ST. CLEMENT'S INN OF COURT

"Law & Religion Forum"

Volume 1, Apostolate Paper #67

"A History of the Anglican Church—Part L: An Essay on the Role of Christian Lawyers and Judges within the Secular State"©

By

Roderick O. Ford, Litt.D., D.D., J.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

"To speak of the separation of church and state is to speak of the separation of soul and body."
-- Rev. Algernon Sidney Crapsey (Anglican Priest)

Part L. Anglican Church: Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* and the Calvinist-Presbyterian Resistance to British Mercantilism —A Prelude to the American Revolution, 1730 - 1780

Preface
Introduction
Summary

I. Collapse of the South Sea Company; British Mercantilism and the Transatlantic Slave Trade, 1700 – 1720

II. Collapse of Commercial Ethics: Mercantilism and the British Empire, 1720 – 1780

III. Collapse of Orthodox Christianity; British Mercantilism in Colonial New England, 1700 – 1780

A. Colonial New England, Secularism and the Half-Way Covenant

B. The Old Light Puritans adopt the 'Half-Way' Covenant through Pressures of British Mercantilism

B. New Light Puritans Found the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1746

C. Rev. Dr. John Witherspoon, a Scottish Presbyterian and President of Princeton, 1768 – 1794

E. Moral Influence of 18th-Century Calvinists Upon African Slavery and the Transatlantic Slave Trade

IV. The "First Great Awakening" and the American Revolt Against Avarice, Consumerism, and British Mercantilism, 1730- 1780.

Conclusion

Biography

The ideas expressed in this Apostolate Paper are wholly those of the author, and subject to modification as a result of on-going research into this subject matter. This paper is currently being revised and edited, but this version is submitted for the purpose of sharing Christian scholarship with clergy, the legal profession, and the general public.

PREFACE

The organized Christian church of the Twenty-First Century is in crisis and at a crossroad. Christianity as a whole is in flux. And I believe that Christian lawyers and judges are on the frontlines of the conflict and changes which are today challenging both the Christian church and the Christian religion. Christian lawyers and judges have the power to influence and shape the social, economic, political, and legal landscape in a way that will allow Christianity and other faith-based institutions to evangelize the world for the betterment of all human beings. I write this essay, and a series of future essays, in an effort to persuade the American legal profession to

rethink and reconsider one of its most critical and important jurisprudential foundations: the Christian religion. To this end, I hereby present the sixty-seventh in this series: "A History of the Anglican Church—Part L."

Introduction[1]

Adam Smith (1723 – 1790) is best known for his masterpiece *The Wealth of Nations* (1776) but, unfortunately, he is less known for his theological treatise *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759) or his career as a Calvinist-Presbyterian theologian and natural-law theorist.[2] But Smith's economic analysis in *The Wealth of Nations* was deeply- rooted in the Calvinism and natural law of the Scottish Enlightenment.[3] In *The Wealth of Nations,* Smith devised an economic theory that comported with the natural moral law, and he argued that natural moral law was the source of efficient economic policies.[4] In so many words, Smith's argument was that the invisible hand of God, implementing natural law, was source of economic analysis and policy.[5] Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* may be described as the voice of Christian faith and church to the secular British Empire and forewarning it against the economic abuses—particularly monopoly, mercantilism, and slavery—that dominated the 18th century:

Church ←---→ State ←---→ Capitalism

Smith's work was a part of a larger movement called the Scottish Enlightenment. During the early 1700s, British mercantilism and the Anglo-American merchants who controlled the British Empire swallowed whole all of colonial Puritan New England. And in reaction to this economic suzerainty over colonial New England, Rev. Jonathan Edwards (1703 – 1758) and others pushed back against what appeared to be widespread social and moral decadence caused by materialism, consumerism, and apostasy. Hence, the First Great Awakening emerged during the 1730s-40s as a result. But as the orthodox Puritan church-state collapsed, a newer form of orthodox Calvinism emerged—Scottish Common Sense Realism ("SCSR").[6] SCSR was the first-fruit of the Scottish-Presbyterian

[1] This paper is dedicated to the Faculty and Staff of the Whitefield Theological Seminary (Lakeland, Florida), to the Christ Presbyterian Church (Lakeland, Florida), and to the Calvinist wing of the Church of England.
[2] James E. Alvey, "The Secret, Natural Theological Foundation of Adam Smith's Work," *Journal of Markets & Morality,* Volume 7, Number 2 (Fall 2004): 335–361
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.
[6] "Though best remembered for its opposition to the pervasive philosophy of David Hume, Scottish common sense

Enlightenment,[7] and it crossed the Atlantic Ocean into colonial British North America during 1760s. SCSR especially took root at the new Presbyterian college at Princeton, where Rev. Edwards had once been the president. At Princeton, a newer, modernized version of orthodox Calvinism was rapidly developed in order to meet the challenges of the Age of Reason.

The American Revolution (1775 – 1783) was significantly influenced by this newer form of orthodox Calvinism known as Scottish Common Sense Realism. This newer form of Calvinism was promoted by Scottish intellectual giants, including as Thomas Reid (1710 – 1796)[8]; John Witherspoon (1723 – 1794); and Adam Smith (1723 – 1790). Scottish Common Sense Realism was, simply put, the Calvinist version of "latitudinarian Anglicanism," which held that "*Christianity is a republication of natural religion.*"[9] SCSR thus sought to reconcile orthodox Calvinism within the Church of Scotland with the newer cosmopolitan ideas

---

philosophy is influential and evident in the works of Thomas Jefferson and late 18th-century American politics… One central concern of the school was to defend 'common sense' against philosophical paradox and scepticism. It argued that common-sense beliefs govern the lives and thoughts even of those who avow non-commonsensical beliefs and that matters of common sense are inherent to the acquisition of knowledge. The qualities of its works were not generally consistent; Edward S. Reed writes, e.g., '[Whereas] Thomas Reid wished to use common sense to develop philosophical wisdom, much of this school simply wanted to use common sense to attack any form of intellectual change.'…

"Common sense (all the senses combined) is how we truly identify the reality of an object; since all that can be perceived about an object, are all pulled into one perception. How do people reach the point of accessing common sense? That's the trick, everyone is born with the ability to access common sense, that is why it is called common sense. 'The principles of common sense are common to all of humanity'…."
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Reid

[7] The Scottish Enlightenment: the school taught that every person had ordinary experiences that provided intuitively certain assurance of a) the existence of the self, b) the existence of real objects that could be seen and felt; and c) certain "first principles" upon which sound morality and religious beliefs could be established. These principles laid the foundation for Reid's influential theory of perception….
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scottish_common_sense_realism

[8] "In his natural religion lectures, Reid provides five arguments for the existence of God, focusing on two mainly, the cosmological and design. Reid loves and frequently uses Samuel Clarke's cosmological argument, which says, in short that the universe either has always been, or began to exist, so there must be a cause (or first principle) for both (Cuneo and Woudenberg 242). As everything is either necessary or contingent, an Independent being is required for contingency (Cuneo and Woudenberg 242). Reid spends even more time on his design argument, but is unclear exactly what he wanted his argument to be, as his lectures only went as far as his students needed. Though there is no perfect interpretation, Reid states that "there are in fact the clearest marks of design and wisdom in the works of nature" (Cuneo and Woudenberg 291) If something carries marks of design (regularity or variety of structure), there must be an intelligent being behind it (Reid EIP 66). This can't be known by experience, fitting with the casual excellence principle, but the cause can be seen in works of nature (Cuneo and Woudenberg 241)."
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Reid

[9] See, e.g., John Witherspoon, *Lectures on Moral Philosophy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1912), pp. 1-3.

emanating from the global highways of the British Empire and recast as the "Age of Reason."

In Scotland, Thomas Reid was instrumental in pioneering this new philosophy called "Scottish Common Sense Realism." In North America, this Common Sense Realism was a sort of compromise between liberal Calvinist theology and the ideals of the conservative Rev. Jonathan Edwards, who held that Arminianism and Enlightenment ideology were both unorthodox and sinful. CSRS did not reject Rev. Edward's orthodoxy, but it did not reject latitudinarian Anglican's conclusion that "*Christianity is a republication of natural religion*," either. Indeed, the influential Rev. John Witherspoon would go on to adopt a theology and philosophy that were similar to that of the influential Anglican Bishop Joseph Butler (1692- 1752),[10] whose *The Analogy of Religion* (1730) held that "*Christianity is a republication of natural religion.*"[11] And after Rev. Witherspoon brought this "Common Sense Realism" to America in 1768, to became president of the Presbyterian college at Princeton, his CSRS philosophy would go on to have an enormous influence over an entire generation of American revolutionary leaders—especially American founding fathers John Adams (1735 – 1826); James Madison (1751 – 1836); and Thomas Jefferson (1743 – 1826):

> Common Sense Realism swept American intellectual circles in the 18th century…. Evidence of the influence of Scottish Common Sense realism can readily be found in the philosophy of both **Thomas**

---

[10] Rev. John Witherspoon was author of *The Works of Joseph Butler (https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/724374.The_Works_of_Joseph_Butler)*

[11] See, generally, John Witherspoon, *Lectures on Moral Philosophy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press, 1912). See also Daniel Craig Norman, "John Witherspoon, Common Sense, and Original Sin," (An Integrative Thesis Submitted to Faculty of Reformed Theological Seminary in Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree Master of Arts, June 2006), p 2. [citing Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), p. 49], stating:

> **Witherspoon incorporated ideas from Joseph Butler**, namely the idea that our moral sense has a rational basis and that this moral sense is what the Bible calls our conscience. Witherspoon taught, "The moral sense is precisely the same thing with what, in scripture and common language, we call conscience. It is the law which our Maker has written upon our hearts, and [so] both intimates and enforces duty, previous to all reasoning." Witherspoon's goal was to provide a moral philosophy that was acceptable to both Christians and non-Christians. He was attempting to bridge the gap between positions represented by Hutcheson and Edwards. Hutcheson had little, if any, concern for revelation and Edwards believed that true virtue came only from God.[11] **Witherspoon's point was that reason and revelation are compatible—that the moral philosophy derived through reason is consistent with that derived from revelation**.

NOTE: Scottish-Presbyterian clergymen and Princeton president Rev. John Witherspoon is the author of *The Works of Joseph Butler* (https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/724374.The_Works_of_Joseph_Butler).

> **Jefferson** and **John Adams**. Adams compared the contributions of Dugald Stewart favorably to works of Aristotle and René Descartes. Scotsman and signer of the *Declaration of Independence*, John Witherspoon presided over Princeton University; students under his tutelage included 12 state governors, 55 delegates to the Constitutional Convention and future president **James Madison**. His education at the University of Edinburgh made him a strong proponent of the Scottish Enlightenment and Realism.
>
> James McCosh (1811–94) continued the influence of Scottish Realism at Princeton when he became president of the university in 1868, reviving its influence as a major stronghold of the movement. Noah Porter (1811–92) taught Common Sense realism to generations of students at Yale.

Indeed, the CSRS taught at Princeton influenced many of the American founding fathers to express orthodox Christian values in the terminology of natural law and natural religion.

From this standpoint, we may rightfully conclude that orthodox Calvinism—a combination of New England Puritanism and Scottish Common Sense Realism--played a major role in initiating and executing the American Revolutionary War (1775 -1783) and in establishing the new government that became the United States of America. As Loraine Boettner tells us:

> It is estimated that of the 3,000,000 Americans at the time of the American Revolution, 900,000 were of Scotch or Scotch-Irish origin, 600,000 were Puritan English, and 400,000 were German or Dutch Reformed. In addition to this the Episcopalians had a Calvinistic confession in their Thirty-nine Articles; and many French Huguenots also had come to this western world. Thus we see that about two-thirds of the colonial population had been trained in the school of Calvin….
>
> With this background we shall not be surprised to find that the Presbyterians took a very prominent part in the American Revolution. Our own historian Bancroft says, 'The Revolution of 1776, so far as it was affected by religion, was a Presbyterian measure….[12]

[12] Kenneth Talbot and Gary Crampton, *Calvinism, Hyper-Calvinism, and Arminianism* (Lakeland, FL.: Whitefield

In this paper, we shall look primarily at the influence of one of the Scottish Enlightenment's most influential thinkers, economist Adam Smith (1723 – 1790) and his most influential work *The Wealth of Nations* (1776).[13] The major issues which led to the First Great Awakening of the 1730s and 40s, the collapse of British mercantilism during the 1750s and 60s, the American Revolution of the 1770s, and the rise and fall of the First British Empire (1707 – 1785), are explained here primarily from the perspective of Adam Smith's economic analysis, as set forth in *The Wealth of Nations* (1776).

Adam Smith's economic ideals were deeply-rooted in Calvinist theology and in the same Scottish Common Sense Realism which Rev. Witherspoon taught to many of the America's prominent young men at Princeton.[14] Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* is a masterpiece that holds that *the field of economics is a representation of natural moral law—a reflection of the mind and will of a divine author*. It is upon this moral foundation that Smith builds a very cogent argument against British mercantilism and the wasteful, corrupt monopolies which it supported. According to Adam Smith's analysis, the American Revolution was deeply-rooted in the economic inefficiencies that were inherent within the British mercantilist system.

Secondarily, this paper also analyzes the impact of British mercantilism, consumerism, and materialism upon the religious civilization of colonial British North America. This paper advances the novel idea that the First Great Awakening (1730s-40s) was a spiritual reaction to fundamental changes in individual perspectives on orthodox Calvinism, moral values, social norms, and public discourses on natural philosophy that were introduced into the colonies through the channels of global trade and British mercantilism. In Puritan New England, the impact of British mercantilism was acute, thus undermining many of orthodox Christian values that served as the basis of family and community life, including the entire church-state structure. British tea, coffee, chocolate, clothing, toys, and other manufactured goods were constantly dumped upon colonial New England, which was forced to consume these luxury goods. The result of this dumping of luxury goods upon New England created a social structure where the well-to-do could engage in conspicuous consumption and the conspicuous display of social status. At the same time, church attendance in Congregationalist churches

---

Media Publishing, 1990), pp. 127- 128.

[13] Adam Smith was an economist as well as an ordained Presbyterian clergyman within the Church of Scotland.

[14] Indeed, Adam Smith was himself a Presbyterian theologian and ordained clergyman, whose conception of economics was that of moral theology and natural law.

declined and the younger generations of New Englanders turned their attention towards social-climbing, investments, money-making, and the enjoyment of British luxuries. During the early 1700s, fewer New Englanders cared about church membership or being converted or becoming "born again." And this caused great alarm to Congregationalist ministers such as Jonathan Edwards and other "New Light" Puritans who launched the First Great Awakening during the 1730s and 40s.

Unfortunately, the Puritan church-state did not survive, and what was eventually built upon its ashes was the Scottish Common Sense Realism (i.e., conception of Christianity as being a republication of natural religion) that emerged from the Scottish Enlightenment and took root in North America at the Presbyterian college at Princeton. Strongly influenced by Calvinism, the American resistance to British mercantilism and imperialism finally resulted in the *Declaration of Independence* (1776) and the American Revolutionary War (1775 – 1783).

Summary

This paper explains how the Calvinist faith coped with the "Age of Reason" and British mercantilism during the 18th century. In Scotland, the Calvinist-Presbyterian clergy were educationally and philosophically far ahead of most of their Calvinist brethren in Puritan colonial New England. These Scottish Calvinists had become familiar with the latitudinarian Anglicanism of the period. For instance, in *The Analogy of Religion (1736),*the latitudinarian Anglican Bishop Joseph Butler, in his rebuttal to Unitarians, skeptics, deists, and atheists, concluded that ***"Christianity is a republication of natural religion."*** In Scotland, the Calvinist-Presbyterian clergy, who were grappling with the same challenges posed by the Age of Reason, reached the same conclusion as Bishop Butler's.[15] In their

[15] See, e.g., Daniel Craig Norman, "John Witherspoon, Common Sense, and Original Sin," (An Integrative Thesis Submitted to Faculty of Reformed Theological Seminary in Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree Master of Arts, June 2006), p 2. [citing Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), p. 49], stating:

> **Witherspoon incorporated ideas from Joseph Butler**, namely the idea that our moral sense has a rational basis and that this moral sense is what the Bible calls our conscience. Witherspoon taught, "The moral sense is precisely the same thing with what, in scripture and common language, we call conscience. It is the law which our Maker has written upon our hearts, and [so] both intimates and enforces duty, previous to all reasoning." Witherspoon's goal was to provide a moral philosophy that was acceptable to both Christians and non-Christians. He was attempting to bridge the gap between positions represented by Hutcheson and Edwards. Hutcheson had little, if any, concern for revelation and Edwards believed that true virtue came only from God.[15] Witherspoon's point was that reason and revelation are compatible—that the moral philosophy derived through reason is consistent with that derived from revelation.

defense of orthodox Calvinism, the Scottish Presbyterians developed a new school of thought known as Scottish Common Sense Realism (SCSR). SCSR allowed orthodox Calvinists to reconcile the validity of the Sacred Scriptures, as taught in the Reformed tradition, with the newer knowledge that was uncovered through scientific inquiry and discovery. SCSR provided orthodox Calvinists with a rebuttal to the Age of Reason. At the new Presbyterian college at Princeton, New Jersey, SCSR took root and spread through Presbyterian and Calvinist circles, and influenced a significant number of the American men who would become the founding fathers and public officials of the new United States of America.

Part L. Anglican Church: Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* and the Calvinist-Presbyterian Resistance to British Mercantilism —A Prelude to the American Revolution, 1730 - 1780

The American Revolution was borne out of dialectical material and economic conflict that was articulated in the form of 18th-century discourses of natural law. Indeed, as Adam Smith's masterpiece *The Wealth of Nations* teaches us, the field of economics and political economy were reviewed through the prism of natural law and natural religion; and, during the 18th-century, both Smith and other learned theologians, economists, and clergymen within the Church of England (both the catholic and reformed branches) continued to treat political economy as a subfield of Christian moral theology—and particularly with respect to the regulation of commerce and monopoly capitalism. Adam Smith interpreted the field of economics through the prism of the "Golden Rule," to wit:

> To restrain private people, it may be said, from receiving in payment the promissory notes of a banker, for any sum whether great or small, when they themselves are willing to receive them; or, to restrain a banker from issuing such notes, when all his neighbours are willing to accept of them, is a manifest violation of that natural liberty which it is the proper business of law, not to infringe, but to support. Such regulations may, no doubt, be considered as in some respect a violation of natural liberty. But **those exertions of the natural liberty of a few individuals, which might endanger the security of the whole society, are, and ought to be, restrained by the laws of all governments**; of the most free, as well as of the most despotical. The

NOTE: Scottish-Presbyterian clergymen and president of Princeton Rev. John Witherspoon is the author of *The Works of Joseph Butler*.

> obligation of building party walls, in order to prevent the communication of fire, is a violation of natural liberty, exactly of the same kind with the regulations of the banking trade which are here proposed.

Smith's economic theology included a doctrine of liberty of occupational pursuit which denounced all forms of slavery and forced servitude—ideals which also were enshrined in the American *Declaration of Independence* (1776).[16] For instance, in *The Wealth of Nations*, Smith wrote:

> The law which prohibited the manufacturer from exercising the trade of a shopkeeper, endeavored to force this division in the employment of stock to go on faster than it might otherwise have done. The law which obliged the farmer to exercise the
>
> trade of a corn merchant, endeavored to hinder it from going on so fast. Both laws were evident violations of natural liberty, and therefore unjust…. It is the interest of every society, that things of this kind should never either be forced or obstructed…. [T]he **law ought always to trust people with the care of their own interest**, as in their local situations they must generally be able to judge better of it than the legislator can do….[17]

---

[16] *Butchers' Union, etc. Co. v Crescent, etc, Co*., 111 U.S. 746, 110-111 (1883).

> A monopoly is defined
>
> "to be an institution or allowance from the sovereign power of the state, by grant, commission, or otherwise, to any person or corporation, for the sole buying, selling, making, working, or using of anything whereby any person or persons, bodies politic or corporate, are sought to be restrained of any freedom or liberty they had before or hindered in their lawful trade,"
>
> **All grants of this kind are void at common law**, because **they destroy the freedom of trade, discourage labor and industry, restrain persons from getting an honest livelihood** and put it in the power of the grantees to enhance the price of commodities. They are void because they interfere with **the liberty of the individual to pursue a lawful trade or employment**.
>
> The oppressive nature of the principle upon which the monopoly here was granted will more clearly appear if it be applied to other vocations than that of keeping cattle and of preparing animal food for market -- to the ordinary trades and callings of life -- to the making of bread, the raising of vegetables, the manufacture of shoes and hats, and other articles of daily use.

[17] Adam Smith, The Wealth of Nations (New York, N.Y.: The Modern Library, 1937), p. 497.

> All **systems either of preference** or **of restraint**, therefore, being thus completely taken away, the **obvious and simple system of natural liberty establishes itself of its own accord**. Every man, as long as he does **not violate the laws of justice, is left perfectly free to pursue his own interest his own way**, and **to bring both his industry and capital into competition with those of any other man**, or order of men…. According to **the system of natural liberty**, the sovereign has only three duties to attend to; three duties of great importance, indeed, but plain and intelligible to common understandings: first, the duty of protecting the society; secondly, the duty of protecting, as far as possible, every member of the society from the injustice or oppression of every other member of it, or the duty of establishing an exact administration of justice; and, thirdly, the duty of erecting and maintaining certain public works and certain public institutions, which it can never be for the interest of any individual, or small number of individuals, though it may frequently do much more than repay it to a great society.[18]

Fundamentally, 18th-century Anglo-American political theory held that political economy, economic justice, and economic regulation, together with public law and civil government, had to comport with the law of nature, the natural moral law, or the "law of Christ."[19] Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* reminds us that the economic inequities of that period—most significantly in the form of government-backed monopoly capital—is what fueled most of the grievances that led to the American Revolution. The American *Declaration of Independence*'s reference to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness" was taken to mean, fundamentally, natural liberty, the freedom of to make and enforce contracts, and the liberty of occupational pursuit— i.e., to be free from all forms of tyranny and restraint.[20] Specifically, within the context of the American Revolution, the

---

[18] Ibid., p. 651.

[19] The fundamental "Law of Christ," to wit, is to "love ye one another" (John 15:12); to do justice and judgement (Genesis 18:18-19; Proverbs 21: 1-3); to judge not according to appearance but to judge righteous judgments (John 7:24); and to do justice, judgment, and equity (Proverbs 1:2-3).

[20] See, e.g., the U.S. Supreme Court's discussion of "monopoly" capitalism and its tendency to impair the natural liberties guaranteed in the American *Declaration of Independence* (1776), in the case of *Butchers' Union, etc. Co. v Crescent, etc, Co*., 111 U.S. 746, 110-111 (1883), to wit:

> A monopoly is defined
>
> "to be an institution or allowance from the sovereign power of the state, by grant, commission, or otherwise, to any person or corporation, for the sole buying, selling, making, working, or using of anything

struggle for liberty fundamentally economic and it was a struggle against British mercantilism, which artificially stifled industry, trade, and economic growth. To that extent, the American Revolution was an economic struggle between American and British elites—it was not, fundamentally, a struggle to raise the standard of living amongst the American working classes and African slaves. Nevertheless, over the course of the next several decades following the American Revolution, the natural rights principles enshrined in the American *Declaration of Independence* (1776) would have a spillover effect upon the liberty and natural rights of all classes of Americans.[21]

Here, it is important to point out that in eighteenth-century thought, Christianity was widely held to be the republication of natural religion and natural law.[22] Indeed, the very text of the *Holy Bible* (i.e., the Sacred Scriptures) taught economic morality. For instance, in my book *Jesus Master of Law*, I analyzed, among other things, how the ancient Hebrew prophets applied the natural moral law (i.e., the Decalogue and the Pentateuch) to economic injustices within ancient

---

> whereby any person or persons, bodies politic or corporate, are sought to be restrained of any freedom or liberty they had before or hindered in their lawful trade,"
>
> **All grants of this kind are void at common law**, because **they destroy the freedom of trade, discourage labor and industry, restrain persons from getting an honest livelihood** and put it in the power of the grantees to enhance the price of commodities. They are void because they interfere with **the liberty of the individual to pursue a lawful trade or employment**.
>
> The oppressive nature of the principle upon which the monopoly here was granted will more clearly appear if it be applied to other vocations than that of keeping cattle and of preparing animal food for market -- to the ordinary trades and callings of life -- to the making of bread, the raising of vegetables, the manufacture of shoes and hats, and other articles of daily use.

[21] For example, the U.S. Supreme Court discussed the implications of those "natural rights" and their impact upon the rights of the working classes to engage in the "liberty of occupational pursuit" in the case of *Butchers' Union, etc. Co. v Crescent, etc, Co*., 111 U.S. 746, 110-111 (1883). Abraham Lincoln also believed that the very "natural rights" principles contained within that *Declaration of Independence* (1776) justified the overthrow of the institution of African slavery, stating in his famous senatorial debate:

> I have never said anything to the contrary, but I hold that, notwithstanding all this, there is no reason in the world why the negro is not entitled to all the natural rights enumerated in the Declaration of Independence, the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. [Loud cheers.] I hold that he is as much entitled to these as the white man. I agree with Judge Douglas he is not my equal in many respects-certainly not in color, perhaps not in moral or intellectual endowment. But in the right to eat the bread, without the leave of anybody else, which his own hand earns, he is my equal and the equal of Judge Douglas, and the equal of every living man. [Great applause.]

[22] See, e.g., Matthew Tindal, *Christianity as Old as the Creation* (1730); William Warburton, *The Alliance of Church and State* (1736); and Joseph Butler, (1736).

Israel.[23] The prophetic approach of Adam Smith, who was himself a Presbyterian and Calvinist theologian, to the field of political economy, similarly relied upon the same natural moral law. Smith's *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759) was a re-statement of classical western theology on "natural moral law" and the "law of reason," which governs the inner soul of human beings.[24] See, also, Paul Olsington, "The 'end' of economics: Adam Smith as theologian," stating:

> It is well known that Adam Smith constructed a system which comprised, not just economics, but history, jurisprudence and moral philosophy. In fact, he seemed more proud of his *Theory of Moral*

[23] See, e.g., Roderick O. Ford, *Jesus Master of Law* (Tampa, FL: Xlibris, 2015), pp. 11-14. (In the ***Book of Isaiah***, there is the forewarning against "unjust gains from oppression," "bribery," and "oppression of the poor, the needy, and the innocent." In the ***Book of Jeremiah***, the prophet observed many Jews becoming rich through craftily exploiting the needy, the fatherless, and the innocent. "For among my people," Jeremiah observed, "are found wicked men: they lay wait, as he that setteth snares; they set a trap, they catch men. As a cage is full of birds, so are their houses full of deceipt: therefore they are become great, and waxen rich." In the ***Book of Ezekiel***, the prophet charges that many in Jerusalem committed "dishonest gain"; "[h]ath oppressed the poor and needy, hath spoiled by violence…."; have "dealt by oppression with the stranger: in thee have they vexed the fatherless and the widow'; and "have they taken gifts to shed blood; thou has taken usury and increase, and thou has greedily gained of they neighbours by extortion, and hast forgotten me, saith the Lord GOD." In the ***Book of Hosea***, the prophet described Israel as "a merchant, the balances of deceipt are in his hand: he loveth to oppress…. [saying] I am become rich…." In the ***Book of Amos***, "[b]usiness is booming and boundaries are bulging. But below the surface, greed and injustice are festering. Hypocritical religious motions have replaced true worship, creating a false sense of security and a growing callousness to God's disciplining hand." Amos does not consider Israel's material success to be honest or honorable, considering the fact that there is much affliction of the poor and needy. He charges Israel with having oppressed the poor and the needy. He forewarns the wealthy in Israel that there shall be consequences for their economic transgressions. In the ***Book of Micah***, the prophet charges his fellow Judeans as being economically oppressive and evil. "For the rich men thereof," says Micah, "are full of violence, and the inhabitants thereof have spoken lies, and their tongue is deceiptful in their mouth." The result was, as Micah noted, widespread injustice, economic oppression, religious hypocrisy, and the social disintegration within Judean society. In the ***Book of Habakkuk***, the prophet notices economic injustices in the southern kingdom of Judah. He described the poor, who were victims of all sorts of crafty economic injustices in the southern kingdom of Judea, and he proclaims "[w]oe to him that increaseth that which is not his!" And finally, in the New Testament, there is Jesus' **Parable of the Rich Man and Lazarus (Luke 6;46-49)**, the Beatitudes, and the "Law of Christ" which further set the theme that true religion means, among other things, alleviating the manacles of economic injustice.

