, contumelious lan-
guage, and misrepresentations of fact—and on the other, repeated
disavowals of any intention to defend Mr. Hall's principles—and
the voluntary implication of his character in several charges which
I should never have dreamt of bringing forward.

Whether, indeed, this E. E. is really fighting on my side,
under a mask, and uses the recognition and exaggeration of Mr.
Hall's errors as his line of attack—or whether he be one of those
poor creatures who perpetually "mean nought, but blunder round
about a meaning," I know not. If the first be the case, let him
know that I disdain such assistance; but if the second, what more
can I offer him than my unsigne'd compassion.

Another of Mr. H's myrmidons has just sprung forth, in the
Chronicle of Saturday last, under the signature of W. W. He
assures the public that the "Review" was "a miserable abortion."
This discovery comes rather late, but is not on that account the less
surprising. It would doubtless astonish beyond measure the
world of medicine, to find that the parent of half a dozen children
had originally been himself an abortive Birth. And scarcely less
startling is it to hear, that the original paper which has caused and
brought into existence about five different replies—was, notwithstanding, no cause at all—for that it fell lifeless, still-born, unno-
ticed, and unregarded from the press.

It was also "a weak and creeping production". Honorable,
no doubt, is this testimony, to the judgment and discernment of
Mr. Hall, who chose to employ five weeks of his valuable time, in
the refutation of this very specimen of weakness. It is a grave
and serious example of

Oceans into tempest lost
To crush an atom, or to drown a fly.

As a specimen of simplicity it is worth while to observe these
two writers, both anonymous, uniting to denominate me a secret
assassin and sculking libeller. But the most amusing part of their
display is the contempt which they so vehemently labour to exhibit.
These gentlemen seem entirely to forget that scorn is not a passion.
Plunging and foaming with rage, and rushing on me with all but
excrinations, they would yet have me believe that they are incapable
of ought but the most sovereign contempt. At the transports and
contortions of their fury, I smile; but nothing can restrain a laugh
when I hear of the coolness and serenity of their scornful elevation.

Before I conclude, I must protest against the assumption of
both Mr. Hall and his friends, that I have been actuated by personal malice, and have disregarded the respect which is justly due to his character. I repel the charge with indignation—There exists not on earth the man for whose talents I have a greater respect, or for whose general character I feel a more profound veneration. It is indeed, upon this very ground that I have attacked a production which, without the sanction of his great name, would never have given my thoughts five minutes occupation. I would combat error whether on level ground, or when seated on an eminence. But I would rather seek it in the most exalted sphere, for there its influence must be proportionably dangerous.

Upon one or two points in the Apology, which have formerly escaped my notice, I wish to add a few observations.

I. In the advertisement to the late New Edition, we are desired to remark the unparalleled magnitude of the apostacy of Pitt, in the circumstance of his being "the son of Lord Chatham, the vehement opposer of the American War—the Champion of Reform, and the idol of the people." Now were it even to be allowed to be "unparalleled apostacy" for a son to differ in politics from his father—still Mr. Pitt would not be found guilty in this respect. He was equally vehement in his opposition to the American War. He did more for, and less against, Reform, than his Father. And he was "the idol of the people" in a greater degree, and during a longer period.

Burgh himself, whom Mr. Hall appears to have studied, could have related the effrontery with which the first Pitt avowed and justified the active interference of Peers in his own Election. And any History of England would have informed him, that two motions for Reform were brought into the House of Commons while he was all powerful in that assembly, and that both were rejected.

II. In the 29th page we are told, that the majority of the House of Commons is chosen by less than eight thousand members. This statement, originally very incorrect, is rendered much more so by the union with Ireland, which has taken place since it was written. The number of electors is now upwards of six hundred thousand.

III. At the 24th page of the 1803 Fast Sermon, I find this expression relative to the measures then taking for the defence of the country. "The zeal of those entrusted with the administration, cannot be questioned—the vast preparations they have made for our defence claim our gratitude; and if in a situation s
arduous, and in the management of affairs so complicated and difficult, they have committed mistakes, they are amply entitled to a candid construction of their measures."

Now, Sir, you well know that these vast preparations were continued by necessity, for several years; that they produced at last, a glorious triumph, but that they produced also, a great addition to the national debt.

You, however, Mr. Hall, approved of the object of these preparations, and their vastness excited your gratitude.

Where then is your honour, where your liberality, where your "candid construction," when you now come forward to declare, that the name of Pitt will go down to posterity, "identified with every image of terror and destruction," because, by these heavy, but well repaid expenses, a large addition has been made to the public burthen.

THE WRITER OF THE REVIEW.

The following is an extract from another Letter signed W. W. which appeared in the Leicester Chronicle at this time.

"I shall leave the Reviewer of Mr. Hall, for the present, in the hands of E. E. who will doubtless administer to him due correction. He is now indebted for his concealment, to my forbearance, and unless he desists from his illiberal aspersions, I will drag him from his ambush, and expose his real name to public contempt."

To the Editor of the Leicester Journal,

SIR,

Inconsistency is one of the most distinguishing marks of error,—and it pervades the late Apologies of Mr. Hall and his friends, in a most remarkable degree.
In some of them, however, it is only diverting, without possessing sufficient interest to render its exposures desirable. A writer, for instance, who signs himself W. W. assures me in one week, that he is excessively "amused" with my letters; and in the next absolutely uses threats to induce me to "desist" from writing them. So that he would appear to be ready to use any means to stop the source of his own peculiar amusement.

My arguments he begs to leave to the most puissant E. E. "who will doubtless" annihilate them. But I am warned, that if I do not desist, I shall be publicly exposed.

Desist! I am threatened with the consequences if I do not forthwith "desist." And is it come to this. After all the terms of weak, frivolous, creeping, grovelling, and contemptible, which have been applied to my communications,—after the assurance that the Review was "an abortion"—and that "the fatuity of my remarks baffled all description"—after all this and much more, the truth comes out, that I must be gagged," by fair means, or by foul.

Was a more contemptible, a more miserable termination, ever attempted to be put to a controversy.—After falling upon me, three to one, with every species of abuse and calumny, and after continuing this kind of contest for some weeks, they stop, in a kind of desperation, and exclaim, "we have got your name, and if you dare to say a word more, we will publish it."

