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Requirements

Rubric
Rhetorical Analysis

Learning Outcomes:
• Determine rhetorical situation and purpose;
• Define and understand rhetoric as a framework for how writers inform and persuade audiences;
• Analyze how those writers use varied rhetorical strategies and genres to make impact on their audiences;
• Demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between writerly intention, audience, and genre;
• Write using an expository method.

Introduction:
For this assignment, you will complete a rhetorical analysis of three texts grounded in a contemporary social issue in order to analyze how writers persuade their audiences. To do so, you will select three pieces to review: creative nonfiction, transcribed speech, and a blog post. For each text, you will explore how the writers construct an argument and determine the overall effectiveness of their approaches.

Purpose:
The purpose of this assignment is to provide you with an opportunity to consider how writers use language to inform and persuade their audiences, in particular how writers persuade different audiences using varied genres. Genres are modes of written expression that require the application of specific rhetorical techniques, style, tone, and content. This assignment is an early introduction to exploring the rhetorical strategies writers employ as a means to better identify and articulate what determines an effective argument. A rhetorical approach to communication will help you not only read more effectively, but also think carefully about the rhetorical choices you make in your own writing.

Genre:
A rhetorical analysis considers how a writer presents an argument or position on a topic instead of determining if the author is correct or if you agree with their perspective. The goal of a rhetorical analysis is to take into consideration the purpose, audience, genre, and position of a rhetorical situation.

Writing Center:
While you can use the Writing Center during any point of the brainstorming and writing process, in past semesters, writers working on this assignment have found it useful to have sessions about:
• Ensuring they are rhetorically analyzing the sources rather than summarizing them
• Identifying the audience of the pieces of writing as well as the audience’s values
• Developing a controlling idea/thesis (this is a step that usually occurs after you’ve read your selected pieces)
• Brainstorming ways in which the rhetoric used in the articles has cultural, social, or political impacts

Requirements:
• Identify and define a contemporary social issue;
• Include a controlling idea or thesis;
• Create a clear organizational pattern/structure;
• Analyze the structure, language, and style of the argument as well as the argument’s relationship to the genre in which it is presented;
• Implement proper use of source to support analysis;
• The blog post must be a .gov or .org (do an advanced Google search: Search topic in Google; next, select “advanced search”; scroll to “domain” and type .gov or .org);
• MLA format (double-spaced, 12-point font, 1” margins, and Times New Roman font);
• 1000-1250 words (4-5 pages).

**Audience:** Classmates, Professor, Writing Center, You. As we advance in our writing projects, our conceptions of audience will become more dynamic and complex.

**Due Dates:**
### UNIT 2: 110 RHETORICAL ANALYSIS RUBRIC

The following rubric reflects the assignment priorities. Please refer to the assignment for specific requirements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS (A)</th>
<th>MEETS EXPECTATIONS (B)</th>
<th>EMERGING (C)</th>
<th>ATTEMPTED (D)</th>
<th>DOES NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS (F)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTROLLING IDEA/PURPOSE/AUDIENCE:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis explicitly stated, debatable, nuanced, rhetorically situated.</td>
<td>Thesis is explicitly stated, nuanced, debatable, rhetorically situated</td>
<td>Thesis is competent, without sophistication or nuance; thesis is explicitly stated, debatable, rhetorically situated</td>
<td>Thesis is vague and/or not situated in an argument about rhetorical choices.</td>
<td>Thesis mainly summarizes or does not address assignment purpose.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texts analyzed address contemporary issue.</td>
<td>Explicitly identifies and defines a contemporary social issue and selects a diverse range of texts to analyze.</td>
<td>Identifies and defines a contemporary social issue and selects a texts to analyze, but some texts choices lack depth and nuance.</td>
<td>Little or inconsistent sense of audience related to assignment/purpose; tone and point-of-view not refined or consistent.</td>
<td>Shows little awareness of a particular audience; reveals no grasp of appropriate tone and/or POV for given assignment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written to an audience of classmates and instructor (as evident in engaging intro, appropriate background and stylistic choices)</td>
<td>Audience awareness proficient, could be enhanced, such as with intro/style and appropriate background.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DEVELOPMENT and SUPPORT:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer provides textual evidence for each claim around structure, language, style.</td>
<td>Claims and analysis are developed around rhetorical choices for each text.</td>
<td>Claims and analysis are adequately developed, yet lack level of sophisticated analysis.</td>
<td>Text reads mainly as summary; claims are not clearly identified or minimally address rhetoric.</td>
<td>Minimal context provided for reader; minimal textual evidence minimal or non-existent.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writer provides context (summary of the rhetorical situation) for each artifact selected. Writer analyzes rhetoric, as it relates to claims.</td>
<td>Textual evidence (structure, language, style) are fresh with specific details that are insightful, relevant, concrete, in support of sound logic.</td>
<td>Textual evidence is adequate, but may lack depth or specificity from text.</td>
<td>Evidence is underdeveloped.</td>
<td>Development is insufficient, providing scarce details, evidence, and examples that may include unsupported claims.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source integration is advanced.</td>
<td>Lack of advanced understanding of source integration.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGANIZATIONAL PATTERN:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Intro provides sufficient background on topic and previews/lede/hook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Clear, logical structure subsequent sections;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Paragraphs are unified by a topic sentence and connected to thesis and subsequent claims.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Conclusion follow logically and offers significant insight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sequenced organization advanced and unified for essay’s plan and purpose; writer took risks to approach the assignment creatively.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ideas are linked, purposeful and in support of the controlling idea;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Competent organization pattern without sophistication; organization is mostly unified and proficient in support of the paper’s purpose/plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ideas are mostly linked and in support of claims and controlling ideas; writer could consider structural enhancements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organization is emerging; limited attempts to use organizational pattern in support of controlling idea.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Ideas are minimally unified and ineffective at times and may demonstrate abrupt or weak transitions between ideas or paragraphs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Organization, while attempted, no clear organization pattern; ideas are disconnected; transitions and sequence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Weak understanding of genre conventions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| STYLE and MECHANICS: |
| sentence structure, word choice, tone, grammar, spelling, punctuation, |
| - Sentences are dynamic, varied and well constructed. |
| - Tone and word choice are precise, fresh, and vivid. |
| - There are virtually no errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, or usage. (instructor can add: ___ or less grammatical errors) |
| - Most sentences are varied and well constructed; competent without sophistication. |
| - Word choice is generally appropriate. |
| - Minor errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, or usage, none of these problems is glaring or highly distracting. (instructor can add: ___ - ___ grammatical errors). |
| - Sentence structure can be repetitive or awkward and word choice imprecise or inappropriate. |
| - Errors in grammar, punctuation, spelling, or usage may distract the reader. |
| (instructor can add: ___ - ___ grammatical errors). |
| - Sentence structure and word choice may be inaccurate, confusing, or awkward. |
| - Many grammar, punctuation, spelling, and usage errors. (instructor can add: ___ - ___ grammatical errors). |

| PRESENTATION: |
| sources, revision documentation, MLA style |
| Exceeds expectations for: |
| - MLA format, |
| - Response to assignment prompt |
| - In text citation no more than ____ errors. |
| - Dynamic revision |
| - Incorporates elements from class and class work |
| Meets requirements for: |
| - MLA (mostly correct) |
| - Assignment prompt |
| - In text citation no more than ____ errors. |
| - evidence of some elements from class work. |
| - Proficient revision |
| Some requirements met: |
| - Little awareness of MLA |
| - Minimally responds to assignment prompt |
| - In text citation no more than ____ errors. |
| - Minimal evidence of incorporating elements from class |
| - Little evidence of revision beyond surface errors. |
| Minimal requirements met: |
| - No awareness of MLA or in text citations |
| - Does not respond to assignment prompt |
| - No evidence of evidence from class |
| - No evidence of revision |

| POINTS: |
Learning Outcomes:
- Determine rhetorical situation and purpose;
- Define and understand rhetoric as a framework for how writers inform and persuade audiences;
- Analyze how those writers use varied rhetorical strategies and genres to impact their audiences;
- Demonstrate an understanding of the relationship between writerly intention, audience, and genre;
- Write using an expository method.

Aspects of the assignment that work well:
Considerations for future work:
Grade:
A free, comprehensive, peer-reviewed, award-winning
Open Text for students and faculty in college-level courses
that require writing and research.

Rhetorical Appeals

Category: Rhetorical Appeals (/chapters/rhetoric/rhetorical-appeals)
Published: 15 April 2012
Last Updated: 29 September 2017
Hits: 125645
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rhetorical Appeal</th>
<th>Abbreviated Definition</th>
<th>Reflective Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Ethos** (/ethos) | appeal to credibility  | • Why should I (the reader) read what the writer has written?  
|                   | You may want to think of ethos as related to "ethics," or the moral principles of the writer: ethos is the author's way of establishing trust with his or her reader. | • How does the author cite that he or she has something valid and important for me to read?  
<p>|                   |                        | • Does the author mention his or her education or professional experience, or convince me that he or she is a |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Pathos (pathos)</strong></th>
<th><strong>appeal to emotion</strong></th>
<th><strong>valid, educated, and experienced source?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You may want to think of pathos as &quot;empathy,&quot; which pertains to the experience of or sensitivity toward emotion.</td>
<td>• How is the writer trying to make me feel, or what has he or she written that makes me want to do something?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What specific parts of the author's writing make me feel happy, sad, inspired, dejected, and so on?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Logos

You may want to think of logos as "logic," because something that is logical "makes sense." It is reasonable.

- What proof is the author offering me?
- What evidence does the writer provide that convinces me that his or her argument is logical—that it makes sense?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kairos (/kairos)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>appeal to timeliness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You may want to think of kairos as the type of persuasion that pertains to &quot;the right place and the right time.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Does the writer make claims that are particularly important given what is happening right now?
- How is the author "making the most of the moment" or attempting to speak to the concern of his or her audience?
Successful writers write to win. Whether a writer wants to achieve a particular grade on a paper, persuade a specific audience to adopt an argument, or obtain an interview with a company, a writer writes with a purpose that he or she aims to fulfill. Using rhetorical appeals, particularly in persuasive writing, is a powerful way to persuade an audience.

Moreover, rhetorical appeals work. For example, in “Reductions in smoking prevalence and cigarette consumption associated with mass-media campaigns,” authors Karen Friend and David T. Levy examine state and local mass-media anti-tobacco campaigns that endeavor to change social norms, knowledge, attitudes, and beliefs regarding smoking. Campaigns like this one undoubtedly use persuasive rhetorical devices, such as appeals, to produce measurable effects. Consequently, Friend and Levy’s study of campaigns in California and Massachusetts found that, in conjunction with a well-coordinated tobacco control program, the campaigns led to a reduction in net smoking prevalence of approximately 6-12% (92). These results unquestionably reduced smoking-related diseases and deaths, an important feat given the fact that, according to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), tobacco use is currently the leading preventable cause of death in the United States (“Tobacco-Related Mortality”).

For the purposes of helping writers write to win, this article discusses why using rhetorical appeals is a valuable skill to learn, what types of rhetorical
appeals exist, and how to start using them.

Identifying Rhetorical Appeals

Writers may employ four rhetorical devices, or appeals, in their persuasive writing:

Logos.
Pathos.
Ethos.
Kairos.

Jimmie Killingsworth provides necessary background information about these appeals by explaining that, in the *Rhetoric* (1.2.2), Aristotle defines what contemporary society has come to call appeals (*pisteis*) by dividing them into two categories: “one called ‘entechnic,’ ‘artistic,’ or intrinsic’; the other ‘atechnic,’ ‘inartistic,’ or ‘extrinsic’” (qtd. in Killingsworth 250). Elaborating, Killingworth notes that the artistic category, the proper concern of rhetoric according to Aristotle, includes ethos, pathos, and logos” (250).

Before turning to examples of how to use these appeals, it will be worthwhile to understand their definitions. As Emily Lane, Jessica McKee, and Megan McIntyre point out, logos relates to “the consistency and clarity of an argument as well as the logic of evidence and reasons.” An argument that offers substantial
evidence, including supporting statistics, will appeal to the rationality and sensibility of its audience members. Writers can also use pathos, or emotion, to help the audience connect with the writer’s argument. In contrast, ethos, a method of persuasion in which the speaker or writer tries to convince the audience by demonstrating his or her credibility (McKee and McIntyre), enables writers and speakers to display their credibility by explaining how their authority, credentials, expertise, and/or experience make what they say or write noteworthy. In contrast, as Kate Pantelides, Megan McIntyre, and Jessica McKee explain, kairos, entails “knowing what is appropriate to do in a given situation...saying (or writing) the right thing at the right time.”

Using Rhetorical Appeals

Identifying these appeals in persuasive writing is a valuable skill to learn (see this related article to get started); understanding how to use these appeals in your persuasive writing can prove to be an even more powerful ability to develop. To begin, several ways to appeal to logic exist. Consider the structure and quality of your argument. Daniel T. Richards asks...
writers to consider these questions: “Does your conclusion follow from your premises? Will your audience be able to follow the progression? Does your argument provide sufficient evidence for your audience to be convinced?” To improve the quality of your argument, consider:

- Referring to facts and figures.
- Citing relevant, current statistics.
- Providing examples.
- Including and addressing an opposing view.
- Using visual representations.

Additionally, as Lane, McKee, and McIntyre recommend in their article regarding logos, maintain consistency in your argument, and avoid fallacious, or faulty, appeals to logic. For example, in “Fallacious Logos,” they provide an overview of several false appeals to logic, including the false dilemma, which assumes that there are only two options when there are more.

Writers may employ several methods to appeal to pathos. Read “Pathos” for more information.
Rhetorical Appeals: An Overview

To explore several suggestions which include:

- Referring to other emotionally compelling stories.
- Citing stark, startling statistics that will invoke a specific emotion in audience members.
- Showing empathy and/or understanding for an opposing view.
- Using humor, if appropriate.

However, in your efforts to appeal to the audience’s emotions, avoid relying on faulty appeals. For example, “Fallacious Pathos (/open-text/information-literacy/rhetorical-analysis/rhetorical-appeals/161-writing-commons-book/information-literacy/rhetorical-analysis/592-fallacious-pathos)” points out that using emotional words that evidence does not support leads to the argument by emotive language fallacy.

In pondering how to effectively employ rhetorical devices and aptly avoid fallacies, writers tend to miss the relationship among the rhetorical appeals. Consequently, there is something very right about such arguments as the one advanced by Richards, who argues that “your argument could be sound. It could even be emotionally compelling. But if your audience doesn’t trust you, if they don’t think you have their interest at heart, it won’t matter” (“The 3 Rhetorical Appeals”). Enhance the effectiveness of appeals to pathos and logos with appeals to ethos.

To demonstrate your credibility, try:
• Referring to relevant work and/or life experience.
• Citing your relevant awards, certificates, and/or degrees.
• Providing evidence from relevant, current, and credible sources.
• Carefully proofreading your work, and asking a few other people to so as well.

Additionally, follow McKee and McIntyre’s advice in “Fallacious Ethos (/open-text/information-literacy/rhetorical-analysis/rhetorical-appeals/161-writing-commons-book/information-literacy/rhetorical-analysis/589-fallacious-ethos).” McKee and McIntyre provide specific examples of fallacious ethos.

Conversely, appeals to kairos can help you make use of the particular moment (Pantelides, McIntyre, and McKee). Ask yourself if you can capitalize on any of the audience’s fast-approaching moments to create a sense of urgency. However, avoid false appeals to kairos. Read “Fallacious Appeals to Kairos (/open-text/information-literacy/rhetorical-analysis/rhetorical-appeals/161-writing-commons-book/information-literacy/rhetorical-analysis/597-fallacious-kairos)” to learn more about this topic.

As this article has argued, good writers write to win. As such, rhetorical appeals underlie much of the successful persuasive writing in society, whether in the form of written arguments, television commercials, or educational campaigns. As previously discussed, some
thoughtful, strategic anti-smoking campaigns have reduced smoking-related diseases and death. Additionally, Ariel Chernin observes that a large body of literature proves that food marketing affects children’s food preferences (107). Similarly, appealing to logos, pathos, ethos, and kairos in your persuasive writing can help you achieve your goals. Approaching rhetorical appeals from the inside out—from the perspective of the writer—one can note their effectiveness in persuasive writing, and one can write to win.

Works Cited


What is the rhetorical situation?

- What occasion gives rise to the need or opportunity for persuasion?
- What is the historical occasion that would give rise to the composition of this text?

Who is the author/speaker?

- How does he or she establish ethos (personal credibility)?
- Does he/she come across as knowledgeable? fair?
- Does the speaker’s reputation convey a certain authority?

What is his/her intention in speaking?

- To attack or defend?
- To exhort or dissuade from certain action?
- To praise or blame?
- To teach, to delight, or to persuade?

Who make up the audience?

- Who is the intended audience?
- What values does the audience hold that the author or speaker appeals to?
- Who have been or might be secondary audiences?
- If this is a work of fiction, what is the nature of the audience within the fiction?

What is the content of the message?

- Can you summarize the main idea?
What are the principal lines of reasoning or kinds of arguments used?
What topics of invention are employed?
How does the author or speaker appeal to reason? to emotion?

What is the form in which it is conveyed?

What is the structure of the communication; how is it arranged?
What oral or literary genre is it following?
What figures of speech (schemes and tropes) are used?
What kind of style and tone is used and for what purpose?

How do form and content correspond?

Does the form complement the content?
What effect could the form have, and does this aid or hinder the author’s intention?

Does the message/speech/text succeed in fulfilling the author’s or speaker’s intentions?

For whom?
Does the author/speaker effectively fit his/her message to the circumstances, times, and audience?
Can you identify the responses of historical or contemporary audiences?

What does the nature of the communication reveal about the culture that produced it?

What kinds of values or customs would the people have that would
How do the allusions, historical references, or kinds of words used place this in a certain time and location?
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Rhetorical Situations

Understanding and being able to analyze rhetorical situations can help contribute to strong, audience-focused, and organized writing. The PowerPoint presentation in the Media box above is suitable for any classroom and any writing task. The resource below explains in more detail how to analyze rhetorical situations.
Understanding Rhetoric

Writing instructors and many other professionals who study language use the phrase “rhetorical situation.” This term refers to any set of circumstances that involves at least one person using some sort of communication to modify the perspective of at least one other person. But many people are unfamiliar with the word “rhetoric.” For many people, “rhetoric” may imply speech that is simply persuasive. For others, “rhetoric” may imply something more negative like “trickery” or even “lying.” So to appreciate the benefits of understanding what rhetorical situations are, we must first have a more complete understanding of what rhetoric itself is.

In brief, “rhetoric” is any communication used to modify the perspectives of others. But this is a very broad definition that calls for more explanation.

The OWL’s “Introduction to Rhetoric” vidcast explains more what rhetoric is and how rhetoric relates to writing. This vidcast defines rhetoric as “primarily an awareness of the language choices we make.” It gives a brief history of the origins of rhetoric in ancient Greece. And it briefly discusses the benefits of how understanding rhetoric can help people write more convincingly. The vidcast provides an excellent primer to some basic ideas of rhetoric.

A more in-depth primer to rhetoric can be found in the online video “In Defense of Rhetoric: No Longer Just for Liars.” This video dispels some widely held misconceptions about rhetoric and emphasizes that, “An education of rhetoric enables communicators in any facet of any field to create and assess messages effectively.” This video should be particularly helpful to anyone who is unaware of how crucial rhetoric is to effective communication.

“In Defense of Rhetoric: No Longer Just for Liars” is a 14-minunte video created by graduate students in the MA in Professional Communication program at Clemson University, and you are free to copy, distribute, and transmit the video with the understanding: 1) that you will attribute the work to its authors; 2) that you will not use the work for commercial purposes; and 3) that you may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.
Listening to the above podcast and watching the above video should help anyone using this resource to better understand the basics of rhetoric and rhetorical situations.

**A Review of Rhetoric: From “Persuasion” to “Identification”**

Just as the vidcast and video above imply, rhetoric can refer to just the persuasive qualities of language. The ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle strongly influenced how people have traditionally viewed rhetoric. Aristotle defined rhetoric as “an ability, in each particular case, to see the available means of persuasion” (Aristotle *Rhetoric* I.1.2, Kennedy 37). Since then, Aristotle’s definition of rhetoric has been reduced in many situations to mean simply “persuasion.” At its best, this simplification of rhetoric has led to a long tradition of people associating rhetoric with politicians, lawyers, or other occupations noted for persuasive speaking. At its worst, the simplification of rhetoric has led people to assume that rhetoric is merely something that manipulative people use to get what they want (usually regardless of moral or ethical concerns).

However, over the last century or so, the academic definition and use of “rhetoric” has evolved to include any situation in which people consciously communicate with each other. In brief, individual people tend to perceive and understand just about everything differently from one another (this difference varies to a lesser or greater degree depending on the situation, of course). This expanded perception has led a number of more contemporary rhetorical philosophers to suggest that rhetoric deals with more than just persuasion. Instead of just persuasion, rhetoric is the set of methods people use to *identify* with each other—to encourage each other to understand things from one another’s perspectives (see Burke 25). From interpersonal relationships to international peace treaties, the capacity to understand or modify another’s perspective is one of the most vital abilities that humans have. Hence, understanding rhetoric in terms of “identification” helps us better communicate and evaluate all such situations.

**Works Cited**


Pathos

Written by Kendra Gayle, Jessica McKee, and Megan McIntyre
Category: Rhetorical Appeals (/chapters/rhetoric/rhetorical-appeals)
Published: 16 April 2012
Last Updated: 29 September 2017
Hits: 240082
"Let's not forget that the little emotions are the great captains of our lives, and we obey them without realizing it."
– Vincent Van Gogh

Remember those after-school specials that aired on TV when you were a kid? They always had some obvious moral (like "don't drink and drive"). And they were often really emotionally driven.

At the end of the show, the camera would pan out, showing the protagonist alone and suffering for the poor decisions that he or she had made. When you were a child, that sort of heavy-handed emotionalism was effective in getting a point across. Now that you're an adult, it becomes easier to feel frustrated, and even manipulated, by an overload of emotion. Emotion, or "pathos," is a rhetorical device that can be used in an argument to draw the audience in and to help it connect with the argument. Relying too much on pathos, though, can make your writing sound like an after-school special.

Pathos works in conjunction with logos (logic) and ethos (credibility) to help form a solid argument. However, not every argument employs all three rhetorical devices. Each writer must choose which combination of rhetorical devices will work well for his or her writing and will suit the chosen topic. Used correctly, pathos can make a bland argument come alive for the audience. Pathos offers a way for the audience to relate to the subject through commonly
held emotions. However, it is important to determine when pathos will be useful and when it will only serve to muddy the argumentative waters.

Take, for instance, a student who is writing an essay on human trafficking. Human trafficking—abducting or entrapping people (usually women and children) and subjecting them to horrific working situations—should be a subject that is already fraught with emotion. However, once the student starts working on the paper, he notices that he has a collection of facts and figures from which the audience will easily be able to disconnect. What the needs is to make the topic come alive for the reader. He needs to make the reader feel sympathy and horror. Then he comes upon a first-person account of a teenager who was trafficked into the United States. By incorporating her account into his essay (with proper citation, of course), he allows the reader to experience the teenager's disbelief and fear. And by experiencing this emotion, the reader begins to develop his or her own emotional response: sympathy, horror, and anger. The student has helped the reader connect to his argument through the effective use of pathos.

Here's another example of a new media text that employs pathos to elicit sympathy from its audience:
Pathos becomes a liability in an argument when it is inappropriate for the subject matter or genre of writing being used. For instance, if you are writing a letter to Publix supermarket to express your displeasure with its corporate response to migrant farmers’ call for a living wage, then a narrative encouraging sympathy for the plight of the migrant worker might not be as effective as a straightforward statement of purpose: if Publix doesn’t change its policies, you will take your business to a supermarket that is more interested in supporting social justice.
An audience can also find an overload of pathos to be off-putting. For instance, after September 11, 2001, the majority of people in the United States experienced an overwhelming sense of anger and fear. However, when references to 9/11 were used extensively in some of the 2004 presidential campaigns, many people were outraged. Why? Because they felt as though their intense feelings about the tragedy of 9/11 were being exploited and cheapened by the candidates, and they were intentionally being made to feel fearful. They felt as though their emotions were being manipulated to obtain votes. In this case, an overload of pathos backfired on the candidates.

Understanding pathos is important for readers and for writers. As a reader, you want to be in tune with the author's use of pathos, consciously evaluating the emotions the author tries to elicit. Then you can make informed decisions about the author's motives and writing methods. As a writer, you want to be aware of proper uses of pathos, paying close attention to both your subject matter and your audience. There is no need to sound like an after-school special, unless, of course, you are writing for one.

It's probably clear by now what pathos does: it evokes an emotional response from a reader by appealing to empathy, fear, humor, or some other emotion. Now let's look at a few examples of pathos that you may find in written, spoken, or visual texts:
• **Anecdotes or other narratives.** When a writer employs a narrative or anecdote, he or she is usually attempting to connect with the reader emotionally. For example, beginning an essay about human trafficking by relaying the personal story of a victim captures the attention of the audience because it humanizes the problem and draws on readers' empathy.

• **Images or other forms of media.** When a writer uses images, songs, and other types of nontextual media, he or she is often attempting to engage a reader's emotions. Songs and pictures produce emotional responses. For example, Toby Keith's post-9/11 anthem, "Courtesy of the Red, White, and Blue," seems to embody the nation's anger after the 9/11 terrorist attacks. While you may not agree with the song's sense of justice, the lyrics recall a painful time in our nation's history. For many, that recollection prompts an emotional response.

• **Direct quotations.** Though quotations are used for a myriad of reasons, direct quoting from an individual who has been personally affected by an issue is usually an appeal to the emotions of a reader. For example, if I were writing an essay about breast cancer and I quoted a cancer patient, that quotation would be an attempt to humanize the topic and appeal to the sympathy of my readers.
Humor. When a writer uses humor in order to illustrate a point, he or she is employing pathos. Though there is logic to satirical humor (as used on The Daily Show or The Colbert Report), the main appeal of such television shows is that they make viewers laugh.
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"Logic is the anatomy of thought."
– John Locke
"Logos" is the appeal to logic. Logos isn't logic like the formal logic in math, philosophy, or even computer science; it is the consistency and clarity of an argument as well as the logic of evidence and reasons.

In formal logic, in abstraction, the following is the case: if A is true and B is true and A is an instance of B, then the repercussions of B will always be true. The problem, however, is that this kind of logic doesn't work for real-life situations. This is where argument comes into play. Formal logic would say that speeding, for example, is a violation of traffic laws. A repercussion of violating a traffic law is a ticket; therefore, every person who speeds gets a ticket. However, in real life, not in abstract theory, things aren't that cut and dried. Most people would not agree that all speeders, in every circumstance, should receive a ticket. In an argument about a real-life situation, the audience needs particulars to make their decisions. Sometimes there's an exception. Why was that person speeding? Well, if an eighteen-year-old is speeding to show off for his friends, then yes, most people would agree that he deserves a ticket. However, if a man is driving his pregnant wife to the hospital, then maybe he does not deserve the ticket. One could, and probably would, make the argument that he should not get a ticket.

Let's examine how the appeal to logic would work in an argument for the speeding father-to-be.
Because arguments are based on values and beliefs as well as facts and evidence, it is logical that the argument must coincide with accepted values and beliefs. The enthymeme is the foundation of every argument. Enthymemes have three parts: the claim, the reason, and the unstated assumption that is provided by the audience. All three of these things must make sense to your audience in order for your argument to be considered logical. The claim of an argument for the father-to-be could be something like, "This man should not get a speeding ticket." That's it. The claim is pretty simple. It is your educated opinion on the matter. The reason would be something like "because his wife is in labor in the backseat." So the two stated parts of your enthymeme would be, "This man should not get a speeding ticket because his wife is in labor in the backseat." Now, this seems obviously logical to us; however, what is our underlying value, our unstated assumption about this argument? Most of us would probably agree that a hospital is a better place to give birth in than a backseat. That is the third part of the enthymeme. Your audience must agree that your assumption is true in order for your argument to be considered logical. If your readers don't have the same assumption, they are not going to see your logic. You must find an enthymeme that works for your audience. The pregnant wife enthymeme is fairly easy to see. In more volatile claims and reasons, the unstated assumptions can be trickier to identify and work out with your audience.
Reasons like "because his wife is in labor" are motivations for the driver's actions, not evidence. Most audiences need facts. Evidence is the facts. Both reasons and evidence are used in an appeal to logic; however, reasons cannot be your only support. Evidence as to why the man should speed might include studies about the problems with births in difficult or dangerous circumstances, interviews with women who have given birth in automobiles, and infant mortality rates for births that do not occur in hospitals. As you can see, there are many different kinds of evidence you could provide for this argument.

Consistency means not changing the unstated or stated rules governing your argument. Consistency is essential to logic. Let us continue with the speeding example. If, for instance, you are arguing that the infant mortality rate is too high for babies born outside the hospital and that the father is required to speed for the safety of his unborn child, then you may not want to include evidence of the high infant mortality rate in car crashes. Although this information may be part of the infant mortality rate, it goes against the underlying assumption that speeding is acceptable because of the high risk of harming the baby if it is born in the backseat.

So why should you care about logos? In your own writing, logos is important because it appeals to your readers' intellects. It makes you readers feel smart. Logos is the part of the argument where you treat your audience like purely rational, "only the facts, ma'am"
kind of people. Also, gaps, leaps, and inconsistencies in logic, no matter how well developed the other appeals may be, can tear apart an argument in short order. This is the same reason you cannot ignore logos in others' arguments either. All the appeals are linked together; for instance, if you use as evidence an article that has leaps in logic, or relies only on authority and emotions, this article could damage your own ethos as an author. It is important to remember that all three appeals must be well developed and work together to make a good argument.

As you now know, logos can be defined as a writer's or speaker's attempt to appeal to the logic or reason of her audience. Let's look at some examples of logos that you might commonly find when reading texts of various media:

- **Statistics.** When a writer employs data or statistics within a text, you can probably assume that he or she is attempting to appeal to the logic and reason of the reader. For example, an argument in favor of keeping abortion legal may cite the May 2011 Pew Research poll that found 54 percent of Americans in favor of legal abortion. This figure makes a logical argument: abortion should be legal because the majority of Americans support it, and in a democracy, the majority makes the decisions.

- **Causal statements.** When you see an "if-then" statement, with credible supporting evidence, the
writer is likely appealing to your reason. Consider an argument about lowering the drinking age from 21 to 18: a writer might suggest that, if the legal drinking age were 18, then people between 18 and 21 would be less likely to drive under the influence. If the writer offers evidence that the reason that some between the ages of 18 and 21 drive drunk is that they fear calling a friend or parent because they have illegally ingested alcohol, then this causal statement would be an appeal to a reader's sense of reason.

- **Relevant examples or other evidence.** You might begin to think about logos as evidence that doesn't involve an appeal to your emotions. Even expert testimony, which would certainly be an example of ethos, also could be an example of logos, depending on its content. For example, in a discussion about recent cuts in education funding, a statement from the Hillsborough County, Florida, superintendent would be an appeal to authority. But if that statement contained a discussion of the number of teachers and classes that would have to be cut if the state were to reduce the district's funding, the statement from the superintendent could also be an appeal to logic.

See also:
A free, comprehensive, peer-reviewed, award-winning Open Text for students and faculty in college-level courses that require writing and research.

Ethos

Written by Jessica McKee and Megan McIntyre
Category: Rhetorical Appeals (/chapters/rhetoric/rhetorical-appeals)
Published: 16 April 2012
Last Updated: 29 September 2017
Hits: 162914
I've always wondered why candidates have to "approve this message"; I mean, if President Obama is on camera talking about himself, then can't I assume he approves the message? Why does he have to state that he approves it at the end?

There's certainly a law that governs what must be said at the end of a political advertisement, or else President Obama wouldn't say exactly the same thing as every other politician at the end of an ad, but there's also an element of persuasion at work here. By appearing on camera saying that he approves the content, the President is giving the ad credibility. It's about him, his work, and his beliefs, and by saying he has approved the ad, President Obama is saying, "You can trust this information about me."

This appeal to credibility is known as "ethos." Ethos is a method of persuasion in which the speaker or writer (the "rhetor") attempts to persuade the audience by demonstrating his own credibility or authority. I think the best way to understand this kind of appeal to the credibility of the author is to look at the three most common ways a rhetor attempts to demonstrate authority on a topic.

By now, you've hopefully gotten an idea of what ethos is: an attempt to persuade by appealing to authority or credibility. You might be wondering, though, what ethos looks like in writing or in speaking. Here are a few examples:
• **References to work experience or life experience related to the topic.** When an author writing about the stock market talks about his years working for an investment bank, that's an appeal to credibility.

• **References to college degrees or awards related to the topic.** When your biology instructor makes clear in the syllabus that he has a PhD in biology and that you'll be using the textbook he's written for the class, he's reminding you of his authority and credibility on the subject.

• **References to the character of the writer.** When a politician writes in a campaign brochure about his years of public service and the contributions he's made to the community, he's letting you know he's trustworthy, a good person, and a credible source of information about the community and the issues that affect it.

• **The use of supporting sources written by authorities on the subject.** When a student writes a paper about why school hours should be changed and uses quotations from principals, teachers, and school board members (all of whom know something about the topic), he's borrowing their credibility and authority to increase his own.

• **References to symbols that represent authority.** When a candidate gives a speech in
front of an American flag, he or she is associating him- or herself with the symbol and borrowing the authority it represents.
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"This is the right time, and this is the right thing."
- Sir Thomas Moore

"Kairos" is an ancient rhetorical concept that has gained importance in different disciplines over the centuries. So what is it? Kairos is knowing what is most appropriate in a given situation; for our purposes, let's think of it as saying (or writing) the right thing at the right time.

Appeals to kairos in written form try to make use of the particular moment—attempting to capture in words what will be immediately applicable, appropriate, and engaging for a particular audience. Kairos is timeliness, appropriateness, decorum, symmetry, balance—awareness of the rhetorical situation or "the circumstances that open moments of opportunity" (Kinneavy; Sipiora; Vatz; Bitzer; Hill 217). Kairos is crafting serendipity, like when the sun comes out at the end of a romantic comedy after all the conflicts have been resolved.

In Greek, both kairos and chronos literally mean "time," but kairos does not mean "time" in the same sense as used in contemporary English. In Greek, kairos represents a kind of "qualitative" time, as in "the right time"; chronos represents a different kind of "quantitative" time, as in, "What time is it?" and "Will we have enough time?" (Kinneavy; Stephenson). Kairos means taking advantage of or even creating a perfect moment to deliver a particular message.
Consider, for example, Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.'s famous "I Have a Dream" speech. The speech was rhetorically powerful: it changed minds, persuaded people to support the civil rights movement, and served as a powerful rallying cry for a generation of reformers. But the speech was so powerful in part because of its kairotic moment: the timing and atmosphere of the speech lent themselves to powerful oratory. Together, the "where" (the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington, D.C.), the "why" (the culmination of a march on Washington by thousands of members of the civil rights movement), and the "when" (during the centennial celebration of the Emancipation Proclamation, at a time of day when broadcast networks could carry the speech live, and during a march which had drawn more than 250,000 people to the capital) created the perfect moment for King's message to reach the largest number of receptive listeners.
Although kairos has long been a key word for many disciplines, within the study of writing, kairos has been the topic of much debate in the last few decades. James Kinneavy is largely credited with reintroducing the importance of kairos into the discipline of Rhetoric and Composition and, thus, the composition classroom. According to Kinneavy, kairos is "the appropriateness of the discourse to the particular circumstances of the time, place, speaker, and audience involved" (84). Other scholars suggest that "kairos refers to a struggle, at the point of rhetorical intervention, between situational factors" (Sheridan, Michel, and Ridolfo). Both definitions get at the elusive, jaguar-in-the-jungle nature of kairos. Kairos is
so hard to pin down because, as Phillip Sipiora suggests, it is "a dynamic principle rather than a static, codified rhetorical technique" (10). So, the rhetor must be "accommodative," waiting for the right time, matching her text to the precise moment in order to be most successful (Sipiora). It's sort of the Goldilocks rule of writing: you don't want your message to be too big, too small, too soft, or too hard; it should be just right.

So far, kairos seems pretty slippery, a sort of "I'll know it when I see it" kind of principle. In some ways, kairos represents the ephemeral, "fleeting" nature of "the right time." In terms of writing, we try to capture the moment of balance, the kairotic moment, and thus move the audience by appealing to that specific context.

Because kairos is so tied to the particular moment, or rhetorical situation, it is hard to provide concrete examples out of context. But a good way to think about kairos is to consider how rhetors try to persuade audiences based on unique timing and current events. For instance, consider the way restaurants, bookstores, and various campus entities appeal to incoming freshman students. Vendors have signs declaring "New to USF? Join this club to meet new people and learn about the campus!" and "First-year students, this week only: $100 off your first month at this apartment building!" They reference the particular moment, first stepping onto a new campus, to persuade you to do everything from opening a new bank account and buying logo bumper stickers to
ordering a dozen pizzas. Effective uses of kairos take advantage of the particular time and place to make texts unique and give them a sense of immediacy.

Kairos is undoubtedly a pretty heady term, something with which ancient philosophers, modern rhetoricians, and contemporary composition students have wrestled. But it’s worth wrestling with. For your own writing, you can skillfully employ kairos by doing the following:

- Examine the rhetorical situation, the factors that create that particular moment.
- Consider the order and timing of your text.
- Be accommodative; appeal to each specific context.

By using kairos as a guiding principle for your own texts, you can bring interest and timeliness to your writing projects. So when you begin to write, think of the moment that your writing will enter into—the audience that will read it, the conversation that it joins, the history surrounding the topic, and the words you use to craft your argument. Awareness and use of this knowledge create beautiful writing that, like turning the key in your door at the end of a long day, seems perfectly timed, effortless, and just right.
By now, you should know what kairos is: an attempt to persuade through appeals to timeliness. Here are a few possible examples of kairos:

- **The call to "Act Now!"** An appeal to some particular fast-approaching moment is often a rhetor's attempt to create a perfect kairotic moment for his or her message by creating a sense of urgency. You've likely seen a commercial or infomercial that pleads with the viewer to "Call now!" to receive some important prize or to avoid missing some sort of opportunity; this type of commercial or infomercial employs kairos.
• **The use of deadlines or goals.** Such appeals to kairos are often seen as part of fundraising literature: by connecting a reader’s or listener’s response to a particular deadline or goal, the writer creates urgency and excitement.

• **References to "current crises" or impending doom.** Such references are prevalent in political and social campaigns. Consider, for example, the large number of financial bills, laws, and investigations undertaken by legislative bodies throughout the country after the most recent economic recession. Lawmakers were responding to and taking advantage of the kairotic moment created by the crisis in order to persuade their fellow lawmakers and constituents to support a particular fiscal policy.
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Organizing Your Analysis

There is no one perfect way to organize a rhetorical analysis essay. In fact, writers should always be a bit leery of plug-in formulas that offer a perfect essay format. Remember, organization itself is not the enemy, only organization without considering the specific demands of your particular writing task. That said, here are some general tips for plotting out
Introduction

Like any rhetorical analysis essay, an essay analyzing a visual document should quickly set the stage for what you're doing. Try to cover the following concerns in the initial paragraphs:

1. Make sure to let the reader know you're performing a rhetorical analysis. Otherwise, they may expect you to take positions or make an evaluative argument that may not be coming.
2. Clearly state what the document under consideration is and possibly give some pertinent background information about its history or development. The intro can be a good place for a quick, narrative summary of the document. The key word here is “quick, for you may be dealing with something large (for example, an entire episode of a cartoon like the Simpsons). Save more in-depth descriptions for your body paragraph analysis.
3. If you're dealing with a smaller document (like a photograph or an advertisement), and copyright allows, the introduction or first page is a good place to integrate it into your page.
4. Give a basic run down of the rhetorical situation surrounding the document: the author, the audience, the purpose, the context, etc.

Thesis Statements and Focus

Many authors struggle with thesis statements or controlling ideas in regards to rhetorical analysis essays. There may be a temptation to think that merely announcing the text as a rhetorical analysis is purpose enough. However, especially depending on your essay’s length, your reader may need a more direct and clear statement of your intentions. Below are a few examples.

1. Clearly narrow the focus of what your essay will cover. Ask yourself if one or two design aspects of the document is interesting and complex enough to warrant a full analytical treatment.

The website for Amazon.com provides an excellent example of alignment and proximity to assist its visitors in navigating a potentially large and confusing amount of information.
2. Since visual documents often seek to move people towards a certain action (buying a product, attending an event, expressing a sentiment), an essay may analyze the rhetorical techniques used to accomplish this purpose. The thesis statement should reflect this goal.

   The call-out flyer for the Purdue Rowing Team uses a mixture of dynamic imagery and tantalizing promises to create interest in potential, new members.

3. Rhetorical analysis can also easily lead to making original arguments. Performing the analysis may lead you to an argument; or vice versa, you may start with an argument and search for proof that supports it.

   A close analysis of the female body images in the July 2007 issue of Cosmopolitan magazine reveals contradictions between the articles’ calls for self-esteem and the advertisements’ unrealistic, beauty demands.

These are merely suggestions. The best measure for what your focus and thesis statement should be the document itself and the demands of your writing situation. Remember that the main thrust of your thesis statement should be on how the document creates meaning and accomplishes its purposes. The OWI has additional information on writing thesis statements.

**Analysis Order (Body Paragraphs)**

Depending on the genre and size of the document under analysis, there are a number of logical ways to organize your body paragraphs. Below are a few possible options. Which ever you choose, the goal of your body paragraphs is to present parts of the document, give an extended analysis of how that part functions, and suggest how the part ties into a larger point (your thesis statement or goal).

**Chronological**
This is the most straight-forward approach, but it can also be effective if done for a reason (as opposed to not being able to think of another way). For example, if you are analyzing a photo essay on the web or in a booklet, a chronological treatment allows you to present your insights in the same order that a viewer of the document experiences those images. It is likely that the images have been put in that order and juxtaposed for a reason, so this line of analysis can be easily integrated into the essay.

Be careful using chronological ordering when dealing with a document that contains a narrative (i.e. a television show or music video). Focusing on the chronological could easily lead you to plot summary which is not the point of a rhetorical analysis.

**Spatial**

A spatial ordering covers the parts of a document in the order the eye is likely to scan them. This is different than chronological order, for that is dictated by pages or screens where spatial order concerns order amongst a single page or plane. There are no unwavering guidelines for this, but you can use the following general guidelines.

- Left to right and top to down is still the normal reading and scanning pattern for English-speaking countries.
- The eye will naturally look for centers. This may be the technical center of the page or the center of the largest item on the page.
- Lines are often used to provide directions and paths for the eye to follow.
- Research has shown that on web pages, the eye tends to linger in the top left quadrant before moving left to right. Only after spending a considerable amount of time on the top, visible portion of the page will they then scroll down.

**Persuasive Appeals**

The classic, rhetorical appeals are logos, pathos, and ethos. These concepts roughly correspond to the logic, emotion, and character of the document’s attempt to persuade. You can find more information on these concepts elsewhere on the OWL. Once you understand these devices, you could potentially order your essay by analyzing the document’s use of logos, ethos, and pathos in different sections.

**Conclusion**
The conclusion of a rhetorical analysis essay may not operate too differently from the conclusion of any other kind of essay. Still, many writers struggle with what a conclusion should or should not do. You can find tips elsewhere on the OWL on writing conclusions. In short, however, you should restate your main ideas and explain why they are important; restate your thesis; and outline further research or work you believe should be completed to further your efforts.
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Backpacks vs. Briefcases: Steps toward Rhetorical Analysis

Laura Bolin Carroll

First Impressions

Imagine the first day of class in first year composition at your university. The moment your professor walked in the room, you likely began analyzing her and making assumptions about what kind of teacher she will be. You might have noticed what kind of bag she is carrying—a tattered leather satchel? a hot pink polka-dotted backpack? a burgundy brief case? You probably also noticed what she is wearing—trendy slacks and an untucked striped shirt? a skirted suit? jeans and a tee shirt?

It is likely that the above observations were only a few of the observations you made as your professor walked in the room. You might have also noticed her shoes, her jewelry, whether she wears a wedding ring, how her hair is styled, whether she stands tall or slumps, how quickly she walks, or maybe even if her nails are done. If you don't tend to notice any of these things about your professors, you certainly do about the people around you—your roommate, others in your residence hall, students you are assigned to work with in groups, or a
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prospective date. For most of us, many of the people we encounter in a given day are subject to this kind of quick analysis.

Now as you performed this kind of analysis, you likely didn’t walk through each of these questions one by one, write out the answer, and add up the responses to see what kind of person you are interacting with. Instead, you quickly took in the information and made an informed, and likely somewhat accurate, decision about that person. Over the years, as you have interacted with others, you have built a mental database that you can draw on to make conclusions about what a person’s looks tell you about their personality. You have become able to analyze quickly what people are saying about themselves through the way they choose to dress, accessorize, or wear their hair.

We have, of course, heard that you “can’t judge a book by its cover,” but, in fact, we do it all the time. Daily we find ourselves in situations where we are forced to make snap judgments. Each day we meet different people, encounter unfamiliar situations, and see media that asks us to do, think, buy, and act in all sorts of ways. In fact, our saturation in media and its images is one of the reasons why learning to do rhetorical analysis is so important. The more we know about how to analyze situations and draw informed conclusions, the better we can become about making savvy judgments about the people, situations and media we encounter.

**Implications of Rhetorical Analysis**

Media is one of the most important places where this kind of analysis needs to happen. Rhetoric—the way we use language and images to persuade—is what makes media work. Think of all the media you see and hear every day: Twitter, television shows, web pages, billboards, text messages, podcasts. Even as you read this chapter, more ways to get those messages to you quickly and in a persuasive manner are being developed. Media is constantly asking you to buy something, act in some way, believe something to be true, or interact with others in a specific manner. Understanding rhetorical messages is essential to help us to become informed consumers, but it also helps evaluate the ethics of messages, how they affect us personally, and how they affect society.

Take, for example, a commercial for men’s deodorant that tells you that you’ll be irresistible to women if you use their product. This cam-
paign doesn’t just ask you to buy the product, though. It also asks you to trust the company’s credibility, or ethos, and to believe the messages they send about how men and women interact, about sexuality, and about what constitutes a healthy body. You have to decide whether or not you will choose to buy the product and how you will choose to respond to the messages that the commercial sends.

Or, in another situation, a Facebook group asks you to support health care reform. The rhetoric in this group uses people’s stories of their struggles to obtain affordable health care. These stories, which are often heart-wrenching, use emotion to persuade you—also called pathos. You are asked to believe that health care reform is necessary and urgent, and you are asked to act on these beliefs by calling your congresspersons and asking them to support the reforms as well.

Because media rhetoric surrounds us, it is important to understand how rhetoric works. If we refuse to stop and think about how and why it persuades us, we can become mindless consumers who buy into arguments about what makes us value ourselves and what makes us happy. For example, research has shown that only 2% of women consider themselves beautiful (“Campaign”), which has been linked to the way that the fashion industry defines beauty. We are also told by the media that buying more stuff can make us happy, but historical surveys show that US happiness peaked in the 1950s, when people saw as many advertisements in their lifetime as the average American sees in one year (Leonard).

Our worlds are full of these kinds of social influences. As we interact with other people and with media, we are continually creating and interpreting rhetoric. In the same way that you decide how to process, analyze or ignore these messages, you create them. You probably think about what your clothing will communicate as you go to a job interview or get ready for a date. You are also using rhetoric when you try to persuade your parents to send you money or your friends to see the movie that interests you. When you post to your blog or tweet you are using rhetoric. In fact, according to rhetorician Kenneth Burke, rhetoric is everywhere: “wherever there is persuasion, there is rhetoric. And wherever there is ‘meaning,’ there is ‘persuasion.’ Food eaten and digested is not rhetoric. But in the meaning of food there is much rhetoric, the meaning being persuasive enough for the idea of food to be used, like the ideas of religion, as a rhetorical device of statesmen” (71–72). In other words, most of our actions are persuasive in nature.
What we choose to wear (tennis shoes vs. flip flops), where we shop (Whole Foods Market vs. Wal-Mart), what we eat (organic vs. fast food), or even the way we send information (snail mail vs. text message) can work to persuade others.

Chances are you have grown up learning to interpret and analyze these types of rhetoric. They become so commonplace that we don’t realize how often and how quickly we are able to perform this kind of rhetorical analysis. When your teacher walked in on the first day of class, you probably didn’t think to yourself, “I think I’ll do some rhetorical analysis on her clothing and draw some conclusions about what kind of personality she might have and whether I think I’ll like her.” And, yet, you probably were able to come up with some conclusions based on the evidence you had.

However, when this same teacher hands you an advertisement, photograph or article and asks you to write a rhetorical analysis of it, you might have been baffled or felt a little overwhelmed. The good news is that many of the analytical processes that you already use to interpret the rhetoric around you are the same ones that you’ll use for these assignments.

The Rhetorical Situation, Or Discerning Context

One of the first places to start is context. Rhetorical messages always occur in a specific situation or context. The president’s speech might respond to a specific global event, like an economic summit; that’s part of the context. You choose your clothing depending on where you are going or what you are doing; that’s context. A television commercial comes on during specific programs and at specific points of the day; that’s context. A billboard is placed in a specific part of the community; that’s context, too.

In an article called “The Rhetorical Situation,” Lloyd Bitzer argues that there are three parts to understanding the context of a rhetorical moment: exigence, audience and constraints. Exigence is the circumstance or condition that invites a response; “imperfection marked by urgency; it is a defect, an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than it should be” (Bitzer 304). In other words, rhetorical discourse is usually responding to some kind of problem. You can begin to understand a piece’s exigence by asking, “What is
this rhetoric responding to?" “What might have happened to make the rhetor (the person who creates the rhetoric) respond in this way?”

The exigence can be extremely complex, like the need for a new Supreme Court justice, or it can be much simpler, like receiving an email that asks you where you and your friends should go for your road trip this weekend. Understanding the exigence is important because it helps you begin to discover the purpose of the rhetoric. It helps you understand what the discourse is trying to accomplish.

Another part of the rhetorical context is audience, those who are the (intended or unintended) recipients of the rhetorical message. The audience should be able to respond to the exigence. In other words, the audience should be able to help address the problem. You might be very frustrated with your campus’s requirement that all first-year students purchase a meal plan for on-campus dining. You might even send an email to a good friend back home voicing that frustration. However, if you want to address the exigence of the meal plans, the most appropriate audience would be the person/office on campus that oversees meal plans. Your friend back home cannot solve the problem (though she may be able to offer sympathy or give you some good suggestions), but the person who can change the meal plan requirements is probably on campus. Rhetors make all sorts of choices based on their audience. Audience can determine the type of language used, the formality of the discourse, the medium or delivery of the rhetoric, and even the types of reasons used to make the rhetor’s argument. Understanding the audience helps you begin to see and understand the rhetorical moves that the rhetor makes.

The last piece of the rhetorical situation is the constraints. The constraints of the rhetorical situation are those things that have the power to “constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence” (Bitzer 306). Constraints have a lot to do with how the rhetoric is presented. Constraints can be “beliefs, attitudes, documents, facts, traditions, images, interests, motives” (Bitzer 306). Constraints limit the way the discourse is delivered or communicated. Constraints may be something as simple as your instructor limiting your proposal to one thousand words, or they may be far more complex like the kinds of language you need to use to persuade a certain community.

So how do you apply this to a piece of rhetoric? Let’s say you are flipping through a magazine, and you come across an advertisement that has a large headline that reads “Why Some People Say ‘D’OH’
When You Say ‘Homer” (“Why”). This ad is an Ad Council public service announcement (PSA) to promote arts education and is sponsored by Americans for the Arts and NAMM, the trade association of the international music products industry.