[24] See, e.g., "Adam Smith," Britannica.com, which describes the *Theory of Moral Sentiments* (1759) as follows:

> Didactic, exhortative, and analytic by turns, it lays the psychological foundation on which The Wealth of Nations was later to be built. In it Smith described the principles of "human nature," which, together with Hume and the other leading philosophers of his time, he took as a universal and unchanging datum from which social institutions, as well as social behaviour, could be deduced.
>
> One question in particular interested Smith in *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*. This was a problem that had attracted Smith's teacher Hutcheson and a number of Scottish philosophers before him. The question was the source of the ability to form moral judgments, including judgments on one's own behaviour, in the face of the seemingly overriding passions for self-preservation and self-interest. Smith's answer, at considerable length, is the presence within each person of an "inner man" who plays the role of the "impartial spectator," approving or condemning one's own and others' actions with a voice impossible to disregard. (The theory may sound less naive if the question is reformulated to ask how instinctual drives are socialized through the superego.)

Sentiments than his much more famous *The Wealth of Nations*. But the fact that Adam Smith was also a theologian has taken much longer to be appreciated….

In 1751, when taking up his Chair at the University of Glasgow, Smith signed the Calvinist Westminster Confession of Faith before the Glasgow Presbytery, satisfied the University of his orthodoxy, and took the Oath of Faith. Smith's scrupulousness in other similar matters suggests sincerity of this profession of orthodox Christian faith.

I would argue that there must be a presumption of a significant theological background to any work of moral philosophy or political economy produced in such a context. Such a presumption is confirmed by the abundance of theological language in Smith's published works. He regularly refers to "the Deity," "the author of nature," "the great Director of nature," "lawful superior" and so on. There are, moreover, repeated references to divine design and providence. For instance:

'**Every part of nature**, when attentively surveyed, equally demonstrates the providential care of its Author, and we admire the wisdom and goodness of God even in the weakness and folly of man.' …

'[T]he **happiness of mankind**, as well as all other rational creatures, seems to have been the original purpose intended by **the author of nature**, when he brought them into existence ... By acting according to **the dictates of our moral faculties**, we necessarily pursue the most effectual means **for promoting the happiness of mankind**, and may therefore be said, in some sense, to co-operate with the Deity, and to advance as far as in our power the plan of Providence.' …

'The idea of that **divine Being**, whose benevolence and wisdom have, from all eternity, **contrived and conducted the immense machine of the universe**, so as at all times to produce the greatest possible quantity of happiness, is certainly of all the objects of human contemplation by far the most sublime.' …

'[T]he **governing principles of human nature**, the rules which they prescribe are to be regarded as **the commands and laws of the Deity**.'

The presumption of a theological dimension to Smith's work is confirmed by the fact that Smith was read theologically by his contemporaries, including important figures in the formation of political economy as a discipline in nineteenth-century Britain.

For instance, Richard Whately, holder of the first chair in economics at a British university, interpreted providentially Smith's assertion of unintended positive consequences of self-interested behaviour: "Man is, in the same act, doing one thing by choice, for his own benefit, and another, undesignedly, under the care of Providence, for the service of the community." Whately also placed Smith's Theory of Moral Sentiments and Wealth of Nations above William Paley's works as natural theology.

Among nineteenth-century British popularisers of political economy none was more influential than Thomas Chalmers. Chalmers also took Smith to be suggesting that the transformation of self-interested behaviour into the greatest economic good is providential:

'Such a result which at the same time not a single agent in this vast and complicated system of trade contemplates or cares for, each caring only for himself — strongly bespeaks **a higher Agent**, **by whose transcendental wisdom it is**, that all is made **to conspire so harmoniously**, and to terminate **so beneficially**.' …

'The whole science of political economy is full of these exquisite adaptions to the wants and comforts of human life, **which bespeak the skill of a master-hand**, in the **adjustment of its laws**, and the working of **its profoundly constructed mechanism**.'

Theological readings of Smith also abound among the nineteenth-century pioneers of political economy as a discipline, and even more so in popular discussions of political economy."[25]

[25] https://www.abc.net.au/religion/adam-smith-theologian-and-the-end-of-economics/11327086

As a Presbyterian clergymen, Adam Smith also believed that the Calvinist doctrine and the Presbyterian form of ecclesiastical church government were most supportive of a free civil government based upon religious liberty and freedom. Smith held that the Roman Catholic Church,[26] the Lutheran Church[27], and Church of England[28] forms of state-sponsored ecclesiastical governments did not correspond very well with free civil governments. But the Reformation principles, opined Smith, were better carried out within the Reformed Churches of Europe.[29] The Presbyterian Churches were more democratic, and the equality among Presbyterian clergymen was more pronounced. In *The Wealth of Nations*, Smith writes:

> The equality which the presbyterian form of church government establishes among the clergy, consists, first, in the equality of authority or ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and, secondly, in the equality of benefice. In all presbyterian churches the equality of authority is perfect: that of benefice is not so. The difference, however, between one benefice and another, is seldom so considerable as commonly to tempt the possessor even of the small one to pay court to his patron, by the vile arts of flattery and assentation, in order to get a better. In all presbyterian churches, where the rights of patronage are thoroughly established, it is by nobler and better arts that established clergy in general endeavor to gain the favor of their superiors; by their learning, by the irreproachable regularity of their life, and by the faithful and diligent discharge of their duty…. There is scare perhaps to be found any where in Europe a more learned, decent, independent, and respectable set of men, than the greater part of the presbyterian clergy of Holland, Geneva, Switzerland, and Scotland.[30]

In colonial British North America, the Presbyterian Church and the Calvinist-led Congregational churches were at the epicenter of that conflict between the American colonies and Great Britain. Indeed, through the only Presbyterian college in the United States, the College of New Jersey (Princeton University), which was founded in 1746, at the tail end of the First Great Awakening and the commencement of American revolutionary thought, the

[26] Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, supra, pp.754-756.
[27] Ibid., p. 759.
[28] Ibid., pp. 759-760.
[29] Ibid., pp. 757 – 766.
[30] Ibid., pp. 761 – 762.

foundation of American constitutional thought was more fully developed and set forth. Princeton would become a haven that was safe for American revolutionaries and revolutionary ideas. And it was there that the economic writings of Adam Smith, which attacked Great Britain's mercantilist policies, found a wide forum.

I. Collapse of the South Sea Company; British Mercantilism and the Transatlantic Slave Trade, 1700 – 1720

During the first three decades of the 18th century, from 1700 to 1730, England took a dark turn towards mercantilism, predatory commercialism, and materialism. As documented in Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*, the first symptom of its moral decadence was reflected in the collapse of the South Sea Company.[31]

> The South Sea Company (officially The Governor and Company of the merchants of Great Britain, trading to the South Seas and other parts of America, and for the encouragement of the Fishery) was a British joint-stock company founded in January 1711, created as a public-private partnership to consolidate and reduce the cost of the national debt. **To generate income, in 1713 the company was granted a monopoly (the Asiento de Negros) to supply African slaves to the islands in the "South Seas" and South America.** When the company was created, Britain was involved in the War of the Spanish Succession and Spain and Portugal controlled most of South America. There was thus no realistic prospect that trade would take place, and as it turned out, the Company never realised any significant profit from its monopoly. However, Company stock rose greatly in value as it expanded its operations dealing in government debt, and peaked in 1720 before suddenly collapsing to little above its original flotation price. The notorious economic bubble thus created,

[31] "South Sea Bubble, the speculation mania that ruined many British investors in 1720. The bubble, or hoax, centred on the fortunes of the South Sea Company, founded in 1711 to trade (mainly in slaves) with Spanish America, on the assumption that the War of the Spanish Succession, then drawing to a close, would end with a treaty permitting such trade. The company's stock, with a guaranteed interest of 6 percent, sold well, but the relevant peace treaty, the Treaty of Utrecht made with Spain in 1713, was less favourable than had been hoped, imposing an annual tax on imported slaves and allowing the company to send only one ship each year for general trade." https://www.britannica.com/event/South-Sea-Bubble . See, also, Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, supra, p. 703 ("The South Sea Company …had an immense capital dividend among an immense number of proprietors. It was naturally to be expected, therefore, that folly, negligence, and profusion should prevail in the whole management of their affairs. The knavery and extravagance of their stock-jobbing projects are sufficiently known…. The fist trade which they engaged in was that of supplying the Spanish West Indies with negroes, of which (in consequence of what was called the Assiento contract granted them by the treaty of Utrecht) they had the exclusive privilege.")

which ruined thousands of investors, became known as the South Sea Bubble.[32]

Hence, the South Sea Company was the most prominent joint-stock company in all of England during the early 1700s. And after England attained in 1713 the covenanted Assiento (i.e., the contract which allowed it to monopolize the African slave-trade for thirty years), *slave trading constituted the main legal commercial activity of the South Sea Company from between 1720 and 1739*.[33] Its prospects for huge profits from the West Indian slave trade attracted investors from all over England, thus placing the continent of Africa and the transatlantic slave trade at the footstool of this British Empire.[34]

W.E.B. Du Bois says that the "British Empire was regarded as a 'magnificent superstructure of American commerce and naval power on an African foundation.'"[35] British capital investment and slavery were clearly linked through a "triangular trade," in which England became "a manufacturing country."[36] "By 1750 there was hardly a manufacturing town in England which was not connected" to this transatlantic trade.[37]

The South Sea Company, founded in 1711, was one such capitalistic enterprise which attracted scores of hundreds of British investors, and was built upon the extraction of fabulous profits from the transatlantic slave trade. Hence, England's financial interests—not just the aristocracy, but also the middle classes and those aspiring to buy stock-- became deeply tied to West Indian and African slavery.[38] In the West Indies and the southern colonies of colonial British North America, tobacco, sugar and, later, cotton, were grown in large plantations designed to produce these "cash crops." But rapid profits from capitalistic investments required immediate labor—white labor and local Native American labor proved unsuitable to the necessary tasks; and it was soon discovered that African labor was most productive. Hence, the British exchanged their

[32] Ibid.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Ibid.
[35] W.E.B. Du Bois, *The World and Africa*, p. 58.
[36] Ibid.
[37] Ibid.
[38] Ibid, p. 56. ("However this wealth was obtained and however pious the regret at the methods of its rape, there can be no doubt as to what became of it. Its owners in the main were not royal spendthrifts, nor aristocratic dilettantes; and even if some were, their financial advisers put their funds largely into the safe investment of West Indian slavery and the African slave trade. Thus an enormous amount of free capital seeking safe investments and permanent income poured into the banks, companies, and new corporations. **The powerful British institution of the stock exchange was born**.")

manufactured goods for slaves on the coast of West Africa. The slaves were taken to the plantations of Spanish America, the British West Indies, and colonial British North America. There, in the Western Hemisphere, the British sold the slaves in exchange for raw materials which were shipped back to England for processing and manufacturing. Hence, the triangular transatlantic slave trade and the British West Indies "became the center of the British Empire and of immense importance to the grandeur of England. It was the Negro slaves who made these sugar colonies the most precious colonies ever recorded in the annals of imperialism."[39]

W.E.B. Du Bois concluded that European, British and upper-class American colonists' elite culture and civilization were built up upon African subjugation, exploitation, and plantation slavery[40]—but often hidden from plain sight through this distance of overseas plantations:

> Elaborate writing, disguised as interpretation, and the testimony of so-called 'experts,' **made it impossible for charming people in Europe to realize what their comforts and luxuries cost in sweat, blood, death, and despair**, not only in the remoter parts of the world, but even on their own doorsteps. **A gracious culture was built up; a delicately poised literature treated the little intellectual problems of the rich and well-born, discussed small matters of manners and convention, and omitted the weightier ones of law, mercy, justice, and truth**. Even the evidence of the eyes and senses was denied by the mere weight of reiteration….
>
> The concept of the European 'gentleman' was evolved: a man well bred and of meticulous grooming, of knightly sportsmanship and invincible courage even in the face of death; but one who did not hesitate to use machine guns against assagais and to cheat 'niggers'; an ideal of sportsmanship which reflected the Golden Rule and yet contradicted it- not only in business and in industry within white

[39] Ibid., p. 58.

[40] See, also, Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations*, supra, p. 703 ("The South Sea Company …had an immense capital dividend among an immense number of proprietors. It was naturally to be expected, therefore, that folly, negligence, and profusion should prevail in the whole management of their affairs. The knavery and extravagance of their stock-jobbing projects are sufficiently known…. The fist trade which they engaged in was that of supplying the Spanish West Indies with negroes, of which (in consequence of what was called the Assiento contract granted them by the treaty of Utrecht) they had the exclusive privilege.")

> countries, but all over Asia and Africa—by indulging in lying, murder, theft, rape, deception, and degradation….[41]

During the early 1700s, the steady loosening of commercial ethics, avarice, and the willingness to exploit African slaves on West Indian and American plantations—notwithstanding the Golden Rule—were omnipresent.[42] African slavery dominated the British economy after 1700:

> In 1713 they gained, by the coveted Treaty of Asiento, the right to monopolize the slave trade from Africa to the Spanish colonies. In that century they beat Holland to her knees and started her economic decline. They overthrew the Portuguese in India, and finally, by the middle of the century, overcame their last rival in India, the French. In the eighteenth century they raised the slave trade to the greatest single body of trade on earth.
>
> The Royal African Company transported an average of five thousand slaves a year between 1680 and 1686; but the newly rich middle-class merchants were clamoring for free trade in human flesh.

---

[41] Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[42] R.H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (New York, N.Y.: Mentor Books, 1954), pp. 156 – 157:

> With the expansion of finance and international trade in the sixteenth century, it was this problem which faced the Church. Granted that I should love my neighbor as myself, the questions which, under modern conditions of large-scale organization, remain for solution are, **Who precisely is my neighbor? And, How exactly am I to make my love for him effective in practice?** To these questions the conventional religious teaching supplied no answer, for it had not even realized that they could be put. It had tried to moralize economic relations by treating every transaction as a case of personal conduct, involving personal responsibility. In an age of impersonal finance, world-markets and a capitalist organization of industry, its traditional social doctrines had no specific to offer, and were merely repeated, when, in order to be effective, they should have been thought out again from the beginning and formulated in new and living terms. It had endeavored to protect the peasant and the craftsman against the oppression of the moneylender and the monopolist. Faced with the problems of a wage-earning proletariat, it could do no more than repeat, with meaningless iteration, its traditional lore as to the duties of master to servant and servant to master. **It had insisted that all men were brethren. But it did not occur to it to point out that, as a result of the new economic imperialism which was beginning to develop in the seventeenth century, the brethren of the English merchants were the Africans whom he kidnaped for slavery in America, or the American Indians whom he stripped of their lands, or the Indian craftsmen from whom he bought muslims and silks at starvation prices**…. [T]he social doctrines advanced from the pulpit offered, in their traditional form, little guidance. Their practical ineffectiveness prepared the way for their theoretical abandonment…. **[T]he Church of England turned its face from the practical world, to pore over doctrines which, had their original authors been as impervious to realities as their later exponents, would never have been formulated. Naturally it was shouldered aside. It was neglected because it had become negligible**.

> Eventually the Royal African Company was powerless against the competition of free merchant traders, and a new organization was established in 1750 called the 'Company of Merchants trading to Africa.'
>
> In the first nine years of this 'free trade,' Bristol alone shipped 160,950 Negroes to the sugar plantations. In 1760, 146 ships sailed from British ports to Africa with a capacity of 36,000 slaves. IN 1771 there were 190 ships and 47,000 slaves. The British colonies between 1680 and 1786 imported over two million slaves. By the middle of the eighteenth century Bristol owned 237 slave trade vessels, London, 147, and Liverpool, 89. Liverpool's first slave vessel sailed for Africa in 1709. In 1730 it had 15 ships in the trade and in 1771, 105. The slave trade brought Liverpool in the late eighteenth century a clear profit of £300,000 a year. A fortunate slave trade voyage made a profit of £8,000, and even a poor cargo would make £5,000. It was not uncommon in Liverpool and Bristol for the slave traders to make 100 per cent profit. The proportion of slave ships to the total shipping of England was one in one hundred in 1709 and one-third in 1771. The slave traders were strong in both the House of Lords and the House of Commons, and a British coin, the guinea, originated in the African trade of the eighteenth century.[43]

What all of this meant was that England had become devoid of commercial ethics and developed a callous indifference to the methods used to extract profits from overseas investments. However, after the South Sea Bubble of 1720, many investors in England were ruined by the share-price collapse, and as a result, the national economy diminished substantially. The founders of the scheme had engaged in insider trading, by using their advance knowledge of the timings of national debt consolidations to make large profits from purchasing debt in advance. Huge bribes were given to politicians to support the Acts of Parliament necessary for the scheme. Company money was used to deal in its own shares, and selected individuals purchasing shares were given cash loans backed by those same shares to spend on purchasing more shares. The expectation of profits from trade with South America was talked up to encourage the public to purchase shares, but the bubble prices reached far beyond what the actual profits of the business (namely the slave trade) could justify.

[43] Ibid., pp. 54-55.

Concerns of financial corruption and fraud suddenly dominated British and American life—and the Church and many pastors were not slow in construing the recent South Sea Bubble as evidence of God's hand moving swiftly against avarice, sin and corruption. See, e.g., Gregory Clowes, "The Devil's Interlude in the South Sea Bubble,"[44] stating:

> This article attempts to make sense of how contemporaries understood the first major financial crash in British history, the South Sea Bubble of 1720. Crucial to this understanding, but hitherto overlooked, were ideas about the supernatural and the Devil in particular.
>
> It is unsurprising that diabolism and ideas about supernaturally orchestrated retribution have been ignored in the secondary literature; to think the Devil had any meaningful connection with a financial crash sits uncomfortably with our modern separation of secular high finance, and religious supernaturalism. Nonetheless, **there is a wealth of unexplored evidence residing in poems, ballads, pamphlets, comedy plays, etchings and visual prints suggesting that the Devil was pivotal to how the populace dealt with this bewildering and historic incident**….
>
> It was the Devil's perceived ability to tantalise and seduce individuals into rapacious avarice – in an attempt to ruin the nation – during 1720, which helps us collapse the false historiographical distinction between economic woes and social anxieties….
>
> In the years leading up to the Bubble, speculators were prospering and business was booming. From 1717 to 1720 investment in joint-stock companies had made a rapid jump from £20million to £50million.11 Importantly however, in the early eighteenth century the stock market was perceived as a strange, new and often mysterious wealth generating or depleting entity. With this rise in stock-market investment and trading activity, fears were stimulated about the ephemeral nature of paper money, the immorality of Exchange Alley

[44] "Those harbouring concerns about the new financial institutions and innovations took the Bubble as the ultimate vindication of their worries, and as a moment of divine retribution for those engaging in such shady financial activities."
https://humanities.exeter.ac.uk/media/universityofexeter/collegeofhumanities/history/exhistoria/volume6/Devil_and_South_Sea_Bubble.pdf

and dubious practice of stockjobbing, along with the broader ramifications that such financial innovations might have for the **domestic family unit**, the **public good**, and **religious morality**….

It must arguably have been a puzzling spectacle for the contemporary onlooker who was unversed in the nuances of the stock market, that someone could be made immensely rich, and also dreadfully poor merely through the powers and outcomes of these conversations. **As pamphleteers pointed out, were these financial dealings not akin to sorcery, since the consequences from mere words could be so great?** Given this allusion, it is worth remembering that witchcraft – with its emphasis on the verbal incantation in causing physical harm, or 'maleficium' – was still a capital offence in England until 1736. There was arguably some residual anxiety about the extreme financial consequences that mere verbal exchange could cause, and its disturbing parallels with sorcery.

There was additional disquiet about the seemingly untrammelled social mixing along the Exchange. As the contemporary Rufus Sherwood comments, '**Turks, Jews, Atheists and Infidels mingle there as if they were a kin to one another**'. Tom Brown also highlights the sexual exploits that were apparently negotiated along the Alley, 'Look! Yonder's a Jew treading upon an Italian's foot, to carry on a Sodomitical Intrigue, and bartering their Souls here, for Fire and Brimstone in another World'. The image of 'bartering Souls' with its financial connotations, gives us a glimpse of how contemporaries associated the (thought to be) immoral activities of the Exchange with ideas of Hell and damnation, ('Fire and Brimstone in another World'), often-in satirical fashion….

Moreover, stockjobbing was thought to serve neither the public good, nor the domestic family, but only to satisfy the individual's 'endless Ambition of still growing rich' or of 'growing wealthy without trouble.' Jonathan Swift for one viewed with alarm the interdependence of government revenue with large-scale gambling, and the terrifying idea that the whole charade rested on a magical bubble of confidence. He invited his readers to 'Conceive the whole

> Enchantment broke', and presciently envisage the distressing consequences.[45]

Indeed, the widespread religious or superstitious interpretation of the collapse of the South Sea Bubble was confirmed by a parliamentary inquiry that was held after the bursting of the bubble to discover its causes.[46] The result of this inquiry lead to a number of politicians being disgraced.[47] Many people were found to have profited immorally from the South Sea Company, and some had their personal assets confiscated.[48] However, the South Sea Company was restructured and continued to operate.[49] And British mercantilism and slave-trading continued as before the crash.[50] But at least, the Bubble Act 1720 (6 Geo I, c 18), which forbade the creation of joint-stock companies without royal charter, was enacted by Parliament in order to curtail the possibility of future similar crashes.

The British Whig Party, led by Prime Minister Robert Walpole, emerged from the 1720 crash stronger than ever before. The Whigs continued England's push toward global expansion through mercantilist policies, deeply-rooted, fundamentally, in the transatlantic slave trade. That wicked trade in human beings, because of its evil consequences, was a principal cause of the American Revolution of 1776. In *The Federalist Papers*, Paper No. 56, American Founding Father James Madison would thus move to explain the U.S. Constitution's temporary tolerance of the transatlantic slave trade for a period of twenty years, until the year 1808:

> The regulation of foreign commerce, having fallen within several views which have been taken of this subject, has been too fully discussed to need additional proofs here of its being properly submitted to the federal administration. It were doubtless to be wished, that the power of prohibiting the importation of slaves had not been postponed until the year 1808, or rather that it had been suffered to have immediate operation. But it is not difficult to account, either

---

[45] Gregory Clowes, "The Devil's Interlude in the South Sea Bubble." https://humanities.exeter.ac.uk/media/universityofexeter/collegeofhumanities/history/exhistoria/volume6/Devil_and_South_Sea_Bubble.pdf

[46] "South Sea Company." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/South_Sea_Company

[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Ibid.

> for this restriction on the general government, or for the manner in which the whole clause is expressed. **It ought to be considered as a great point gained in favor of humanity, that a period of twenty years may terminate forever, within these States, a traffic which has so long and so loudly upbraided the barbarism of modern policy**; that within that period, it will receive a considerable discouragement from the federal government, and may be totally abolished, by a concurrence of the few States which continue the unnatural traffic, in the prohibitory example which has been given by so great a majority of the Union. **Happy would it be for the unfortunate Africans, if an equal prospect lay before them of being redeemed from the oppressions of their European brethren**!

South Carolina and Georgia insisted that all anti-slavery references be removed from the *Declaration of Independence* (1776) and threatened to succeed from the union[51] if such references were placed in the U.S. Constitution (1787).[52]

---

[51] See, e.g., "Madison, James and Slavery" ("Madison reassured the convention that the state's ban on the slave trade would remain in effect. More importantly, **South Carolina** and **Georgia** would not have accepted the Constitution without the compromise. 'Great as the evil is, a dismemberment of the Union would be worse,' he said.") https://encyclopediavirginia.org/entries/madison-james-and-slavery/

[52] On this very subject, historian W.E.B. Du Bois says:

> The Declaration of Independence showed a significant drift of public opinion from the firm stand taken in 'Association' resolutions. The clique of political philosophers to which Jefferson belonged never imagined the continued existence of the country with slavery. It is well known that the first draft of the Declaration contained a severe arraignment of Great Britain as the real promoter of slavery and the slave trade in America. In it the king was charged with waging a 'cruel war against human nature itself, violating its most sacred rights of life and liberty in the persons of a distant people in their transportation thither. This piratical warfare, the opprobrium of infidel powers, is the warfare of the Christian king of Great Britain. Determined to keep open a market where men should be bought and sold, he has prostituted his negative for suppressing every legislative attempt to prohibit or to restrain this execrable commerce. And that this assemblage of horrors might want no fact of distinguished die, he is now exciting those very people to rise in arms among us, and to purchase that liberty of which he has deprived them, by murdering the people on whom he also obtruded them: thus paying off former crimes committed against the liberties of one people with crimes which he urges them to commit against the lives of another.' …
>
> Jefferson himself says that this clause 'was struck out in complaisance to **South Carolina** and **Georgia**, who had never attempted to restrain the importation of slaves, and who, on the contrary, still wished to continue it. Our northern brethren also, I believe,' said he, 'felt a little tender under those censures; for though their people had very few slaves themselves, yet they had been pretty considerable carriers of them to others.'

W.E.B. Du Bois, "The Suppression of the African Slave Trade," *Writings* (New York, N.Y.: The Library of America, 1986), p. 54.

II. Collapse of Commercial Ethics: Mercantilism and the British Empire, 1720 – 1780

The fraud, widespread corruption, and collapse of the South Sea Company in 1720 prefigured the economic collapse of British mercantilism over the course of the next fifty years. As previously mentioned, this moral collapse was documented in the renowned British economics professor Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations.* According to Professor Smith, economic activity—as all human activities—are governed by moral laws and the laws of nature. Human labor, wrote Smith, was naturally the source of all wealth and value, and the social of nature of human beings made the division of labor and bartering essential to human civilization. Bartering is natural law of human existence; and the introduction of money, as a medium of exchange, does not change this fundamental natural state of mankind. Therefore, natural law and natural religion had to govern economic relations—even the most mundane of secular activities—including the business of earning profits from commerce. Professor Smith says:

> This division of labour, from which so many advantages are derived, is not originally the effect of any human wisdom, which foresees and intends that general opulence to which it gives occasion. **It is the necessary**, though very slow and gradual, **consequence of a certain propensity in human nature** which has in view no such extensive utility; the propensity to truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another.[53]

This tendency to collect property and to barter is strictly confined to human beings, says Smith.[54] And from these exchanges, in order to make the whole process easier, arose the use of money and the wages of labour[55] and profits from stocks.[56] From these transactions arise, perhaps inevitably, the problem of economic sins and the inequality in wealth between human beings, owing to the varied economic interests between different social classes.[57] One manifestation of that economic problem, according to Professor Smith, was 18th-century British mercantilism.

Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* advocated for free trade and laisses-faire economic policies which he felt the British mercantilist system, which held the

[53] Ibid., p. 13.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Ibid., pp. 13- 86.
[56] Ibid., p. 87-98.
[57] Ibid., p. 99 – 149.

American colonies in a state of economic and political vassalage, did not promote.[58] The current imperial economic relationship between Great Britain and her American colonies was a bad deal for both parties, argued Professor Smith, and the problem rested within the nature of the colonial system itself.

First of all, Great Britain (i.e., British merchants) needed to make a profit off of the colonies in order to afford the costs of protecting them from the French and other competitors. And in order to make a profit, it needed to monopolize its trade with the American colonies. To do this, Parliament passed various navigation acts,[59] which allowed England to monopolize the American colonial trade.[60] "[T]his monopoly has necessarily contributed to keep up the rate of profit in all the different branches of British trade higher than it naturally would have been, had all nations been allowed a free trade to the British colonies."[61] But Professor Smith observed that the effect of this monopoly had evil consequences in other areas of British economic life. Namely, "capital" became withdrawn from domestic industries and redirected toward profit-making from the colony trade,[62] and the overall affects of that monopoly was harmful to most other areas of England's *own domestic* economic life.[63] Professor Smith writes on the monopoly of the American colonial trade, as follows:

> It has in all cases, therefore, turned it, from a direction in which it would have maintained a much smaller quantity. By suiting, besides, to one particular market only, so great a part of the industry and commerce of Great Britain, it has rendered the whole state of that industry and commerce more precarious and less secure, than if their produce had been accommodated to a greater variety of markets. We must carefully distinguish between the effects of the colony trade and those of the monopoly of that trade. The former are always and necessarily beneficial; the latter always and necessarily hurtful….[64]
>
> The monopoly of the colony trade, on the contrary, by excluding the competition of other nations, and thereby raising the rate of profit both

[58] Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations* (New York, N.Y.: The Modern Library, 1937).
[59] Ibid., p. 562 ("When, by the act of navigation, England assumed to herself the monopoly of the colony trade…."). These Navigation Acts (1660 -1700s) supported **British mercantilism** by **requiring all American trade to go through English** ports, on English ships, and to be **for the benefit of Britain** rather than the colonists.
[60] Ibid., p. 562-564.
[61] Ibid., p. 564.
[62] Ibid., p. 566.
[63] Ibid., p. 574.
[64] Ibid., p. 573.

> in the new market and in the new employment, draws produce from the old market and capital from the old employment. To augment our share of the colony trade beyond what it otherwise would be, is the avowed purpose of the monopoly. If our share of that trade were to be no greater with, than it would have been without the monopoly, there could have been no reason for establishing the monopoly. But whatever forces into a branch of trade of which the returns are slower and more distant than those of the greater part of other trades, a greater proportion of the capital of any country, than what of its own accord would go to that branch, necessarily renders the whole quantity of productive labour annually maintained there, the whole annual produce of the land and labour of that country, less than they otherwise would be. It keeps down the revenue of the inhabitants of that country, below what it would naturally rise to, and thereby diminishes their power of accumulation. It not only hinders, at all times, their capital from maintaining so great a quantity of productive labour as it would otherwise maintain, but it hinders if from increasing so fast as it would otherwise increase, and consequently from maintaining a still greater quantity of productive labour….[65]
>
> All the original sources of revenue, the wages of labour, the rent of land, and the profits of stock, the monopoly renders much less abundant than they otherwise would be. **To promote the little interest of one little order of men in one country, it hurts the interest of all other orders of men in that country, and all men in all other countries**….[66]
>
> It is thus that the single advantage which the monopoly procures to a single order of men, is in many different ways hurtful to the general interest of the country.[67]

Nevertheless, the short-sightedness of British merchants insisted upon monopolizing the colonial trade with the American colonies but therein arose the problem that would eventually lead to the American Revolutionary War (1775 – 1781). "It is rather for the manufactured than for the rude produce of Europe, that

[65] Ibid., p. 574.
[66] Ibid., p. 578.
[67] Ibid., p. 579. ("The policy of the monopoly is a policy of shopkeepers.")

the colony trade opens a new market."[68] "The **monopoly of the colony trade, therefore, like all the other mean and malignant expedients of the mercantile system**, **depresses the industry of all the other countries**, **but chiefly that of the colonies**, without in the least increasing, but on the contrary diminishing, that of the country in whose favour it is established."[69] Stated differently, Great Britain's monopoly trade with the American colonies was bad for both the people of England as well as the American colonists.[70] Nevertheless, "monopoly" persisted as the desired settled policy among the 18th-century British elite.

Great Britain's monopoly over local American economic life unnecessarily retarded the colonies' industrial and commercial development.[71] Great Britain's objectives for the American colonies had become reduced simply to "raising up a people of customers,"[72] presumably for economic exploitation, and this was the settled, seemingly unchangeable policy of Great Britain toward her colonies. England had "a nation whose government is influenced by shopkeepers."[73] Great Britain, in other words, had become shopkeepers to the thirteen American colonies—and this was an economic relationship designed by and for the British merchants and a few elites.[74]

Paying for the expenses of maintaining Britain's economic monopoly over the American colonies eventually led to the outbreak of the American Revolutionary War (1775 – 1783). The Seven Year's War (or the French and Indian War), between 1754 and 1763, had been fought to maintain Great Britain's monopoly over its thirteen American colonies, to the exclusion of France and all other competitors. As Professor Smith writes:

> The maintenance of this monopoly has hitherto been the principal, or more properly perhaps the sole end and purpose of the dominion which Great Britain assumes over her colonies. In the exclusive trade, it is supposed, consists the great advantage of provinces, which have never yet afforded either revenue or military force for the support of the civil government, or the defence of the mother country. The monopoly is the principal badge of their dependency, and it is the sole

[68] Ibid., p. 575.
[69] Ibid., p. 576.
[70] Ibid., pp. 576- 577.
[71] Ibid., pp. 577 – 578.
[72] Ibid., p. 579.
[73] Ibid., p. 579.
[74] Ibid., p. 580.

> fruit which has hitherto been gathered from the dependency. Whatever expense Great Britain has hitherto laid out in maintaining this dependency, has really been laid out in order to support this monopoly.[75]

Given that Great Britain's settled policy was dominated by "monopoly" capitalism which hurt the local economies of England as well as the working-class Englishmen, and depressed the economic development of the American colonies, Professor Smith argued that "parting good friends" with the American colonies and settling up with "a treaty of commerce" as would effectually secure "free trade" to Great Britain, then Great Britain would "be immediately freed from the whole annual expense of the peace establishment of the colonies."[76] (What, in fact, Professor Smith was arguing, in terms of an Anglo-American economic alliance, as early as 1776,[77] would eventually become the settled policy of both Great Britain and the United States over the course of the next two centuries).

On the other hand, Professor Smith argued that maintaining monopoly control over the American colonies was not only economically unsound for both England and the colonies, but that it was politically impossible to do so, given the distance between the two nations. America's ambitious, local political leaders and America's growing economic potential, made continued British mercantilist control impossible.[78] The colonial legislatures and assemblies would not likely submit completely to Parliament forever, without a meaningful voice in that Parliament. On the other hand, Parliament would still need reliable means to enforce its necessary taxation laws. So long as Great Britain did not permit the American politicians to represent the colonies in Parliament, there would be trouble.[79] "The leading men of America," writes Smith, "like those of all other countries, desire to preserve their own importance."[80] And for these Americans to give up the sovereignty of the own local legislatures, in deference to Parliament, would be tantamount to slavery. On this very point, Professor Smith says:

> Should the parliament of Great Britain, at the same time, be ever fully established in the right of taxing the colonies, even independent of the consent of their own assemblies, the importance of those assemblies

[75] Ibid., p. 580.
[76] Ibid., p. 582.
[77] *The Wealth of Nations* was published in 1776.
[78] Ibid., pp. 583-585.
[79] Ibid., pp. 586-588.
[80] Ibid., p. 586.

> would from that moment be at an end, and with it, that of all the leading men of British America…. The leading men of America, like those of all other countries, desire to preserve their own importance. They feel, or imagine, that if their assemblies, which they are fond of calling parliaments, and of considering as equal in authority to the parliament of Great Britain, should be so far degraded as to become the humble ministers and executive officers of that parliament, the greater part of their own importance would be at an end. They have rejected, therefore, the proposal of being taxed by parliamentary requisition, and like other ambitious and high-spirited men, have rather chosen to draw the sword in defense of their own importance.[81]

Thus, Professor Smith does show a great deal of empathy towards the economic grievances set forth by the American founding fathers. To resolve their concerns, he strongly advocated, as an alternative to "friendly separation," the enfranchisement of American representatives in Parliament.[82] He contended that this would not only quell the tensions between the Americans and the British, but that it would lay the foundations of an expanded Anglo-American empire whereby, over the course of the next century, the new seat of government would likely be transplanted from London to North America.[83]

III. Collapse of Orthodox Christianity; British Mercantilism in Colonial New England, 1700 – 1780

In colonial British North America, the Calvinist-Evangelical preacher Rev. George Whitefield (1714 – 1770) would become the most influential leader of the First Great Awakening. Originally a part of the new Methodist Movement, Rev. Whitefield preached a message of grace and redemption that moved the soul. But what led to the need for Rev. Whitefield's preaching and revivalist message in the first place? Throughout the British Empire, the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG)— e.g., Rev. John Wesley had been one of the early SPG ministers to the colony of Georgia during the early 1730s—essentially tried to achieve the same results. But the SPG had minimal or uneven success, and in colonial British North America, the SPG struggled and failed to accomplish most

[81] Ibid., pp. 586 – 587.
[82] Ibid., p. 589.
[83] Ibid., pp. 589 - 590.

of its goals of strengthening orthodox Anglicanism in the American colonies.[84] Even in areas where the Anglican Church was established, the Carolinas, Georgia, Virginia, and New York, the Church of England failed to establish a firm footing due in large measure to the new spirit of latitudinarian Anglicanism and Deism that had become popular during the 18th century. British merchants and the Whigs had overthrown the orthodox High-Church Anglicans and the Tories in England; and these same British merchants and Whig politicians were not interested in establishing a strong, orthodox Anglican Church in colonial British North America. For these reasons, the SPG failed to establish a strong Anglican Church in the colonies. But where the SPG failed as an official arm of the Church of England, its "unofficial arm," the Methodist movement, would flourish.[85]

Three of the SPG's most promising young clergymen included the Revs. John and Charles Wesley, who came to the colony of Georgia at the invitation of its founder, Gen. James Oglethorpe,[86] and Rev. George Whitefield.[87] And while these three Anglican pastors did not establish the Anglican Church on firmer grounds, they instead helped to spread a "new orthodoxy" which was both evangelical and perhaps better suited to the conditions of the American colonists than an English-style system of Anglican parishes.

Rev. John Wesley claimed that the "second phase"[88] of the Methodist movement occurred in Georgia during the 1730s, when the Wesley brothers and Whitefield travelled to Georgia. This means that the First Great Awakening also began at the same time, as perhaps an unintended consequence of the work of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts (SPG) in colonial

[84] Louis Duchense and Charles Frederick Pascoe, *Two Hundred Years of the S.P.G.: An Historical Account of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts, 1701 – 1900* (London, England: SPG, 1901), p. 79 ("In withdrawing from the Mission field in the United States in 1785 the Society….).

[85] "Sir John Phillips, a prime mover in the SPCK, became a substantial contributor to the Oxford Methodists' causes. Wesley in turn purchased from the Society's booklist many tracts, Bibles, and other works for distribution among his friends. Wesley's life and thought was influenced by his connection with the Society, of which he became a 'corresponding member' in 1732. The Society not only functioned to some degree as a model for his own group, but also initiated and encouraged his interest in the Georgia colony." Richard P. Heitzenrater, *Wesley and the People Called Methodists* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2013), p. 49.

[86] During the 1730s, the SPG sent dozens of young missionaries to the colonies with the objective of spreading the gospel, improving the morals, and building a stronger Anglican church. Included within this network were two of leaders of what had become a student group at Oxford. Rev. John Wesley had been invited by Gen. James Oglethorpe to go to Savannah, Georgia in order to lead the Anglican church in that colony. Rev. Wesley went to Georgia in 1735 and returned to England in 1738.

[87] Rev. George Whitefield first travelled to Georgia in 1738.

[88] The "first phase" of the Methodist Movement had occurred at Christ Church, Oxford during the 1720s. Richard P. Heitzenrater, *Wesley and the People Called Methodists* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2013), pp. 37- 106.

British North America.[89] However, Rev. George Whitefield was the firm leader of the Methodist movement in colonial British North America, from the period 1740 until 1770, while the Wesley brothers led this movement in England. After the death of Rev. Whitefield in 1770, the undisputed leadership of the entire Methodist movement fell into the hands of the Rev. John Wesley, who may be described as the leader of the Evangelical Awakening in England as well. Rev. Wesley's theological concerns for the spiritual welfare of the common man led naturally to the same concerns over the social, economic, and political conditions of the common man. The implication here is that the Wesleyan-led Evangelical Awakening in England was a direct response to the moral collapse caused by British mercantilism and the rise of the First British Empire (1714 – 1815).

A. Colonial New England, Secularism and the Half-Way Covenant

British mercantilism and international trade brought diverse views and opinions from around the world into provincial colonial New England. These diverse views both challenged and threatened New England's orthodox Calvinist worldview. Perhaps the greatest threat to Puritan New England was the influx of wealthy Whig mercantilist families and Anglicans who sympathized with the Arminian theological perspective.[90] "For Jonathan Edwards [and other 'New Light' Calvinists], Enlightened philosophies were akin to Arminianism because they implied that human thought was independent of God."[91]

[89] Richard P. Heitzenrater, *Wesley and the People Called Methodists* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2013), p. 49.
[90] After Calvin's death, another dissenter arose up among the ranks of the Calvinist Reformers—a man named Jacobus Arminius (1560 – 1609). Arminius disagreed with certain aspects of Calvin's orthodoxy, such as the question of "justification" and "election." These differences slowly created a growing rift within the Reformed Churches of Europe—and, eventually, within the early 18thcentury Calvinists-Puritans of colonial New England.
[91] Daniel Craig Norman, "John Witherspoon, Common Sense, and Original Sin," (An Integrative Thesis Submitted to Faculty of Reformed Theological Seminary in Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree Master of Arts, June 2006), p 2. [citing Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), p. 49].

Table 1. The Arminian Challenge to orthodox Calvinism in New England During early 1700s[92]

Calvinism and Arminianism in Colonial New England	
Orthodox Calvinism-- TULIP	Arminian Theology—ACURA
1. Total depravity	1. All are sinful
2. Unconditional election	2. Conditional election
3. Limited atonement	3. Unlimited atonement
4. Irresistible grace	4. Resistible grace
5. Perseverance of the saints	5. Assurance of salvation

During the early 1700s, more and more New Englanders held the Arminian perspectives of Christian theology. The first group of Puritans who held Arminian views were called "**New Methodists**,"[93] and this group included Anglican theologians and pastors such as "Moses Amyraldus, Peter Baro, Richard Baxter, and Daniel Williams."[94] Thus, within the Puritan community, as early as the 1600s, "Arminian" views were early associated with views held by Puritan dissenters who were called "New Methodists."[95] By 1700, more and more New England Puritans were beginning to consider and to adopt the Arminian theological view. And since the Calvinist-leaning Puritans believed that Arminianism led to Unitarianism, Deism, and atheism, they jealously guarded against the spread of Arminianism theology. To orthodox Calvinists, the Arminian doctrine of general atonement represented the dilution of the Gospel and threat the foundation of the Puritan church.

However, British mercantilism brought Arminian theology as well as other diverse views and opinions into colonial Puritan New England. "At the same time, church membership was low from having failed to keep up with population growth, and **the influence of Enlightenment rationalism was leading many people to turn to atheism, Deism, Unitarianism and Universalism**. The churches in New England had fallen into a 'staid and routine formalism in which

[92] Don Thoresen, *Calvin vs. Wesley: Bringing Belief in Line with Practice* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2013), p. 139.
[93] Richard P. Heitzenrater, *Wesley and the People Called Methodists* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2013), p. 19
[94] Ibid.
[95] Within England and colonial New England, during the 1600s—even before the births of John Wesley (1703-1791), Charles Wesley (1707- 1788), and George Whitefield (1714- 1770)— English Puritans who held the Arminian view of Christian theology, such as Richard Baxter (1615 - 1691) were called **"New Methodists."** Thus, the name **"New Methodists"** was coined several decades before it was used by the Wesley brothers and Whitefield during the 1700s.

experiential faith had been a reality to only a scattered few.'"[96] In lands influenced by John Calvin, such as colonial New England, and where trade and capitalism were encouraged and allowed to flourish, commodities, trade and consumerism tended to introduce materialism and consumerism into the social order. Calvinist universities such as Harvard College in colonial New England became more liberal and secular, and began to reflect this new spirit of materialism, commercialism, and humanism. Christian humanism thus took hold of universities (including New England's Harvard College) where Calvinism had been firmly established:

> In Geneva, on the contrary, in the protestant cantons of Switzerland, in Sweden, and Denmark, the most eminent men of letters whom those countries have produced, have, not all indeed, but the far greater part of them, been professors in universities. In **those countries the universities are continually draining the church of all its most eminent men of letters**.[97]

Simultaneously, Calvinism's tolerance of capitalism and the widespread participation of Calvinist merchants in global mercantilism contributed to the undermining of orthodox Calvinist values. Calvinism, by itself, could not contain excesses within the spirit of capitalism, materialism, and mammon. "[In Geneva] after the short supremacy of the Calvinistic theocracy had been transformed into a moderate national Church, and with it **Calvinism had perceptibly lost in its power of ascetic influence**….[98] [A]lso in Holland, which was really only dominated by strict Calvinism for seven years, the greater simplicity of life in the more seriously religious circles, in combination with great wealth, **led to an excessive propensity to accumulation**."[99] And this was also true of Calvinis in colonial New England and British North America as a whole.

In Philadelphia, for instance, the Calvinist-reared Benjamin Franklin had deified money-making, so long as money-making was done legally, and he had elevated it to a supreme moral virtue, as being an ethical duty and as sure evidence of honesty, integrity and divine favor.[100] Material and financial success likewise became evidence of the spiritually "regenerated" and the "elect" of God. Not John Calvin himself, *but many Calvin's followers*, suddenly merged Calvinism with material success and with capitalistic enterprises. Hence the powerful forces of

---

[96] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/First_Great_Awakening
[97] Adam Smith, *The Wealth of Nations* (New York, N.Y.: The Modern Library, 1937), p. 763- 764.
[98] Max Webber, The Protestant Work Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism (New York, N.Y.: Vigeo Press, 2017), 120.
[99] Ibid., p 123.
[100] Ibid., pp. 26-32.

mammon and materialism infected both Calvinism and Puritanism with a fatal disease:

> The question, **Am I one of the elect?** must sooner or later have arisen for every believer and have forced all other interests into the back-ground. And **how can I be sure of this state of grace?** For **Calvin himself his was not a problem.** He felt himself to be a chosen agent of the Lord, and was certain of his own salvation. Accordingly, to the question of how the individual can be certain of his own election, he has at bottom only the answer that we should be content with the knowledge that God has chosen and depended further only on that implicit trust in Christ which is the result of true faith. **He rejects in principle the assumption that one can learn from the conduct of others whether they are chosen or damned. It is an unjustifiable attempt to force God's secrets. The elect differ externally in this lie in no way from the damned**; and even all the subjective experiences of the chosen are, as *lubibria spiritus sancti,* possible for the damned with the single exception of that *finaliter expectant*, trusting faith. **The elect thus are and remain God's invisible Church**.
>
> **Quite naturally this attitude was impossible for his followers as early as Beza**, and, above all, for the broad mass of ordinary men. For them the *certitude salutis* in the sense of the recognizability of the state of grace necessarily became of absolutely dominant importance. So, wherever the doctrine of predestination was held, the question could not be suppressed whether there were any infallible criteria by which membership in the *electi* could be known…. On it depended, for instance, his admission to the Communion, i..e., to the central religious ceremony which determined the social standing of the participants.
>
> It was impossible, at least so far as the question of a man's own state of grace arose, to be satisfied with Calvin's trust in the testimony of the expectant faith resulting from grace, even though the orthodox doctrine had never formally abandoned that criterion. Above all, **practical pastoral work**, which had immediately to deal with all the suffering caused by the doctrine, could not be satisfied. It **met these difficulties in various ways**. So far as **predestination was not reinterpreted, toned down, or fundamentally abandoned**, two principal, mutually connected, **types of pastoral advice appear**. On

> the one hand it is held to be **an absolute duty to consider oneself chosen**, and to **combat all doubts as temptations of the devil**, since lack of self-confidence is the result of insufficient faith, hence of imperfect grace. The **exhortation of the apostle to make fast one's own call is here interpreted as a duty to attain certainty of one's own election and justification in the daily struggle of life**. In the place of the humble sinners to whom Luther promises grace if they trust themselves to God in penitent faith are bred **those self-confident saints whom we can rediscover in the hard Puritan merchants of the heroic age of capitalism** and in isolated instances down to the present. On the other hand, in order to attain the **self-confidence intense worldly activity is recommended** as the most suitable means. It and **it alone disperses religious doubts** and **gives the certainty of grace**.[101]

For during the 18th-century, it was clear that Puritanism and Calvinism had allied themselves with the twin demons of British mercantilism and consumerism. The result of all of this is that by 1770, British mercantilism—through the instrument of the Whig parties in both England and British North America—had overthrown the Calvinistic Puritan church-state, as it had overthrown orthodox Anglicanism within the Church of England during the very same period.

Church ←-----→ State ←------→ Capitalism

In a word, the orthodox Puritan "Church-State," which had been developed since the early 1600s, collapsed under the weight of British mercantilism, trade, commerce, and the promise of imperial expansion to the West. Commercial and economic priorities suddenly began to challenge Puritan priorities of "family government" and "covenant theology" directing man's relationship to God. See, e.g., Table 2, in this series, "Part XXIX- A History of the Anglican Church: 'Puritans, the Family, and Family Government.'" In a word, British mercantilism posed a mortal threat to the Puritan way of life.

Table 2. Puritans, the Family, and Family Government

Part XXIX- A History of the Anglican Church: "Puritans, the Family, and Family Government"

A. Puritanism and Family Law: Christian Theology (Section One)

[101] Ibid.

1. Sanctification of the Family Unit
   a. The Covenants of Noah and Abraham
   b. The First Passover and Circumcision— Family Sacraments

2. The Family Covenant
   a. Family as Church
   b. Family Prayer and Family Time
   c. Holy Education of Children

3. The Family as Basic Unit of the Christian Commonwealth

B. Puritanism and Family Law: Christian Theology (Section Two)

4. General Duties and Obligations during Marriage
   a. Duty to Help Each Other to Salvation
   b. Duty to Guard against Dissension and Discord
   c. Duty to Maintain Conjugal Love

5. Specific Duties and Obligations during Marriage
   a. Husband's duties to wife
   b. Wife's duties to husband
   c. Wife's duties regarding, and control over, marital property

6. Cases of Conscience: Marriage, Separation and Divorce

C. Sacred Duties of the Parent-Child Relation (Section Three)

7. Duty of Infant Baptism

8. Duty of Confirmation

9. Duty to Train Children to be in Obedience to Parents, etc.

10. Duty of Correction

11. General Duties and Obligations of Children to Parents

12. General Duties and Obligations of Children to God

13. Duty of Parents to provide a Christian Education

D. Sacred Duties of the Lord's Day and of Daily Living (Section Four)

14. Duty of Holiness on the Lord's Day

15. Duty of Holy Living Each Day of the Week

16. Duty of Holy Instruction to Servants and Slaves on the Lord's Day

The lynch-pin to the Puritan way of life was the "conversion" experience. In a word, the Puritan needed to be "born again" in order to be a member of the local Congregational Church. And in order to vote and hold political office in colonial New England, a man needed also to be a member in good standing of a Congregational Church. In other words, in order to participate politically in colonial New England, a man needed to be a "born-again" Christian—as determined by Congregational pastors—in order to participate in the civil government. Indeed, the history of the founding of colonial New England (and thereby the history of the constitution of the United States of America) are inextricably tied to Jesus of Nazareth's instructions to Nicodemus in the Gospel of John, to wit, that "[e]xcept a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God."[102] This "born again" experience, the Calvinists called "regeneration" from the state of "total depravity"—a spiritual state, without which, it was impossible for either individual persons, individual households, or individual nations to please God or to possess the favor of His divine providence. This belief was the bedrock of Puritan and Calvinist covenantal theology—the 17th-century charters and constitutions of colonial New England were thus "divine" Mosaic covenants. The governments of colonial New England were thus both Calvinistic and theocratic.

Now the duty to assess and cross-examine the influx of new philosophies and ideals that were steadily infiltrating colonial New England fell into the laps of leading Congregational clergymen such as **Rev. Jonathan Edwards** (1703 – 1758). Whereas many other Congregational clergymen were beginning to bend and buckle under the weight of liberalization and British mercantilism, Rev. Edwards did not bend. As one of the last orthodox Puritans, Rev. Edwards insisted that the old Puritan church-state, centered around "family government" and "church membership," should be maintained. In a world where Unitarianism, Deism, and science were beginning to challenge the strict standards of Holy Ghost

[102] John 3: 3-6.

and Sacred Scripture, Rev. Edwards insisted in his signature sermon "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God" that the God of Heaven is still very much the sovereign God of all, and that he is a jealous God, and a God of cause and effect, executing his punishment and judgment against sinners and rebels. What was necessary, argued Rev. Edwards, was that men and women acknowledge God and accept his saving grace through the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion—but only after having received the saving grace of the Holy Ghost.

To understand Rev. Edwards' ecclesiastical, social, and political objectives, it is important to remember that church membership in colonial New England was very prestigious and political. Only church members could vote or hold public office. But the Congregational Churches of colonial New England had such **high standards for church membership**, that very few persons could meet their qualifications. First off, a person had be able to prove to the elders that they were, in fact, born-again, through both *testimony* and *demonstrated life standards*. This was a very difficult hurdle. As a consequence, church membership dwindled during the later part of the 1600s and early 1700s. Notwithstanding, Rev. Edwards not only launched the evangelical revivalist service, whereby men and women could receive the Holy Ghost and be converted, but as a Yale graduate and scientist he published his "findings" on various indicia or marks of the conversion experience.[103] Rev. Edwards believed that if a person could demonstrate that he or she had experienced certain marks of the Holy Ghost, that this could prove their worthiness of membership in a Congregational Church as well as salvation.[104] Otherwise, membership should be denied to those person who could not prove these experiences. Social pressures to either prove worthiness of church membership became so great that some men and women committed suicide during the year 1735[105]—perhaps through feelings of guilt, after thus recognizing that they were not members of the "elect," having not experienced the Holy Ghost as

[103] "The revival gave Edwards an opportunity to study the process of conversion in all its phases and varieties, and he recorded his observations with psychological minuteness and discrimination in *A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God in the Conversion of Many Hundred Souls in Northampton* (1737)." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jonathan_Edwards_(theologian)

[104] Ibid.