Beyond, however, the kind of feeling which is sometimes experienced towards the reptile, who, writhing under your crushing heel, strives to force his teeth into the hardened leather—these creatures cannot move me. I am indifferent to their threats, because I am assured they know me not. And I should be equally indifferent, if I were certain that they knew me well.

That they cannot know me is a fact, the reasons of which I shall not choose to explain. That they have conjectured something, I am quite aware. Nor can I have any objection to this kind of amusement. At their guesses I have already laughed much, and expect to laugh still more.

My retention of the anonymous character up to this period has arisen from one cause alone. Namely, that I could perceive no possible reason for the publication of my name. It is well known that the highest literary characters have written and do write in the Public Journals, anonymously,—and so universal has this practice
become, that it is held to be a token of conceit, to sign with a real name, a letter in a newspaper; except that letter contains assertions of facts, which require a personal guarantee.

The original Review, the signature of which would have been regarded as an absurdity,—merely stated such and such things as the substance of a certain pamphlet, and slightly remarked upon their tendency. Mr. Hall then chose to attack "the Writer" of that Review, and the Writer took the liberty to defend himself. Other assailants then opened their attack under anonymous signatures, and the Writer repelled them. In all this there was nothing to call for a name. My assertions relate to things before the public—let the public examine the facts. I ask for no unenquiring belief. As to the arguments which have been adduced, I suppose they would derive but little assistance from the addition of any name, distinguished or obscure.

W. W. then, may take just whatever course he pleases. If to his former blunders he is anxious to add a crowning one, in the name of all that is laughable, let him. Or should he even, contrary almost to the possibility of the thing, have stumbled upon my name, he is welcome to do the best, or the worst that he can with it. Concealment has happened unto me, not been sought by me—and whether it shall end, or when, are matters to which I am totally indifferent.

I turn from this writer, whose threats I despise, and whom I have only by an effort forced myself to notice, to one of another stamp—to one who quits the highest station in the Republic of Letters, and the most honored post in the service of Christianity—to defile himself with Black Dwarfs and Monthly Repositories—to contest with Cobbett the office of Coryphaeus of the Radicals—to become a defender of Radical Reform,—and to be himself defended (lost man!) by E. E. and W. W.

Will it be believed, by any who have paid attention to the late discussion, that Mr. Hall has again reprinted his Apology without alteration. The plea of the non-protection of the work by the Copyright-Act, is again put forth, although it has been proved to be utterly unfounded and contrary to fact. The allowance of every kind of publication is still defended; although within these few weeks, Mr. Hall has avowed the contradictory doctrine, that blasphemous writings ought not to be allowed. The sovereignty of the people is still held forth, notwithstanding his late declarations, that he had no intention to express any meaning of the kind.
It is impossible that any reputation, however high, can bear without injury, the frequent recurrence of steps so perfectly suicidal. It is not to be supposed that much influence can continue to dwell with a writer who thus repeats assertions which he is warned, and ought to know, to be untrue—who puts forth in one short month, doctrines in diametrical opposition to each other—and who continues to use language which he had declared to be without meaning.

That a man of such talents and attainments should have thus inflicted on himself a voluntary disgrace, is a deplorable instance of human weakness. That I have been, however unconsciously and unintentionally, a distant and partial cause of it, would cause me, if any thing could, almost to repent of the part I have taken in what I believe to be, THE VINDICATION OF TRUTH.

THE WRITER OF THE REVIEW.

To the Editor of the Leicester Journal.

SIR,

It is with reluctance that I trouble you with any further notice of the pertinacious misrepresentations of your incorrigible correspondent, the Writer of a certain "short and moderate" article in the Christian Guardian.

I had told this gentlemen, that not only has the Act of 1814 no retrospective bearing on the work in question, but that the former Act of 1801, which gave authors a second fourteen years' term did not extend to books already published. With the Acts before me, I repeat the assertion. That the Act 54 Geo. III. cap. 8, is explicit in its provision, that the book or books already published, "shall not have been published fourteen years at the time of passing this Act." The Act 41 Geo. III. cap. 2, runs thus: "Provided also, and be it further enacted, that nothing in this Act contained shall extend or be construed to extend to any book or books heretofore composed, and printed, or published, &c." The "apology" which I require for the misrepresentation of both Acts on the part of the Reviewer, is, that he shall admit that he brought forward an incorrect charge in the first instance, and that he has persevered in it with singular obstinacy.

* This Act could not give to Authors a right which they had already enjoyed for nearly a Century by the 8th of Anne, Cap. 19.
I shall not stoop to vindicate myself from the Reviewer's strictures. The epithets I applied to him, I applied deliberately, as believing them to be both just and called for. I believe so still; and am confirmed in that opinion by the disingenuousness manifested in his reply. I asserted that the Review was a libel: it was written in the spirit of a libel, and its republication in the Leicester Journal, shewed what were the feeling and object of the Writer. I called him a scurking libeller—a man who was ashamed to put his name to the attack he made on the character of a man he affects to venerate. I repeat the charge; and though he has no right whatever to demand that the author of a reply to an anonymous libel should disclose his name, I pledge myself to give up mine, as soon as he discloses his own. Unambitious as I am of publicity, I have no motive for wishing to remain concealed. My only reason for being unwilling to know my antagonist, is, that I should regret to connect with the name of any individual, the feelings of contempt with which his conduct has inspired me.

I think it due to Mr. Hall to state, that E. E. was strictly a volunteer; that Mr. Hall did not see a line of my reply till it appeared in the Leicester Journal; and that in asserting that "Mr. Hall would feel," that "Mr. Hall consulted," &c. I spoke from a knowledge of the fact not derived from any personal communication with Mr. Hall. I have, however, reason to believe that he is not dissatisfied with either the matter or the manner of my reply.