Since you want to understand more about what this ad means and what it wants you to believe or do, you begin to think about the rhetorical situation. You first might ask, “what is the ad responding to? What problem does it hope to address?” That’s the exigence. In this case, the exigence is the cutting of arts funding and children’s lack of exposure to the arts. According to the Ad Council’s website, “the average kid is provided insufficient time to learn and experience the arts. This PSA campaign was created to increase involvement in championing arts education both in and out of school” (“Arts”). The PSA is responding directly to the fact that kids are not getting enough arts education.

Then you might begin to think about to whom the Ad Council targeted the ad. Unless you’re a parent, you are probably not the primary audience. If you continued reading the text of the ad, you’d notice that there is information to persuade parents that the arts are helpful to their children and to let them know how to help their children become more involved with the arts. The ad tells parents that “the experience will for sure do more than entertain them. It’ll build their capacity to learn more. In fact, the more art kids get, the smarter they become in subjects like math and science. And that’s reason enough to make a parent say, ‘D’oh!’ For Ten Simple Ways to instill art in your kids’ lives visit AmericansForTheArts.org” (“Why”). Throughout the text of the ad, parents are told both what to believe about arts education and how to act in response to the belief.

There also might be a secondary audience for this ad—people who are not the main audience of the ad but might also be able to respond to the exigence. For example, philanthropists who could raise money for arts education or legislators who might pass laws for arts funding or to require arts education in public schools could also be intended audiences for this ad.

Finally, you might want to think about the constraints or the limitations on the ad. Sometimes these are harder to get at, but we can guess a few things. One constraint might be the cost of the ad. Different magazines charge differently for ad space as well as placement within the magazine, so the Ad Council could have been constrained by how much money they wanted to spend to circulate the ad. The ad
is also only one page long, so there might have been a limitation on the amount of space for the ad. Finally, on the Ad Council’s webpage, they list the requirements for organizations seeking the funding and support of the Ad Council. There are twelve criteria, but here are a few:

1. The sponsor organization must be a private non-profit 501(c)3 organization, private foundation, government agency or coalition of such groups.

2. The issue must address the Ad Council’s focus on Health & Safety, Education, or Community. Applications which benefit children are viewed with favor—as part of the Ad Council’s Commitment to Children.

3. The issue must offer a solution through an individual action.

4. The effort must be national in scope, so that the message has relevance to media audiences in communities throughout the nation. (“Become”)

Each of these criteria helps to understand the limitations on both who can participate as rhetor and what can be said.

The exigence, audience and constraints are only one way to understand the context of a piece of rhetoric, and, of course, there are other ways to get at context. Some rhetoricians look at subject, purpose, audience and occasion. Others might look at the “rhetorical triangle” of writer, reader, and purpose.

An analysis using the rhetorical triangle would ask similar questions about audience as one using the rhetorical situation, but it would also ask questions about the writer and the purpose of the document. Asking questions about the writer helps the reader determine whether she or he is credible and knowledgeable. For example, the Ad Council has been creating public service announcements since 1942 (“Loose Lips Sink Ships,” anyone?) and is a non-profit agency. They also document their credibility by showing the impact of their campaigns in several ways: “Destruction of our forests by wildfires has been reduced from 22 million acres to less than 8.4 million acres per year, since our Forest Fire Prevention campaign began” and “6,000 Children were paired with a mentor in just the first 18 months of our mentoring campaign” (“About”). Based on this information, we can assume that the Ad Council is a credible rhetor, and whether or not we agree with the rhetoric they produce, we can probably assume it contains reliable
information. Asking questions about the next part of the rhetorical triangle, the purpose of a piece of rhetoric, helps you understand what the rhetor is trying to achieve through the discourse. We can discern the purpose by asking questions like "what does the rhetor want me to believe after seeing this message?" or "what does the rhetor want me to do?" In some ways, the purpose takes the exigence to the next step. If the exigence frames the problem, the purpose frames the response to that problem.

The rhetorical situation and rhetorical triangle are two ways to begin to understand how the rhetoric functions within the context you find it. The key idea is to understand that no rhetorical performance takes place in a vacuum. One of the first steps to understanding a piece of rhetoric is to look at the context in which it takes place. Whatever terminology you (or your instructor) choose, it is a good idea to start by locating your analysis within a rhetorical situation.

The Heart of the Matter—The Argument

The rhetorical situation is just the beginning of your analysis, though. What you really want to understand is the argument—what the rhetor wants you to believe or do and how he or she goes about that persuasion. Effective argumentation has been talked about for centuries. In the fourth century BCE, Aristotle was teaching the men of Athens how to persuade different kinds of audiences in different kinds of rhetorical situations. Aristotle articulated three "artistic appeals" that a rhetor could draw on to make a case—logos, pathos, and ethos.

Logos is commonly defined as argument from reason, and it usually appeals to an audience's intellectual side. As audiences we want to know the "facts of the matter," and logos helps present these—statistics, data, and logical statements. For example, on our Homer ad for the arts, the text tells parents that the arts will "build their capacity to learn more. In fact, the more art kids get, the smarter they become in subjects like math and science" ("Why"). You might notice that there aren't numbers or charts here, but giving this information appeals to the audience's intellectual side.

That audience can see a continuation of the argument on the Ad Council's webpage, and again much of the argument appeals to logos and draws on extensive research that shows that the arts do these things:
- Allow kids to express themselves creatively and bolster their self-confidence.
- Teach kids to be more tolerant and open.
- Improve kids’ overall academic performance.
- Show that kids actively engaged in arts education are likely to have higher SAT scores than those with little to no arts involvement.
- Develop skills needed by the 21st century workforce: critical thinking, creative problem solving, effective communication, teamwork and more.
- Keep students engaged in school and less likely to drop out. ("Arts")

Each bullet above is meant to intellectually persuade parents that they need to be more intentional in providing arts education for their children.

Few of us are persuaded only with our mind, though. Even if we intellectually agree with something, it is difficult to get us to act unless we are also persuaded in our heart. This kind of appeal to emotion is called pathos. Pathetic appeals (as rhetoric that draws on pathos is called) used alone without logos and ethos can come across as emotionally manipulative or overly sentimental, but are very powerful when used in conjunction with the other two appeals.

Emotional appeals can come in many forms—an anecdote or narrative, an image such as a photograph, or even humor. For example, on their web campaign, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) uses an image of a baby chick and of Ronald McDonald wielding a knife to draw attention to their Chicken McCruely Un-Happy Meal. These images are meant to evoke an emotional response in the viewer and, along with a logos appeal with the statistics about how cruelly chickens are treated, persuade the viewer to boycott McDonalds.

Pathos can also be a very effective appeal if the rhetor has to persuade the audience in a very short amount of time, which is why it is used heavily in print advertisements, billboards, or television commercials. An investment company will fill a 30-second commercial with images of families and couples enjoying each other, seeming happy, and surrounded by wealth to persuade you to do business with them.
The 30-second time spot does not allow them to give the 15-year growth of each of their funds, and pathetic appeals will often hold our interest much longer than intellectual appeals.

The ad promoting the importance of art uses humor to appeal to the audience's emotional side. By comparing the epic poet Homer to Homer Simpson and his classic “d’oh!” the ad uses humor to draw people into their argument about the arts. The humor continues as they ask parents if their kids know the difference between the Homers, “The only Homer some kids know is the one who can’t write his own last name” (“Why”). The ad also appeals to emotion through its language use (diction), describing Homer as “one very ancient dude,” and describing The Odyssey as “the sequel” to The Iliad. In this case, the humor of the ad, which occurs in the first few lines, is meant to draw the reader in and help them become interested in the argument before the ad gets to the logos, which is in the last few lines of the ad.

The humor also makes the organization seem real and approachable, contributing to the ethos. The humor might lead you to think that Americans for the Arts is not a stuffy bunch of suits, but an organization you can relate to or one that has a realistic understanding of the world. Ethos refers to the credibility of the rhetor—which can be a person or an organization. A rhetor can develop credibility in many ways. The tone of the writing and whether that tone is appropriate for the context helps build a writer's ethos, as does the accuracy of the information or the visual presentation of the rhetoric.

In the Homer ad, the ethos is built in several ways. The simple, humorous and engaging language, such as “Greek Gods. Achilles Heel. Trojan Horse. All of these icons are brought to us by one very ancient dude—Homer. In The Iliad and its sequel, The Odyssey, he presented Greek mythology in everyday language” (“Why”) draws the audience in and helps the tone of the ad seem very approachable. Also, the knowledge of Greek mythology and the information about how the arts help children—which also contribute to the logos appeal—make the ad seem credible and authoritative. However, the fact that the ad does not use too many statistics or overly technical language also contributes to the ethos of the ad because often sounding too intellectual can come across as pompous or stuffy.

Aristotle’s artistic appeals are not the only way to understand the argument of rhetoric. You might choose to look at the claim or the unstated assumptions of a piece; someone else might consider the vi-
suual appeal of the rhetoric, like the font, page layout, types of paper, or images; another person might focus on the language use and the specific word choice and sentence structure of a piece. Logos, pathos, and ethos can provide a nice framework for analysis, but there are numerous ways to understand how a piece of rhetoric persuades (or fails to persuade).

Looking at the context and components of a piece of rhetoric often isn't enough, though, because it is important to draw conclusions about the rhetoric—does it successfully respond to the exigence? Is it an ethical approach? Is it persuasive? These kinds of questions let you begin to create your own claims, your own rhetoric, as you take a stand on what other people say, do, or write.

Beginning to Analyze

Once you have established the context for the rhetoric you are analyzing, you can begin to think about how well it fits into that context. You've probably been in a situation where you arrived way underdressed for an occasion. You thought that the dinner was just a casual get together with friends; it turned out to be a far more formal affair, and you felt very out of place. There are also times when discourse fails to respond to the situation well—it doesn't fit. On the other hand, successful discourses often respond very well to the context. They address the problem, consider the audience's needs, provide accurate information, and have a compelling claim. One of the reasons you work to determine the rhetorical situation for a piece of discourse is to consider whether it works within that context. You can begin this process by asking questions like:

- Does the rhetoric address the problem it claims to address?
- Is the rhetoric targeted at an audience who has the power to make change?
- Are the appeals appropriate to the audience?
- Does the rhetor give enough information to make an informed decision?
- Does the rhetoric attempt to manipulate in any way (by giving incomplete/inaccurate information or abusing the audience's emotions)?
What other sub-claims do you have to accept to understand the rhetor's main claim? (For example, in order to accept the Ad Council’s claim that the arts boost math and science scores, you first have to value the boosting of those scores.)

What possible negative effects might come from this rhetoric?

Rhetorical analysis asks how discourse functions in the setting in which it is found. In the same way that a commercial for denture cream seems very out of place when aired during a reality television show aimed at teenagers, rhetoric that does not respond well to its context often fails to persuade. In order to perform analysis, you must understand the context and then you must carefully study the ways that the discourse does and does not respond appropriately to that context.

The bottom line is that the same basic principles apply when you look at any piece of rhetoric (your instructor’s clothing, an advertisement, the president’s speech); you need to consider the context and the argument. As you begin to analyze rhetoric, there are lots of different types of rhetoric you might encounter in a college classroom, such as:

- Political cartoon
- Wikipedia entry
- Scholarly article
- Bar Graph
- Op-Ed piece in the newspaper
- Speech
- YouTube video
- Book chapter
- Photograph
- PowerPoint Presentation

All of the above types of discourse try to persuade you. They may ask you to accept a certain kind of knowledge as valid, they may ask you to believe a certain way, or they may ask you to act. It is important to understand what a piece of rhetoric is asking of you, how it tries to persuade you, and whether that persuasion fits within the context you encounter it in. Rhetorical analysis helps you answer those questions.
Implications of Rhetorical Analysis, Or Why Do This Stuff Anyway?

So you might be wondering if you know how to do this analysis already—you can tell what kind of person someone is by their clothing, or what a commercial wants you to buy without carefully listening to it—why do you need to know how to do more formal analysis? How does this matter outside a college classroom?

Well, first of all, much of the reading and learning in college requires some level of rhetorical analysis: as you read a textbook chapter to prepare for a quiz, it is helpful to be able to distill the main points quickly; when you read a journal article for a research paper, it is necessary to understand the scholar’s thesis; when you watch a video in class, it is useful to be able to understand how the creator is trying to persuade you. But college is not the only place where an understanding of how rhetoric works is important. You will find yourself in many situations—from boardrooms to your children’s classrooms or churches to city council meetings where you need to understand the heart of the arguments being presented.

One final example: in November 2000, Campbell’s Soup Company launched a campaign to show that many of their soups were low in calories and showed pre-pubescent girls refusing to eat because they were “watching their weight.” A very small organization called Dads and Daughters, a group that fights advertising that targets girls with negative body images, contacted Campbell’s explaining the problems they saw in an ad that encouraged young girls to be self-conscious about their weight, and asked Campbell’s to pull the ad. A few days later, Campbell’s Vice President for Marketing and Corporate Communications called. One of the dads says, “the Vice President acknowledged he had received their letter, reviewed the ad again, saw their point, and was pulling the ad,” responding to a “couple of guys writing a letter” (“Media”). Individuals who understand rhetorical analysis and act to make change can have a tremendous influence on their world.

DISCUSSION

1. What are examples of rhetoric that you see or hear on a daily basis?

2. What are some ways that you create rhetoric? What kinds of messages are you trying to communicate?
3. What is an example of a rhetorical situation that you have found yourself in? Discuss exigence, audience, and constraints.
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As a citizen and a scholar, I use rhetorical analysis to sort out questions about politics and relationships. In everyday life, rhetorical analysis is a valuable tool for understanding and preparing to engage in the world.

I hadn’t thought much about the word “help” until the summer day I strolled along the beach with my boyfriend. A young man on the boardwalk struggled with something—tying a kite maybe? collapsing a stroller? I don’t remember what he was doing, only that it looked like one of those tasks that are easier to do with two people.

“Do you need a hand?” I asked as we passed.

The man looked up abruptly. He shook his head with a scowl. We walked on.

“Don’t do that,” my boyfriend instructed.

“Do what?”

“Don’t ask people if they need help,” he said. “It’s demeaning.”

Perhaps because I am a woman, the youngest of four daughters, I had never considered helping or being helped as anything but good. I had been praised for anticipating which tool my dad might need at the workbench or helping my sister bring in more wood
for the fire. But my boyfriend pointed out another side of the story: the masculine expectation that you are supposed to do it alone and the accompanying narrative that “real men” are capable, strong, and independent. I had blundered with my casual offer, adding insult to the embarrassment the young man probably already felt. I might as well have said, “Let me rescue you, little one.”

The moment reminded me that the world in which I live is not the universal world but just one dimension of it. I started noticing attitudes about “help” everywhere: people (mostly men) soldiered through alone; other people (mostly women) looked around for help. I don’t mean to overgeneralize or to suggest that I now believe that accepting help is weak. But I do look for cues now about how an offer of help might be experienced. I decide more consciously whether and how to engage.

This kind of experience—a burst of insight about how language has shaped a moment—that’s the reason I do rhetorical analysis. That’s the reason lots of people do rhetorical analysis, even if they don’t call it by the same name. Rhetorical analysis is a tool for digging into language-infused moments to uncover the networks of values, assumptions, and expectations that shape how people experience such moments.

I’m afraid that many people don’t recognize the value of this tool because teachers in high school and college (including me) have jumped too quickly to talk
about how to do rhetorical analysis instead of why. I want to invite people—citizens, students, communities, neighbors—to see the advantage of this way of exploring.

I begin by sharing some examples of rhetorical analysis to illustrate the different purposes that the method can serve and where we encounter it. Because I’m using examples from my life, I draw on the sources and issues with which I’ve been concerned, which happen to lean left, politically. However, the strategies I offer as I unpack these examples are equally useful for anyone who encounters an argument that seems puzzling or a situation in which they aren’t sure how to respond.

Two Starting Points: Puzzling Encounters and Tricky Situations

I find it helpful to categorize rhetorical analysis based on what initiates the desire to explore the world in this way. The first kind of rhetorical analysis begins from a puzzling encounter with language. We are surprised by something we heard or read or witnessed, and we wonder how to better understand what we just experienced. That’s the example from my opening story; the man’s scowl surprised me, and I learned something more about this idea of “help.”

A second category begins from the other side—not as a response to an encounter but rather the desire to have a certain encounter. We want to know how to
successfully engage someone (or some group) about a particular topic, and we know that something about the encounter might be tricky. We study the situation before we blunder. We examine the rhetorical choices that people in similar situations have used: How did they make sure that their audience didn’t scowl after the first line?

I’ll share examples of both of these approaches.

Starting From a Puzzling Encounter.

Baton Rouge,” was taken by Jonathan Bachman for Reuters; it was later nominated for a Pulitzer Prize and won first prize in the Contemporary Issues category in the 2017 World Press Photo Contest, so it’s not surprising that it stood out to Cole. Yet what struck Cole back in July was that the image had gone viral. He pondered why it had such power.

The strategies that Cole used to figure out why this image had such an impact are those of rhetorical analysis. First, he examined the construction of the photo—how the woman, Iesha Evans, “seems almost to be levitating” (Cole); how the two cops opposite her, with their “storm-trooper get-up—the shoulder pads, helmets and what look like rocket-booster backpacks” appear to be not two cops but “three or four.” The photo, Coles writes, taps into the cultural imagery of a superhero and “[tells] such an apparently clear story that when it hit social media, it went viral” (Cole)

Next, Cole compared this photo to a series of other photos from a range of parallel contexts. He identified other moments within the Black Lives Matter movement where protesters were captured in superhero-like poses. He contrasted the images to photographs in other social movements, a strategy that allowed him to identify more precisely the tone of these images—not “dignity intruded on but outright victory” (Cole).

Finally, he considered the image in the context of the photos usually seen in the media. Images of powerful, calm black women are rarely seen in American media. Moreover, the videos that anchor the BLM movement (the images caught on cell phone cameras of black
men and women gunned down by cops) are devastating, moments of where black bodies are destroyed. From all this exploration, Cole concludes that “[t]he ‘superhero’ photographs of protesters, with their classic form and triumphant tone, are engaged in a labor of redress. They bring a counterweight to the archive. Against death and helplessness, they project power and agency” (Cole).

Cole’s analysis enables me to peek under the surface of that photo and see the visual, historical, and cultural allusions that the image invokes. He helps me recognize how I am programmed to respond, how I was persuaded to feel. That’s the power of rhetorical analysis.

Cole argues for the value of such work: “The things we think of as ‘intriguing but comparatively minor’ must also be attended to, in part because of how they illuminate what is not at all minor” (Cole). This is what rhetorical analysis offers—a way to slow down and pay attention to seemingly small choices that build to something bigger. It gives us a glimpse into how language—whether words or images—shapes our relationships to ideas and to each other.
Here’s a second example, from my own work—as a scholar and a citizen. Early in Donald Trump’s candidacy, I noticed how much he loved to bash “political correctness.” Coming as I do from the left (and academia, to boot), I had never been angered by the idea of “political correctness,” but I could see that crowds were (are) livid about it. I know some of these people so I wasn’t content simply to dismiss them as evil, ignorant, or useless. Instead, I wanted to understand what they were really mad about. I turned to rhetorical analysis.

My methods were similar to Cole’s: I looked carefully at the materials that caused such strong reactions, and I looked for patterns, allusions, and unstated values. Instead of a single photograph, I listened to many of Trump’s campaign speeches and read articles about political correctness in right and alt-right blogs and newspapers. After immersing myself in the material, I
discovered
(https://ryderwriting.wordpress.com/2016/08/21/what-does-it-mean-to-be-against-political-correctness-part-1/)
that I could group the explicit and implicit arguments about the danger of political correctness into four categories: 1) “political correctness” is simply a way to promote liberalism because it relies on identity politics; 2) “political correctness” is inauthentic because it requires people to edit their language choices; 3) “political correctness” is a tool to stifle real debate; and 4) “political correctness” creates a dangerous security climate. Noticing these patterns and taking them seriously has allowed me to see how the debate about this term is a symptom of a bigger debate—namely, that regarding how citizens should interact in a pluralist democracy. I also learned that the usual responses to attacks about “political correctness” often don’t get at this underlying disagreement so they fail to move the conversation forward. This exercise has been very useful to me; I can choose my words more carefully and decide when and how to ask the deeper questions.

Both of these examples use the key techniques of rhetorical analysis: breaking down what makes the text—an image, a phrase, a poem, a speech, a meme, a joke, etc.—move people. Both pieces look for patterns in the material and connect those patterns with broader historical, cultural, social, or local moments.
When you start to rhetorically analyze something that puzzles you—something about which you’re genuinely curious—the discoveries you make can feel meaningful.

Starting From the Desire to have an Encounter

Another category of rhetorical analysis begins when we anticipate an encounter and want to set ourselves up for a positive experience. If we know that the circumstances are going to be particularly challenging, we analyze it to choose the best options, including looking at how other people have responded in similar moments.

The scene with which I opened—about offering to “help” a man on a boardwalk—provides an example. When I reflect on that day, I wish I had had a way to call attention to the gendered dynamics of what happened. This is what I notice now: both men assumed that receiving help is weak. In fact, my boyfriend instructed me to stop offering to help. Eventually, I came to understand how my actions clashed with their worldview, but they may not have noticed that I brought a different—and valid—perspective. So, how could I have responded?

To figure this out, I must identify several things—these are basic questions for all important rhetorical encounters:

- What do I want to say to whom?
• What parts of my message might be hardest for my audience to hear?
• What are my options about how to say the more difficult parts?
• Which of those options align best with my own values?

Say I’ve decided to tell my boyfriend that I think offering help is a sign of compassion and connection rather than power. If he thinks I’m trying to “help” him understand, he might feel defensive or dismissive, even a little threatened. What are my options for how to present my position? I could step fully into a deferential language by using lots of qualifiers, hedging, and tag questions, e.g., saying, “For some people,” “It might be” or “don’t you think?” Alternatively, I might feel truer to myself by being assertive and direct, even though that could create tension. I don’t have to figure out my options alone. I could look up “how-to” blogs (such as feministing.com’s “How to Talk to Your Boyfriend about Feminism” [https://feministing.com/2013/08/02/how-to-talk-to-your-boyfriend-about-feminism/]). Or I could read the work of feminist authors whose approaches I admire and figure out what to emulate.

All of this is rhetorical analysis—figuring out how to speak in a way that works for my audience and that reflects my own values.
These “how-to” types of rhetorical analysis are not published as often as the kinds of rhetorical analysis I described in the section “Starting from a Puzzling Encounter.” For example, as we listen to speeches, read blogs, and skim websites, we might get a warm feeling about a particular politician or organization. Most likely, communication teams behind the scenes have created handbooks to guide the person and/or organization staff in their communications. Political communications researchers study how people think and talk about specific public issues and then create guidelines about the most effective way to frame the discussion. (See the website of the FrameWorks Institute ([https://www.frameworksinstitute.org/](https://www.frameworksinstitute.org/)), a nonprofit that analyzes the ways people think about various social issues, for some current examples.)

There are times, however, when people start debating publicly about how to speak most effectively on a particular issue. These are the moments when pundits and activists show us how important rhetorical analysis is for the work they do.

Here’s another example that has been in the news a lot: How should media, politicians, and citizens talk about the relationship between the police and black communities in the United States? What does it mean to say “Black Lives Matter” in this context, and why persist with this slogan when so many people find it divisive? We can see these arguments worked out over and over again in newspapers, blogs, and magazines. The “All Lives Matter” group says that the
right approach is to affirm the broader goal—that everyone should be treated equally—instead of singling out one group. (An archive of tweets explaining this position is analyzed on The Wrap (https://www.thewrap.com/what-is-all-lives-matter-a-short-explainer/).) However, Black Lives Matter founders Patrisse Cullors, Opal Tometi, and Alicia Garza disagree; their guidelines (https://blacklivesmatter.com/guiding-principles/) assert “We are unapologetically Black in our positioning. In affirming that Black Lives Matter, we need not qualify our position. To love and desire freedom and justice for ourselves is a necessary prerequisite for wanting the same for others.” The Huffington Post’s John Halstead parses (https://www.huffingtonpost.com/john-halstead/dear-fellow-white-people-_b_11109842.html) why white people are uncomfortable saying the word “black,” tracing out a history of assumptions about how race works. In the struggle over the phrase “Black Lives Matter,” Americans are arguing about how to do anti-racist work in the United States: How do we name racism, how do we define the nature of inequality, and who has the power to say where the conversation should begin? This is what’s at stake in rhetorical analysis—figuring out how to speak so that you accurately convey your deeper philosophies, even as you weigh how your choices will affect your audience.

As a scholar, I find these public debates about the right way to name and persuade people about issues to be fascinating, but they aren’t just “academic”
debates. I am grateful to listen as activists and politicians explain their rhetorical choices because I learn so much about the deeper assumptions, values, and issues that are involved.

Underlying Assumptions

When you conduct a rhetorical analysis, you’re stepping into a world that has a set of deeper assumptions and values about language and its role in the world. I’ll spell these out explicitly here. If they make sense to you, you’ll be in good shape to develop either type of rhetorical analysis—a response to a puzzling encounter or an attempt to discover the right approach for an encounter. However, if find yourself resisting these assumptions, you might find it harder to rhetorically analyze a puzzling encounter because you probably don’t agree that doing so would be meaningful. The good news is that you might be able switch your focus and write more explicitly about which of these assumptions doesn’t hold up for you, using specific examples from public texts to illustrate your position.

What assumptions about rhetoric are given when we conduct rhetorical analysis?

*Rhetoric means more than manipulation or empty words.* Although often used in public discourse as a dismissive thing, the term “rhetoric” is neutral for those who study it. It means simply that *language is more than it seems*. Rhetoric scholars begin from a belief
that language is not something we can step out of—we are shaped by words always. Furthermore, language is not just about words. What we say and what we hear are wrapped up in networks of assumptions about how to be in the world and how to communicate about it. Those assumptions prescribe a sort of structure that guides what we say and how we say it.

We can uncover these assumptions by looking closely at texts. Rhetorical analysis presumes that we can work backward from the texts to uncover the assumptions and name the values that are at work in them. Rhetorical analysis presumes that we learn by paying attention to all parts of an interaction: Who is speaking? To whom is the piece directed? Where is the interaction taking place? What is the broader context of the speaker’s or writer’s relationship or the history of the space? Do they agree about the facts, the definitions, the correct interpretation of the events, and/or the course of action? Do they have different experiences to bring to bear on the issue at hand? A close look at all of this helps us uncover the underlying assumptions and values each brings to the subject under discussion.

Texts don’t exist in isolation. We make discoveries by looking not only at one text, but at patterns across a broader context. We put texts in the context of a larger conversation. What other interactions are being borrowed, extended, or countered?
Rhetorical analysis is not always positive. It can be a strategy to engage or to deflect. Sometimes arguments about the proper way to speak or interact are diversions from another, more fundamental disagreement. Sometimes we argue about the right way to speak because we don’t want to talk about the difficult thing.

How to Conduct Rhetorical Analysis

- Figure out why the question matters. (Still not sure? Consider “Why Study Rhetoric? Or What Freestyle Rap Teaches Us about Writing (https://writingcommons.org/information-literacy/rhetorical-analysis/582-why-we-study-rhetoric).”)
- If you are writing to figure out a puzzling encounter, examine the rhetorical situation of the text at hand—the immediate context. Who is speaking to whom and why? Who may not be able to speak? What is the relationship among the speaker and the listener? How much does each know or care about the subject?
- Consider whether the speaker and audience are approaching this moment from the same starting point. Where is the locus of the disagreement? (Stasis theory (https://owlenglish.purdue.edu/owl/resource/736/1/))
- Compare this moment to others like it, where people write about similar issues for similar audiences. Look for patterns in the approach—not so much a repetition of particular words but
the web of associations that come together to frame the way they approach the moments. The patterns might help you see an underlying logic in their approach that wasn’t apparent from just one text. A useful starting point for noticing such patterns might be the FrameWorks Institute (https://www.frameworksinstitute.org/)’s website.

- Whether you are writing to figure out a puzzling encounter or to prepare yourself for a challenging situation, figure out who needs to hear what you have to say. It’s tempting to try to write for everyone at once, but if you do, you miss the opportunity to think more about why the question matters and why people might resist your view. Anticipate their concerns and dig into their reasons.


Final Words
Rhetorical analysis seems like one of those types of writing that people do only in school. And while I concede that many assignments don’t have a counterpart outside of the classroom, I don’t think rhetorical analysis is “merely academic.”

People argue about how to argue all the time. People listen deeply all the time, trying to understand not just what is being said but also how, knowing that the how matters.

Rhetorical analysis can be empowering. It can help you develop a repertoire of strategies for engaging with the world on your terms, even as it helps you understand how to respond when others try to set up the encounter on their terms.

I hope that you, too, will find rhetorical analysis to be a valuable tool in everyday life.

WORKS CITED
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Why Study Rhetoric? or, What Freestyle Rap Teaches Us about Writing

Written by Kyle D. Stedman
Category: Rhetoric (/chapters/rhetoric)
The website eHow has a page on “How to Freestyle Rap” (https://www.ehow.com/how_2034496_freestyle-rap.html) (“Difficulty: Moderately Challenging”), and I’m trying to figure out what I think about it. On one hand, it seems like it would be against the ethos of an authentic rapper to use a page like this to brush up on freestyle skills. After all, the page is hosted on a corporate website owned by Demand Media, Inc., the same people behind, among other things, a golf site.

But on the other hand, the advice seems solid. The eHow page encourages me to follow an easy, seven-step model:

1. “Learn the basics.”
2. “Just start flowing.”
3. “Write down some good rhymes ahead of time.”
4. “Work on your wordplay.”
5. “Practice at home in your spare time.”
6. “Have a rap battle.”
7. “Rap what you know.” (“How to Freestyle Rap”)

The page treats freestyling as an art that can be practiced effectively by anyone, as long as the rapper is willing to research, take risks, spend time
developing the craft, practice with a community and for an audience, and stay true to him/herself—i.e., to keep it real.

And here’s the thing: I think rhetoric is the same way. That is, it’s an art that can be practiced effectively by anyone, as long as the rhetor (the person who is communicating rhetorically) is willing to research, take risks, spend time developing the craft, practice with a community and for an audience, and stay true to him/herself.

You don’t hear me though.

***

That’s right: rhetoric is an art. But not necessarily art the way we think of it. The ancient Greeks called rhetoric a techne, a word they used to mean “a craft or ability to do something, a creative skill; this can be physical or mental, positive or negative, like that of metalworking or trickery” (Papillion 149).

Other examples of techne? Ship-building, for one. [1] You’d better not muddle your way through the art of building a ship, or you’ll ruddy well sink.

Rhetoric developed as an oral art, the art of knowing how to give an effective speech—say, in a court, in a law-making session, or at a funeral speech. And if you
muddled your way through a speech, not convincing anyone, not moving anyone, looking like a general schmuck in a toga, you’d ruddy well sink there, too.

***

So rhetoric is an art. But of what? The shortest answer: it’s an art of communication, whether written, spoken, painted, streamed, or whatever.

But how do you judge when communication has worked, when it’s effective? In other words, how do you know when someone has used rhetorical skills well?

That’s easy: when an audience says it’s effective. So:

• An anchor on a conservative news show makes a jab at President Obama. Conservative watchers thought the jab was well-deserved and well-timed; it was rhetorically effective for them. Liberal watchers thought it was a cheap shot; it wasn’t rhetorically effective for them.

• A student writes an essay arguing that advertisements are so pervasive in the U.S. that he can’t even go to the bathroom without seeing Coke’s logo. His roommate reads it and doesn’t think advertising is a big deal; he’s not convinced, so it’s not a rhetorically effective essay for him. But his teacher reads it and thinks it’s cleverly argued and bitingly true. It works for
her; it’s rhetorically effective for her.

- Eminem ends a rap battle to raucous applause from the people in the room, but the old grandmother in the back of the club thinks it was all a lot of noise. To her, Eminem’s rapping wasn’t rhetorically effective.

So rhetoric can’t be judged completely objectively. It wouldn’t make sense to say that someone’s rhetoric was “right” or “wrong” (though it can be “better” or “worse” for specific audiences). It all comes down to the audience.

Also, notice that all of those examples describe situations where the rhetor is being persuasive in one way or another. That’s a common definition of rhetoric—that it’s the art of persuasion. And persuasion is important—we’re constantly trying to convince people, either subtly or overtly, to understand our points of view, and people are constantly trying to convince us of their points of view.

But I like to think of rhetoric as being about more than just persuasion, which starts to sound all bossy and manipulative when I think of that way. Instead, I think rhetoric is the art of making a connection with an audience. It’s a series of techniques to help me share the way I see things with someone else. And depending on who I’m sharing with, I’ll use different
techniques. I wouldn’t communicate my views to my wife in the same way that I would to the U.S. president, or to Jay-Z.

***

The best rappers are surprising. You lean over laughing at wordplay that you didn’t expect. You smile, get into the groove, listen more carefully, and later you remember how much you enjoyed it. The communication was effective.

***

I read Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance in my senior year of high school, but I didn’t really get it. The author kept talking about rhetoric, and even after I looked up the definition, it didn’t make any sense to me.

Looking back, I think that’s ironic: the beating, blood-pumping heart of rhetoric is a consideration of audience. Speaking or writing or composing something that works the way you want it to for the audience you want it to work for.

But I don’t think senior-year me was the intended audience of Zen. If I had been, the author was pretty lousy at being rhetorical, because he didn’t explain well enough what rhetoric even means. The concepts he wanted his audience to be convinced of after
reading his book didn’t leave me convinced and riveted; instead, I was glassy-eyed and dreaming about angsty 90s rock.
He was thoroughly un-rhetorical in his discussion of rhetoric.

I read the book now and I’m moved and touched. He shared his views effectively with me. Without the text changing at all, I became his audience. I get it now. So he was being rhetorical after all. It’s both.

***

Why study rhetoric? It’s the same as if you asked, “Why study freestyle rap?” Both are a set of skills and techniques that often come naturally, but which people can learn to do better by studying the methods that have proven effective in the past.

“Why study painting?” Because by studying how other people paint, you learn new techniques that make you a more effective painter.

“Why study business?” Because by studying how other people do business, you learn new techniques that make you a more effective businessperson.

Why study ship-building, or basket-weaving, or trickery, or anything else that you might be able to muddle through but which you’d be better at with some training and practice? Isn’t it obvious?
It’s the same with rhetoric, but in realm of communication. Why not learn some techniques that will increase the chance that your audience will think/feel/believe the way you want them to after hearing/reading/experiencing whatever it is that you’re throwing at them?

And that’s only thinking about you in the composer’s role. What about when you’re in the receiving end, hearing/reading/experiencing things that have been carefully crafted so that you’ll buy into them? A scary list of rhetorically effective people: politicians, advertisers, super-villains. (You want rhetoric? Just listen to the slimy words of the Emperor in Return of the Jedi or the words Voldemort beams into everyone’s brain in Harry Potter and the Deathly Hallows, Part Two.) Studying rhetoric has the uncanny effect of opening your eyes to when people are trying to be all rhetorical on you, wielding their communication skills like an evil weapon.

***

My friend to me, the other day: “Ugh. Carrie just wrote something inappropriate on her fiancée’s Facebook wall again.”

Me: “What’d she say?”

My friend: “I don’t even remember. It was something all gushy and uncomfortable. I skinned back a bit and saw she’s been doing that a lot. Doesn’t she know...”
that she can write messages that go just to him and not the rest of us? She doesn’t have to post that stuff on his wall!”

As I thought about this conversation, I realized that Carrie (not her real name) was in some ways being a rhetorical failure. Yes, her fiancée (one person), who was certainly the primary intended recipient of her message, probably found the wall post very rhetorically effective. That is, he surely felt the gushy emotions that she meant for him to feel. Her message worked. How rhetorical!

But because a Facebook wall is to some extent public, there are others who will read her post too (hundreds of people). What is the intended message for them? If we trust and like Carrie (and if she’s lucky), then we may think, “Oh, it’s sweet when people are public about their love for each other!” If we’re kind of sick of Carrie, we might think, “She just plain doesn’t get that we don’t care about her digital smooches and hugs.” And if we’re mad at her, we might think, “She’s publicly declaring her love to him because she wants us to feel bad that we don’t have the kind of true love that she has!”

In short, the message to most of us is either A) that’s nice, B) oh, gross, or C) that hussy.

Why study rhetoric? Because so many people so often seem to have no no no idea about how to communicate well.
We’re still beating around the bush when it comes to what rhetorical skills actually look like. Up to this point, you could say, "You keep talking about all these different collections of skills, but besides freestyling, I barely have any idea how to go about being effective at this stuff." Fine—pass the mic.

Mic passed. Among lots of other things, some of the skills practiced by rhetors (and composition students) include:

- Basics that effective communicators keep in mind (like discovering the best time and place to communicate, clarifying what the communication is about, and learning about your audience)

- Techniques for deciding the best kinds of ideas and evidence to use for a given audience (like freewriting, open-minded research, and other forms of what we call “invention”)

- Techniques for deciding on the best way to organize material for a given audience (like models for organizing information into a business report, or a classical six-part speech, or a thesis-driven research essay)

- Suggestions for how to shape your style in ways that will be both understandable and exciting for your audience (like using rhetorical figures to
liven up your sentences or varying sentence length and type)

- Considerations on the best way to get your communication to your audience (like a speech, an essay, a video, a recording, a painting, a sticky note, a letter made from words cut out of a magazine)

Yes, I keep writing the word audience over and over. That’s because it’s the core of any rhetorical endeavor. Remember? All those bullets can be summed up in one sentence: thinking rhetorically means thinking about your audience.

And that means communicating in a way that doesn’t make you look stupid, mean, or confusing.

And that means you should communicate in a way that makes you look smart, nice, and clear.

It sounds obvious, right? I think so too. But then, why are people so bad at it?

***

The failures of a failed rhetor are those of a failed freestyle rapper, too. He gets up to start a rap battle and seems impressive at first (i.e. he has a strong
ethos—a word we use a lot when analyzing communication from a rhetorical angle), but then things go badly when he gets the mic.

He starts out blundering around, looking like he’s never done this before. (He should have followed eHow’s advice to “Write down some good rhymes ahead of time.”)

In desperation, he lashes out at the other guy with attacks that seem like low blows, even for a rap battle. The audience groans; he broke an unspoken rule about how mean to be. Rhetorical failure.

He can tell that he’s losing the audience, so he changes his tactics and starts blending together all kinds of words that rhyme. But he fails at this too, since nothing he says makes any sense.

Eventually, he’s booed off the stage.

Why study rhetoric? So you can succeed in rap battles. I thought that was obvious.

[1] Thanks to Dr. Debra Jacobs for pointing out this to me.


See also:
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On the Duty of Civil Disobedience

by Henry David Thoreau

1849, original title: Resistance to Civil Government

I heartily accept the motto,—“That government is best which governs least;” and I should like to see it acted up to more rapidly and systematically. Carried out, it finally amounts to this, which also I believe—“That government is best which governs not at all;” and when men are prepared for it, that will be the
kind of government which they will have. Government is at best but an expedient; but most governments
are usually, and all governments are sometimes, inexpedient. The objections which have been brought
against a standing army, and they are many and weighty, and deserve to prevail, may also at last be brought
against a standing government. The standing army is only an arm of the standing government. The
government itself, which is only the mode which the people have chosen to execute their will, is equally
liable to be abused and perverted before the people can act through it. Witness the present Mexican war,
the work of comparatively a few individuals using the standing government as their tool; for, in the outset,
the people would not have consented to this measure.

This American government,—what is it but a tradition, though a recent one, endeavoring to transmit
itself unimpaired to posterity, but each instant losing some of its integrity? It has not the vitality and force
of a single living man; for a single man can bend it to his will. It is a sort of wooden gun to the people
themselves; and, if ever they should use it in earnest as a real one against each other, it will surely split.
But it is not the less necessary for this; for the people must have some complicated machinery or other, and
hear its din, to satisfy that idea of government which they have. Governments show thus how successfully
men can be imposed on, even impose on themselves, for their own advantage. It is excellent, we must all
allow; yet this government never of itself furthered any enterprise, but by the alacrity with which it got out
of its way. It does not keep the country free. It does not settle the West. It does not educate. The character
inherent in the American people has done all that has been accomplished; and it would have done
somewhat more, if the government had not sometimes got in its way. For government is an expedient, by
which men would fain succeed in letting one another alone; and, as has been said, when it is most
expedient, the governed are most let alone by it. Trade and commerce, if they were not made of India
rubber, would never manage to bounce over obstacles which legislators are continually putting in their
way; and, if one were to judge these men wholly by the effects of their actions, and not partly by their
intentions, they would deserve to be classed and punished with those mischievous persons who put
obstructions on the railroads.

But, to speak practically and as a citizen, unlike those who call themselves no-government men, I ask
for, not at once no government, but at once a better government. Let every man make known what kind of
government would command his respect, and that will be one step toward obtaining it.

After all, the practical reason why, when the power is once in the hands of the people, a majority are
permitted, and for a long period continue, to rule, is not because they are most likely to be in the right, nor
because this seems fairest to the minority, but because they are physically the strongest. But a government
in which the majority rule in all cases can not be based on justice, even as far as men understand it. Can
there not be a government in which the majorities do not virtually decide right and wrong, but conscience?
—in which majorities decide only those questions to which the rule of expediency is applicable? Must the
citizen ever for a moment, or in the least degree, resign his conscience to the legislator? Why has every
man a conscience, then? I think that we should be men first, and subjects afterward. It is not desirable to
cultivate a respect for the law, so much as for the right. The only obligation which I have a right to assume,
is to do at any time what I think right. It is truly enough said that a corporation has no conscience; but a
corporation of conscientious men is a corporation with a conscience. Law never made men a whit more
just; and, by means of their respect for it, even the well-disposed are daily made the agents of injustice. A
common and natural result of an undue respect for the law is, that you may see a file of soldiers, colonel, captain, corporal, privates, powder-monkeys and all, marching in admirable order over hill and dale to the wars, against their wills, aye, against their common sense and consciences, which makes it very steep marching indeed, and produces a palpitation of the heart. They have no doubt that it is a damnable business in which they are concerned; they are all peaceably inclined. Now, what are they? Men at all? or small movable forts and magazines, at the service of some unscrupulous man in power? Visit the Navy Yard, and behold a marine, such a man as an American government can make, or such as it can make a man with its black arts, a mere shadow and reminiscence of humanity, a man laid out alive and standing, and already, as one may say, buried under arms with funeral accompaniment, though it may be

“Not a drum was heard, not a funeral note,  
As his corpse to the ramparts we hurried;  
Not a soldier discharged his farewell shot  
O’er the grave where our hero we buried.”

The mass of men serve the State thus, not as men mainly, but as machines, with their bodies. They are the standing army, and the militia, jailers, constables, posse comitatus, &c. In most cases there is no free exercise whatever of the judgment or of the moral sense; but they put themselves on a level with wood and earth and stones; and wooden men can perhaps be manufactured that will serve the purpose as well. Such command no more respect than men of straw, or a lump of dirt. They have the same sort of worth only as horses and dogs. Yet such as these even are commonly esteemed good citizens. Others, as most legislators, politicians, lawyers, ministers, and office-holders, serve the state chiefly with their heads; and, as they rarely make any moral distinctions, they are as likely to serve the devil, without intending it, as God. A very few, as heroes, patriots, martyrs, reformers in the great sense, and men, serve the State with their consciences also, and so necessarily resist it for the most part; and they are commonly treated by it as enemies. A wise man will only be useful as a man, and will not submit to be “clay,” and “stop a hole to keep the wind away,” but leave that office to his dust at least:

“I am too high-born to be propertied,  
To be a secondary at control,  
Or useful serving-man and instrument  
To any sovereign state throughout the world.”

He who gives himself entirely to his fellow-men appears to them useless and selfish; but he who gives himself partially to them is pronounced a benefactor and philanthropist.

How does it become a man to behave toward the American government today? I answer that he cannot without disgrace be associated with it. I cannot for an instant recognize that political organization as my government which is the slave’s government also.

All men recognize the right of revolution; that is, the right to refuse allegiance to and to resist the government, when its tyranny or its inefficiency are great and unendurable. But almost all say that such is not the case now. But such was the case, they think, in the Revolution of ’75. If one were to tell me that this was a bad government because it taxed certain foreign commodities brought to its ports, it is most
probable that I should not make an ado about it, for I can do without them: all machines have their friction; and possibly this does enough good to counter-balance the evil. At any rate, it is a great evil to make a stir about it. But when the friction comes to have its machine, and oppression and robbery are organized, I say, let us not have such a machine any longer. In other words, when a sixth of the population of a nation which has undertaken to be the refuge of liberty are slaves, and a whole country is unjustly overrun and conquered by a foreign army, and subjected to military law, I think that it is not too soon for honest men to rebel and revolutionize. What makes this duty the more urgent is that fact, that the country so overrun is not our own, but ours is the invading army.

Paley, a common authority with many on moral questions, in his chapter on the “Duty of Submission to Civil Government,” resolves all civil obligation into expediency; and he proceeds to say, “that so long as the interest of the whole society requires it, that is, so long as the established government cannot be resisted or changed without public inconveniency, it is the will of God that the established government be obeyed, and no longer.”—“This principle being admitted, the justice of every particular case of resistance is reduced to a computation of the quantity of the danger and grievance on the one side, and of the probability and expense of redressing it on the other.” Of this, he says, every man shall judge for himself. But Paley appears never to have contemplated those cases to which the rule of expediency does not apply, in which a people, as well as an individual, must do justice, cost what it may. If I have unjustly wrested a plank from a drowning man, I must restore it to him though I drown myself. This, according to Paley, would be inconvenient. But he that would save his life, in such a case, shall lose it. This people must cease to hold slaves, and to make war on Mexico, though it cost them their existence as a people.

In their practice, nations agree with Paley; but does anyone think that Massachusetts does exactly what is right at the present crisis?

“A drab of state, a cloth-o’-silver slut,
To have her train borne up, and her soul trail in the dirt.”

Practically speaking, the opponents to a reform in Massachusetts are not a hundred thousand politicians at the South, but a hundred thousand merchants and farmers here, who are more interested in commerce and agriculture than they are in humanity, and are not prepared to do justice to the slave and to Mexico, cost what it may. I quarrel not with far-off foes, but with those who, near at home, co-operate with, and do the bidding of those far away, and without whom the latter would be harmless. We are accustomed to say, that the mass of men are unprepared; but improvement is slow, because the few are not materially wiser or better than the many. It is not so important that many should be as good as you, as that there be some absolute goodness somewhere; for that will leaven the whole lump. There are thousands who are in opinion opposed to slavery and to the war, who yet in effect do nothing to put an end to them; who, esteeming themselves children of Washington and Franklin, sit down with their hands in their pockets, and say that they know not what to do, and do nothing; who even postpone the question of freedom to the question of free-trade, and quietly read the prices-current along with the latest advices from Mexico, after dinner, and, it may be, fall asleep over them both. What is the price-current of an honest man and patriot today? They hesitate, and they regret, and sometimes they petition; but they do nothing in earnest and with effect. They will wait, well disposed, for others to remedy the evil, that they may no longer have it to
regret. At most, they give only a cheap vote, and a feeble countenance and Godspeed, to the right, as it goes by them. There are nine hundred and ninety-nine patrons of virtue to one virtuous man; but it is easier to deal with the real possessor of a thing than with the temporary guardian of it.

All voting is a sort of gaming, like chequers or backgammon, with a slight moral tinge to it, a playing with right and wrong, with moral questions; and betting naturally accompanies it. The character of the voters is not staked. I cast my vote, perchance, as I think right; but I am not vitally concerned that that right should prevail. I am willing to leave it to the majority. Its obligation, therefore, never exceeds that of expediency. Even voting for the right is doing nothing for it. It is only expressing to men feebly your desire that it should prevail. A wise man will not leave the right to the mercy of chance, nor wish it to prevail through the power of the majority. There is but little virtue in the action of masses of men. When the majority shall at length vote for the abolition of slavery, it will be because they are indifferent to slavery, or because there is but little slavery left to be abolished by their vote. They will then be the only slaves. Only his vote can hasten the abolition of slavery who asserts his own freedom by his vote.

I hear of a convention to be held at Baltimore, or elsewhere, for the selection of a candidate for the Presidency, made up chiefly of editors, and men who are politicians by profession; but I think, what is it to any independent, intelligent, and respectable man what decision they may come to, shall we not have the advantage of his wisdom and honesty, nevertheless? Can we not count upon some independent votes? Are there not many individuals in the country who do not attend conventions? But no: I find that the respectable man, so called, has immediately drifted from his position, and despairs of his country, when his country has more reasons to despair of him. He forthwith adopts one of the candidates thus selected as the only available one, thus proving that he is himself available for any purposes of the demagogue. His vote is of no more worth than that of any unprincipled foreigner or hireling native, who may have been bought. Oh for a man who is a man, and, as my neighbor says, has a bone in his back which you cannot pass your hand through! Our statistics are at fault: the population has been returned too large. How many men are there to a square thousand miles in the country? Hardly one. Does not America offer any inducement for men to settle here? The American has dwindled into an Odd Fellow,—one who may be known by the development of his organ of gregariousness, and a manifest lack of intellect and cheerful self-reliance; whose first and chief concern, on coming into the world, is to see that the alms-houses are in good repair; and, before yet he has lawfully donned the virile garb, to collect a fund for the support of the widows and orphans that may be; who, in short, ventures to live only by the aid of the Mutual Insurance company, which has promised to bury him decently.

It is not a man’s duty, as a matter of course, to devote himself to the eradication of any, even the most enormous wrong; he may still properly have other concerns to engage him; but it is his duty, at least, to wash his hands of it, and, if he gives it no thought longer, not to give it practically his support. If I devote myself to other pursuits and contemplations, I must first see, at least, that I do not pursue them sitting upon another man’s shoulders. I must get off him first, that he may pursue his contemplations too. See what gross inconsistency is tolerated. I have heard some of my townsmen say, “I should like to have them order me out to help put down an insurrection of the slaves, or to march to Mexico,—see if I would go;” and yet these very men have each, directly by their allegiance, and so indirectly, at least, by their money, furnished a substitute. The soldier is applauded who refuses to serve in an unjust war by those who do not refuse to
sustain the unjust government which makes the war; is applauded by those whose own act and authority he disregards and sets at naught; as if the State were penitent to that degree that it hired one to scourge it while it sinned, but not to that degree that it left off sinning for a moment. Thus, under the name of Order and Civil Government, we are all made at last to pay homage to and support our own meanness. After the first blush of sin, comes its indifference; and from immoral it becomes, as it were, *unn* immoral, and not quite unnecessary to that life which we have made.

The broadest and most prevalent error requires the most disinterested virtue to sustain it. The slight reproach to which the virtue of patriotism is commonly liable, the noble are most likely to incur. Those who, while they disapprove of the character and measures of a government, yield to it their allegiance and support, are undoubtedly its most conscientious supporters, and so frequently the most serious obstacles to reform. Some are petitioning the State to dissolve the Union, to disregard the requisitions of the President. Why do they not dissolve it themselves,—the union between themselves and the State,—and refuse to pay their quota into its treasury? Do not they stand in same relation to the State, that the State does to the Union? And have not the same reasons prevented the State from resisting the Union, which have prevented them from resisting the State?

How can a man be satisfied to entertain an opinion merely, and enjoy *it*? Is there any enjoyment in it, if his opinion is that he is aggrieved? If you are cheated out of a single dollar by your neighbor, you do not rest satisfied with knowing you are cheated, or with saying that you are cheated, or even with petitioning him to pay you your due; but you take effectual steps at once to obtain the full amount, and see that you are never cheated again. Action from principle,—the perception and the performance of right,—changes things and relations; it is essentially revolutionary, and does not consist wholly with anything which was. It not only divided states and churches, it divides families; aye, it divides the *individual*, separating the diabolical in him from the divine.

Unjust laws exist: shall we be content to obey them, or shall we endeavor to amend them, and obey them until we have succeeded, or shall we transgress them at once? Men generally, under such a government as this, think that they ought to wait until they have persuaded the majority to alter them. They think that, if they should resist, the remedy would be worse than the evil. But it is the fault of the government itself that the remedy *is* worse than the evil. It makes it worse. Why is it not more apt to anticipate and provide for reform? Why does it not cherish its wise minority? Why does it cry and resist before it is hurt? Why does it not encourage its citizens to be on the alert to point out its faults, and do better than it would have them? Why does it always crucify Christ, and excommunicate Copernicus and Luther, and pronounce Washington and Franklin rebels?

