

they possibly expect obedience in such a case as this? Would they themselves, in a similar case, even under a competent legislative authority, submit to laws which would destroy the great end of all laws, Self-Preservation? Human nature says, No. The Genius of the English constitution says, No. The nation itself hath heretofore said, No; and a great oracle \* of its laws has given his sanction to the verdict—"In cases of national oppression, says he, the nation hath very *justifiably* risen as one man, to vindicate the original compact, subsisting between the King and people." And—"If the sovereign power threaten devaluation to a state, mankind will not be reasoned out of the feelings of humanity, nor sacrifice liberty to a scrupulous adherence to political maxims."

If the case of America does not come within the above description, there seems to be no equity left upon earth; and whatever is exacted by *force* must be yielded through *fear*. But if justice be any thing more than a name, it is surely a solecism in politics to say, that one part of a free country has a right to command that which the other "cannot *obey* without being *slaves*, nor *resist* without being *rebels*." Yet to such a sad dilemma does the parliamentary claim of a "right to bind us in all cases whatsoever," reduce America; involving in it a total surrender of our liberties; superseding the use of our own legislatures; marking us with such a badge of servitude as no freemen can consent to wear; and subjecting us to burdens laid by those who are not only unacquainted with our circumstances, and bear no part of the weight, but ease themselves in proportion as they load us. If this be *law*, if it be *equity*, it has no example among any other people, possessing the least glimmerings of virtue or native freedom.

But although this claim be so repugnant to every idea of natural as well as legal justice, that the guilt of  
blood

\* Blackstone.