I did not imagine that Mr. Hall's character was "endangered" by this writer, but that it was called in question. Cannot your correspondent distinguish between what an uninformed or ill-disposed person may call in question, and what is in itself questionable? Does a fact become doubtful* the moment it is doubted? I said that it was not my object to defend Mr. Hall's opinions, because I was not professing to review his "Apology," or to enter into the wide discussion of the principles it involves. Had the Reviewer confined himself to an argumentative examination of those principles, neither Mr. Hall, nor any one of his friends would have felt called upon to notice him. But his attack was pointed against Mr. Hall's religious character. It was an arrogant attempt to sit in judgment upon his motives and feelings. It broadly impugned to him inconsistency both of opinion and conduct, and charged him with a culpable negligence in ascertaining the truth of his assertions. On this account, E. E. stepped forward on learning that Mr. Hall declined to waste any more words on a Writer, who, to an utter

* It was not the Reviewer, but E. E., that treated the fact of Mr. Hall's veracity as "doubtful," by professing to come forward in its defence.
disregard of truth and of the decencies of controversy*, united the
glory and the meanness betrayed in the assertion that it cost Mr.
Hall five weeks to refute the Reviewer's assertions.

I am not aware that it is necessary to prosecute the argument,
for I should have only to repeat, point by point, the statements in
my former letter, disentangling them from the artful misrepresenta-
tion of the Reviewer. That Mr. Hall's publisher knew what was
meant by "the Sermon before the Bristol Volunteers," is, it
seems, a proof that the Fast Sermon was preached before them!
Whether it was or was not, is a point, as I remarked, of not the
slightest consequence in the discussion†. But the fact is, that it
was not professedly or intentionally preached before any military
body; and it is not known that a single Bristol Volunteer was
present. But, that it contains an appeal‡ to "the defenders of
their country," neither was denied, nor would the denial have
served any purpose. In that appeal, I asserted that Mr. Hall's
conduct was broadly distinguished from that of the clergy. I
repeat it, and refer to the arguments in support of my assertion,
which the Reviewer has not noticed. I said, "never does Mr.
Hall betray less of the partizan than in that sermon." This word-
catcher construes this into admission that he does sometimes betray
the partizan. And suppose I that were to admit that, in his Apolo-
gy, or in any other political tract, he does so, would this prove any
thing as to Mr. Hall's sermons, or to his uniform conduct as a
preacher? But what if I were to say that the Writer of the Re-
view never shows less good sense and fairness than in such petty
criticism as this; would it imply an opinion that he does elsewhere
exhibit those qualities as a writer?

I shall notice but one more of his misrepresentations. He
says: "Mr. Pitt, then, it would seem, is to be defamed, because
he is remembered with admiration, while his rival is forgotten."
For a writer who could so distort his opponent's argument, it is
impossible to have any respect. In this short sentence are con-
tained three mis-statements. I neither vindicated any defamation
of Pitt, nor vindicated a severe treatment of his memory on the
ground alleged, nor admitted that his rival is forgotten. My
remark was to this effect; that the faults of Mr. Pitt were not
private views, like those of his rival, but public faults, embalmed
in the admiration of a party; and not only so, but perpetuated in
the principles of that party; that they derive from this considera-

* E. E. charges the Reviewer, without offering an atom of proof, with an utter disre-
gard of truth... And then talks of "the decencies of controversy." Where has the
Reviewer exhibited these decencies in a similar manner?
† I stress this point however which E. E. himself first noted.
‡ An appeal which, when reiterated by the Clergy of the Church, is made by Mr. Hall to
appear a crime!
tion a permanent importance which does not attach to the personal character of an individual; and that it is not against Mr. Pitt as a man, but against Mr. Pitt as the Moloch of the war-party and the idol of the Ultras, that it becomes necessary to employ the language of indignant reprobation. Few persons besides this Writer would be so heedless or so weak as to speak of Mr. Fox as forgotten, or as likely to be forgotten.* But his errors are admitted; and are deplored by none more sincerely than by his admirers; while the political votaries of the heaven-born minister, not content with blazoning and exaggerating his splendid talents and those high qualities which undoubtedly attached to his character, stoop to apologize for his delinquencies, to justify his disregard of religious obligations, and ascribe to him a moral greatness and an elevation of virtue which he was far enough from possessing. And this for the purpose of upholding the system of which he is the patron saint. But like the legendary hero, whose marvellous feat is emblazoned on our gold coin, notwithstanding the credit usually assigned him, of having destroyed a most terrible dragon, he was at best a hero of the second order, and a most apocryphal saint.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

E. E.

London, April 20th, 1822.

P. S.—I beg to state, as a reason for the delay in replying to the Writer of the Review, that, owing to my absence from home, the paper containing his last letter did not fall into my hands till a few days ago, and that I have taken the earliest opportunity of replying to it of which my engagements would allow.

Since writing this postscript, I have seen the letter of the Writer of the Review in your paper of the 12th inst. I do not perceive that it requires any notice from me, as it contains little more than a reiteration of malignant insinuations respecting Mr. Hall, and a silly vapouring about his not fearing detection, in answer to W. W. I can assure him that I am neither curious to detect him, nor do I think it possible that a man who has a character to lose would be guilty of so much baseness. I have done with him. There is one sentence in a previous communication of his, which he knows cannot be distinctly noticed, but which convinces me that he is a person to whom the character of a gentleman, a man of feeling, or a man of principle, cannot possibly attach.

* The expressions bearing this meaning came from E. E. himself, not from the Reviewer.
To the Editor of the Leicester Journal.

SIR,

It is with feelings of unmixed pleasure that I learn from E. E. that he has "done with me"—an intimation conveying equal relief and satisfaction. He will doubtless ascribe this self-gratulation to my joy at an escape from so powerful and merciless an avenger—and will take me to the criminal who has just received a mitigation of his sentence. Some few individuals, however, may possibly question the correctness of this interpretation. They may fancy my distaste to arise from weariness, not of receiving, but of inflicting punishment.

They may imagine, for instance, something like disgust on my part, at being called upon for another word on the Copyright question. They may think that my original warning given not quite five months since, ought to have sent any opponent to the Act of Parliament, and that the very margin alone, of that Act, fully establishes every word I have written. They may feel, with me, that it is rather annoying at this stage of the controversy, to be challenged to the proof of a legal fact, which is just as plain and certain, as that murder is a capital offence, or that a square is comprised within four sides.