One would think, that a deliberate and practical denial of its authority was the only offence never contemplated by government; else, why has it not assigned its definite, its suitable and proportionate penalty? If a man who has no property refuses but once to earn nine shillings for the State, he is put in prison for a period unlimited by any law that I know, and determined only by the discretion of those who placed him there; but if he should steal ninety times nine shillings from the State, he is soon permitted to go at large again.

If the injustice is part of the necessary friction of the machine of government, let it go, let it go: perchance it will wear smooth,—certainly the machine will wear out. If the injustice has a spring, or a
pulley, or a rope, or a crank, exclusively for itself, then perhaps you may consider whether the remedy will not be worse than the evil; but if it is of such a nature that it requires you to be the agent of injustice to another, then, I say, break the law. Let your life be a counter friction to stop the machine. What I have to do is to see, at any rate, that I do not lend myself to the wrong which I condemn.

As for adopting the ways which the State has provided for remediaying the evil, I know not of such ways. They take too much time, and a man’s life will be gone. I have other affairs to attend to. I came into this world, not chiefly to make this a good place to live in, but to live in it, be it good or bad. A man has not every thing to do, but something; and because he cannot do every thing, it is not necessary that he should do something wrong. It is not my business to be petitioning the Governor or the Legislature any more than it is theirs to petition me; and, if they should not hear my petition, what should I do then? But in this case the State has provided no way: its very Constitution is the evil. This may seem to be harsh and stubborn and unconcilliatory; but it is to treat with the utmost kindness and consideration the only spirit that can appreciate or deserves it. So is all change for the better, like birth and death which convulse the body.

I do not hesitate to say, that those who call themselves abolitionists should at once effectually withdraw their support, both in person and property, from the government of Massachusetts, and not wait till they constitute a majority of one, before they suffer the right to prevail through them. I think that it is enough if they have God on their side, without waiting for that other one. Moreover, any man more right than his neighbors constitutes a majority of one already.

I meet this American government, or its representative, the State government, directly, and face to face, once a year, no more, in the person of its tax-gatherer; this is the only mode in which a man situated as I am necessarily meets it; and it then says distinctly, Recognize me; and the simplest, the most effectual, and, in the present posture of affairs, the indispensables mode of treating with it on this head, of expressing your little satisfaction with and love for it, is to deny it then. My civil neighbor, the tax-gatherer, is the very man I have to deal with,—for it is, after all, with men and not with parchment that I quarrel,—and he has voluntarily chosen to be an agent of the government. How shall he ever know well what he is and does as an officer of the government, or as a man, until he is obliged to consider whether he shall treat me, his neighbor, for whom he has respect, as a neighbor and well-disposed man, or as a maniac and disturber of the peace, and see if he can get over this obstruction to his neighborliness without a ruder and more impetuous thought or speech corresponding with his action? I know this well, that if one thousand, if one hundred, if ten men whom I could name,—if ten honest men only,—aye, if one HONEST man, in this State of Massachusetts, ceasing to hold slaves, were actually to withdraw from this copartnership, and be locked up in the county jail therefor, it would be the abolition of slavery in America. For it matters not how small the beginning may seem to be: what is once well done is done for ever. But we love better to talk about it: that we say is our mission. Reform keeps many scores of newspapers in its service, but not one man. If my esteemed neighbor, the State’s ambassador, who will devote his days to the settlement of the question of human rights in the Council Chamber, instead of being threatened with the prisons of Carolina, were to sit down the prisoner of Massachusetts, that State which is so anxious to foist the sin of slavery upon her sister,—though at present she can discover only an act of inhospitality to be the ground of a quarrel with her,—the Legislature would not wholly waive the subject of the following winter.
Under a government which imprisons any unjustly, the true place for a just man is also a prison. The proper place today, the only place which Massachusetts has provided for her freer and less desponding spirits, is in her prisons, to be put out and locked out of the State by her own act, as they have already put themselves out by their principles. It is there that the fugitive slave, and the Mexican prisoner on parole, and the Indian come to plead the wrongs of his race, should find them; on that separate, but more free and honorable ground, where the State places those who are not with her but against her,—the only house in a slave-state in which a free man can abide with honor. If any think that their influence would be lost there, and their voices no longer afflict the ear of the State, that they would not be as an enemy within its walls, they do not know by how much truth is stronger than error, nor how much more eloquently and effectively he can combat injustice who has experienced a little in his own person. Cast your whole vote, not a strip of paper merely, but your whole influence. A minority is powerless while it conforms to the majority; it is not even a minority then; but it is irresistible when it clogs by its whole weight. If the alternative is to keep all just men in prison, or give up war and slavery, the State will not hesitate which to choose. If a thousand men were not to pay their tax-bills this year, that would not be a violent and bloody measure, as it would be to pay them, and enable the State to commit violence and shed innocent blood. This is, in fact, the definition of a peaceable revolution, if any such is possible. If the tax-gatherer, or any other public officer, asks me, as one has done, “But what shall I do?” my answer is, “If you really wish to do any thing, resign your office.” When the subject has refused allegiance, and the officer has resigned his office, then the revolution is accomplished. But even suppose blood should flow. Is there not a sort of blood shed when the conscience is wounded? Through this wound a man’s real manhood and immortality flow out, and he bleeds to an everlasting death. I see this blood flowing now.

I have contemplated the imprisonment of the offender, rather than the seizure of his goods,—though both will serve the same purpose,—because they who assert the purest right, and consequently are most dangerous to a corrupt State, commonly have not spent much time in accumulating property. To such the State renders comparatively small service, and a slight tax is wont to appear exorbitant, particularly if they are obliged to earn it by special labor with their hands. If there were one who lived wholly without the use of money, the State itself would hesitate to demand it of him. But the rich man—not to make any invidious comparison—is always sold to the institution which makes him rich. Absolutely speaking, the more money, the less virtue; for money comes between a man and his objects, and obtains them for him; it was certainly no great virtue to obtain it. It puts to rest many questions which he would otherwise be taxed to answer; while the only new question which it puts is the hard but superfluous one, how to spend it. Thus his moral ground is taken from under his feet. The opportunities of living are diminished in proportion as what are called the “means” are increased. The best thing a man can do for his culture when he is rich is to endeavor to carry out those schemes which he entertained when he was poor. Christ answered the Herodians according to their condition. “Show me the tribute-money,” said he;—and one took a penny out of his pocket;—if you use money which has the image of Cæsar on it, and which he has made current and valuable, that is, if you are men of the State, and gladly enjoy the advantages of Cæsar’s government, then pay him back some of his own when he demands it; “Render therefore to Cæsar that which is Cæsar’s and to God those things which are God’s,”—leaving them no wiser than before as to which was which; for they did not wish to know.
When I converse with the freest of my neighbors, I perceive that, whatever they may say about the magnitude and seriousness of the question, and their regard for the public tranquillity, the long and the short of the matter is, that they cannot spare the protection of the existing government, and they dread the consequences of disobedience to it to their property and families. For my own part, I should not like to think that I ever rely on the protection of the State. But, if I deny the authority of the State when it presents its tax-bill, it will soon take and waste all my property, and so harass me and my children without end. This is hard. This makes it impossible for a man to live honestly and at the same time comfortably in outward respects. It will not be worth the while to accumulate property; that would be sure to go again. You must hire or squat somewhere, and raise but a small crop, and eat that soon. You must live within yourself, and depend upon yourself, always tucked up and ready for a start, and not have many affairs. A man may grow rich in Turkey even, if he will be in all respects a good subject of the Turkish government. Confucius said, —“If a State is governed by the principles of reason, poverty and misery are subjects of shame; if a State is not governed by the principles of reason, riches and honors are the subjects of shame.” No: until I want the protection of Massachusetts to be extended to me in some distant southern port, where my liberty is endangered, or until I am bent solely on building up an estate at home by peaceful enterprise, I can afford to refuse allegiance to Massachusetts, and her right to my property and life. It costs me less in every sense to incur the penalty of disobedience to the State, than it would to obey. I should feel as if I were worth less in that case.

Some years ago, the State met me in behalf of the church, and commanded me to pay a certain sum toward the support of a clergyman whose preaching my father attended, but never I myself. “Pay it,” it said, “or be locked up in the jail.” I declined to pay. But, unfortunately, another man saw fit to pay it. I did not see why the schoolmaster should be taxed to support the priest, and not the priest the schoolmaster; for I was not the State’s schoolmaster, but I supported myself by voluntary subscription. I did not see why the lyceum should not present its tax-bill, and have the State to back its demand, as well as the church. However, at the request of the selectmen, I condescended to make some such statement as this in writing: —“Know all men by these presents, that I, Henry Thoreau, do not wish to be regarded as a member of any incorporated society which I have not joined.” This I gave to the town-clerk; and he has it. The State, having thus learned that I did not wish to be regarded as a member of that church, has never made a like demand on me since; though it said that it must adhere to its original presumption that time. If I had known how to name them, I should then have signed off in detail from all the societies which I never signed on to; but I did not know where to find such a complete list.

I have paid no poll-tax for six years. I was put into a jail once on this account, for one night; and, as I stood considering the walls of solid stone, two or three feet thick, the door of wood and iron, a foot thick, and the iron grating which strained the light, I could not help being struck with the foolishness of that institution which treated me as if I were mere flesh and blood and bones, to be locked up. I wondered that it should have concluded at length that this was the best use it could put me to, and had never thought to avail itself of my services in some way. I saw that, if there was a wall of stone between me and my townsmen, there was a still more difficult one to climb or break through, before they could get to be as free as I was. I did nor for a moment feel confined, and the walls seemed a great waste of stone and mortar. I felt as if I alone of all my townsmen had paid my tax. They plainly did not know how to treat me, but
behaved like persons who are underbred. In every threat and in every compliment there was a blunder; for they thought that my chief desire was to stand the other side of that stone wall. I could not but smile to see how industriously they locked the door on my meditations, which followed them out again without let or hindrance, and they were really all that was dangerous. As they could not reach me, they had resolved to punish my body; just as boys, if they cannot come at some person against whom they have a spite, will abuse his dog. I saw that the State was half-witted, that it was timid as a lone woman with her silver spoons, and that it did not know its friends from its foes, and I lost all my remaining respect for it, and pitied it.

Thus the state never intentionally confronts a man’s sense, intellectual or moral, but only his body, his senses. It is not armed with superior wit or honesty, but with superior physical strength. I was not born to be forced. I will breathe after my own fashion. Let us see who is the strongest. What force has a multitude? They only can force me who obey a higher law than I. They force me to become like themselves. I do not hear of men being forced to live this way or that by masses of men. What sort of life were that to live? When I meet a government which says to me, “Your money or your life,” why should I be in haste to give it my money? It may be in a great strait, and not know what to do: I cannot help that. It must help itself; do as I do. It is not worth the while to snivel about it. I am not responsible for the successful working of the machinery of society. I am not the son of the engineer. I perceive that, when an acorn and a chestnut fall side by side, the one does not remain inert to make way for the other, but both obey their own laws, and spring and grow and flourish as best they can, till one, perchance, overshadows and destroys the other. If a plant cannot live according to its nature, it dies; and so a man.

The night in prison was novel and interesting enough. The prisoners in their shirt-sleeves were enjoying a chat and the evening air in the door-way, when I entered. But the jailer said, “Come, boys, it is time to lock up;” and so they dispersed, and I heard the sound of their steps returning into the hollow apartments. My room-mate was introduced to me by the jailer as “a first-rate fellow and a clever man.” When the door was locked, he showed me where to hang my hat, and how he managed matters there. The rooms were whitewashed once a month; and this one, at least, was the whitest, most simply furnished, and probably the neatest apartment in town. He naturally wanted to know where I came from, and what brought me there; and, when I had told him, I asked him in my turn how he came there, presuming him to be an honest man, of course; and, as the world goes, I believe he was. “Why,” said he, “they accuse me of burning a barn; but I never did it.” As near as I could discover, he had probably gone to bed in a barn when drunk, and smoked his pipe there; and so a barn was burnt. He had the reputation of being a clever man, had been there some three months waiting for his trial to come on, and would have to wait as much longer; but he was quite domesticated and contented, since he got his board for nothing, and thought that he was well treated.

He occupied one window, and I the other; and I saw, that, if one stayed there long, his principal business would be to look out the window. I had soon read all the tracts that were left there, and examined where former prisoners had broken out, and where a grate had been sawed off, and heard the history of the various occupants of that room; for I found that even here there was a history and a gossip which never circulated beyond the walls of the jail. Probably this is the only house in the town where verses are composed, which are afterward printed in a circular form, but not published. I was shown quite a long list
of verses which were composed by some young men who had been detected in an attempt to escape, who avenged themselves by singing them.

I pumped my fellow-prisoner as dry as I could, for fear I should never see him again; but at length he showed me which was my bed, and left me to blow out the lamp.

It was like travelling into a far country, such as I had never expected to behold, to lie there for one night. It seemed to me that I never had heard the town-clock strike before, nor the evening sounds of the village; for we slept with the windows open, which were inside the grating. It was to see my native village in the light of the Middle Ages, and our Concord was turned into a Rhine stream, and visions of knights and castles passed before me. They were the voices of old burghers that I heard in the streets. I was an involuntary spectator and auditor of whatever was done and said in the kitchen of the adjacent village-inn—a wholly new and rare experience to me. It was a closer view of my native town. I was fairly inside of it. I never had seen its institutions before. This is one of its peculiar institutions; for it is a shire town. I began to comprehend what its inhabitants were about.

In the morning, our breakfasts were put through the hole in the door, in small oblong-square tin pans, made to fit, and holding a pint of chocolate, with brown bread, and an iron spoon. When they called for the vessels again, I was green enough to return what bread I had left; but my comrade seized it, and said that I should lay that up for lunch or dinner. Soon after, he was let out to work at haying in a neighboring field, whither he went every day, and would not be back till noon; so he bade me good-day, saying that he doubted if he should see me again.

When I came out of prison,—for some one interfered, and paid the tax,—I did not perceive that great changes had taken place on the common, such as he observed who went in a youth, and emerged a gray-headed man; and yet a change had to my eyes come over the scene,—the town, and State, and country,—greater than any that mere time could effect. I saw yet more distinctly the State in which I lived. I saw to what extent the people among whom I lived could be trusted as good neighbors and friends; that their friendship was for summer weather only; that they did not greatly purpose to do right; that they were a distinct race from me by their prejudices and superstitions, as the Chinamen and Malays are; that, in their sacrifices to humanity they ran no risks, not even to their property; that, after all, they were not so noble but they treated the thief as he had treated them, and hoped, by a certain outward observance and a few prayers, and by walking in a particular straight though useless path from time to time, to save their souls.

This may be to judge my neighbors harshly; for I believe that most of them are not aware that they have such an institution as the jail in their village.

It was formerly the custom in our village, when a poor debtor came out of jail, for his acquaintances to salute him, looking through their fingers, which were crossed to represent the grating of a jail window, “How do ye do?” My neighbors did not thus salute me, but first looked at me, and then at one another, as if I had returned from a long journey. I was put into jail as I was going to the shoemaker’s to get a shoe which was mended. When I was let out the next morning, I proceeded to finish my errand, and, having put on my mended shoe, joined a huckleberry party, who were impatient to put themselves under my conduct; and in half an hour,—for the horse was soon tackled,—was in the midst of a huckleberry field, on one of our highest hills, two miles off; and then the State was nowhere to be seen.
This is the whole history of “My Prisons.”

I have never declined paying the highway tax, because I am as desirous of being a good neighbor as I am of being a bad subject; and, as for supporting schools, I am doing my part to educate my fellow-countrymen now. It is for no particular item in the tax-bill that I refuse to pay it. I simply wish to refuse allegiance to the State, to withdraw and stand aloof from it effectually. I do not care to trace the course of my dollar, if I could, till it buys a man, or a musket to shoot one with,—the dollar is innocent,—but I am concerned to trace the effects of my allegiance. In fact, I quietly declare war with the State, after my fashion, though I will still make use and get what advantages of her I can, as is usual in such cases.

If others pay the tax which is demanded of me, from a sympathy with the State, they do but what they have already done in their own case, or rather they abet injustice to a greater extent than the State requires. If they pay the tax from a mistaken interest in the individual taxed, to save his property or prevent his going to jail, it is because they have not considered wisely how far they let their private feelings interfere with the public good.

This, then, is my position at present. But one cannot be too much on his guard in such a case, lest his actions be biassed by obstinacy, or an undue regard for the opinions of men. Let him see that he does only what belongs to himself and to the hour.

I think sometimes, Why, this people mean well; they are only ignorant; they would do better if they knew how: why give your neighbors this pain to treat you as they are not inclined to? But I think, again, this is no reason why I should do as they do, or permit others to suffer much greater pain of a different kind. Again, I sometimes say to myself, When many millions of men, without heat, without ill-will, without personal feeling of any kind, demand of you a few shillings only, without the possibility, such is their constitution, of retracting or altering their present demand, and without the possibility, on your side, of appeal to any other millions, why expose yourself to this overwhelming brute force? You do not resist cold and hunger, the winds and the waves, thus obstinately; you quietly submit to a thousand similar necessities. You do not put your head into the fire. But just in proportion as I regard this as not wholly a brute force, but partly a human force, and consider that I have relations to those millions as to so many millions of men, and not of mere brute or inanimate things, I see that appeal is possible, first and instantaneously, from them to the Maker of them, and, secondly, from them to themselves. But, if I put my head deliberately into the fire, there is no appeal to fire or to the Maker of fire, and I have only myself to blame. If I could convince myself that I have any right to be satisfied with men as they are, and to treat them accordingly, and not according, in some respects, to my requisitions and expectations of what they and I ought to be, then, like a good Mussulman and fatalist, I should endeavor to be satisfied with things as they are, and say it is the will of God. And, above all, there is this difference between resisting this and a purely brute or natural force, that I can resist this with some effect; but I cannot expect, like Orpheus, to change the nature of the rocks and trees and beasts.

I do not wish to quarrel with any man or nation. I do not wish to split hairs, to make fine distinctions, or set myself up as better than my neighbors. I seek rather, I may say, even an excuse for conforming to the laws of the land. I am but too ready to conform to them. Indeed I have reason to suspect myself on this head; and each year, as the tax-gatherer comes round, I find myself disposed to review the acts and
position of the general and state governments, and the spirit of the people to discover a pretext for conformity.

“We must affect our country as our parents,
And if at any time we alienate
Out love of industry from doing it honor,
We must respect effects and teach the soul
Matter of conscience and religion,
And not desire of rule or benefit.”

I believe that the State will soon be able to take all my work of this sort out of my hands, and then I shall be no better patriot than my fellow-countrymen. Seen from a lower point of view, the Constitution, with all its faults, is very good; the law and the courts are very respectable; even this State and this American government are, in many respects, very admirable, and rare things, to be thankful for, such as a great many have described them; seen from a higher still, and the highest, who shall say what they are, or that they are worth looking at or thinking of at all?

However, the government does not concern me much, and I shall bestow the fewest possible thoughts on it. It is not many moments that I live under a government, even in this world. If a man is thought-free, fancy-free, imagination-free, that which is not never for a long time appearing to be to him, unwise rulers or reformers cannot fatally interrupt him.

I know that most men think differently from myself; but those whose lives are by profession devoted to the study of these or kindred subjects content me as little as any. Statesmen and legislators, standing so completely within the institution, never distinctly and nakedly behold it. They speak of moving society, but have no resting-place without it. They may be men of a certain experience and discrimination, and have no doubt invented ingenious and even useful systems, for which we sincerely thank them; but all their wit and usefulness lie within certain not very wide limits. They are wont to forget that the world is not governed by policy and expediency. Webster never goes behind government, and so cannot speak with authority about it. His words are wisdom to those legislators who contemplate no essential reform in the existing government; but for thinkers, and those who legislate for all time, he never once glances at the subject. I know of those whose serene and wise speculations on this theme would soon reveal the limits of his mind’s range and hospitality. Yet, compared with the cheap professions of most reformers, and the still cheaper wisdom and eloquence of politicians in general, his are almost the only sensible and valuable words, and we thank Heaven for him. Comparatively, he is always strong, original, and, above all, practical. Still his quality is not wisdom, but prudence. The lawyer’s truth is not Truth, but consistency or a consistent expediency. Truth is always in harmony with herself, and is not concerned chiefly to reveal the justice that may consist with wrong-doing. He well deserves to be called, as he has been called, the Defender of the Constitution. There are really no blows to be given by him but defensive ones. He is not a leader, but a follower. His leaders are the men of ’87. “I have never made an effort,” he says, “and never propose to make an effort; I have never countenanced an effort, and never mean to countenance an effort, to disturb the arrangement as originally made, by which the various States came into the Union.” Still thinking of the sanction which the Constitution gives to slavery, he says, “Because it was part of the original compact,—
let it stand.” Notwithstanding his special acuteness and ability, he is unable to take a fact out of its merely political relations, and behold it as it lies absolutely to be disposed of by the intellect,—what, for instance, it behoves a man to do here in America today with regard to slavery, but ventures, or is driven, to make some such desperate answer as the following, while professing to speak absolutely, and as a private man,—from which what new and singular code of social duties might be inferred?—“The manner,” says he, “in which the governments of those States where slavery exists are to regulate it, is for their own consideration, under the responsibility to their constituents, to the general laws of propriety, humanity, and justice, and to God. Associations formed elsewhere, springing from a feeling of humanity, or any other cause, have nothing whatever to do with it. They have never received any encouragement from me and they never will.” [These extracts have been inserted since the Lecture was read —HDT]

They who know of no purer sources of truth, who have traced up its stream no higher, stand, and wisely stand, by the Bible and the Constitution, and drink at it there with reverence and humanity; but they who behold where it comes trickling into this lake or that pool, gird up their loins once more, and continue their pilgrimage toward its fountain-head.

No man with a genius for legislation has appeared in America. They are rare in the history of the world. There are orators, politicians, and eloquent men, by the thousand; but the speaker has not yet opened his mouth to speak who is capable of settling the much-vexed questions of the day. We love eloquence for its own sake, and not for any truth which it may utter, or any heroism it may inspire. Our legislators have not yet learned the comparative value of free-trade and of freedom, of union, and of rectitude, to a nation. They have no genius or talent for comparatively humble questions of taxation and finance, commerce and manufactures and agriculture. If we were left solely to the wordy wit of legislators in Congress for our guidance, uncorrected by the seasonable experience and the effectual complaints of the people, America would not long retain her rank among the nations. For eighteen hundred years, though perchance I have no right to say it, the New Testament has been written; yet where is the legislator who has wisdom and practical talent enough to avail himself of the light which it sheds on the science of legislation.

The authority of government, even such as I am willing to submit to,—for I will cheerfully obey those who know and can do better than I, and in many things even those who neither know nor can do so well,—is still an impure one: to be strictly just, it must have the sanction and consent of the governed. It can have no pure right over my person and property but what I concede to it. The progress from an absolute to a limited monarchy, from a limited monarchy to a democracy, is a progress toward a true respect for the individual. Even the Chinese philosopher was wise enough to regard the individual as the basis of the empire. Is a democracy, such as we know it, the last improvement possible in government? Is it not possible to take a step further towards recognizing and organizing the rights of man? There will never be a really free and enlightened State, until the State comes to recognize the individual as a higher and independent power, from which all its own power and authority are derived, and treats him accordingly. I please myself with imagining a State at last which can afford to be just to all men, and to treat the individual with respect as a neighbor; which even would not think it inconsistent with its own repose, if a few were to live aloof from it, not meddling with it, nor embraced by it, who fulfilled all the duties of neighbors and fellow-men. A State which bore this kind of fruit, and suffered it to drop off as fast as it
ripened, would prepare the way for a still more perfect and glorious State, which also I have imagined, but not yet anywhere seen.
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### IRELAND IN THE DAYS OF DEAN SWIFT.


INTRODUCTION.

The shifting combinations of party, from the settlement of the constitution at the Revolution to a later period, is an attractive study to any who wish to find the origin of abuses which have long vexed the political life of England. Besides, it is wholesome and instructive to be carried away from the modern difficulty to the broader issues which have gradually led to the present complication.

William III. was a Whig, and his successor a Tory, but except for short periods no Tory party was able in either reign to carry on the government upon Tory principles. William made no complete change of ministry during his reign, only modifying its composition according to what appeared the prevailing sentiment of the parliament or the nation. It was composed of both parties; the Whigs predominated till the close of the reign, when their opponents acquired ascendency. Anne’s first ministry was Tory, but a change was soon wrought by a favourite of the court who happened to be a Whig and who soon turned the scale. Some knowledge of the character of the monarch is indispensable to a clear understanding of the times. In 1702, Anne ascended the throne. The queen’s notions of government were those of her family—narrow and despotic. She would have been as arbitrary in her conduct as Elizabeth, but that her actions were restrained by the imbecility of her mind. The queen was the constant slave of favourites who, in their turn, were the tools of intriguing politicians. Events of the greatest importance were crowded into the short space of the twelve years which covered her reign, and the most distinguished intellects adorned the period.

It was because the queen was fascinated by the Duchess of Marlborough that her reign was adorned by the glories of Ramillies and Blenheim: it was because Mrs. Abigail Masham artfully supplanted her benefactress in royal favour, that a stop was put to the war which ravaged the Continent, while by a chambermaid’s intrigue Bolingbroke triumphed over his rival, the Earl of Oxford.

During the first part of Anne’s reign, Marlborough was paramount in the Houses of Parliament and his wife in the closet. The Tories came into power on the queen’s accession, with Marlborough and Godolphin as leaders. They substantially maintained the policy of King William in prosecuting the war with France, which resulted in making England illustrious in Europe.

Whig principles soon acquired a decided majority in the House, when an act of national importance took place, the effect of which thrilled the empire. The queen and the duchess quarrelled, and the intriguing waiting-maid stepped into the latter’s place. Besides the queen’s whims she had a superstitious reverence for the Church; and had been taught to regard the Whigs as Republicans and Dissenters, who wished to subvert the monarchy. Harley traded on this weakness through the instrumentality of Mrs. Masham. This lady was used by him to oust Marlborough and Godolphin, and she continued the tool of Harley and St. John, who now became the chiefs of the new ministry. A jealousy between these two ministers afterwards sprang up, which finally resulted in a quarrel and separation. St. John, created Viscount Bolingbroke, plotted with Mrs. Masham to procure the crown for the Pretender, but the cabal oozed out and alarmed the Tories. The last night of the queen’s life was spent in listening to an open quarrel between the waiting-maid and the minister. At two o’clock in the morning she went out of the room to die; she had strength, however, to defeat the schemers by consigning the staff of state to Lord Shrewsbury. “Take it,” she said,
“for the good of my country.” They were the last, perhaps the most pathetic words of her life. When Bolingbroke
was defeated, the Whigs came into power and continued in office till the reign of George III.

It was during the reign of William III. that Swift began his political career as a Whig. His patron, Sir William
Temple, introduced him to the king, who was so impressed with his talents that he offered to make him a captain of
dragoons. Had he accepted this offer, he might have become a second Cromwell. As this distinction was declined,
the king promised to see to his future interest. On the death of Temple, Swift edited the works of his patron,
dedicated them to the sovereign, and reminded him of his promise. Neither the dedication nor the memorial was
noticed. Swift had to fall back on the post of chaplain and private secretary to the Earl of Berkeley, one of the Lords
Justices of Ireland. He became a political writer on the side of the Whigs, and associated with Addison, Steele, and
Halifax. From the party leaders he received scores of promises and in the end was neglected. The cup of preferment
was twice dashed from his hand; on the first occasion when Lord Berkeley would have given him a bishopric, his
name was vetoed by the Primate on the grounds of his youth, and on the second when he was named for a vacant
canonry, but at the last moment the prize was given to another.

During Anne’s reign Swift paid frequent visits to England, and became closely connected with the leading Tories. In
1710 he broke with the Whigs and united with Harley and the Tory administration. The five last years of Anne’s
government found him playing a prominent part in English politics as the leading political writer of the Tories. He
was on terms of the closest intimacy with Oxford (Harley) and Bolingbroke, and attempted to heal the breach
between the rival statesmen. He helped the Tories in a paper called the Examiner, upholding the policy of the
ministers and supplying his party with the arguments they would have used if they had had the brains to think of
them. This series of articles culminated in the “Conduct of the Allies,” a pamphlet which brought about the disgrace
of Marlborough and made the peace popular. In it the author denounced the war as the plot of a ring of Whig stock-
jobbers and monied men. These weekly papers in the Examiner produced a great effect upon the public mind and
called forth a multitude of opponents. Swift gave the Press the wonderful position it holds now. He almost created
the “leading article;” and though his contributions will not bear comparison with the light style of our own day, they
suited his times. They were written in a plain, homely style, for Swift had a thorough contempt for abstract thought
and abstract politics; indeed, his low estimate of men convinced him that they were about as good for flying as for
thinking. Mr. Leslie Stephen aptly states that Swift’s pamphlets were rather “blows than words;” he had serious
political effects to produce, and what he had to prove it was necessary to say in plain words, for honest Tory squires
of the country party to understand and obey.

The Examiner, the Medley, the Tattler, and the pamphlets of that day bear no analogy to the modern newspaper;
their influence did not penetrate to the lower classes of the community, who were still without education.

Swift is condemned by many who are not conversant with his character, his writings, or the times in which he lived.
In detached views, no man was more liable to be misunderstood; his individual acts must be compared with his
entire conduct, in order to give him his proper place in the gallery of historical characters. The charge of deserting
his party is answered by Dr. Johnson, whose evidence is of greater value as he never professed to be his friend.
“Swift, by early education, had been associated with the Whigs; but he deserted them when they deserted their
principles, yet he never ran into the opposite extreme; for he continued throughout his life to retain the disposition
which he assigned to the Church of England man, of thinking commonly with the Whigs of the State and with the Tories of the Church.”

“Swift,” say his opponents, “rails at the whole human race;” so he does, and so do we all, at particular times and seasons; when long experience has shown us the selfishness of some, the hollowness of others, and the base ingratitude of the world. Not having lifted his voice in protestation against the terrible penal laws inflicted on his Catholic brethren, and enacted before his door, is, perhaps, the heaviest indictment brought against his name, and the one which, on examination, will prove the most futile. He was the last man who, from his connection with a discarded Tory party, could have taken action with any effect; for if he had made the attempt, and if complaints had originated from it, they would have been interpreted into murmurs of rebellion. One revolt had been put down in Scotland, in which it was supposed that every Catholic in Ireland was implicated, and another which was hatching in the country, broke out in 1745; consequently, any interference of Swift on behalf of the Roman Catholics would have drawn upon him the total displeasure of the government and have caused him to be voted an enemy to his country, as was done in the case of Lucas, twenty years after. His words on another occasion show that he was not wanting in sympathy towards the native Irish. “The English should be ashamed of the reproaches they cast on their ignorance, dullness, and want of courage; defects arising only from the poverty and slavery they suffer from their inhuman neighbours, and the base, corrupt spirit of too many of the gentry. By such treatment as this the very Grecians are grown slavish, ignorant, and superstitious. I do assert that from several experiments I have made in travelling in both England and Ireland, I have found the poor cottagers in the latter kingdom, who could speak our language, to have a much better natural taste for good sense, humour, and raillery than ever I observed among people of the sort in England. But the million of oppressions the national Irish lie under, the tyranny of their landlords, the ridiculous zeal of their priests and the general misery of the whole nation, have been enough to damp the best spirits under the sun.”

When Swift’s friends were out of power, Oxford no longer at Court and Bolingbroke in exile, he returned to Ireland, and after visiting several parts of the country, and making himself acquainted with the exact condition of the people, he took up the cause of Ireland with a vigour rarely exhibited by any patriot. The last twenty-five years of his sane life were given to his country, during which time he devoted almost all his energy to Irish concerns. His stern sense of justice prompted him to lay bare the wrongs of his native land with the cool calculation of a banker examining accounts, or that of a surgeon cutting open a tumour. His letters, pamphlets, and sermons are full of allusions to the miseries and disabilities of the Irish. In writing to Pope, he disclaims the title of Patriot, and gives us exactly his motive. “What I do,” he says, “is owing to perfect rage and resentment, and the mortifying sight of slavery, folly, and baseness about me, among which I am forced to live.” It is said that he was a disappointed, mortified man. I allow he was. Swift was ill-used as well as his country. Was he therefore not to resent the injuries offered her because wrongs were heaped on himself, or, after remaining quiet under the disappointments of years, are we to suppose that at the end of that period his own private grievances ceased to be intolerable, and that the public provocations which became urgent had no effect upon him?

About 1720, a narrow, exclusive clique governed Ireland in avowed contempt of all phases of Irish opinion. The need of reform had occupied the attention only of an insignificant handful. None had yet succeeded in rousing a national spirit to resist the people’s wrongs, an over-insistence of which wrongs was looked upon as veiled Jacobitism. No doubt Swift’s first motive was opposition to Walpole and his party. He looked back with bitterness to
the fall of his friends. He disliked the cant of the Whigs and their travesty of liberty; from that moment his real interest in Ireland began. Swift scorned Jacobitism, and had a righteous contempt for “divine right and absolute prerogative.” He justified the Revolution; was opposed to a Popish successor; had a mortal antipathy to a standing army in time of peace; desired that parliaments should be annual; disliked the monied interest in opposition to the territorial; feared the growth of the national debt; and dreaded further encroachments on the liberty of the subject. He believed the Whig government of Ireland to be founded on corruption. All these opinions went to swell the current of his indignation against Irish wrongs, and it was in consequence of them that he lashed the government with his scorpion pen.

The papers written by Swift during the years 1720 to 1734 are now little studied by the people or their representatives; nevertheless, if carefully examined, they will be found useful in throwing light upon the unsolved problem. They deal with everything connected with the country: with banks, currency, agriculture, fisheries, grazing, beggars, planting, bog-reclaiming and road-making; and all in a style peculiarly his own, a style seldom equalled and never surpassed. His pictures of the state of the country present curious parallels to what we find today. There are, of course, references to grievances which have long ceased to exist; such as the penal laws, and the restriction on trade, but there are many long-standing evils which are not much better now than they were in Swift’s day. The rack-renting, absentee landlords are more numerous in 1887 than they were in 1730, while the improvements effected by the tenants were as much a dead loss of capital in the time of Swift, as in the days of Gladstone.

The secret of Swift’s forcible utterances is that he infused himself into everything he wrote; and his writings, in consequence, exhibit, not merely his intellectual power, but also his moral nature, his principles, his prejudices, even his temper. Swift possessed the most masculine intellect of his age, and was the most earnest thinker of his times. He wrote like a man of the world, and a gentleman; scorning the conceits of rhetorical flourish, and never stooping to ad misericordiam appeals for sympathy.

Of all writers of the English language, his style most approximates to that of the old orators of Greece in force, rapidity, directness, dexterity, luminous statement, and honest homeliness. The reader is impelled with his vigour, as a soldier by the blast of a trumpet; while his feelings are captivated by his author’s manifest sincerity; his outburst of derisive scorn and withering invective, alternately heat and chill the blood. Perhaps his merit is most revealed in the profound sagacity of his political observations, infusing into his country that spirit which enabled her to demand those rights she at last established. Swift’s character rose in Ireland with his defence of it in 1724; for, by his conduct then, he acquired an esteem and influence which can never be forgotten. The question of consideration at that day was not whether Wood’s halfpence were good or bad:—the question was, whether an enterprising manufacturer of copper should prevail against Ireland. An insulting patent, obtained in the most insidious way, was issued by the British Cabinet without consulting the legitimate rulers of the country. Against it the grand juries protested, the corporations protested, the Irish parliament protested. All failed. At last there stood forth a private clergyman, whose party was proscribed and himself persecuted, and he carried the country at his back and forced the British minister to retire within his trenches. Ireland, trampled on by a British minister, by a British and Irish parliament; Ireland that had lost her trade, her judicature, her parliament; sunk with the weight of oppression, prevails under the direction of a solitary priest, who not only inspired but instructed his countrymen in a magnificent vindication of their liberty and the most noble repudiation of dependence ever taught a nation; telling them, “that by
the law of God, of nature, of nations, and of their country they are and ought to be as free a people as their brethren in England.”

The patriot rose above the divine. He taught his country to protest against her grievances, and gave her a spirit by which she redressed them. Besides, he created a public opinion in “a nation of slaves” and used it as a political force against a vicious system of government. “For my own part,” says Swift, referring to the imposition of the copper coinage, “who am but a man of obscure condition, I do solemnly declare in the presence of Almighty God that I will suffer the most ignominious torturing death, rather than submit to receive this accursed coin, or any other that shall be liable to these objections, until they shall be forced upon me by a law of my own country, and if that shall ever happen, I will transport myself into some foreign land, and eat the bread of poverty among a free people.”

And who was this man who touched with fire the hearts of a nation and played on their feelings as a skilful musician runs his fingers over the keys of an instrument? A simple journalist, of obscure origin, without rank or station, with nothing but a beggarly Irish living to fall back upon, yet endowed with heaven-born genius and the pride of an insulted god. He treated art like man: with the same sovereign pride scribbling his articles in haste, scorning the wretched necessity for reading them over, putting his name to nothing he wrote; letting every piece make its way on its own merits, recommended by none. Swift had the soul of a dictator and the heart of a woman.

This self-devouring heart could not understand the callousness and indifference of the world. He asked: “Do not the corruptions and villainies of men eat your flesh and consume your spirits?” Swift, like his great Master, was moved by compassion for the multitude. He knew what poverty and scorn were, even at an age when the mind expands and the path of life is sown with generous hopes. At that time, his career was crushed with the iron ring of poverty; maintained by the alms of his family; secretary to a flattered, gouty courtier, at the magnificent salary of 20l. a year, and a seat at the servants’ table: obliged to submit to the whims of my lord and the fancies of an acidulous virgin, my lord’s sister; lured with false hopes; and forced, after an attempt at independence, to resume the livery which scorched his soul. When writing his directions to servants, he was relating with bitterness what he himself had suffered; his proud heart bursting at the memory of indignities received while his lips were locked. Under an outward calm, a tempest of wrath and desire lashed his soul. Twenty years of insult and humiliation, the inner tempest raging, as all his brilliant dreams faded from hope deferred;—such was the man who moved his country to its centre and won her eternal gratitude.

In discussing the burning topics of the day, Swift had against him the king, his parliament, and all the people of England, together with the Irish government and the Irish judges. The Irish parliament, whose cause he defended, could not have saved him: that sycophant assembly could not save itself, and was besides so lowered and debased by the over-ruling power of England, that it was more likely to become his prosecutor than his protector. Swift stood like Atlas, unmoved, and so laid the foundation of his country’s liberty.

“Swift was honoured,” says Johnson, “by the populace of Ireland as their champion, patron, and instructor, and gained such power as, considered both in its extent and duration, scarce any man has ever enjoyed without greater wealth or higher station. The benefit was indeed great. He had rescued Ireland from a very oppressive and predatory invasion: and the popularity which he had gained he was very diligent to keep, by appearing forward and zealous on every occasion when the public interest was supposed to be involved. He showed clearly that wit, confederated with
truth, had such fire as authority was not able to resist. He said truly of himself that Ireland was his debtor. It was from this time, when he first began to patronize the Irish, that they may date their riches and prosperity. He taught them first to know their own interest, their weight and their strength; and gave them spirit to assert that equality with their fellow-subjects, to which they have ever since been making vigorous advances, and to claim those rights which they have at last established. Nor can they be charged with ingratitude to their benefactor, for they reverenced him as a guardian and obeyed him as a dictator.”

The birth of political and patriotic spirit in Ireland may be traced to the “Drapier’s Letters.” No agitation that has since taken place in the country has been so immediately and completely successful. The whole power of the English government was found ineffectual to cope with the opposition that had been roused, and marshalled by one man. The Letters brought Swift fame and influence, and from the date of their publication, he became the most powerful and popular man in Ireland. The Irish obeyed his words as if they were the fiat of an oracle.

Swift was no hack writer, lending his pen to any administration that paid for his services; his individuality placed him above the herd of writers, and he scorned to be used in this way. When Harley sent him a 50l. cheque for his first articles in the *Examiner*, he returned it, and haughtily demanded an apology, which was promptly given. He warned the ministers that he acted with them on terms of equality, and that he would not tolerate even coldness on their part; “for it is what I would hardly bear from a crowned head; no subject’s favour was worth it.” He afterwards explained, “If we let these great ministers pretend too much, there will be no governing them.”

After the publication of the fourth Drapier’s Letter, the government offered a reward for the apprehension of the printer; Swift was so enraged at this proceeding that he suddenly entered the reception-room, elbowed his way up to the Lord-Lieutenant, and, with indignation on his countenance and thunder in his voice, said: “So, my Lord, this is a glorious exploit you performed yesterday in suffering a proclamation against a poor shop-keeper, whose only crime is an honest endeavour to save his country from ruin;” and then added, with a bitter laugh, “I suppose your lordship will expect a statue in copper for your services to Mr. Wood.”

The accession of George I. exiled Swift to Ireland, at that time the most impoverished country on the face of the globe. Swift regarded Dublin as a “good enough place to die in.” No wonder, when he showed that there were not found in it five gentlemen who could give a dinner at which a scholar and gentleman could find congenial companionship. Ireland then was in a state of national ruin and semi-barbarism; one of the most palpable evils of Irish life was absenteeism. It was the habit of the English officials elected to remunerative offices, to employ a deputy to perform the duty on the tenth of the salary—to come over in batches, landing at Ringsend on Saturday night, receiving the sacrament at the nearest church on Sunday morning, taking the oaths on Monday in the Courts, and setting sail for England in the afternoon, leaving no trace of their existence in Ireland, save their names on the civil list as recipients of a salary.

Out of a total rental of 1,800,000l. about 600,000l. was spent in England. There was nothing to encourage a landlord to live in the country; no political career was open to him; all the offices in his country went to strangers. He was without education or any intellectual interest; nothing was left him but lavish displays of brutal luxury, endless carouses, and barbaric hospitality. The Irish landlords were despised for their rude manners by the fresh importations from England; they repaid this contempt on their tenants.
The vast majority of the Catholics were without the protection of the law; absolutely ignorant and sunk in an abyss of poverty. The poor peasant, as soon as the potatoes were planted, shut up his damp, smoky hut, and started soliciting alms through the country: idle and lazy, he wandered from house to house. Begging became a recognized profession. Adept were hired to complete the family group, and these shared the spoils of the season; girls were debauched, in order that they might, as fictitious widows, move compassion and earn alms. In winter they camped together in companies; the length and breadth of the country was cursed with a brood of hedgers, born of adultery and incest, herding together in troops, when the ties of relationship were as completely lost as in a herd of cattle.

The English clique at the Castle were too much occupied in checking fancied disaffection and dispensing patronage to secure the support of hungry partisans, to care for the welfare of the masses. The local gentry, despised by the governing clique, allowed matters to drift from bad to worse. The better part of the population left the country in disgust. Such was the condition of Ireland when Swift stood out as its defender. The wrongs of Ireland cried to heaven for adjustment.

Since the days of Charles II. the Irish had been forbidden to seek a market in England for their cattle. Since the last years of William III. harsh laws crushed out the woollen trade, restricting it to a precarious market formed by a contraband trade with France, every year getting worse. Misery wanted only a voice to utter its lamentation. Swift assumed this function in his “Proposal for the universal use of manufactures,” published in 1720. Comments on the pamphlets are needless.

The evil of absenteeism was of ancient date and the efforts to eradicate it still older. By a statute of Richard II., two-thirds of the estate of an absentee were forfeited to the Crown. The Lancastrian kings pursued the same policy. Henry VIII. made a strong effort to correct the abuse, by resuming whole Irish estates of some English nobles who were habitual absenteees. Under the early Stuarts the same course was pursued, but the evil continues to our own day without any abatement. In Swift’s time, residence had not been encouraged; statutes to enforce it remained on the statute-book, but they were a dead letter. The landlord drew the rent from Ireland, without helping to pay the taxes. He spent it in England and frequently more than the amount, leaving the estates encumbered with mortgages in the hands of English mortgagees. The holder of an Irish office thought only of its emoluments, and was indignant at any suggestion of living in the country burdened with his support, and nominally entitled to his services. The land was reduced to a state of bankruptcy and desolation; famine swept through it, and the people were perishing in thousands. It was at this terrible juncture that Swift put forth in despair his “Modest Proposal,” one of the last efforts of his marvellous genius, and it shamed the government into taking some steps to redress the suffering which prevailed.

“Swift’s pieces relating to Ireland,” says Edmund Burke, “are those of a public nature, in which the Dean appears, as usual, in the best light, because they do honour to his heart as well as his head, furnishing some additional proofs, that though he was very free in his abuse of the inhabitants of that country, as well natives as foreigners, he had their interest sincerely at heart, and perfectly understood it. His sermon on doing good, though peculiarly adapted to Ireland, and Wood’s design upon it, contains perhaps the best motives to Patriotism that was ever delivered within so small a compass.”
There is no need to refer here to the other works of genius that came from his pen; they are well known. The object of the present writer is to deal exclusively with what has reference to Ireland, and while exhibiting Swift as a patriot, no attempt is made to exclude his faults or deny his imperfections; those faults were redeemed by devoted friendship and noble generosity.

His friendship with Addison continued till the day of his death, and so strong was the bond between them, that when the two met for an evening, they never wished for a third person to support or enliven the conversation. Of him, Pope said:—“Nothing of you can die; nothing of you can decay; nothing of you can suffer; nothing of you can be obscured or locked up from esteem and admiration, except what is at the Deanery. May the rest of you be as happy hereafter as honest men may expect and need not doubt, while they know that their Maker is merciful.” One can imagine how dear he was to those friends, when Bolingbroke writes:—“I love you for a thousand things, for none more than for the just esteem and love which you have for all the sons of Adam.” No one esteemed Swift more than Lord Carteret, who, when hearing of his illness, wrote:—“That you may enjoy the continuation of all happiness is my wish. As to futurity I know your name will be remembered, when the names of Kings, Lord-Lieutenants, Archbishops, and Parliamentary politicians will be forgotten. At last you yourself must fall into oblivion, which may be less than one thousand years, though the term may be uncertain and will depend on the progress that barbarity and ignorance may make, notwithstanding the sedulous endeavours of the great Prelates in this and succeeding ages.”

The account of Swift thus coming from men of the greatest genius of their age, carries with it incontestable evidence in his favour, and completely pulverizes the slanderous accusations heaped on him by his enemies. The manly tone of his writing penetrated the character of the whole English colony and bore fruit, long after the proud heart was laid at rest in the great Irish cathedral. The place is marked by an inscription written by himself, and touchingly refers to a time when the heart can no longer be tortured with fierce indignation born from the contemplation of licensed injustice. The character of Swift has long been vindicated, for animosity perishes, but humanity is eternal.

THE DRAPIER’S LETTERS.

There was a lack of copper coin in Ireland, which hampered the small transactions of the poor, and rendered the payment of weekly or daily wages a matter of difficulty. This want was reported to the English Cabinet; it was taken up, not as a grievance to be met with redress, but as a new opportunity for a job. A patent to make a copper coinage was granted to William Wood, a gentleman whose antecedents were not creditable. According to the habits of the day, the patent had to pass through various officials, each of whom had doubtless to be paid: a sort of black-mail on the transaction. The amount of the coinage had to be large to enable Wood to recoup himself and make his own
profit. It was fixed at 108,000l., a sum vastly in excess of its need. The greatest share of the plunder was to fall to
the king’s mistress. The Duchess of Kendal was to receive 10,000l. from Wood, to whom she farmed the patent. It
was from the bottom to the top a scandalous job, and to add to its depravity, it was passed without consulting the
responsible governors of the country. It was only when all efforts to defeat its passage were concluded, that Swift
stepped in. The indignation of the country had risen to boiling-point; he gave it a voice. In describing the patent,
Swift exaggerated its consequences. It is absurd to suppose that what he said of it was absolutely true, or that Swift
thought it to be true. His object was to put a scandalous transaction in the grossest aspect possible. Swift adopted
the ordinary recognized methods of political controversy. Apart from exaggeration, there was enough of injustice in the
matter to justify any language which would tend to remove it.

LETTER I.

To the Tradesmen, Shopkeepers, Farmers, and Country-people in
general, of the Kingdom of Ireland,

Concerning the brass halfpence coined by one William Wood,
Hardwareman, with a design to have them pass in this kingdom!

Wherein is shewn the power of his Patent, the value of his Halfpence,
and how far every person may be obliged to take the same in
payments, and how to behave himself, in case such an attempt
should be made by Wood, or any other person.

(VERY PROPER TO BE KEPT IN EVERY FAMILY.)

By M. B., DRAPIER, 1724.

BRETHREN, FRIENDS, COUNTRYMEN, AND FELLOW-SUBJECTS.

What I intend now to say to you, is, next to your duty to God, and the care of your salvation, of the greatest concern
to yourselves and your children; your bread and clothing, and every common necessary of life, depend entirely upon
it. Therefore I do most earnestly exhort you as men, as Christians, as parents, and as lovers of your country, to read
this paper with the utmost attention, or get it read to you by others; which, that you may do at the less expense, I
have ordered the printer to sell it at the lowest rate.

It is a great fault among you, that when a person writes with no other intention than to do you good, you will not be
at the pains to read his advices. One copy of this paper may serve a dozen of you, which will be less than a farthing
apiece. It is your folly, that you have no common or general interest in your view, not even the wisest among you;
neither do you know, or inquire, or care, who are your friends, or who are your enemies.

About four years ago, a little book was written to advise all people to wear the manufactures of this our own dear
country.[1] It had no other design, said nothing against the King or Parliament, or any persons whatever; yet the poor
printer was prosecuted two years with the utmost violence, and even some weavers themselves (for whose sake it was written), being upon the jury, found him guilty. This would be enough to discourage any man from endeavouring to do you good, when you will either neglect him, or fly in his face for his pains, and when he must expect only danger to himself, and to be fined and imprisoned, perhaps to his ruin.

However, I cannot but warn you once more of the manifest destruction before your eyes, if you do not behave yourself, as you ought.

I will therefore first tell you the plain story of the fact, and then I will lay before you how you ought to act, in common prudence according to the laws of your country.

The fact is this: It having been many years since copper halfpence or farthings were last coined in this kingdom, they have been for some time very scarce, and many counterfeits passed about under the name of raps, several applications were made to England that we might have liberty to coin new ones, as in former times we did; but they did not succeed. At last, one Mr. Wood, a mean ordinary man, a hardware dealer, procured a patent under his Majesty’s broad seal to coin 108,000l. in copper for this kingdom; which patent, however, did not oblige any one here to take them, unless they pleased. Now you must know, that the halfpence and farthings in England pass for very little more than they are worth; and if you should beat them to pieces, and sell them to the brazier, you would not lose much above a penny in a shilling. But Mr. Wood made his halfpence of such base metal, and so much smaller than the English ones, that the brazier would not give you above a penny of good money for a shilling of his; so that this sum of 108,000l. in good gold and silver, must be given for trash, that will not be worth eight or nine thousand pounds real value. But this is not the worst; for Mr. Wood, when he pleases, may, by stealth, send over another 108,000l., and buy all our goods for eleven parts in twelve under the value. For example, if a hatter sells a dozen of hats for five shillings apiece, which amounts to three pounds, and receives the payment in Wood’s coin, he really receives only the value of five shillings.

