

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Did the members of the congress deny the authority of Parliament over the colonies?
2. What did they deem to be at issue here: their duties to the government or their rights as English subjects?
3. What were their grievances?
4. Did they appear more concerned about the constitutional issues raised by this act or the possible economic repercussions? Why?

JOHN DICKINSON

FROM *Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania* (1767–68)

In 1767 John Dickinson, a well-educated and wealthy lawyer in his thirties, began writing the popular essays that in the following year were collected and published together as Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania. Dickinson was no radical (as a member of the Second Continental Congress he abstained in the vote for independence), but he was determined to protect his fellow colonists' rights to life, liberty, and property. In a moderate, reasonable tone, Dickinson articulated the American position against the Townshend Acts. Before he died, Charles Townshend, chancellor of the Exchequer, had pushed the acts through in his determination to raise money in America that could be used not only to help defray the costs of the troops in the colonies but also to pay the royal officials there so that they would be independent of popular control. Dickinson outlined a reasonable program of protest but, unfortunately for the moderates in the colonies, it was doomed when expectations on both sides of the Atlantic were not met.

From *Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania, to the Inhabitants of the British Colonies* (Philadelphia: David Hall and William Sellers, 1768), pp. 7–17. Reprinted in *Empire and Nation: Letters from a Farmer in Pennsylvania, John Dickinson, Letters from the Federal Farmer, Richard Henry Lee*, intro. Forrest McDonald (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1962), pp. 7–20. [Editorial insertions appear in square brackets—Ed.]

Letter II

My dear Countrymen,

There is another late act of parliament, which appears to me to be unconstitutional, and as destructive to the liberty of these colonies, as that mentioned in my last letter; that is, the act for granting the duties on paper, glass, etc.

The parliament unquestionably possesses a legal authority to regulate the trade of Great Britain, and all her colonies. Such an authority is essential to the relation between a mother country and her colonies; and necessary for the common good of all. He who considers these provinces as states distinct from the *British Empire*, has very slender notions of justice, or of their interests. We

are but parts of a *whole*; and therefore there must exist a power somewhere, to preside, and preserve the connection in due order. This power is lodged in the parliament; and we are as much dependent on *Great Britain*, as a perfectly free people can be on another.

I have looked over *every statute* relating to these colonies, from their first settlement to this time; and I find every one of them founded on this principle, till the *Stamp Act* administration. *All before*, are calculated to regulate trade, and preserve or promote a mutually beneficial intercourse between the several constituent parts of the empire; and though many of them imposed duties on trade, yet those duties were always imposed *with design* to restrain the commerce of one part, that was injurious to another, and thus to promote the general welfare. . . . Never did the *British* parliament, till the period above mentioned, think of imposing duties in *America* FOR THE PURPOSE OF RAISING A REVENUE. . . .

* * *

This I call an innovation: and a most dangerous innovation. It may perhaps be objected, that *Great Britain* has a right to lay what duties she pleases upon her exports, and it makes no difference to us, whether they are paid here or there.

To this I answer. These colonies require many things for their use, which the laws of *Great Britain* prohibit them from getting any where but from her. Such are paper and glass.

That we may legally be bound to pay any *general* duties on these commodities, relative to the regulation of trade, is granted; but we being *obliged by her laws* to take them from *Great Britain*, any *special* duties imposed on their exportation *to us only*, with intention to raise a revenue from us only, are as much *taxes* upon us, as those imposed by the *Stamp Act*.

What is the difference in *substance* and *right*, whether the same sum is raised upon us by the rates mentioned in the *Stamp Act*, on the *use* of paper, or by these duties, on the *importation* of it. It is only the edition of a former book, shifting a sentence from the end to the *beginning*.

* * *

. . . [T]he *Stamp Act* was said to be a law THAT WOULD EXECUTE ITSELF. For the very same reason, the last act of parliament, if it is granted to have any force here, WILL EXECUTE ITSELF, and will be attended with the very same consequences to *American* liberty.

Some persons perhaps may say that this act lays us under no necessity to pay the duties imposed because we may ourselves manufacture the articles on which they are laid; . . .

* * *

. . . But can any man, acquainted with *America*, believe this possible? I am told there are but two or three *Glass-Houses* on this continent, and but very few *Paper-Mills*; . . . This continent is a country of planters, farmers, and fishermen; not of manufacturers. . . .

Inexpressible therefore must be our distresses in evading the late acts, by the disuse of *British* paper and glass. Nor will this be the extent of our misfortune, if we admit the legality of that act.

Great Britain has prohibited the manufacturing *iron* and *steel* in these colonies, without any objection being made to her *right* of doing it. The *like* right she must have to prohibit any other manufacture among us. Thus she is possessed of an undisputed *precedent* on that point. This authority, she will say, is founded on the *original intention* of settling these colonies; that is, that she should manufacture for them, and that they should supply her with materials. . . .

* * *

Here then, my dear countrymen, ROUSE yourselves, and behold the ruin hanging over your heads. If you ONCE admit, that *Great Britain* may lay duties upon her exportations to us, *for the purpose of levying money on us only*, she then will have nothing to do, but to lay those duties on the articles which she prohibits us to manufacture—and the tragedy of *American* liberty is finished. . . . if *Great Britain* can order us to come to her for necessaries we want, and can order us to pay what taxes she pleases before we take them away, or when we

land them here, we are as abject slaves as *France* and *Poland* can show in wooden shoes and with uncombed hair.¹

* * *

... [T]he single question is, whether the parliament can legally impose duties to be paid by the people of these colonies only, FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF RAISING A REVENUE, on commodities which she obliges us to take from her alone, or, in other words, whether the parliament can legally take money out of our pockets, without our consent. If they can, our boasted liberty is but

Vox et praeterea nihil.
A sound and nothing else.