E. E. talks much of an Act of the 41st Geo. III. Now I beg to inform him that a reference to the Riot Act would have been nearly as much to the purpose. The Act of the 41st was made for the purpose of extending to Ireland the benefits of the English Law of Copyright; but that Act had no kind of reference to, or operation upon, Mr. Hall's work. It left the term of Copyright of the Apology, just what the act of Anne had made it

And that Act runs thus—8 Anne, c. 19, s. 1. "The Author of any Book that shall hereafter be composed shall have the sole liberty of printing or re-printing such book for the term of fourteen years and no longer," and at s. 11. "That after the expiration of the said term of fourteen years, the sole right of printing or disposing of copies shall return to the Authors thereof, if they are then living; for another term of fourteen years.

By this Act, then, the Apology, if published in 1794, would have completed its first fourteen years in 1808. But the Author being then alive, another term of the same length would commence, which would end in the course of this year, 1822. All
this the Act of 41. Geo.III. leaves precisely as it was, only extending its operation to Ireland.

But the Act of the 54th Geo. III. cap. 156, enacts at s. 9.—
"That if the Author of any Book or Books which have been already published shall be living at the end of twenty-eight years after the first publication of the same, he or she shall for the remainder of his or her life, have the sole right of printing and publishing the same." Thereby giving to Mr. Hall the "sole right" of publishing the Apology for "the remainder of his life."

But, says E. E. "with the Acts before me I repeat the assertion—that the Act of 1814 has no retrospective bearing on the work in question." This is startling! But how is it made out? "The Act is explicit in its provision that the book or books already published shall not have been published fourteen years at the time of passing this Act." If this be so, the Act must contradict itself, for the words I have quoted above are, any book, already published.

But it is not so. The whole is a most disgraceful mis-representation—disgraceful either for folly or falsehood.

The passage which E. E. has quoted is marked in the margin, "Authors of Books already published, to have the benefit of the extension." And yet he quotes it to shew that the Act has not a retrospective bearing!!

This Act, 54 Geo. III. did two things:—It extended the first term of Copyright from 14 to 28 years.—And it made the second term co-extensive with the Author's life. Both these it was desired to give to the Authors of works already published.

First then, it was necessary to provide for Authors whose works had not been published 14 years. For, by the old law, if the Author died within that time, the Copyright ceased at the expiration of the term. The Act therefore orders—"That if the Author of any Book or Books which shall not have been published fourteen years at the time of passing this Act shall be living at the said time, and if such Author shall afterwards die before the expiration of the said fourteen years," then his personal representative shall have the sole right for 14 years in addition to the first 14.

And, second, it provides in the passage I have already quoted, "That if the Author of any Book or Books which have been already
published, shall be living at the end of twenty-eight years after
the first publication;" he or she shall for the remainder of his or her
life have the sole right of printing, &c.

Now is it not plain that the first of these enactments, (the one E.
E. has quoted,) is made to give the benefit of the Act even to those
who might die within the fourteen years, and the second, to those
who continue to live. But as Mr. Hall is among the living, and
not among the dead, it is clear that the second, in which nothing
is said of "not having been published fourteen years"—belongs to
him, and that he has the benefit of it, the sole right of printing the
Apology.

In fact these words "which shall not have been published
fourteen years," are not inserted to exclude any Book or any
Author, but merely to describe the persons alluded to. They have
no meaning without the rest of the sentence, "and if such Author
shall afterwards die before the expiration of the fourteen years.

I should trust that this is the last time that I shall be called
upon to write upon this Copyright Question. I cannot help feeling
some degree of astonishment that men claiming the possession of
common sense, should have needed and called for, all this instruc-
tion upon so plain a point.

I have sent the Act to the Office of the Leicester Journal, &c.

* 54 GEORGH III. Cap. 156.

Instead of Copyright for 34 Years, and contingently for 14 more, Authors and their
Assigns shall have 28 Years Copyright in their Works, and for the Residue of their Lives,

SECTION IV.---And whereas by the said recited Acts of the Eighth Year of Queen Anne,
and the Forty-first Year of His present Majesty's Reign, it is enacted, that the Author of any
Book or Books, and the Assignee or Assigns of such Author respectively, should have the sole
liberty of printing and reprinting such Book or Books for the Term of Fourteen Years, to
commence from the day of first publishing the same, and no longer; and it was provided, that
after the Expiration of the said Term of Fourteen Years, the right of printing or disposing of
Copies should return to the Authors thereof, if they were then living, for another term of
Fourteen Years; And whereas it will afford further Encouragement to Literature, if the dura-
tion of such Copyright were extended in manner hereinafter mentioned; be it further enacted,
That from and after the passing of this Act, the Author of any Book or Books composed and
not printed and published, or which shall hereafter be composed, and be printed and published,
and his Assignee or Assigns, shall have the sole Liberty of printing and reprinting such Book
or Books for the full Term of Twenty-eight Years, to commence from the day of first publish-
ing the same, and also, if the Author shall be living at the End of that Period, for the Residue
of his natural Life.

And if living at the End of 28 Years the sole Right of Publication shall be in them during
Life.

SECTION IX.---And be it also further enacted, That if the Author of any Book or Books
which have been already published shall be living at the End of Twenty-eight Years after the
where I trust the Editor will allow it to lie for the inspection of any person who may wish for any further understanding on the point. And as E. E. calls upon me for an apology, upon the supposition that I am wrong; I might, if I had any confidence in his candour or fairness, retort upon him his own words, and, having proved myself to be in the right, might demand of him an admission "that he brought forward an incorrect charge in the first instance, and that he has persevered in it with singular obstinacy." But I forbear.—His admissions, assertions, apologies, and slanders would now be equally unable to interest me, or to give me either satisfaction or disquietude. Added to which I am by no means certain that the calibre of his understanding is competent to so serious a matter as an Act of Parliament. As yet he has shown no signs of the least ability to comprehend so complex a subject. So haphazard have been his assertions, that he first sought to bring in an Act (of the 41st.) which had no imaginable connexion with the question; and then he pressed into his service, a passage relating to dead Authors, which was nearly the only one in the last Copyright Act, with which Mr. Hall could have nothing whatever to do.