Perhaps you will wonder how such an ordinary fellow as this Mr. Wood could have so much interest as to get his Majesty’s broad seal for so great a sum of bad money to be sent to this poor country; and that all the nobility and gentry here could not obtain the same favour, and let us make our own halfpence, as we used to do. Now I will make that matter very plain: We are at a great distance from the King’s court, and have nobody there to solicit for us, although a great number of lords and squires, whose estates are here, and are our countrymen, spend all their lives and fortunes there; but this same Mr. Wood was able to attend constantly for his own interest; he is an Englishman, and had great friends; and, it seems, knew very well where to give money to those that would speak to others, that could speak to the King, and would tell a fair story. And his Majesty, and perhaps the great lord or lords who advise him, might think it was for our country’s good; and so, as the lawyers express it, “The King was deceived in his grant,” which often happens in all reigns. And I am sure if his Majesty knew that such a patent, if it should take effect according to the desire of Mr. Wood, would utterly ruin this kingdom, which has given such great proofs of its loyalty, he would immediately recall it, and perhaps show his displeasure to somebody or other; but a word to the wise is enough. Most of you must have heard with what anger our honourable House of Commons received an account of this Wood’s patent. There were several fine speeches made upon it, and plain proofs that it was all a wicked cheat from the bottom to the top; and several smart votes were printed, which that same Wood had
the assurance to answer likewise in print; and in so confident a way, as if he were a better man than our whole Parliament put together.

This Wood, as soon as his patent was passed, or soon after, sends over a great many barrels of those halfpence to Cork, and other seaport towns; and to get them off, offered a hundred pounds in his coin, for seventy or eighty in silver; but the collectors of the King’s customs very honestly refused to take them, and so did almost everybody else. And since the Parliament has condemned them, and desired the King that they might be stopped, all the kingdom do abominate them.

But Wood is still working underhand to force his halfpence upon us; and if he can, by the help of his friends in England, prevail so far as to get an order, that the commissioners and collectors of the King’s money shall receive them, and that the army is to be paid with them, then he thinks his work shall be done. And this is the difficulty you will be under in such a case: for the common soldier, when he goes to the market, or alehouse, will offer this money; and if it be refused, perhaps he will swagger and hector, and threaten to beat the butcher or ale-wife, or take the goods by force, and throw them the bad halfpence. In this and the like cases, the shopkeeper or victualler, or any other tradesman, has no more to do, than to demand ten times the price of his goods, if it is to be paid in Wood’s money; for example, twenty pence of that money for a quart of ale and so in all things else, and not part with his goods till he gets the money.

For, suppose you go to an ale-house with that base money, and the landlord gives you a quart for four of those halfpence, what must the victualler do? his brewer will not be paid in that coin; or, if the brewer should be such a fool, the farmers will not take it from them for their bere,[3] because they are bound, by their leases, to pay their rent in good and lawful money of England; which this is not, nor of Ireland neither; and the ’squire, their landlord, will never be so bewitched to take such trash for his land; so that it must certainly stop somewhere or other; and wherever it stops, it is the same thing, and we are all undone.

The common weight of these halfpence is between four and five to an ounce—suppose five, then three shillings and four pence will weigh a pound, and consequently twenty shillings will weigh six pounds butter weight. Now there are many hundred farmers, who pay two hundred pounds a year rent; therefore, when one of these farmers comes with his half-year’s rent, which is one hundred pounds, it will be at least six hundred pounds’ weight, which is three horses’ load.

If a ’squire has a mind to come to town to buy clothes and wine, and spices for himself and family, or perhaps to pass the winter here, he must bring with him five or six horses well loaden with sacks, as the farmers bring their corn; and when his lady comes in her coach to our shops, it must be followed by a car loaded with Mr. Wood’s money. And I hope we shall have the grace to take it for no more than it is worth.

They say ’Squire Conolly[4] has sixteen thousand pounds a-year; now, if he sends for his rent to town, as it is likely he does, he must have two hundred and fifty horses to bring up his half-year’s rent, and two or three great cellars in his house for stowage. But what the bankers will do I cannot tell; for I am assured, that some great bankers keep by them forty thousand pounds in ready cash, to answer all payments; which sum, in Mr. Wood’s money, would require twelve hundred horses to carry it.
For my own part, I am already resolved what to do; I have a pretty good shop of Irish stuffs and silks; and instead of taking Mr. Wood's bad copper, I intend to truck with my neighbours, the butchers, and bakers, and brewers, and the rest, goods for goods; and the little gold and silver I have, I will keep by me, like my heart's blood, till better times, or until I am just ready to starve; and then I will buy Mr. Wood's money, as my father did the brass money in King James's time,[5] who could buy ten pounds of it with a guinea; and I hope to get as much for a pistole, and so purchase bread from those who will be such fools as to sell it me. These halfpence, if they once pass, will soon be counterfeited, because it may be cheaply done, the stuff is so base. The Dutch, likewise, will probably do the same thing, and send them over to us to pay for our goods; and Mr. Wood will never be at rest, but coin on: so that in some years we shall have at least five times 108,000l. of this lumber. Now the current money of this kingdom is not reckoned to be above four hundred thousand pounds in all; and while there is a silver sixpence left, these bloodsuckers will never be quiet. When once the kingdom is reduced to such a condition, I will tell you what must be the end: the gentlemen of estates will all turn off their tenants for want of payments, because, as I told you before, the tenants are obliged by their leases to pay sterling, which is lawful current money of England; then they will turn their own farmers, as too many of them do already, run all into sheep, where they can, keeping only such other cattle as are necessary; then they will be their own merchants, and send their wool, and butter, and hides, and linen beyond sea, for ready money, and wine, and spices, and silks. They will keep only a few miserable cottagers; the farmers must rob, or beg, or leave their country; the shopkeepers in this, and every other town, must break and starve; for it is the landed man that maintains the merchant, and shopkeeper, and handicraftsman.

But when the 'squire turns farmer and merchant himself, all the good money he gets from abroad he will hoard up to send for England, and keep some poor tailor or weaver and the like in his own house, who will be glad to get bread at any rate.

I should never have done, if I were to tell you all the miseries that we shall undergo, if we be so foolish and wicked as to take this cursed coin. It would be very hard if all Ireland should be put into one scale, and this sorry fellow, Wood, into the other; that Mr. Wood should weigh down this whole kingdom, by which England gets above a million of good money every year clear into their pockets; and that is more than the English do by all the world besides.

But your great comfort is, that as his Majesty's patent does not oblige you to take this money, so the laws have not given the crown a power of forcing the subject to take what money the King pleases; for then, by the same reason, we might be bound to take pebble-stones, or cockle-shells, or stamped leather, for current coin, if ever we should happen to live under an ill prince; who might likewise, by the same power, make a guinea pass for ten pounds, a shilling for twenty shillings, and so on; by which he would, in a short time, get all the silver and gold of the kingdom into his own hands, and leave us nothing but brass or leather, or what he pleased. Neither is anything reckoned more cruel and oppressive in the French government than their common practice of calling in all their money, after they have sunk it very low, and then coining it anew at a much higher value; which, however, is not the thousandth part so wicked as this abominable project of Mr. Wood. For the French give their subjects silver for silver, and gold for gold; but this fellow will not so much as give us good brass or copper for our gold and silver, nor even a twelfth part of their worth. Having said thus much, I will now go on to tell you the judgment of some great lawyers in this matter, whom I fee'd on purpose for your sakes, and got their opinions under their hands, that I
might be sure I went upon good grounds.... I will now, my dear friends, to save you the trouble, set before you, in short, what the law obliges you to do, and what it does not oblige you to.

First, you are obliged to take all money in payments which is coined by the King, and is of the English standard or weight, provided it be of gold or silver.

Secondly, you are not obliged to take any money which is not of gold or silver; not only the halfpence or farthings of England, but of any other country. And it is merely for convenience or ease, that you are content to take them; because the custom of coining silver halfpence and farthings has long been left off; I suppose on account of their being subject to be lost.

Thirdly, much less are you obliged to take those vile halfpence of the same Wood, by which you must lose almost eleven pence in every shilling. Therefore, my friends, stand to it one and all; refuse this filthy trash. It is no treason to rebel against Mr. Wood. His Majesty in his patent, obliges nobody to take these halfpence, our gracious prince has no such ill-advisers about him; or, if he had, yet you see the laws have not left it in the King’s power to force us to take any coin but what is lawful, of right standard, gold and silver. Therefore you have nothing to fear.

And let me in the next place apply myself particularly to you who are the poorer sort of tradesmen. Perhaps you may think you will not be so great losers as the rich, if these halfpence should pass; because you seldom see any silver, and your customers come to your shops or stalls with nothing but brass, which you likewise find hard to be got. But you may take my word, whenever this money gains footing among you, you will be utterly undone. If you carry these halfpence to a shop for tobacco or brandy, or any other thing that you want, the shopkeeper will advance his goods accordingly, or else he must break, and leave the key under the door. “Do you think I will sell you a yard of tenpenny stuff for twenty of Mr. Wood’s halfpence? No, not under two hundred at least; neither will I be at the trouble of counting, but weigh them in a lump.” I will tell you one thing farther, that if Mr. Wood’s project should take, it would ruin even our beggars; for when I give a beggar a halfpenny, it will quench his thirst, or go a good way to fill his belly; but the twelfth part of a halfpenny will do him no more service than if I should give him three pins out of my sleeve.

In short, these halfpence are like “the accursed thing, which,” as the Scripture tells us, “the children of Israel were forbidden to touch.” They will run about like the plague, and destroy every one who lays his hand upon them. I have heard scholars talk of a man who told the King, that he had invented a way to torment people, by putting them into a bull of brass with fire under it; but the prince put the projector first into it, to make the experiment. This very much resembles the project of Mr. Wood; and the like of this may probably be Mr. Wood’s fate; that the brass he contrived to torment this kingdom with, may prove his own torment, and his destruction at last.

N.B. The author of this paper is informed by persons, who have made it their business to be exact in their observations on the true value of these halfpence, that any person may expect to get a quart of twopenny ale for thirty-six of them.

I desire that all families may keep this paper carefully by them, to refresh their memories whenever they shall have farther notice of Mr. Wood’s halfpence, or any other the like imposture.
SECOND LETTER.

Walpole recommended his Majesty to compromise the grave issue which had risen. An order was issued restricting the importation of Wood’s copper coin to the sum of 40,000l. instead of 108,000l., to be current only amongst those who should be willing to accept them. But the dispute had risen too high to admit of accommodation. The real grievance of this measure lay rather in its principle than its immediate effects. The merits and details of the question are now laid aside. Even Wood is almost forgotten in the vehemence of rage, that a nation should be exposed to the menaces or mercies of such an adventurer.

LETTER II.

To Mr. Harding, the Printer,

On occasion of a paragraph in his newspaper of August 1, 1724, relating to Mr. Wood’s halfpence.

August 4, 1724.

In your Newsletter of the first instant, there is a paragraph, dated from London, July 25, relating to Wood’s halfpence; whereby it is plain, what I foretold in my letter to the shopkeepers, &c., that this vile fellow would never be at rest; and that the danger of our ruin approaches nearer; and therefore the kingdom requires new and fresh warning. However, I take this paragraph to be, in a great measure, an imposition upon the public; at least I hope so, because I am informed that Mr. Wood is generally his own newswriter. I cannot but observe from that paragraph, that this public enemy of ours, not satisfied to ruin us with his trash, takes every occasion to treat this kingdom with the utmost contempt. He represents several of our merchants and traders, upon examination before a committee of council, agreeing, that there was the utmost necessity of copper money here, before his patent; so that several gentlemen have been forced to tally with their workmen, and give them bits of cards sealed and subscribed with their names. What then? If a physician prescribe to a patient a dram of physic, shall a rascal apothecary cram him with a pound, and mix it up with poison? And is not a landlord’s hand and seal to his own labourers a better security for five or ten shillings, than Wood’s brass, ten times below the real value, can be to the kingdom for a hundred and eight thousand pounds?

Who are these merchants and traders of Ireland that made this report of the utmost necessity we are under for copper money? They are only a few betrayers of their country, confederates with Wood, from whom they are to purchase a great quantity of coin, perhaps at half the price that we are to take it, and vend it among us to the ruin of the public, and their own private advantages. Are not these excellent witnesses, upon whose integrity the fate of the kingdom must depend, evidences in their own cause, and sharers in this work of iniquity?
If we could have deserved the liberty of coining for ourselves as we formerly did—and why we have it not is everybody’s wonder as well as mine—ten thousand pounds might have been coined here in Dublin of only one-fifth below the intrinsic value, and this sum, with the stock of halfpence we then had, would have been sufficient. But Wood, by his emissaries—enemies to God and this kingdom—has taken care to buy up as many of our old halfpence as he could, and from thence the present want of change arises; to remove which, by Mr. Wood’s remedy, would be to cure a scratch on the finger by cutting off the arm. But, supposing there were not one farthing of change in the whole nation, I will maintain that five-and-twenty thousand pounds would be a sum fully sufficient to answer all our occasions. I am no inconsiderable shopkeeper in this town. I have discoursed with several of my own and other trades, with many gentlemen both of city and country, and also with great numbers of farmers, cottagers, and labourers, who all agree that two shillings in change for every family would be more than necessary in all dealings. Now, by the largest computation—even before that grievous discouragement of agriculture, which has so much lessened our numbers—the souls in this kingdom are computed to be one million and a half; which, allowing six to a family, makes two hundred and fifty thousand families, and, consequently, two shillings to each family will amount only to five-and-twenty thousand pounds; whereas this honest, liberal hardwareman, Wood, would impose upon us above four times that sum. Your paragraph relates further, that Sir Isaac Newton reported an assay taken at the Tower of Wood’s metal, by which it appears, that Wood had in all respects performed his contract. His contract!—With whom? Was it with the Parliament or people of Ireland? Are not they to be the purchasers? But they detest, abhor, and reject it, as corrupt, fraudulent, mingled with dirt and trash. Upon which he grows angry, goes to law, and will impose his goods upon us by force.

But your newsletter says, that an assay was made of the coin. How impudent and insupportable is this! Wood takes care to coin a dozen or two halfpence of good metal, sends them to the Tower, and they are approved; and these must answer all that he has already coined, or shall coin for the future. It is true, indeed, that a gentleman often sends to my shop for a pattern of stuff; I cut it fairly off, and, if he likes it, he comes, or sends, and compares the pattern with the whole piece, and probably we come to a bargain. But if I were to buy a hundred sheep, and the grazier should bring me one single wether, fat and well-fleeced, by way of pattern, and expect the same price round for the whole hundred, without suffering me to see them before he was paid, or giving me good security to restore my money for those that were lean, or shorn, or scabby, I would be none of his customer. I have heard of a man who had a mind to sell his house, and therefore carried a piece of brick in his pocket, which he showed as a pattern to encourage purchasers; and this is directly the case in point with Mr. Wood’s assay.

The next part of the paragraph contains Mr. Wood’s voluntary proposals for preventing any further objections or apprehensions.

His first proposal is, “That whereas he has already coined seventeen thousand pounds, and has copper prepared to make it up forty thousand pounds, he will be content to coin no more, unless the EXIGENCIES OF TRADE REQUIRE IT, although his patent empowers him to coin a far greater quantity.”

To which if I were to answer, it should be thus:—“Let Mr. Wood, and his crew of founders and tinkers coin on, till there is not an old kettle left in the kingdom,—let them coin old leather, tobacco-pipe clay, or the dirt in the street, and call their trumpery by what name they please, from a guinea to a farthing,—we are not under concern to know
how he and his tribe of accomplices think fit to employ themselves. But I hope and trust, that we are all to a man fully determined to have nothing to do with him or his ware.”

The King has given him a patent to coin halfpence, but has not obliged us to take them; and I have already shown, in my letter to the shopkeepers, &c., that the law has not left it in the power of the prerogative to compel the subject to take any money besides gold and silver, of the right sterling and standard.

Wood further proposes, if I understand him right—for his expressions are dubious—that he will not coin above forty thousand pounds, unless the exigencies of trade require it.

First, I observe, that this sum of forty thousand pounds is almost double to what I proved to be sufficient for the whole kingdom, although we had not one of our old halfpence left.

Again, I ask, who is to be judge when the exigencies of trade require it? Without doubt he means himself; for as to us of this poor kingdom, who must be utterly ruined if this project should succeed, we were never once consulted till the matter was over, and he will judge of our exigencies by his own. Neither will these ever be at an end till he and his accomplices think they have enough; and it now appears, that he will not be content with all our gold and silver, but intends to buy up our goods and manufactures with the same coin.... His last proposal, being of a peculiar strain and nature, deserves to be very particularly considered, both on account of the matter and the style. It is as follows:—

“Lastly, in consideration of the direful apprehensions which prevail in Ireland, that Mr. Wood will, by such coinage, drain them of their gold and silver, he proposes to take their manufactures in exchange, and that no person be obliged to receive more than fivepence halfpenny at one payment.”

First, observe this little impudent hardwareman turning into ridicule the direful apprehensions of a whole kingdom, priding himself as the cause of them, and daring to prescribe what no King of England ever attempted, how far a whole nation shall be obliged to take his brass coin. And he has reason to insult; for sure there was never an example in history of a great kingdom kept in awe for above a year, in daily dread of utter destruction—not by a powerful invader, at the head of twenty thousand men—not by a plague or a famine—not by a tyrannical prince (for we never had one more gracious), or a corrupt administration—but by one single, diminutive, insignificant mechanic.... His proposals conclude with perfect high treason. He promises, that no person shall be obliged to receive more than fivepence halfpenny of his coin in one payment. By which it is plain, that he pretends to oblige every subject in this kingdom to take so much in every payment if it be offered; whereas his patent obliges no man, nor can the prerogative, by law, claim such a power, as I have often observed; so that here Mr. Wood takes upon him the entire legislature, and an absolute dominion over the properties of the whole nation.

Good God! who are this wretch’s advisers? Who are his supporters, abettors, encouragers, or sharers? Mr. Wood will oblige me to take fivepence halfpenny of his brass in every payment; and I will shoot Mr. Wood and his deputies through the head, like highwaymen or housebreakers, if they dare to force one farthing of their coin on me in the payment of a hundred pounds. It is no loss of honour to submit it to the lion; but who, with the figure of a man, can think with patience of being devoured alive by a rat? He has laid a tax upon the people of Ireland of
seventeen shillings, at least, in the pound; a tax, I say, not only upon lands, but interest-money, goods, manufactures,
the hire of handicraftsmen, labourers, and servants.

Shopkeepers, look to yourselves!—Wood will oblige and force you to take fivepence halfpenny of his trash in every
payment, and many of you receive twenty, thirty, forty payments in one day, or else you can hardly find bread. And,
pray, consider how much that will amount to in a year. Twenty times fivepence halfpenny is nine shillings and
twopence, which is above a hundred and sixty pounds a year; wherein you will be losers of at least one hundred and
forty pounds by taking your payments in his money. If any of you be content to deal with Mr. Wood on such
conditions, you may; but, for my own particular, let his money perish with him! If the famous Mr. Hampden rather
chose to go to prison than pay a few shillings to King Charles I. without authority of Parliament, I will rather choose
to be hanged than have all my substance taxed at seventeen shillings in the pound, at the arbitrary will and pleasure
of the venerable Mr. Wood.

The paragraph concludes thus:—“N.B.” that is to say, nota bene, or mark well, “No evidence appeared from Ireland,
or elsewhere, to prove the mischiefs complained of, or any abuses whatsoever committed, in the execution of the
said grant.”

The impudence of this remark exceeds all that went before. First, the House of Commons in Ireland, which
represents the whole people of the kingdom, and, secondly, the Privy-council, addressed his Majesty against these
halfpence. What could be done more to express the universal sense of the nation? If his copper were diamonds, and
the kingdom were entirely against it, would not that be sufficient to reject it? Must a committee of the whole House
of Commons, and our whole Privy-council, go over to argue pro and con with Mr. Wood? To what end did the King
give his patent for coining halfpence for Ireland? Was it not because it was represented to his sacred Majesty, that
such a coinage would be of advantage to the good of this kingdom, and of all his subjects here? It is to the
patentee’s peril if this representation be false, and the execution of his patent be fraudulent and corrupt. Is he so
wicked and foolish to think, that his patent was given him to ruin a million and a half of people, that he might be a
gainer of three or four score thousand pounds to himself? Before he was at the charge of passing a patent, much
more of raking up so much filthy dross, and stamping it with his Majesty’s image and superscription, should he not
first, in common sense, in common equity, and common manners, have consulted the principal party concerned,—
that is to say, the people of the kingdom, the House of Lords, or Commons, or the Privy-council? If any foreigner
should ask us, whose image and superscription there is on Wood’s coin? we should be ashamed to tell him it was
Cæsar’s. In that great want of copper halfpence which he alleges we were, our city set up our Cæsar’s statue in
excellent copper, at an expense that is equal to thirty thousand pounds of his coin, and we will not receive his image
in worse metal.

I observe many of our people putting a melancholy case on this subject. “It is true,” say they, “we are all undone if
Wood’s halfpence must pass; but what shall we do if his Majesty puts out a proclamation, commanding us to take
them?” This has often been dinned in my ears; but I desire my countrymen to be assured that there is nothing in it.
The King never issues out a proclamation but to enjoin what the law permits him. He will not issue out a
proclamation against law; or, if such a thing should happen by a mistake, we are no more obliged to obey it, than to
run our heads into the fire.
Besides, his Majesty will never command us by a proclamation, what he does not offer to command us in the patent itself.

There he leaves it to our discretion, so that our destruction must be entirely owing to ourselves; therefore, let no man be afraid of a proclamation which will never be granted, and if it should, yet, upon this occasion, will be of no force.

The King’s revenues here are near four hundred thousand pounds a-year. Can you think his ministers will advise him to take them in Wood’s brass, which will reduce the value to fifty thousand pounds? England gets a million sterling by this nation; which, if this project goes on, will be almost reduced to nothing. And do you think those who live in England upon Irish estates, will be content to take an eight or tenth part by being paid in Wood’s dross?

If Wood and his confederates were not convinced of our stupidity, they never would have attempted so audacious an enterprise. He now sees a spirit has been raised against him, and he only watches till it begin to flag: he goes about watching when to devour us. He hopes we shall be weary of contending with him; and at last, out of ignorance or fear, or of being perfectly tired with opposition, we shall be forced to yield; and therefore, I confess, it is my chief endeavour to keep up your spirits and resentments. If I tell you, “there is a precipice under you, and that if you go forward you will certainly break your necks;” if I point to it before your eyes, must I be at the trouble of repeating it every morning? Are our people’s hearts waxed gross? Are their ears dull of hearing? And have they closed their eyes? I fear there are some few vipers among us, who for ten or twenty pounds’ gain would sell all their souls and their country; although at last it should end in their own ruin, as well as ours. Be not like “the deaf adder, who refuseth to hear the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely.”

Although my letter be directed to you, Mr. Harding, yet I intend it for all my countrymen. I have no interest in this affair, but what is common to the public. I can live better than many others; I have some gold and silver by me, and a shop well furnished; and shall be able to make a shift when many of my betters are starving. But I am grieved to see the coldness and indifference of many people with whom I discourse. Some are afraid of a proclamation; others shrug up their shoulders, and cry, “What would you have us to do?” Some give out there is no danger at all; others are comforted, that it will be a common calamity, and they shall fare no worse than their neighbours. Will a man who hears midnight robbers at his door, get out of bed, and raise his whole family for a common defence; and shall a whole kingdom lie in a lethargy, while Mr. Wood comes, at the head of his confederates, to rob them of all they have, to ruin us and our posterity for ever? If a highwayman meets you on the road, you give him your money to save your life; but, God be thanked, Mr. Wood cannot touch a hair of your heads. You have all the laws of God and man on your side; when he or his accomplices offer you his dross, it is but saying no, and you are safe. If a madman should come into my shop with a handful of dirt raked out of the kennel, and offer it in payment for ten yards of stuff, I would pity or laugh at him; or, if his behaviour deserved it, kick him out of my doors. And if Mr. Wood comes to demand my gold and silver, or commodities for which I have paid my gold and silver, in exchange for his trash, can he deserve or expect better treatment?

When the evil day is come (if it must come), let us mark and observe those who persevere to offer these halfpence in payment. Let their names and trades, and places of abode, be made public, that every one may be aware of them, as betrayers of their country, and confederates with Mr. Wood. Let them be watched at markets and fairs; and let the...
first honest discoverer give the word about that Mr. Wood’s halfpence have been offered, and caution the poor innocent people not to receive them.

Perhaps I have been too tedious, but there would never be an end if I attempted to say all that this melancholy subject will bear. I will conclude with humbly offering one proposal; which, if it were put into practice, would blow up this destructive project at once. Let some skilful, judicious pen draw up an advertisement to the following purpose:—

“Whereas one William Wood, hardwareman, now or lately sojourning in the city of London, has, by many misrepresentations, procured a patent for coining a hundred and eight thousand pounds in copper halfpence for this kingdom, which is a sum five times greater than our occasions require: And whereas it is notorious, that the said Wood has coined his halfpence of such base metal and false weight, that they are at least six parts in seven below the real value: And whereas we have reason to apprehend, that the said Wood may at any time hereafter clandestinely coin as many more halfpence as he pleases: And whereas the said patent neither does, nor can, oblige his Majesty’s subjects to receive the said halfpence in any payment, but leaves it to their voluntary choice; because by law the subject cannot be obliged to take any money, except gold or silver: And whereas, contrary to the letter and meaning of the said patent, the said Wood has declared that every person shall be obliged to take fivepence halfpenny of his coin in every payment: And whereas the House of Commons and Privy-council have severally addressed his most sacred Majesty, representing the ill consequences which the said coinage would have upon this kingdom: And lastly, whereas it is universally agreed, that the whole nation to a man (except Mr. Wood and his confederates) are in the utmost apprehensions of the ruinous consequences that must follow from the said coinage; Therefore, we, whose names are underwritten, being persons of considerable estates in this kingdom, and residers therein, do unanimously resolve and declare, that we will never receive one farthing or halfpenny of the said Wood’s coining; and that we will direct all our tenants to refuse the said coin from any person whatsoever; of which, that they may not be ignorant, we have sent them a copy of this advertisement, to be read to them by our stewards, receivers,” &c.

I could wish, that a paper of this nature might be drawn up, and signed by two or three hundred principal gentlemen of this kingdom; and printed copies thereof sent to their several tenants. I am deceived if anything could sooner defeat this execrable design of Wood and his accomplices. This would immediately give the alarm, and set the kingdom on their guard; this would give courage to the meanest tenant and cottager.

“How long, O Lord, righteous and true,” &c.

I must tell you in particular, Mr. Harding, that you are much to blame. Several hundred persons have inquired at your house for my “Letter to the Shopkeepers,” &c., and you had none to sell them. Pray keep yourself provided with that letter and with this; you have got very well by the former; but I did not then write for your sake, any more than I do now. Pray advertise both in every newspaper; and let it not be your fault or mine, if our countrymen will not take warning. I desire you likewise to sell them as cheap as you can.

I am your servant,

M. B.
THIRD LETTER.

The object of this Letter is no longer to argue against a scheme which is universally condemned. The independence of Ireland is what he insists on: and the duty of her leading men is to assert that independence. In this he assumed a freedom of spirit which did not really exist. The sketch was skilfully drawn, so as to prepare men for a new appeal, and was far from being the last word. Two months after the fourth and greatest Letter appeared.

LETTER III.

Some observations on a paper, called, The report of the committee of the most honourable the Privy-council in England, relating to Wood's halfpence.

TO THE NOBILITY AND GENTRY OF THE KINGDOM OF IRELAND.

August 25th, 1724.

Having already written two letters to the people of my own level and condition, and having now very pressing occasion for writing a third, I thought I could not more properly address it than to your lordships and worships.

The occasion is this. A printed paper was sent to me on the 18th instant, entitled, “A Report of the Committee of the Lords of his Majesty’s Most Honourable Privy-council in England, relating to Mr. Wood’s Halfpence and Farthings.”

There is no mention made where the paper was printed, but I suppose it to have been in Dublin; and I have been told, that the copy did not come over in the Gazette, but in the London Journal, or some other print of no authority or consequence. And, for anything that legally appears to the contrary, it may be a contrivance to fright us; or a project of some printer, who has a mind to make a penny by publishing something upon a subject which now employs all our thoughts in this kingdom. Mr. Wood, in publishing this paper, would insinuate to the world, as if the Committee had a greater concern for his credit, and private emolument, than for the honour of the Privy-council and both Houses of Parliament here, and for the quiet and welfare of this whole kingdom; for it seems intended as a vindication of Mr. Wood, not without several severe reflections on the Houses of Lords and Commons of Ireland.

The whole is indeed written with the turn and air of a pamphlet; as if it were a dispute between William Wood on the one part, and the Lords Justices, Privy-council, and both Houses of Parliament, on the other; the design of it being to clear William Wood, and to charge the other side with casting rash and groundless aspersions upon him.

But, if it be really what the title imputes, Mr. Wood has treated the Committee with great rudeness, by publishing an act of theirs in so unbecoming a manner, without their leave, and before it was communicated to the Government and Privy-council of Ireland, to whom the Committee advised that it should be transmitted.
But, with all deference be it spoken, I do not conceive that a Report of a Committee of the Council in England is hitherto a law in either kingdom; and, until any point is determined to be a law, it remains disputable by every subject. This, may it please your lords and worshipships, may seem a strange way of discoursing in an illiterate shopkeeper. I have endeavoured (although without the help of books) to improve that small portion of reason God has been pleased to give me; and when reason plainly appears before me, I cannot turn away my head from it. Thus, for instance, if any lawyer should tell me that such a point were law, from which many gross palpable absurdities must follow, I could not believe him. If Sir Edward Coke should positively assert (which he nowhere does, but the direct contrary) “that a limited prince could, by his prerogative, oblige his subjects to take half an ounce of lead, stamped with his image, for twenty shillings in gold,” I should swear he was deceived, or a deceiver; because a power like that would leave the whole lives and fortunes of the people entirely at the mercy of the monarch; yet this in effect is what Wood has advanced in some of his papers, and what suspicious people may possibly apprehend from some passages in what is called the Report.

That paper mentions such persons to have been examined, who were desirous and willing to be heard upon this subject. I am told they were four in all—Coleby, Brown, Mr. Finley the banker, and one more, whose name I know not. The first of these was tried for robbing the Treasury in Ireland; and, though he was acquited for want of legal proof, yet every person in the Court believed him to be guilty.

The second stands recorded in the votes of the House of Commons, for endeavouring, by perjury and subornation, to take away the life of John Bingham, Esq.

But, since I have gone so far as to mention particular persons, it may be some satisfaction to know who is this Wood himself, that has the honour to have a whole kingdom at his mercy for almost two years together. I find he is in the patent entitled esquire, although he were understood to be only a hardware-man, and so I have been bold to call him in my former letters; however a 'squire he is, not only by virtue of his patent, but by having been a collector in Shropshire; where, pretending to have been robbed, and suing the county, he was cast, and, for the infamy of the fact, lost his employment. I have heard another story of this 'Squire Wood, from a very honourable lady, that one Hamilton told her. Hamilton was sent for, six years ago, by Sir Isaac Newton, to try the coinage of four men, who then solicited a patent for coining halfpence for Ireland; their names were Wood, Costor, Eliston, and Parker. Parker made the fairest offer, and Wood the worst; for his coin was three halfpence in a pound weight less value than the other. By which it is plain, with what intentions he solicited his patent; but not so plain how he obtained it.

It is alleged in the said paper, called the Report, “that upon repeated orders from a secretary of state, for sending over such papers and witnesses as should be thought proper to support the objections made against the patent by both Houses of Parliament, the Lord-Lieutenant represented the great difficulty he found himself in, to comply with these orders: that none of the principal members of both Houses, who were in the King’s service or council, would take upon them to advise, how any material, person, or papers, might be sent over on this occasion,” &c. And this is often repeated, and represented as a proceeding that seems very extraordinary; and that in a matter which had raised so great a clamour in Ireland, no person could be prevailed upon to come over from Ireland in support of the united sense of both Houses of Parliament in Ireland; especially, that the chief difficulty should arise from a general apprehension of a miscarriage, in an inquiry before his Majesty, or in a proceeding by due course of law, in a case
where both Houses of Parliament had declared themselves so fully convinced, and satisfied upon evidence and examinations taken in the most solemn manner.

How shall I, a poor ignorant shopkeeper, utterly unskilled in law, be able to answer so weighty an objection? I will try what can be done by plain reason, unassisted by art, cunning, or eloquence.

In my humble opinion, the Committee of Council has already prejudged the whole case, by calling the united sense of both Houses of Parliament in Ireland “a universal clamour.” Here the addresses of the Lords and Commons of Ireland, against a ruinous destructive project of an obscure single undertaker, is called “a clamour.” I desire to know, how such a style would be resented in England from a Committee of Council there to a Parliament; and how many impeachments would follow upon it? But supposing the appellation to be proper, I never heard of a wise minister who despised the universal clamour of a people; and if that clamour can be quieted by disappointing the fraudulent practice of a single person, the purchase is not exorbitant.

But, in answer to this objection; first, it is manifest, that if this coinage had been in Ireland, with such limitations as have been formerly specified in other patents, and granted to persons of this kingdom, or even of England, able to give sufficient security, few or no inconveniences could have happened which might not have been immediately remedied....

Put the case that the two Houses of Lords and Commons of England, and the Privy-council there should address his Majesty to recall a patent, from whence they apprehend the most ruinous consequences to the whole kingdom; and to make it stronger, if possible, that the whole nation almost to a man, should thereupon discover “the most dismal apprehensions,” as Mr. Wood styles them; would his Majesty debate half an hour what he had to do?

Would any minister dare to advise him against recalling such a patent? Or would the matter be referred to the Privy-council, or to Westminster Hall; the two Houses of Parliament plaintiffs, and William Wood defendant? And is there even the smallest difference between the two cases? Were not the people of Ireland born as free as those of England? How have they forfeited their freedom? Is not their Parliament as fair a representative of the people as that of England? And has not their Privy-council as great, or a greater share in the administration of public affairs? Are not they subjects of the same King? Does not the same sun shine upon them? And have they not the same God for their protector? Am I a freeman in England, and do I become a slave in six hours by crossing the Channel? No wonder, then, if the boldest persons were cautious to interpose in a matter already determined by the whole voice of the nation, or to presume to represent the representatives of the kingdom; and were justly apprehensive of meeting such a treatment as they would deserve at the next session. It would seem very extraordinary, if any inferior court in England should take a great matter out of the hands of the high court of Parliament during a prorogation, and decide it against the opinion of both Houses. It happens so, however, that although no persons were so bold as to go over as evidences, to prove the truth of the objections made against this patent by the high court of Parliament here, yet these objections stand good, notwithstanding the answers made by Mr. Wood and his counsel.

The Report says, “That upon an assay made of the fineness, weight, and value of this copper, it exceeded in every article.” This is possible enough in the pieces on which the assay was made, but Wood must have failed very much in point of dexterity, if he had not taken care to provide a sufficient quantity of such halfpence as would bear the
trial, which he was able to do, although they were taken out of several parcels, since it is now plain that the bias of
favour has been wholly on his side....

As to what is alleged, that these halfpence far exceed the like coinage for Ireland in the reigns of his Majesty’s
predecessors, there cannot well be a more exceptional way of arguing, although the fact were true; which, however,
is altogether mistaken, not by any fault in the Committee, but by the fraud and imposition of Wood, who certainly
produced the worst patterns he could find; such as were coined in small numbers by permissions to private men, as
butchers’ halfpence, black dogs, and others the like; or perhaps the small St. Patrick’s coin which passes now for a
farthing, or at best some of the smallest raps of the latest kind. For I have now by me halfpence coined in the year
1680, by virtue of the patent granted to my Lord Dartmouth, which was renewed to Knox, and they are heavier by a
ninth part than those of Wood, and of much better metal, and the great St. Patrick’s halfpence are yet larger than
either.

But what is all this to the present debate?

If, under the various exigencies of former times, by wars, rebellions, and insurrections, the Kings of England were
sometimes forced to pay their armies here with mixed or base money, God forbid that the necessities of turbulent
times should be a precedent for times of peace, and order, and settlement.

In the patent above-mentioned, granted to Lord Dartmouth in the reign of King Charles II., and renewed to Knox,
the securities given into the exchequer, obliging the patentee to receive his money back upon every demand, were
an effectual remedy against all inconveniences, and the copper was coined in our own kingdom; so that we were in
no danger to purchase it with the loss of all our silver and gold carried over to another, nor to be at the trouble of
going to England for the redressing of any abuse....

Among other clauses mentioned in this patent, to show how advantageous it is to Ireland, there is one which seems
to be of a singular nature: “That the patentee shall be obliged, during his term, to pay eight hundred pounds a year to
the Crown, and two hundred pounds a year to the comptroller.” I have heard, indeed, that the King’s council do
always consider, in the passing of a patent, whether it will be of advantage to the Crown; but I have likewise heard,
that it is at the same time considered whether passing of it may be injurious to any other persons or bodies politic.
However, although the attorney and solicitor be servants to the King, and therefore bound to consult his Majesty’s
interest, yet I am under some doubt whether eight hundred pounds a year to the Crown would be equivalent to the
ruin of a kingdom. It would be far better for us to have paid eight thousand pounds a-year into his Majesty’s coffers,
in the midst of all our taxes (which, in proportion, are greater in this kingdom than ever they were in England, even
during the war), than purchase such an addition to the revenue at the price of our utter undoing. But here it is plain
that fourteen thousand pounds are to be paid by Wood, only as a small circumstantial charge for the purchase of his
patent. What were his other visible costs I know not, and what were his latent is variously conjectured, but he must
surely be a man of some wonderful merit. Has he saved any other kingdom at his own expense, to give him a title of
reimbursing himself by the destruction of ours? Has he discovered the longitude or the universal medicine? No; but
he has found the philosopher’s stone after a new manner, by debasing copper, and resolving to force it upon us for
gold.
When the two Houses represented to his Majesty that the patent to Wood was obtained in a clandestine manner, surely the Committee could not think the Parliament would insinuate, that it had not passed in the common forms, and run through every office where fees and perquisites were due. They knew very well, that persons in places were no enemies to grants; and that the officers of the Crown could not be kept in the dark. But the late Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland affirmed it was a secret to him; and who will doubt his veracity, especially when he swore to a person of quality, from whom I had it, “that Ireland should never be troubled with these halfpence”? It was a secret to the people of Ireland, who were to be the only sufferers; and those who but knew the state of the kingdom, and were most able to advise in such an affair, were wholly strangers to it.

It is allowed by the Report, that this patent was passed without the knowledge of the chief governor or officers of Ireland; and it is there elaborately shown, that former patents have passed in the same manner, and are good in law. I shall not dispute legality of patents, but am ready to suppose it in his Majesty’s power to grant a patent for stamping round bits of copper to every subject he has.

Therefore, to lay aside the point of law, I would only put the question, whether, in reason and justice, it would not have been proper, in an affair upon which the welfare of this depends, that the said King should have received timely notice; and the matter not be carried on between the patentee, and the officers of the Crown, who were to be the only gainers by it....

But suppose there were not one single halfpenny of copper coin in this whole kingdom (which Mr. Wood seems to intend, unless we will come to his terms, as appears by employing his emissaries to buy up our old ones at a penny in the shilling more than they pass for), it could not be any real evil to us, although it might be some inconvenience. We have many sorts of small silver coins, to which they are strangers in England; such as the French threepences, fourpence-halfpennies, and eightpence-farthings, the Scotch fivepences and tenpences, besides their twenty-pences and three-and-four-pences, by which we are able to make change to a halfpenny of almost any piece of gold and silver; and if we are driven to the expedient of a sealed card, with the little gold and silver still remaining, it will, I suppose, be somewhat better, than to have nothing left, but Wood’s adulterated copper, which he is neither obliged by his patent, nor hitherto able by his estate, to make good....

The sum of the whole is this. The Committee advises the King to send immediate orders to all his officers here, that Wood’s coin be suffered and permitted, without any let, suit, trouble, &c., to pass and be received as current money, by such as shall be willing to receive the same. It is probable that the first willing receivers may be those who must receive it whether they will or not, at least under the penalty of losing an office. But the landed undepending men, the merchants, the shopkeepers, and bulk of the people, I hope and am almost confident, will never receive it. What must the consequence be? The owners will sell it for as much as they can get. Wood’s halfpence will come to be offered for six a penny (yet then he will be a sufficient gainer), and the necessary receivers will be losers of two-thirds in their salaries or pay.

I am very sensible that such a work as I have undertaken might have worthily employed a much better pen; but when a house is attempted to be robbed, it often happens the weakest in the family runs first to the door. All the assistance I had were some informations from an eminent person; whereof I am afraid I have spoiled a few, by endeavouring to make them of a piece with my own productions, and the rest I was not able to manage. I was in the
case of David, who could not move in the armour of Saul; and therefore I chose to attack this uncircumcised Philistine (Wood, I mean) with a sling and a stone. And I may say, for Wood’s honour, as well as my own, that he resembles Goliah in many circumstances very applicable to the present purpose; for Goliah had “a helmet of brass upon his head, and he was armed with a coat of mail; and the weight of the coat was five thousand shekels of brass; and he had greaves of brass upon his legs, and a target of brass between his shoulders.”

In short, he was like Mr. Wood, all over brass, and he defied the armies of the living God. Goliah’s conditions of combat were likewise the same with those of Wood’s, “If he prevail against us, then shall we be his servants.” But if it happens that I prevail over him, I renounce the other part of the condition: “He shall never be a servant of mine; for I do not think him fit to be trusted in any honest man’s shop.”

FOURTH LETTER.

Ireland is here summoned to assert her independence in the indignant voice of a nation that has borne the yoke of slavery far too long. Every line in this letter is instinct with life, and thrilling with sarcastic force. No more waste of words. The question is simply one of might against right: as old as human nature, but never brought into shorter compass. The printer of this letter was thrown into prison, as if to shame the undoubted author into surrender. Ireland was now under a new rule, the refined and cultivated Carteret was appointed Lord-Lieutenant in 1724. Swift used the privilege of an old friend in writing to him freely on the subject of the coinage. He was sorry to see his friend used as the tool of the Government, which occasioned the outburst, “What in God’s name do you here? Get you gone, and send us our boobies again.”

LETTER IV.

To the whole People of Ireland.

October 23rd, 1724.

My dear Countrymen,

Having already written three letters upon so disagreeable a subject as Mr. Wood and his halfpence, I conceived my task was at an end; but I find that cordials must be frequently applied to weak constitutions, political as well as natural. A people long used to hardships lose by degrees the very notions of liberty. They look upon themselves as creatures at mercy, and that all impositions, laid on them by a stronger hand, are, in the phrase of the Report, legal and obligatory. Hence proceed that poverty and lowness of spirit, to which a kingdom may be subject, as well as a particular person. And when Esau came fainting from the field at the point to die, it is no wonder that he sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. I thought I had sufficiently shown, to all who could want instruction, by what methods they might safely proceed, wherever this coin should be offered to them; and, I believe, there has not been, for many ages, an example of any kingdom so firmly united in a point of great importance, as this of ours is at
present against that detestable fraud. But, however, it so happens, that some weak people begin to be alarmed anew by rumours industriously spread. Wood prescribes to the newsmongers in London what they are to write. In one of their papers, published here by some obscure printer, and certainly with a bad design, we are told, “That the Papists in Ireland have entered into an association against his coin,” although it be notoriously known, that they never once offered to stir in the matter; so that the two Houses of Parliament, the Privy-council, the great number of corporations, the Lord Mayor and aldermen of Dublin, the grand juries, and principal gentlemen of several counties, are stigmatized in a lump under the name of “Papists.” This impostor and his crew do likewise give out, that, by refusing to receive his dross for sterling, we “dispute the King’s prerogative, are grown ripe for rebellion, and ready to shake off the dependency of Ireland upon the crown of England.”

To countenance which reports, he has published a paragraph in another newspaper, to let us know, that “the Lord-Lieutenant is ordered to come over immediately to settle his halfpence.”

I entreat you, my dear countrymen, not to be under the least concern upon these and the like rumours, which are no more than the last howls of a dog dissected alive, as I hope he has sufficiently been. These calumnies are the only reserve that is left him. For surely our continued and (almost) unexampled loyalty, will never be called in question, for not suffering ourselves to be robbed of all that we have by one obscure ironmonger.

As to disputing the King’s prerogative, give me leave to explain, to those who are ignorant, what the meaning of that word prerogative is.

The Kings of these realms enjoy several powers, wherein the laws have not interposed. So, they can make war and peace without the consent of Parliament—and this is a very great prerogative; but if the Parliament does not approve of the war, the King must bear the charge of it out of his own purse—and this is a great check on the crown.

So, the King has a prerogative to coin money without consent of Parliament; but he cannot compel the subject to take that money, except it be sterling gold or silver, because herein he is limited by law. Some princes have, indeed, extended their prerogative farther than the law allowed them; wherein, however, the lawyers of succeeding ages, as fond as they are of precedents, have never dared to justify them. But, to say the truth, it is only of late times that prerogative has been fixed and ascertained; for, whoever reads the history of England will find, that some former Kings, and those none of the worst, have, upon several occasions, ventured to control the laws, with very little ceremony or scruple, even later than the days of Queen Elizabeth. In her reign, that pernicious counsel of sending base money hither, very narrowly failed of losing the kingdom—being complained of by the lord-deputy, the council, and the whole body of the English here; so that, soon after her death, it was recalled by her successor, and lawful money paid in exchange.

Having thus given you some notion of what is meant by “the King’s prerogative,” as far as a tradesman can be thought capable of explaining it, I will only add the opinion of the great Lord Bacon: “That, as God governs the world by the settled laws of nature, which He has made, and never transcends those laws but upon high important occasions, so among earthly princes, those are the wisest and the best, who govern by the known laws of the country, and seldomest make use of their prerogative.”
Now here you may see, that the vile accusation of Wood and his accomplices, charging us with disputing the King’s prerogative by refusing his brass, can have no place—because compelling the subject to take any coin which is not sterling, is no part of the King’s prerogative, and I am very confident, if it were so, we should be the last of his people to dispute it; as well from that inviolable loyalty we have always paid to his Majesty, as from the treatment we might, in such a case, justly expect from some, who seem to think we have neither common sense nor common senses. But, God be thanked, the best of them are only our fellow-subjects, and not our masters. One great merit I am sure we have, which those of English birth can have no pretence to—that our ancestors reduced this kingdom to the obedience of England; for which we have been rewarded with a worse climate—the privilege of being governed by laws to which we do not consent—a ruined trade—a House of Peers without jurisdiction—almost an incapacity for all employments—and the dread of Wood’s halfpence.

But we are so far from disputing the King’s prerogative in coining, that we own he has power to give a patent to any man for selling his royal image and superscription upon whatever materials he pleases, and liberty to the patentee to offer them in any country from England to Japan; only attended with one small limitation—that nobody alive is obliged to take them....

Let me now say something concerning the other great cause of some people’s fear, as Wood has taught the London newswriter to express it, that his excellency the Lord-Lieutenant is coming over to settle Wood’s halfpence. We know very well, that the Lord-Lieutenants for several years past, have not thought this kingdom worthy the honour of their residence longer than was absolutely necessary for the King’s business, which, consequently, wanted no speed in the despatch. And therefore it naturally fell into most men’s thoughts, that a new governor, coming at an unusual time, must portend some unusual business to be done; especially if the common report be true, that the Parliament, prorogued to I know not when, is, by a new summons, revoking that prorogation, to assemble soon after the arrival; for which extraordinary proceeding, the lawyers on the other side the water have, by great good fortune, found two precedents.

All this being granted, it can never enter into my head, that so little a creature as Wood could find credit enough with the King and his ministers, to have the Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland sent hither in a hurry upon his errand. For, let us take the whole matter nakedly as it lies before us, without the refinements of some people, with which we have nothing to do.

Here is a patent granted under the great seal of England, upon false suggestions, to one William Wood for coining copper halfpence for Ireland. The Parliament here, upon apprehensions of the worst consequences from the said patent, address the King to have it recalled. This is refused; and a Committee of the Privy-council report to his Majesty, that Wood has performed the conditions of his patent. He then is left to do the best he can with his halfpence, no man being obliged to receive them; the people here, being likewise left to themselves, unite as one man, resolving they will have nothing to do with his ware.

By this plain account of the fact it is manifest, that the King and his ministry are wholly out of the case, and the matter is left to be disputed between him and us. Will any man, therefore, attempt to persuade me, that a Lord-Lieutenant is to be despatched over in great haste before the ordinary time, and a Parliament summoned by
anticipating a prorogation, merely to put a hundred thousand pounds into the pocket of a sharper by the ruin of a most loyal kingdom?

But, supposing all this to be true, by what arguments could a Lord-Lieutenant prevail on the same Parliament, which addressed with so much zeal and earnestness against this evil, to pass it into a law? I am sure their opinion of Wood and his project is not mended since their last prorogation; and, supposing those methods should be used, which detractors tell us have been sometimes put in practice for gaining votes, it is well known, that, in this kingdom, there are few employments to be given; and, if there were more, it is as well known to whose share they must fall. But, because great numbers of you are altogether ignorant of the affairs of your country, I will tell you some reasons why there are so few employments to be disposed of in this kingdom. All considerable offices for life are here possessed by those to whom the reversions were granted; and these have been generally followers of the chief governors, or persons who had interest in the Court of England. So, the Lord Berkeley of Stratton holds that great office of Master of the rolls; the Lord Palmerstown is first remembrancer, worth near 2000l. per annum. One Doddington, secretary to the Earl of Pembroke, begged the reversion of clerk of the pells, worth 2500l. a-year, which he now enjoys by the death of the Lord Newtown. Mr. Southwell is secretary of State, and the Earl of Burlington lord high treasurer of Ireland by inheritance. These are only a few among many others which I have been told of, but cannot remember. Nay, the reversion of several employments, during pleasure, is granted the same way. This, among many others, is a circumstance, whereby the kingdom of Ireland is distinguished from all other nations upon earth; and makes it so difficult an affair to get into a civil employ, that Mr. Addison was forced to purchase an old obscure place, called keeper of the records in Bermingham’s Tower, of 10l. a year, and to get a salary of 400l. annexed to it, though all the records there are not worth half-a-crown, either for curiosity or use. And we lately saw a favourite secretary descend to be master of the revels,[8] which, by his credit and extortion, he has made pretty considerable. I say nothing of the under-treasurership, worth about 9000l. a year, nor of the commissioners of the revenue, four of whom generally live in England, for I think none of these are granted in reversion; but the jest is, that I have known, upon occasion, some of these absent officers as keen against the interest of Ireland, as if they had never been indebted to her for a single groat.

I confess, I have been sometimes tempted to wish that this project of Wood’s might succeed; because I reflected with some pleasure, what a jolly crew it would bring over among us of lords and squires, and pensioners of both sexes, and officers civil and military, where we should live together as merry and sociable as beggars, only with this one abatement, that we should neither have meat to feed, nor manufactures to clothe us, unless we could be content to prance about in coats of mail, or eat brass as ostriches do iron.

I return from this digression to that which gave me the occasion of making it. And I believe you are now convinced, that if the Parliament of Ireland were as temptable as any other assembly within a mile of Christendom (which God forbid!), yet the managers must of necessity fail for want of tools to work with. But I will yet go one step farther, by supposing that a hundred new employments were erected on purpose to gratify compliers, yet still an insuperable difficulty would remain. For it happens, I know not how, that money is neither Whig nor Tory—neither of town nor country party, and it is not improbable that a gentleman would rather choose to live upon his own estate, which brings him gold and silver, than with the addition of an employment, when his rents and salary must both be paid in Wood’s brass, at above eighty per cent. discount.
For these, and many other reasons, I am confident you need not be under the least apprehension from the sudden expectation of the Lord-Lieutenant,[9] while we continue in our present hearty disposition, to alter which no suitable temptation can possibly be offered. And if, as I have often asserted from the best authority, the law has not left a power in the crown to force any money, except sterling, upon the subject, much less can the crown devolve such a power upon another....

Another slander spread by Wood and his emissaries is, “That by opposing him we discover an inclination to throw off our dependence upon the crown of England.” Pray observe how important a person is this same William Wood, and how the public weal of two kingdoms is involved in his private interest. First, all those who refuse to take his coin are Papists; for he tells us, “That none but Papists are associated against him.” Secondly, “they dispute the King’s prerogative.” Thirdly, “they are ripe for rebellion.” And, fourthly “they are going to shake off their dependence upon the crown of England;” that is to say, they are going to choose another king, for there can be no other meaning in this expression, however some may pretend to strain it.