Letter III

My dear Countrymen,

* * *

... [T]he meaning of [these letters] is, to convince the people of these colonies that they are at this moment exposed to the most imminent dangers; and to persuade them immediately, vigorously, and unanimously, to exert themselves in the most firm, but most peaceable manner, for obtaining relief.

The cause of *liberty* is a cause of too much dignity to be sullied by turbulence and tumult. It ought to be maintained in a manner suitable to her nature. Those who engage in it, should breathe a sedate, yet fervent spirit, animating them to actions of prudence, justice, modesty, bravery, humanity and magnanimity.

* * *

I hope, my dear countrymen, that you will, in every colony, be upon your guard against those who may at any time endeavor to stir you up, under pretenses of patriotism, to any measures disrespectful to our

Sovereign, and our mother country. Hot, rash, disorderly proceedings, injure the reputation of the people as to wisdom, valor, and virtue, without procuring them the least benefit. . . .

Every government at some time or other falls into wrong measures. These may proceed from mistake or passion. But every such measure does not dissolve the obligation between the governors and the governed. The mistake may be corrected; the passion may subside. It is the duty of the governed to endeavor to rectify the mistake, and to appease the passion. They have not at first any other right, than to represent their grievances, and to pray for redress, unless an emergency is so pressing as not to allow time for receiving an answer to their applications, which rarely happens. If their applications are disregarded, then that kind of *opposition* becomes justifiable which can be made without breaking the laws or disturbing the public peace. . . .

If at length it becomes UNDOUBTED that an inveterate resolution is formed to annihilate the liberties of the governed, the *English* history affords frequent examples of resistance by force. What particular circumstances will in any future case justify such resistance can never be ascertained till they happen. Perhaps it may be allowable to say generally, that it never can be justifiable until the people are FULLY CONVINCED that any further submission will be destructive to their happiness.

When the appeal is made to the sword, highly probable is it, that the punishment will exceed the offense; and the calamities attending on war outweigh those proceeding it. . . .

To these reflections on this subject, it remains to be added, and ought for ever to be remembered, that resistance, in the case of colonies against their mother country, is extremely different from the resistance of a people against their prince. A nation may change their king, or race of kings, and, retaining their ancient form of government, be gainers by changing. Thus *Great Britain*, under the illustrious house of *Brunswick* [Hanover], a house that seems to flourish for the happiness of man-kind, has found a felicity unknown in the reigns of the *Stuarts*. But if once we are separated from our

¹Dickinson remarked in a footnote that French peasants wore wooden shoes and that Polish vassals had uncombed matted hair.

mother country, what new form of government shall we adopt, or where shall we find another *Britain* to supply our loss? Torn from the body, to which we are united by religion, liberty, laws, affections, relation, language and commerce, we must bleed at every vein.

In truth—the prosperity of these provinces is founded in their dependence on *Great Britain*; and when she returns to her “old good humor, and her old good nature,” as Lord *Clarendon* expresses it, I hope they will always think it their duty and interest, as it most certainly will be, to promote her welfare by all the means in their power.

We cannot act with too much caution in our disputes. Anger produces anger; and differences, that might be accommodated by kind and respectful behavior, may, by imprudence, be enlarged to an incurable rage. . . .

The constitutional modes of obtaining relief are those which I wish to see pursued on the present occasion; that is, by petitions of our assemblies, or where they are not permitted to meet, of the people, to the powers that can afford us relief.

We have an excellent prince, in whose good dispositions toward us we may confide. We have a generous, sensible and humane nation, to whom we may apply. They may be deceived. They may, by artful men, be provoked to anger against us. I cannot believe they will be cruel and unjust; or that their

anger will be implacable. Let us behave like dutiful children who have received unmerited blows from a beloved parent. Let us complain to our parent; but let our complaints speak at the same time the language of affliction and veneration.

If, however, it shall happen, by an unfortunate course of affairs, that our applications . . . prove ineffectual, let us then take *another step*, by withholding from *Great Britain* all the advantages she has been used to receive from us. . . . Let us all be united with one spirit, in one cause. . . .

REVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Why did Dickinson believe the Townshend duties to be unconstitutional?
2. How does he argue that the taxes on certain enumerated goods such as glass and paper were particularly pernicious? In forming his argument, does he condemn the actor (Parliament) as well as the act?
3. Why did he, an author who was trying to persuade people to exert themselves vigorously against encroachments on their liberty, condemn those who more violently stirred up the populace?
4. Why did he want protest to be reasonable and limited? Was that a reasonable desire?

SAMUEL ADAMS

About the Boston Massacre (1770)

British troops began occupying Boston in the fall of 1768 in response to increasing tensions that bubbled into violence. What was supposed to impose order, however, multiplied disorders and increased colonial opposition to imperial control. Samuel Adams (1722–1803) was a leader in that opposition. Adams proclaimed against the new duties and taxes of the 1760s as transgressions against colonial rights. His words and actions helped spur others, which in turn led Massachusetts Governor Francis Bernard to ask for help and Lord Hillsborough, the British colonial secretary, to send

To the Print

The trial were indicted, Caldwell, March 1770, Town: And of the coolness of this trial, Jury, the Witnesses have conscience, no one contrary.

I am free so great injury all his Majesty's subjects of this city to have the present administration in his Majesty's