E. E. thinks it desirable that the public should know, that the epithets, which, without the shadow of reason or justice, he applied to me in his former letter, were deliberately applied; and with the same deliberation he now pronounces, that I am a Libeller. He has proof, too,—strong, irrefragable proof. Hear him.—

"The republication of the Review in the Leicester Journal, shewed what were the feelings and object of the Writer." My malice (a necessary ingredient in the guilt of a libel), is proved from my procuring this republication.—Did E. E. then know it to be a fact that I was accessory to that republication—Oh, no:—but it answered his purpose to assume it, in default of any other proof of malice, and accordingly it was assumed. While the truth is, that I never even heard of this republication until the appearance of Mr. Hall's reply informed me of it. I laughed at first, but now I begin to grow tired, of an antagonist like this, whose proofs are all assumptions, and his facts, mere fancies.

As to my having "been ashamed to put my name" to the Review, E. E. knows perfectly well that a signature to a Review would have exposed the writer to general ridicule, as being per-
fectly contrary to the general custom. My name, I shall only add, will appear immediately I receive a sufficient reason for obstructing it on the public. Till then, if my statements and arguments cannot support themselves without it—let them fall!

Of the “personal communication,” between Mr. Hall and E. E. I know perhaps more than either of them imagine. Were I indeed, as I am represented to be—“a person to whom the character of a gentleman cannot possibly attach,” I might place E. E. in rather an awkward light before the public.—But I forbear.

E. E. had no idea, it seems, of Mr. Hall’s character for veracity being endangered. Nor had I. But E. E. talked of his only object being “to defend Mr. H.’s veracity and consistency,” is it customary with him, then, to write whole columns in the Public Journals, in defence of that which he does not conceive to be endangered.

He does not, however, think “it necessary to prosecute the argument,” seeing that he “would have only to repeat, point by point, the statements in his former letter.” If this be all that he could attempt, he is quite right in declining it; for if, after my reply to his former letter, he were to reiterate “point by point, the statements” contained in it; he would, beyond doubt or question, be guilty of several most clear, positive, and deliberate falsehoods. It is certainly, therefore, the wiser course, to say no more about it. But there is “one sentence” he tells me, “in a former communication of mine, which I know cannot be distinctly noticed, but which convinces him that I am every thing that is abominable and barbarous. Now I certainly do not know what particular sentence is here alluded to. I have spoken of nothing but public principles, and notorious facts, but I have certainly an idea that many “sentences” have been contained in my letters, which cannot be noticed by my opponents, because they cannot contrive even the appearance of a decent reply to them. This may be rather annoying to these gentlemen, but it is not my fault; nor can I allow that the stubbornness of the facts I have adduced, or the pain which their exposure may have given to my antagonists, ought to deprive me of all pretensions to “the character of a gentleman, a man of feeling, or a man of principle.”

To cover his retreat, however, E. E. attempts a stroke or two at my arguments: keeping clear, at the same time, of any thing like a serious attack. My charge, for instance, against Mr. Hall, of inconsistency, in himself preaching a Sermon “to rouse the
People'' and then censuring the Clergy of the establishment for the very same act, remains unanswered. But we have another quibble about the title of that Sermon. ''That Mr. Hall's Publisher knew'' what was meant by the ''Sermon before the Bristol Volunteers'' is, it seems, a proof that the last Sermon was preached before them.''

Now I never represented it as any such proof. I adduced the fact to show that when speaking of the ''Sermon before the Volunteers'' I was speaking of a work which was well known under that title. I then referred to the contents of that Sermon, but here E. E. declines to follow me.

''But suppose I were to admit'' says E. E. ''that in his Apology or in any other political tract, Mr. Hall does betray the partizan, would this prove anything as to his Sermons, or to his uniform conduct as a preacher?'' We have here got back to my original ground of quarrel with Mr. Hall. I grant that his partizanship would not ''prove any thing'' as to his Sermons. But it would stand very materially in the way of his general usefulness. It has, in fact, at this moment, done his character, and through his character, the cause of Religion, incalculable injury wherever it has become known. It may, indeed, make little difference to his own immediate congregation, but throughout the wide sphere in which his writings used to circulate, it has already diffused a doubt and suspicion the most lamentable.

The character of a Christian Minister is indeed, whatever Mr. Hall may think of it, very sensibly deteriorated by the admixture of worldly and Party Politics. He may preach ''my kingdom is not of this world''—he may exclaim ''Set your affections on things above, not on things on the earth'' he may ask ''who is sufficient for these things''—he may repeat ''Give thyself wholly unto them.''' But all his instructions will fall dead upon his people's ears, except they appear to direct his practice. If instead of ''being examples to the flock''—''giving none offence that the Ministry be not blamed''—''cutting off occasion from them that desire occasion''—seeking not the worldly but the eternal good of men—he can find time to be penning ''Apologies'' for Parliamentary Reform—getting up ''Addresses to the Queen'' and Petitions for Radical Reform;—he will doubtless ''hinder the Gospel'' throw a stumbling block in the way of a great majority of those who might be benefited by his instructions, and greatly ''strengthen the hands of evil doers''. This was the principle upon which I first reprehended the publication of the Apology, and against this principle I have not yet heard a single word.

We come now to the last point—the character of Mr. Pitt. And I am here accused of misrepresentation. Let your readers.
turn to E. E.'s former letter, and to my reply, and they will see that there is no ground for the charge. I have no right to fill up your columns in such a manner, or I would quote the whole. Suf- fice it to say, that the reason given for passing lightly over the same faults in Mr. Fox, which were strongly censured in Mr. Pitt, was this, that the former was "not the object of political idolatry" and that his errors were therefore "innoxious as respects his country" while those of the latter were "enbalm'd in the admiration of a Party." Upon this I remarked, that to attack a Statesman's character because his name is held in greater veneration than that of your own leader, has certainly a great resemblance to Envy.

The "splendid talents" and "high qualities" of Mr. Pitt are now acknowledged, and his "devotion to his country's service" has been recognized by Mr. Hall himself. What then is it that excites the feelings of bitterness and rancour which these writers display. Upon what ground is it that "the language of indignant reprobation" is thought justifiable.