[105] "Over the summer of 1735, religious fervor took a dark turn. A number of New Englanders were shaken by the revivals but not converted, and became convinced of their inexorable damnation. Edwards wrote that "multitudes" felt urged—presumably by Satan—to take their own lives. At least two people committed suicide in the depths of their spiritual distress, one from Edwards's own congregation—his uncle Joseph Hawley II. It is not known if any others took their own lives, but the "suicide craze" effectively ended the first wave of revival, except in some parts of Connecticut." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jonathan_Edwards_(theologian)

described by Rev. Edwards and others.[106] This ended the first wave of the New England revival.

As Rev. Edwards and others came under much criticism, some Congregational Churches and pastors began to **lower their standards for church membership**, and this caused a major concern among the more conservative, orthodox Calvinistic pastors throughout colonial New England. Despite the "suicide craze," measures were taken to maintain high orthodox Calvinistic standards throughout the colonial churches in New England, but this only led to more resistance, not only to the rise in the outright rejection of orthodoxy but even to a new sect called **Unitarianism**. Next during the early 18th-century came ideas of **Deism** into colonial New England. During the year 1739-40, Rev. Edwards met Rev. George Whitefield (1714 – 1770) for the first time, and Whitefield injected new life into the New England revival movement.[107] But as Rev. Edwards and Rev. Whitefield continued their revivalist preaching, the liberal Congregationalists began to attack their methods of open-air preaching or suggestions that the "bodily effects" of receiving the Holy Ghost, causing persons to pass out, speak in tongues, and the like, were false indications that a person had, in fact, been saved. The Congregationalists who criticized Rev. Edwards often refused to acknowledge that fact that Rev. Edwards never equated "bodily effects" with actually being "born again." Nevertheless, widespread prejudice against the evangelical revival services continued to spread throughout New England.[108] By the year1748, Rev. Edwards' conservative position was becoming more and more

[106] http://dmarlin.com/pastprologue/blog/great-awakening-hawley-family-northampton-ma/

[107] "Despite these setbacks and the cooling of religious fervor, word of the Northampton revival and Edwards's leadership role had spread as far as England and Scotland. It was at this time that Edwards became acquainted with George Whitefield, who was traveling the Thirteen Colonies on a revival tour in 1739–40. The two men may not have seen eye to eye on every detail. Whitefield was far more comfortable with the strongly emotional elements of revival than Edwards was, but they were both passionate about preaching the Gospel. They worked together to orchestrate Whitefield's trip, first through Boston and then to Northampton. When Whitefield preached at Edwards's church in Northampton, he reminded them of the revival they had undergone just a few years before.[29] This deeply touched Edwards, who wept throughout the entire service, and much of the congregation too was moved." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jonathan_Edwards_(theologian)

[108] "The movement met with opposition from conservative Congregationalist ministers. In 1741, Edwards published in the defense of revivals The Distinguishing Marks of a Work of the Spirit of God, dealing particularly with the phenomena most criticized: the swoonings, outcries, and convulsions. These 'bodily effects," he insisted, were not distinguishing marks of the work of the Spirit of God one way or another. So bitter was the feeling against the revival in the more strictly Puritan churches, that in 1742, he felt moved to write a second apology, Thoughts on the Revival in New England, where his main argument concerned the great moral improvement of the country. In the same pamphlet, he defends an appeal to the emotions, and advocates preaching terror when necessary, even to children, who in God's sight "are young vipers... if not Christ's.'"
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jonathan_Edwards_(theologian)

controversial. His own congregation, the Northampton Church (Massachusetts), voted to relieve him of his pastoral duties.[109]

During the early 1700s, there was a new waive of "liberal" Puritan theology now sweeping through old-guard colonial New England, and that new "liberal" Puritan theology shifted in favor of the theology of Rev. Richard Baxter (1615 – 1691) and the "New Methodist" Puritans who had adopted Arminian theology. The growing shift within old-guard colonial New England was to relax the requirements for membership in Congregational churches, was represented by the "Half-Way" Covenant. Church membership would not be contingent upon "proof of spiritual regeneration," but based solely upon the sacrament of baptism. During the meanwhile, the "conservative" or "revivalist" Puritans such as Rev. Edwards, reorganized themselves and became known as the "New Light" theologians.[110] In

[109] "Edwards's preaching became unpopular. For four years, no candidate presented himself for admission to the church, and when one eventually did, in 1748, he was met with Edwards's formal tests as expressed in the Distinguishing Marks and later in Qualifications for Full Communion, 1749. The candidate refused to submit to them, the church backed him, and the break between the church and Edwards was complete. Even permission to discuss his views in the pulpit was refused. He was allowed to present his views on Thursday afternoons. His sermons were well attended by visitors, but not his own congregation. A council was convened to decide the communion matter between the minister and his people. The congregation chose half the council, and Edwards was allowed to select the other half of the council. His congregation, however, limited his selection to one county where the majority of the ministers were against him. The ecclesiastical council voted by 10 to 9 that the pastoral relation be dissolved. The church members, by a vote of more than 200 to 23, ratified the action of the council, and finally a town meeting voted that Edwards should not be allowed to occupy the Northampton pulpit, though he continued to live in the town and preach in the church by the request of the congregation until October 1751. In his "Farewell Sermon" he preached from 2 Corinthians 1:14 and directed the thoughts of his people to that far future when the minister and his people would stand before God. In a letter to Scotland after his dismissal, he expresses his preference for Presbyterian to congregational polity. His position at the time was not unpopular throughout New England. His doctrine that the Lord's Supper is not a cause of regeneration and that communicants should be professing Protestants has since (largely through the efforts of his pupil Joseph Bellamy) become a standard of New England Congregationalism." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jonathan_Edwards_(theologian)

[110] "The terms were first used during the First Great Awakening (1730s-1740s), which expanded through the British North American colonies in the middle of the 18th century. In A Faithful Narrative of the Surprising Work of God (1737), Jonathan Edwards, a leader in the Awakening, describes his congregants' vivid experiences with grace as causing a 'new light' in their perspective on sin and atonement. Old Lights and New Lights generally referred to Congregationalists and Baptists in New England who took different positions on the Awakening from the traditional branches of their denominations. New Lights embraced the revivals that spread through the colonies, while Old Lights were suspicious of the revivals (and their seeming threat to authority). The historian Richard Bushman credits the division between Old Lights and New Lights for the creation of political factionalism in Connecticut in the mid-eighteenth century. Often many 'new light' Congregationalists who had been converted under the preaching of George Whitefield left that connection to become 'new light' Baptists when they found no evidence of infant baptism in the apostolic church. When told of this development, Whitefield famously quipped that he was glad to hear about the fervent faith of his followers but regretted that "so many of his chickens had become ducks.' The Presbyterian Church in Pennsylvania would experience a division during the Great Awakening, with those elements of the denomination embracing the revivals called 'New Side' and those opposed to the revivals called 'Old Side.' In the Church of Scotland in the 1790s the 'Old Lights' followed the principles of the Covenanters, while the 'New Lights' were more focused on personal salvation and considered the strictures of the Covenants as less binding moral enormities.'" https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Old_and_New_Lights

1746, the "New Lights" Puritans founded "College of New Jersey" (i.e., Princeton) as a seminary to preserve and promote their theological position.[111] In 1757, Rev. Jonathan Edwards, who was himself a Yale graduate, was elected the third president of the college.[112] Hence, through Rev. Edwards and his sons (three Princeton graduates) and daughters (wives of two Yale presidents), the theological, social, and political links between Yale and Princeton is quite extensive.[113]

B. The Old Light Puritans adopt the 'Half-Way' Covenant through Pressures of British Mercantilism

By 1740, there were 423 Congregational churches in colonial America—33.7 percent of all churches. Nevertheless, at the start of the 18th century, many believed that New England had become a morally degenerate society more focused on worldly gain than religious piety. Church historian Williston Walker described New England piety of the time as "low and unemotional."[114] Notwithstanding all of this, the "Old Light" Puritans who had opposed Edwards, Whitefield and the evangelical awakening, and begun to acquiesce in the newer movement toward latitudinarian Anglican worldviews.

Like the Church of England, New England Puritanism also began to show strain as its society became more vested in the mammon and materialism of the British Empire. First off, the moral fibre of the second- and third-generation of colonial New Englanders was not as sturdy as of the first-generation of colonial settlers. This posed a peculiar problem for Puritan society: the Congregational Church was at the heart of the society—both family and civil government centred around the church. No person could hold office in the civil government, unless he was a member of the church. And church membership required very high standards

---

[111] "The founding of [**Princeton] university** itself originated from a split in the Presbyterian church following the Great Awakening. In 1741, **New Light Presbyterians** were expelled from the Synod of Philadelphia in defense of how the Log College ordained ministers. The four founders of Princeton, who were New Lights, were either expelled or withdrew from the Synod and devised a plan to establish a new college, for they were disappointed with Harvard and Yale's opposition to the Great Awakening and dissatisfied with the limited instruction at the Log College. They convinced three other Presbyterians to join them and decided on New Jersey for where to found the school, as at the time, there was no institution between Yale in New Haven, Connecticut and the College of William & Mary in Williamsburg, Virginia; it was also where some of the founders preached. Although their initial request was rejected by the Anglican governor, Lewis Morrison, the acting governor after Morrison's death, John Hamilton, granted a charter for the College of New Jersey on October 22, 1746."
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Princeton_University#Founding

[112] https://www.princetonianamuseum.org/artifact/03c5788d-06db-4235-9151-1d2bff675dc5

[113] Ibid.

[114] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Congregationalism_in_the_United_States#Associations_develop

of proof; namely, satisfactory evidence that a person had indeed been "born-again" and constituted a member of the "elect."

The perennial questions for church membership within New England's Congregational churches must have gone something like this:

- How long have you attended Church? Are your parents saved?
- Are you born again?
- Have you ever felt the Holy Spirit?
- If so, when and where? And can you describe your experience?
- Why do you believe that you have been born again?
- Please tell us when you became born again, and be as detailed and as specific as possible.
- Do you know Christ? Do you speak with him? Do you walk with him on a daily basis?
- Have you ever spoken in tongues?
- Have you ever exorcised a demon?
- Have you ever performed any miracles?
- Can you give us any witnesses?
- Etc., etc.

It is for these reasons that many second- and third-generation colonial New Englanders began to honestly to fall away from Congregational Church membership. To their credit, rather than tell a lie or make up fabrications, many of the younger New Englanders refused to attest that they had been "born again" or had ever experienced the conversion. By the 1670s and 80s, a significant problem suddenly presented itself to the Puritan churches of Colonial New England: "What to do with Unconverted New Englanders?"

- Unconverted New Englanders could not join any Congregational or Presbyterian Church
- Unconverted New Englanders could not vote
- Unconverted New Englanders could not hold public office
- Unconverted New Englanders could not take the Lord's Supper
- The children of Unconverted New Englanders were ineligible for baptism

By 1700, the "unconverted" New Englanders outnumbered the "converted" New Englanders, and in some towns by a ratio was 4 to 1.[115] The Puritan Church was slowly dying. In order to prevent it from dying, there was only one solution: lower or change the standards for Church Membership.

One form of this solution was the "**Half-Way Covenant**," which provided a special provision for allowing "unconverted" adults to join the Congregational Church and have their children baptized:

> The provisions of the Half-Way Covenant were outlined and endorsed by a meeting of ministers initiated by the legislatures of Connecticut and Massachusetts. This ministerial assembly met in Boston on June 4, 1657. Plymouth Colony sent no delegates, and New Haven declined to take part, insisting on adhering to the older practice. The assembly recommended that **the children of unconverted baptized adults receive baptism** if their **parents publicly agreed with Christian doctrine and affirmed the church covenant in a ceremony known as "owning the baptismal covenant"** in which "they give up themselves and their children to the Lord, and subject themselves to the Government of Christ in the Church". These baptized but unconverted members were not to be admitted to the Lord's Supper or vote on church business (such as choosing ministers or disciplining other members) until they had professed conversion.

The "Half-Way Covenant" reflected the central problem of orthodox Calvinism: nobody, except God, knows who the "elect" really are. This throws practical Church administration into a tailspin: **how does the Calvinist church know whether an unconverted soul shall someday be converted in the future, or whether a person purporting to be one of God's "elect" is not really a wolf in sheep's clothing?** Hence, what happened to the Calvinist churches of Colonial New England was a tell-tale sign of things to come with respect to general Christian ministry, as reflected rise of the 18th-century Methodist movement and beyond.[116] Even if Calvin's theological doctrines are eternally true, the practical and pragmatic way to conduct church business still appeared to continue to keep

---

[115] "One Massachusetts estimate from 1708 stated the ratio was four half-way members to each full member." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Half-Way_Covenant.

[116] "Although John Calvin profoundly influenced the development of Christianity, John Wesley did a better job than Calvin of conceptualizing and promoting Christian beliefs, values, and practices as described in the Bible and as lived by Protestant Christians. This claim may surprise people because Calvin is more often thought to speak theologically on behalf of Christianity, since he was a founding leader of the Protestant Reformation in the sixteenth century. Ironically, despite professed appeal that Christians may make to Calvin's theology, they often live in practice more like the teaching, practice, and ministries of Wesley." Don Thorsen, *Calvin vs. Wesley: Bringing Belief in Line with Practice* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 2013), p. xi.

the church doors open even to sinners and lost souls. Thus, the Puritan church-state experiment was on the decline by the end of the 17th century.

By 1700, more and more Congregational Churches had been comprised of "unconverted" churchmen—men and women with no spirituality, no love of Christ, no outward signs of holiness. In addition, there seemed to be, at least in the eyes of the orthodox Calvinist, a widespread moral decay and coming gloom: the "Half-Way" Covenant had explicitly allowed infidels and self-avowed non-elect adult persons into church membership. How could the church continue to legitimately call itself the church, under these conditions? When Jesus said to love ye one another, did he mean that the church must permit general membership to those persons who had not yet been **"born again?"** This was the very foundation of Puritan society and democracy. God's special covenant with the New England nation was premised upon its holiness, righteousness, and adherence to the will of God. The Calvinist doctrine of "regeneration" was proof of who were the elect. But now that church membership could be based upon something other than "regeneration," the whole edifice of Puritan polity stood in jeopardy.

Hence the Congregational Churches throughout colonial New England began to split apart over the question of accepting or rejecting the "Half-Way" covenant. Some Congregational Churches offered both baptism and the Lord's Supper to all members, whether they had been "regenerated" or not. And this was tantamount to Arminianism! But the new "Half-Way" covenant would open the door to permit Arminians, Unitarians, and Deists to attain membership in Congregational Churches, and thus to participate in local politics and hold public office.

Time-Line of Events: the Half-Way Covenant

Clergy Associations[117]—total of 5 by 1705

1690s--Proposed Changes to Congregational Practices[118]

1690s—Opposition to Proposed Changes by Increase Mather, President of Harvard[119]

[117] These Clergy Associations sought to expand church membership by instituting "Half-Way Covenants."
[118] These changes included abandoning the consideration of "conversion narratives" in granting church membership and allowing **all baptized members** of a community (whether full members or not) to vote in elections for ministers. They also supported the **baptism of all children** presented by any Christian sponsor and the liturgical use of the Lord's Prayer.
[119] As President of Harvard College, Increase Mather held the more conservative view and rejected the "Half-Way Covenant." However, the majority of Harvard's trustees supported the "Half-Way Covenant" and Harvard College eventually supported the liberal position. This change in Harvard's position angered many Congregational pastors

1698-- Invitation of the more liberal Presbyterian ministers from England, Benjamin Coleman to come to Boston; Brattle Street Church organized in 1699, and Rev. Coleman to the helm. By the 1730s, it was a leading church and Rev. Coleman, a leading clergyman.[120]

1701—Yale University founded in order to maintain a more "conservative" and traditional Calvinist theology within Congregational churches.[121]

1705-- Proposals to tighten supervision on local churches and licensure of pastors. Several proposals put in place—all of this was in response to Rev. Coleman and the Brattle Street Church. The goal was to enforce uniformity, by creating supervisory conferences, etc.[122]

Massachusetts rejected the 1705 proposals.[123]

Connecticut accepted the 1705 proposals.[124]

1708—the Connecticut General Assembly called for the **Saybrook Platform**.[125]

---

who, as a result, founded Yale College in 1701. For this reason, Increase Mather also supported the founding of Yale College.

[120] This liberal and influential Congregational Church adopted the "Half-Way Covenant."

[121] "[A] group of ten Congregational ministers, Samuel Andrew, Thomas Buckingham, Israel Chauncy, Samuel Mather (nephew of Increase Mather), Rev. James Noyes II (son of James Noyes), James Pierpont, Abraham Pierson, Noadiah Russell, Joseph Webb, and Timothy Woodbridge, all alumni of Harvard, met in the study of Reverend Samuel Russell, located in Branford, Connecticut, to donate their books to form the school's library. The group, led by James Pierpont, is now known as "The Founders"…. Meanwhile, **there was a rift forming at Harvard between its sixth president, Increase Mather, and the rest of the Harvard clergy, whom Mather viewed as increasingly liberal, ecclesiastically lax, and overly broad in Church polity**. The feud caused the Mathers to champion the success of the Collegiate School [i.e., Yale College] in the hope that it would maintain the Puritan religious orthodoxy in a way that Harvard had not." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Yale_University

[122] The conservative Congregational pastors sought to limit or restrict the founding of additional "Half-Way Covenant" churches.

[123] Harvard College and the Massachusetts clergy adopted the liberal position and accepted the "Half-Way Covenant" theological position as a legitimate expression of the Christian faith.

[124] Yale College and Connecticut maintained the more orthodox Calvinist theological position and rejected the "Half-Way Covenant." Rev. Jonathan Edwards (1703 – 1758) was a graduate of Yale College and stern advocate of Calvinist orthodoxy. He, too, rejected the "Half-Way Covenant" view. But even the great Jonathan Edwards was voted out of his position as pastor of a Connecticut congregation which felt that his views were much too conservative.

[125] The Saybrook Platform was an effort to maintain orthodox Puritanism in Connecticut.

> The Saybrook Platform was a new constitution for the Congregational church in Connecticut in 1708. Religious and civic leaders in Connecticut around 1700 were distressed by the colony-wide decline in

1746 The College of New Jersey (Princeton University) was founded by "New Light" Puritans in order to maintain the original theological position that laid the foundation of Yale in 1701.

The fall-out from what appeared to be the lowering of sound theological doctrine at Harvard College (founded, circa, 1636) led to the founding of Yale College in 1701 and, later to Princeton in 1746. Both Yale and Princeton were founded as conservative Calvinist seminaries that rejected the both Arminianism and the "Half-Way Covenant." Nevertheless, the liberal view of Harvard College and the Massachusetts Bay Colony carried greater weight throughout colonial New England. The colony of Rhode Island had already adopted a more liberal view than the "Half-Way Covenant," and so the tendency of 18th-century colonial New England was toward greater religious tolerance, secularism, and cosmopolitanism. This led to the collapse of the Puritan Church-State during the early 1700s. Yet, although the Puritan church-state failed, the spirit of Puritanism lived on. As the Rev. Algernon Sidney Crapsey has written:

> In the very nature of things a government based upon the Calvinistic interpretation of Holy Scripture must be short-lived. But **while the Puritan church-state failed as an institution, it endured as an idea**. The Puritan influence dominated all other influences in American life

---

personal religious piety and in church discipline. The colonial legislature took action by calling 12 ministers and four laymen to meet in Saybrook, Connecticut; eight were Yale trustees. They prepared fifteen articles that theologically put the church in the Westminister theological tradition. It rejected extreme localism or "congregationalism" that had been inherited from England, replacing it with a centralized system similar to what the Presbyterians had. The Congregational church was now to be led by local ministerial associations and consociations composed of ministers and lay leaders from a specific geographical area. A colony-wide General Assembly had final authority. Instead of the congregation from each local church selecting its minister, the associations now had the responsibility to examine candidates for the ministry, and to oversee a behavior of the ministers. The consociations (where laymen were powerless) could impose discipline on specific churches and judge disputes that arose.

The result was a centralization of power that bothered many local church activists. However the official associations responded by disfellowshipping churches that refused to comply. The system worked for 150 years, guaranteeing orthodox Puritanism. The Platform was conservative victory against a non-conformist tide which had begun with the Halfway Covenant and would culminate in the Great Awakening.[1][2] Similar proposals for more centralized clerical control of local churches were defeated in Massachusetts, where a much more liberal theology flourished.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Saybrook_Platform

> from the landing of the Pilgrims down to the close of the Civil War….[126] Puritan New England was the breeding place of spiritual enthusiasm and high moral purpose. **It was the belief of the Puritan that was the motive power of the American Revolution**. **It was the stern conviction of the Puritan that not King George, but God, was the rightful sovereign in America**, **not the Parliament of England, but the people of the united Colonies, were the sole keepers of the purse and the only source of political power**; and it was this conviction of the Puritan that sustained the people of the country through the long years of the Revolutionary War.[127]

The Puritan-Church state, however, led by Rev. Jonathan Edwards (1703- 1758), Rev. George Whitefield (1714 1770), and the "New Light" old-guard Puritans did not go down without a fight—the Great Evangelical Awakening in New England was largely a last-ditch, failed effort by Puritans to revitalize an orthodox Calvinistic conception of civil and ecclesiastical polity. However, the founding of the College of New Jersey ("Princeton") by these "New Light" Puritans would go on to stamp its imprint upon colonial British North America.

C. New Light Puritans Found the College of New Jersey (Princeton) in 1746

Of great significance to the Puritan legacy was the "New Light" Puritan founding of the College of New Jersey ("Princeton") in 1746. The colleges first president was Rev. Jonathan Dickinson. Rev. Aaron Burr, Sr., who was a son-in-law to Rev. Jonathan Edwards, was the second president of the college. Rev. Jonathan Edwards became the third president of the college in 1758. This school was founded by Presbyterian ministers in order to preserve orthodox Calvinism and to welcome those Calvinists scholars who were being persecuted at Harvard and Yale for asserting their orthodox ideologies. At Princeton, the "Age of the Enlightenment" would confront orthodox Calvinism, in the same manner in which the Age of Enlightenment had already confronted orthodox Anglicanism at Oxford and Cambridge.

[126] Algernon Sidney Crapsey, *Religion and Politics* (New York, N.Y.: Thomas Whittaker, p. 1905), p. 244.
[127] Ibid., pp. 242- 243.

The Age of Enlightenment		
Moderate Enlightenment	John Locke (1632-1704); Isaac Newton (1643-1727)	Reason and Revelation are perfectly compatible with each other
Skeptical Enlightenment	David Hume (1711 – 1776); Thomas Paine (1737 – 1809)	Reason is distinct from Revelation; and Revelation cannot be based upon, or confused with, Reason
Revolutionary Enlightenment	Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712 – 1778); Maximilien Robespierre (1758-1794); and	Human beings should rely upon Human Reason Divine Revelation is a hoax and has been contrived to enslave the Human Mind

The latitudinarian Anglican clergymen answered the "Age of Enlightenment" with a philosophy of natural religion, and held generally that "*Christianity is a republication of natural religion*."[128] Within two decades of its founding, through influence of one its most influential presidents, Rev. John Witherspoon (1723 – 1794), the College of New Jersey (i.e., "Princeton") adopted the same philosophical view as the latitudinarian Anglicans—i.e., the philosophy of "Common Sense Realism." Rev. Witherspoon agreed with Anglican bishop Joseph Buter, who held generally that "*Christianity is a republication of natural religion*." [129]

[128] Matthew Tindal, *Christianity as Old as Creation* (1730); Joseph Butler, *The Analogy of Religion* (1736); and William Warburton, *The Alliance of Church and State* (1736).

[129] Daniel Craig Norman, "John Witherspoon, Common Sense, and Original Sin," (An Integrative Thesis Submitted to Faculty of Reformed Theological Seminary in Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree Master of Arts, June 2006), p 2. [citing Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), p. 49], stating:

> **Witherspoon incorporated ideas from Joseph Butler**, namely the idea that our moral sense has a rational basis and that this moral sense is what the Bible calls our conscience. Witherspoon taught, "The moral sense is precisely the same thing with what, in scripture and common language, we call conscience. It is the law which our Maker has written upon our hearts, and [so] both intimates and enforces duty, previous to all reasoning." Witherspoon's goal was to provide a moral philosophy that was acceptable to both Christians and non-Christians. He was attempting to bridge the gap between positions represented by Hutcheson and Edwards. Hutcheson had little, if any, concern for revelation and Edwards believed that true virtue came only from God.[130] Witherspoon's point was that reason and revelation are compatible—that the moral philosophy derived through reason is consistent with that derived from revelation. [131]

Rev. Witherspoon's ideals reflected the new Scottish Enlightenment, and it represented the American version of the new philosophy of Scottish Common Sense Realism (SCSR), founded by Thomas Reid (1710 – 1796) in Scotland. Rev. Witherspoon insisted that orthodox Calvinism could co-exist alongside natural philosophy and science. Similar in content to latitudinarian Anglicanism, Witherspoon's SCSR became the American Presbyterian and Calvinist answer to

---

> **Witherspoon incorporated ideas from Joseph Butler**, namely the idea that our moral sense has a rational basis and that this moral sense is what the Bible calls our conscience. Witherspoon taught, "The moral sense is precisely the same thing with what, in scripture and common language, we call conscience. It is the law which our Maker has written upon our hearts, and [so] both intimates and enforces duty, previous to all reasoning." Witherspoon's goal was to provide a moral philosophy that was acceptable to both Christians and non-Christians. He was attempting to bridge the gap between positions represented by Hutcheson and Edwards. Hutcheson had little, if any, concern for revelation and Edwards believed that true virtue came only from God.[129] **Witherspoon's point was that reason and revelation are compatible—that the moral philosophy derived through reason is consistent with that derived from revelation**.

NOTE: Scottish-Presbyterian clergymen and Princeton president Rev. John Witherspoon is the author of *The Works of Joseph Butler* (https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/724374.The_Works_of_Joseph_Butler).

[130] At Princeton, Witherspoon grappled with two conflicting streams of Scottish-Calvinist-Presbyterian thoughts--Francis Hutchinson (1694 – 1746) on the liberal end of the spectrum and Jonathan Edwards (1703 – 1758) on the conservative end.

[131] Daniel Craig Norman, "John Witherspoon, Common Sense, and Original Sin," (An Integrative Thesis Submitted to Faculty of Reformed Theological Seminary in Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree Master of Arts, June 2006), p 2. [citing Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), p. 49].

the new Deism, Unitarianism, and Skepticism that swept across colonial British North America. While the orthodox Puritan church-state of colonial New England was rapidly fading away, its essential ideals were revitalized at Princeton under the leadership of Rev. John Witherspoon.

D. Rev. Dr. John Witherspoon, a Scottish Presbyterian and President of Princeton, 1768 – 1794

The great legacy and reputation of what became known as Princeton University owes much to the administration of its seventh president, the Scottish Presbyterian, Rev. John Witherspoon, who served in that office from 1768 to 1794. During this period, the college would become a "seedbed" of revolutionary activism; Rev. Witherspoon taught at Princeton young men who would go on to have a tremendous influence upon American government and politics, including "**nine cabinet officers, 21 senators, 39 congressmen, three justices of the Supreme Court, and 12 state governors**."[132] Similarly, another source states:

> Much of Witherspoon's legacy reflected in theology, ecclesiology, education and government followed from his immediate students. Among Princeton graduates who were his students were 114 pastors, 13 college presidents, a US President, a US Vice President, 10 cabinet officers, six members of the Continental Congress, 39 US Representatives, 21 Senators, 12 state governors, 56 state representatives and 30 judges, including three to the US Supreme Court. Having a direct impact on such a significant group of influential leaders was especially powerful given the population of the

[132] https://pr.princeton.edu/pub/presidents/witherspoon/. And see, also, *The forgotten founder: John Witherspoon* by Roger Kimball:

> **Princeton, the only Presbyterian institution in the colonies**, was deeply implicated in the rebellion. Under Witherspoon's tutelage, the college produced one president (**James Madison**), one vice-president (Aaron Burr), ten cabinet ministers, sixty members of congress, twelve governors, fifty-six state legislators, and thirty judges, including three justices of the supreme court. Princeton almost got Alexander Hamilton, too. In 1773, the eighteen-year-old Hamilton, bursting with ambition, presented himself to Witherspoon and asked to be admitted to the college and be allowed to advance "with as much rapidity as his exertions would enable him to." Witherspoon was deeply impressed by the young man, but wrote denying his request because it was "contrary to the usage of the college." Hamilton, for his part, was impressed by Witherspoon. In 1789, he was one of a handful of people (Madison was another) to whom Hamilton turned for advice in preparing two of his landmark state papers on public credit.

https://newcriterion.com/issues/2006/6/the-forgotten-founder-john-witherspoon

> country at that time. Many of his students transmitted his ideas in their endeavors, especially through higher education.[133]

In addition, during the Revolutionary War, America's leading statesmen found their way to the college's campus. "By July 1783, parts of Nassau Hall had been sufficiently repaired to serve a second purpose: For four months that year, the building housed the Continental Congress, bringing such statesmen as George Washington (1732–1799; see entry in volume 2), John Adams (1735–1826; see entry in volume 1), and Thomas Jefferson (1743–1826; see entry in volume 1) to Princeton."[134] And Witherspoon himself would become the only clergyman and college president to sign the American *Declaration of Independence* (1776).[135] His biography is particularly relevant to the subject matter of this paper because in Rev. Witherspoon we find the combination of "latitudinarian Anglicanism" or Enlightenment philosophy with orthodox Calvinism (i.e., "Scottish Common Sense Realism"):

> Common Sense Realism swept American intellectual circles in the 18th century…. Evidence of the influence of Scottish Common Sense realism can readily be found in the philosophy of both Thomas Jefferson and John Adams. Adams compared the contributions of Dugald Stewart favorably to works of Aristotle and René Descartes. Scotsman and signer of the Declaration of Independence, John Witherspoon presided over Princeton University; students under his tutelage included 12 state governors, 55 delegates to the Constitutional Convention and future president James Madison. His education at the University of Edinburgh made him a strong proponent of the Scottish Enlightenment and Realism.
>
> James McCosh (1811–94) continued the influence of Scottish Realism at Princeton when he became president of the university in 1868, reviving its influence as a major stronghold of the movement. Noah

[133] Daniel Craig Norman, "John Witherspoon, Common Sense, and Original Sin," (An Integrative Thesis Submitted to Faculty of Reformed Theological Seminary in Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree Master of Arts, June 2006), p 2. [citing Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), p. 49].

[134] https://www.encyclopedia.com/people/history/us-history-biographies/john-witherspoon-minister
[135] "John Witherspoon," https://pr.princeton.edu/pub/presidents/witherspoon/

> Porter (1811–92) taught Common Sense realism to generations of students at Yale.[136]

In other words, "Scottish Common Sense Realism," as it was clearly symbolized by the American *Declaration of Independence* (1776), was officially endorsed by one of America's leading Presbyterian and Calvinist clergymen of the Revolutionary era:

> John Witherspoon was the **only clergyman** and the **only college president** to sign the *Declaration of Independence*.
>
> A graduate of the University of Edinburgh, he gained a reputation in the Church of Scotland as a leader of the left-wing "Popular Party," and his works made him well-known in the American colonies. The trustees of the College first elected him president in 1766. He declined the call to serve but eventually arrived in Princeton in August 1768 with his wife, five children, and 300 books for the College library. The students welcomed him by "illuminating" Nassau Hall with a lighted tallow dip in each window.
>
> Despite the warmth of his reception, Witherspoon soon found a number of disturbing conditions in the College. Many students were inadequately prepared; the enrollment from the southern colonies had declined; and, most worrisome of all, the College's finances were in a sorry state.
>
> Witherspoon began a series of highly successful trips throughout the colonies to preach, recruit students, and gather funds. While traveling through Virginia, he encouraged the Madisons of Montpelier to enroll their son James, who later graduated with the Class of 1771; later, he persuaded his friend George Washington to give 50 gold guineas to the College. (Washington was a longtime advocate of the place. "No college has turned out better scholars or more estimable characters than Nassau," he said in a letter to his adopted son, a member of the Class of 1799.)
>
> Witherspoon called the College's pastoral setting a campus, thereby introducing that word into the American vocabulary.
>
> In addition to managing the College's affairs and preaching twice on Sundays, Witherspoon had a heavy teaching load. To the College's

[136]"Common Sense Realism or Scottish School of Common Sense" https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scottish_common_sense_realism#American_declaration_of_independence

faculty of five (three tutors and two professors), he added a professor of mathematics and natural philosophy, leaving him responsible for providing instruction in moral philosophy, divinity, rhetoric, history, and French. He introduced English grammar and composition and added to the teaching equipment of the College, especially books for the library and laboratory apparatus for science instruction.

Witherspoon saw no conflict between faith and reason; he encouraged students to test their faith by experiment and experience. He applied the test of common sense to any proposition, reducing it to its simplest terms. His name is identified with certain attitudes and assumptions known as the "Common Sense Philosophy," which was important in the development of our national character.

Witherspoon was careful not to protect students from exposure to ideas that were in conflict with his own strong convictions. The many books he added to the library gave them access to a wide range of contemporary literature, including works by authors with whom he had engaged in public dispute.

Witherspoon's administration was a turning point in the life of the College. He put fresh emphasis on **the need for a broadly educated clergy**. **He did not hesitate to teach both politics and religion**, and **he gave wholehearted support to the national cause of liberty and became a leading member of the Continental Congress**; as a result many of his students entered government service. **In addition to a president and vice president of the United States, he taught nine cabinet officers, 21 senators, 39 congressmen, three justices of the Supreme Court, and 12 state governors**.

Largely because of him, Princeton became known as the "seedbed" of revolution. Six months after he signed the *Declaration of Independence*, **the College became the site of a strategic victory as Washington surprised the British in the Battle of Princeton. Six years later Washington was again in Princeton, at the invitation of Congress assembled in Nassau Hall, to accept the official thanks of the nation for the successful conclusion of the war**. During that visit he also attended Commencement exercises for the Class of 1783.

If the Calvinist doctrine can make a strong claim to America's founding documents, then it can cite Scottish Common Sense Realism, Princeton University and Rev. John Witherspoon as persuasive examples of its influence—all of which

were, in turn, significantly influenced by the latitudinarian Anglicanism of Bishop Joseph Butler.

E. Moral Influence of 18th-Century Calvinists Upon African Slavery and the Transatlantic Slave Trade

Many Calvinists owned slaves and profited from both slavery and the transatlantic slave trade. At Princeton, the Calvinist attitude toward slavery was mixed—there were abolitionists, pro-slavery proponents, and those who advocated for gradual emancipation and the emigration of African Americans to new territories. Of great significance, too, was Rev. Witherspoon's attitude toward slavery. In his *Lectures on Moral Philosophy*, Dr. Witherspoon advocated for the humane treatment of laborers and against the institution of slavery, stating:

> Relation of Master and Servant
>
> This relation is first generated by the difference which God hath permitted to take place between man and man.
>
> Some are superior to others in mental powers and intellectual improvement—some by the great increase of their property through their own, or their predecessors industry, and some make it their choice, finding they cannot live otherwise better, to let out their labor to others for hire.
>
> Let us shortly consider (1.) How far this subjection extends. (2.) The duties on each side.
>
> As to the first it seems to be only that the master has a right to the labors and ingenuity of the servant for a limited time, or at most for life. **He can have no right either to take away life, or to make it insupportable by excessive labor**. The **servant therefore retains all his other natural rights**.
>
> The practice of ancient nations, of making their prisoners of war slaves, was altogether unjust and barbarous; for though we could suppose that those who were the causes of an unjust war deserved to be made slaves; yet this could not be the case of all who fought on their side; besides the doing so in one instance would authorize the doing it in any other; and those who fought in defense of their

> country, when unjustly invaded, might be taken as well as others. **The practice was also impolitic, as slaves never are so good or faithful servants, as those who become so for a limited time by consent**.[137]

It may thus be correctly stated that Dr. Witherspoon did not support "chattel" slavery of the type which dominated the southern "cotton kingdom" during the 19th century. Moreover, Dr. Witherspoon's own actions towards African Americans tend to lead us naturally to the conclusion that he held the same views as did Rev. Richard Baxter on slave-holding as a form of Christian stewardship. But on the whole, there is not a scintilla of evidence to support any assertion that Dr. Witherspoon was "pro-slavery" advocate who vindicated the transatlantic slave trade or the institution of African slavery.[138] In fact, the plain weight of evidence support the finding that Dr. Witherspoon had concluded that slaveholding was unnatural and unjust[139]; that slave-catching or men-stealing should never be used to subdue so-called barbarous nations in order to "civilize" them[140]; that slavery should be rarely used and, if so, only as a punishment of crime[141]; and, the African slaves then dwelling in colonial British North America should be manumitted on a "gradual" basis, so as not "to make them free to their own ruin."[142]

It therefore appears, and perhaps has been suggested, that Dr. Witherspoon was in a position to advocate the high-moral position of abolitionism at the Constitutional Conventions, but missed this opportunity of doing so. But there is not hard evidence that Rev. Witherspoon did not support the more liberal positions taken, for example, in Rev. John Wesley's *Thoughts Upon Slavery* (1778) (discussed below), and in leading court opinions such as *Somerset v Stewart* (1772) 98 ER 499. The settled view among the most fair-minded Christians of the late 18th century was that (a) slavery was immoral and wrong; (b) emancipation was most consistent with the revolutionary ideals for which the late revolutionary war was fought to establish; and (c) gradual emancipation was the most practical policy, rather than freeing the slaves to "their own ruin."[143] Renowned historian W.E.B. Du Bois, in his *Suppression of the African Slave Trade*, confirmed that this was the

---

[137] John Witherspoon, *Lectures on Moral Philosophy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1912), pp. 85-86.
[138] This is a very important point. There are "revisionists" historians who wish to paint the picture of all of the American founding fathers to be slave-holding white supremacists and racists.
[139] John Witherspoon, *Lectures on Moral Philosophy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1912), pp. 73-74.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Ibid.
[142] Ibid., p. 74.
[143] John Witherspoon, *Lectures on Moral Philosophy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1912), p. 74.

general sentiment amongst many of the American revolutionary patriots in colonial New England,[144] including Pennsylvania, New York, and New Jersey. On this very point, Du Bois writes:

> Meantime there was slowly arising a significant divergence of opinion on the subject. Probably the whole country still regarded both slavery and the slave-trade as temporary; but the Middle States expected to see the abolition of both within a generation, while the South scarcely thought it probable to prohibit even the slave-trade in that short time. Such a difference might, in all probability, have been satisfactorily adjusted, if both parties had recognized the real gravity of the matter. As it was, both regarded it as a problem of secondary importance, to be solved after many other more pressing ones had been disposed of. The anti-slavery men had seen slavery die in their own communities, and expected it to die the same way in others, with as little active effort on their own part. The Southern planters, born and reared in a slave system, thought that some day the system might change, and possibly disappear; but active effort to this end on their part was ever farthest from their thoughts. Here, then, began that fatal policy toward slavery and the slave-trade that characterized the nation for three-quarters of a century, the policy of *laissez-faire*, *laissez-passer*.[145]

And it was documented that Dr. Witherspoon had fallen into that "*laissez-faire*, *laissez-passer*" crowd of Americans who acknowledged the immoral nature of slavery but who also considered that the "institution of slavery" would die naturally. Indeed, Dr. Witherspoon believed that American slavery should be phased out, or die out naturally, within a generation:

---

[144] See, e.g., W.E.B. DuBois, *The Suppression of the African Slave Trade*, (New York, N.Y.: The Library of America, 1986), pp. 34-44.

> **Massachusetts**: "Committees on the slavery question were appointed in 1776 and 1777, and although a letter to Congress on the matter, and a bill for the abolition of slavery were reported, no decisive action was taken…. Slavery was eventually declared by judicial decision to have been abolished." [Washburn, *Extinction of Slavery in Massachusetts*; Haynes, *Struggle for the Constitution in Massachusetts*; La Rochefoucauld, *Travels through the United States*, II. 166.]
>
> **Rhode Island**: "In 1779 an act to prevent the sale of slaves out of the State was passed, and in 1784, an act gradually to abolish slavery." Ibid., p. 43.
>
> **Connecticut**: "This [Acts and Laws of Connecticut] was re-enacted in 1784, and provisions were made for the abolition of slavery." Ibid., p. 44.

[145] Ibid., pp. 55-56.

> In this connection it may be noted that in 1790 President Witherspoon, while a member of the New Jersey Legislature, was chairman of a committee on the abolition of slavery in the state, and brought in a report advising no action, on the ground that the law already forbade the importation of slaves and encouraged voluntary manumission. He suggested, however, that the state might enact a law that all slaves born after its passage should be free at a certain age—e.g., 28 years, as in Pennsylvania, although in his optimistic opinion the state of society in America and the progress of the idea of universal liberty gave little reason to believe that there would be any slaves at all in America in 28 years' time, and precipitation therefore might do more harm than good.[146]

Thus, it may be correctly deduced that Witherspoon's influence upon Princeton University and the American Founding Fathers was greatest on the question of slavery, as being one of *gradual emancipation*.[147] But, as historian

---

[146] John Witherspoon, *Lectures on Moral Philosophy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1912), p. 74.

[147] This was particularly true of Witherspoon's successor to the presidency of Princeton, **Rev. Samuel Smith**:

> Though Scottish moral philosophy offered new definitions of cruelty, benevolence, and human passion, the ambiguity of these broad philosophical concepts meant that slavery's apologists could wield them as well as anti-slavery advocates. For some Princeton students, moral philosophy exalted the importance of benevolence, sympathy, and moderate passions, thereby framing slavery's cruelty as a moral danger to American society. But others, especially those from Southern states and slave-owning families, used the concept of cruelty to argue that masters' economic interests actually provided for and protected enslaved people—in turn framing slave-owners as benevolent….
>
> In 1812, **Samuel Stanhope Smith delivered a series of lectures addressing slavery's compatibility with moral philosophy. Posed as a series of questions and responses, Stanhope raised questions such as "Is slavery on any ground consistent with the natural laws of justice and humanity?" or "Is that slavery which was unjust in its origin, equally unjust in it continuance?" His responses to these questions reveal the ways the Scottish moral philosophy as taught at Princeton shaped ongoing debates over slavery. Smith concluded that, if practiced by benevolent masters, slavery in and of itself was not immoral; but that the slave trade, and especially abusive and cruel masters, were indeed immoral. Smith also argued forcefully against instant and complete emancipation as "a worse evil than their servitude." Instead, he proposed that other states follow New Jersey's example and enact gradual emancipation laws while in the meantime easing the labor required of slaves in order to teach them how to labor for themselves**.
>
> **Concluding that free blacks could never live with white Americans on terms of equality, Smith believed that the United States government should set aside a large swathe of "unappropriated land" on which freed slaves could settle. According to Smith, this would avoid the "supercilious contempt of the whites," whose prejudices would "render it impossible to amalgamate the two races." Smith pleaded with masters to treat their slaves humanely and closed his lectures with an ominous warning: if white Americans did not free their slaves soon, slavery would serve to produce many moral and political evils. Slavery, Smith said, was "a volcano which sleeps for a time only to burst at last upon**

W.E.B. Du Bois diagnosed the situation, the question of slavery challenged the American Founding Father's moral cowardice and ambivalence towards the rights of American slaves:

> It may be doubted if ever before such political mistakes as the slavery compromises of the Constitutional Convention had such serious results, and yet, by a succession of unexpected accidents, still left a nation in position to work out its destiny. No American can study the connection of slavery with United States history, and not devoutly pray that his country may never have a similar social problem to solve, until it shows more capacity for such work than it has shown in the past. It is neither profitable nor in accordance with scientific truth to consider that whatever the constitutional fathers did was right, or that slavery was a plague sent from God and fated to be eliminated in the due time. We must face the fact that this problem arose principally from the cupidity and carelessness of our ancestors. **It was the plain duty of the colonies to crush the trade and the system in its infancy: they preferred to enrich themselves on its profits. It was the plain duty of a Revolution based upon 'Liberty' to take steps toward the abolition of slavery: it preferred promises to**

---

the unsuspecting tranquility of the country with a more terrible destruction." Lectures like Smith's shaped the intellectual climate on campus, influencing the group of Princeton alumni who founded the American Colonization Society in 1816. **But while Smith's viewpoints seem conservative today, his contemporaries viewed him as a radical—leading to his forced resignation from the presidency at the start of the 1812-1813 academic year.**

The composition of Princeton's student body also affected students' varied viewpoints on the issue of slavery. At the time, Princeton had more Southern-born students than any other college in the Northeast: from 1781 to the start of the Civil War, Southerners regularly comprised more than 50% of the total number of students, and exceeded 60% in 1790, 1805, 1821, and 1851. Proslavery interpretations of moral philosophy resonated with these students, reaching the pages of campus journals and newspapers. In 1843, one student denounced British abolitionists' "flood of simulated tears" and "affectation of high-wrought sensibility" over slavery; in 1851, another expressed his disbelief that abolitionists were "prompted only by their sympathy for blacks." In contrast, one student in 1847 argued that benevolence towards one's slaves was not enough to establish morality, as false benevolence showed "the most tender regard for humanity [while] it cared not a whit for the man." Another argued in 1848 that there could be no true sympathy in a society in which some "live, and sport, and trifle, on what others have produced with toil and pain.

Princeton's moral philosophy curriculum played an important role in forming early American understandings of human rights, good and evil, and the nature of slavery. On campus, students' debates over slavery—based on differing understandings of Princeton's curriculum—both mirrored and influenced discussions taking place across the country.

https://slavery.princeton.edu/stories/slavery-in-the-curriculum

> **straightforward action. It was the plain duty of the Constitutional Convention, in founding a new nation, to compromise with a threatening social evil only in case its settlement would thereby be postponed to a more favorable time: this was not the case in the slavery and the slave-trade compromises; there never was a time in the history of American when the system had a slighter economic, political, and moral justification than in 1787; and yet with this real, existent, growing evil before their eyes, a bargain largely of dollars and cents was allowed to open the highway that led straight to the Civil War**. Moreover, it was due to no wisdom and foresight on the part of the fathers that fortuitous circumstances made the result of that war what it was, nor was it due to exceptional philanthropy on the part of their descendants that that result included the abolition of slavery.
>
> With the faith of the nation broken at the very outset, the system of slavery untouched, and twenty years' respite given to the slave-trade to feed and foster it, there began, with 1787, **that system of bargaining, truckling, and compromising with a moral, political, and economic monstrosity**…. The most obvious question which this study suggests is: **How far in a State can a recognized moral wrong safely be compromised?** And although this chapter of history can give us no definite answer suited to the ever-varying aspects of political life, yet it would seem to warn any nation from allowing, through carelessness and moral cowardice any social evil to grow. **No persons would have seen the Civil War with more surprise and horror than the Revolutionists of 1776; yet from the small and apparently dying institution of their day arose the walled and castled Slave-Power**.[148]

Puritan New England, New York, and New Jersey followed the Calvinistic theological plan of *gradual emancipation*; but within a generation after 1787, many in the slave-holding middle colonies and the South balked at any thought of abolishing slavery, and gradual emancipation gave what to the emergence of the "Slave Power." Rev. Witherspoon and many of the American founding fathers

[148] W.E.B. Bu Bois, "Suppression of the African Slave Trade," *Writings* (New York, N.Y. : The Library of America, 1986), pp. 196 – 198.

had simply misjudged the resolve of slave-holders and had no way of foreseeing the "Slave Power" that would emerge.[149]

However, not all of the "New Light" Puritans followed Rev. Witherspoon's gradual-emancipation approach to slavery and emancipation— one notable exception was the **Reverend Jonathan Edwards, Jr.** ("Edwards the Younger"). Edwards the Younger upheld the same theological views of his father (i.e., Rev. Jonathan Edwards, Sr. (1703 – 1758), including maintaining orthodox Calvinism and opposition to the Half-Way Covenant. But unlike his father, Edwards the Younger was firmly opposed to both Slavery and the African slave trade, and he favored immediate emancipation. Edwards the Younger's theological views are, in my humble opinion, the purest expression of orthodox Calvinism. The following extract is taken from the Princeton University webpage[150]:

> **Slavery and the Bible**
>
> In the 1770s and '80s, Edwards Jr. also took up his pen against slavery—another departure from his father. Though Jonathan Edwards Sr. spoke against the cruelty of the Atlantic slave trade and considered enslaved people his spiritual equals (God "condescends to poor negroes" as well as white Christians, he'd preached), the Congregationalist minister owned at least four slaves during his life, including two he likely brought to serve him at the President's House in Princeton.
>
> His son, however, considered the practice of slavery to be in direct contradiction with Christianity. In 1773—while serving as pastor of the White Haven Church near Yale—Edwards Jr. published a series of antislavery articles in a local newspaper. He was 28 years old, a relatively new minister who had been ordained only four years prior; perhaps this was why he chose to write under a pseudonym. He chose "Antidoulios," Greek for "against slavery."
>
> In his articles, Edwards Jr. challenged the biblical arguments often used to defend slavery. While he acknowledged that Old Testament patriarchs such as Abraham "*had servants born in his house and bought with his money,*" he questioned whether these servants were

[149] Ibid.
[150] https://slavery.princeton.edu/stories/jonathan-edwards-jr

subject to the same form of "perpetual bondage" that enslaved people in his day suffered. But even if they were—Edwards continued—that didn't mean the Father of Israel had been right to enslave them: *For, however good a man he was, he had not arrived at sinless perfection.*

On a broader level, Edwards Jr. applied the Gospel of Matthew's golden rule to the practice of slavery. "Why," he asked, "are the slave-holders exempt from attending to the golden rule of our Saviour? *'Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so unto them.'*"

Edwards Jr. expanded on these arguments in a powerful antislavery sermon he delivered nearly two decades later, in 1791. No longer writing anonymously, the 46-year-old minister condemned slavery from his pulpit in New Haven, beginning with the scripture that had long informed his antislavery thought: "Therefore all things whatsoever you would, that men should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets."

In his sermon, Edwards Jr. challenged his congregation to question their basic assumptions about morality and racial difference in 18th-century America. "Should we be willing, that the Africans or any other nation should purchase us, our wives and children, transport us into Africa and there sell us into perpetual and absolute slavery?" he asked. (The answer, of course, was no.) So then "why is it not as right for them to treat us in this manner, as it is for us to treat them in the same manner?" And if slavery was based on skin color, he continued, why shouldn't any person with lighter skin enslave any other with darker? "The nations from Germany to Guinea have complexions of every shade," he noted, so "where shall slavery begin? Or where shall it end?"

Finally, Edwards Jr. once again raised the specter of the patriarchs, biblical as well as contemporary. "Perhaps though this truth"—of the immorality of slavery—"be clearly demonstrable from both reason and revelation, you scarcely dare receive it, because it seems to bear hardly on the characters of our pious fathers, who held slaves," he said. The son of a slave-owner himself, Edwards knew firsthand how difficult it might be for his congregants to criticize "our fathers and

men now alive" for a practice that had long gone virtually unquestioned. "They did so ignorantly and in unbelief of the truth," he conceded—or in other words, they were men of their times. Now, however, their time had passed.

"You therefore to whom the present blaze of light as to this subject has reached," Edwards Jr. said, sweeping those famously piercing eyes across his audience, "cannot sin at so cheap a rate as our fathers."

Slavery and Revolution

The late-18th century was a turning point in American political thought on slavery: an intermediate period between the colonial era, in which slaveholding had gone almost entirely unchallenged by Anglo-Americans, and the radical antislavery activism to come in the 1830s and after.

Part of this shift was driven by gradual emancipation laws inspired by patriotic rhetoric of liberty and equality that many northern state legislatures passed in the wake of the American Revolution.

Edwards Jr. applied Revolutionary ideals to the practice of slavery as early as 1773, when he published his series of antislavery articles in New Haven. As Antidoulios, Edwards paired the Bible's golden rule with the Revolution's: that all men are created equal. Writing mere months before "Sons of Liberty" tossed British tea into Boston Harbor, Edwards pointed out the hypocrisy of American colonists protesting the "Tyranny of the British Parliament" for imposing new taxes ("which amount to but a mere trifle for each individual") while at the same time "exercising a worse Tyranny over his Negro Slaves."

Edwards Jr. demanded consistency from patriots just as he did from Christians. The American revolutionaries "have ever laid this at the foundation of their arguings," he wrote, "that Mankind were possessed of some natural and unalienable Rights" that no government or society could take away.

Yet the same people demanding liberty for themselves denied it to enslaved Africans and African Americans. "The silence of others" had

> compelled Edwards Jr. to speak out, and when he did, he accepted no compromise:
>
> I assert that every Man is born free. No Man is or can be born a Slave. This Maxim is what every free Government in the World is founded upon. This Maxim is what the British Government is founded upon. This and This only can support the glorious Revolution.
>
> After the war was won and the British North American colonies reconstituted themselves into the United States, Edwards Jr. continued to use the language of revolution to oppose slavery. In his 1791 sermon—delivered three months before the Bill of Rights was ratified—Edwards once again appealed to the principle "that all men are born equally free." And "if this be true, the Africans are by nature equally entitled to freedom as we are."
>
> Edwards Jr. witnessed an increase in antislavery sentiment in the last decades of the 18th century. Connecticut, where he served as a minister until 1799, passed a gradual emancipation law in 1784, declaring that any child born to an enslaved woman after March 1st would be freed at the age of 25.
>
> Since 1777, five other northern states had passed similar laws. When he delivered his antislavery sermon in 1791, Edwards had reason to hope that "the light of truth" about slavery's evils would eventually lead to its abolition throughout the entire country.
>
> "This light is still increasing," he told his congregation, "and in time will effect a total revolution."[151]

Edwards the Younger's interpretation of the *Declaration of Independence* and the *U.S. Constitution,* together with his understanding of the essential meaning of the *Holy Bible,* is what eventually became the predominant view amongst American theologians and constitutional lawyers during the later half of the 19th century. And Edwards the Younger's interpretation of American constitutional law and Christian theology was certainly the viewpoint of nearly every African American church denomination—including Baptist, Congregationalist or Presbyterian—and

[151] Ibid.

of nearly every African American clergyman, including notable Calvinist minister **Rev. Lemuel Haynes** (Congregationalist).[152]

It is not clear as to whether Rev. Haynes, who was an African American, was as "New Light" or an "Old Light" Puritan,[153] but he held the same theological views as did Edward the Younger on slavery and the slave trade.[154] The first African American to pastor an predominantly white church in America,[155] Rev. Hayne's political and Calvinist outlook may be viewed as both representative and significant:

> During the American Revolution, Haynes began to write extensively, criticizing the slave trade and slavery. He continued these activities after the war, and also began to prepare sermons, family prayers and other theological works. The **Scripture**, **abolitionism**, and **republicanism** affected his published writings, in which Haynes argued that **slavery denied black people their natural rights to 'Life, Liberty and the pursuit of happiness.'** Paralleling the recent

[152] Other African American ministers who embraced the same viewpoint include: Rev. Alexander Crummell (Anglican); Rev. Henry Highland Garnett (Presbyterian); Frederick Douglass (Methodist), and Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. (Baptist).