And this gives me an opportunity of explaining to those who are ignorant, another point, which has often swelled in my breast. Those who come over hither to us from England, and some weak people among ourselves, whenever in discourse we make mention of liberty and property, shake their heads, and tell us that Ireland is a depending kingdom; as if they would seem by this phrase to intend that the people of Ireland are in some state of slavery or dependence different from those of England; whereas a depending kingdom is a modern term of art, unknown, as I have heard, to all ancient civilians, and writers upon government; and Ireland is, on the contrary, called in some statutes “an imperial crown,” as held only from God, which is as high a style as any kingdom is capable of receiving. Therefore, by this expression, “a depending kingdom,” there is no more to be understood than that, by a statute made here in the thirty-third year of Henry VIII., the King and his successors are to be kings imperial of this realm, as united and knit to the imperial crown of England. I have looked over all the English and Irish statutes, without finding any law that makes Ireland depend upon England, any more than England does upon Ireland. We have, indeed, obliged ourselves to have the same King with them, and consequently they are obliged to have the same King with us. For the law was made by our own Parliament, and our ancestors then were not such fools (whatever they were in the preceding reign) to bring themselves under I know not what dependence, which is now talked of, without any ground of law, reason, or common sense. Let whoever thinks otherwise, I, M. B., Drapier, desire to be excepted; for I declare, next under God, I depend only on the King my sovereign, and on the laws of my own country. And I am so far from depending on the people of England, that if ever they should rebel against my sovereign (which God forbid!) I would be ready, at the first command from his Majesty, to take arms against them, as some of my countrymen did against theirs at Preston. And if such a rebellion should prove so successful as to fix the Pretender on the throne of England, I would venture to transgress that statute so far as to lose every drop of my blood to hinder him from being King of Ireland.

It is true, indeed, that within the memory of man, the Parliaments of England have sometimes assumed the power of binding this kingdom by laws enacted there:[10] wherein they were at first openly opposed (as far as truth, reason and justice,[11] are capable of opposing) by the famous Mr. Molineux, an English gentleman born here, as well as by several of the greatest patriots and best Whigs in England; but the love and torrent of power prevailed. Indeed the arguments on both sides were invincible. For, in reason, all government without the consent of the governed, is the very definition of slavery; but, in fact, eleven men well armed will certainly subdue one single man in his shirt.
I have done; for those who have used to cramp liberty, have gone so far as to resent even the liberty of complaining; 
although a man upon the rack was never known to be refused the liberty of roaring as loud as he thought fit.

And as we are apt to sink too much under unreasonable fears, so we are too soon inclined to be raised by groundless 
hopes, according to the nature of all consumptive bodies like ours. Thus it has been given about, for several days 
past, that somebody in England empowered a second somebody, to write to a third somebody here, to assure us that 
we should no more be troubled with these halfpence. And this is reported to have been done by the same person, 
who is said to have sworn some months ago, “that he would ram them down our throats,” though I doubt they would 
stick in our stomachs; but whichever of these reports be true or false, it is no concern of ours. For, in this point, we 
have nothing to do with English ministers; and I should be sorry to leave it in their power to redress this grievance, 
or to enforce it; for the report of the Committee has given me a surfeit.

The remedy is wholly in your own hands; and therefore I have digressed a little, in order to refresh and continue that 
spirit so seasonably raised among you; and to let you see, that by the laws of God, of Nature, of Nations, and of 
your Country, you are, and ought to be, as free a people as your brethren in England....

THE FIFTH LETTER

Was addressed to Viscount Molesworth, a distinguished Whig; and the author of several works written in a patriotic 
spirit. His agricultural treatise on Ireland was highly approved by Swift. This closed the series for the present. The 
tone of the letter is apologetic. Hitherto he has not shaken off the impression left by the works of Lord Molesworth 
himself, of Locke, of Molyneux and Sidney, who talked of liberty as a common blessing. But now he will “grow 
wiser and learn to consider my driver, the road I am in, and with whom I am yoked.”

LETTER V.

To the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Molesworth.

Directions to the Printer.

From my shop in St. Francis’ Street,

December 24th, 1724.

MR. HARDING,

When I sent you my former papers, I cannot say I intended you either good or hurt; and yet you have happened, 
through my means, to receive both. I pray God deliver you from any more of the latter, and increase the former. 
Your trade, particularly in this kingdom, is, of all others, the most unfortunately circumstantiated; for as you deal in 
the most worthless kind of trash, the penny productions of pennyless scribblers, so you often venture your liberty, 
and sometimes your lives, for the purchase of half-a-crown; and, by your own ignorance, are punished for other
men’s actions. I am afraid, you, in particular, think you have reason to complain of me, for your own and your wife’s confinement in prison, to your great expense as well as hardship, and for a prosecution still impending. But I will tell you, Mr. Harding, how that matter stands.

Since the press has lain under so strict an inspection, those who have a mind to inform the world are become so cautious, as to keep themselves, if possible, out of the way of danger. My custom, therefore, is, to dictate to a 'prentice,[12] who can write in a feigned hand, and what is written we send to your house by a blackguard boy. But at the same time I do assure you, upon my reputation, that I never did send you anything for which I thought you could possibly be called to an account; and you will be my witness, that I always desired you, by letter, to take some good advice, before you ventured to print, because I knew the dexterity of dealers in the law at finding out something to fasten on, where no evil is meant. I am told, indeed, that you did accordingly consult several very able persons, and even some who afterwards appeared against you; to which I can only answer, that you must either change your advisers, or determine to print nothing that comes from a Drapier.

I desire you to send the enclosed letter, directed, “To my Lord Viscount Molesworth, at his house at Brackdenstown, near Swords;” but I would have it sent printed, for the convenience of his Lordship’s reading, because this counterfeit hand of my apprentice is not very legible. And, if you think fit to publish it, I would have you first get it read over by some notable lawyer. I am assured, you will find enough of them who are friends to the Drapier, and will do it without a fee; which, I am afraid, you can ill-afford after all your expenses. For although I have taken so much care, that I think it impossible to find a topic out of the following papers for sending you again to prison, yet I will not venture to be your guarantee.

This ensuing letter contains only a short account of myself, and an humble apology for my former pamphlets, especially the last, with little mention of Mr. Wood for his halfpence, because I have already said enough upon that subject, until occasion shall be given for new fears; and, in that case, you may perhaps hear from me again.

I am your friend and servant,
M. B.

P.S.—For want of intercourse between you and me, which I never will suffer, your people are apt to make very gross errors in the press, which I desire you will provide against.

A LETTER

To the Right Honourable the Lord Viscount Molesworth, at his house at Brackdenstown, near Swords.

From my shop in St. Francis Street, December 14th, 1724.

My Lord,
I reflect too late on the maxim of common observers, “that those who meddle in matters out of their calling will have reason to repent;” which is now verified in me: for, by engaging in the trade of a writer, I have drawn upon myself the displeasure of the government, signified by a proclamation, promising a reward of three hundred pounds to the first faithful subject who shall be able and inclined to inform against me; to which I may add the laudable zeal and industry of my Lord Chief Justice Whitshed, in his endeavours to discover so dangerous a person. Therefore, whether I repent or not, I have certainly cause to do so; and the common observation still stands good.

It will sometimes happen, I know not how, in the course of human affairs, that a man shall be made liable to legal animadversion where he has nothing to answer for either to God or his country, and condemned at Westminster Hall for what he will never be charged with at the day of judgment.

After strictly examining my own heart, and consulting some divines of great reputation, I cannot accuse myself of any malice or wickedness against the public,—of any designs to sow sedition,—of reflecting on the King and his ministers,—or of endeavours to alienate the affections of the people of this kingdom from those of England.[13] All I can charge myself with is, a weak attempt to serve a nation in danger of destruction by a most wicked and malicious projector, without waiting until I were called to its assistance; which attempt, however it may perhaps give me the title of pragmatical and overweening, will never lie a burden upon my conscience.

God knows, whether I may not, with all my caution, have already run myself into a second danger by offering thus much in my own vindication; for I have heard of a judge, who, upon the criminal’s appeal to the dreadful day of judgment, told him he had incurred a premunire, for appealing to a foreign jurisdiction; and of another in Wales, who severely checked the prisoner for offering the same plea, taxing him with “reflecting on the Court by such a comparison, because comparisons were odious.”

But, in order to make some excuse for being more speculative than others of my condition, I desire your Lordship’s pardon, while I am doing a very foolish thing; which is, to give you some little account of myself.

I was bred at a free school, where I acquired some little knowledge in the Latin tongue. I served my apprenticeship in London, and there set up for myself with good success; until, by the death of some friends, and the misfortunes of others, I returned into this kingdom, and began to employ my thoughts in cultivating the woollen manufacture through all its branches, wherein I met with great discouragement and powerful opposers, whose objections appeared to me very strange and singular. They argued, “that the people of England would be offended if our manufactures were brought to equal theirs;” and even some of the weaving trade were my enemies, which I could not but look upon as absurd and unnatural. I remember your lordship, at that time, did me the honour to come into my shop, where I showed you a piece of black and white stuff just sent from the dyer,[14] which you were pleased to approve of, and be my customer for.

However, I was so mortified, that I resolved, for the future, to sit quietly in my shop, and deal in common goods, like the rest of my brethren; until it happened, some months ago, considering with myself that the lower and poorer sort of people wanted a plain, strong, coarse stuff, to defend them against cold easterly winds, which then blew very fierce and blasting for a long time together, I contrived one[15] on purpose, which sold very well all over the kingdom, and preserved many thousands from agues. I then made a second and a third kind of stuffs[16] for the gentry with the same success; insomuch, that an agrue has hardly been heard of for some time.
This incited me so far, that I ventured upon a fourth piece,[7] made of the best Irish wool I could get; and I thought it grave and rich enough to be worn by the best lord or judge of the land. But of late some great folks complain, as I hear, “that, when they had it on, they felt a shuddering in their limbs,”—and have thrown it off in a rage, cursing to hell the poor Drapier who invented it; so that I am determined never to work for persons of quality again, except for your lordship, and a very few more.

I assure your lordship, upon the word of an honest citizen, that I am not richer, by the value of one of Mr. Wood’s halfpence, with the sale of all the several stuffs I have contrived, for I give the whole profit to the dyers and pressers;[8] and, therefore, I hope you will please to believe, that no other motive, beside the love of my country, could engage me to busy my head and hands, to the loss of my time, and the gain of nothing but vexation and ill-will.

I have now in hand one piece of stuff, to be woven on purpose for your lordship; although I might be ashamed to offer it to you after I have confessed, that it will be made only from the shreds and remnants of the wool employed in the former. However, I shall work it up as well as I can; and, at worst, you need only give it among your tenants....

I am told that the two points in my last letter, from which an occasion of offence has been taken, are where I mention his Majesty’s answer to the address of the House of Lords upon Mr. Wood’s patent; and where I discourse upon Ireland’s being a dependent kingdom. As to the former, I can only say that I have treated it with the utmost respect and caution; and I thought it necessary to show where Wood’s patent differed, in many essential parts, from all others that ever had been granted; because the contrary had, for want of due information, been so strongly and so largely asserted. As to the other, of Ireland’s dependency, I confess to have often heard it mentioned, but was never able to understand what it meant. This gave me the curiosity to inquire among several eminent lawyers, who professed they knew nothing of the matter. I then turned over all the statutes of both kingdoms, without the least information, farther than an Irish act, that I quoted, of the 33rd of Henry VIII., uniting Ireland to England under one King. I cannot say I was sorry to be disappointed in my search, because it is certain I could be contented to depend only upon God and my prince, and the laws of my own country, after the manner of other nations. But since my betters are of a different opinion, and desire farther dependencies, I shall outwardly submit; yet still insisting in my own heart, upon the exception I made of M. B., Drapier.... All I desire is, that the cause of my country against Mr. Wood, may not suffer by any inadvertency of mine. Whether Ireland depends upon England or only upon God, the King, and the law, I hope no man will assert that it depends upon Mr. Wood. I should be heartily sorry that this commendable spirit against me should accidentally (and what, I hope, was never intended) strike a damp upon that spirit in all ranks and corporations of men against the desperate and ruinous design of Mr. Wood. Let my countrymen blot out those parts in my last letter which they dislike; and let no rust remain on my sword, to cure the wounds I have given to our most mortal enemy. When Sir Charles Sedley was taking the oaths, where several things were to be renounced, he said, “he loved renouncing;” asked, “if any more were to be renounced; for he was ready to renounce as much as they pleased.” Although I am not so thorough a renouncer, yet let me have but good city-security against this pestilent coinage, and I shall be ready not only to renounce every syllable in all my four letters, but to deliver them cheerfully with my own hands into those of the common hangman, to be burnt with no better company than the coiner’s effigies, if any part of it has escaped out of the secular hands of my faithful friends, the common people. But, whatever the sentiments of some people may be, I think it is agreed that many of those who
subscribed against me, are on the side of a vast majority in the kingdom who opposed Mr. Wood; and it was with great satisfaction that I observed some right honourable names very amicably joined with my own, at the bottom of a strong declaration against him and his coin. But if the admission of it among us be already determined, the worthy person who is to betray me ought in prudence to do it with all convenient speed; or else it may be difficult to find three hundred pounds sterling for the discharge of his hire, when the public shall have lost five hundred thousand, if there be so much in the nation; besides four-fifths of its annual income for ever. I am told by lawyers, that in quarrels between man and man, it is of much weight which of them gave the first provocation, or struck the first blow. It is manifest that Mr. Wood has done both, and therefore I should humbly propose to have him first hanged, and his dross thrown into the sea; after which the Drapier will be ready to stand his trial. “It must needs be that offences come, but woe unto him by whom the offence comes.” If Mr. Wood had held his hand, everybody else would have held their tongues; and then there would have been little need of pamphlets, juries, or proclamations, upon this occasion. The provocation must needs have been very great, which could stir up an obscure, indolent Drapier, to become an author. One would almost think, the very stones in the street would rise up in such a cause; and I am not sure they will not do so against Mr. Wood, if ever he comes within their reach. It is a known story of the dumb boy, whose tongue forced a passage for speech by the horror of seeing a dagger at his father’s throat. This may lessen the wonder, that a tradesman, hid in privacy and silence should cry out when the life and being of his political mother are attempted before his face, and by so infamous a wretch.

I am now resolved to follow (after the usual proceeding of mankind, because it is too late) the advice given, me by a certain Dean.[19] He showed the mistake I was in of trusting to the general good-will of the people; “that I had succeeded hitherto better than could be expected; but that some unfortunate circumstantial lapse would bring me within the reach of power; that my good intentions would be no security against those who watched every motion of my pen in the bitterness of my soul.” He produced an instance of “a writer as innocent, as disinterested, and as well-meaning as myself; who had written a very seasonable and inoffensive treatise, exhorting the people of this kingdom to wear their own manufactures;[20] for which, however, the printer, was prosecuted with the utmost virulence; the jury sent back nine times; and the man given up to the mercy of the Court.” The Dean farther observed, “that I was in a manner left alone to stand the battle; while others, who had ten thousand times better talents than a Drapier, were so prudent as to lie still; and perhaps thought it no unpleasant amusement to look on with safety, while another was giving them diversion at the hazard of his liberty and fortune; and thought they made a sufficient recompense by a little applause.” Whereupon he concluded with a short story of a Jew at Madrid, who, being condemned to the fire on account of his religion, a crowd of schoolboys following him to the stake, and apprehending they might lose their sport if he should happen to recant, would often clap him on the back, and cry, “Sta firme, Moyse: Moses, continue steadfast.”

I allow this gentleman’s advice to have been very good, and his observations just; and in one respect my condition is worse than that of the Jew; for no recantation will save me. However, it should seem, by some late proceedings, that my state is not altogether deplorable. This I can impute to nothing but the steadiness of two impartial grand juries; which has confirmed in me an opinion I have long entertained; that, as philosophers say, virtue is seated in the middle; so, in another sense, the little virtue left in the world, is chiefly to be found among the middle rank of mankind, who are neither allured out of her paths by ambition, nor driven by poverty....
But, to confess the truth, my lord, I begin to grow weary of my office as a writer, and could heartily wish it were devolved upon my brethren, the makers of songs and ballads, who perhaps are the best qualified at present to gather up the gleanings of this controversy. As to myself, it has been my misfortune to begin and pursue it upon a wrong foundation. For, having detected the frauds and falsehoods of this vile impostor Wood in every part, I foolishly disdained to have recourse to whining, lamenting, and crying for mercy; but rather chose to appeal to law and liberty, and the common rights of mankind, without considering the climate I was in. Since your last residence in Ireland, I frequently have taken my nag to ride about your grounds, where I fancied myself to feel an air of freedom breathing around me; and I am glad the low condition of a tradesman did not qualify me to wait on you at your house; for then I am afraid my writings would not have escaped severer censures. But I have lately sold my nag, and honestly told his greatest fault, which was that of snuffing up the air about Brackdenstown; whereby he became such a lover of liberty, that I could scarce hold him in. I have likewise buried, at the bottom of a strong chest, your lordship’s writings, under a heap of others that treat of liberty, and spread over a layer or two of Hobbes, Filmer, Bodin, and many more authors of that stamp, to be readiest at hand whenever I shall be disposed to take up a new set of principles in government. In the meantime, I design quietly to look to my shop, and keep as far out of your lordship’s influence as possible; and if you ever see any more of my writings on this subject, I promise you shall find them as innocent, as insipid, and without a sting, as what I have now offered you. But, if your lordship will please to give me an easy lease of some part of your estate in Yorkshire, thither will I carry my chest, and, turning it upside down, resume my political reading where I left off, feed on plain homely fare, and live and die a free, honest English farmer; but not without regret for leaving my countrypeople under the dread of the brazen talons of Mr. Wood;—my most loyal and innocent countrypeople, to whom I owe so much for their good opinion of me, and my poor endeavours to serve them.

I am, with the greatest respect,
My Lord,
Your Lordship’s most obedient, and most humble servant,
M. B.

SIXTH LETTER

Was written a little after the proclamation against the Drapier’s fourth Letter. It is delivered with much caution, because the Author confesses himself to be the Dean of St. Patrick’s.

LETTER VI.

To the Lord Chancellor Middleton.

Deanery-house, October, 1724.
I desire you will consider me as a member who comes in at the latter end of a debate; or as a lawyer who speaks to a cause when the matter has been almost exhausted by those who spoke before.

I remember, some months ago, I was at your house upon a commission, where I am one of the governors; but I went thither, not so much on account of the commission, as to ask you some questions concerning Mr. Wood’s patent to coin halfpence for Ireland; where you very freely told me, in a mixed company, how much you had always been against that wicked project; which raised in me an esteem for you so far that I went in a few days to make you a visit, after many years’ intermission. I am likewise told that your son wrote two letters from London (one of which I have seen), empowering those to whom they were directed to assure his friends, that whereas there was a malicious report spread of his engaging himself to Mr. Walpole for forty thousand pounds of Wood’s coin to be received in Ireland, the said report was false and groundless; and he had never discoursed with that minister on this subject, nor would ever give his consent to have one farthing of the said coin current here. And although it be a long time since I have given myself the trouble of conversing with people of titles or stations, yet I have been told by those who can take up with such amusements, that there is not a considerable person of the kingdom scrupulous in any sort to declare his opinion. But all this is needless to allege, when we consider, that the ruinous consequences of Wood’s patent have been so strongly represented by both Houses of Parliament, by the Privy-council, the Lord Mayor and Aldermen of Dublin; by so many corporations; and the concurrence of the principal gentlemen in most counties at their quarter-sessions, without any regard to party, religion, or nation.

I conclude from hence, that the currency of these halfpence would, in the universal opinion of our people, be utterly destructive to this kingdom; and, consequently, that it is every man’s duty, not only to refuse this coin himself, but, as far as in him lies, to persuade others to do the like; and whether this be done in private or in print, is all a case; as no layman is forbidden to write or to discourse upon religious or moral subjects, although he may not do it in a pulpit, at least in our Church. Neither is this an affair of State, until authority shall think fit to declare it so, or, if you should understand it in that sense, yet you will please to consider, that I am not now preaching.

Therefore, I do think it my duty, since the Drapier will probably be no more heard of, so far to supply his place, as not to incur his fortune; for I have learned from old experience that there are times wherein a man ought to be cautious as well as innocent. I therefore hope that, preserving both those characters, I may be allowed, by offering new arguments or enforcing old ones, to refresh the memory of my fellow-subjects, and keep up that good spirit raised among them, to preserve themselves from utter ruin by lawful means, and such as are permitted by his Majesty.

I believe you will please to allow me two propositions: First, that we are a most loyal people; and, secondly, that we are a free people, in the common acceptation of that word, applied to a subject under a limited monarch. I know very well that you and I did, many years ago, in discourse differ much in the presence of Lord Wharton about the meaning of that word liberty, with relation to Ireland. But, if you will not allow us to be a free people, there is only another appellation left, which I doubt my Lord Chief Justice Whitshed would call me to account for, if I venture to bestow: for I observed (and I shall never forget upon what occasion) the device upon his coach to be, Libertas et natale solum, at the very point of time when he was sitting in his court, and perjuring himself to betray both....
I am heartily sorry that any writer should, in a cause so generally approved, give occasion to the government and council to charge him with paragraphs “highly reflecting upon his Majesty and his ministers; tending to alienate the affections of his good subjects in England and Ireland from each other, and to promote sedition among the people.” I must confess that, with many others, I thought he meant well, although he might have the failing of better writers, not to be always fortunate in the manner of expressing himself.

However, since the Drapier is but one man, I shall think I do a public service by asserting that the rest of my countrymen are wholly free from learning, out of his pamphlets to reflect on the King or his ministers, and to breed sedition. I solemnly declare, that I never once heard the least reflection cast upon the King on the subject of Mr. Wood’s coin: for in many discourses on this matter, I do not remember his Majesty’s name to be so much as mentioned. As to the ministry in England, the only two persons hinted at were the Duke of Grafton and Mr. Walpole; the former, as I have heard you and a hundred others affirm, declared, “that he never saw the patent in favour of Mr. Wood before it was passed,” although he was then Lord-Lieutenant; and therefore, I suppose, everybody believes that his Grace has been wholly unconcerned in it ever since. Mr. Walpole was indeed supposed to be understood by the letter W. in several newspapers, where it is said that some expressions fell from him not very favourable to the people of Ireland, for the truth of which the kingdom is not to answer, any more than for the discretion of the publishers. You observe, the Drapier wholly clears Mr. Walpole of this charge by very strong arguments, and speaks of him with civility.

I cannot deny myself to have been often present where the company gave their opinion that Mr. Walpole favoured Mr. Wood’s projects, which I always contradicted, and for my own part never once opened my lips against that minister, either in mixed or particular meetings; and my reason for this reservedness was, because it pleased him in the Queen’s time (I mean Queen Anne, of ever-blessed memory) to make a speech directly against me by name in the House of Commons, as I was told a very few minutes after, in the Court of Requests, by more than fifty members....

But whatever unpleasing opinion some people might conceive of Mr. Walpole, on account of those halfpence, I dare boldly affirm it was entirely owing to Mr. Wood. Many persons of credit come from England, have affirmed to me and others, that they have seen letters under his hand, full of arrogance and insolence towards Ireland, and boasting of his favour with Mr. Walpole; which is highly probable; because he reasonably thought it for his interest to spread such a report, and because it is the known talent of low and little spirits, to have a great man’s name perpetually in their mouths. Thus I have sufficiently justified the people of Ireland from learning any bad lesson out of the Drapier’s pamphlets, with regard to his Majesty and his ministers; and therefore, if those papers were intended to sow sedition among us, God be thanked the seeds have fallen upon a very improper soil.

As to alienating the affections of the people of England and Ireland from each other, I believe the Drapier, whatever his intentions were, has left that matter just as he found it. I have lived long in both kingdoms, as well in country as in town; and therefore take myself to be as well informed as most men, in the dispositions of each people toward the other. By the people, I understand here only the bulk of the common people: and I desire no lawyer may distort or extend my meaning. There is a vein of industry and parsimony, that runs through the whole people of England, which, added to the easiness of their rents, makes them rich and sturdy.
As to Ireland, they know little more of it than they do of Mexico: farther than that it is a country subject to the King of England, full of bogs, inhabited by wild Irish Papists, who are kept in awe by mercenary troops sent from thence: and their general opinion is, that it were better for England if this whole island were sunk into the sea; for they have a tradition, that every forty years there must be a rebellion in Ireland.

I have seen the grossest suppositions passed upon them: “That the wild Irish were taken in toils; but that in some time they would grow so tame as to eat out of your hands.” I have been asked by hundreds, and particularly by my neighbours, your tenants at Pepper-harrow, “whether I had come from Ireland by sea?” and, upon the arrival of an Irishman to a country town, I have known crowds coming about him, and wondering to see him look so much better than themselves.

A gentleman, now in Dublin, affirms, “that, passing some months ago through Northampton, and finding the whole town in a flurry, with bells, bonfires, and illuminations; upon asking the cause, he was told that it was for joy that the Irish had submitted to receive Wood’s halfpence.” This, I think, plainly shows what sentiments that large town has of us; and how little they made it their own case; although they lie directly in our way to London, and therefore cannot but be frequently convinced that we have human shapes.

As to the people of this kingdom, they consist either of Irish Papists, who are as inconsiderable in point of power as the women and children; or of English Protestants, who love their brethren of that kingdom, although they may possibly sometimes complain when they think they are hardly used. However, I confess I do not see that it is of any great consequence, how the personal affections stand to each other, while the sea divides them and while they continue in their loyalty to the same prince. And yet I will appeal to you, whether those from England have reason to complain when they come hither in pursuit of their fortunes? or, whether the people of Ireland have reason to boast, when they go to England upon the same design? My second proposition was, that we of Ireland are a free people; this, I suppose, you will allow, at least with certain limitations remaining in your own breast. However, I am sure it is not criminal to affirm it; because the words liberty and property, as applied to the subject, are often mentioned in both Houses of Parliament, as well as in yours and other courts below; whence it must follow, that the people of Ireland do or ought to enjoy all the benefits of the common and statute law: such as to be tried by juries, to pay no money without their own consent as represented in Parliament, and the like. If this be so, and if it be universally agreed that a free people cannot by law be compelled to take any money in payment except gold and silver, I do not see why any man should be hindered from cautioning his countrymen against this coin of William Wood, who is endeavouring by fraud to rob us of that property which the laws have secured....

Before I conclude, I cannot but observe that for several months past there have more papers been written in this town, such as they are, all upon the best public principle, the love of our country, than perhaps has been known in any other nation in so short a time. I speak in general, from the Drapier down to the maker of ballads; and all without any regard to the common motives of writers, which are profit, favour, and reputation. As to profit, I am assured by persons of credit, that the best ballad upon Mr. Wood will not yield above a groat to the author; and the unfortunate adventurer Harding declares he never made the Drapier any present, except one pair of scissors. As to favour, whoever thinks to make his court by opposing Mr. Wood, is not very deep in politics; and as to reputation, certainly no man of worth and learning would employ his pen upon so transitory a subject, and in so obscure a
corner of the world, to distinguish himself as an author, so that I look upon myself, the Drapier, and my numerous brethren, to be all true patriots in our several degrees.

All that the public can expect for the future is, only to be sometimes warned to beware of Mr. Wood’s halfpence, and to be referred for conviction to the Drapier’s reasons. For a man of the most superior understanding will find it impossible to make the best use of it while he writes in constraint, perpetually softening, correcting, or blotting out expressions for fear of bringing his printer, or himself, under a prosecution from my Lord Chief Justice Whitshed. It calls to my remembrance the madman in “Don Quixote,” who being soundly beaten by a weaver for letting a stone (which he always carried on his shoulder), fall upon a spaniel, apprehended that every cur he met was of the same species.

For these reasons I am convinced, that what I have now written will appear low and insipid; but if it contributes in the least to preserve that union among us for opposing this fatal project of Mr. Wood, my pains will not be altogether lost.

I sent these papers to an eminent lawyer (and yet a man of virtue and learning into the bargain), who, after many alterations, returned them back, with assuring me that they are perfectly innocent; without the least mixture of treason, rebellion, sedition, malice, disaffection, reflection, or wicked insinuation whatsoever.

If the bellman of each parish, as he goes his circuit, would cry out every night “Past twelve o’clock; Beware of Wood’s halfpence,” it would probably cut off the occasion for publishing any more pamphlets; provided that in country towns it were done upon market-days. For my own part, as soon as it shall be determined that it is not against law, I will begin the experiment in the liberty of St. Patrick’s; and hope my example may be followed in the whole city. But if authority shall think fit to forbid all writings or discourses upon this subject, except such as are in favour of Mr. Wood, I will obey, as it becomes me; only, when I am in danger of bursting, I will go and whisper among the reeds, not any reflection upon the wisdom of my countrymen, but only these few words, BEWARE OF WOOD’S HALFPENCE.

I am, with due respect,
Your most obedient, humble servant,
J. S.

SEVENTH LETTER

Did not appear till 1735. It appears to have been written during the first session in Lord Carteret’s government. It is much more a start on a new course, than a continuation of the past struggle.

LETTER VII.

An Humble Address to Both Houses of Parliament.
I have been told, that petitions and addresses, to either King or Parliament, are the right of every subject, provided they consist with that respect which is due to princes and great assemblies. Neither do I remember, that the modest proposals or opinions of private men have been ill-received, when they have not been delivered in the style of advice; which is a presumption far from my thoughts. However, if proposals should be looked upon as too assuming, yet I hope every man may be suffered to declare his own and the nation’s wishes. For instance; I may be allowed to wish, that some farther laws were enacted for the advancement of trade; for the improvement of agriculture, now strangely neglected, against the maxims of all wise nations; for supplying the manifest defects in the acts concerning the plantation of trees; for setting the poor to work; and many others.

Upon this principle I may venture to affirm, it is the hearty wish of the whole nation, very few excepted, that the Parliament, in this session, would begin by strictly examining into the detestable fraud of one William Wood, now or late of London, hardwareman; who illegally and clandestinely, as appears by your own votes and addresses, procured a patent in England for coining halfpence in that kingdom to be current here. This, I say, is the wish of the whole nation, very few excepted; and upon account of those few, is more strongly and justly the wish of the rest; those few consisting either of Wood’s confederates, some obscure tradesmen, or certain bold UNDERTAKERS,[23] of weak judgment and strong ambition, who think to find their accounts in the ruin of the nation, by securing or advancing themselves. And because such men proceed upon a system of politics, to which I would fain hope you will be always utter strangers, I shall humbly lay it before you.

Be pleased to suppose me in a station of fifteen hundred pounds a year, salary and perquisites: and likewise possessed of 800l. a-year, real estate. Then suppose a destructive project to be set on foot; such for instance, as this of Wood; which, if it succeed in all the consequences naturally to be expected from it, must sink the rents and wealth of the kingdom one half, although I am confident it would have done so five-sixths; suppose, I conceive that the countenancing, or privately supporting, this project, will please those by whom I expect to be preserved or higher exalted; nothing then remains, but to compute and balance my gain and my loss, and sum up the whole. I suppose that I shall keep my employment ten years, not to mention the fair chance of a better.

This, at 1500l. a year, amounts in ten years to 15,000l. My estate, by the success of the said project, sinks 400l. a-year; which, at twenty years’ purchase, is but 8000l.; so that I am a clear gainer of 7000l. upon the balance. And during all that period I am possessed of power and credit, can gratify my favourites, and take vengeance on mine enemies. And if the project miscarry, my private merit is still entire. This arithmetic, as horrible as it appears, I knowingly affirm to have been practised and applied, in conjunctures whereon depended the ruin or safety of a nation; although probably the charity and virtue of a senate will hardly be induced to believe, that there can be such monsters among mankind. And yet the wise Lord Bacon mentions a sort of people (I doubt the race is not yet extinct) who would “set a house on fire for the convenience of roasting their own eggs at the flame.”
But whoever is old enough to remember, and has turned his thoughts to observe, the course of public affairs in this kingdom from the time of the Revolution, must acknowledge, that the highest points of interest and liberty have often been sacrificed to the avarice and ambition of particular persons, upon the very principles and arithmetic that I have supposed. The only wonder is, how these artists were able to prevail upon numbers, and influence even public assemblies, to become instruments for effecting their execrable designs.

It is, I think, in all conscience, latitude enough for vice, if a man in station be allowed to act injustice upon the usual principles of getting a bribe, wreaking his malice, serving his party, or consulting his preferment, while his wickedness terminates in the ruin only of particular persons; but to deliver up our whole country and every living soul who inhabits it, to certain destruction, has not, as I remember, been permitted by the most favourable casuists on the side of corruption.

It were far better, that all who have had the misfortune to be born in this kingdom, should be rendered incapable of holding any employment whatsoever above the degree of a constable (according to the scheme and intention of a great minister,[24] gone to his own place), than to live under the daily apprehension of a few false brethren among ourselves; because, in the former case, we should be wholly free from the danger of being betrayed, since none could then have impudence enough to pretend any public good. It is true, that in this desperate affair of the new halfpence, I have not heard of any man above my own degree of a shopkeeper, to have been hitherto so bold, as, in direct terms, to vindicate the fatal project; although I have been told of some very mollifying expressions which were used, and very gentle expedients proposed and handed about, when it first came under debate; but since the eyes of the people have been so far opened, that the most ignorant can plainly see their own ruin in the success of Wood’s attempt, these grand compounders have been more cautious.... In the small compass of my reading (which, however, has been more extensive than is usual to men of my inferior calling,) I have observed, that grievances have always preceded supplies. And if ever grievances had a title to such pre-eminence, it must be this of Wood; because it is not only the greatest grievance that any country could suffer, but a grievance of such a kind, that, if it should take effect, would make it impossible for us to give any supplies at all, except in adulterate copper; unless a tax were laid, for paying the civil and military lists and the large pensions, with real commodities instead of money. Which, however, might be liable to some few objections, as well as difficulties; for, although the common soldiers might be content with beef, and mutton, and wool, and malt, and leather, yet I am in some doubt as to the generals, the colonels, the numerous pensioners, the civil officers and others, who all live in England upon Irish pay, as well as those few who reside among us only because they cannot help it. There is one particular, which, although I have mentioned more than once in some of my former papers, yet I cannot forbear to repeat, and a little enlarge upon it; because I do not remember to have read or heard of the like in the history of any age or country, neither do I ever reflect upon it without the utmost astonishment.

After the unanimous addresses to his sacred Majesty, against the patent of Wood, from both Houses of Parliament, which are the three estates of the kingdom, and likewise an address from the Privy-council, to whom, under the chief governors, the whole administration is entrusted, the matter is referred to a committee of council in London. Wood and his adherents are heard on one side; and a few volunteers, without any trust or direction from hence, on the other. The question, as I remember, chiefly turned upon the want of halfpence in Ireland. Witnesses are called on the behalf of Wood, of what credit I have formerly shown. Upon the issue, the patent is found good and legal; all his Majesty’s officers here, not excepting the military, commanded to be aiding and assisting to make it effectual; the
addresses of both Houses of Parliament, of the Privy-council, and of the city of Dublin, the declarations of most counties and corporations throughout the kingdom, are altogether laid aside, as of no weight, consequence, or consideration whatsoever; and the whole kingdom of Ireland non-suited in default of appearance, as if it were a private case between John Doe, plaintiff, and William Roe, defendant.

With great respect to those honourable persons, the committee of council in London, I have not understood them to be our governors, councillors, or judges. Neither did our case turn at all upon the questions whether Ireland wanted halfpence or no. For there is no doubt, but we do want both halfpence, gold, and silver; and we have numberless other wants, and some that we are not so much as allowed to name, although they are peculiar to this nation; to which no other is subject, whom God has blessed with religion and laws, or any degree of soil and sunshine; but for what demerits on our side, I am altogether in the dark. But I do not remember that our want of halfpence was either affirmed or denied in any of our addresses or declarations against those of Wood. We alleged the fraudulent obtaining and executing of his patent; the baseness of his metal; and the prodigious sum to be coined, which might be increased by stealth, from foreign importation and his own counterfeits, as well as those at home; whereby we must infallibly lose all our little gold and silver, and all our poor remainder of a very limited and discouraged trade. We urged, that the patent was passed without the least reference hither; and without mention of any security given by Wood, to receive his own halfpence upon demand; both which are contrary to all contrary proceedings in the like cases.

These, and many other arguments, we offered, but still the patent went on; and at this day our ruin would have been half completed, if God in His mercy had not raised a universal detestation of these halfpence in the whole kingdom, with a firm resolution never to receive them; since we are not under obligations to do so by any law, either human or divine.

But, in the name of God, and of all justice and pity, when the King’s Majesty was pleased that this patent should pass, is it not to be understood that he conceived, believed, and intended it, as a gracious act for the good and benefit of his subjects, for the advantage of a great and fruitful kingdom; of the most loyal kingdom upon earth, where no hand or voice was ever lifted up against him; a kingdom, where the passage is not three hours from Britain; and a kingdom where Papists have less power and less land than in England? Can it be denied or doubted that his Majesty’s ministers understood and proposed the same end, the good of this nation, when they advised the passing of this patent? Can the person of Wood be otherwise regarded than as the instrument, the mechanic, the head-workman, to prepare his furnace, his fuel, his metal, and his stamps? If I employ a shoe-boy, is it in view to his advantage, or to my own convenience? I mention the person of William Wood alone, because no other appears; and we are not to reason upon surmises; neither would it avail, if they had a real foundation. Allowing therefore (for we cannot do less) that this patent for the coining of halfpence was wholly intended by a gracious King, and a wise public-spirited ministry, for the advantage of Ireland; yet when the whole kingdom to a man, for whose good the patent was designed, do, upon maturest consideration, universally join in openly declaring, protesting, addressing, petitioning, against these halfpence, as the most ruinous project that ever was set on foot to complete the slavery and destruction of a poor innocent country; is it, was it, can it, or will it, ever be a question, not, whether such a kingdom, or William Wood, should be a gainer; but whether such a kingdom should be wholly undone, destroyed, sunk, depopulated, made a scene of misery and desolation, for the sake of William Wood? God of His infinite mercy
avert this dreadful judgment! And it is our universal wish, that God would put it into your hearts to be His instruments for so good a work.

For my own part, who am but one man, of obscure condition, I do solemnly declare, in the presence of Almighty God, that I will suffer the most ignominious and torturing death, rather than submit to receive this accursed coin, or any other that shall be liable to these objections, until they shall be forced upon me by a law of my own country; and, if that shall ever happen, I will transport myself into some foreign land, and eat the bread of poverty among a free people.

Am I legally punishable for these expressions? shall another proclamation issue against me, because I presume to take my country’s part against William Wood, where her final destruction is intended? But, whenever you shall please to impose silence upon me, I will submit; because I look upon your unanimous voice to be the voice of the nation; and this I have been taught, and do believe, to be in some manner the voice of God....

I have sometimes wondered upon what motives the peerage of England were so desirous to determine our controversies; because I have been assured, and partly know, that the frequent appeals from hence have been very irksome to that illustrious body: and whoever has frequented the Painted Chamber and Courts of Requests, must have observed, that they are never so nobly filled as when an Irish appeal is under debate.

The peers of Scotland, who are very numerous, were content to reside in their castles and houses in that bleak and barren climate; and although some of them made frequent journeys to London, yet I do not remember any of their greatest families, till very lately, to have made England their constant habitation before the Union; or, if they did, I am sure it was generally to their own advantage, and whatever they got was employed to cultivate and increase their own estates, and by that means enrich themselves and their country.

As to the great number of rich absentees under the degree of peers, what particular ill-effects their absence may have upon this kingdom, besides those already mentioned, may perhaps be too tender a point to touch. But whether those who live in another kingdom upon great estates here, and have lost all regard to their own country, farther than upon account of the revenues they receive from it; I say, whether such persons may not be prevailed upon to recommend others to vacant seats, who have no interest here except a precarious employment, and consequently can have no views but to preserve what they have got, or to be higher advanced; this, I am sure, is a very melancholy question, if it be a question at all.

But, besides the prodigious profit which England receives by the transmittal thither of two-thirds of the revenues of this old kingdom, it has another mighty advantage, by making our country a receptacle, wherein to disburden themselves of their supernumerary pretenders to offices; persons of second-rate merit in their own country, who, like birds of passage, most of them thrive and fatten here, and fly off when their credit and employments are at an end. So that Ireland may justly say, what Luther said of himself, POOR Ireland makes many rich!

If, amid all our difficulties, I should venture to assert that we have one great advantage, provided we could improve it as we ought, I believe most of my readers would be long in conjecturing what possible advantage could ever fall to our share. However, it is certain that all the regular seeds of party and faction among us are entirely rooted out, and if any new ones shall spring up, they must be of equivocal generation, without any seed at all, and will be justly
imputed to a degree of stupidity beyond even what we have been ever charged with upon the score of our birthplace and climate.

The parties in this kingdom (including those of modern date) are, first, of those who have been charged or suspected to favour the Pretender; and those who were zealous opposers of him. Secondly, of those who were for and against a toleration of Dissenters by law. Thirdly, of High and Low Church, or (to speak in the cant of the times) of Whig and Tory. And, fourthly, of court and country. If there be any more, they are beyond my observation or politics; for, as to subaltern or occasional parties, they have been all derivations from the same originals.

Now it is manifest, that all these incitements to faction, party, and division, are wholly removed from among us. For, as to the Pretender, his cause is both desperate and obsolete. There are very few now alive who were men in his father’s time, and in that prince’s interest; and in all others, the obligation of conscience has no place. Even the Papists in general, of any substance or estates, and their priests almost universally, are what we call Whigs, in the sense which by that word is generally understood. They feel the smart, and see the scars of their former wounds, and very well know, that they must be made a sacrifice to the least attempts toward a change; although it cannot be doubted that they would be glad to have their superstition restored, under any prince whatsoever.

Secondly, the Dissenters are now tolerated by law; neither do we observe any murmurs at present from that quarter, except those reasonable complaints they make of persecution, because they are excluded from civil employments; but their number being very small in either House of Parliament, they are not yet in a situation to erect a party: because, however indifferent men may be with regard to religion, they are now grown wise enough to know that if such a latitude were allowed to Dissenters, the few small employments left us in cities and corporations would find other hands to lay hold on them.

Thirdly, the dispute between High and Low Church is now at an end; two-thirds of the bishops having been promoted in this reign, and most of them from England, who have bestowed all preferments in their gift to those they could well confide in: the deaneries, all except three, and many principal church-livings are in the donation of the Crown, so that we already possess such a body of clergy as will never engage in controversy upon that antiquated and exploded subject.

Lastly, as to court and country parties, so famous and avowed under most reigns in English Parliaments; this kingdom has not, for several years past, been a proper scene whereon to exercise such contentions, and is now less proper than ever; many great employments for life being in distant hands, and the reversions diligently watched and secured; the temporary ones of any inviting value are all bestowed elsewhere as fast as they drop, and the few remaining are of too low consideration to create contests about them, except among younger brothers, or tradesmen like myself. And therefore, to institute a court and country party, without materials would be a very new system in politics, and what I believe was never thought on before: nor, unless in a nation of idiots, can ever succeed; for the most ignorant Irish cottager will not sell his cow for a groat.

Therefore I conclude, that all party and faction, with regard to public proceedings, are now extinguished in this kingdom; neither does it appear in view how they can possibly revive, unless some new causes be administered; which cannot be done without crossing the interests of those who are the greatest gainers by continuing the same measures. And general calamities, without hope of redress, are allowed to be the great uniters of mankind.
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However we may dislike the causes, yet this effect of begetting a universal discord among us, in all national debates, as well as in cities, corporations, and country neighbourhoods, may keep us at least alive, and in a condition to eat the little bread allowed us in peace and amity.

I have heard of a quarrel in a tavern, where all were at daggers drawing, till one of the company cried out, desiring to know the subject of the quarrel; which, when none of them could tell, they put up their swords, sat down, and passed the rest of the evening in quiet. The former has been our case, I hope the latter will be so too; that we shall sit down amicably together, at least until we have something that may give us a title to fall out, since nature has instructed even a brood of goslings to stick together, while the kite is hovering over their heads....

---

THE ADDRESS TO THE JURY.

This piece, as its title expresses, was published when the bill against the printer was to be brought before the grand jury: it warned them of what was expected from them. Whiteshed, the Chief Justice, again attempted to browbeat the jury, but in vain. The bill was thrown out: and the Chief Justice could only show his resentment by dissolving the Grand Jury. Whiteshed was so ridiculed that the vexation he suffered was thought to have shortened his life.

Seasonable Advice to the Grand Jury.

Concerning the bill preparing against the printer of the Drapier’s fourth letter.

November 11th, 1724.

Since a bill is preparing for the grand jury to find against the printer of the Drapier’s last letter, there are several things maturely to be considered by those gentlemen before they determine upon it.

First, they are to consider, that the author of the said pamphlet did write three other discourses on the same subject, which, instead of being censured, were universally approved by the whole nation, and were allowed to have raised and continued that spirit among us, which has hitherto kept out Wood’s coin; for all men will grant, that if those pamphlets had not been written, his coin must have overrun the nation some months ago.

Secondly, it is to be considered, that this pamphlet, against which a proclamation has been issued, is written by the same author: that nobody ever doubted the innocence and goodness of his design; that he appears, through the
whole tenour of it, to be a loyal subject to his Majesty, and devoted to the House of Hanover, and declares himself in a manner peculiarly zealous against the Pretender. And if such a writer, in four several treatises on so nice a subject, where a royal patent is concerned, and where it was necessary to speak of England and of liberty, should in one or two places happen to let fall an inadvertent expression, it would be hard to condemn him, after all the good he has done, especially when we consider that he could have no possible design in view, either of honour or profit, but purely the good of his country.

Thirdly, it ought to be well considered, whether any one expression in the said pamphlet be really liable to a just exception, much less to be found “wicked, malicious, seditious, reflecting upon his Majesty and his ministry,” &c. The two points in that pamphlet, which it is said the prosecutors intend chiefly to fix on, are, first, where the author mentions the penner of the King’s answer. First, it is well known his Majesty is not master of the English tongue; and therefore it is necessary that some other person should be employed to pen what he has to say or write in that language. Secondly, his Majesty’s answer is not in the first person, but in the third. It is not said, we are concerned, or our royal predecessors; but his Majesty is concerned, and his royal predecessors. By which it is plain, these are properly not the words of his Majesty, but supposed to be taken from him, and transmitted hither by one of his ministers. Thirdly, it will be easily seen, that the author of the pamphlet delivers his sentiments upon this particular with the utmost caution and respect, as any impartial reader will observe.

The second paragraph, which it is said will be taken notice of as a motive to find the bill, is what the author says of Ireland’s being a dependent kingdom; he explains all the dependence he knows of, which is a law made in Ireland, whereby it is enacted, “that whoever is King of England shall be King of Ireland.” Before this explanation be condemned, and the bill found upon it, it would be proper that some lawyers should fully inform the jury what other law there is, either statute or common, for this dependency; and if there be no law, there is no transgression.

The fourth thing very maturely to be considered by the jury, is, what influence their finding the bill may have upon the kingdom; the people in general find no fault in the Drapier’s last book, any more than in the three former; and therefore, when they hear it is condemned by a grand jury of Dublin, they will conclude it is done in favour of Wood’s coin; they will think we of this town have changed our minds, and intend to take those halfpence, and therefore it will be in vain for them to stand out: so that the question comes to this, which will be of the worst consequence?—to let pass one or two expressions, at the worst only unwary, in a book written for the public service; or to leave a free, open passage for Wood’s brass to overrun us, by which we shall be undone for ever. The fifth thing to be considered is, that the members of the grand jury, being merchants and principal shopkeepers, can have no suitable temptation offered them as a recompense for the mischief they will do and suffer by letting-in this coin; nor can be at any loss or danger by rejecting the bill. They do not expect any employments in the State, to make up in their own private advantages the destruction of their country; whereas those who go about to advise, entice, or threaten them to find that bill, have great employments, which they have a mind to keep, or to get a greater; as it was likewise the case of all those who signed the proclamation to have the author prosecuted. And therefore it is known, that his grace the Lord Archbishop of Dublin, so renowned for his piety and wisdom, and love of his country, absolutely refused to condemn the book or the author.
Lastly, it ought to be considered what consequence the finding of the bill may have upon a poor man perfectly innocent. I mean the printer. A lawyer may pick out expressions, and make them liable to exception, where no other man is able to find any. But how can it be supposed that an ignorant printer can be such a critic? He knew the author’s design was honest and approved by the whole kingdom: he advised with friends, who told him there was no harm in the book, and he could see none himself: it was sent him in an unknown hand; but the same in which he received the three former. He and his wife have offered to take their oaths that they knew not the author, and therefore, to find a bill that may bring punishment upon the innocent, will appear very hard, to say no worse. For it will be impossible to find the author, unless he will please to discover himself; although I wonder he ever concealed his name; but I suppose what he did at first out of modesty, he continues to do out of prudence. God protect us and him!

I will conclude all with a fable ascribed to Demosthenes. He had served the people of Athens with great fidelity in the station of an orator, when, upon a certain occasion, apprehending to be delivered over to his enemies, he told the Athenians, his countrymen, the following story: Once upon a time the wolves desired a league with the sheep, upon this condition, that the cause of the strife might be taken away, which was the shepherds and mastiffs: this being granted, the wolves, without all fear, made havoc of the sheep.

---

**SWIFT’S DESCRIPTION OF QUILCA.**

The summers of 1724 and 1725 were spent in this country-seat, which his friend Sheridan built for himself amongst the wildest of the Cavan heaths. Quilca stood near a little lake surrounded by trees. Here Sheridan tried a revival of the Roman chariot-races; the slope close by the lake was used for a theatre; the place is redolent with memories of Swift, who loved the place, though he perpetuated in verse the memory of its disorders, its dilapidations, and the general shortcomings, in which it reflected its owner’s character and that of his scolding wife.

**THE BLUNDERS, DEFICIENCIES, DISTRESSES, AND MISFORTUNES OF QUILCA.**

*Proposed to contain one-and-twenty volumes in quarto.*

Begun April 20, 1724. To be continued weekly, if due encouragement be given.

But one lock and a half in the whole house.
The key of the garden-door lost.
The empty bottles all uncleanable.
The vessels for drink very few and leaky.
The new house going to ruin before it is finished.
One hinge of the street-door broke off, and the people forced to go out and come in at the back-door.
The door of the Dean’s bed-chamber full of large chinks.
The beaufet letting in so much wind that it almost blows out the candles.
The Dean’s bed threatening every night to fall under him.
The little table loose and broken in the joints.
The passages open overhead, by which the cats pass continually into the cellar, and eat the victuals, for which one was tried, condemned, and executed by the sword.
The large table in a very tottering condition.
But one chair in the house fit for sitting on, and that in a very ill state of health.
The kitchen perpetually crowded with savages.
Not a bit of mutton to be had in the country.
Want of beds, and a mutiny thereupon among the servants, until supplied from Kells.
An egregious want of all the most common necessary utensils.
Not a bit of turf in this cold weather; and Mrs. Johnson and the Dean in person, with all their servants, forced to assist at the bog, in gathering up the wet bottoms of old clumps.
The grate in the ladies’ bedchamber broke, and forced to be removed, by which they were compelled to be without fire, the chimney smoking intolerably; and the Dean’s great-coat was employed to stop the wind from coming down the chimney, without which expedient they must have been starved to death.
A messenger sent a mile to borrow an old broken tun-dish.
Bottles stopped with bits of wood and tow, instead of corks.
Not one utensil for a fire, except an old pair of tongs, which travels through the house, and is likewise employed to take the meat out of the pot, for want of a flesh-fork.
Every servant an arrant thief as to victuals and drink, and every comer and goer as arrant a thief of everything he or she can lay their hands on.

The spit blunted with poking into bogs for timber, and tears the meat to pieces.

*Bellum atque fæminam*; or a kitchen war between nurse and a nasty crew of both sexes; she to preserve order and cleanliness, they to destroy both; and they generally are conquerors.

*April 28.* This morning the great fore-door quite open, dancing backward and forward with all its weight upon the lower hinge, which must have been broken if the Dean had not accidentally come and relieved it.

A great hole in the floor of the ladies’ chamber, every hour hazarding a broken leg.

Two iron spikes erect on the Dean’s bedstead, by which he is in danger of a broken shin at rising and going to bed.

The ladies’ and Dean’s servants growing fast into the manners and thieveries of the natives; the ladies themselves very much corrupted; the Dean perpetually storming, and in danger of either losing all his flesh, or sinking into barbarity for the sake of peace.

Mrs. Dingley full of cares for herself, and blunders and negligence for her friends. Mrs. Johnson sick and helpless. The Dean deaf and fretting; the lady’s maid awkward and clumsy; Robert lazy and forgetful; William a pragmatical, ignorant, and conceited puppy; Robin and nurse the two great and only supports of the family.

*Bellum lactæum*; or the milky battle, fought between the Dean and the crew of Quilca; the latter insisting on their privilege of not milking till eleven in the forenoon: whereas Mrs. Johnson wanted milk at eight for her health. In this battle the Dean got the victory; but the crew of Quilca begin to rebel again; for it is this day almost ten o’clock, and Mrs. Johnson has not got her milk.

A proverb on the laziness and lodgings of the servants: “The worse their sty—the longer they lie.”

Two great holes in the wall of the ladies’ bedchamber, just at the back of the bed, and one of them directly behind Mrs. Johnson’s pillow, either of which would blow out a candle in the calmest day.

---

**ANSWER TO A PAPER,**

**CALLED**

*A Memorial of the poor Inhabitants, Tradesmen, and Labourers of the Kingdom of Ireland*. [26]
Dublin, March 25th, 1738.

Sir,

I received a paper from you, whoever you are, printed without any name of author or printer, and sent, I suppose, to me among others, without any particular distinction. It contains a complaint of the dearness of corn, and some schemes for making it cheaper which I cannot approve of.

But pray permit me, before I go farther, to give you a short history of the steps by which we arrived at this hopeful situation.

It was, indeed, the shameful practice of too many Irish farmers, to wear out their ground with ploughing; while, either through poverty, laziness, or ignorance, they neither took care to measure it as they ought, nor gave time to any part of the land to recover itself; and when their leases were near expiring, being assured that their landlords would not renew, they ploughed even the meadows, and made such havoc, that their landlords were considerable sufferers by it.

This gave birth to that abominable race of graziers, who, upon expiration of the farmers’ leases, were ready to engross great quantities of land; and the gentlemen having been often before ill paid, and their land worn out of heart, were too easily tempted, when a rich grazier made an offer to take all their land, and give them security for payment. Thus a vast tract of land, where twenty or thirty farmers lived, together with their cottagers and labourers in their several cabins, became all desolate, and easily managed by one or two herdsmen and their boys; whereby the master grazier, with little trouble, seized to himself the livelihood of a hundred people.

It must be confessed, that the farmers were justly punished for their knavery, brutality, and folly. But neither are the squires and landlords to be excused; for to them is owing the depopulating of the country, the vast number of beggars, and the ruin of those few sorry improvements we had. That farmers should be limited in ploughing is very reasonable, and practised in England, and might have easily been done here by penal clauses in their leases; but to deprive them, in a manner, altogether from tilling their lands, was a most stupid want of thinking.

Had the farmers been confined to plough a certain quantity of land, with a penalty of ten pounds an acre for whatever they exceeded, and farther limited for the three or four last years of their leases, all this evil had been prevented; the nation would have saved a million of money, and been more populous by above two hundred thousand souls.

For a people, denied the benefit of trade, to manage their lands in such a manner as to produce nothing but what they are forbidden to trade with, or only such things as they can neither export nor manufacture to advantage, is an absurdity that a wild Indian would be ashamed of; especially when we add, that we are content to purchase this hopeful commerce, by sending to foreign markets for our daily bread.

The grazier’s employment is to feed great flocks of sheep, or black-cattle, or both. With regard to sheep, as folly is usually accompanied with perverseness, so it is here. There is something so monstrous to deal in a commodity (farther than for our own use), which we are not allowed to export manufactured, nor even unmanufactured, but to
one certain country, and only to some few ports in that country; there is, I say, something so sottish, that it wants a name in our language to express it by, and the good of it is, that the more sheep we have, the fewer human creatures are left to wear the wool, or eat the flesh.

Ajax was mad when he mistook a flock of sheep for his enemies; but we shall never be sober until we have the same way of thinking.

The other part of the grazier’s business is, what we call black-cattle, producing hides, tallow, and beef for exportation: all which are good and useful commodities, if rightly managed. But it seems the greatest part of the hides are sent out raw, for want of bark to tan them; and that want will daily grow stronger, for I doubt the new project of tanning without it is at an end.

Our beef, I am afraid, still continues scandalous in foreign markets, for the old reasons; but our tallow, for anything I know, may be good. However, to bestow the whole kingdom on beef and mutton, and thereby drive out half the people who should eat their share, and force the rest to send sometimes as far as Egypt for bread to eat with it, is a most peculiar and distinguished piece of public economy, of which I have no comprehension.

I know very well that our ancestors the Scythians, and their posterity, our kinsmen the Tartars, lived upon the blood, and milk, and raw flesh of their cattle, without one grain of corn; but I confess myself so degenerate, that I am not easy without bread to my victuals....

Now, sir, to return more particularly to you and your memorial. A hundred thousand barrels of wheat, you say, should be imported hither: and ten thousand pounds, premium to the importers. Have you looked into the purse of the nation?

I am no Commissioner of the Treasury; but am well assured that the whole running cash would not supply you with a sum to purchase so much corn, which, only at twenty shillings a barrel, will be a hundred thousand pounds; and ten thousand more for the premium. But you will traffic for your corn with other goods; and where are those goods? if you had them, they are all engaged to pay the rents of absentees, and other occasions in London, besides a huge balance of trade this year against us. Will foreigners take our bankers’ paper? I suppose they will value it at little more than so much a quire. Where are these rich farmers and engrossers of corn, in so bad a year, and so little sowing. You are in pain for two shillings premium, and forget the twenty shillings for the price; find me out the latter, and I will engage for the former.

Your scheme for a tax for raising such a sum is all visionary, and owing to a great want of knowledge in the miserable state of this nation. Tea, coffee, sugar, spices, wine, and foreign clothes, are the particulars you mention upon which this tax should be raised. I will allow the two first; because they are unwholesome; and the last, because I should be glad if they were all burned: but I beg you will leave us our wine to make us awhile forget our misery, or give your tenants leave to plough for barley. But I will tell you a secret, which I learned many years ago from the commissioners of the customs in London: they said, when any commodity appeared to be taxed above a moderate rate, the consequence was, to lessen that branch of the revenue by one half; and one of those gentlemen pleasantly told me, that the mistake of parliaments, on such occasions, was owing to an error of computing two and two to make four, whereas, in the business of laying impositions, two and two never made more than one; which happens
by lessening the import, and the strong temptation of running such goods as paid high duties at least in this kingdom....

You are concerned how strange and surprising it would be in foreign parts to hear that the poor were starving in a rich country, &c. Are you in earnest? Is Ireland the rich country you mean? Or are you insulting our poverty? Were you ever out of Ireland? Or were you ever in it till of late? You may probably have a good employment, and are saving all you can to purchase a good estate in England.

But by talking so familiarly of one hundred and ten thousand pounds, by a tax upon a few commodities, it is plain you are either naturally or affectedly ignorant of our present condition: or else you would know and allow, that such a sum is not to be raised here, without a general excise; since, in proportion to our wealth, we pay already in taxes more than England ever did in the height of war. And when you have brought over your corn, who will be the buyers?—most certainly not the poor, who will not be able to purchase the twentieth part of it.

Sir, upon the whole, your paper is a very crude piece, liable to more objections than there are lines; but I think your meaning is good, and so far you are pardonable.

If you will propose a general contribution for supporting the poor in potatoes and butter-milk till the new corn comes in, perhaps you may succeed better, because the thing at least is possible; and I think if our brethren in England would contribute upon this emergency, out of the million they gain from us every year, they would do a piece of justice as well as charity. In the meantime, go and preach to your own tenants to fall to the plough as fast as they can, and prevail with your neighbouring squires to do the same with theirs; or else die with the guilt of having driven away half the inhabitants, and starving the rest.

But why all this concern for the poor? We want them not, as the country is now managed; they may follow thousands of their leaders, and seek their bread abroad. Where the plough has no work, one family can do the business of fifty, and you may send away the other forty-nine. An admirable piece of husbandry, never known or practised by the wisest nations, who erroneously thought people to be the riches of a country!

If so wretched a state of things would allow it, methinks I could have a malicious pleasure, after all the warning I have in vain given the public, at my own peril, for several years past, to see the consequences and events answering in every particular. I pretend to no sagacity; what I writ was little more than what I had discoursed to several persons, who were generally of my opinion, and it was obvious to every common understanding that such effects must needs follow from such causes—a fair issue of things begun upon party rage, while some sacrificed the public to fury, and others to ambition; while a spirit of faction and oppression reigned in every part of the country, where gentlemen, instead of consulting the ease of their tenants, or cultivating their lands, were worrying one another upon points of Whig and Tory, of High Church and Low Church, which no more concerned them than the long and famous controversy of strops for razors: while agriculture was wholly discouraged, and consequently half the farmers and labourers, and poorer tradesmen forced to beggary or banishment. “Wisdom crieth in the streets: Because I have called on you; I have stretched out my hand, and no man regarded; but ye have set at nought all my counsels, and would none of my reproof; I also will laugh at your calamity, and mock when your fear cometh.”
I have now done with your Memorial, and freely excuse your mistakes, since you appear to write as a stranger, and as of a country which is left at liberty to enjoy the benefits of nature, and to make the best of those advantages which God has given it, in soil, climate, and situation.

MAXIMS CONTROLLED.

The heading of this tract would imply that the theories of political economy have no application to Ireland. Here he shows, one by one, how the ordinary rules that guide us in regard to other nations are utterly fallacious when applied to Ireland. What strikes us most in all these tracts is the deliberate incisiveness of their irony, the despairing bitterness that gives them finish and completeness.

MAXIMS CONTROULED IN IRELAND.

_The Truth of Maxims in State and Government examined with reference to Ireland._

Written in 1724.

There are certain maxims of State, founded upon long observation and experience, drawn from the constant practice of the wisest nations, and from the very principles of government, nor even controiled by any writer on politics. Yet all these maxims do necessarily presuppose a kingdom, or commonwealth, to have the same natural rights common to the rest of mankind, who have entered into civil society; for if we could conceive a nation where each of the inhabitants had but one eye, one leg, and one hand, it is plain, before you could institute them into a republic, that an allowance must be made for those material defects wherein they differed from other mortals. Or, imagine a legislature forming a system for the government of bedlam, and, proceeding upon the maxim that man is a sociable animal, should draw them out of their cells, and form them into corporations or general assemblies; the consequence might probably be that they would fall foul on each other, or burn the house over their own heads.

Of the like nature are innumerable errors committed by crude and short thinkers, who reason upon general topics, without the least allowance for the most important circumstances, which quite alter the nature of the case.

This has been the fate of those small dealers who are every day publishing their thoughts, either on paper or in their assemblies, for improving the trade of Ireland, and referring us to the practice and example of England, Holland, France, or other nations.
I shall, therefore, examine certain maxims of government, which generally pass for uncontroled in the world, and consider how far they will suit with the present condition of this kingdom. First, It is affirmed by wise men that the dearness of things necessary for life, in a fruitful country, is a certain sign of wealth and great commerce; for when such necessaries are dear, it must absolutely follow that money is cheap and plentiful.

But this is manifestly false in Ireland, for the following reason. Some years ago, the species of money here did probably amount to six or seven hundred thousand pounds; and I have good cause to believe that our remittances then did not much exceed the cash brought in to us. But, by the prodigious discouragements we have since received in every branch of our trade, by the frequent enforcement and rigorous execution of the Navigation-act—the tyranny of under custom-house officers—the yearly addition of absentees—the payments to regiments abroad, to civil and military officers residing in England—the unexpected sudden demands of great sums from the treasury—and some other drains of perhaps as great consequence—we now see ourselves reduced to a state (since we have no friends) of being pitied by our enemies; at least, if our enemies were of such a kind as to be capable of any regard towards us except of hatred and contempt.

Forty years are now passed since the Revolution, when the contention of the British Empire was, most unfortunately for us, and altogether against the usual course of such mighty changes in government, decided in the least important nation; but with such ravages and ruin executed on both sides, as to leave the kingdom a desert, which in some sort it still continues.

Neither did the long rebellions in 1641, make half such a destruction of houses, plantations, and personal wealth, in both kingdoms, as two years’ campaigns did in ours, by fighting England’s battles.

By slow degrees, as by the gentle treatment we received under two auspicious reigns, we grew able to live without running in debt.

Our absentees were but few; we had great indulgence in trade, and a considerable share in employments of Church and State; and while the short leases continued, which were let some years after the war ended, tenants paid their rents with ease and cheerfulness, to the great regret of their landlords, who had taken up a spirit of opposition that is not easily removed. And although in these short leases, the rent was gradually to increase after short periods, yet, as soon as the terms elapsed, the land was let to the highest bidder, most commonly without the least effectual clause for building or planting. Yet, by many advantages, which this island then possessed, and has since utterly lost, the rents of land still grew higher upon every lease that expired, till they have arrived at the present exorbitance; when the frog, over-swelling himself, burst at last.

With the price of land, of necessity rose that of corn and cattle, and all other commodities that farmers deal in; hence likewise, obviously, the rates of all goods and manufactures among shopkeepers, the wages of servants, and hire of labourers. But although our miseries came on fast, with neither trade nor money left; yet neither will the landlord abate in his rent, nor can the tenant abate in the price of what the rest must be paid with, nor any shopkeeper, tradesman, or labourer live, at lower expense for food and clothing, than he did before.

I have been the larger upon this first head, because the same observations will clear up and strengthen a good deal of what I shall affirm upon the rest.
The second maxim of those who reason upon trade and government, is, to assert that low interest is a certain sign of great plenty of money in a nation, for which, as in many other articles, they produce the examples of Holland and England. But, with relation to Ireland, this maxim is likewise entirely false.

There are two reasons for the lowness of interest in any country. First, that which is usually alleged, the great plenty of species; and this is obvious. The second is, want of trade, which seldom falls under common observation, although it be equally true, for, where trade is altogether discouraged, there are few borrowers. In those countries where men can employ a large stock, the young merchant, whose fortune may be four or five hundred pounds, will venture to borrow as much more, and can afford a reasonable interest. Neither is it easy, at this day, to find many of those, whose business reaches to employ even so inconsiderable a sum, except among the importers of wine, who, as they have most part of the present trade in these parts of Ireland in their hands, so they are the most exorbitant, exacting fraudulent dealers, that ever trafficked in any nation, and are making all possible speed to ruin both themselves and the nation.

From this defect of gentlemen’s not knowing how to dispose of their ready money, arises the high purchase of land, which in all other countries is reckoned a sign of wealth. For, the frugal squires, who live below their incomes, have no other way to dispose of their savings but by mortgage or purchase, by which the rates of land must naturally increase; and if this trade continues long, under the uncertainty of rents, the landed men of ready money will find it more for their advantage to send their cash to England, and place it in the funds; which I myself am determined to do, the first considerable sum I shall be master of.

It has likewise been a maxim among politicians, “That the great increase of buildings in the metropolis, argues a flourishing state.” But this, I confess, has been controul'd from the example of London; when, by the long and annual parliamentary session, such a number of senators with their families, friends, adherents, and expectants, draw such prodigious numbers to that city, that the old hospitable custom of lords and gentlemen living in their ancient seats among their tenants, is almost lost in England; is laughed out of doors; insomuch that, in the middle of summer, a legal House of Lords and Commons might be brought in a few hours to London, from their country villas within twelve miles round.

The case in Ireland is yet somewhat worse: for the absentees of great estates, who, if they lived at home, would have many rich retainers in their neighbourhoods, have learned to rack their lands, and shorten their leases, as much as any residing squire; and the few remaining of those latter, having some vain hope of employments for themselves, or their children, and discouraged by the beggarliness and thievery of their own miserable farmers and cottagers, or seduced by the vanity of their wives, on pretence of their children’s education (whereof the fruits are so apparent), together with that most wonderful, and yet more unaccountable zeal, for a seat in their assembly, though at some years’ purchase of their whole, estates: these, and some other motives, have drawn such concourse to this beggarly city, that the dealers of the several branches of building have found out all the commodious and inviting places for erecting new houses; while fifteen hundred of the old ones, which is a seventh part of the whole city, are said to be left uninhabited, and falling to ruin. Their method is the same with that which was first introduced by Dr. Barebone at London, who died a bankrupt. The mason, the bricklayer, the carpenter, the Slater, and the glazier, take a lot of ground, club to build one or more houses, unite their credit, their stock, and their money; and when their work is finished sell it to the best advantage they can. But, as it often happens, and more every day, that their fund will not
answer half their design, they are forced to undersell it at the first story, and are all reduced to beggary. Insomuch, that I know a certain fanatic brewer, who is reported to have some hundreds of houses in this town, is said to have purchased the greatest part of them at half value from ruined undertakers; has intelligence of all new houses where the finishing is at a stand, takes advantage of the builders’ distress, and, by the advantage of ready money, gets fifty per cent. at least for his bargain.

It is another undisputed maxim in government, “That people are the riches of a nation;” which is so universally granted, that it will be hardly pardonable to bring it into doubt. And I will grant it to be so far true, even in this island, that if we had the African custom, or privilege, of selling our useless bodies for slaves to foreigners, it would be the most useful branch of our trade, by ridding us of a most unsupportable burden, and bringing us money in the stead. But, in our present situation, at least five children in six who are born, lie a dead weight upon us, for want of employment. And a very skilful computer assured me, that above one half of the souls in this kingdom supported themselves by begging and thievery; two-thirds whereof would be able to get their bread in any other country upon earth. Trade is the only incitement to labour; where that fails, the poorer native must either beg, steal or starve, or be forced to quit his country. This has made me often wish, for some years past, that instead of discouraging our people from seeking foreign soil, the public would rather pay for transporting all our unnecessary mortals, whether Papists or Protestants, to America; as drawbacks are sometimes allowed for exporting commodities, where a nation is overstocked. I confess myself to be touched with very sensible pleasure, when I hear of a mortality in any country parish or village, where the wretches are forced to pay for a filthy cabin, and two ridges of potatoes, treble the worth; brought up to steal or beg, for want of work; to whom death would be the best thing to be wished for on account both of themselves and the public.

Among all taxes imposed by the legislature, those upon luxury are universally allowed to be the most equitable, and beneficial to the subject; and the commonest reasoner on government might fill a volume with arguments on the subject. Yet here again, by the singular fate of Ireland, this maxim is utterly false; and the putting of it in practice may have such a pernicious consequence, as, I certainly believe, the thoughts of proposers were not able to reach.

The miseries we suffer by our absentees, are of a far more extensive nature than seems to be commonly understood. I must vindicate myself to the reader so far, as to declare solemnly, that what I shall say of those lords and squires, does not arise from the least regard I have for their understandings, their virtues, or their persons: for, although I have not the honour of the least acquaintance with any one among them (my ambition not soaring so high), yet I am too good a witness of the situation they have been in for thirty years past; the veneration paid them by the people, the high esteem they are in among the prime nobility and gentry, the particular marks of favour and distinction they receive from the Court; the weight and consequence of their interest, added to their great zeal and application for preventing any hardships their country might suffer from England, wisely considering that their own fortunes and honours were embarked in the same bottom.
A SHORT VIEW OF THE STATE OF IRELAND, 1727.

Here, Swift catalogues in regular order the possible adjuncts and conditions of prosperity, and shows how the very negative of each is present in Ireland. “If we flourish, it is against every law of nature and reason: like the thorn of Glastonbury, which blossoms in the midst of winter.” He draws a fanciful picture of what Ireland might seem to a stranger, favoured as she is by nature; but breaks from it in despair. All his tracts have one end and aim: “Be independent.” Law cannot help; theory is futile; English selfishness is great. Whatever you get will be by self-assertion and by that alone. Swift was acquainted with the current nostrums, which he despised. He saw the evil lay deeper, and that it could be cured only by giving to Ireland the motive power of independence. He kindled her energy by plain bald statements, withering sarcasm, derisive scorn, and the fiercest indignation. The sarcasm and indignation are for the English selfishness; the scorn for Irish imbecility and weakness.

I am assured, that it has for some time been practised as a method of making men’s court, when they are asked about the rate of lands, the abilities of the tenants, the state of trade and manufacture in this kingdom, and how their rents are paid; to answer, that in their neighbourhood all things are in a flourishing condition, the rent and purchase of land every day increasing. And if a gentleman happen to be a little more sincere in his representation, besides being looked on as not well-affected, he is sure to have a dozen contradictors at his elbow. I think it is no manner of secret, why these questions are so cordially asked, or so obligingly answered.

But since, with regard to the affairs of this kingdom, I have been using all endeavours to subdue my indignation, to which indeed I am not provoked by any personal interest, not being the owner of one spot of ground in the whole island; I shall only enumerate, by rules generally known, and never contradicted, what are the true causes of any country’s flourishing and growing rich; and then examine what effects arise from those causes in the kingdom of Ireland.

The first cause of a kingdom’s thriving is, the fruitfulness of the soil to produce the necessaries and conveniences of life; not only sufficient for the inhabitants, but for exportation into other countries.

The second is, the industry of the people, in working up all their native commodities to the last degree of manufacture.

The third is, the conveniency of safe ports and havens, to carry out their own goods as much manufactured, and bring in those of others as little manufactured as the nature of mutual commerce will allow.

The fourth is, that the natives should, as much as possible, export and import their goods in vessels of their own timber, made in their own country.

The fifth is, the privilege of a free trade in all foreign countries which will permit them, except those who are in war with their own prince or State.
The sixth is, by being governed only by laws made with their own consent; for otherwise they are not a free people. And therefore all appeals for justice, or applications for favour or preferment, to another country, are so many grievous impoverishments.

The seventh is, by improvement of land, encouragement of agriculture, and thereby increasing the number of their people; without which any country, however blessed by nature, must continue poor.

The eighth is, the residence of the prince, or chief administrator of the civil power.

The ninth is, the concourse of foreigners, for education, curiosity, or pleasure, or as to a general mart of trade.

The tenth is, by disposing all offices of honour, profit, or trust, only to the natives; or at least with very few exceptions, where strangers have long inhabited the country, and are supposed to understand and regard the interests of it as their own.

The eleventh is, when the rents of land and profits of employment are spent in the country which produced them, and not in another; the former of which will certainly happen where the love of our native country prevails.

The twelfth is, by the public revenues being all spent and employed at home, except on the occasions of a foreign war.

The thirteenth is, where the people are not obliged unless they find it for their own interest or conveniency, to receive any moneys, except of their own coinage by a public mint, after the manner of all civilized nations.

The fourteenth is, a disposition of the people of a country to wear their own manufactures, and import as few incitements to luxury, either in clothes, furniture, food, or drink, as they can possibly live conveniently without.

There are many other causes of a nation’s thriving, which I at present cannot recollect; but without advantage from at least some of these, after turning my thoughts a long time, I am not able to discover whence our wealth proceeds, and therefore would gladly be better informed. In the meantime, I will here examine what share falls to Ireland of these causes, or of the effects and consequences.

It is not my intention to complain, but barely to relate facts; and the matter is not of small importance. For it is allowed, that a man who lives in a solitary house, far from help, is not wise in endeavouring to acquire in the neighbourhood the reputation of being rich; because those who come for gold, will go off with pewter and brass, rather than return empty: and in the common practice of the world, those who possess most wealth, make the least parade; which they leave to others, who have nothing else to bear them out in showing their faces on the Exchange.

As to the first cause of a nation’s riches, being the fertility of the soil, as well as temperature of the climate, we have no reason to complain; for, although the quantity of unprofitable land in this kingdom, reckoning bog and rock and barren mountain, be double in proportion to what it is in England; yet the native productions, which both kingdoms deal in, are very near on an equality in point of goodness, and might, with the same encouragement, be as well manufactured. I except mines and minerals; in some of which, however, we are only defective in point of skill and
industry. In the second, which is the industry of the people, our misfortune is not altogether owing to our own fault, but to a million of discouragements.

The conveniency of ports and havens, which nature has bestowed so liberally on this kingdom, is of no more use to us than a beautiful prospect to a man shut up in a dungeon.

As to shipping of its own, Ireland is so utterly unprovided, that of all the excellent timber cut down within these fifty or sixty years, it can hardly be said that the nation has received the benefit of one valuable house to dwell in, or one ship to trade with. Ireland is the only kingdom I ever heard or read of, either in ancient or modern story, which was denied the liberty of exporting their native commodities and manufactures wherever they pleased, except to countries at war with their own prince or State: yet this privilege, by the superiority of mere power, is refused us in the most momentous parts of commerce; besides an act of navigation, to which we never consented, pinned down upon us, and rigorously executed; and a thousand other unexampled circumstances, as grievous as they are invidious to mention. To go on to the rest. It is too well known, that we are forced to obey some laws we never consented to; which is a condition I must not call by its true uncontroverted name, for fear of Lord Chief Justice Whitshed’s ghost, with his *Libertas et natale solum* written for a motto on his coach, as it stood at the door of the court, while he was perjuring himself to betray both. Thus we are in the condition of patients, who have physic sent them by doctors at a distance, strangers to their constitution and the nature of their disease....

As to the improvement of land, those few who attempt that or planting, through covetousness, or want of skill, generally leave things worse than they were; neither succeeding in trees nor hedges; and, by running into the fancy of grazing, after the manner of the Scythians, are every day depopulating the country.

We are so far from having a king to reside among us, that even the viceroy is generally absent four-fifths of his time in the government.

No strangers from other countries make this a part of their travels; where they can expect to see nothing but scenes of misery and desolation.

Those who have the misfortune to be born here, have the least title to any considerable employment; to which they are seldom preferred, but upon a political consideration. One-third part of the rents of Ireland is spent in England; which, with the profit of employments, pensions, appeals, journeys of pleasure or health, education at the Inns of Court and both Universities, remittances at pleasure, the pay of all superior officers in the army, and other incidents, will amount to a full half of the income of the whole kingdom, all clear profit to England.

We are denied the liberty of coining gold, silver, or even copper. In the Isle of Man they coin their own silver; every petty prince, vassal to the Emperor, can coin what money he pleases. And in this, as in most of the articles already mentioned, we are an exception to all other states and monarchies that were ever known in the world.

As to the last, or fourteenth article, we take special care to act diametrically contrary to it in the whole course of our lives. Both sexes, but especially the women, despise and abhor to wear any of their own manufactures, even those which are better made than in other countries; particularly a sort of silk plaid, through which the workmen are forced to run a kind of gold thread, that it may pass for Indian.
Even ale and potatoes are imported from England, as well as corn; and our foreign trade is little more than importation of French wine, for which I am told we pay ready money.

Now, if all this be true (upon which I could easily enlarge), I should be glad to know, by what secret method it is that we grow a rich and flourishing people, without liberty, trade, manufactures, inhabitants, money, or the privilege of coining; without industry, labour, or improvement of land; and with more than half the rent and profits of the whole kingdom annually exported, for which we receive not a single farthing; and to make up all this, nothing worth mentioning, except the linen of the North, a trade, casual, corrupted, and at mercy; and some butter from Cork. If we do flourish, it must be against every law of nature and reason; like the thorn at Glastonbury, that blossoms in the midst of winter....

There is not one argument used to prove the riches of Ireland, which is not a logical demonstration of its poverty. The rise of our rents is squeezed out of the very blood, and vitals, and clothes, and dwellings of the tenants, who live worse than English beggars. The lowness of interest, in all other countries a sign of wealth, is in us a proof of misery; there being no trade to employ any borrower. Hence alone comes the dearness of land, since the savers have no other way to lay out their money; hence the dearness of necessaries of life; because the tenants cannot afford to pay such extravagant rates for land (which they must take, or go a’begging), without raising the price of cattle and of corn, although themselves should live upon chaff. Hence our increase of building in this city; because workmen have nothing to do but to employ one another, and one half of them are infallibly undone. Hence the daily increase of bankers, who may be a necessary evil in a trading country, but so ruinous in ours; who, for their private advantage, have sent away all our silver, and one-third of our gold; so that within three years past the running cash of the nation, which was about five hundred thousand pounds, is now less than two, and must daily diminish, unless we have liberty to coin, as well as that important kingdom the Isle of Man, and the meanest principality in the German empire, as I before observed.

I have sometimes thought, that this paradox of the kingdom’s growing rich is chiefly owing to those worthy gentlemen the bankers; who, except some custom-house officers, birds of passage, oppressive thrifty squires, and a few others who shall be nameless, are the only thriving among us: and I have often wished that a law were enacted to hang up half a dozen bankers every year, and thereby interpose at least some short delay to the farther ruin of Ireland.

Ye are idle! ye are idle! answered Pharaoh to the Israelites, when they complained to his Majesty that they were forced to make bricks without straw.

England enjoys every one of those advantages for enriching a nation which I have above enumerated; and, into the bargain, a good million returned to them every year without labour or hazard, or one farthing value received on our side; but how long we shall be able to continue the payment, I am not under the least concern. One thing I know, that, when the hen is starved to death, there will be no more golden eggs. I think it a little unhospitable, and others may call it a subtle piece of malice, that because there may be a dozen families in this town able to entertain their English friends in a generous manner at their tables, their guests upon their return to England shall report that we wallow in riches and luxury.
Yet I confess I have known an hospital, where all the household officers grew rich; while the poor, for whose sake it was built, were almost starved for want of food and raiment.

To conclude: If Ireland be a rich and flourishing kingdom, its wealth and prosperity must be owing to certain causes, that are yet concealed from the whole race of mankind; and the effects are equally invisible. We need not wonder at strangers, when they deliver such paradoxes; but a native and inhabitant of this kingdom, who gives the same verdict, must be either ignorant to stupidity, or a man-pleaser, at the expense of all honour, conscience, and truth.

THE STORY OF THE INJURED LADY.

Written by herself, in a letter to her Friend; with his answer.

Sir,

Being ruined by the inconstancy and unkindness of a lover, I hope a true and plain relation of my misfortunes may be of use and warning to credulous maids, never to put too much trust in deceitful men.

A gentleman in the neighbourhood had two mistresses, another and myself; and he pretended honourable love to us both. Our three houses stood pretty near one another; his was parted from mine by a river, and from my rival’s by an old broken wall. But before I enter into the particulars of this gentleman’s hard usage of me, I will give a very just and impartial character of my rival and myself.

As to her person, she is tall and lean, and very ill-shaped; she has bad features, and a worse complexion. As to her other qualifies, she has no reputation either for honesty, truth, or manners, and it is no wonder, considering what her education has been. To sum up all, she is poor and beggarly, and gets a sorry maintenance by pilfering wherever she comes.

As for this gentleman, who is now so fond of her, she still bears him an invincible hatred; reviles him to his face, and rails at him in all companies. Her house is frequented by a company of rogues and thieves, and pickpockets, whom she encourages to rob his hen-roosts, steal his corn and cattle, and do him all manner of mischief. She has been known to come at the head of these rascals, and beat her lover until he was sore from head to foot, and then force him to pay for the trouble she was at. Once, attended with a crew of ragamuffins, she broke into his house, turned all things topsy-turvy, and then set it on fire. At the same time she told so many lies among his servants that it set them all by the ears, and his poor steward was knocked on the head; for which I think, and so does all the country, that she ought to be answerable. To conclude her character: she is of a different religion, being a
Presbyterian of the most rank and violent kind, and consequently having an inveterate hatred to the Church; yet I am sure I have been always told, that in marriage there ought to be a union of minds as well as of persons.

I will now give my own character, and shall do it in few words, and with modesty and truth. I was reckoned to be as handsome as any in our neighbourhood, until I became pale and thin with grief and ill-usage. I am still fair enough, and have, I think, no very ill features about me. They that see me now will hardly allow me ever to have had any great share of beauty; for, besides being so much altered, I go always mobbed and in an undress, as well out of neglect, as indeed for want of clothes to appear in. I might add to all this, that I was born to a good estate, although it now turns to little account under the oppressions I endure, and has been the true cause of all my misfortunes.

Some years ago, this gentleman, taking a fancy either to my person or fortune, made his addresses to me: which, being then young and foolish, I too readily admitted. When he had once got possession, he began to play the usual part of a too fortunate lover, affecting on all occasions to show his authority, and to act like a conqueror. First, he found fault with the government of my family, which, I grant was none of the best, consisting of ignorant, illiterate creatures, for at that time I knew but little of the world. In compliance to him, therefore, I agreed to fall into his ways and methods of living; I consented that his steward should govern my house, and have liberty to employ an under steward, who should receive his directions. My lover proceeded farther, turned away several old servants and tenants, and supplying me with others from his own house. These grew so domineering and unreasonable, that there was no quiet, and I heard of nothing but perpetual quarrels, which, although I could not possibly help, yet my lover laid all the blame and punishment upon me; and upon every falling out still turned away more of my people, and supplied me in their stead with a number of fellows and dependents of his own, whom he had no other way to provide for. Overcome by love, and to avoid noise and contention, I yielded to all his usurpations, and finding it in vain to resist, I thought it my best policy to make my court to my new servants, and draw them to my interests; I fed them from my own table with the best I had, put my new tenants on the choice parts of my land, and treated them all so kindly that they began to love me as well as their master. In process of time, all my old servants were gone, and I had not a creature about me, nor above one or two tenants, but what were of his choosing; yet I had the good luck, by gentle usage, to bring over the greatest part of them to my side. When my lover observed this, he began to alter his language; and to those who inquired about me, he would answer that I was an old dependent upon his family, whom he had placed on some concerns of his own; and he began to use me accordingly, neglecting, by degrees, all common civility in his behaviour. I shall never forget the speech he made me one morning, which he delivered with all the gravity in the world. He put me in mind of the vast obligations I lay under to him in sending me so many of his people for my own good, and to teach me manners: that it had cost him ten times more than I was worth to maintain me; that it had been much better for him if I had been burnt, or sunk to the bottom of the sea; that it was reasonable I should strain myself as far as I was able to reimburse him some of his charges; that from henceforward he expected his word should be a law to me in all things; that I must maintain a parish-watch against thieves and robbers, and give salaries to an overseer, a constable, and others, all of his own choosing whom he would send from time to time to be spies upon me; that, to enable me the better in supporting these expenses, my tenants should be obliged to carry all their goods across the river to his own town-market, and pay toll on both sides, and then sell them at half value. But because we were a nasty sort of people, and that he could not endure to touch anything that we had a hand in, and, likewise, because he wanted work to employ his own folks, therefore we must send all our goods to his market just in their naturals—the milk immediately from the cow, without making into cheese or butter;
the corn in the ear; the grass as it was mowed; the wool as it comes from the sheep's back; and bring the fruit upon
the branch, that he might not be obliged to eat it after our filthy hands: that if a tenant carried but a piece of bread
and cheese to eat by the way, or an inch of worsted to mend his stockings, he should forfeit his whole parcel: and
because a parcel of rogues usually plied on the river between us, who often robbed my tenants of their goods and
boats, he ordered a waterman of his to guard them, whose manner was to be out of the way till the poor wretches
were plundered, then to overtake the thieves, and seize all as lawful prize to his master and himself. It would be
endless to repeat a hundred other hardships he has put upon me; but it is a general rule, that whenever he imagines
the smallest advantage will redound to one of his footboys by any new oppression of me and my whole family and
estate, he never disputeth it a moment. All this has rendered me so very insignificant and contemptible at home, that
some servants, to whom I pay the greatest wages, and many tenants, who have the most beneficial leases, are gone
over to live with him, yet I am bound to continue their wages and pay their rents; by which means one-third of my
income is spent on his estate, and above another third by his tolls and markets: and my poor tenants are so sunk and
impoverished, that instead of maintaining me suitably to my quality, they can hardly find me clothes to keep me
warm, or provide the common necessaries of life for themselves.

Matters being in this posture between me and my lover, I received intelligence that he had been for some time
making very pressing overtures of marriage to my rival, until there happened to be some misunderstandings
between them. She gave him ill words, and threatened to break off all commerce with him. He, on the other side,
having either acquired courage by his triumphs over me, or supposing her to be as tame a fool as I, thought at first to
carry it with a high hand, but hearing at the same time that she had thought of making some private proposals to join
with me against him, and doubting, with very good reason, that I would readily accept them, he seemed very much
disconcerted. This, I thought, was a proper occasion to show some great example of generosity and love; and so,
without farther consideration, I sent him word, that hearing there was likely to be a quarrel betwixt him and my
rival, notwithstanding all that had passed, and without binding him to any conditions in my own favour, I would
stand by him against her and all the world, while I had a penny in my purse, or a petticoat to pawn. This message
was subscribed by all my chief tenants, and proved so powerful, that my rival immediately grew more tractable
upon it. The result of which was, that there is now a treaty of marriage concluded between them, the wedding
clothes are bought, and nothing remains but to perform the ceremony, which is put off for some days, because they
design it to be a public wedding. And to reward my love, constancy, and generosity, he has bestowed on me the
office of being sempstress to his grooms and footmen, which I am forced to accept or starve.

For my part, I think, and so does all the country, too, that the man is possessed; at least none of us are able to
imagine what he can possibly see in her, unless she has bewitched him, or given him some powder. I am sure I never sought this alliance, and you can bear me witness that I might have had other matches; nay if I
were lightly disposed, I could still perhaps have offers, that some, who hold their heads higher, would be glad to
accept. But alas! I never had any such wicked thought; all I now desire is, only to enjoy a little quiet, to be free from
the persecutions of this unreasonable man, and that he will let me manage my own little fortune to the best
advantage; for which I will undertake to pay him a considerable pension every year, much more considerable than
what he now gets by his oppressions; for he must needs find himself a loser at last, when he has drained me and my
tenants so dry, that we shall not have a penny for him or ourselves. There is one imposition of his I had almost
forgot, which I think unsufferable, and will appeal to you, or any reasonable person, whether it be so or not. I told you before, that by an old compact we agreed to have the same steward; at which time I consented likewise to regulate my family and estate by the same method with him, which he then showed me written down in form, and I approved of. Now, the turn he thinks fit to give this compact of ours is very extraordinary; for he pretends, that whatever orders he shall think fit to prescribe for the future in his family, he may, if he will, compel mine to observe them without asking my advice, or hearing my reasons.

So that I must not make a lease without his consent, or give any directions for the well-governing of my family, but what he countermands whenever he pleases. This leaves me at such confusion and uncertainty, that my servants know not when to obey me; and my tenants, although many of them be very well-inclined, seem quite at a loss.

But I am too tedious upon this melancholy subject, which however I hope you will forgive, since the happiness of my whole life depends upon it. I desire you will think awhile, and give your best advice what measures I shall take with prudence, justice, courage, and honour, to protect my liberty and fortune against the hardships and severities I lie under from that unkind, inconstant man.

THE ANSWER TO THE INJURED LADY.

MADAM,

I have received your ladyship’s letter, and carefully considered every part of it, and shall give you my opinion how you ought to proceed for your own security. But first I must beg leave to tell your ladyship, that you were guilty of an unpardonable weakness the other day, in making that offer to your lover of standing by him in any quarrel he might have with your rival. You know very well, that she began to apprehend he had designs of using her as he had done you; and common prudence might have directed you rather to have entered into some measures with her for joining against him, until he might at least be brought to some reasonable terms; but your invincible hatred to that lady has carried your resentments so high, as to be the cause of your ruin; yet if you please to consider, this aversion of yours began a good while before she became your rival, and was taken up by you and your family in a sort of compliment to your lover, who formerly had a great abhorrence of her. It is true, since that time you have suffered very much by her encroachments upon your estate,[38] but she never pretended to govern and direct you; and now you have drawn a new enemy upon yourself; for I think you may count upon all the ill offices she can possibly do you, by her credit with her husband; whereas, if, instead of openly declaring against her, without any provocation, you had but sat still awhile, and said nothing, that gentleman would have lessened his severity to you out of perfect fear. This weakness of yours you call generosity; but I doubt there was more in the matter: in short, madam, I have
good reasons to think you were betrayed to it by the pernicious counsel of some about you; for to my certain knowledge, several of your tenants and servants to whom you have been very kind, are as arrant rascals as any in the country. I know the matters of fact, as you relate them, are true, and fairly represented.

My advice therefore is this: get your tenants together as soon as you conveniently can, and make them agree to the following resolutions.

First, that your family and servants have no dependence upon the said gentleman, farther than by the old agreement, which obliges you to have the same steward, and to regulate your household by such methods as you should both agree to.

Secondly, that you will not carry your goods to the market of his town, unless you please, nor be hindered from carrying them anywhere else.

Thirdly, that the servants you pay wages to shall live at home, or forfeit their places.

Fourthly, that whatever lease you make to a tenant, it shall not be in his power to break it.

If he will agree to these articles, I advise you to contribute as largely as you can to all charges of parish and county.

I can assure you, several of that gentleman’s ablest tenants and servants are against his severe usage of you and would be glad of an occasion to convince the rest of their error, if you will not be wanting to yourself.

If the gentleman refuses these just and reasonable offers, pray let me know it, and perhaps I may think of something else that will be more effectual.

I am,

Madam,

Your Ladyship’s, etc.

A LETTER TO THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN,[39] CONCERNING THE WEAVERS.

MY LORD,
The corporation of weavers in the woollen manufacture, who have so often attended your Grace, and called upon me with their schemes and proposals, were with me on Thursday last; when he who spoke for the rest, and in the name of his absent brethren, said, “It was the opinion of the whole body, that if somewhat was written at this time, by an able hand, to persuade the people of this kingdom to wear their own woollen manufactures, it might be of good use to the nation in general, and preserve many hundreds of their trade from starving.”

To which I answered, “That it was hard for any man of common spirit to turn his thoughts to such speculations, without discovering a resentment, which people are too delicate to bear.” For I will not deny to your Grace, that I cannot reflect on the singular condition of this country, different from all others upon the face of the earth, without some emotion; and without often examining, as I pass the streets, whether those animals which come in my way, with two legs and human faces, clad and erect, be of the same species with what I have seen very like them in England as to the outward shape, but differing in their notions, natures, and intellects, more than any two kinds of brutes in the forest; which any man of common prudence would immediately discover, by persuading them to define what they meant by law, liberty, property, courage, reason, loyalty, or religion.

One thing, my lord, I am very confident of; that if God Almighty, for our sins, would most justly send us a pestilence, whoever should dare to discover his grief in public for such a visitation, would certainly be censured for disaffection to the government; for I solemnly profess that I do not know one calamity we have undergone these many years, which any man, whose opinions were not in fashion, dared to lament, without being openly charged with that imputation. And this is the harder, because although a mother, when she has corrected her child, may sometimes force it to kiss the rod, yet she will never give that power to the footboy or the scullion.

My lord, there are two things for the people of this kingdom to consider; first, their present evil condition; and secondly, what can be done in some degree to remedy it.... I am weary of so many abortive projects for the advancement of trade; of so many crude proposals, in letters sent me from unknown hands; of so many contradictory speculations, about raising or sinking the value of gold and silver. I am not in the least sorry to hear of the great numbers going to America, although very much for the causes that drive them from us, since the uncontrolled maxim, “That people are the riches of a nation,” is no maxim here under our circumstances. We have neither manufactures to employ them about, nor food to support them. If a private gentleman’s income be sunk irretrievably for ever, from a hundred pounds to fifty, and he has no other method to supply the deficiency; I desire to know, my lord, whether such a person has any other course to take, than to sink half his expenses in every article of economy, to save himself from ruin and a gaol.

Is not this more than doubly the case of Ireland, where the want of money, the irretrievable ruin of trade, with the other evils above-mentioned, and many more too well known and felt, and too numerous or invidious to be related, have been gradually sinking us, for above a dozen years past, to a degree, that we are at least by two-thirds in a worse condition than was ever known since the Revolution? Therefore, instead of dreams and projects for the advancing of trade, we have nothing left but to find out some expedient, whereby we may reduce our expenses to our incomes.

Yet this procedure, allowed so necessary in all private families, and in its own nature so easy to put in practice, may meet with strong opposition by the cowardly slavish indulgence of the men, to the intolerable pride, arrogance,
vanity, and luxury of the women; who, strictly adhering to the rules of modern education, seem to employ their whole stock of invention in contriving new arts of profusion, faster than the most parsimonious husband can afford: and, to compass this work the more effectually, their universal maxim is, to despise and detest everything of the growth of their own country, and most to value whatever comes from the very remotest parts of the globe. And I am convinced that if the virtuosi could once find out a world in the moon, with a passage to it, our women would wear nothing but what directly came from thence. The prime cost of wine yearly imported to Ireland is valued at thirty thousand pounds; and the tea (including coffee and chocolate) at five times that sum. The laces, silks, calicoes, and all other unnecessary ornaments for women, including English cloths and stuffs, added to the former articles, make up (to compute grossly) about four hundred thousand pounds. Now if we should allow the thirty thousand pounds, wherein the women have their share, and which is all we have to comfort us, and deduct seventy thousand pounds more for over-reaching, there would still remain three hundred thousand pounds, annually spent, for unwholesome drugs and unnecessary finery; which prodigious sum would be wholly saved, and many thousands of our miserable shopkeepers and manufacturers comfortably supported.

Let speculative people bury their brains as they please, there is no other way to prevent this kingdom from sinking for ever, than by utterly renouncing all foreign dress and luxury.

It is absolutely so in fact, that every husband of any fortune in the kingdom, is nourishing a poisonous, devouring serpent in his bosom, with all the mischief, but with none of its wisdom.

If all the women were clad with the growth of their own country, they might still vie with each other in the course of foppery; and still have room left to vie with each other and equally show their wit and judgment, in deciding upon the variety of Irish stuffs. And if they could be contented with their native wholesome slops for breakfast, we should hear no more of the spleen, hysterics, colics, palpitations, and asthmas. They might still be allowed to ruin each other and their husbands at play, because the money lost would circulate among ourselves.

My lord, I freely own it a wild imagination, that any words will cure the sottishness of men, or the vanity of women; but the kingdom is in a fair way of producing the most effectual remedy, when there will not be money left for the common course of buying and selling the very necessaries of life in our markets, unless we absolutely change the whole method of our proceedings.

The corporation of weavers in woollen and silk, who have so frequently offered proposals both to your Grace and to me, are the hottest and coldest generation of men that I have known. About a month ago, they attended your Grace, when I had the honour to be with you; and designed me the same favour. They desired you would recommend to your clergy to wear gowns of Irish stuffs which might probably spread the example among all their brethren in the kingdom; and perhaps among the lawyers and gentlemen of the university, and among the citizens of those corporations who appear in gowns on solemn occasions. I then mentioned a kind of stuff, not above eightpence a yard, which I heard had been contrived by some of the trade, and was very convenient. I desired they would prepare some of that, or any sort of black stuff, on a certain day, when your Grace would appoint as many clergymen as could readily be found to meet at your palace; and there give their opinions; and that your Grace’s visitation approaching, you could then have the best opportunity of seeing what could be done in a matter of such consequence, as they seemed to think, to the woollen manufacture. But instead of attending, as was expected, they
came to me a fortnight after with a new proposal, that something should be written by an acceptable and able hand, to promote in general the wearing of home manufactures; and their civilities would fix that work upon me.

I asked if they had prepared the stuffs, as they had promised, and your Grace expected; but they had not made the least step in the matter, nor, as it appears, thought of it more.

I did, some years ago, propose to the masters and principal dealers in the home-manufactures of silk and wool, that they should meet together; and, after mature consideration, publish advertisements to the following purpose:

“That in order to encourage the wearing of Irish manufactures in silk and woollen, they gave notice to the nobility and gentry of the kingdom, that they, the undersigned, would enter into bonds, for themselves and for each other, to sell the several sorts of stuffs, cloths, and silks, made to the best perfection they were able, for certain fixed prices; and in such a manner, that if a child were sent to any of their shops, the buyer might be secure of the value and goodness and measure of the ware; and, lest this might be thought to look like a monopoly, any other member of the trade might be admitted, upon such conditions as should be agreed on. And if any person whatsoever should complain that he was ill-used, in the value and goodness of what he bought, the matter should be examined, the persons injured be fully satisfied by the whole corporation without delay, and the dishonest seller be struck out of the society, unless it appeared evidently that the failure proceeded only from mistake.”

The mortal danger is, that if these dealers could prevail, by the goodness and cheapness of their cloths and stuffs, to give a turn to the principal people of Ireland in favour of their goods; they would relapse into the knavish practice, peculiar to this kingdom, which is apt to run through all trades, even so low as a common ale-seller; who, as soon as he gets a vogue for his liquor, and outsells his neighbours, thinks his credit will put off the worst he can buy till his customers will come no more. Thus, I have known at London, in a general mourning, the drapers dye black all their damaged goods, and sell them at double rates; then complain, and petition the Court, that they are ready to starve by the continuance of the mourning.

Therefore, I say, those principal weavers who would enter into such a compact as I have mentioned, must give sufficient security against all such practices; for if once the women can persuade their husbands that foreign goods, besides the finery, will be as cheap, and do more service, our last state will be worse than the first.

I do not here pretend to digest perfectly the method by which these principal shopkeepers shall proceed, in such a proposal; but my meaning is clear enough, and cannot be reasonably objected against.

We have seen what a destructive loss the kingdom received by the detestable fraud of the merchants, or northern linen weavers, or both; notwithstanding all the cares of the governor of that board, when we had an offer of commerce with the Spaniards for our linens to the value, as I am told, of thirty thousand pounds a year. But, while we deal like pedlars, we shall practise like pedlars, and sacrifice all honesty to the present urging advantage.

What I have said may serve as an answer to the desire made me by the corporation of weavers, that I would offer my notions to the public. As to anything farther, let them apply themselves to the Parliament in their next session. Let them prevail on the House of Commons to grant one very reasonable request; and I shall think there is still some spirit left in the nation, when I read a vote to this purpose: “Resolved, nemine contradicente, That this House will,
for the future, wear no clothes but such as are made of Irish growth, or of Irish manufacture, nor will permit their wives or children to wear any other; and that they will, to the utmost, endeavour to prevail with their friends, relations, dependents, and tenants, to follow their example.” And if, at the same time, they could banish tea and coffee, and china-ware, out of their families, and force their wives to chat their scandal over an infusion of sage, or other wholesome domestic vegetables, we might possibly be able to subsist, and pay our absentees, pensioners, generals, civil officers, appeals, colliers, temporary travellers, students, school boys, splenetic visitors of Bath, Tunbridge, and Epsom, with all other smaller drains, by sending our crude, unwrought goods to England, and receiving from thence, and all other countries, nothing but what is fully manufactured, and keep a few potatoes and oatmeal for our own subsistence.

I have been for a dozen years past wisely prognosticating the present condition of this kingdom; which any human creature of common sense could foretell, with as little sagacity as myself. My meaning is, that a consumptive body must needs die, which has spent all its spirits, and received no nourishment. Yet I am often tempted to pity, when I hear the poor farmer and cottager lamenting the hardness of the times, and imputing them either to one or two ill seasons, which better climates than ours are more exposed to; or to scarcity of silver, which, to a nation of liberty, would only be a slight and temporary inconvenience, to be removed at a month’s warning.

\[\text{TWO LETTERS ON SUBJECTS RELATIVE TO THE IMPROVEMENT OF IRELAND.}\]

\[\text{I.}\]

\[\text{TO MESSRS. TRUMAN AND LAYFIELD.}\]

\[\text{GENTLEMEN,—}\]

I am inclined to think that I received a letter from you two, last summer, directed to Dublin, while I was in the country, whither it was sent me; and I ordered an answer to it to be printed, but it seems it had little effect, and I suppose this will not have much more. But the heart of this people is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed. And, gentlemen, I am to tell you another thing: that the world is too regardless of what we write for public good; that after we have delivered our thoughts, without any prospect of advantage, or of reputation, which latter is not to be had but by subscribing our names, we cannot prevail upon a printer to be at the charge of sending it into the world unless we will be at all or half the expense; and although we are willing enough
to bestow our labours, we think it unreasonable to be out of pocket; because it probably may not consist with the situation of our affairs.

I do very much approve your good intentions, and in a great measure your manner of declaring them; and I do imagine you intended that the world should not only know your sentiments, but my answer, which I shall impartially give.... Although your letter be directed to me, yet I take myself to be only an imaginary person; for, although I conjecture I had formerly one from you, yet I never answered it otherwise than in print; neither was I at a loss to know the reasons why so many people of this kingdom were transporting themselves to America.

And if this encouragement were owing to a pamphlet written, giving an account of the country of Pennsylvania, to tempt people to go thither, I do declare that those who were tempted, by such a narrative, to such a journey, were fools, and the author a most impudent knave; at least, if it be the same pamphlet I saw when it first came out, which is about twenty-five years ago, dedicated to William Penn (whom by a mistake you call “Sir William Penn,”) and styling him, by authority of the Scripture, “Most noble Governor.” For I was very well acquainted with Penn, and did, some years after, talk with him upon that pamphlet, and the impudence of the author, who spoke so many things in praise of the soil and climate, which Penn himself did absolutely contradict. For he did assure me, “That this country wanted the shelter of mountains, which left it open to the northern winds from Hudson’s Bay and the Frozen Sea, which destroyed all plantations of trees, and was even pernicious to all common vegetables.” But, indeed, New York, Virginia, and other parts less northward, or more defended by mountains, are described as excellent countries; but upon what conditions of advantage foreigners go thither, I am yet to seek. What evils our people avoid by running from hence, is easier to be determined. They conceive themselves to live under the tyranny of most cruel exacting landlords, who have no views farther than increasing their rent-rolls. Secondly, you complain of the want of trade, whereof you seem not to know the reason. Thirdly, you lament most justly the money spent by absentees in England. Fourthly, you complain that your linen manufacture declines. Fifthly, that your tithe collectors oppress you. Sixthly, that your children have no hopes of preferment in the church, the revenue, or the army; to which you might have added the law, and all civil employments whatsoever. Seventhly, you are undone for want of silver, and want all other money.

I could easily add some other motives, which, to men of spirit, who desire and expect, and think they deserve the common privileges of human nature, would be of more force, than any you have yet named, to drive them out of this kingdom. But as these speculations may probably not much affect the brains of your people, I shall choose to let them pass unmentioned.... I must confess to you both, that if one reason of your people’s deserting us be the despair of things growing better in their own country, I have not one syllable to answer; because that would be to hope for what is impossible, and so I have been telling the public these ten years. For there are events which must precede any such blessing; first, a liberty of trade; secondly, a share of preferments in all kinds, equal to the British natives; and thirdly, a return of those absentees, who take almost one half of the kingdom’s revenue. As to the first and second, there is nothing left us but despair; and for the third, it will never happen till the kingdom has no money to send them; for which, in my own particular, I shall not be sorry. The exactons of landlords has indeed been a grievance of above twenty years’ standing. But as to what you object about the severe clauses relating to the improvement, the fault lies wholly on the other side; for the landlords, either by their ignorance, or greediness of making large rent-rolls, have performed this matter so ill, as we see by experience, that there is not one tenant in five hundred who has made any improvement worth mentioning: for which I appeal to any man who rides through the
kingdom, where little is to be found among the tenants but beggary and desolation; the cabins of the Scotch themselves, in Ulster, being as dirty and miserable as those of the wildest Irish. Whereas good firm penal laws for improvement, with a tolerable easy rent, and a reasonable period of time, would, in twenty years, have increased the rents of Ireland at least a third part of the intrinsic value. I am glad to hear you speak with some decency of the clergy, and to impute the exactions you lament to the managers or farmers of the tithes. But you entirely mistake the fact; for I defy the most wicked and most powerful clergyman in the kingdom to oppress the meanest farmer in the parish; and I defy the same clergyman to prevent himself from being cheated by the same farmer, whenever that farmer shall be disposed to be knavish or peevish.

For, although the Ulster tithing-teller is more advantageous to the clergy than any other in the kingdom, yet the minister can demand no more than his tenth; and where the corn much exceeds the small tithes, as, except in some districts, I am told it always does, he is at the mercy of every stubborn farmer, especially of those whose sect as well as interest incline them to opposition. However, I take it that your people bent for America do not show the best side of their prudence in making this one part of their complaint; yet they are so far wise, as not to make the payment of tithes a scruple of conscience, which is too gross for any Protestant dissenter, except a Quaker, to pretend. But do your people indeed think, that if tithes were abolished, or delivered into the hands of the landlord, after the blessed manner in the Scotch spiritual economy, the tenant would sit easier in his rent under the same person, who must be lord of the soil and of the tithe together?

I am ready enough to grant, that the oppression of landlords, the utter ruin of trade, with its necessary consequences, the want of money, half the revenues of the kingdom spent abroad, the continued dearth of three years, and the strong delusion in your people by false allurement from America, may be the chief motives of their eagerness after such an expedition. But there is likewise another temptation, which is not of inconsiderable weight; which is their itch of living in a country where their sect is predominant, and where their eyes and consciences will not be offended by the stumbling block of ceremonies, habits, and spiritual titles. But I was surprised to find that those calamities, whereof we are innocent, have been sufficient to drive many families out of their country, who had no reason to complain of oppressive landlords. For, while I was last year in the northern parts, a person of quality, whose estate was let above twenty years ago, and then at a very reasonable rent, some for leases of lives, and some perpetuities, did, in a few months, purchase eleven of those leases at a very inconsiderable price, although they were, two years ago, reckoned to pay but half value; whence it is manifest that our present miserable condition, and the dismal prospect of worse, with other reasons above assigned, are sufficient to put men upon trying this desperate experiment of changing the scene they are in, although landlords should, by a miracle, become less inhuman.

There is hardly a scheme proposed for improving the trade of this kingdom, which does not manifestly show the stupidity and ignorance of the proposer, and I laugh with contempt at those weak wise heads, who proceed upon general maxims, or advise us to follow the examples of Holland and England. These empirics talk by rote, without understanding the constitution of the kingdom: as if a physician, knowing that exercise contributed much to health, should prescribe to his patient under a severe fit of the gout, to walk ten miles every morning. The directions for Ireland are very short and plain: to encourage agriculture and home consumption, and utterly discard all importations which are not absolutely necessary for health or life. And how few necessaries, conveniences, or even comforts of life, are denied us by nature, or not to be attained by labour and industry! Are those detestable extravagances of Flanders lace, English cloths made of our own wool, and other goods, Italian or Indian silks, tea,
coffee, chocolate, chinaware, and that profusion of wines, by the knavery of merchants growing dearer every season, with a hundred unnecessary fopperies, better known to others than me, are these, I say, fit for us, any more than for the beggar who could not eat his veal without oranges?

Is it not the highest indignity to human nature, that men should be such poltroons as to suffer the kingdom and themselves to be undone by the vanity, the folly, the pride, and wantonness of their wives, who, under their present corruptions, seem to be a kind of animal, suffered, for our sins, to be sent into the world for the destruction of families, societies, and kingdoms, and whose whole study seems directed to be as expensive as they possibly can, in every useless article of living; who, by long practice, can reconcile the most pernicious foreign drugs to their health and pleasure, provided they are but expensive, as starlings grow fat with henbane; who contract a robustness by mere practice of sloth and luxury; who can play deep several hours after midnight, sleep beyond noon, revel upon Indian poisons, and spend the revenues of a moderate family to adorn a nauseous, unwholesome, living carcase? Let those few who are not concerned in any part of this accusation, suppose it unsaid; let the rest take it among them. Gracious God, in His mercy, look down upon a nation so shamefully besotted!

Is there any mortal who can show me, under the circumstances we stand with our neighbours, under their inclinations towards us, under laws never to be repealed, under the desolation caused by absentees, under many other circumstances not to be mentioned, that this kingdom can ever be a nation of trade, or subsist by any other method than that of a reduced family, by the utmost parsimony?

II.

ANSWER TO SEVERAL LETTERS SENT FROM UNKNOWN HANDS. 1729.

I am very well pleased with the good opinion you express of me, and wish it were any way in my power to answer your expectations, for the service of my country. I have carefully read your several schemes and proposals, which you think should be offered to Parliament. In answer, I will assure you, that, in another place, I have known very good proposals rejected with contempt by public assemblies, merely because they were offered from without doors, and yours, perhaps, might have the same fate, especially if handed to the public by me, who am not acquainted with three members, nor have the least interest with one. My printers have been twice prosecuted, to my great expense, on account of discourses I writ for the public service, without the least reflection on parties or persons, and the success I had in those of the Drapier, was not owing to my abilities, but to a lucky juncture, when the fuel was ready for the first hand that would be at the pains of kindling it. It is true, both those envenomed prosecutions were the workmanship of a judge, who is now gone to his own place. But, let that be as it will, I am determined, henceforth never to be the instrument of leaving an innocent man at the mercy of that bench. It is certain there are several particulars relating to this kingdom (I have mentioned a few of them in one of my Drapier’s letters), which it were heartily to be wished that the Parliament would take under their consideration, such as will no way interfere with England, otherwise than to its advantage.
The first I shall mention, is touched at in a letter which I received from one of you, gentlemen, about the highways; which, indeed, are almost everywhere scandalously neglected. I know a very rich man in this city, a true lover and saver of his money, who, being possessed of some adjacent lands, has been at great charge in repairing effectually the roads that lead to them, and, has assured me that his lands are thereby advanced four or five shillings an acre, by which he gets treble interest. But, generally speaking, all over the kingdom the roads are deplorable, and, what is more particularly barbarous there is no sort of provision made for travellers on foot; no, not near the city, except in a very few places, and in a most wretched manner: whereas the English are so particularly careful in this point, that you may travel there a hundred miles with less inconvenience than one mile here. But, since this may be thought too great a reformation, I shall only speak of roads for horses, carriages, and cattle.

Ireland is, I think, computed to be one-third smaller than England; yet, by some natural disadvantages, it would not bear quite the same proportion in value, with the same encouragement. However, it has so happened, for many years past, that it never arrived to above one-eleventh part in point of riches, and of late, by the continual decrease of trade, and the increase of absentees, with other circumstances not here to be mentioned, hardly to a fifteenth part; at least, if my calculations be right, which I doubt are a little too favourable on our side.

Now, supposing day-labour to be cheaper by one half here than in England, and our roads, by the nature of our carriages, and the desolation of our country, to be not worn and beaten above one-eighth part so much as those of England, which is a very moderate computation, I do not see why the mending of them would be a greater burden to this kingdom than to that.

There have been, I believe, twenty Acts of Parliament, in six or seven years of the late King, for mending long tracts of impassable ways in several counties of England, by erecting turnpikes, and receiving passage-money in a manner that everybody knows.

If what I have advanced be true, it would be hard to give a reason against the same practice here; since the necessity is as great, the advantage, in proportion, perhaps much greater, the materials of stone and gravel as easy to be found, and the workmanship, at least, twice as cheap.

Besides, the work may be done gradually, with allowances for the poverty of the nation, by so many perch a-year; but with a special care to encourage skill and diligence, and to prevent fraud in the undertakers, to which we are too liable, and which are not always confined to those of the meaner sort; but against these, no doubt, the wisdom of the nation may and will provide. Another evil, which, in my opinion, deserves the public care, is the ill management of the bogs; the neglect whereof is a much greater mischief to this kingdom than most people seem to be aware of.

It is allowed, indeed, by those who are esteemed most skilful in such matters, that the red, swelling mossy bog, whereof we have so many large tracts in this island, is not by any means to be fully reduced; but the skirts, which are covered with a green coat, easily may, being not accretion, or annual growth of moss, like the other.

Now, the landlords are generally so careless as to suffer their tenants to cut their turf in these skirts, as well as the bog adjoined; whereby there is yearly lost a considerable quantity of land throughout the kingdom, never to be recovered.
But this is not the greatest part of the mischief; for the main bog, although, perhaps, not reducible to natural soil, yet, by continuing large, deep, straight canals through the middle, cleaned at proper times as low as the channel or gravel, would become secure summer-pasture; the margins might, with great profit and ornament, be filled with quickens, birch, and other trees proper for such a soil, and the canals be convenient for water-carriage of the turf, which is now drawn upon sled-cars, with great expense, difficulty, and loss of time, by reason of the many turf-pits scattered irregularly through the bog, wherein great numbers of cattle are yearly drowned. And it has been, I confess, to me a matter of the greatest vexation, as well as wonder, to think how any landlord could be so absurd as suffer such havoc to be made.

All the acts for encouraging plantations of forest-trees are, I am told, extremely defective; which, with great submission, must have been owing to a defect of skill in the contrivers of them. In this climate, by the continual blowing of the west-south-west wind, hardly any tree of value will come to perfection that is not planted in groves, except very rarely, and where there is much land-shelter. I have not, indeed, read all the acts: but, from inquiry, I cannot learn that the planting in groves is enjoined. And as to the effects of these laws, I have not seen the least, in many hundred miles’ riding, except about a very few gentlemen’s houses, and even those with very little skill or success. In all the rest, the hedges generally miscarry, as well as the larger, slender twigs planted upon the tops of ditches, merely for want of common skill and care.

I do not believe that a greater and quicker profit could be made, than by planting large groves of ash a few feet asunder, which in seven years would make the best kind of hop-poles, and grow in the same or less time to a second crop from their roots.

It would likewise be of great use and beauty in our desert scenes, to oblige cottagers to plant ash or elm before their cabins, and round their potato-gardens, where cattle either do not or ought not to come to destroy them.

The common objection against all this, drawn from the laziness, the perverseness, or thievish disposition of the poor native Irish, might be easily answered by showing the true reasons for such accusations, and how easily those people may be brought to a less savage manner of life; but my printers have already suffered too much for my speculations.

However, supposing the size of a native’s understanding just equal to that of a dog or a horse, I have often seen those two animals civilized by rewards, at least as much as by punishments.

It would be a noble achievement to abolish the Irish language in this kingdom, so far at least as to oblige all the natives to speak only English on every occasion of business, in shops, markets, fairs, and other places of dealing: yet I am wholly deceived, if this might not be effectually done in less than half an age, and at a very trifling expense; for such I look upon a tax to be of only six thousand pounds a-year, to accomplish so great a work. This would, in a great measure, civilize the most barbarous among them, reconcile them to our customs and manner of living, and reduce great numbers to the national religion, whatever kind may then happen to be established.

This method is plain and simple; and although I am too desponding to produce it, yet I could heartily wish some public thoughts were employed to reduce this uncultivated people from that idle, savage, beastly, thievish manner of life, in which they continue sunk to such a degree, that it is almost impossible for a country gentleman to find a
servant of human capacity, or the least tincture of natural honesty, or who does not live among his own tenants in continual fear of having his plantations destroyed, his cattle stolen, and his goods pilfered.

The love, affection, or vanity of living in England, continuing to carry thither so many wealthy families, the consequences thereof, together with the utter loss of all trade, except what is detrimental, which has forced such great numbers of weavers, and others, to seek their bread in foreign countries; the unhappy practice of stocking such vast quantities of land with sheep and other cattle, which reduces twenty families to one; those events, I say, have exceedingly depopulated this kingdom for several years past. I should heartily wish therefore, under this miserable dearth of money, that those who are most concerned would think it advisable to save a hundred thousand pounds a year, which is now sent out of this kingdom, to feed us with corn. There is not an older or more uncontroverted maxim in the politics of all wise nations, than that of encouraging agriculture; and therefore, to what kind of wisdom a practice so directly contrary among us may be reduced I am by no means a judge. If labour and people make the true riches of a nation, what must be the issue where one part of the people are forced away, and the other have nothing to do?

If it should be thought proper by wiser heads, that his Majesty might be applied to in a national way, for giving the kingdom leave to coin halfpence for its own use, I believe no good subject will be under the least apprehension that such a request could meet with refusals, or the least delay. Perhaps we are the only kingdom upon earth, or that ever was or will be upon earth, which did not enjoy that common right of civil society, under the proper inspection of its prince or legislature, to coin money of all usual metals for its own occasions. Every petty prince in Germany, vassal to the Emperor, enjoys this privilege. And I have seen in this kingdom several silver pieces, with the inscription of Civitas Waterford, Droghedagh, and other towns.

---

THE PRESENT MISERABLE STATE OF IRELAND.

This letter was addressed to Sir Robert Walpole on Swift’s return to Ireland in 1726 before his final rupture with the Premier the following year. Swift endeavoured to combat the English prejudices of the minister on the mode of managing Ireland, seeking the emancipation of his country rather than personal advancement. Here he seems to assume the character of the Drapier besides adding his initials.

Sir,

By the last packets I had the favour of yours, and am surprised that you should apply to a person so ill-qualified as I am, for a full and impartial account of the state of our trade. I have always lived as retired as possible; I have
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carefully avoided the perplexed honour of city-offices; I have never minded anybody’s business but my own; upon
all which accounts, and several others, you might easily have found among my fellow-citizens, persons more
capable to resolve the weighty questions you put to me than I can pretend to be. But being entirely at leisure, even at
this season of the year, when I used to have scarce time sufficient to perform the necessary offices of life, I will
endeavour to comply with your requests, cautioning you not implicitly to rely upon what I say, excepting what
belongs to that branch of trade in which I am more immediately concerned.

The Irish trade is, at present, in the most deplorable condition that can be imagined; to remedy it, the causes of its
languishment must be inquired into. But as those causes (you may assure yourself) will not be removed, you may
look upon it as a thing past hope of recovery.

The first and greatest shock our trade received was from an act passed in the reign of King William, in the
Parliament of England, prohibiting the exportation of wool manufactured in Ireland, an act (as the event plainly
shows) fuller of greediness than good policy; an act as beneficial to France and Spain, as it has been destructive to
England and Ireland. At the passing of this fatal act, the condition of our trade was glorious and flourishing, though
no way interfering with the English; we made no broadcloths above 6s. per yard; coarse druggests, bays and
shalloons, worsted damasks, strong draught-works, slight half-works, and gaudy stuffs, were the only products of
our looms: these were partly consumed by the meanest of our people, and partly sent to the northern nations, from
which we had in exchange timber, iron, hemp, flax, pitch, tar, and hard dollars. At the time the current money of
Ireland was foreign silver, a man could hardly receive 100l., without finding the coin of all the northern powers, and
every prince of the empire among it.

This money was returned into England for fine cloths silks, &c., for our own wear, for rent, for coals, for hardware,
and all other English manufactures, and in a great measure supplied the London merchants with foreign silver for
exportation.

The repeated clamours of the English weavers produced this act, so destructive to themselves and us.

They looked with envious eyes upon our prosperity, and complained of being undersold by us in those commodities
which themselves did not deal in. At their instances the act was passed, and we lost our profitable northern trade.
Have they got it? No; surely you have found out they have ever since declined in the trade they so happily
possessed? You shall find (if I am rightly informed) towns without one loom in them, which subsisted entirely upon
the woollen manufactory before the passing of this unhappy bill; and I will try if I can give the true reasons for the
decay of their trade, and our calamities.

Three parts in four of the inhabitants of that district of the town where I dwell were English manufacturers, whom
either misfortunes in trade, little petty debts contracted through idleness, or the pressures of a numerous family, had
driven into our cheap country. These were employed in working up our coarse wool, while the finest was sent into
England. Several of these had taken the children of the native Irish apprentices to them, who being humbled by the
forfeiture of upward of three millions by the Revolution, were obliged to stoop to a mechanic industry. Upon the
passing of this bill, we were obliged to dismiss thousands of these people from our service. Those who had settled
their affairs returned home, and overstocked England with workmen; those whose debts were unsatisfied went to
France, Spain, and the Netherlands, where they met with good encouragement, whereby the natives, having got a
firm footing in the trade, being acute fellows, soon became as good workmen as any we have, and supply the foreign manufacturies with a constant recruit of artisans; our island lying much more under pasture than any in Europe. The foreigners (notwithstanding all the restrictions the English Parliament has bound us up with) are furnished with the greatest quantity of our choicest wool. I need not tell you, sir, that a custom-house oath is held as little sacred here as in England, or that it is common for masters of vessels to swear themselves bound for one of the English wool-ports, and unload in France or Spain. By this means the trade in those ports is, in a great measure, destroyed, and we were obliged to try our hands at finer works, having only our own consumption to depend upon; and I can assure you we have, in several kinds of narrow goods, even exceeded the English, and I believe we shall in a few years more, be able to equal them in broadcloths; but this you may depend upon, that scarce the tenth part of English goods are now imported, of what used to be before the famous act.

The only manufactured wares we are allowed to export, are linen cloth and linen yarn, which are marketable only in England; the rest of our commodities are wool, restrained to England, and raw hides, skins, tallow, beef, and butter. Now these are things for which the northern nations have no occasion; we are therefore obliged, instead of carrying woollen goods to their markets, and bringing home money, to purchase their commodities.

In France, Spain, and Portugal, our wares are more valuable, though it must be owned, our fraudulent trade in wool is the best branch of our commerce; from hence we get wines, brandy, and fruit, very cheap, and in great perfection; so that though England has constrained us to be poor, they have given us leave to be merry. From these countries we bring home moydores, pistoles, and louisdores, without which we should scarce have a penny to turn upon.

To England we are allowed to send nothing but linen cloth, yarn, raw hides, skins, tallow, and wool. From thence we have coals, for which we always pay ready money, India goods, English woollen and silks, tobacco, hardware, earthenware, salt, and several other commodities. Our exportations to England are very much overbalanced by our importations; so that the course of exchange is generally too high, and people choose rather to make their remittances to England in specie, than by a bill, and our nation is perpetually drained of its little running cash.

Another cause of the decay of trade, scarcity of money, and swelling of exchange, is the unnatural affectation of our gentry to reside in and about London. Their rents are remitted to them, and spent there. The countryman wants employment from them; the country shopkeeper wants their custom. For this reason he can’t pay his Dublin correspondent readily, nor take off a great quantity of his wares. Therefore the Dublin merchant can’t employ the artisan, nor keep up his credit in foreign markets.

I have discoursed some of these gentlemen, persons esteemed for good sense, and demanded a reason for this, their so unaccountable proceeding—expensive to them for the present, ruinous to their country, and destructive to the future value of their estates—and find all their answers summed up under three heads, curiosity, pleasure, and loyalty to King George. The two first excuses deserve no answer; let us try the validity of the third. Would not loyalty be much better expressed by gentlemen staying in their respective counties, influencing their dependents by their examples, saving their own wealth, and letting their neighbours profit by their necessary expenses, thereby keeping them from misery and its unavoidable consequence, discontent? Or is it better to flock to London, be lost in a crowd, kiss the King’s hand, and take a view of the royal family? The seeing of the royal house may animate their zeal for it; but other advantages I know not. What employment have any of our gentlemen got by their attendance at
Court, to make up to them their expenses? Why, about forty of them have been created peers, and a little less than a hundred of them baronets and knights. For these excellent advantages, thousands of our gentry have squeezed their tenants, impoverished the trader, and impaired their own fortunes! Another great calamity is the exorbitant raising of the rents of lands. Upon the determination of all leases made before the year 1690, a gentleman thinks he has but indifferently improved his estate if he has only doubled his rent-roll. Farms are screwed up to a rack-rent—leases granted but for a small term of years—tenants tied down to hard conditions, and discouraged from cultivating the lands they occupy to the best advantage, by the certainty they have of their rent being raised on the expiration of their lease, proportionally to the improvements they shall make. Thus is honest industry restrained; the farmer is a slave to his landlord; ’tis well if he can cover his family with a coarse, home-spun frieze. The artisan has little dealings with him; yet he is obliged to take his provisions from him at an extravagant price, otherwise the farmer cannot pay his rent.

The proprietors of lands keep great part of them in their own hands for sheep-pasture; and there are thousands of poor wretches who think themselves blessed, if they can obtain a hut worse than the squire’s dog-kennel, and an acre of ground for a potato plantation, on condition of being as very slaves as any in America. What can be more deplorable than to behold wretches starving in the midst of plenty?

We are apt to charge the Irish with laziness, because we seldom find them employed; but then we don’t consider they have nothing to do.

Sir William Temple, in his excellent remarks on the United Provinces, inquires, why Holland, which has the fewest and worst ports and commodities of any nation in Europe, should abound in trade, and Ireland, which has the most and best of both, should have none? This great man attributes this surprising accident to the natural aversion man has for labour; who will not be persuaded to toil and fatigue himself for the superfluities of life throughout the week, when he may provide himself with all necessary subsistence by the labour of a day or two. But, with due submission to Sir William’s profound judgment, the want of trade with us is rather owing to the cruel restraints we lie under, than to any disqualifications whatsoever in our inhabitants. I have not, sir, for these thirty years past, since I was concerned in trade (the greatest part of which time distresses have been flowing in upon us), ever observed them to swell so suddenly to such a height as they have done within these few months. Our present calamities are not to be represented; you can have no notion of them without beholding them. Numbers of miserable objects crowd our doors, begging us to take their wares at any price, to prevent their families from immediate starving. We cannot part with our money to them, both because we know not when we shall have vent for our goods, and as there are no debts paid, we are afraid of reducing ourselves to their lamentable circumstances. The dismal time of trade we had during Marr’s Troubles in Scotland, are looked upon as happy days when compared with the present. I need not tell you, sir, that this griping want, this dismal poverty, this additional woe, must be put to the accursed stocks, which have desolated our country more effectually than England. Stock-jobbing was a kind of traffic we were utterly unacquainted with. We went late to the South Sea market, and bore a great share in the losses of it, without having tasted any of its profits.

If many in England have been ruined by stocks, some have been advanced. The English have a free and open trade to repair their losses; but, above all, a wise, vigilant, and uncorrupted Parliament and ministry, strenuously endeavouring to restore public trade to its former happy state. Whilst we, having lost the greatest part of our cash,
without any probability of its returning, must despair of retrieving our losses by trade, and have before our eyes the
dismal prospect of universal poverty and desolation.

I believe, sir, you are by this time heartily tired with this indigested letter, and are firmly persuaded of the truth of
what I said in the beginning of it, that you had much better have imposed this task on some of our citizens of greater
abilities. But perhaps, sir, such a letter as this may be, for the singularity of it, entertaining to you, who correspond
with the politest and most learned men in Europe. But I am satisfied you will excuse its want of exactness and
perspicuity when you consider my education, my being unaccustomed to writings of this nature, and, above all,
those calamitous objects which constantly surround us, sufficient to disturb the clearest imagination, and the
soundest judgment.

Whatever cause I have given you, by this letter, to think worse of my sense and judgment, I fancy I have given you
a manifest proof that I am, sir,

Your most obedient, humble servant,

J. S.

“A PROPOSAL FOR THE UNIVERSAL USE
OF IRISH MANUFACTURES.” 1720.

The social condition of Ireland at the above period has been already briefly described. When the landlord class were
degraded and the tenantry debased by the iniquitous laws of Charles II. and William III., which suppressed the trade
of the country, the oppressed people found in Swift a mouthpiece for their wrongs. The above proposal was the
voice of the nation rendered articulate by his utterance. It proposes in effect a reprisal on England for her
restrictions, by a refusal to use anything that comes thence. A confederation is to be formed, pledged to use nothing
that is not of Irish manufacture. Everything, he trusts, will be burned that comes from England, except the people
and the coals. Swift’s proposal was faulty in political economy. Of this the age knew little, and Swift cared less. The
printer of this pamphlet was prosecuted. The Chief Justice (Whitshed) sent back the jury nine times, and kept them
eleven hours before they would consent to bring in a “special verdict.” The unpopularity of the prosecution became
so great that it was at last dropped.

A PROPOSAL FOR THE UNIVERSAL USE OF IRISH MANUFACTURE,

In clothes and furniture of houses, &c.
It is the peculiar felicity and prudence of the people in this kingdom, that whatever commodities and productions lie under the greatest discouragements from England, those are what they are sure to be most industrious in cultivating and spreading.

Agriculture, which has been the principal care of all wise nations, and for the encouragement whereof there are so many statute laws in England, we countenance so well, that the landlords are everywhere, by penal clauses, absolutely prohibiting their tenants from ploughing; not satisfied to confine them within certain limitations, as is the practice of the English: one effect of which is already seen in the prodigious dearness of corn, and the importation of it from London, as the cheaper market. And because people are the riches of a country, and that our neighbours have done, and are doing, all that in them lies to make our wool a drug to us, and a monopoly to them; therefore, the politic gentlemen of Ireland have depopulated vast tracts of the best land for the feeding of sheep.

I could fill a volume as large as the history of the Wise Men of Gotham, with a catalogue only of some wonderful laws and customs we have observed within thirty years past. It is true, indeed, our beneficial traffic of wool with France has been our only support for several years, furnishing us with all the little money we have to pay our rents, and go to market. But our merchants assure me, this trade has received a great damp by the present fluctuating condition of the coin in France; and that most of their wine is paid for in specie, without carrying thither any commodity from hence.

However, since we are so universally bent upon enlarging our flocks, it may be worth inquiring what we shall do with our wool, in case Barnstaple should be overstocked, and our French commerce should fail.

I could wish the Parliament had thought fit to have suspended their regulation of church matters, and enlargements of the prerogative, until a more convenient time, because they did not appear very pressing, at least to the persons principally concerned; and, instead of these great refinements in politics and divinity, had amused themselves and their committees a little with the state of the nation. For example: What if the House of Commons had thought fit to make a resolution, *nemine contradicente*, against wearing any cloth or stuff in their families, which were not of the growth and manufacture of this kingdom? What if they had extended it so far as utterly to exclude all silks, velvets, calicoes, and the whole lexicon of female fopperies; and declared, that whoever acted otherwise should be deemed and reputed an enemy to the nation? What if they had sent up such a resolution to be agreed to by the House of Lords, and by their own practice and encouragement, spread the execution of it in their several countries? What if we should agree to make burying in woollen a fashion, as our neighbours have made it a law? What if the ladies would be content with Irish stuffs for the furniture of their houses, for gowns and petticoats for themselves and their daughters? Upon the whole, and to crown all the rest, let a firm resolution be taken, by male and female, never to appear with one single shred that comes from England, and let all the people say AMEN.

I hope and believe, that nothing could please his Majesty better than to hear that his loyal subjects of both sexes in this kingdom celebrated his birthday (now approaching) universally clad in their own manufacture. Is there virtue enough left in this deluded people to save them from the brink of ruin? If men’s opinions may be taken, the ladies
will look as handsome in stuffs as in brocades; and since all will be equal, there may be room enough to employ their wit and fancy, in choosing and matching patterns and colours.

I heard the late Archbishop of Tuam mention a pleasant observation of somebody’s, that Ireland would never be happy, till a law were made for burning everything that came from England, except their people and their coals.

I must confess, that as to the former, I should not be sorry if they would stay at home; and for the latter, I hope in a little time we shall have no occasion for them.

Non tanti mitra est, non tanti judicis ostrum—

but I should rejoice to see a stay-lace from England be thought scandalous, and become a topic for censure at visits and tea-tables.

If the unthinking shopkeepers in this town had not been utterly destitute of common sense, they would have made some proposal to the Parliament, with a petition to the purpose I have mentioned; promising to improve the cloths and stuffs of the nation into all possible degrees of fineness and colours, and engaging not to play the knave, according to their custom, by exacting and imposing upon the nobility and gentry, either as to the prices or the goodness.

For I remember, in London, upon a general mourning, the rascally mercers and woollen-drapers would in twenty-four hours raise their cloths and silks to above a double price, and if the mourning continued long, then come whining with petitions to the court, that they were ready to starve, and their fineries lay upon their hands.

I could wish our shopkeepers would immediately think on this proposal, addressing it to all persons of quality and others; but, first, be sure to get somebody who can write sense, to put it into form.

I think it needless to exhort the clergy to follow this good example; because, in a little time, those among them who are so unfortunate as to have had their birth and education in this country, will think themselves abundantly happy when they can afford Irish crape, and an Athlone hat; and as to the others, I shall not presume to direct them. I have, indeed, seen the present Archbishop of Dublin clad from head to foot in our own manufacture; and yet, under the rose be it spoken, his Grace deserves as good a gown as if he had not been born among us.

I have not courage enough to offer one syllable on this subject to their honours of the army; neither have I sufficiently considered the great importance of scarlet and gold lace.

The fable in Ovid of Arachne and Pallas is to this purpose.—The goddess had heard of one Arachne, a young virgin, very famous for spinning and weaving. They both met upon a trial of skill; and Pallas, finding herself almost equalled in her own art, stung with rage and envy, knocked her rival down, and turned her into a spider; enjoining her to spin and weave for ever out of her own bowels, and in a very narrow compass.

I confess, that, from a boy, I always pitied poor Arachne, and could never heartily love the goddess, on account of so cruel and unjust a sentence; which, however, is fully executed upon us by England, with farther additions of
rigour and severity; for the greatest part of our bowels and vitals is extracted, without allowing us the liberty of spinning and weaving them.

The Scripture tells us, that “oppression makes a wise man mad;” therefore, consequently speaking, the reason why some men are not mad is because they are not wise. However it were to be wished, that oppression would in time teach a little wisdom to fools.

I was much delighted with a person, who has a great estate in this kingdom, upon his complaints to me, how grievously poor England suffers by impositions from Ireland:—That we convey our wool to France, in spite of all the harpies at the custom-house; that Mr. Shuttleworth and others, on the Cheshire coast, are such fools to sell us their bark at a good price for tanning our own hides into leather; with other enormities of the like weight and kind. To which I will venture to add more:—That the mayoralty of this city is always executed by an inhabitant, and often by a native, which might as well be done by a deputy with a moderate salary, whereby poor England loses at least one thousand pounds a-year upon the balance; that the governing of this kingdom costs the Lord-Lieutenant three thousand six hundred pounds a year—so much net loss to poor England; that the people of Ireland presume to dig for coals on their own grounds; and the farmers in the county of Wicklow send their turf to the very market of Dublin, to the great discouragement of the coal trade of Mostyn and Whitehaven; that the revenues of the post-office here, so righteously belonging to the English treasury, as arising chiefly from our commerce with each other, should be remitted to London clogged with that grievous burden of exchange; and the pensions paid out of the Irish revenues to English favourites, should lie under the same disadvantage, to the great loss of the grantees. When a divine is sent over to a bishopric here, with the hopes of five-and-twenty hundred pounds a year, and, upon his arrival, he finds, alas! a dreadful discount of ten or twelve per cent.; a judge, or a commissioner of the revenue, has the same cause of complaint.... These are a few among the many hardships we put upon that poor kingdom of England, for which, I am confident, every honest man wishes a remedy. And I hear there is a project on foot for transporting our best wheaten straw, by sea and land carriage, to Dunstable, and obliging us, by a law, to take off yearly so many ton of straw hats, for the use of our women; which will be a great encouragement to the manufacture of that industrious town.

I should be glad to learn among the divines, whether a law to bind men without their own consent be obligatory in foro conscientiae; because I find Scripture, Sanderson, and Suarez, are wholly silent on the matter. The oracle of reason, the great law of nature, and general opinion of civilians, wherever they treat of limited governments, are indeed decisive enough.

It is wonderful to observe the bias among our people in favour of things, persons, and wares of all kinds, that come from England. The printer tells his hawkers, that he has got an excellent new song just brought from London. I have somewhat of a tendency that way myself; and, upon hearing a coxcomb from thence displaying himself, with great volubility, upon the park, the playhouse, the opera, the gaming ordinaries, it was apt to beget in me a kind of veneration for his parts and accomplishments. It is not many years since I remember a person, who, by his style and literature, seems to have been the corrector of a hedge-press in some blind alley about Little Britain, proceed gradually to be an author, at least a translator of a lower rate, although somewhat of a larger bulk, than any that now flourish in Grub Street; and, upon the strength of this foundation, come over here, erect himself up into an orator and politician, and lead a kingdom after him. This, I am told, was the very motive that prevailed on the author of a
play, called “Love in a Hollow Tree,” to do us the honour of a visit; presuming, with very good reason, that he was a writer of a superior class. I know another, who, for thirty years past, has been the common standard of stupidity in England, where he was never heard a minute in any assembly, or by any party, with common Christian treatment; yet, upon his arrival here, could put on a face of importance and authority, talk more than six, without either gracefulness, propriety, or meaning, and, at the same time, be admired and followed as the pattern of eloquence and wisdom.

I would now expostulate a little with our country landlords; who, by immeasurable screwing and racking their tenants all over the kingdom, have already reduced the miserable people to a worse condition than the peasants in France, or the vassals in Germany and Poland; so that the whole species of what we call substantial farmers, will, in a very few years, be utterly at an end. It was pleasant to observe these gentlemen labouring, with all their might, for preventing the bishops from letting their revenues at a moderate half value (whereby the whole order would, in an age, have been reduced to manifest beggary), at the very instant when they were everywhere canting[41] their own land upon short leases, and sacrificing their oldest tenants for a penny an acre advance.... I have heard great divines affirm, that nothing is so likely to call down a universal judgment from Heaven upon a nation as universal oppression; and whether this be not already verified in part, their worships the landlords, are now at full leisure to consider. Whoever travels this country, and observes the face of nature, or the faces, and habits, and dwellings of the natives, will hardly think himself in a land where law, religion, or common humanity is professed. I cannot forbear saying one word upon a thing they call a bank, which, I fear, is projecting in this town.[42] I never saw the proposals, nor understood any one particular of their scheme. What I wish for at present, is only a sufficient provision of hemp, and caps and bells, to distribute according to the several degrees of honesty and prudence in some persons. I hear only of a monstrous sum already named; and if others do not soon hear of it too, and hear with a vengeance, then I am a gentleman of less sagacity than myself, and very few beside myself, take me to be. And the jest will be still the better if it be true, as judicious persons have assured me, that one half of this money will be real, and the other half altogether imaginary. The matter will be likewise much mended, if the merchants continue to carry off our gold, and our goldsmiths to melt down our heavy silver.

A MODEST PROPOSAL. 1729.

This came out when the people were starving in hundreds through famine, and the dead were left unburied before their own doors. English civilization was shamed by the sight. His sarcasm was never applied with more deadly seriousness of purpose. There is no strain in the language with which the state of matters is described: the very simplicity and matter-of-fact tone that are assumed, make the description all the more telling. With the calm
deliberation of a statistician calculating the food supply of the country, Swift brings forward his suggestion. No
work of Swift has been more grievously misunderstood. Some have esteemed it a heartless piece of ridicule, a
callous laugh raised out of abject misery. The interpretation is as wrong as the Frenchman who took it as a grave and
practical suggestion, and who fancied that Swift in sober earnest proposed that infants in Ireland should be used for
food. In truth the ridicule is but a thin disguise. From beginning to end, it is laden with grave and torturing
bitterness. Each touch, if calm and ghastly human, is added with the gravity of a surgeon who probes a wound to the
quick. There is nothing like it in all literature.

A MODEST PROPOSAL

*For preventing the children of poor people in Ireland from being a
burden to their parents or country, and for making them
beneficial to the public.* 1729.

It is a melancholy object to those who walk through this great town, or travel in the country, when they see the
streets, the roads, and cabin doors, crowded with beggars of the female sex, followed by three, four, or six children,
all in rags, and importuning every passenger for an alms. These mothers, instead of being able to work for an honest
livelihood, are forced to employ all their time in strolling to beg sustenance for their helpless infants; who, as they
grow up, either turn thieves for the want of work, or leave their dear native country to fight for the Pretender in
Spain, or sell themselves to the Barbadoes.

I think it is agreed by all parties, that this prodigious number of children in the arms, or on the backs, or at the heels
of their mothers, and frequently of their fathers, is, in the present deplorable state of the kingdom, a very great
additional grievance; and, therefore, whoever could find out a fair, cheap, and easy method of making these children
sound, useful members of the commonwealth, would deserve so well of the public, as to have his statue set up for a
preserver of the nation.

But my intention is very far from being confined to provide only for the children of professed beggars; it is of a
much greater extent, and shall take in the whole number of infants at a certain age, who are born of parents in effect
as little able to support them, as those who demand charity in our streets.

As to my own part, having turned my thoughts for many years upon this important subject, and maturely weighed
the several schemes of our projectors, I have always found them grossly mistaken in their computation. It is true, a
child, just dropped from its dam, may be supported by her milk for a solar year, with little other nourishment; at
most, not above the value of two shillings, which the mother may certainly get, or the value in scraps, by her lawful
occupation of begging; and it is exactly at one year old that I propose to provide for them in such a manner, as,
instead of being a charge upon their parents, or the parish, or wanting food and raiment for the rest of their lives,
they shall, on the contrary, contribute to the feeding, and partly to the clothing, of many thousands....

The number of souls in this kingdom being usually reckoned one million and a half, of these I calculate there may
be about two hundred thousand couple whose wives are breeders; from which number I subtract thirty thousand
couple, who are able to maintain their own children, (although I apprehend there cannot be so many, under the
present distresses of the kingdom); but this being granted, there will remain a hundred and seventy thousand breeders. I again subtract fifty thousand for those women who miscarry, or whose children die by accident or disease within the year. There only remains a hundred and twenty thousand children of poor parents annually born. The question therefore is: How this number shall be reared and provided for?—which, as I have already said, under the present situation of affairs, is utterly impossible by all the methods hitherto proposed. For we can neither employ them in handicraft or agriculture; we neither build houses (I mean in the country) nor cultivate land; they can very seldom pick up a livelihood by stealing, till they arrive at six years old, except where they are of towardly parts; although I confess they learn the rudiments much earlier; during which time they can, however, be properly looked upon only as probationers; as I have been informed by a principal gentleman in the county of Cavan, who protested to me, that he never knew above one or two instances under the age of six, even in a part of the kingdom so renowned for the quickest proficiency in that art.

I am assured by our merchants, that a boy or girl before twelve years old is no saleable commodity; and even when they come to this age, they will not yield above three pounds, or three pounds and half-a-crown at most, on the exchange; which cannot turn to account either to the parents or kingdom, the charge of nutriment and rags having been at least four times that value. I shall now, therefore, humbly propose my own thoughts, which I hope will not be liable to the least objection.

I have been assured by a very knowing American of my acquaintance in London, that a young healthy child, well nursed, is, at a year old, a most delicious, nourishing, and wholesome food, whether stewed, roasted, baked or boiled; and I make no doubt that it will equally serve in a fricassee or a ragout.

I do therefore humbly offer it to public consideration, that of the hundred and twenty thousand children already computed, twenty thousand may be reserved for breed. That the remaining hundred thousand may, at a year old, be offered in sale to the persons of quality and fortune through the kingdom; always advising the mother to let them suck plentifully in the last month, so as to render them plump and fat for a good table. A child will make two dishes at an entertainment for friends; and when the family dines alone, the fore or hind quarter will make a reasonable dish, and, seasoned with a little pepper or salt, will be very good boiled on the fourth day, especially in winter.

I have reckoned, upon a medium, that a child just born will weigh twelve pounds, and in a solar year, if tolerably nursed, will increase to twenty-eight pounds. I grant this food will be somewhat dear, and therefore very proper for landlords, who, as they have already devoured most of the parents, seem to have the best title to the children....

I have already computed the charge of nursing a beggar’s child (in which list I reckon all cottagers, labourers, and four-fifths of the farmers) to be about two shillings per annum, rags included; and I believe no gentleman would require to give ten shillings for the carcass of a good fat child, which, as I have said, will make four dishes of excellent nutritive meat, when he has only some particular friend, or his own family to dine with him. Thus the squire will learn to be a good landlord, and grow popular among his tenants; and the mother will have eight shillings net profit.

Those who are more thrifty (as I must confess that times require) may flay the carcass; the skin of which, artificially dressed, will make admirable gloves for ladies, and summer boots for fine gentlemen. As to our city of Dublin, shambles may be appointed for this purpose in the most convenient parts of it, and butchers we may be assured will
not be wanting; although I rather recommend buying the children alive, then dressing them hot from the knife, as we do roasting pigs.

A very worthy person, a true lover of his country, and whose virtue I highly esteem, was lately pleased, in discoursing on this matter, to offer a refinement upon my scheme. He said, that many gentlemen of this kingdom, having of late destroyed their deer, he conceived that the want of venison might be well supplied by the bodies of young lads and maidens, not exceeding fourteen years of age, nor under twelve; so great a number of both sexes in every country being now ready to starve for want of work and service; and these to be disposed of by their parents, if alive, or otherwise by their nearest relations. But, with due deference to so excellent a friend, and so deserving a patriot, I cannot be altogether in his sentiments; for as to the males, my American acquaintance assured me, from frequent experience, that their flesh was generally tough and lean like that of our schoolboys, by continual exercise, and their taste disagreeable; and to fatten them would not answer the charge; and besides, it is not improbable that some scrupulous people might be apt to censure such a practice (although indeed very unjustly), as a little bordering upon cruelty; which, I confess, has always been with me the strongest objection against any project, how well soever intended.

But in order to justify my friend, he confessed that this expedient was put into his head by the famous Psalmanazar, a native of the island Formosa, who came from thence to London above twenty years ago; and in conversation told my friend, that in his country, when any young person happened to be put to death the executioner sold the carcass to persons of quality as a prime dainty; and that in his time the body of a plump girl of fifteen, who was crucified for an attempt to poison the emperor, was sold to his imperial Majesty’s prime minister of state, and other great mandarins of the court, in joints from the gibbet, at four hundred crowns.

Neither indeed can I deny, that if the same use were made of several plump young girls in this town, who without one single groat to their fortunes, cannot stir abroad without a chair, and appear at playhouse and assemblies in foreign fineries which they will never pay for, the kingdom would not be the worse.

Some persons of a desponding spirit are in great concern about that vast number of poor people, who are aged, diseased, or maimed; and I have been desired to employ my thoughts, what course may be taken to ease the nation of so grievous an encumbrance. But I am not in the least pain upon that matter, because it is very well known, that they are every day dying by cold and famine, as fast as can be reasonably expected. And as to the young labourers, they are now in almost as hopeful a condition: they cannot get work, and consequently pine away for want of nourishment, to a degree, that if at any time they are accidentally hired to common labour, they have not strength to perform it; and thus the country and themselves are happily delivered from the evils to come.

I have too long digressed, and therefore shall return to my subject. I think the advantages by the proposal which I have made, are obvious and many, as well as of the highest importance.

For first, it would greatly lessen the number of Papists, with whom we are yearly overrun, being the principal breeders of the nation, as well as our most dangerous enemies, and who stay at home on purpose to deliver the kingdom to the Pretender, hoping to take their advantage by the absence of so many good Protestants, who have chosen rather to leave their country than stay at home and pay tithes against their conscience to an Episcopal curate.
Secondly, The poorer tenants will have something valuable of their own, which by law may be made liable to distress, and help to pay their landlord’s rent; their corn and cattle being already seized, and money a thing unknown.

Thirdly, Whereas the maintenance of a hundred thousand children, from two years old and upward, cannot be computed at less than ten shillings a-piece per annum, the nation’s stock will be thereby increased fifty thousand pounds per annum, beside the profit of a new dish introduced to the tables of all gentlemen of fortune in the kingdom, who have any refinement in taste. And the money will circulate among ourselves, the goods being entirely of our own growth and manufacture.

Fourthly, The constant breeders, besides the gain of eight shillings sterling per annum by the sale of their children, will be rid of the charge of maintaining them after the first year.

Fifthly, This food would likewise bring great custom to taverns; where the vintners will certainly be so prudent as to procure the best receipts for dressing it to perfection, and, consequently, have their houses frequented by all the fine gentlemen, who justly value themselves upon their knowledge in good eating; and a skilful cook, who understands how to oblige his guests, will contrive to make it as expensive as they please.

Sixthly, This would be a great inducement to marriage, which all wise nations have either encouraged by rewards, or enforced by laws and penalties. It would increase, the care and tenderness of mothers towards their children, when they were sure of a settlement for life to the poor babes, provided in some sort by the public, to their annual profit or expense. We should see an honest emulation among the married women, which of them could bring the fattest child to the market....

I can think of no one objection, that will possibly be raised against this proposal, unless it should be urged that the number of people will be thereby much lessened in the kingdom. This I freely own, and it was indeed one principal design in offering it to the world. I desire the reader will observe that I calculate my remedy for this one individual kingdom of Ireland, and for no other that ever was, is, or, I think, ever can be, upon earth. Therefore let no man talk to me of other expedients: of taxing our absentees at five shillings a pound; of using neither clothes, nor household furniture, except what is our own growth and manufacture; of utterly rejecting the materials and instruments that promote foreign luxury; of curing the expensiveness of pride, vanity, idleness, and gaming in our women: of introducing a vein of parsimony, prudence, and temperance; of learning to love our country, in the want of which we differ even from Laplanders, and the inhabitants of Topinamboo; of quitting our animosities and factions, nor acting any longer like the Jews, who were murdering one another at the very moment their city was taken; of being a little cautious not to sell our country and conscience for nothing; of teaching landlords to have at least one degree of mercy toward their tenants: lastly, of putting a spirit of honesty, industry, and skill into our shopkeepers; who, if a resolution could now be taken to buy only our negative goods, would immediately unite to cheat and exact upon us in the price, the measure, and the goodness, nor could never yet be brought to make one fair proposal of just dealing, though often and earnestly invited to it.

Therefore I repeat, let no man talk to me of these and the like expedients, till he has at least some glimpse of hope that there will be ever some hearty and sincere attempt to put them in practice.
But as to myself, having been wearied out for many years with offering vain, idle, visionary thoughts, and at length utterly despairing of success, I fortunately fell upon this proposal; which as it is wholly new, so it has something solid and real, of no expense and little trouble, full in our own power, and whereby we can incur no danger in disobliging England. For this kind of commodity will not bear exportation, the flesh being of too tender a consistence to admit a long continuance in salt, although perhaps I could name a country which would be glad to eat up our whole nation without.

After all, I am not so violently bent upon my own opinion as to reject any offer proposed by wise men, which shall be found equally innocent, cheap, easy, and effectual. But before something of that kind shall be advanced in contradiction to my scheme, and offering a better, I desire the author or authors will be pleased maturely to consider two points. First, as things now stand, how they will be able to find food and raiment for a hundred thousand useless mouths and backs. And, secondly, there being a round million of creatures of human figure throughout this kingdom, whose whole subsistence put into a common stock would leave them in debt two millions of pounds sterling, adding those who are beggars by profession, to the bulk of farmers, cottagers, and labourers, with the wives and children who are beggars in effect. I desire those politicians who dislike my overture, and may perhaps be so bold as to attempt an answer that they will first ask the parents of these mortals, whether they would not at this day think it a great happiness to have been sold for food at a year old, in the manner I prescribe, and thereby have avoided a perpetual scene of misfortunes, as they have since gone through, by the oppression of landlords, the impossibility of paying rent without money or trade, the want of common sustenance, with neither house nor clothes to cover them from the inclemencies of the weather, and the most inevitable prospect of entailing the like, or greater miseries, upon their breed for ever.

I profess, in the sincerity of my heart, that I have not the least personal interest in endeavouring to promote this necessary work, having no other motive than the public good of my country, by advancing our trade, providing for infants, relieving the poor, and giving some pleasure to the rich. I have no children by which I can propose to get a single penny; the youngest being nine years old and my wife past child-bearing.

A CHARACTER, PANEGYRIC, AND DESCRIPTION
OF THE LEGION CLUB, 1736.

Swift levelled his heaviest invective against the corrupt practices of the so-called Irish Parliament, which did not contain a single representative of the people who comprised the bulk of the nation. The colonial representation were of the most degraded order, most of the characters described in the poem were hit off with caustic precision. The
portraits were so true to life that many recognized themselves. The piece is generally accepted as a good skit on the House.

A CHARACTER, PANEGYRIC, AND DESCRIPTION OF THE LEGION CLUB, 1736.

As I stroll the city, oft I
See a building large and lofty,
Not a bow-shot from the college;
Half the globe from sense and knowledge:
By the prudent architect,
Placed against the church direct,
Making good my granddam’s jest,
“Near the church,”—you know the rest.

Tell us what the pile contains?
Many a head that holds no brains,
These demoniacs let me dub
With the name of Legion Club.
Such assemblies, you might swear,
Meet when butchers bait a bear:
Such a noise, and such haranguing,
When a brother thief is hanging;
Such a rout and such a rabble
Run to hear Jackpudding gabble.

Could I from the building’s top
Hear the rattling thunder drop,
While the devil upon the roof
(If the devil be thunder-proof)
Should with poker fiery red
Crack the stones, and melt the lead;
Drive them down on every skull,
When the den of thieves is full;
Quite destroy that harpies’ nest;
How might then our isle be blest!
For divines allow, that God
Sometimes makes the devil his rod;
And the gospel will inform us,
He can punish sins enormous.
Yet should Swift endow the schools,
For his lunatics and fools,
With a rood or two of land,
I allow the pile may stand.
You perhaps will ask me, Why so?
But it is with this proviso;
Since the house is like to last,
Let the royal grant be pass’d,
That the club have right to dwell
Each within his proper cell,
With a passage left to creep in,
And a hole above for peeping.

Let them, when they once get in,
Sell the nation for a pin;
While they sit a-picking straws,
Let them rave at making laws;
Let them form a grand committee,
How to plague and starve the city;
Let them stare, and storm, and frown,
When they see a clergy gown;
Let them, with their gosling quills,
Scribble senseless heads of bills.

Come, assist me, Muse obedient!
Let us try some new expedient;
Shift the scene for half an hour,
Time and place are in thy power.
Thither, gentle Muse, conduct me;
I shall ask, and you instruct me.

See, the Muse unbars the gate;
Hark, the monkeys, how they prate!
All ye gods who rule the soul;
Styx, through Hell whose waters roll!
Let me be allowed to tell
What I heard in yonder Hell.

Near the door an entrance gapes,
Crowded round with antic shapes,
Poverty, and Grief, and Care,
Causeless Joy, and true Despair;
Discord periwigg’d with snakes,
See the dreadful strides she takes!
By this odious crew beset,
I began to rage and fret,
And resolved to break their pates,
Ere we entered at the gates;
Had not Clio in the nick
Whispered me, “Lay down your stick.”
What! said I, is this the madhouse?
These, she answer’d, are but shadows,
Phantoms bodiless and vain,
Empty visions of the brain.

In the porch Briareus stands,
Shows a bribe in all his hands;
Briareus the secretary,
But we mortals call him Carey.[43]
When the rogues their country fleece,
They may hope for pence a-piece.

Clio, who had been so wise
To put on a fool’s disguise,
To bespeak some approbation,
And be thought a near relation,
When she saw three hundred brutes
All involved in wild disputes,
Roaring till their lungs were spent,
Privilege of Parliament,
Now a new misfortune feels,
Dreading to be laid by th’ heels.
Never durst a Muse before
Enter that infernal door:
Clio, stifled with the smell,
Into spleen and vapours fell,
By the Stygian steams that flew
From the dire infectious crew.
Not the stench of Lake Avernus
Could have more offended her nose
Had she flown but o’er the top,
She had felt her pinions drop.
And by exhalations dire,
Though a goddess, must expire.
In a fright she crept away,
Bravely I resolved to stay.
When I saw the keeper frown,
Tipping him with half-a-crown,
Now, said I, we are alone,
Name your heroes one by one.

Who is that hell-featured brawler?
Is it Satan? No, ’tis Waller.
In what figure can a bard dress
Jack the grandson of Sir Hardress?
Honest keeper, drive him further,
In his looks are Hell and murther;
See the scowling visage drop,
Just as when he murder’d Throp.
Keeper, show me where to fix
On the puppy pair of Dicks:
By their lantern jaws and leathern,
You might swear they both are brethren:
Dick Fitzbaker, Dick the player,
Old acquaintance are you there?
Tie them, keeper, in a tether,
Let them starve and sink together;
Both are apt to be unruly,
Lash them daily, lash them duly;
Though ’tis hopeless to reclaim them,
Scorpion rods, perhaps, may tame them.
Keeper, yon old dotard smoke,
Sweetly snoring in his cloak:
Who is he? ’Tis humdrum Wynne,
Half encompassed by his kin:
There observe the tribe of Bingham,
For he never fails to bring ’em;
While he sleeps the whole debate,
They submissive round him wait;
Yet would gladly see the hunks,
In his grave, and search his trunks,
See, they gently twitch his coat,
Just to yawn and give his vote,
Always firm in his vocation,
For the court against the nation.
Those are Allens Jack and Bob,
First in every wicked job,
Son and brother to a queer
Brain-sick brute, they call a peer.
We must give them better quarter
For their ancestor trod mortar,
And at Hoath, to boast his fame,
On a chimney cut his name.

There sit Clements, Dilks, and Harrison;
How they swagger from their garrison!
Such a triplet could you tell
Where to find on this side Hell?
Harrison, and Dilks, and Clements,
Keeper, see they have their payments,
Every mischief’s in their hearts;
If they fail ’tis want of parts.

Bless us! Morgan, art thou there, man?
Bless mine eyes! art thou the chairman?
Chairman to yon damn’d committee!
Yet I look on thee with pity.
Dreadful sight! what, learned Morgan
Metamorphosed to a Gorgon!
For thy horrid looks, I own,
Half convert me to a stone.
Hast thou been so long at school,
Now to turn a factious tool?
Alma Mater was thy mother,
Every young divine thy brother.
Thou ungrateful to thy teachers,
Who are all grown reverend preachers!
Morgan, would it not surprise one!
Turn thy nourishment to poison!
When you walk among your books,
They reproach you with their looks;
Bind them fast, or from their shelves
They will come and right themselves:
Homer, Plutarch, Virgil, Flaccus,
All in arms prepare to back us;
Soon repent, or put to slaughter
Every Greek and Roman author.
Will you, in your faction’s phrase,
Send the clergy all to graze;
And to make your project pass,
Leave them not a blade of grass?
Now I want thee, humorous Hogarth!
Thou, I hear, a pleasant rogue art.
Were but you and I acquainted,
Every monster should be painted:
You should try your graving tools
On this odious group of fools;
Draw the beasts as I describe them:
From their features while I gibe them;
Draw them like; for I assure you,
You will need no caricatura;
Draw them so that we may trace
All the soul in every face.

Keeper, I must now retire,
You have done what I desire:
But I feel my spirits spent
With the noise, the sight, the scent.
“Pray, be patient; you shall find
Half the best are still behind!
You have hardly seen a score;
I can show two hundred more.”
Keeper, I have seen enough,
Taking then a pinch of snuff,
I concluded, looking round them,
“May their god, the devil, confound them!”

ON DOING GOOD.
Nature directs every one of us, and God permits us, to consult our own private good, before the private good of any other person whatsoever. We are, indeed, commanded to love our neighbour as ourselves, but not as well as ourselves. The love we have for ourselves, is to be the pattern of that love we ought to have toward our neighbour; but as the copy doth not equal the original, so my neighbour cannot think it hard, if I prefer myself, who am the original, before him, who is only the copy. Thus, if any matter equally concern the life, the reputation, the profit of my neighbour and my own; the law of nature, which is the law of God, obligeth me to take care of myself first, and afterward of him. And this I need not be at much pains in persuading you to; for the want of self-love, with regard to things of this world, is not among the faults of mankind. But then, on the other side, if, by a small hurt and loss to myself, I can procure a great good to my neighbour, in that case his interest is to be preferred. For example, if I can be sure of saving his life, without great danger to my own; if I can preserve him from being undone without ruining myself; or recover his reputation without blasting mine; all this I am obliged to do, and if I sincerely perform it, I do then obey the command of God, in loving my neighbour as myself.

But, besides this love we owe to every man in his particular capacity, under the title of our neighbour, there is yet a duty of a more large extensive nature incumbent on us; our love to our neighbour in his public capacity, as he is a member of that great body the commonwealth, under the same government with ourselves; and this is usually called love of the public, and is a duty to which we are more strictly obliged, than even that of loving ourselves; because therein ourselves are also contained, as well as all our neighbours, in one great body. This love of the public, or of the commonwealth, or love of our country, was in ancient times properly known by the name of virtue, because it was the greatest of all virtues, and was supposed to contain all virtues in it; and many great examples of this virtue are left us on record, scarcely to be believed or even conceived, in such a base, corrupted, wicked age as this we live in. In those times it was common for men to sacrifice their lives for the good of their country, although they had neither hope nor belief of future rewards; whereas, in our days, very few make the least scruple of sacrificing a whole nation, as well as their own souls, for a little present gain; which often hath been known to end in their own ruin in this world; as it certainly must in that to come. Have we not seen men, for the sake of some petty employment, give up the very natural rights and liberties of their country, and of mankind, in the ruin of which themselves must at last be involved? Are not these corruptions gotten among the meanest of our people, who, for a piece of money, will give their votes at a venture, for the disposal of their own lives and fortunes, without considering whether it be to those who are most likely to betray or defend them? But, if I were to produce only one instance of a hundred, wherein we fail in this duty of loving our country, it would be an endless labour, and therefore I shall not attempt it.

But here I would not be misunderstood; by the love of our country, I do not mean loyalty to our King, for that is a duty of another nature; and a man may be very loyal, in the common sense of the word, without one grain of public good at his heart.
Witness this very kingdom we live in. I verily believe, that since the beginning of the world, no nation upon earth ever showed (all circumstances considered) such high constant marks of loyalty, in all their actions and behaviour, as we have done; and, at the same time, no people ever appeared more utterly void of what is called a public spirit. When I say the people, I mean the bulk or mass of the people, for I have nothing to do with those in power. Therefore I shall think my time not ill-spent, if I can persuade most or all of you who hear me, to show the love you have for your country, by endeavouring, in your several situations, to do all the public good you are able.

For I am certainly persuaded, that all our misfortunes arise from no other original cause than that general disregard among us to the public welfare. I therefore undertake to show you three things:—

First, That there are few people so weak or mean, who have it not sometimes in their power to be useful to the public.

Secondly, That it is often in the power of the meanest among mankind to do mischief to the public.

And, lastly, That all wilful injuries done to the public, are very great and aggravated sins in the sight of God.

First, There are few people so weak or mean, who have it not sometimes in their power to be useful to the public.

Solomon tells us of a poor wise man, who saved a city by his counsel. It hath often happened that a private soldier, by some unexpected brave attempt, hath been instrumental in obtaining a great victory. How many obscure men have been authors of very useful inventions, whereof the world now reaps the benefit. The very example of honesty and industry in a poor tradesman, will sometimes spread through a neighbourhood, when others see how successful he is; and thus so many useful members are gained, for which the whole body of the public is the better. Whoever is blessed with a true public spirit, God will certainly put it in his way to make use of that blessing, for the ends it was given him, by some means or other: and therefore it hath been observed, in most ages that the greatest actions for the benefit of the commonwealth, have been performed by the wisdom or courage, the contrivance or industry, of particular men, and not of numbers, and that the safety of a kingdom hath often been owing to those hands whence it was least expected.

But, secondly, It is often in the power of the meanest among mankind to do mischief to the public, and hence arise most of those miseries with which the states and kingdoms of the earth are infested. How many great princes have been murdered by the meanest ruffians!

The weakest hand can open a flood-gate to drown a country, which a thousand of the strongest cannot stop. Those who have thrown off all regard for public good, will often have it in their way to do public evil, and will not fail to exercise that power whenever they can.

The greatest blow given of late to this kingdom, was by the dishonesty of a few manufacturers; by imposing bad wares at foreign markets, in almost the only traffic permitted to us, did half ruin that trade; by which this poor unhappy kingdom still suffers in the midst of sufferings. I speak not here of persons in high stations who ought to be free from all reflection, and are supposed always to intend the welfare of the community: but we now find by experience, that the meanest instrument may, by the concurrence of accidents, have it in his power to bring a whole kingdom to the very brink of destruction, and is at this present endeavouring to finish his work; and hath agents
among ourselves who are contented to see their own country undone, to be small sharers in that iniquitous gain, which at last must end in their own ruin, as well as ours. I confess it was chiefly the consideration of that great danger we are in, which engaged me to discourse to you on this subject, to exhort you to a love of your country, and a public spirit, when all you have is at stake; to prefer the interest of your prince and your fellow-subjects, before that of one destructive impostor, and a few of his adherents.

Perhaps it may be thought by some, that this way of discoursing is not so proper from the pulpit. But, surely, when an open attempt is made, and far carried on, to make a great kingdom one large poorhouse, to deprive us of all means to exercise hospitality or charity, to turn our cities and churches into ruins, to make the country a desert for wild beasts and robbers, to destroy all arts and sciences, all trades and manufactures, and the very tillage of the ground, only to enrich one obscure, ill-designing projector and his followers; it is time for the pastor to cry out, “that the wolf is getting into his flock,” to warn them to stand together, and all to consult the common safety. And God be praised for His infinite goodness in raising such a spirit of union among us, at least in this point, in the midst of all our former divisions; which union, if it continue, will in all probability defeat the pernicious design of this pestilent enemy to the nation!

But hence it clearly follows how necessary the love of our country, or a public spirit, is, in every particular man, since the wicked have so many opportunities of doing public mischief. Every man is upon his guard for his private advantage; but where the public is concerned, he is apt to be negligent, considering himself as only one among two or three millions, among whom the loss is equally shared; and thus, he thinks, he can be no great sufferer. Meanwhile the trader, the farmer, and the shopkeeper, complain of the hardness and deadness of the times, and wonder whence it comes; while it is in a great measure owing to their own folly, for want of that love of their country, and public spirit and firm union among themselves, which are so necessary to the prosperity of every nation.

Another method, by which the meanest wicked man may have it in his power to injure the public, is false accusation; whereof this kingdom hath afforded too many examples; neither is it long since no man, whose opinions were thought to differ from those in fashion could safely converse beyond his nearest friends, for fear of being sworn against, as a traitor, by those who made a traffic of perjury and subornation; by which the very peace of the nation was disturbed, and men fled from each other as they would from a lion or a bear got loose. And it is very remarkable, that the pernicious project now in hand, to reduce us to beggary, was forwarded by one of these false accusers, who had been convicted of endeavouring, by perjury and subornation, to take away the lives of several innocent persons here among us; and, indeed, there could not be a more proper instrument for such a work.

Another method, by which the meanest people may do injury to the public, is the spreading of lies and false rumours; thus raising a distrust among the people of a nation, causing them to mistake their true interest, and their enemies for their friends; and this hath been likewise too successful a practice among us, where we have known the whole kingdom misled by the grossest lies, raised upon occasion to serve some particular turn. As it hath also happened in the case I lately mentioned, where one obscure man, by representing our wants where they were least, and concealing them where they were greatest, had almost succeeded in a project of utterly ruining this whole kingdom; and may still succeed, if God doth not continue that public spirit, which He hath almost miraculously kindled in us upon this occasion.
Thus we see the public is many times, as it were, at the mercy of the meanest instrument, who can be wicked enough to watch opportunities of doing it mischief, upon the principles of avarice or malice, which I am afraid are deeply rooted in too many breasts, and against which there can be no defence, but a firm resolution in all honest men, to be closely united and active in showing their love to their country, by preferring the public interest to their present private advantage. If a passenger, in a great storm at sea, should hide his goods, that they might not be thrown overboard to lighten the ship, what would be the consequence? The ship is cast away, and he loses his life and goods together.

We have heard of men, who, through greediness of gain, have brought infected goods into a nation; which bred a plague, whereof the owners and their families perished first. Let those among us consider this and tremble, whose houses are privately stored with those materials of beggary and desolation, lately brought over to be scattered like a pestilence among their countrymen, which may probably first seize upon themselves and their families, until their houses shall be made a dunghill.

I shall mention one practice more, by which the meanest instruments often succeed in doing public mischief; and this is, by deceiving us with plausible arguments, to make us believe that the most ruinous project they can offer is intended for our good, as it happened in the case so often mentioned. For the poor ignorant people, allured by the appearing convenience in their small dealings, did not discover the serpent in the brass, but were ready, like the Israelites, to offer incense to it; neither could the wisdom of the nation convince them, until some, of good intentions, made the cheat so plain to their sight, that those who run may read. And thus the design was to treat us, in every point, as the Philistines treated Samson (I mean when he was betrayed by Delilah), first to put out our eyes, and then to bind us with fetters of brass.

I proceed to the last thing I proposed, which was to show you that all wilful injuries done to the public, are very great and aggravating in the sight of God.

*First*, It is apparent from Scripture, and most agreeable to reason, that the safety and welfare of nations are under the most peculiar care of God’s providence. Thus He promised Abraham to save Sodom, if only ten righteous men could be found in it. Thus the reason which God gave to Jonah for not destroying Nineveh was, because there were six score thousand men in that city.

All government is from God, who is the God of order; and therefore whoever attempts to breed confusion or disturbances among a people, doth his utmost to take the government of the world out of God’s hands, and to put it into the hands of the devil, who is the author of confusion. By which it is plain, that no crime, how heinous soever, committed against particular persons, can equal the guilt of him who does injury to the public.

*Secondly*, All offenders against their country lie under this grievous difficulty: that it is impossible to obtain a pardon or make restitution. The bulk of mankind are very quick at resenting injuries, and very slow at forgiving them: and how shall one man be able to obtain the pardon of millions, or repair the injury he hath done to millions? How shall those, who, by a most destructive fraud, got the whole wealth of our neighbouring kingdom into their hands, be ever able to make a recompense? How will the authors and promoters of that villainous project, for the ruin of this poor country, be able to account with us for the injuries they have already done, although they should no farther succeed? The deplorable care of such wretches must entirely be left to the unfathomable mercies of God: for
those who know the least in religion are not ignorant, that without our utmost endeavours to make restitution to the person injured, and to obtain his pardon, added to a sincere repentance, there is no hope of salvation given in the Gospel.

Lastly, All offences against our own country have this aggravation, that they are ungrateful and unnatural. It is to our country we owe those laws, which protect us in our lives, our liberties, our properties, and our religion. Our country produced us into the world, and continues to nourish us, so that it is usually called our mother; and there have been examples of great magistrates, who have put their own children to death for endeavouring to betray their country, as if they had attempted the life of their natural parent.

Thus I have briefly shown you how terrible a sin it is to be an enemy to our country, in order to incite you to the contrary virtue, which at this juncture is so highly necessary, when every man’s endeavour will be of use. We have hitherto been just able to support ourselves under many hardships; but now the axe is laid to the root of the tree, and nothing but a firm union among us can prevent our utter undoing. This we are obliged to, in duty to our gracious King, as well as to ourselves. Let us therefore preserve that public spirit, which God hath raised in us, for our own temporal interest. For, if this wicked project should succeed, which it cannot do but by our own folly; if we sell ourselves for nought, the merchant, the shopkeeper, the artificer, must fly to the desert with their miserable families, there to starve, or live upon rapine, or at least exchange their country for one more hospitable than that where they were born.

Thus much I thought it my duty to say to you who are under my care, to warn you against those temporal evils which may draw the worst of spiritual evils after them; such as heart-burnings, murmurings, discontents, and all manner of wickedness, which a desperate condition of life may tempt men to.

I am sensible that what I have now said will not go very far, being confined to this assembly; but I hope it may stir up others of my brethren to exhort their several congregations, after a more effectual manner, to show their love for their country on this important occasion. And this, I am sure, cannot be called meddling in affairs of state.

I pray God protect his most gracious Majesty, and his kingdom long under his government; and defend us from all ruinous projectors, deceivers, suborners perjurers, false accusers, and oppressors; from the virulence of party and faction; and unite us in loyalty to our King, love to our country, and charity to each other.
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Diplomatic Reception Room
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THE PRESIDENT: Good morning. My fellow Americans, this morning, our nation is overcome with shock, horror, and sorrow. This weekend, more than 80 people were killed or wounded in two evil attacks.

On Saturday morning, in El Paso, Texas, a wicked man went to a Walmart store, where families were shopping with their loved ones. He shot and murdered 20 people, and injured 26 others, including precious little children.
Then, in the early hours of Sunday morning in Dayton, Ohio, another twisted monster opened fire on a crowded downtown street. He murdered 9 people, including his own sister, and injured 27 others.

The First Lady and I join all Americans in praying and grieving for the victims, their families, and the survivors. We will stand by their side forever. We will never forget.

These barbaric slaughters are an assault upon our communities, an attack upon our nation, and a crime against all of humanity. We are outraged and sickened by this monstrous evil, the cruelty, the hatred, the malice, the bloodshed, and the terror. Our hearts are shattered for every family whose parents, children, husbands, and wives were ripped from their arms and their lives. America weeps for the fallen.

We are a loving nation, and our children are entitled to grow up in a just, peaceful, and loving society. Together, we lock arms to shoulder the grief, we ask God in Heaven to ease the anguish of those who suffer, and we vow to act with urgent resolve.

I want to thank the many law enforcement personnel who responded to these atrocities with the extraordinary grace and courage of American heroes.

I have spoken with Texas Governor Greg Abbott and Ohio Governor Mike DeWine, as well as Mayor Dee Margo of El Paso, Texas, and Mayor Nan Whaley of Dayton, Ohio, to express our profound sadness and unfailing support.

Today, we also send the condolences of our nation to President Obrador of Mexico, and all the people of Mexico, for the loss of their citizens in the El Paso shooting. Terrible, terrible thing.
I have also been in close contact with Attorney General Barr and FBI Director Wray. Federal authorities are on the ground, and I have directed them to provide any and all assistance required — whatever is needed.

The shooter in El Paso posted a manifesto online consumed by racist hate. In one voice, our nation must condemn racism, bigotry, and white supremacy. These sinister ideologies must be defeated. Hate has no place in America. Hatred warps the mind, ravages the heart, and devours the soul. We have asked the FBI to identify all further resources they need to investigate and disrupt hate crimes and domestic terrorism — whatever they need.

We must recognize that the Internet has provided a dangerous avenue to radicalize disturbed minds and perform demented acts. We must shine light on the dark recesses of the Internet, and stop mass murders before they start. The Internet, likewise, is used for human trafficking, illegal drug distribution, and so many other heinous crimes. The perils of the Internet and social media cannot be ignored, and they will not be ignored.

In the two decades since Columbine, our nation has watched with rising horror and dread as one mass shooting has followed another — over and over again, decade after decade.

We cannot allow ourselves to feel powerless. We can and will stop this evil contagion. In that task, we must honor the sacred memory of those we have lost by acting as one people. Open wounds cannot heal if we are divided. We must seek real, bipartisan solutions. We have to do that in a bipartisan manner. That will truly make America safer and better for all.

First, we must do a better job of identifying and acting on early warning signs. I am directing the Department of Justice to work in partisan — partnership with local, state, and federal agencies, as well as social media companies, to develop tools that can detect mass shooters before they strike.
As an example, the monster in the Parkland high school in Florida had many red flags against him, and yet nobody took decisive action. Nobody did anything. Why not?

Second, we must stop the glorification of violence in our society. This includes the gruesome and grisly video games that are now commonplace. It is too easy today for troubled youth to surround themselves with a culture that celebrates violence. We must stop or substantially reduce this, and it has to begin immediately. Cultural change is hard, but each of us can choose to build a culture that celebrates the inherent worth and dignity of every human life. That’s what we have to do.

Third, we must reform our mental health laws to better identify mentally disturbed individuals who may commit acts of violence and make sure those people not only get treatment, but, when necessary, involuntary confinement. Mental illness and hatred pulls the trigger, not the gun.

Fourth, we must make sure that those judged to pose a grave risk to public safety do not have access to firearms, and that, if they do, those firearms can be taken through rapid due process. That is why I have called for red flag laws, also known as extreme risk protection orders.

Today, I am also directing the Department of Justice to propose legislation ensuring that those who commit hate crimes and mass murders face the death penalty, and that this capital punishment be delivered quickly, decisively, and without years of needless delay.

These are just a few of the areas of cooperation that we can pursue. I am open and ready to listen and discuss all ideas that will actually work and make a very big difference.
Republicans and Democrats have proven that we can join together in a bipartisan fashion to address this plague. Last year, we enacted the STOP School Violence and Fix NICS Acts into law, providing grants to improve school safety and strengthening critical background checks for firearm purchases. At my direction, the Department of Justice banned bump stocks. Last year, we prosecuted a record number of firearms offenses. But there is so much more that we have to do.

Now is the time to set destructive partisanship aside — so destructive — and find the courage to answer hatred with unity, devotion, and love. Our future is in our control. America will rise to the challenge. We will always have and we always will win. The choice is ours and ours alone. It is not up to mentally ill monsters; it is up to us.

If we are able to pass great legislation after all of these years, we will ensure that those who were attacked will not have died in vain.

May God bless the memory of those who perished in Toledo. May God protect them. May God protect all of those from Texas to Ohio. May God bless the victims and their families. May God bless America.

Thank you very much. Thank you.

END
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President Obama Speaks on the Shooting in Connecticut

DECEMBER 14, 2012 AT 3:34 PM ET BY MEGAN SLACK

Summary: President Obama delivers a statement from the Briefing Room on the shooting at an elementary school in Newtown, Connecticut.
This afternoon, President Obama made a statement from the Briefing Room on the shooting at an elementary school in Newtown, Connecticut.

We’ve endured too many of these tragedies in the past few years. And each time I learn the news I react not as a President, but as anybody else would -- as a parent. And that was especially true today. I know there’s not a parent in America who doesn’t feel the same overwhelming grief that I do.

The majority of those who died today were children -- beautiful little kids between the ages of 5 and 10 years old. They had their entire lives ahead of them -- birthdays, graduations, weddings, kids of their own. Among the fallen were also teachers -- men and women who devoted their lives to helping our children fulfill their dreams.

So our hearts are broken today -- for the parents and grandparents, sisters and brothers of these little children, and for the families of the adults who were lost. Our hearts are broken for the parents of the survivors as well, for as blessed as they are to have their children home tonight, they know that their children’s innocence has been torn away from them too early, and there are no words that will ease their pain.

As a country, we have been through this too many times. Whether it’s an elementary school in Newtown, or a shopping mall in Oregon, or a temple in Wisconsin, or a movie theater in Aurora, or a street corner in Chicago -- these neighborhoods are our neighborhoods, and these children are our children. And we’re going to have to come together and take meaningful action to prevent more tragedies like this, regardless of the politics.

This evening, Michelle and I will do what I know every parent in America will do, which is hug our children a little tighter and we’ll tell them that we love them, and we’ll remind each other how deeply we love one another. But there are families in
Connecticut who cannot do that tonight. And they need all of us right now. In the hard days to come, that community needs us to be at our best as Americans. And I will do everything in my power as President to help.

Read the full remarks here.

The President also issued a proclamation honoring the victims of the tragedy, ordering U.S. flags to be flown at half-staff until sunset on December 18.

President Barack Obama delivers a statement in the James S. Brady Press Briefing Room of the White House regarding the mass shooting at Sandy Hook Elementary School in Newtown, Connecticut, Dec. 14, 2012. (Official White House Photo by Lawrence Jackson)

Megan Slack
Former Deputy Director of Digital Content for the Office of Digital Strategy
Gun Control and the Circumambient Rhetoric

Gun control is an issue that has recently been a subject of national debate. Mass shootings are the driving factor behind much of this discourse because of the seemingly endless barrage occurring across the United States. This is likely due to the nature of mass shootings: occurring in heavily populated areas where one would expect to be safe, defenseless victims chosen for no apparent reason, and a heavily armed man with no regard for human life. The fear resulting from such incidents is a motivation for many to seek to mobilize and find a solution. The media consistently plays upon this fear, using mass shootings as an opportunity to push their own political agenda. The result of this fear-mongering is an abundance of demonizing/otherizing in the news, contributing to nationwide polarization. Using gun control as an example, news outlets in favor of gun control generally portray gun owners and those against gun control as stereotypical right wing gun-nuts. If the gun control media is losing the argument they tend to resort to talking about the lives of children lost, as well as the possibility of future mass shootings, implying the opposition is uncaring and selfish. In contrast, the pro gun news outlets cause havoc by interpreting any gun control measures as the first step to complete gun control, and typically fall back on defending different interpretations of the second amendment. At the end of the day, this causes an “us against them” herd mentality among the viewers and people begin to believe the stereotypes that all gun owners are selfish, radical NRA members, and that all in favor of gun control wish to do away with the second amendment. There is a lot of rhetoric floating around about gun control, and it can be difficult to cut through the inflammatory language that is typically employed. It is useful to consider that often people are absolutely sure
they’re right, up until the moment they’re proven wrong. For this reason, readers/viewers need to cut through any persuasive tactics a speaker/writer may be utilizing, and to be able to understand and consider the true argument that one is presenting you, rather than allowing your opinion to be swayed by captivating rhetoric.

Margot Bennet asks the question “When did hunters become the new protected class” in her post published on the blog *Women Against Gun Violence*. The author is writing in response to multiple legislations passed by the House of Representatives one week prior to her writing of the article. Under the title in bold text it reads “When Congress Cares More About Hunters Than Our Children, WE MUST ACT!” (Bennet 1). Bennet’s immediate reference to children, as well as the medium of the article (WAGV), makes it clear that the article’s intended audience are parents, and more specifically mothers. She begins by describing how her view of hunting was shaped by the film *Bambi*, and that she doesn’t know many hunters, establishing that she does not know much about hunting. This serves to protect her from future criticism by watering down the credibility of her claims, giving her a way out in case she is challenged. Bennet then provides a positive description of hunters, however she interjects atypical anecdotes throughout contrasting this positive description. “I’m told many are conservationists. They don’t kill endangered species. Most are not like the dentist that killed a protected lion. Most are not like the sons of a world leader who hunt for trophy and pose by the dead bodies. Most do not leave their hunting guns loaded and not secured in their home so that a young child, like the one in Kentucky, picks it up and unintentionally shoots and kills his younger brother” (1). Bennet’s use of repeating the phrase “most do not” serves to emphasize the anecdote that follows. These anecdotes juxtapose any positive description, drastically altering one's perception of the ordinary hunter.
Bennet concludes her description of hunters with “That’s what I hear from hunters” (1) and transitions to the second half of the article with the contrast “This is what I hear from Congress...and the NRA” (1). Bennet trivializes hunters’ complaints of hearing loss, then refers to the Hearing Protection Act, which allows the purchase and usage of firearm suppressors. She then sarcastically asserts that “…even though the use of silencers endangers all of us including law enforcement, hunters must be protected!”(Bennet 1). Bennet’s tone takes a shift towards reprimanding the government in order to further inspire a sense of guilt and wrongdoing by the government in her readers. Bennet frequently constructs her arguments from outrage, the intended effect of which is to sway the reader’s opinion by making them angry. “Hunters also need to be able to kill baby bear cubs in Alaska’s wildlife refuges...allow the killing of mother bears, wolves, and their babies…” (Bennet 1). Referring to these animals as “babies” and “mothers” speaks directly to her target audience, and can also appeal to those concerned with animals rights. “And while congress is busy protecting hunters, you know what I don’t hear? I don't hear any action to protect our children from gun violence. In fact I hear and see the contrary.” (Bennet 1) Again, Bennet makes a primal emotional appeal to her main audience by implying the lives of children are at stake. She then describes multiple legislations that were passed, and her diction becomes even more resentful and accusatory as Bennet once again implies that the recreation of hunters is valued more strongly than the lives of our children in the eyes of the government. She ties up her blog post by invoking her audience to petition, with an email template for readers to copy, fill in, and send to their senators, making it very easy to take action if you were affected by the article. The persuasive technique Bennet primarily utilized was to frame the issue in a way that makes the lives of children seem like a lower priority than recreational hunting in the eyes of congress. Considering Bennet’s main audience, her strategy is
likely effective despite the concrete facts and evidence which she failed to provide in support or defense of her arguments.

Delaney Tarr, a survivor of the Parkland school shooting, gave a speech at the “March for our Lives” protest in Washington D.C. The goal of this protest was to “demand that a comprehensive and effective bill be immediately brought before Congress to address these gun issues.” In giving the speech she hoped to elevate gun control as a key issue in the upcoming midterm election, as well as to sway the opinions of listeners to her viewpoint that there needs to be further regulation of guns. Tarr begins by introducing herself and asserting that she’s “...not here for the crowd”(1), but for her “...17 fellow Eagles who were pronounced dead because of gunfire.”(1). By referring to her deceased classmates, Tarr reminds the crowd why they’re there and what they are trying to prevent from happening again. Tarr then galvanizes the crowd by referring to the protest as “...more than just one day, one event then moving on... this is a movement.” (1) Tarr then describes the NRA as the main adversary to their cause, and creates a villainous image of the NRA through her description, directing the anger of the crowd “They want us to forget. They want our voices to be silenced. And they want to retreat into the shadows where they can remain unnoticed... unquestioned in their corruption...” (1). Tarr’s use of repetition serves to emphasize the negative image she creates of the NRA. Tarr uses repetition throughout her speech, and we see it again in the repeated “we will continue to fight for...” creating an atmosphere of righteousness and determination. “...we will continue to fight for those things that are right. We will continue to fight for common sense. We will continue to fight for our lives. We will continue to fight for our dead friends.”(Tarr 1).

Following this moral appeal, Tarr again makes use of repetition, but now for the purpose of reinforcing her point of view which follows the repeated phrase. “All for that assault weapons
ban...All for the prohibition of high-capacity magazines...All for the reinforcement of background checks and closing of loopholes…” (Tarr 1). She then suggests that those looking to take action sign her petition “It takes two seconds and it matters. We will take the big and we will take the small, but we will keep fighting. When they give us that inch, that bump stock ban, we will take a mile.” (Tarr 1). Tarr’s diction impels the listener to sign her petition by framing it as the snowball that kicks off the avalanche, which speaks to the motivation of her audience; to take action and compel the government to pass gun regulations. Tarr then shifts to threatening politicians, and once more uses repetition to assert her views “The pressure is on for every person in power, and it will stay that way... They know that if there is no assault weapons ban, then we will vote them out.” (1). Tarr reminds her audience of the democratic process, urging listeners to empower themselves and take action wherever they can, even if that means doing something as simple as voting or signing a petition. Tarr leaves the protesters with words of motivation and support, urging them to never be silent and to continue the fight against gun violence.

“Let’s Be Honest, Gun Control Opponents” is a piece of creative nonfiction written by Nick Laure and published to HuffingtonPost, a left-leaning news and opinion site. It was written as a general response to mass shootings that occurred such as Sandy Hook and Aurora. Laure acts somewhat as a rabble-rouser in this piece by blatantly demonizing the opposition and providing straw man counterclaims to his views on gun control. Much of the focus of the piece is on reducing the credibility of stereotypical pro gun arguments. Laure begins by greeting gun rights advocates, then proceeds to clarify that he is specifically addressing those that refuse to accept “common sense gun reform”(1) to further clarify that the piece is intended to address the more radical among gun rights activists. The effect of referring to gun reform as “common
sense” frames those who oppose it as lacking in common sense, reducing the perceived credibility of the opposition. While Laure presents the article as directed toward gun rights activists, the language he uses calls into question Laure’s intended target audience, as well as the true motivation to his writing of the piece; it is not clear whether Laure truly intends to sway the opinions of the opposition and the undecided, or whether he merely intends to further the current political divide by reinforcing the opinions of those who already share his viewpoint. He states within the first few sentences that “I have already come to terms with the fact that you and I will never agree on gun rights or how they should be regulated in this country” (1). This statement, along with the condescending attitude of the writer, gives the impression that the article’s true purpose is to aid in political polarization, reinforcing people’s current convictions rather than opening up their minds to other points of view.

In bold, Laure makes the claim “Your gun rights are more important to you than other people’s lives” (1), then begins belittling gun owners ability to actually make use of their gun in the case of a mass shooting. ”So really, you can drop the pretenses. You know your arguments are just there as a front for your real intentions, because they fall apart with any analysis. You can’t try to tell me that you oppose gun control because you think that arming civilians will prevent mass shootings. Surely you don’t expect...patrons in a dark movie theater will be able to see and stop a shooter before he opens fire” (Laure 2). Laure’s tone becomes contemptuous as he vilifies gun owners for caring more about their guns than the potential loss of life resulting from another mass shooting, serving to frame the opposing views as illogical and unconsidered. “You’re not even fooling yourself with that argument anymore, so maybe it’s time to be honest about it” (Laure 3). Laure provides counterclaims to gun control but quickly disparages these claims as well as those that adhere to them. “You really cannot tell me with any seriousness that
making it more difficult to obtain assault weapons would stop nobody. There is no way a logical person could possibly believe that”. (Laure 4). Laure provides two explanations for the people who agree with the counterclaims he dispenses, attributing to them either selfishness or stupidity. Laure’s arrogance and the image he creates of the opposition likely removes the possibility that his writing will be viewed with any open-mindedness by those who Laure claims he intends to sway - rather, a pro gun activist would likely respond to such a close-minded article by applying the same lack of openness that Laure delivers when considering the opposing view.

After providing and dismissing various counterclaims, and occasionally including anecdotal arguments, Laure provides examples of successful instances of gun control to shed light on its effectiveness. Laure closes his article by again imploring gun rights activists to “Admit that your gun rights are more important to you than preventing even one mass shooting...”(5) To Laure, the issue is black and white. His main concern is the cessation of mass shootings. He does not perceive his right to own a gun as a necessity, and would rather do away with guns altogether if it meant innocent lives were spared. Although this is likely true, many gun owners perceive their gun rights as a defense not only against criminals and home invaders, but also as a protection from the possibility of our government turning tyrannical. While many people feel this fear is overblown and ridiculous, history shows us that the threat of a government turning tyrannical is far from inconceivable. Before government action is taken to change or limit our constitutional rights, the people should have a clear understanding of the risks associated with the revision. While gun control may solve the short-term issue of mass shootings, the long-term risks still need to be evaluated.

The issue of gun control is very complex and there is no easy solution in sight. The media makes little attempt to cut through the rhetoric and get to the real issue, and instead actually aids
in the opacification of the true arguments each side of the debate is presenting. One must be able to understand the true argument that is being presented, or they will fall prey to the ideas of anyone who makes use of fancy rhetoric. Learning about rhetorical strategies allows one to recognize when they are being used, leading to a greater understanding and awareness of persuasive rhetoric in everyday life, and allowing one to critically analyze claims and come up with their own conclusion.
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Reflection

The process of analyzing three separate pieces of rhetoric was useful for getting a taste of the persuasive techniques writers/speakers typically use. I learned new ways to analyze rhetoric. By focusing on the exigence and audience of a piece, the smaller persuasive techniques became obvious as I read through the work, rather than focusing on identifying the specific rhetorical strategies an author used to persuade. I sometimes found myself summarizing rhetoric rather than analyzing it, and I will mind this realization while writing future analyzes. Analyzing different types of rhetoric illuminated the wide array of persuasive techniques that authors use to influence one’s opinion. After analyzing my articles I was surprised by the lack of logical arguments/information present in my selected pieces of rhetoric. Even though the more influential forms of persuasion are ethos and pathos, I expected to see more logical arguments with supporting evidence as well as sources for said evidence.
Shooting an Elephant: Rhetorical Analysis

George Orwell's social commentary in *Shooting an Elephant* reveals the detrimental effects of imperialism through the use of narration. Michael Parenti’s *Imperialism 101* and William Jennings Bryan’s speech use different techniques to prove that imperialism must end in order for society to progress. All three sources explore the ethical concerns of imperialism, and discuss the wrongs of this destructive system in great detail. Each source implements rhetorical devices to validate their claims and persuade the audience.

By flipping the social norm, *Shooting an Elephant* proves that imperialism negatively affects everyone, including the ones trying to enforce it. Orwell begins his argument by admitting that he was hated by a large group of people when he held an important position in government. This first line instantly captures the attention of the reader, as it raises the question, "Why was the author hated?" Throughout the story, Orwell gradually reveals the implications of the time period: British imperialism was the catalyst for an intense resentment towards Europeans across Burma. These feelings of indignation cause Europeans of both high and low classes to be unfairly treated by the Burmans residing there, and the main character is no exception to this abuse. Orwell states that his imperial position led him to become an "obvious target" and he was "baited whenever it seemed safe to do so". This is ironic because, as an authoritative figure, it is expected of him to hold power over the oppressed people. Instead, Orwell portrays himself as the victim of the Burmans' abuse and, in many ways, imperialism itself. This argument is strengthened again when Orwell mentions, "There were several thousand of [the Burmans]...and none of them seemed to have anything to do except stand on street corners and jeer at Europeans" (Orwell 272-273). Imperialism cultivates hatred in the oppressed
people. It causes tension between the perpetrators and persecuted people.

Orwell uses powerful imagery and tone to evoke the audience's sympathy for the Burmans. He despises his job because it forces him to witness the unsettling effects of imperialism on the Burmese people. Orwell goes into great detail about the Burmans' confinement and the terrible conditions that they endure. He describes them as, "The wretched prisoners huddling in the stinking cages of the lock-ups, the grey, cowed faces...the scarred buttocks of the men who had been flogged with bamboos..."(Orwell 273). This imagery elicits sympathy from the audience, portraying the Burmese people as weak and defenseless against British imperialism. It is interesting to note Orwell's diction in the following line: “All of these [sights] oppressed me with an intolerable sense of guilt” (Orwell 273). The word “oppressed” is paradoxical because Orwell represents the oppressor of imperialism. This emphasizes that imperialism is a hindrance to the perpetrator and the oppressed people.

Michael Parenti’s blog, *Imperialism*, also serves to prove the detrimental effects of imperialism. In the blog post, Parenti uses diction to prove that imperialism is a corrupt system. He begins his argument with the line, “Imperialism has been the most powerful force in world history over the last four or five centuries, carving up whole continents while oppressing indigenous peoples and obliterating entire civilizations” (Parenti 1). By using powerful phrases such as ‘carving up’ and ‘obliterating’, Parenti makes his audience rethink imperialism and how it truly impacts civilization. It paints a vivid picture in the audience’s mind of carving up continents, extracting valuable
resources, and leaving the continent hollow and worthless.

In addition, Parenti uses historical examples to prove the negative effects of imperialism. He alludes to the rule of Charlemagne— one of the earliest examples of European imperialism— and discusses the toxic political climate that resulted. He explains, “The people Charlemagne worked to death in his mines in his early part of the ninth century were Slavs. So frequent and prolonged was the enslavement of Eastern Europeans that "Slav" became synonymous with servitude” (Parenti 2). Parenti mentions this in order to create a logical argument and further validate his claims. His blog serves as a reminder of imperialism’s destructive effects.

Finally, William Jennings Bryan’s speech outrightly criticizes the system of imperialism. His speech was used to fuel an opposition to imperialism after the end of the Spanish-American War, a war started by imperialism. He intended to strengthen the resolve of the Democratic party, while admonishing the Republicans’ complacent view of imperialism. Bryan uses a similar technique as Orwell in order to garnish sympathy from his audience. He repeats the phrase, “the menace of imperialism” throughout his speech in order to paint the system as corrupt and unjust. Bryan expands on this belief, saying that imperialism can “repudiate the principles upon which the [United States] rests; it can employ force instead of reason; it can substitute might for right; it can conquer weaker people; it can exploit their lands, appropriate their property and kill their people...” (Bryan 37). In this line, Bryan acknowledges the flaws of imperialism by pointing out the system’s hypocrisy.
Bryan also proves that imperialism goes against the ideals that the United States was founded upon. He appeals to nationalism in order to emphasize how imperialism negatively affects the people. Bryan accomplishes this by alluding to the beliefs of significant American leaders throughout history:

If the republicans are prepared to censure all who have used language calculated to make the Filipinos hate foreign domination, let them condemn the speech of Patrick Henry. When he uttered that passionate appeal, “Give me liberty or give me death,” he expressed a sentiment which still echoes in the hearts of men. Let them censure Jefferson; of all the statesmen of history none have used words so offensive to those who would hold their fellows in political bondage. Let them censure Washington, who declared that the colonists must choose between liberty and slavery. (Bryan 24-25)

Bryan mentions the acts of renowned leaders to remind the American people of the integral beliefs of the country. Furthermore, he questions the patriotism of those who support imperialism. Bryan argues that those who support imperialism condemn the work of Washington and Jefferson, important leaders in American history who shaped the beliefs of the country. By doing this, Bryan effectively proves that imperialism is a system that must be discarded in order to preserve the beliefs of the United States.

All three forms of writing discuss the terrible conditions of imperialism and encourage
the audience to discard the system in order to improve American society. Though each argument is crafted differently, they all serve to highlight the unjust system of imperialism.
Rhetorical Analysis

Student 1

In Cristina Henríquez’s *Lunch*, she gives us insight on her family’s traditions surrounding meal time. On the surface level, *Lunch* appears to only be a short look at this aspect of her life, and how it changed when her grandfather died. However, Henríquez’s short essay goes beyond a simple recounting. While she does not explicitly state this, it is clear that she is making the claim that family and mealtime are connected, and that the familial element of bonding while eating is what truly matters. Because she does not explicitly state this claim, she ingeniously has used a variety of writing strategies to communicate this. Through her use of juxtaposition, tone, and detail, we can understand her connection of family and food. Likewise, Karen Hickson-Smith’s Ted Talk and Liz Martinich’s blog post offer a more direct support of eating as a family.

The primary and most direct method of which Henríquez demonstrates the necessity of the familial element of a meal is through the juxtaposition present throughout the piece. The first six paragraphs out of the eight of the passage are dedicated to describing her time at her grandparents’ house in Panama. We learn that “two aunts, two uncles, six cousins, and at least a dozen friends so intimate that we called them family…” would often be in attendance, prompting her grandmother to set two tables should any show up. Having many family and friends over is common place for Henríquez’s family, making meals “… a boisterous time of day”. Family and friends talked and laughed and spent time bonding with each other, with the food itself being a sort of afterthought. However, these get-togethers would come to an abrupt stop when her
grandfather died. Her grandmother moved to her aunt’s house and, due to circumstances, these
large family gatherings were never quite the same, and considerably less frequent. In her own
words, their “…lunch ceremony has never quite been the same”. It is obvious that she misses that
‘lunch time ceremony’ with her family. In fact, one of Martinich’s own claims is that ‘…children
love rituals.’ It can be said that these provide a sense of stability and ‘sameness’ that one can rely
one. Even if dinners are ‘boisterous’, as in both Henríquez’s case and Smith-Hickson’s anecdote,
they can be a time where individuals can resolve differences or even talk one another through
pains.

When Henríquez makes the transition from describing her old family lunches to the
present day, we see a tonal shift present in her writing. Language like ‘boisterous’, ‘grinning
underneath his silver mustache’, and ‘tales of politics’ as well as similes likening melamine
bowls to miniature igloos, were used to emphasize the ‘warmth’ and joyousness of her past.
When her grandfather dies, her language choice resonates ‘hopeless’ or ‘resigned’, now that her
family’s circumstances have changed. The tone can now best be described as cold and bleak,
with her own grandmother grimacing when eating mixed vegetables and tofu, not because of her
dislike of the food necessarily, but because she misses being with family.

Lastly, Henríquez, whether on purpose or simply as a byproduct of her feelings, changes
the way she describes events again in the aftermath of her grandfather’s death. Of the eight
paragraphs, six are devoted to describing her past as I’ve mentioned. This is because of, or rather
reflects, her feelings. When describing her past, she goes in depth to describe every minutia,
from the salt shakers with added rice to prevent clumping, to “…drinking glasses emblazoned
with worn World Cup decals”. This level of care and attention to detail only goes to show how
much she misses these family meals. In the final two paragraphs, the level and amount of detail
is cut noticeably. The emotion that was conveyed in the previous passages is simply no longer present. Even the type of food she ate, the contrasting of the elaborate dinner feast to measly Chinese food takeout and tofu leftovers, goes to show how much of a loss it has been for her. In Martinich’s post, one of her claims is that, “by cooking a healthy, homemade meal you are showing your child love”. While tofu is considered healthy, the ‘reheated’ nature of the leftovers speaks to her own desire to rekindle the familial bonding that she once had. Reheating leftovers doesn’t show any love from anyone at all. “By sitting down and taking the time to eat as a family, without interruption, you are sending your child the message, “You are important to me. I want to spend time with you and hear what you have to say.” (Martinich). In some way, we all look for validation within ourselves or from others, so it is likely Martinich’s words would not only ring true to Henriquez, but also within us.

The main way in which all three sources emphasize the importance of family is through the use of pathos. Not only is the very language evocative at times, but the use of personal anecdotes and the acceptance of no family being perfect (along with many other realistic concessions) helps the reader relate and form connections with their own life. We may take eating with family for granted at times, but when Karen Hickson-Smith shares with us that she met a nineteen-year-old girl who “...went on to say that that meal time actually had with [them] was the first time that she'd ever eaten with a family”. And while Martinich’s blog post is stylistically very different, the claims she makes are still designed to evoke similar emotions in the reader. As I mentioned before, “by cooking a healthy, homemade meal you are showing your child love”. It seems almost a given that this is the case, but do we really live up to these standards? The conflict present in Lunch may be a result of the death of the author’s grandfather, but it is the death of ‘family’ that marks not only the shift in her writing, but in her life as well.
Today, the connection between family, friends and food seems to be dying in America. And because a family dinner has such a plethora of not only beneficial but even necessary effects, as Martinich claims, future generations are being done a great disservice. Our culture does not seem to value the interconnectivity between family members quite the same as it used to, or even as much as other cultures today. From Henriquez’s experience and the way, she goes about describing it, we can see how important the bonds between family and friends really are. Martinich, Henriquez, and Smith-Hickson all make evident that you cannot separate the ‘family’ from the ‘food’ without suffering the consequences.


Portfolio Checklist
Portfolio submission will include the following:

- **Idea generation (reflection):** Discuss your initial approaches to the prompt, how your ideas for your paper came into being, and the processes you used to brainstorm.
- **Drafts:** All drafts, including your final product.
- **Revision process (reflection):** Discuss how workshops, conferences, writing center visits helped you develop, evolve, and refine your ideas into a fully realized piece of writing.
- **Cultivation of voice as an individual (reflection):** Discuss how the process of this unit helped you to articulate your ideas, increase your own self-knowledge or reaffirm your agency, to develop your individual voice as a writer. Consider moments of challenge, when you pushed through tension or took for granted something you thought to be true, in order to produce new knowledge.
- **Cultivation of voice as a community (reflection):** Discuss moments during the process of this unit when you offered your voice to the collective, in order to come to deeper understandings together. Consider moments of challenge, where discussion and disagreement created evolution in your community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCESS</th>
<th>Exceeds</th>
<th>Meets</th>
<th>Emerging</th>
<th>Attempted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Engaged in the writing process and gained an awareness of writing options and effects | Student has:  
- Made significant changes (reworked order, changed ideas, moved or reworded sentences)  
- Engaged with peer and instructor responses  
- Played with various technical options and devices | Student has:  
- Completed drafts  
- Either made significant changes in each draft or engaged with peer response and teacher response | Student has:  
- Completed most drafts  
- Made some changes between drafts  
- Engaged with either peer review or teacher response | Student has:  
- Not completed most drafts or made changes in between  
- Has not engaged with peers or instructor |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio is organized into specific section. Work samples are arranged in a sequence to highlight progression over time. Each section contains a clear header. The overall organization of the portfolio is excellent.</td>
<td>The Portfolio is organized into specific sections. Most sections contain a header. The overall organization of the portfolio to show progress is clear.</td>
<td>Portfolio contains work not organized in specific section. Little thought is given to progress over time. The overall organization of the portfolio is confusing and/or incomplete.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTENT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portfolio contains all assignments requested. Supplemental material included (annotations of work as it relates to the outcomes and reflection).</td>
<td>Portfolio contains most of the assignments for the unit, completed, and most of the supplemental materials (some annotations as it relates to the outcomes and reflection).</td>
<td>Portfolio contains some completed work and some supplemental material (minimal annotations).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Artifacts give a precise picture of progress and attention to unit details.</td>
<td>Artifacts presented give a general picture of progress in the course and attention to unit details.</td>
<td>Artifacts show an incomplete picture of progress and do not reflect unit details.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>