The charges brought against him are these: First, "his unparallelled tergiversation and inconsistency," and secondly, that he was "the Moloch of the War Party." Upon the first point I have already said enough. I have brought facts and dates, which remain unanswered, to prove that the changes of Mr. Pitt's principles and conduct were scarcely perceptible, when compared with the turns and returns, the shifts and changes of that Charles James Fox, whose principles Mr. Hall himself adopts, and by whose name he is content to be called. By every rule, therefore, of justice and candour, Mr. H. ought, on this point, to be silent. That which, in a greater degree, cannot prevent his admiration of one character, ought not, in a less, to move his indignation against another.

"The Moloch of the War Party." How well sounds this appellation from "a friend of Mr. Hall"—How striking an instance is it, of that very tergiversation and inconsistency, which in Mr. Pitt, whether real or fancied, is visited with the full fury of their virtuous indignation. What was the language of that East Sermon of 1803, to which I have before referred.

Of the necessity of the War it told us that "it was a struggle for existence, not for empire," and that "engaged with such an enemy, no weak hopes of moderation or clemency can tempt us for a moment to relax in our resistance to his power, and the only alternative is, to conquer or die."

Of the National feeling respecting this contest, Mr. Hall thus
spoke: "Hence that unexampled unanimity which distinguishes the present season."—"In other wars we have been a divided people," but now "we have buried our mutual animosities in a regard to the common safety. The sentiment of self-preservation has absorbed every other feeling; and the fire of liberty has melted down the discordant sentiments and minds of the British Empire into one mass, and propelled them in one direction."

If indeed I wanted evidence of this fact, I might appeal to Lord John Russell's late Speech on Reform, in which he confessed, that "Mr. Pitt entered upon the war with the whole people on his side." Or I might call upon the Editor of the Eclectic Review, a publication of which E. E. probably knows something, and who pleads, in the number for April last, "that there is little justice in making out the Administration to be the root of all evil;" and who, while he is a professed opponent of the late war, asks "why blame the Minister for the madness of the Nation."

Mr. Hall might have told him, indeed, that this "madness" was nothing more than the zeal of men whose "only alternative was, to conquer, or die." But upon the general principle Mr. H. must have agreed with this Eclectic Reviewer. One of the most prominent doctrines of the Apology is, that the will of the people, be it right or wrong, wisdom or madness, ought to be the only rule of conduct with the Government. And as, upon Mr. Hall's own shewing, the will of the People was in favour of the war, no blame can attach to the Organ of their will, the Minister.

But what is to be said to those who after declaring that the war was "a contest for existence, not for empire," and that "Death or Victory was our only alternative;" now turn upon the Man who "devoted himself" on his country's shrine, giving up all "his splendid talents" to her service, and at last died a Martyr to his care and solicitude for her welfare; who turn, I say, to the memory of such a man with malice which the lapse of years seems only to inflame, and denominate him "the Moloch of the War Party!!" What can be said—what language can describe the hypocrisy, the—-But I must break off, or my feelings will betray me into language too nearly resembling their own.

THE WRITER OF THE REVIEW.
To the Editor of the Leicester Journal.

SIR,

I would have you look to it, that your Correspondent E. E. is not a snake in the grass.—And I would recommend to Mr. Hall and his friends, to find some means of stopping his pen, or of superseding his employment.—If allowed to go on, there is no anticipating the mischief he may do them.

The unmerciful Writer of the Review held out the idea, in his reply to E. E.'s first letter, that there was something treacherous about it. As a matter of policy he had better have held his tongue, and not have checked or alarmed so active an assistant. But let that pass.

This E. E. seems to be one of that class who use this sort of language.—"I am sure, my friend N.—on the whole is a very good sort of man. It is too true, indeed, that there's some necessity to look sharp after his money transactions, nor is his word always to be depended on.—I've heard too that he is rather fond of a dram. But still on the whole he is a very tolerable sort of a fellow as times go." And this is called, standing up for your friend.

In the same style, "suppose," says E. E. "that I were to admit, that in his Apology, &c. Mr. Hall does betray the partizan." Suppose that you admit this? Why then you admit at once half the subject of the dispute.—You admit that which cannot but lower such a name as Mr. Hall's most exceedingly; and then are content with asking, "what does this prove as to his Sermons?"

A few lines farther I find these words, "The faults of Mr. Pitt were not private vices, like those of his opponent."

This is admirable.—The Reviewer had the decency and fairness to keep within bounds.—He set the Parliamentary conduct of Fox in comparison with that of Pitt, and the changes of the one, against the changes of the other. He forbore to allude to the private characters of these two illustrious men, or to use the advantage which this topic might have given him. He left it to E. E. to remind us of the "private vices" of Fox, and by that expression, to call up all the disgraceful recollections of shameless profligacy to which it must give rise.

I shall say nothing of the confession that the Writer had said one very severe thing, which could not be answered. But I cannot
avoid remarking the folly or wickedness of denoting Mr. Pitt the "Moloch of the War Party."

After E. E.'s own assertion that the Fast Sermon of 1803 was preached to "rouse the people" to arms, it will not, I suppose, be disputed that Mr. Hall was himself one of "the War Party." But he was not a quiet member of this national confederacy. He preached and printed an Appeal of so inspiring and animating a nature, that its effect was felt throughout the contest. For this, and for other manifestations, he may justly claim, in the language of E. E., the title of "High Priest of Moloch."

I am yours, &c.

A BYSTANDER.
CONCLUDING REMARKS.

Having been informed that a republication of the whole of the Correspondence in the Leicester Journal, on the subject of Mr. Hall's Apology, is intended,—I have revised that part of it to which my signature is affixed, and have made a few corrections and additions. I have more readily taken this trouble upon the present occasion, because I am sensible that it had been previously neglected. My impatience of folly and equivocation, urged me, in the course of the controversy, to reply rapidly to most leisurely antagonists.—The blemishes, therefore, which haste had left, I have endeavoured to remove.