[153] The biography of Rev. Lemuel Hayes is significant here:

> Haynes was born on July 18, 1753 in West Hartford, Connecticut, reportedly to a Caucasian mother of some status and an unknown man who was African or African-American. The identity of Haynes's mother has long been the subject of debate among historians and theologians. The most prevalent theory is that she was a servant named Lucy or Alice Fitch who worked for the John Haynes family of West Hartford. Another theory suggests that Fitch was a stand-in, willing or unwilling, for his real mother. According to this theory, Haynes's mother was a member of the prominent Goodwin family of Hartford who tried to avoid the scandal associated with giving birth while unmarried by staying with the Haynes family. Both theories suggest that Lucy (or Alice) Fitch was fired by the Haynes family after she attested to or was accused of being the mother. She named her son Haynes, either to give him respectability or to take revenge against the Hayneses for firing her.
>
> At the age of five months, Lemuel Haynes was given over to indentured servitude to Deacon David Rose, a blind farmer of Granville, Massachusetts. **Part of the indenture required Rose to see to Haynes's education, and by accompanying Rose to church, he became exposed to Calvinistic religious doctrine, including the works of Jonathan Edwards, George Whitefield, and Philip Doddridge, who all became strong influences on Haynes' religious outlook.** According to Haynes, while David Rose fulfilled his indenture obligations to Haynes, Rose's wife Elizabeth (Fowler) (d. 1775) was especially devoted to his upbringing, to the point of treating him as though he was her own child.

[154] https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lemuel_Haynes

[155] "Haynes was ordained in 1785 and settled at Hemlock Congregational Church in Torrington, Connecticut. He was the first African American ordained in the United States. On March 28, 1788, Haynes left his pastorate at Torrington to accept a call at the West Parish Church of Rutland, Vermont (now West Rutland's United Church of Christ), where he led the mostly white congregation for 30 years." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lemuel_Haynes

> American experience with oppression to the slave experience, Haynes wrote: '**Liberty is equally as precious to a black man, as it is to a white one, and bondage as equally as intolerable to the one as it is to the other**.'[156]

To sum things up, the "New Light" Puritans, had by the middle of the 18th century, the end of the Seven Year's War (1754 – 1763), and the outbreak of the American Revolutionary War (1775 – 1781), begun to adopt a modernist, Enlightenment view of constitutional law and the Christian faith that was similar to those views expressed by the Christian Deists (e.g., Matthew Tindal's *Christianity as Old as the Creation* (1730); William Warburton's *Alliance of Church and State* (1736) and Joseph Butler's *The Analogy of Religion* (1736))[157]. Natural law and natural religion, together with Enlightenment philosophy, in the form of "Scottish Common Sense Realism" had been taught by Rev. John Witherspoon at Princeton University. Indeed, through Rev. Witherspoon, Calvinism left its indelible mark upon the founding documents of the new United States government:

> As president of Princeton, Witherspoon educated five delegates to the U.S. Constitutional Convention of 1787, including Virginia's James Madison, as well as scores of individuals who served as judges and justices, members of Congress, and members of state ratifying conventions….
>
> One of the most active members of the Continental Congress, Witherspoon advocated independence, served on a large number of

---

[156] Ibid.

[157] Daniel Craig Norman, "John Witherspoon, Common Sense, and Original Sin," (An Integrative Thesis Submitted to Faculty of Reformed Theological Seminary in Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree Master of Arts, June 2006), p 2. [citing Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), p. 49], stating:

> **Witherspoon incorporated ideas from Joseph Butler**, namely the idea that our moral sense has a rational basis and that this moral sense is what the Bible calls our conscience. Witherspoon taught, "The moral sense is precisely the same thing with what, in scripture and common language, we call conscience. It is the law which our Maker has written upon our hearts, and [so] both intimates and enforces duty, previous to all reasoning." Witherspoon's goal was to provide a moral philosophy that was acceptable to both Christians and non-Christians. He was attempting to bridge the gap between positions represented by Hutcheson and Edwards. Hutcheson had little, if any, concern for revelation and Edwards believed that true virtue came only from God.[157] **Witherspoon's point was that reason and revelation are compatible—that the moral philosophy derived through reason is consistent with that derived from revelation**.

NOTE: Scottish-Presbyterian clergymen and Princeton president Rev. John Witherspoon is the author of *The Works of Joseph Butler* (https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/724374.The_Works_of_Joseph_Butler).

> committees, and authored a number of Resolutions of Prayer and Thanksgiving. Some believe that he may have been responsible for adding the words **"with a firm reliance on the protection of divine Providence"** to the *Declaration of Independence*….
>
> He likely also would have been selected to the Constitutional Convention had he not been meeting simultaneously in Philadelphia to draw up a constitution for his own denomination, which paralleled the national document in a number of key respects….
>
> Herbert Foster has identified **"five points of political Calvinism"** that appear to apply to Witherspoon*:* "**fundamental law**, **natural rights**, **contract and consent of people**, **popular sovereignty**, **resistance to tyranny through responsible representatives**" (Quoted in Morrison 2005: 81). Consistent with his Presbyterian theology, Witherspoon believed that God was the author of freedom, and he did not think that the state, which was administered by imperfect individuals, had the right to dictate personal religious beliefs.[158]

Although Rev. Witherspoon was unwilling to extend his ideas on liberty to include the immediate emancipation of African Americans, there is no reason to conclude that Witherspoon would have endorsed reducing blacks to "chattel slavery" and denying to them minimal human rights and education, as was consistent with the milder form of New England slavery, where that institution was modeled after the slavery of the Old Testament. Notwithstanding, not all "New Light" Puritans adopted the same viewpoint, as, for instance, the son of Jonathan Edwards was himself a "New Light" Calvinists who staunchly opposed both slavery and the transatlantic slave trade as being inconsistent with the Gospels. Edward the Younger's viewpoint on slavery seems to have been the predominant view in Puritan New England following the American Revolution period—slavery was clearly inconsistent with both the Gospels and the noble principles enunciated in the American *Declaration of Independence* (1776). After 1787, all of the New England state legislative assemblies adopted "gradual emancipation" statutes designed to phase out slavery.

[158] https://www.mtsu.edu/first-amendment/article/1233/john-witherspoon

IV. The "First Great Awakening" and the American Revolt Against Avarice, Consumerism, and British Mercantilism, 1730- 1780.

As economic competition with France tightened during the 18th century, Great Britain began to demand more from its American colonies. The challenge of paying the cost of the Seven Years War (1754 – 1763) suddenly presented itself to Parliament, and Parliament decided to demand that the American colonists begin to pay their fair share in taxes. Most of the reputable men of Great Britain considered Parliament's position on taxing the colonists to be reasonable, including Methodist founder John Wesley (1703 – 1791), who argued:

> But 'a late Act declares that this kingdom has power to make statutes to bind the colonies in all cases whatever! Dreadful power indeed! I defy anyone to express slavery in stronger terms.' (Page 34.). In all cases whatever! What is there peculiar in this? Certainly, in all cases, or in none. And has not every supreme Governor this power? This the English Parliament always had, and always exercised, from that first settlement of the America colonies. But it was not explicitly declared, because it was never controverted. The dreadfulness of it was never thought of for above an hundred years; nor is it easy to discern where that dreadfulness lies. Wherein does it consist? The Parliament has power to make statutes, which bind Englishmen likewise, in all cases whatever. And what then? Why, you say, 'I defy anyone to express slavery in stronger terms.' I think I can 'express slavery in stronger terms.' Let the world judge between us. Slavery is a state wherein neither a man's goods, nor liberty, nor life, are at his own disposal. Such is the state of a thousand, of ten thousand, Negroes in the American colonies. And are their masters in the same state with them? In just the same slavery with the Negroes? Have they no more disposal of their own goods, or liberty, or lives? Does anyone beat or imprison them at pleasure; or take away their wives, or children, or lives; or sell them like cows or horses? This is slavery; and will you face us down that the Americans are in such slavery as this? … A Second objection, you say, is this: 'But we are taxd [*archaic*]; why should not they?' You answer: 'You are taxd by yourselves; they insist on the same privilege.' I reply, They are now taxd by themselves, in the very same sense that nine-tenths of us are. We have not only no vote in the Parliament, but none in electing the members:

> Yet Mr. Evans says, 'We are virtually represented:' And if we are, so are the Americans.[159]

But whether or not Great Britain's colonial taxation laws were ill-advised is uncertain to know. Even Professor Adam Smith, in his *The Wealth of Nations*, maintained that "parliament should have some means of rendering its [taxation] requisitions immediately effective, in case the colony assemblies should attempt to evade or reject them."[160] Nor did Adam Smith seem to think that Parliament's current taxation policies (as of 1776) were unjust, stating:

> Parliament in attempting to exercise its supposed right, whether well or ill grounded of taxing the colonies, has never hitherto demanded of them any thing which even approached to a just proportion to what was paid by their fellow-subjects at home. If the contribution of the colonies, besides, was to rise or fall in proportion to the rise or fall of the land tax, parliament could not tax them without taxing at the same time its own constituents, and the colonies might in this case be considered as virtually represented in parliament.[161]

Moreover, like Rev. John Wesley, Professor Adam Smith responded to many of the American colonists' calls for "complete independence with no strings attached" as absurd, stating:

> [t]o propose that Great Britain should voluntarily give up all authority over her colonies, and leave them to elect their own magistrates, to enact their own laws, and to make peace and war as they might think proper, would be to propose such a measure as never was, and never will be adopted, by any nation in the world.[162]

Thus, from the British perspective—including reputable persons such as John Wesley (Anglican priest and founder of Methodism) and Adam Smith (Scottish-Presbyterian theologian and British economists), many of the American complaints against colonial taxation and demands for independence were unreasonable. And perhaps this fundamental difference in perspectives between the Americans and the British is why the American Revolutionary War (1775 – 1781) was inevitable.

---

[159] Rev. John Wesley, "Some Observations On Liberty" (1776).
[160] Ibid., p. 586.
[161] Ibid., p. 585.
[162] Ibid., pp. 581 – 582.

Indeed, Great Britain's taxation laws were designed to assert authority and control over what England believed were the unruly American colonies. This power of taxation contained within it the discretionary prerogative to take and dispose American property, without input from the American colonists themselves—"*taxation without representation*." This meant that American agriculture and industry was subordinated to the demands of Great Britain's manufacturing needs. The American colonists could not sell its produce or products overseas to other nations, without Great Britain's permission. The American colonists could not open manufacturing plants that would compete with any manufacturing done in England. Furthermore, these American colonists were encouraged or induced to buy British products, luxury items, and manufactured goods at prices that guaranteed huge profits for British merchants. Americans were also expected to pay their fair share of taxes to protect themselves against the French and Native Americans (or even from the African slaves and the Spanish settlers) on their borders. The controversial parliamentary enactments that eventually led to the American revolutionary war included the following:

- **Sugar Act of 1764--** The Sugar Act **actually reduced the tax on sugar** from the Molasses Act (1733), but it **cracked down on smugglers** by using **Writs of Assistance** allowing officers to search colonists and, if they are suspected, then try them in **Vice Admiralty courts** where British judges gave harsh punishments.

- **Currency Act of 1764--** The Currency Act limited the Americans' ability to make their own paper money, instead making them rely on British paper money notes and British currency.

- **Stamp Act of 1765**—The Stamp Act taxed **all paper documents** in the colonies, the **first internal tax** on them (not on imports/exports)

- **Declaratory Act of 1766—**The Declaratory Act repealed the Stamp Act

- **Townsend Acts of 1767—The Townsend Acts were taxes on luxury goods** like glass, lead, paints, paper and tea

- **Tea Act of 1773—The Tea Act was not an actual tax, but it was a way** to **save the British East India Company** by making Americans purchase their **surplus of tea.**

- **Intolerable Act of 1774—Following the "Boston Tea Party," whereby Americans dressed up like native Americans and threw tea into the Boston harbour, Great** Britain **closed Boston's port** until it paid for the tea it wasted, reinforced the **Quartering Act**, and made it so **British soldiers would be tried back in Britain** rather than America, so they had greater immunity.

But according to many New England pastors who preached during this era, the new spirit of Anglo-American consumerism, avarice and materialism contributed significantly to British mercantilism, to the transatlantic slave trade and slavery, to the Seven Year's War (1754 – 1763), and to the Parliamentary taxation which followed.[163]

But long before the 1760s, as Rev. John Wesley acknowledged, when his brother Rev. Charles Wesley[164] visited New England during the 1730s, the American colonists had for a very long time before there were any taxes, complained about the "yoke" of British suzerainty over the North American

---

[163] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, *Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America* (Master's Thesis: Baylor University, 2015), p. 5, stating:

> Consumer jeremiads continued in full force through the Stamp Act, the Townshend Duties, the Tea Act, the Coercive Acts, and into the Revolutionary War itself. During this era, sermons against rampant consumerism grew in strength, as it seemed God's judgment had indeed come. Colonists had purchased unnecessary British goods in such excess, that Parliament felt justified in taxing them to help pay for the Seven Years War. It appeared to Parliament that Americans were wealthy enough to afford it. Colonial Americans disagreed, and by 1775 war broke out. Ministers, especially Congregationalists, believed these troubles were God's judgment for too much indulgence in selfishness and luxury.

https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y

[164] Rev. John Wesley, "Some Observations On Liberty" (1776)("Forty years ago, [during the 1730s] when my brother was in Boston, it was the general language there, 'We must shake off the yoke; we never shall be a free people till we shake off the English yoke.' These, you see, were even then 'trying the question,' just as you are now; 'not by charters,' but by what you call, 'the general principles of liberty.' And the late Acts of Parliament were not the cause of what they have since done, but barely the occasion they laid on."). In other words, Rev. Wesley appears to be saying here that most of the American colonists were simply using Britain's colonial taxation laws as a very bad excuse for demanding complete independence from the British Empire.

colonies.[165] In other words, Rev. Wesley believed that most of the American colonists were simply using Britain's colonial taxation laws as a very bad excuse for demanding complete independence from the British Empire. But more fundamentally, like most of the ministers of the Great Awakening and the Evangelical Awakening, Rev. Wesley felt that the root cause of all the commotion within Great Britain was "ungodliness."[166] Rev. Wesley said:

> [W]hat is the present characteristic of the English nation?
>
> It is ungodliness. This is at present the characteristic of the English nation. Ungodliness is our universal, our constant, our peculiar character.
>
> I do not mean Deism; the not assenting to revealed religion. No; a Deist is a respectable character, compared to an ungodly man. But by ungodliness I mean, first, the total ignorance of God; Secondly, a total contempt of him.
>
> And, First, a total ignorance of God is almost universal among us. The exceptions are exceeding few, whether among the learned or unlearned. High and low, cobblers, tinkers, hackney-coachmen men and maid servants, soldiers, sailors, tradesmen of all ranks, Lawyers, Physicians, Gentlemen, Lords, are as ignorant of the Creator of the world as Mahometans or Pagans…. They know not, they do not in the least suspect, that he governs the world he has made; that he is the supreme and absolute Disposer of all things both in heaven and earth….
>
> Whether this is right or no, it is almost the universal sentiment of the English nation…. They do not take God into their account; they can do their whole business without him; without considering whether there be any God in the world; or whether he has any share in the management of it….
>
> But negative ungodliness (so to speak) is the least exceptionable part of our character…. The first branch of this positive ungodliness, and such as shows an utter contempt of God, is **perjury**. And to this the common people are strongly tempted in our public Courts of Justice,

[165] Ibid.
[166] Rev. John Wesley, "An Estimate of The Manners of the Present Times" (1785).

> by the shocking manner wherein oaths are usually administered there, contrary to all sense and decency…. Hence perjury infects the whole nation. It is constant, from month to month, from year to year. And it is a glory which no nation divides with us; it is peculiar to ourselves. There is nothing like it to be found in any other (Christian or Heathen) nation under heaven….
>
> There is one other species of ungodliness, which is, if possible, still more general among us; which is also constant, being to be heard in every street every day in the year; and which is quite peculiar to our nation, to England, and its dependencies; namely, the stupid, senseless, shameless ungodliness of **taking the name of God in vain**.[167]
>
> See then, Englishmen, what is the undoubted characteristic of our nation; it is ungodliness. True, it was not always so: For many ages we had as much the fear of God as our neighbors. But in the last age, many who were absolute strangers to this, made so large a profession of it, that the nation in general was surfeited, and, at the Restoration,[168] ran headlong from one extreme to the other. It was then ungodliness broke in upon us as a flood; and when shall its dire waves be stayed?[169]

Other forms of ungodliness that ran rampant throughout the British Empire were well-documented in the Sermons of other Great Awakening preachers such as Rev. George Whitefield (1714 – 1770) and others. These pastors preached sermons, often in the form of jeremiads, against avarice, consumerism, and materialism that were rampaging the British Empire. Americans, and particularly New Englanders, were becoming less "Puritan" or "Holy," and what needed was a revival or an

[167] To take God's name in "vain" essentially means to "curse" God; to make a false oath; or to knowingly claim to have been called by God or to prophesy falsely.
[168] King Charles II was restored (i.e., the "Restoration") to the Throne of England in 1660. According to Wesley, this marks the beginning for England's moral decline. It should be noted here that under Charles II, the new Stuart monarchy launched the beginning of the English-led transatlantic slave trade and the suppression of religious tolerance. This period, from about 1660 onward, marked the beginning of the decline in England's moral values. By the early 1700s, this problem of moral decline was felt in the Church of England and throughout Great Britain. This led to the First Great Awakening and the Evangelical Revival (1730s-40s).
[169] Rev. John Wesley, "An Estimate of The Manners of the Present Times" (1785).

awakening movement.[170] The universal message preached during the 1730s and 40s was that "**The love of the world quenches the love of God**."[171]

> Once the Great Awakening developed, ministers, even itinerants, continued to decry worldliness….[172]
>
> Consumerism presented a direct challenge to the evangelical faith….[173] During the height of the Great Awakening, sinful excess continued to be a strong discussion point….[174]
>
> Even after the height of the Great Awakening in the early 1740's, evangelicalism flourished. Ministers continued to handle problems of frivolous consumerism with no foreseeable end in sight.[175]
>
> At the same time as the Great Awakening, the consumer revolution, a transatlantic consumer craze in the American colonies and England, spread. This meant colonists could display their social status through items they were finally able to purchase, especially those in middling classes. Marketing efficiency improved, and manufacturing and transportation became more streamlined. As a result, items once considered luxury goods became more plentiful, less expensive, and more varied. Advertising also began to improve, directly affecting consumer desires. Colonists from New England to the Chesapeake were able to keep up to English standards. Despite the evangelical derision of consumer products due to their detrimental spiritual effects, evangelicalism and consumerism rose side by side and even depended on the other to a certain extent. Evangelical ministers frequently spoke about the perils of vanity and luxury, yet revivalist itinerants often used consumer methods of advertising to spread their message.[176]…
>
> Later, during the American Revolution, consumerism became a distinctly feminine occupation, and evangelical jeremiads focused on the effeminacy of participating in the consumer market to discourage

[170] Ibid.
[171] Ibid., p. 19.
[172] P 34
[173] P 35
[174] P. 36
[175] P. 38
[176] Ibid, p. 21.

> the practice. Purchasing goods was generally a task done for the purposes of the private home, which was identified as the woman's sphere. However, the moderate radicalism of the Great Awakening toned down these sharp gender distinctions.[177]

The Reverend George Whitefield[178] was a great leader in the Great Awakening movement in colonial British North America. Whitefield's contributions to the American Revolution lay precisely in the fact that his emphasis upon the "born-again" experience continued the work of Martin Luther (1483- 1546) in "democratizing" the Western Church and civil polity.[179] One of Whitefield's major concerns was the growing impact of materialism and consumerism throughout the empire:

> Evangelical itinerant Whitefield recognized this challenge and preached a sermon to a wide audience in England, imploring them to pray for kings because of the heavy authority bestowed upon them. Britons (and colonists alike) were subject to the authority of the king, wanting to live quiet, honest, godly lives, so it was imperative that their king lived his life in such a manner. Whitefield explained, 'If we set before us the many Dangers and Difficulties, to which Governours by their Station are exposed, and the continual Temptations they lye under to Luxury and Self-Indulgence; We shall not only Pity, but Pray for Them.'[180]
>
> According to Lambert, Whitefield, although an employer of commercial techniques, felt uncomfortable about the driving consumer market, and echoed Puritan 'pronouncements against luxuries' from a century earlier. He was heavily critical of anyone who placed their worldly material wealth in front of salvific concern.

---

[177] P. 39.

[178] George Whitefield, Intercession for Every Christian's Duty: A Sermon Preach'd to a Numerous Audience in England (Boston: T. Fleet for Charles Harrison, 1739), 9–10.; George Whitefield, A Continuation of the Reverend Mr. Whitefield's Journal from His Embarking after the Embargo,. To His Arrival at Savannah in Georgia (Philadelphia: Printed and sold by B. Franklin, in Market-Street, 1740), 98.

[179] See, e.g., "George Whitefield," https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Whitefield#Whitefield_versus_laity ("New divinity schools opened to challenge the hegemony of Yale and Harvard; personal experience became more important than formal education for preachers. Such concepts and habits formed a necessary foundation for the American Revolution. Whitefield's preaching bolstered '**the evolving republican ideology that sought local democratic control of civil affairs and freedom from monarchial and parliamentary intrusion**.'")

[180] P. 35

> Lambert notes that Whitefield particularly condemned sins associated with consuming goods that led to self-fashioning.[181]

In a word, British mercantilism was a major threat to Christian culture and civilization, because it not only enticed the Christian faithful with luxury items and consumer goods, but it created an air of "social status," "social climbing," and "status consciousness" that were altogether destructive of Christian humility, grace, and charity.[182]

> [Lambert][183] explains, 'Consumer goods served as props for presenting self to others—markers of social identification.' The wealthy in particular were able to show off their status through goods, and in a sense, fashion themselves. The middling classes attempted to copy this act of self-fashioning once they had the means to do so. Bushman claims that the conditions needed for an evangelical conversion to happen during the Awakening were 'an increased desire for material wealth,' also known as 'worldly pride or covetousness,' and more and more authority clashes as a result of material gain. He states, 'Both were the results of economic expansion, and both were, in the Puritan mind, offenses against God.' Increased desires for wealth and materialism led colonists to realize their utter depravity and instead, cry out for salvation.[184]

---

[181] P. 36

[182] Amanda S. Mylin, *Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America*, pp. 30-31:

> Some of these polemicists brought to light social class differences. Society was challenged by consumerism as wealthy colonists concerned themselves with the effect rising middling colonists would have on the social order. According to Lois Green Carr and Lorena S. Walsh, the consumer revolution did have an effect on social life. Before 1760, dress, household décor, and social ceremonies were the way the wealthy flaunted their social standing. Thus, purchasing consumer goods was a prideful right accorded to those at the top of the social bracket. However, as middling sorts and even some poor began to assert themselves in the consumer marketplace, the medium for showing wealth and power was forced to change. Sumptuary laws could not stop middling classes from accumulating luxury items, because they could not be denied goods they were easily able to purchase. Therefore, by 1800 the wealthy showed their status through elegance of lifestyle. Christine Heyrman's article on third-generation Puritan clergy also discusses social hierarchy and wealth. Ministers felt that social hierarchy needed to be determined by church membership and charitable giving rather than wealth alone. She states that 'the clergy deliberately played upon the anxieties of merchant families recently rich and eager for recognition.' Charity had the ability to neutralize the negative stain and power of wealth associated with commercial interests in colonial society. Spiritual nourishing was encouraged by these ministers rather than worldly wealth and wisdom.

[183] Lambert, Pedlar in Divinity, 8; Thomas S Kidd, *George Whitefield: America's Spiritual Founding Father* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2014), 76.

[184] P 36 - 37

Anglican and Puritan ministers alike, together with Quakers, Baptists, and Independents—in the spirit of the Great Awakening and Evangelical Revival—preached against the collapse of Orthodox Christian values due to the rising tide of materialism throughout the empire. The First Great Awakening, then, was largely a spiritual movement to maintain Christian holiness in the spirt of the rising tide of commercialism and secularism throughout the British Empire. See, e.g., Table 3, "Great Awakening Pastors and Jeremiads Against Avarice, Consumerism, and Materialism, 1730s- 1780s."[185]

Table 3. "Great Awakening Pastors and Jeremiads"

ENGLISH AND AMERICAN PASTORS (OR PUBLISHERS) WHO PREACHED AGAINST AVARICE, CONSUMERISM, AND MATERIALISM	**SERMONS PREACHED AGAINST AVARICE, CONSUMERISM, AND MATERIALISM**
Rev. William Cooper (1694 – 1743)	"The Sin and Danger" (1741)[186] "The sermon discussed the sin and danger of the love of earthly things. In it, Cooper exclaimed, "Again, Earthly-mindedness is a sin that quenches the Spirit. Earth puts out fire as well as water." He continued, explaining that the love of the world and the love of things were not compatible: "The love of the world quenches the love of God. The earth is damp; and earthly-mindedness will damp and quench the fire of divine love. Therefore, take heed and beware of covetousness."[187]

[185] [Note, the "*" means this individual was not an ordained minister but a "newspaper or magazine publisher."]
[186] https://books.google.com/books/about/The_Sin_and_Danger_of_Quenching_the_Spir.html?id=w1cqxQEACAAJ
[187] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 19) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
(Quoting William Cooper, *The Sin and Danger* (Boston: Rogers for Eliot, 1741), 31–32.)

Rev. Ebenezer Gay (1696 -1787) [188]	"The Duty of People to Pray" (1730)[189] "Ebenezer Gay, minister of the First Church of Hingham, Massachusetts and later to join the Arminian camp, asked his people to pray for their wealthy magistrates because they were especially susceptible to this sin. He stated, "They are exposed more than others to the Snares of this World, the Pleasures, Honours and Riches of it, which are very dangerous Temptations unto them to Luxury, Pride, Avarice and Oppression…." Since magistrates held power over the people, self-fashioning and the fall into corruption was clearly a real concern."[190]
Rev. Josiah Smith (1704 -1781)	"Solomon's Caution" (1730)[191] "Smith was modest about the changes that evangelicalism would bring to the region. He wanted religion that could "threaten the planter class's consumer excesses," but not upset the racial social order otherwise. Using Solomon as his focal point, Smith discussed the potential danger of abusing wine. While God created it to cheer the heart of man, abuse of it was forbidden and

[188] Alasdair Macphail, "Book Review: The Benevolent Deity: Ebenezer Gay and The Rise of Rational Religion in New England, 1696-1787.," Eighteenth-Century Studies 19, no. 2 (1985): 278–283.

[189] The full title of this sermon is: *The Duty of People to Pray for and Praise Their Rulers. a Sermon at the Lecture in Hingham, August 12. 1730. on Occasion of the Arrival of His Excellency Jonathan Belcher, Esq; To His Government*

[190] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, *Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America*, p. 24. (https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Ebenezer Gay, *The Duty of People to Pray* (Boston: Fleet, 1730), 20–21.)

[191] Solomon's caution against the cup. A sermon delivered at Cainboy, in the province of South-Carolina. March 30. 1729. / By Josiah Smith, M.A.

	could lead to lack of reasoning and appetite control and inflamed passions. Furthermore, liquor led to sloth, poverty, bad character, unclean actions, profanity, and even "sometimes murder." Liquor, according to Smith, had the power to conquer."[192]
Rev. John Brown (1696- 1742)	"An Ordination Sermon Preach'd at Arundel" (1731) "Choosing worldliness over devotion to God was a large part of the concern that ministers shared with their congregations. God employed his people to glorify him in their work and families and support of those in need, all necessary things for life, rather than unnecessary luxuries that created pride and intemperance."[193]
Rev. Gilbert Tennet (1703 -1764)	"The Unsearchable Riches of Christ Considered in Two Sermons" (1739) "Once the Great Awakening developed, ministers, even itinerants, continued to decry worldliness. Gilbert Tennent, an itinerant minister in the middle colonies, gave a sermon on the riches of Christ, located in a diverse ministers collection. While he noted that wealth was not bad in itself

[192] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 25) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
(Quoting Josiah Smith, *Solomon's Caution* (Boston: Henchman, 1730), 1–10.)

[193] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 27) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
(Quoting John Brown, *An Ordination Sermon Preach'd at Arundel* (Boston: Fleet for Hancock, 1731), 20.)

	because it was a gift of God, he explained that humans were so corrupted and sinful that riches only served to "swell Mens Pride and feed their Luxury." Wealth would never be able to fill the role of God and make humankind wise or content on earth or in heaven. It couldn't make any person noble or virtuous. In fact, 'it's impossible, feeling they are of a gross, elementary, and limited Nature, that they shou'd satisfy the expanded Whishes of a spiritual and immortal Soul.'"[194]
Rev. George Whitefield (1714 – 1770)[195]	"Intercession for Every Christian's Duty: A Sermon Preach'd to a Numerous Audience in England" (1739) "Evangelical itinerant Whitefield recognized this challenge and preached a sermon to a wide audience in England, imploring them to pray for kings because of the heavy authority bestowed upon them. Britons (and colonists alike) were subject to the authority of the king, wanting to live quiet, honest, godly lives, so it was imperative that their king lived his life in such a manner. Whitefield explained, 'If we set before us the many Dangers and Difficulties, to

[194] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 34) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Gilbert Tennent, *The Unsearchable Riches of Christ Considered, in Two Sermons* (Boston: Draper for Henchman, 1739), 46.)

[195] Rev. Whitefield was one the great evangelists of the 18th century. He was one of the founding fathers of Methodism.

	which Governours by their Station are exposed, and the continual Temptations they lye under to Luxury and Self-Indulgence; We shall not only Pity, but Pray for Them.'"[196]
Peter Clark (1694 – 1768)	"The Rulers Highest Dignity" (1739) Even after the height of the Great Awakening in the early 1740's, evangelicalism flourished. Ministers continued to handle problems of frivolous consumerism with no foreseeable end in sight. Peter Clark explained that this was the majority of the Christian's daily struggle because of the close surroundings of tempting worldly objects. He suggested that "we have need of a Spirit of Fortitude, that we may quit our selves like Men, and preserve the Dignity of our Natures, as Men" in order to keep a reasonable conscience "over brutal Appetites and Passions." This called for fortitude as a "Guard to every Virtue, and a Bulwark against every Vice." Clark explained that fortitude was necessary because without it, men would be too weak to protect themselves from the trap of luxury and passion, and would fail to be charitable. Among other reasons, this was his strong argument for the

[196] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 35) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
(Quoting George Whitefield, Intercession for Every Christian's Duty: A Sermon Preach'd to a Numerous Audience in England (Boston: T. Fleet for Charles Harrison, 1739), 9–10.)

	necessity of fortitude. Consumer desire was a continuing situation which evangelical ministers felt the need to discuss with their congregations.[197]
Rev. William Cooper (1694 -1743)	"The Sin and Danger" (1714) "'The Sin and Danger' that William Cooper preached in 1741 in Boston was the sin and danger of luxury. Consuming unnecessary goods was a mental and physical problem because it drowned reason and was a poor use of personal income, but was also harsh on spiritual edification. He noted, 'Luxury will suppress the actings of the spiritual life.'"[198]
Benjamin Franklin (1706 – 1790)*	"Father Abraham's Speech in Poor Richard's Almanac" (1758) "Franklin's 1758 Poor Richard's Almanac also discussed wealth and luxury as a vice as well. "Father Abraham's Speech" stated, "What maintains one Vice, would bring up two Children. You may think perhaps, that a little Tea, or a little Punch now and then, Diet a little more costly, Clothes a little finer, and a little Entertainment now and then, can be no great Matter; but

[197] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 38) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Peter Clark, *Christian Bravery* (Boston: Kneeland & Green for Henchman, 1756), 16.)

[198] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 45) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Cooper, *The Sin and Danger*.)

	remember what Poor Richard says, Many a Little makes a Mickle."[199]
Rev. William Williams (1688 - 1760)	"God the Strength of Rulers" (1741) "Williams preached that 'Luxury and Intemperance are Vices very dishonourable in themselves, as they subject our noble Part, to mean and brutal Appetites.' The results of partaking of luxury items or being intemperate were a weak and enfeebled body, a depraved mind, and an inability to serve themselves and others. He likened intemperance, luxury, and excess to a disease that would 'weaken and destroy them.' Williams was concerned about colonists indulging in luxuries both because it destroyed personal lives and ability to serve others."[200]
Rev. Andrew Eliot (1718 – 1778)	"An Evil and Adulterous Generation" (1758) "Andrew Eliot of the New North Church in Boston largely agreed with William Currie on the sin of pride and luxury. He stated that, 'It appears in our Dress, in our Furniture, and in all our Behaviour.' Pride had everything

[199] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 48) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Benjamin Franklin, "Father Abraham's Speech," in *Poor Richard's Almanac*, 1758..)

[200] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 48) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting William Williams, *God the Strength of Rulers* (Boston: Kneeland, 1741), 9, 29.)

	to do with luxury and consumption because 'Superiours treat those, who are below them, with Haughtiness and Contempt,' while 'Inferiours affect to make as good an Appearance, as they do, whom Providence has placed over them." Wealth and luxury made the wealthy haughty, and made the less wealthy yearn to live up to the standards of the wealthy. He strongly asserted that the poor attempting to live sumptuously and give in to appetites "destroys our Health, consumes our Substance, enfeebles the Mind, feeds our Lusts, and stupefies Conscience. While we feed and pamper our Bodies, we starve our Souls.'"[201]
Rev. Philip Reading (1720 – 1778)	"The Protestant's Danger" (1755) "For **Philip Reading**, missionary at Apoquiniminck in New-Castle, Delaware, 'virtuous Frugality' was the only real way to be wealthy, whereas luxury and vice were to be 'discouraged and branded with Infamy.' Reading's idea of wealth was more aligned with wealth of the soul than the world's idea of wealth. **James Sterling** illustrated this concept by using the ancient Israelites as an example. They grew apart from God, becoming 'wanton, like the stall-fed Ox fit for Slaughter,' because of their waxing love for opulence and luxury.' Thus, luxury and salvation were

[201] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 50) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Andrew Eliot, *An Evil and Adulterous Generation* (Boston: Kneeland, 1753), 19.)

	intimately connected for many ministers."[202]
Rev. James Sterling (1701 -1763)	"A Sermon Preached Before His Excellency" (1750) "For **Philip Reading**, missionary at Apoquiniminck in New-Castle, Delaware, 'virtuous Frugality' was the only real way to be wealthy, whereas luxury and vice were to be 'discouraged and branded with Infamy.' Reading's idea of wealth was more aligned with wealth of the soul than the world's idea of wealth. **James Sterling** illustrated this concept by using the ancient Israelites as an example. They grew apart from God, becoming 'wanton, like the stall-fed Ox fit for Slaughter,' because of their waxing love for opulence and luxury.' Thus, luxury and salvation were intimately connected for many ministers."[203]
Rev. William Currie (1709 – 1803)	"A Sermon Preached in Radnor Church" (1748) "William Currie, Presbyterian minister turned Anglican minister in Radnor, Pennsylvania, took the salvation and consumerism connection even further

[202] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 50) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Philip Reading, *The Protestant's Danger* (Philadelphia: Franklin & Hall, 1755), 9.)

[203] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 50) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting James Sterling, *A Sermon Preached Before His Excellency* (Annapolis, 1755), 27.)

	through his cry that luxury led to atheism. He claimed it was a "very natural" progression; "when a Man has broke Bounds, and given a Loose to lawless Desires, and indulg'd himself in the Accomplishment of 'em, he is glad to entertain Thoughts of Impunity, and this makes him take Shelter in Atheism." For Currie, the problem of consumerism and luxurious living was directly related to Christianity. He did not imply that prosperity was in itself inherently bad, but admitted it could be a blessing. However, it became a curse when people "make God's Blessing subservient to their Lusts and Passions." Obsession with position and feverish pursuit of wealth and consumer goods was the problem, not prosperity itself."[204]
Rev. John Mellen (1722 – 1807)	"The Duty of All to Be Ready" (1756) "John Mellen's sermon, 'The Duty of all to be Ready,' explained that soldiers needed the right attitudes and lifestyles to be prepared. Additionally, Mellen, pastor in Lancaster, Massachusetts, explained that they had found themselves in 'this dreadful rebuke of heaven," because of their luxurious living. Mellen felt that God could 'righteously withhold from us those blessings which we have heretofore

[204] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 49) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
(Quoting William Currie, *A Sermon Preached in Radnor Church* (Philadelphia: Franklin and Hall, 1748).)

	consumed upon our lusts; and turn our fruitful land into barrenness, for the sins of them that dwell therein.' He believed colonists had brought the war upon themselves by their lustful desire for goods, and the only way out of the situation was to return to humble frugality."[205]
Rev. Arthur Browne (1699 – 1773)	"The Necessity of Reformation" (1757) "Arthur Browne, an Anglican minister of Rhode Island and New Hampshire, noted that luxury was one of many reasons why future prospects seemed 'dismal' and 'have taken possession both of town and country.' Vices were increasingly disguised as 'modish and fashionable,' and to their detriment, colonists forgot to give thanks to God for blessings. Browne exclaimed, 'He has fed us to the full, but how do we requite this blessing, why, by the gratification of our wanton lusts.—He has given us repeated warnings of his intentions to destroy us, but what effect have they had? They are become as wind to us.' His warning shows that he was concerned that carelessness would lead to destruction, and they would have none other to blame than themselves. Notably, Browne's sermon in 1757 occurred amidst the Seven Years War, so his connections between God,

[205] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 49) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting John Mellen, *The Duty of All to Be Ready* (Boston: Kneeland, 1756), 6–7.)

	thankfulness, and consumerism also connected to war."[206]
Rev. Nathaniel Potter (1733 -1768)	"A Discourse on Jeremiah" (1758) "Still other ministers made connections between flagrant consumerism, sin, and the nation. Nathaniel Potter, four year minister of the First Parish church in Brookline, Massachusetts, gave a discourse on Jeremiah, speaking on the vices of luxury and extravagance, using the biblical prophet to speak to the colonists about their present situation. He explained that these vices led to sloth and idleness, and 'enervate, debase, and destroy the true Spirit of Trade, Husbandry and Business of every Sort!' Potter grew more emphatic, crying, 'What horrid Consumption do they make of rich and valuable Commodities!' Furthermore, from Potter's perspective, colonists were defensive and unwilling to consider that they were acting sinfully, crying, "We have only changed our Vices and Virtues, and may upon the whole, boast as great and perfect a Piety and Goodness, as we ever could." Potter's sermon on Jeremiah attempted to point out their hypocrisy. He also explained that consumer vice did not just affect the wealthy, but the poor too because "Men naturally emulate those above them, and study to equal or resemble their Superiours in the

[206] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 49) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Arthur Browne, *The Necessity of Reformation* (Portsmouth, 1757), 7–8.)

	Luxuries and Superfluities of Life." For Potter, this was how an entire nation could be ruined. Pursuing gratification impaired the mind and made men into unreasonable fools. Thus, as fools, men could not lead a nation. He asked,' Is it not the bad Principles and Practices of particular Persons, that denominates a Nation corrupt and vicious?' Potter spoke of the American colonies as part of Great Britain, embroiled in the Seven Years War and struggling because of softness due to overindulgence in luxury and ignoring God. According to New England and Middle colony ministers, they had led themselves into their own mess."[207]
Rev. Ebenezer Prime (1700 – 1779)	"The Importance of the Divine Prescence" (1759) "Ebenezer Prime, First Presbyterian church minister in Huntington, New York, claimed that "Luxury, Wantonness, and Effeminacy" were the worst kind of disease that destroyed more lives than did the sword."[208]
Rev. Abraham Keteltas (1732 -1798)	"The Religious Soldier" (1759)

[207] Nathaniel Potter, *A Discourse on Jeremiah* (Boston: Edes & Gills, 1758), 7–16, 26.
[208] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 53) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
(Quoting Ebenezer Prime, *The Importance of the Divine Presence* (New York: Parker, 1759), 12.)

	"Abraham Keteltas, also a Presbyterian minister and later well known as an ardent patriot of the American Revolution, touched directly on the issue of the sword and consumerism. He reprimanded those who 'sacrifice the INTERESTS OF A NATION to their luxury, effeminacy and ease.' Rather, 'he that devote himself to a military life, should learn to endure hardness, to mortify his appetites, and [?] himself, when the interests of his country, call him, to it; otherwise he will prove but a very indifferent soldier.'"[209]
Rev. Jonathan Mayhew (1720 – 1766)	"Two Thanksgiving Discourses Delivered October 9th" (1760) "Jonathan Mayhew's 'Two Discourses' delivered in Boston in 1760 used these terms as well. Colonists, according to Mayhew, a Boston Congregationalist minister, needed to be careful to see God's blessings and beware not to let pride, luxury, and effeminacy turn these blessings into curses. These could come in the form of 'outward prosperity, riches, and security.'"[210]
Rev. Philip Doddridge (1702 – 1751)	"Sermons on the Religious Education

[209] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 54) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Abraham Keteltas, *The Religious Soldier* (New York, 1759), 10.)

[210] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 54) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Jonathan Mayhew, *Two Thanksgiving Discourses Delivered October 9th, 1760* (Boston: Draper, Edes & Gill, and Fleet, 1760), 64.)

	of Children" (1763) "For Philip Doddridge, an English Dissenting minister open to evangelical concerns, the only way to prevent the calamity of indulging the human appetite was to train children properly in the 'Way of Self-Denial' right from the beginning. He pointed out that it was impossible to be followers of Christ and 'pass comfortably through the World' simultaneously. One was either a 'Slave of Appetite,' or a true Christian. In order to learn this, early self-denial was key, lest mothers who let their children eat and drink as they please, lay 'a Foundation for most of those Calamities in human Life.' Doddridge added that these lessons in self-denial referred to food and dress. Man could only be successful in life's difficult circumstances if he was familiar with plain fare, whereas a life of luxury and delicacy would make a man incapable of handling life's challenges."[211]
Rev. Josiah Smith (1704-1781)	"Sermons on Several Important Subjects" (1757) "Smith explained that God made wine to cheer the heart of man, and did not make it in vain. However, 'it may not be abused, to feast our Luxury, and to quench our

[211] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 55) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Philip Doddridge, *Sermons on the Religious Education of Children*, 4th ed. (Boston: Kneeland, 1763), 3–4.)

	drunken and excessive Thirst.' Abuse of anything God made was not only forbidden, but unwise as it 'dethron'd' reason and made passion absolute. Men can often have good intentions in the world, but becoming addicted to liquor reduces them to 'penury and want,' living on charity, and ending up in jail. Furthermore, Smith pointed out that consuming liquor was expensive, both time-wise and financially. Insatiable alcohol consumption was both a moral and a costly problem."[212]
Rev. David Judson (1715 – 1776)	"Timely Warning" (1752)[213] "Newtown, Connecticut Congregational minister David Judson offered a "Timely Warning," to be moderate in consumption as God "kindly nourishes and strengthens our animal Nature."36 Yet, when man did not hold back, the stomach was overloaded, senses blunted, the brain intoxicated, and men became stupid. Drunkenness was dependent upon unnecessary extravagant expense, made one unfit for work, and led to foolishness, bad habits, and eventually poverty. The worst part of all this was that men (and women) became unfit for

[212] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 58) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Josiah Smith, *Sermons on Several Important Subjects* (Boston: Edes & Gills, 1757), 330–332.)

[213] The full title to this sermon is: *Timely warning, against surfeiting and drunkenness. Shewing the nature of intemperance, with the sad effects and fatal consequence of this sin, how it is to be guarded against, and the important necessity of taking heed thereto, with constancy and diligence. In a discourse preached at New-Town in Connecticut*. Jan. 12. 1752.

	'the Service of God, or the Duties of Life.' Alcohol consumption in excess was not only a matter of earthly failure, but a salvific concern as well."[214]
Rev. Benjamin Lay (1682 – 1759)[215]	"All Slave-Keepers That Keep the Innocent in Bondage" (1737) "Abolitionist Benjamin Lay shared these Quaker moral sentiments as early as 1737. He began with the evils of sugar, which was then used to make rum and molasses. He explained that sugar contained "Grease, Dirt, Dung, and other Filthiness, as, it may be Limbs, Bowels and Excrements of the poor Slaves." He labeled colonists "ridiculously infatuated" for purchasing the "filthy Stuff, which tends to the Corruption of Mankind," in addition to purchasing slaves. All in all, according to Lay, the use of sugar, rum, molasses, and slaveholding would destroy Pennsylvania and the Country."[216]

[214] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 58) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
(Quoting David Judson, *Timely Warning* (New York, 1752), 7, 9.)

[215] "Benjamin Lay (January 26, 1682 – February 8, 1759) was an Anglo-American Quaker humanitarian and abolitionist. He is best known for his early and strident anti-slavery activities which would culminate in dramatic protests. He was also an author, farmer, an early vegetarian, and distinguished by his early concern for the ethical treatment of animals." https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Benjamin_Lay

[216] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 59) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
(Quoting Benjamin Lay, All Slave-Keepers That Keep the Innocent in Bondage, Apostates..." (Benjamin Franklin, 1737), 34–35.)

Rev. Anthony Benezet (1713 – 1784)	"A Short Sermon on That Part of Africa Inhabited by Negroes" (1762)[217] "A popular example of the moral critique of sugar, rum, and slavery was found in abolitionist Anthony Benezet's 'A Short Account of that Part of Africa, Inhabited by Negroes…' in 1762. He discussed the importance of ending the slave trade, and rebutted arguments that objected to it. Benezet explained that some objected to prohibiting the slave trade because it would 'greatly lessen, if not utterly ruin, some other considerable Branches of our Commerce, especially the Sugar and the Tobacco Trades' because the number of laborers able to produce these goods would be reduced. He asserted that this was not a worthy objection, though, because the forfeit of tobacco and sugar were worthwhile losses in the struggle to end slave cruelty. Benezet desired to see no more men tormented and tortured, even if 'we were never any more to see an Ounce of Tobacco or Sugar in Great-Britain.' Overall, Benezet hated 'love of wealth' including 'consumption, ingestion, appropriation and assimilation.' Benezet found consumerism to be a moral problem in terms of slave contribution, and as a

[217] See, also, Kenneth P. Minkena, "Jonathan Edward's Defense of Slavery," *Massachusetts Historical Review*, Vol. 4, Race & Slavery (2002), pp. 23 – 59. ("Whatever the combination of causes that motivated the venerable Captain Wright and his fellow Calvinists, **the awakenings created an atmosphere of heightened moral, even apocalyptic, urgency that provided the catalyst for their indictment of slave owning**. In this case, the pro-revival faction's objections against slave owning? objections they might otherwise have kept to themselves? became a weapon in their fight against their pastor and his opposition to the revivals. The debate over slavery could now be counted among the many issues that divided New Lights and Old Lights.)

	personal problem related to over-indulgence and a lack of self-control."[218]
Rev. Peter Whitney (1744 – 1816)	"The Transgression of a Land" (1774) "As one voice crying out among many other Revolutionary era Christian voices, Peter Whitney lamented the place the consumption of foreign goods had landed the colonies. Most unfortunately, 'Many things absolutely superfluous' had been imported from Great Britain; 'things which tend only to feed our pride and vanity.' What was worse, 'Many things are imported, which might be manufactured among ourselves.'[219]
Rev. Edward Barnard (1720 – 1774)[220]	"A Sermon Preached before His Excellency" (1766) "Edward Barnard, Congregational pastor of the First Church in Haverhill, preached a sermon in Boston on the occasion of the anniversary of the election of the governor and local House of Representatives. Barnard preached affection for the king and

[218] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 60) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Anthony Benezet, *A Short Sermon on That Part of Africa, Inhabited by the Negroes*...Second Edition (Philadelphia, 1762), 60.)

[219] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 66) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Peter Whitney, *The Transgression of a Land* (Boston, 1744), 44.)

[220] Edward Barnard, A.M. Pastor of the First Church in Haverhill.

	Parliament, and "our commercial interests flourishing,—the land of our original pouring in her ample stores upon us, for convenience and delight." Yet, he asked, if they should "grow proud in heart, and forget God," making "proficiency in extravagance, luxury, and every vice dependant upon plenty, how sad would be our condition?" Barnard stressed that the colonists should take care not to forget God in favor of luxurious consumption pouring in from Great Britain. He was unopposed to consuming British luxury goods for convenience and delight, but sought to make his parishioners understand the necessity of thanking God rather than falling into prideful dependency upon goods."[221]
Rev. Abiel Leonard[222]	"The Memory of God's Goodness" (1768) "Despite fertile soils and the ability to live independently apart from severe commercial laws, including the newly enacted Townshend Duties of June 1767, Connecticut minister Abiel Leonard exclaimed that colonists had only themselves to thank for their dependent state. How could colonists

[221] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 70) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Edward Barnard, *A Sermon Preached before His Excellency* (Boston, 1766), 35–37..)

[222] "Abiel Leonard was a Congregational minister from Connecticut who served as a chaplain in the Continental Army. From George Washington's correspondence, it is clear that the commanding general took a great interest in Chaplain Leonard. No other chaplain's name appears nearly as often or as favorably in Washington's letters and orders." https://milewis.wordpress.com/2017/02/24/washington-and-abiel-leonard/

	complain of poverty when they were responsible for it? He warned, 'Had we been content with the produce of our own soil, and less fond of importing superfluities, tending to promote luxury, we had been at this day a wealthy people: now nothing but industry and frugality will save these colonies.'"[223]
Rev. Samuel Fothegill (1715 - 1752)	"A Prayer of Agur" (1768) "Samuel Fothergill reminded Quaker parishioners in a funeral sermon that it was difficult for a rich man to enter the Kingdom of Heaven. Sharing with the poor would help to alleviate this problem. Fothergill's sermon was delivered after the Stamp Act crisis, which colonists believed was precipitated by rampant consumption of unnecessary goods. Fothergill's reminder to be good stewards was probably connected to the consumer revolution."[224]
Rev. Joseph Robinson (1742 – 1807)	"Affections of the Mind" (1769) "[This is a] 1769 published catechism warned colonists that earthly pleasures 'are not to be pursued too ardently,

[223] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 71) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Abiel Leonard, *The Memory of God's Great Goodness* (Providence, 1768), 25–26.)

[224] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 71) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Samuel Fothergill, *The Prayer of Agur* (Philadelphia, 1768), 11–13.)

	which have no tendency to our salvation.'"[225]
Rev. Abraham Williams (1727 – 1784)	"A Sermon on James V.9" (1766) "One minister expounded upon chapter 5 of the book of James, showing that the rich who feast upon luxury end up living in misery. They could 'reasonably expect from the righteous governor of the world, who observes their conduct with detestation,…proper recompense.'"[226]
Rev. Robert Smith (1723 – 1793)	"The Principles of Sin and Holiness and the Conflict Between These, in the Hearts of Believers" (1769) "Smith was a patriot and an ardent New Light Presbyterian, converted as a child during a Whitefield revival. Within his sermon he presented 'riches, the luxuries, the pomp, and the various gaieties of this life' to be the 'gods of ungodly sinners, and temptations to the saints themselves.' These luxuries took hold of weak sinners and became idols in their lives, even tempting those strong in the Lord. Smith continued, stating that 'fine cloathes, houses, glittering equipages, and high sounding titles, strike the mind with their fancied

[225] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 71) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Joseph Robinson, *Affections of the Mind* (Augusta, Virginia, 1769), 34.)

[226] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 71) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Abraham Williams, *A Sermon on James V.9* (Boston, 1766), 3–4.)

	beauty. Relishing dishes and flowing bowls please voluptuous palates. The adulterer's heart is caught by deceptive charms. Large treasures and large estates are snares for the covetous.' He compared luxuries to David's lust for Bathsheba, Achan's 'covetous desire' for gold, and Nebuchadnezzar's pride of his kingdom. Smith asserted that unregenerate sinners were under the influence of the 'things of the flesh.' His warning of the 'Principles of Sin and Holiness' implored colonists to be wary of lusting after earthly riches, luxuries, and equipages. For Smith, careful frugality was directly linked with sin, holiness, and salvation amidst the taxation crisis."[227]
Rev. Samuel Langdon (1723 – 1797)	"Government Corrupted by Vice" (1775)[228] "In a Sermon Before Congress on May 31, 1775, Samuel Langdon, Congregational minister and Harvard president, asked his audience to consider that a people's sins may cause God to let a government become corrupted, and that only reformation would bring about restoration. He explained that as governments become

[227] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 72) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Robert Smith, *The Principles of Sin and Holiness and the Conflict Between These, in the Hearts of Believers* (Philadelphia, 1769), 22–23.)

[228] "Samuel Langdon preached this sermon during a key turning point at the beginning of the American Revolution (1775). Langdon was an ardent patriot, and graduated from Harvard College in 1740 during the administration of Governor Jonathan Belcher (1682-1757), when that governor of Massachusetts and New Hampshire was also an Overseer of Harvard College. (The patriot Samuel Adams was also in the class of 1740.) Langdon later went on to become a Harvard College president."

	complacent, frugality and prudence go out the window, and vice 'increase[s] with the riches and glory of an empire.' The Israelites under Judah 'loved gifts and followed after rewards…and their avarice and luxury were never satisfied.' In consequence, God in His 'righteous judgment' led them to destruction because they had forgotten him. Just as the Jewish people had suffered this fate, argued Langdon, so would the American colonists. The Americans, 'especially in our Seaports,' sank deeply into pride and luxury. He considered that the commonwealth and country might be saved if the people turned away their minds from pleasure and luxuries, and that the people themselves might be saved. While pastors and colonists saw the British government as tyrannical, pastors imparted the idea to their parishioners that they were responsible in large part for the political mess."[229]
Rev. Timothy Hilliard (1747 – 1790)	"The Duty of a People" (1774)[230] In 1774, Timothy Hilliard, minister of the First Congregational Church in Cambridge, Massachusetts, noted that if 'luxury and extravagance were to increase among us, in the proportion they have done for some years past, we

[229] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 78) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Samuel Langdon, *Government Corrupted by Vice* (Watertown, 1775), 10–24.)

[230] The full title of this sermon is: *The duty of a people under the oppression of man, to seek deliverance from God (The substance of two sermons, delivered at Barnstable, July 14th, 1774. A day set apart for humiliation and prayer on account of the present dark and melancholy aspect of our public affairs).*

	should in all probability be in a great measure ruined, without the concurrence of any other causes.' Yet, Hilliard admitted that it would be presumptuous to assume to know 'the designs of God's providence.' In fact, he was optimistic that if the colonists were penitent and obedient, God would help them in their trouble and show them the way to walk. Still, Hilliard recommended colonists be 'humbled before God on account of our sins' because they were 'the procuring causes of our sufferings.' Hilliard was cautious to pretend to understand the mind of God, but he did believe that their sufferings were caused by sin, which included partaking of luxury and extravagance."[231]
Rev. Samuel Sherwood (1729 – 1783)	"A Sermon, Containing Scriptural Instruction" (1774) "Samuel Sherwood, however, proclaimed that 'the present judgment' and 'God's displeasure against us' were due to 'indulging pride and vanity, luxury and intemperance. The plain voice of providence is, that God is awfully offended with all that practice these ruinous and destructive vices.' Sherwood clarified in his sermon that Britain was tyrannical and to blame for the present situation, but

[231] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 80) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
(Quoting Timothy Hilliard, *The Duty of a People* (Boston, 1774), 27.)

	he also did not hedge around the idea that God was punishing the colonists for their sins of overconsumption."[232]
Rev. Jacob Duche (1737 – 1798)[233]	"The American Vine" (1775)[234] "Jacob Duchè of Christ Church, Philadelphia, noted that God was the source of all prosperity in a General Fast sermon preached in July 1775 before the Continental Congress. He cried, 'Alas! My brethren, have we not rather been so far carried away by the stream of prosperity, as to be forgetful of the source from whence it was derived?' Colonists had been too overcome by the availability of luxuries and forgotten to be thankful to God for them. In addition, Duchè asked, 'Have not luxury and vice, the common attendants of wealth and grandeur, too soon made their appearance amongst us, and begun to spread a dangerous infection through our hitherto healthy and thriving state?'"[235]

[232] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 81) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
(Quoting Samuel Sherwood, *A Sermon, Containing Scriptural Instructions* (New Haven, 1774), 36.)

[233] The Reverend Jacob Duché (1737–1798) was a Rector of Christ Church in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and the first chaplain to the Continental Congress. See, e.g., https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jacob_Duch%C3%A9 .

[234] The full title to this sermon is: *The American Vine: A Sermon, Preached in Christ-Church, Philadelphia, before the Honourable Continental Congress, July 20th, 1775. Being the Day Recommended by Them for a General Fast throughout the United English Colonies of America.*
For full text of this sermon, see http://anglicanhistory.org/usa/jduche/vine1775.html

[235] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 81) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
(Quoting Jacob Duchè, *The American Vine* (Philadelphia, 1775), 23–27.)

Rev. John Lathrop (1740 – 1816)[236]	"A Sermon Preached to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company" (1774)[237] "John Lathrop in Boston, while using the jeremiad form, attempted to offer solutions to the present situation in a sermon preached to the artillery-company on the anniversary of their officer elections. New England patriarchs had been content to dress plainly without expense, so he suggested they also make their own clothes. Lathrop believed these patriarchs would "shrink back into the darkness of death" ashamed, if they could see the way their children dressed in 'costly apparel' that they could not afford. The colonists' godly ancestors would be appalled to discover their children's consumer behavior. In order to right the wrongs, colonists would have to return to the simple and frugal patterns of their forefathers."[238]

[236] John Lathrop (1740-1816) was a congregationalist minister in Boston, Massachusetts, during the revolutionary and early republic periods. See, e.g.,

[237] See, e.g. https://teachingamericanhistory.org/document/a-sermon-preached-to-the-ancient-and-honorable-artillery-company-in-boston/ ("But we have little reason to expect, however ardently we may wish, that this country will always be the habitation of peace. Ambition, avarice, and other unruly passions have a great hand in directing the conduct of most of the kingdoms of this world. British America is already become considerable among the European nations for its numbers, and their easiness of living; and is continually rising into greater importance. I will not undertake to decipher the *signs of the times*, or to say from what quarter we are most likely to be molested. But from the course of human affairs, we have the utmost reason to expect that the time will come, when we must either submit to *slavery*, or defend our liberties by our own sword. And this perhaps may be the case sooner than some imagine…. To conclude: This whole assembly will bear in mind, that there is another and more valuable kind of liberty, than that to which the foregoing discourse more immediately relates, and which, at this day, so generally employs our attention and conversation; a liberty, which consists in being free from the power and dominion of sin, through the assistance of the divine spirit, concurring with our own pious, rational and persevering endeavors. Whatever our outward circumstances may be, if we are destitute of this spiritual liberty, we are in reality slaves, how much soever we may hate the name; if we possess it we are *free indeed:* And our being free in this sense, will give us the best grounds to hope for temporal freedom, through the favour of heaven; and, at length, gain us admission into the regions of perfect and uninterrupted liberty, peace and happiness.")

[238] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion

Rev. William Smith (1727- 1803)[239]	"A Sermon on the Present Situation" (1775)[240] "Other sermons offered hope to colonists for reforming their behaviors. So long as colonists guarded themselves against 'luxury, veniality, and corruption,' America would be triumphant."[241]
Francis Bailey (1744 – 1817)[242] *	"A Sermon on Tea" (1774)[243] "One of [Francis Bailey's] published works, a 'Sermon on Tea,' was printed in 1774 amidst boycotts and in response to the Tea Act of 1773. It claimed that if preachers could turn

and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 81) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting John Lathrop, *A Sermon Preached to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery-Company* (Boston, 1774), 29.)

[239] Anglican minister in colonial British North American and Loyalist.

[240] See, e.g., https://www.williamreesecompany.com/pages/books/WRCAM35887A/william-smith/a-sermon-on-the-present-situation-of-american-affairs-preached-in-christ-church-june-23-1775-at-the ("An important sermon, delivered shortly after the Battle of Bunker Hill. Its author, William Smith (1727-1803), was an Anglican clergyman, teacher, and first provost of the College, Academy, and Charitable School of Philadelphia. Although Smith opposed the Stamp Act and argued strongly for full rights and representation of the American colonies, he did not favor independence - a position that placed him, at the outset of the Revolution, in "an embarrassing predicament" (DAB). The present sermon, preached before Congress at Christ Church, Philadelphia, June 28, 1775, '...created a great sensation. It went through many editions and was translated into several foreign languages. It opposed British measures and awakened patriotism, but in its preface Smith professed himself as 'ardently panting for a return of those Halcyon-days of harmony' and as 'animated with purest zeal for the mutual interests of Great-Britain and the Colonies'"")

[241] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 82) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting William Smith, *A Sermon on the Present Situation* (Wilmington, 1775), 16.)

[242] Francis Bailey was not a clergyman but a pro-Patriot and Revolutionary Publisher. See, e.g., https://www.lancasterlyrics.com/g_francis_bailey/ ("Francis Bailey is the perfect Scots-Irish symbol of a revolutionary American free press. He is one of Lancaster's greatest claims to letterpress fame. **1774 - Lancaster City:** Bailey prints *Sermon on Tea*, calling for American resistance to the British, authored by Lancaster-native David Ramsay. (Don't be a slave to the British. Don't drink their tea.)")

[243] Ibid.

	into politicians, taking Scripture and turning it into a political sermon, then he could "take a text from the Gazette, and deliver what ought to appear from the pulpit, in the form of a sermon." He used biblical imagery to make his political statement, such as the example of the weak-willed Eve. Prime Minister Lord North, responsible for enacting the Coercive Acts, held tea, chains, and military law in his hands while the 'guardian genius of America' hung her head, using her last strength to exclaim, '"Taste not the forbidden fruit; for in the day ye eat thereof, ye shall surely die."—Here and there a silly Eve, regardless of her countries call, stretches forth her unthinking hand, and receives the accursed herb with all its baneful attendants.' Eve, the epitome of the sinful, weak woman in the Bible, was used to describe the enslavement of the colonies to consuming British tea, thereby to Parliament's taxation. Descriptions of Eve, associated with destructive tea, motivated colonists to avoid it lest they be known as silly and unthinking themselves."[244]
Rev. John Wesley (1703 – 1791)	"Thoughts Upon Slavery" (1778)[245]

[244] See, e.g., Amanda S. Mylin, M.A. ("Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America," p. 82) https://baylor-ir.tdl.org/bitstream/handle/2104/9465/MYLIN-THESIS-2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y (Quoting Francis Bailey, *A Sermon on Tea* (Lancaster, Pa., 1774), 3, 6.)

[245] Although this work was not written during the period of the First Great Awakening (1730s-40s), it should be noted that the revivalist movements of that period produced similar anti-slavery views. See, e.g., Kenneth P. Minkena, "Jonathan Edward's Defense of Slavery," *Massachusetts Historical Review*, Vol. 4, Race & Slavery (2002), pp. 23 – 59. ("Whatever the combination of causes that motivated the venerable Captain Wright and his fellow Calvinists, **the awakenings created an atmosphere of heightened moral, even apocalyptic, urgency that**

	"This is the plain, un-aggravated matter of fact. Such is the manner wherein our African slaves are procured: Such is the manner wherein they are removed from their native land, and wherein they are treated in our Plantations. I would now enquire, whether these things can be defended, on the principles of even heathen honesty? Whether they can be reconciled (setting the Bible out of the question) with any degree of either justice or mercy. The grand plea is, 'They are authorized by law.' But can law, human law, change the nature of things? Can it turn darkness into light, or evil into good? By no means. Notwithstanding ten thousand laws, right is right, and wrong is wrong still. There must still remain an essential difference between justice and injustice, cruelty and mercy. So that I still ask, Who can reconcile this treatment of the negroes, first and last, with either mercy or justice…. This equally concerns every merchant, who is engaged in the slave-trade. It is you that induce the African villain, to sell his countrymen; and in order thereto, to steal, rob, murder men, women and children without number. By enabling the English villain to pay him for so doing; whom you over pay for his execrable labour. It is your money, that is the spring of all, that

provided the catalyst for their indictment of slave owning. In this case, the pro-revival faction's objections against slave owning? objections they might otherwise have kept to themselves? became a weapon in their fight against their pastor and his opposition to the revivals. The debate over slavery could now be counted among the many issues that divided New Lights and Old Lights.)

	impowers him to go on: so that whatever he or the African does in this matter, it is all your act and deed…. Has gold entirely blinded your eyes, and stupefied your heart? … Perhaps you will say, 'I do not buy any negroes: I only use those left me by my father.' – So far is well: but is it enough to satisfy your own conscience? Had your father, have you, has any man living, a right to use another as a slave? It cannot be, even setting revelation aside. It cannot be, that either war, or contract, can give any man such a property in another as he has in sheep and oxen. Much less is it possible, that any child of man, should ever be born a slave. Liberty is the right of every human creature, as soon as he breathes the vital air. And no human law can deprive him of that right, which he derives from the law of nature."[246]

The Great Awakening movement thus contained within it—as a part of its general efforts to preach the Gospel and to offer Christ's salvation to lost souls— a message of holiness that stressed the **duty to guard against avarice, luxury, and consumerism**.[247] This Christian message, of course, ran counter to the "necessity"

[246] Rev. John Wesley, *Thoughts Upon Slavery* (London, England/ Philadelphia, PA: J. Crukshank Pub., 1778) pp. 33-34, 53, 56.

[247] Amanda S. Mylin, Evangelical Jeremiads and Consuming Eves: The Relationship of Religion and Consumerism in Eighteenth Century Colonial America (Master's Thesis: Baylor University, 2015), p. 27:

> Evangelical ministers worried about the incompatibility of capitalism and consumerism on their theological beliefs. Participation in the consumer craze could undermine one's theological commitment and cause

of money-making by the British merchants and the "Whig" politicians who promoted the mercantilist system. The "First Great Awakening" in British North America was largely a movement to overthrow deadly and decadent consumerism that was keeping the American colonists in a state of political and economic subjugation to British merchants. The "Evangelical Revival" in England, which occurred at the same time, was largely a revolt of spirit-filled Anglicans and the working classes against the Whig politicians and their High-Church Anglican allies who seemed to promote policies that promoted global British mercantilism as well as the steady weaking of the Church of England. Thus, in a real sense, these two great church-based and spiritual movements which occurred during the 1730s and 40s were movements British mercantilism, materialism, and consumerism:

Church ←----→ State ←----→ Capitalism

The British merchants seemed to have their allies within the Church of England, particularly among certain latitudinarian and High-Church Anglicans. These British merchants were also strongly represented amongst the Whigs within Parliament, although not a small number of Tories enjoyed the investments from British mercantilism. But the Whig party was the preferred party of British mercantilism, and they controlled both King George II and the Parliament. The Whigs promoted "religious freedom," but at the same time they simultaneously relaxed ethical and moral standards, and relinquished ecclesiastical oversight over British commercial standards.[248] Commercial or business ethics collapsed during the 18th century, as the Church of England was more and more alienated from brokering public policies or administering the laws of finance and commerce.[249]

After 1718, when King George II prorogued the Church of England's Convocation, the powerful Anglican bishops lost their independent political authority to enact legislation, and were instead reassigned permanent seats in Parliament's House of Lords. But as members of the secular House of Lord, they sat as "Lords Spirituals" but not allowed to think or to legislate outside of a sort of prepackaged "box" already assigned to them by the Whigs who controlled

---

> wavering. Specifically, Congregational evangelicals in New England believed in the utter depravity of humankind. In contrast, consuming goods was a pleasurable experience, one that did not allow for self-reflection and self-improvement of humanity. Instead, it indulged the sinful nature by placing worldly choice over self repression….

[248] See, generally, R.H. Tawney, *Religion and the Rise of Capitalism* (New York, N.Y.: Mentor Books, 1954).
[249] Ibid.

Parliament. This historical act of proroguing the Convocation of the Church of England prompted historian Gerald Switzer to write:

> That in so epochal a period England's greatest religious communion should rest supinely without visible means of corporate action, while dissenting groups in council, assembly, and conference, weighed the vital spiritual issues of the day, is a phenomenon defying parallel in the Protestant world. That the results in religious apathy and moral decline were deplorable is the over- whelming testimony of reliable historians.[250]

As a result of what appeared to be a fatal blow to the social and welfare policies of the Church of England, Whig Prime Minister Robert Walpole was often petitioned and rebuffed by those British commoners who relied upon the alms and charity of the Church of England.[251] So long as the Church of England supported Whig

---

[250] Gerald B. Switzer, "The Suppression of the Convocation of the Church of England," *Church History* , Sep., 1932, Vol. 1, No. 3 (Sep., 1932), p. 151.

[251] To the working classes in England, the important charitable mission of the Church were essential. Although Prime Minister Walpole continued to endorse the Church of England as an established institution, the Church's ability to address the moral and spiritual concerns of the British Empire was seriously impaired. See, "18th Century Britain, 1714- 1815," https://www.britannica.com/place/United-Kingdom/18th-century-Britain-1714-1815, stating:

> Walpole's **religious policy** was also designed to foster **social and political quiescence**. Traditionally the Whig party had supported **wider concessions to the Protestant dissenters** (Protestants who believed in the doctrine of the Trinity but who refused to join in the worship of the state church, the Church of England). They had been given freedom of worship under the Toleration Act of 1689 but were barred from full civil rights and access to university education in England. In **1719 the Whigs had repealed two pieces of Tory legislation** aimed against dissent, the Schism and the Occasional Conformity acts. **These concessions ensured that Protestant dissenters would be able to establish their own educational academies and hold public office in the localities, if not in the state**.
>
> There was always a danger, however, that **too many concessions to Protestant dissent would alienate the Church of England**, which **enjoyed wide support in England and Wales**. There were 5,000 parishes in these two countries, each containing at least one church served by a vicar (minister) or a curate (his deputy). For much of the 18th century these Anglican churches provided the only large, covered meeting places available outside of towns. **They served as sources of spiritual comfort and also as centres for village social life**. **At religious services vicars would not only preach the word of God but also explain to congregations important national developments: wars, victories, and royal deaths and births. Thus churches often supplied the poor, the illiterate, and particularly women with the only political information available to them**. **Weakening the Church of England therefore struck Walpole as unwise**, for at least two reasons. Its ministers provided a vital service to the state by communicating political instruction to the people. The **church, moreover, commanded massive popular loyalty**, and **assaults on its position would arouse nationwide discontent**. Walpole therefore determined to reach an accommodation with the church, and **in 1723 he came to an agreement with Edmund Gibson, Bishop of London**. **Gibson was to ensure that only clergymen sympathetic to the Whig administration were appointed to influential positions in the Church of England**. In return, **Walpole undertook that no further extensive concessions would be made to Protestant**

policies and King George II, Prime Minister Walpole supported the Church of England.[252] To that end, Walpole insisted that the Church of England only appoint ministers and bishops who were favorable to Whig policies—hence, the Church of England became subordinated to the Whigs. And, for so long as this subordination occurred, the Church of England was allowed to maintain its supremacy of the other Protestant dissenters—e.g., the Presbyterians, Baptists, Quakers, and Independents. In the end, the powerful British merchants, who controlled the Whig party, supplanted the Christian religion in both England and throughout the British Empire. The Whigs supplanted the Church of England; the Whigs had promoted "religious liberty" by aligning themselves with the Protestant dissenters in order to weaken traditionalism, the orthodox High-Church Anglicans, and the Tory party; but after the Whigs finished using these Protestant dissenters, they had no more concern for "religious liberty"—commercial expansion of the British Empire had always been their primary goal and objective.

In colonial British North America, where many of those same Protestant dissenters had immigrated, the hypocrisy of the Whigs and the British merchants was very clear. The Whigs cared only for commercial investments, profits, and defeating their global European competitors through mercantilist policies. The American colonists had to buy British goods and pay taxes in order to keep profits high amongst the British merchants and to pay for the British military. Under this set of circumstances, there was little room for a diversity of political views and opinions from the American colonists who had become negatively affected. Their new clamor "No Taxation Without Representation" was, in fact, a threat to economic interests of the British merchants who controlled British mercantilism throughout the British empire. American consumers and consumerism were the foundation, if not the very "footstool," of the British Empire. The American colonists needed to buy British goods and pay taxes. As a consequence, the provincial character of New England Puritanism gave way to widespread materialism and the influx of cosmopolitan ideals such as Unitarianism, Deism, atheism, and market culture ("consumerism," "social status," and "social climbing").

It is within this context that the First Great Awakening occurred during the 1730s and 40s—in a word, British mercantilism (i.e., primitive global capitalism)

---

dissenters. This arrangement continued until 1736.

[252] Ibid.

was slowly undermining the Christian foundations of the Puritan and orthodox Anglican social order. In reaction to this economic revolution within the Puritan church-state, New England's orthodox Calvinists pushed back against what appeared to be social and moral decadence of materialism, consumerism, and apostasy. Hence, the First Great Awakening as a result. And as the orthodox Puritan church-state collapsed, a newer form of orthodox Calvinism—Scottish Common Sense Realism ("SCSR")[253]—, which emerged out of the Presbyterian Enlightenment,[254] crossed the Atlantic Ocean into colonial British North America. SCSR took root at the new Presbyterian college at Princeton, and a newer, modernized version of Calvinism was rapidly developed. This newer form of Calvinism was advanced by Scottish intellectual giants such as Rev. Dr. John Witherspoon, who would have a tremendous influence upon the American founding fathers. SCRS was, simply put, the Calvinist version of latitudinarian Anglicanism which held that "*Christianity is a republication of natural religion.*"[255] This was Calvinism's global response to the "Age of Reason."

---

[253] "Though best remembered for its opposition to the pervasive philosophy of David Hume, Scottish common sense philosophy is influential and evident in the works of Thomas Jefferson and late 18th-century American politics… One central concern of the school was to defend 'common sense' against philosophical paradox and scepticism. It argued that common-sense beliefs govern the lives and thoughts even of those who avow non-commonsensical beliefs and that matters of common sense are inherent to the acquisition of knowledge. The qualities of its works were not generally consistent; Edward S. Reed writes, e.g., '[Whereas] Thomas Reid wished to use common sense to develop philosophical wisdom, much of this school simply wanted to use common sense to attack any form of intellectual change.'…

"Common sense (all the senses combined) is how we truly identify the reality of an object; since all that can be perceived about an object, are all pulled into one perception. How do people reach the point of accessing common sense? That's the trick, everyone is born with the ability to access common sense, that is why it is called common sense. 'The principles of common sense are common to all of humanity'…."
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Reid

[254] The Scottish Enlightenment: the school taught that every person had ordinary experiences that provided intuitively certain assurance of a) the existence of the self, b) the existence of real objects that could be seen and felt; and c) certain "first principles" upon which sound morality and religious beliefs could be established. These principles laid the foundation for Reid's influential theory of perception….
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scottish_common_sense_realism

[255] Daniel Craig Norman, "John Witherspoon, Common Sense, and Original Sin," (An Integrative Thesis Submitted to Faculty of Reformed Theological Seminary in Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree Master of Arts, June 2006), p 2. [citing Henry F. May, *The Enlightenment in America* (New York, N.Y.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1978), p. 49], stating:

> **Witherspoon incorporated ideas from Joseph Butler**, namely the idea that our moral sense has a rational basis and that this moral sense is what the Bible calls our conscience. Witherspoon taught, "The moral sense is precisely the same thing with what, in scripture and common language, we call conscience. It is the law which our Maker has written upon our hearts, and [so] both intimates and

CONCLUSION

We may safely deduce from the influence of latitudinarian Anglicanism and Bishop Joseph Butler's *The Analogy of Religion* upon Rev. John Witherspoon's "Scottish Common Sense Realism" (SCSR) philosophy, which was developed at Princeton during the late 1700s, that SCSR left its mark on the American students who were taught at Princeton under the tutelage of Rev. Witherspoon. Witherspoon merged liberal arts and moral philosophy in with orthodox Calvinism, and held generally that Christianity is a republication of natural religion. Although the influential orthodox Puritan Rev. Jonathan Edwards never held the same view, it was Rev. Witherspoon's conceptualization of orthodox Calvinism that ultimately came to influence the American Revolution during the late 18th century. Indeed, Rev. Witherspoon was the only clergyman and the only college president to sign the *Declaration of Independence* (1776). And Witherspoon's view of Calvinism held that natural law and natural religion represented the fundamental Christian mandate of to do justice, faith and love—there was no conflict between reason and revelation. From this standpoint, we may safely conclude that orthodox Calvinism, together with latitudinarian Anglicanism, was the foundation of the constitutional documents of the United States of America.

THE END

Bibliography:

Butler, Joseph. *Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature* (1736).

Heitzenrater, Richard P. *Wesley and the People Called Methodists*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press (1995).

Smith, Adam. *The Wealth of Nations*. New York, N.Y.: The Modern Library (1937).

---

enforces duty, previous to all reasoning." Witherspoon's goal was to provide a moral philosophy that was acceptable to both Christians and non-Christians. He was attempting to bridge the gap between positions represented by Hutcheson and Edwards. Hutcheson had little, if any, concern for revelation and Edwards believed that true virtue came only from God.[255] **Witherspoon's point was that reason and revelation are compatible—that the moral philosophy derived through reason is consistent with that derived from revelation**.

NOTE: Scottish-Presbyterian clergymen and Princeton president Rev. John Witherspoon is the author of *The Works of Joseph Butler* (https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/724374.The_Works_of_Joseph_Butler).

Smith, Goldwin. *A History of England*. New York, N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons (1957).

Talbot, Kenneth and Gary Crampton. *Calvinism, Hyper-Calvinism and Arminianism*. Lakeland, FL.: Whitefield Media Publishing (1990).

Tindal, Matthew. *Christianity as Old as the Creation: or the Gospel a Republication of the Religion of Nature*. London, England: Forgotten Books (2012).

Witherspoon, John. *Lectures on Moral Philosophy* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton Univ. Press (1912).

Witherspoon, John. *The Works of Joseph Butler* (1998) https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/724374.The_Works_of_Joseph_Butler

Wikipedia On-Line: "John Witherspoon"; "Scottish Common Sense Realism"; "Scottish Enlightenment"; "Thomas Reid"; "Jonathan Edwards"; "First Great Awakening."

References:

Aquinas, Thomas (Saint). *Summa Theologica.* New York, NY: The Catholic Primer (2005).

Augustine, Aurelius (Saint). *Confessions*. New York, N.Y.: Barnes & Nobles Classics (2007).

_____. *On Grace and Free Will*. Louisville, KY: GLH Publishing (2017).

_____. *The City of God*. New York, NY: The Modern Library (1950).

Bode, Carl. *The Portable Emerson*. New York, NY: Penguin Books (1981).

Burtt, Edwin A. *The English Philosophers From Bacon To Mill*. New York, NY: The Modern Library (1967).

Butler, Joseph. *Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed, to the Constitution and Course of Nature* (1736).

Catechism of the Catholic Church (New York, NY: Doubleday, 1997).

Crapsey, Algernon Sidney. *Religion and Politics*. New York, N.Y.: Thomas Whittaker (1905).

Daniell, Timothy Tyndale. *The Lawyers: The Inns of Court: The Home of the Common Law*. New York, N.Y.: Oceana Publications, Inc. (1976).

Doe, Norman. *Christianity and Natural Law*. Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge Univ. Press. (2017).

Ford, Roderick. *Jesus Master of Law: A Juridical Science of Christianity and the Law of Equity*. Tampa, Fl.: Xlibris Pub. (2015).

Jefferson, Thomas. *Jefferson Writings*. New York, N.Y.: The Library of America (1984).

Paine, Thomas. Collected Writings. New York, N.Y.: The Library of America (1995).

Russell, Bertrand. *A History of Western Philosophy*. New York, NY: Touchstone, (2007).

Smith, Adam. *The Wealth of Nations*. New York, N.Y.: The Modern Library (1994).

Smith, Goldwin. *A History of England*. New York, N.Y.: Charles Scribner's Sons (1957).

The Federalist Papers. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc. 2014.

Warburton, William. *An Alliance of Church and State* (1736).

Witte, John, Jr. and Frank S. Alexander. *Christianity and Law: An Introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Press, 2008.

Woods, Thomas E. *How The Catholic Church Built Western Civilization*. Washington, D.C.: Regnery Publishing, Inc., 2005.