I have also thought it desirable, at the close of the argument, to revert back to the original ground taken, and to enquire what advantage had been gained, what positions forced, or what successfully defended, on either side of the question.—And in attempting this I shall be studiously concise and simple.—All the advantages of wit and sarcasm—eloquence and poetry, I yield to Mr. Hall—Be it my part to rest on truth alone; how bare, how naked, I care not.

The points urged in the Review were eight.—Let us see then how these now stand.

I. The first was an opinion, that a Minister of the Gospel ought, to use Mr. H.'s own words, "on no occasion to meddle with Party Politics."

Against this principle, no objection has been raised—Nor does Mr. H. deny that he has meddled. But he pleads that certain of the Clergy, alias "Spiritual Janisaries," have done the same, and that therefore he ought not to be blamed. He might upon the same ground have pleaded the example of Dr. Dodd in justification of Forgery. But I cannot think so meanly of his judgment as to suppose that he imagined this defence a valid one. The objection of the Review, then, remains.

II. It was said that Mr. H. had the power of preventing the republication of the Apology.

This point has been questioned and contested, but the Copyright Act has been quoted, and it is clear that the right of printing
rests with the Author for Life.—This allegation, then, of the Review, remains.

III. It was urged that the integrity and disinterestedness of Mr. Pitt ought to have preserved his memory from contumely, insult and bitter reviling.

In reply, his talent, his disinterestedness, and his devotion to his country are allowed. But it is said that his influence has been the cause of vast national calamity—of accumulated taxes and augmented debt.

Now this calamitous accumulation of taxes and debt arose solely from the late war.—Was Mr. Pitt then to blame for supporting that War?

Mr. Hall declared in 1803 that the war "was a contest for existence, not for empire," and that the only alternative was, "to conquer or die." If Mr. Hall spoke truth, Mr. Pitt could not be blameworthy for the part he took in such a contest. Nor can the Debt and the Taxes thus necessarily incurred in the salvation of the Country, be charged upon Mr. Pitt as a personal crime. The objections of the Review to such accusations, then, remain.

IV. It was remarked that Bishop Horsley was an object of Mr. Hall's bitterest censure, and Priestley, Price and Wolstonecroft of his eulogies. The one being a Champion of the Christian Faith,—the others contemners and despisers of it.

In defence of his applause of Wolstonecroft he says nothing.—In extenuation of his praise of Priestley he observes that "it was not under the character of a Socinian that he was eulogised." But upon this principle a highwayman might be made the subject of a general eulogium for courage, foresight, prudence, &c., and the reply would be, to any one who questioned the propriety of applauding a robber, that "it was not under that character that he was eulogized." If nothing better than this be produced, I must consider that the censure applied in the Review, still remains.

V. It was said, that Mr. Hall supported the doctrines of the Radical Reformers.

He is greatly offended at the application of this appellation to him, but does not attempt to prove his innocence of the charge.—The most violent of that party hail him as their Champion and Defender;—while he himself does not offer to shew that his
principles are any other than those of Radical Reform.—And while he continues publicly to advocate Universal Suffrage, Annual Parliaments, an irresponsible Press, and the ruin of all Establishments, the accusation of being a Radical Reformer must be allowed to remain.

VI. It was next said that Mr. Hall argued for the "infallibility and sovereignty of the People."

He flatly denies this.—But the passages quoted from the Apology, at page 23 will prove the fact, and the charge must therefore be allowed to remain.

VII. It was urged that Mr. Hall spoke of the Liberty of the Press as dead, abolished and extinct, after the acquittals of Hone and Wooler, and while Carlile was braving the Law.

(It might have been added, that if Mr. H. spoke of the Liberty of publishing without any previous restraint, that liberty was never attacked or suspended. But if he spoke of the liberty of publishing without any future responsibility, he spoke of a liberty which never had any existence. Either way, to speak of it as dead, was factious misrepresentation.)

But his only answer is, complaint at being coupled with the mention of Hone and Carlile—a complaint having no other foundation than the fact that the names appeared to stand in the same paragraph of the Review, (while he himself had coupled Bonner and Horsley together, as kindred spirits.)—The accusation, therefore, thus answered, or rather, thus left unanswered, remains.

VIII. Lastly, it was remarked that Mr. H. had prophesied, about thirty years since, that without then immediate Reform, the State must be ruined—and that this prediction had never been fulfilled.

Finding it impossible to prove that the Ruin thus predicted had taken place, he fixed upon an expression in the Review that "our general condition was better and not worse, than when the prediction was first uttered"—and gallantly attacked this averment with the whole force of Pauperism, Debt, Taxes, and Distress.—Of the impression which he made let the Public judge, but it should at the same time be observed, that in defence of the prophecy itself, he said not a word. That it had been fulfilled could not be said, and was not said. That he has republished a false and detected presage of evil, is therefore an accusation which remains.
These points comprise the whole substance of the Review, and I trust that I may be allowed to say that they are all established rather than shaken, by the past correspondence. For any good purpose, therefore, to Mr. Hall, this controversy had better, on his part, have been declined.

I might indeed go through his Letter, in a similar manner, and shew that every sentence of it has been refuted.—But this is not, on my part, an offensive warfare. I leave it therefore to my readers, who, I apprehend, will not fail to observe it as they proceed.

One word more. Mr. Hall has set up, in his estimate of the character of Pitt, a rule of consistency much stricter than I am disposed to admit. But having done so, he, at least, can have no right to complain if that rule is applied to his own conduct.—Knowing, then, that proofs of inconsistency are the destruction of all authority in a Writer, and believing that it is desirable that Mr. Hall's authority in political matters should be annihilated, I shall endeavour to shew that he is, according to his own rule, a far greater "apostate" than he can ever make Pitt appear.

Let it be borne in mind, then, that Mr. Pitt, in his boyhood, warmly espoused the doctrines of Reform, and continued to support them, whether in or out of office, for three or four years.—Tired, at last, of successive defeats, he ceased to agitate the question; and, in the meantime, the disturbances in France rendered the subject much more doubtful, and the time then present, the most unfit.—Mr. Pitt, therefore, discouraged the agitation of the question at that period, and died before a more peaceful one arrived. And for thus objecting to remodel the Constitution in the midst of a hurricane, he is charged by Mr. Hall with shameless tergiversation and unparalleled apostacy."

Let us see, then, if the history of Mr. Hall's opinions will present so perfect a model of consistency, as to warrant so harsh a judgment upon others. Or whether he does not himself furnish a singular example of the mutability of human professions.

I am prepared to shew, by extracts from his own writings, that he is about the last man in existence who should conceive himself entitled to claim from others a fixed adherence to expressed opinions. For no more striking instance of political inconsistency can be found, than that which he himself presents.

I shall quote, in illustration of this feature of his character, a few passages from his Apology published in 1793—and his Fast Sermon of 1803. The general tendency of which two publications will be found to be in exact counteraction of each other.
In the Apology he thus speaks of the origin and authority of Government.

"Government is the creature of the People, and that which they have created they have surely a right to examine."—p. 9.

"The origin of political right must inevitably rest upon the acquiescence of the People.—The tracing Civil Power up to the Sovereignty of the People explains its reasons, and fixes it upon clear and determinate principles.—p. 58. The People have always the same right to remodel their government and set aside their Rulers.—p. 57.

But in the Fast Sermon he allows that "the Apostles continually enjoin respect to Government as Government,—as a permanent ordinance of God," and as a representation of the dominion of God over the earth"—and he adds, "the wisdom of resting the duty of submission on this ground is obvious.—He also warns his hearers to "guard against any system which would withdraw the duties we owe to our rulers and to society from the jurisdiction of conscience."

On the subject of political discussion, he thus expressed himself in the Apology.

"Every point relating to the right of dominion, is left to be settled by the consent and approbation of mankind."—p. 9. "If we allow the people are the true origin of political power, it is absurd to require them to resign the right of discussing any question that can arise either upon its form or its measures, as this would put it for ever out of their power to revoke the trust which they have placed in the hands of their rulers."—p. 11.

But in the Fast Sermon he avers, that "A good man is accustomed to acquiesce in the idea of his duties as an ultimate object, without enquiring at every step why he should perform them, or, amusing himself with imagining cases and situations in which they would be liable to limitations and exceptions. Instead of being curious after these, let the great general duty of submission to civil authority be engraven on our hearts, wrought into the very habit of the mind, and made a part of our elementary morality."—p. 23.

In the Apology he said of the Ministry:

"Meanwhile the violence and injustice of the internal administration keeps pace with our iniquities abroad, Liberty and Truth
are silenced."—p. 1. And of the Minister, "It is needless any farther to expose the effrontery, or detect the sophistry of this shameless apostate.—A Veteran in fraud, while in the bloom of youth, falsifying every promise, violating every political engagement."—p. 3. "The contempt we feel for his meanness and duplicity, is lost in dread of his machinations and in abhorrence of his crimes."—p. 10.

But in the Fast Sermon, he declared, that "their conduct is not to be approved who indulge in wanton and indiscriminate censures of the measures of our rulers." "There is," he continued, "a respect due to Civil Governors on account of their office, which we are not permitted to violate even when we are under the necessity of blaming their measures."—p. 20. "Every endeavour to excite discontent by reviling the character, or depreciating the talents of those who are entrusted with the administration, is highly criminal.—p. 24. And one circumstance he stated, "with sincere reluctance, because," said he, "it implies something like a censure on the conduct of those whom it is our duty to respect."—p. 58.

Of the French Revolution, he said, in the Apology, after the murder of Louis:—

"I am free to confess that the French Revolution has always appeared to me, and does still appear, the most splendid event recorded in the Annals of History."—p. 107. "The grandeur of its principles, and the beneficence (?) of its effects."—p. 108.

But in the Fast Sermon, he says:—

"The seeds of guilt were sown with an unsparing hand in France, a congenial soil, were they produced a thick vegetation. The fabric of society tottered to its base, the earth shook under their feet, the heavens were involved in darkness, and a voice more audible than thunder called upon them to desist.—But instead of revering the judgments, or confessing the finger of God, they only made more haste to desolate his works, and destroy his image, as if they were apprehensive the shades of a premature night might fall and cover their victims."—p. 50.

In the Apology, he thus censured Bishop Horsley, for his sympathy with the French Emigrant Clergy:—

"Admirable consistency in a Protestant Bishop! to lament over the fall of that Antichrist, whose overthrow is represented by unerring inspiration, as an event the most splendid and happy!"
But in the Sermon on Infidelity, he holds, that "it ill becomes the liberality of the present age to contemplate with sullen indifference, or malicious joy, the sufferings of the conscientious Catholics."

I might continue these extracts, but to proceed would weary my readers, and enough has been given to prove that a total change took place in Mr. Hall's views, between 1793 and 1803. Such a change, however, is by no means unusual, nor ought it to be considered criminal.

But, the most remarkable part of Mr. Hall's case is this:—That he now, after the lapse of a second ten years—makes another pirouette—flies back again to his first principles, and then clamorously charges Mr. Pitt, with shameless apostacy and unparalleled tregiversation.

He whose principles,—if to impute the possession of any seem not a sarcasm—have passed through all the variation of the rainbow—whose creed has made a complete revolution of the political compass, and pointed, in turn, in every opposite direction—whose mind, when politics are the question, seems to possess all the attributes and propensities of a weathercock,—this man deliberately charges the most consistent Statesman that ever breathed, with "unparalleled tregiversation." He says too, of himself, "I have changed no principle." It may, perhaps, be a fair matter of doubt whether the words principle, consistency, apostacy, &c. have the same meaning in his vocabulary, which the rest of the world are in the habit of putting upon them.—Certain, at least it is, that he lately published within the space of a few months, new editions of both the Fast Sermon, and the Apology. And we are bound to believe that he did not discern any thing like contradiction in these two productions, or he surely would have endeavoured to remove it.

But, if his mental organs were really thus obscured, he is beyond the reach of blame or responsibility in these matters, and must be considered as a man whose vagaries are allowed, but quietly disregarded. For my own part I must continue to entertain towards him, as a Theologian, sentiments of the most profound respect and esteem. But as a Politician, I can never regard him with a particle of either.

THE WRITER OF THE REVIEW: