

University of North Carolina at Asheville

The Right to Mount the People's Throne:
Radical Whig Ideology and the Succession Debate in Late Seventeenth Century
England

A Senior Thesis Submitted to
The Faculty of the Department of History
In Candidacy for the Degree of
Bachelor of Arts in History

By
Kevin Shuford
1048

Asheville, North Carolina
22 April 2010

"... Women running with their Hair about their Ears, Men covered with Blood, Children sprawling under Horse's Feet, and only the Walls of Houses left standing."¹ This scene, which could easily describe a vicious battle or a brutal massacre, was in fact a warning to London of its fate should a Catholic king come to the throne of England. While to modern ears this warning may sound alarmist or even absurd, the Englishmen living in the late seventeenth century to whom it was addressed would undoubtedly have understood its significance. The issue of royal succession and the religious affiliation of royal successors were of paramount concern for the Protestant kingdom of England throughout the 1680's. It was this fear of Catholic hegemony in England that sparked the Glorious Revolution of 1689, in which a Protestant prince, although a foreigner, was given the Crown in a move to prevent a Catholic successor to the monarchy.

This heated debate over proper succession severely polarized the English political scene. On one side of the ideological struggle were the Whigs, who included radicals such as Robert Ferguson, Thomas Hunt, Samuel Johnson, and Charles Blount, the author of the startling warning to London. These men wrote passionately against the doctrines of sacred kingship and passive obedience to an absolute monarchy. Instead, these Whig apologists argued for a constitutional monarchy that was based on the consent of the people and instituted for the good of the community. In stark opposition to the Whig faction were the Tories, supporters of a divine kingship and an unalterable royal succession. The traditionalist Tories, notably the staunch royalist of the 1630's, Sir Robert Filmer, constantly attacked the emerging Whig notions of popular sovereignty and a social contract between a king and his subjects. For the Tories, a king ruled with divine authority, which made the line of succession sacred and untouchable by human hands. It was within this factious system that the theories of social contract and popular

¹ Charles Blount], *An Appeal from the Country to the City, for the Preservation of Her Majesty's Person, Liberty, Property, and the Protestant Religion* (London, 1695), Duke University, Perkins/Roscoe Library Microforms, N2377; Reel 1088, 3.

sovereignty emerged, fashioned by the polemical writings of Whig idealists like Blount, Ferguson, Hunt, and Johnson.

Although the radical Whigs of the 1680's were highly influential in their time, modern scholarship has often relegated them to historical mediocrity, particularly compared to their high-profile contemporary John Locke. While Locke's *Two Treatises of Government* is considered by most historians today to be the definitive manifesto of social contract theory and the quintessential fulfillment of seventeenth century Whig ideology, his work was not actually published until 1689. By that time, the radicals Ferguson, Blount, Johnson, and Hunt had been prolifically asserting for years what scholars now call "Lockean" ideals.³ In light of this, it seems obvious that Locke's now famous philosophy was predicated on the desperate struggles of radical Whigs who dared to publish before him. Therefore, the political history of seventeenth century England must be reexamined with Charles Blount, Robert Ferguson, and other underrepresented radicals receiving their due consideration as integral to the success of the Glorious Revolution, and subsequently all of English political history that followed from that truly revolutionary event.

With so much of modern political theory hinging on a social contract theory and notions of popular sovereignty, it is essential to understand where those ideologies have their root. Many scholars have investigated this issue, although as has already been stated, many historians tend to subsume all other political figures into the legacy of John Locke and marginalize their role in the shaping of English political thought. This practice must be corrected if a fair and accurate understanding of 17th Century political culture and the events leading to the Revolution of 1689 is to be achieved.

³ Melinda Zook, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England* (University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999), xvi.

A clear example of the disparity in the scholarly literature is the enduring critique of the radical Charles Blount by the nineteenth century British historian Lord Macaulay.³ To Macaulay, Blount was simply a man "...of some small literary talent," lacking in both intellectual and moral fortitude, who had attached himself to more prominent Whig lords.⁴ Macaulay focused his monumental history of England on men such as John Locke and Lord Shaftesbury, who he saw as the true face of radical Whig ideology. This disparaging view of Blount has colored the scant historical analysis of his work ever since, a trend that can also be seen in the scholarly treatment of many of Blount's radical contemporaries.

Yet, not all historians have followed in the path of Macaulay. The historian Melinda Zook has taken a more favorable approach to radical Whig propaganda, allowing pre-Locke radicals a more prominent place in the historical narrative. In contrast to Macaulay, Zook points out that Blount and his compatriots were members of the radical Green Ribbon Club, where they would have interacted with the most influential politicians and thinkers of their time, the majority of whom were defenders of Whig ideology in Parliament and later supporters of the Glorious Revolution.⁵ However, while Zook examined the radical Whig legacy apart from John Locke, her work replaced the overshadowing influence of Locke with that of other eminent radicals, at the expense of some underrepresented apologists. This research attempts to include Charles Blount as a highly visible and influential radical Whig who worked in tandem with Johnson, Hunt, and Ferguson to fight Catholic succession in England and preserve the natural rights of the people to define their government.

³ Thomas Macaulay, *The History of England From the Accession of James the Second*, vol. 6 (New York: A.C. Armstrong and Son, 1880), 399-410.

⁴ Macaulay, 399-400.

⁵ Zook, *Radical Wings*, 9-11.

Perhaps the most thorough of the historians to comment on the succession debate, and certainly the most inclusive of radical Whig arguments, is Howard Nenner. In his work on the royal succession, Nenner skillfully examines the major positions and contentions involved, weaving together various voices to present a full perspective of the debate.⁶ Nenner references Blount, Johnson, and the others several times in his discussion, allowing them a noticeable, albeit minor, place in the history of the time period. Melinda Zook, who wrote a detailed account of radical Whig politics in the late 1600's, is likely the most important scholar of Johnson, Hunt, Ferguson, and Blount, devoting much of her work to understanding these men.⁷ Both of these historians offer important analysis of the issues and events surrounding the succession, and their treatment of underrepresented radicals seems to be the most inclusive. Since Charles Blount seems to be the least considered of his contemporaries, the only source to treat Blount at some length is an older article by J.A. Redwood.⁸ However, even Redwood relegates Blount to political mediocrity, focusing primarily on his controversial religious beliefs.

There has also been a great deal of work done on the broader events of the 1680's in England. For a discussion of the debate over a Catholic successor, Mark Knights' *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*, is an essential source.⁹ Furthermore, prolific historian Richard Greaves provides an overarching survey of the political activities of radicals and nonconformists in England, a tradition of which Ferguson, Hunt, and the others were clearly a product.¹⁰ For an analysis of social contract theory and other applications of radical ideology, Richard Ashcraft is

⁶ Howard Nenner, *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England 1663-1714* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1995).

⁷ Zook, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics*.

⁸ J.A. Redwood, "Charles Blount (1654-93), Deism, and English Free Thought," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 25, no. 3 (1974): 490-498.

⁹ Mark Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*, Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

¹⁰ Richard Greaves, *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688-89* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992).

a recognized authority.¹¹ In addition, some quality work has been done on the 1685 rebellion of the Duke of Monmouth, an event in which radical Whigs were intimately involved. For an account and analysis of the rebellion itself, Peter Earle's work, although older scholarship, is the most useful and detailed available.¹² Furthermore, there is a very thorough article, written by Wolfram Schmidgen, on the Duke and his significance for the succession debate.¹³ There has also of course been a great deal of historical scholarship done on the events of the Glorious Revolution, notably the anthology entitled *By Force or By Default*, which uses various historical perspectives to deal with the complex issue of the Revolution.¹⁴

Despite its inconsequential representation in the secondary literature, the work of seventeenth century radicals was obviously thought-provoking and noteworthy in its own time, as evidenced by the ferocity and scope of the responses to their writing, particularly Charles Blount's.¹⁵ Therefore, in order to understand and appreciate their work, it must be placed within the political and religious tradition in which it was written. The late 1600's was a time of great change in England, beginning with the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 after the tumultuous Civil War, and culminating in the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89. Throughout the political and social upheavals, the religious identity of England played an integral role in the ensuing drama.

Since the reign of Queen Elizabeth I in the sixteenth century, Protestantism under the Church of England had been the dominant ecclesiastical force in the kingdom, with numerous penalties being levied against Catholics living and practicing their faith in England.¹⁶ The enforcement of these penal laws waxed and waned with the religious fears of the English public

¹¹ Richard Ashcraft, *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986).

¹² Peter Earle, *Monmouth's Rebels: The Road to Sedgemoor, 1685* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977).

¹³ Wolfram Schmidgen, "The Last Royal Bastard and the Multitude," *Journal of British Studies* 47 (January 2008): 53-76.

¹⁴ *By Force or By Default*, ed. Tiveline C. Rickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1989).

¹⁵ Redwood, 498.

¹⁶ John Miller, *Popery and Politics in England 1600-1688* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 52.

until anti-Catholic sentiments reached new heights of hysteria in what was known as the Popish Plot (1678-81). This supposed plot by papists (a common name for Catholics) to murder King Charles II and replace him with a Catholic monarch became so widespread that it was officially recognized as authentic and imminently dangerous by the English House of Commons in 1678.¹⁷ This anti-papist agitation spilled over into the political arena and fueled what would become a defining debate in English political history – the exclusion of the Duke of York, the king’s brother and heir apparent, from the line of succession.

Known as the Exclusion Crisis, this issue of a papist heir to the throne sparked intense debate on both sides, with most of the Whig faction, including the radicals Blount, Ferguson, Hunt, and Johnson, arguing vehemently against the Duke’s succession.¹⁸ It was amidst the debate over exclusion that the radical ideologies of seventeenth century Whigs were forged and tested. Charles Blount used his *Appeal from the Country to the City*, written during the Exclusion debate, to warn against a papist successor and instead endorse the illegitimate Duke of Monmouth as the preferred heir.¹⁹ Robert Ferguson supported Blount in his argument that the needs of the people, not proximity of blood, should determine the succession, stating emphatically that Parliament had the authority to “...put the Scepter into whose hands they please.”²⁰ Their fellow Whig Thomas Hunt wrote during the same time of a “pact” between government and the people and the necessity of a limited monarchy.²¹ And joining the radical cadre responding to the succession, Samuel Johnson assailed the doctrines of divine right of

¹⁷ *An Impartial Account of Divers Remarkable Proceedings: The Last Session of Parliament Relating to the Horrid Popish Plot* (London, 1679), Duke University, Perkins-Bostock Library Microforms, N2377: Reel 901, 2.

¹⁸ Zook, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics*.

¹⁹ [Blount], *An Appeal from the Country to the City*, 5, 32.

²⁰ [Robert Ferguson], *A Letter to a Person of Honour Concerning the Black Boy* (London, 1680), The Internet Archive, <http://ia301526.us.archive.org/2/items/lettertopersonof00ferguof/ikenopersonof00ferguoft.pdf>.

²¹ Thomas Hunt, *Mr. Hunt's Postscript for Rectifying Some Mistakes in Some of the Inferior Clergy: Mischievous to Our Government and Religion: With Two Discourses about the Succession, and Bill of Exclusion* (London, 1682), Duke University, Perkins-Bostock Library Microforms, N2377: Reel 816.

kings and passive obedience to authority as a ploy "...to make us an easier prey to the Bloody Papists."²² All of these men wrote some of their most famous works in response to the Exclusion Crisis and the prospect of a Catholic king, while John Locke watched and wrote, unwilling to engage publically in the turbulent debate.

Although the Exclusion Crisis, which saw numerous attempts by Parliament to pass a bill to debar the Duke of York from the succession,²³ was ultimately quashed by the king dissolving the Exclusion Parliaments.²⁴ Blount and his fellow radicals did not give up the fight against a Catholic successor. When Charles died in 1685, his brother James did in fact ascend to the throne, much to the chagrin of the radical Whig faction. Almost immediately, the Duke of Monmouth, the late king's bastard son in exile, returned to England to denounce James and defend the Protestant cause.²⁵ Monmouth's Rebellion was short lived, yet it provided another opportunity for Blount and his fellow Whigs to apply their radical ideology to the succession debate. By the ousting of James in the 1688 Revolution, radical Whigs had been engaged in what they saw as one continued struggle against Catholic supremacy and the hated doctrines of divine right and passive obedience, which they considered appendages to that religion.²⁶ This long fight over proper succession was predicated on and sustained by the ideals forged by Blount, Ferguson, and others during the Exclusion Crisis of earlier years.

²² Samuel Johnson, *Julian the Apostate: Being a Short Account of His Life; The Sense of the Primitive Christians about his Succession... Together with A Comparison of Pagan and Paganism* (London, 1682). Duke University, Perkins/Bostock Library Microforms, N2377: Reel 1465, 57.

²³ *An Act for Securing of the Protestant Religion by Disabling James, Duke of York, to Inherit the Imperial Crown of England...* in *English Historical Documents 1660-1714*, vol. 8, ed. Andrew Browning (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953), 113-114.

²⁴ *His Majesty's Declaration to All His Loving Subjects, touching the Causes and Reasons that Moved Him to Dissolve the Two Last Parliaments*, in *English Historical Documents 1660-1714*, vol. 8, ed. Andrew Browning (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953), 185-188.

²⁵ Gilbert Burnet, *Burnet's History of His Own Time: From the Restoration of King Charles the Second to the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne* (London, Challo and Windus, 1875), 410-414.

²⁶ Zook, xiv-xv.

In light of this intense struggle of ideology, the political works of radical Whigs take on important historical significance. With the royal succession occupying such a central place in the seventeenth century English psyche, any opinion that was as widely read as Blount's or Ferguson's must be carefully examined and placed in the context of contemporary literature. Although not as recognized or prolific as many of their fellows Whigs – high-profile lords such as the Earl of Shaftesbury, William Russell, or even the Duke of Monmouth – the radical Whig's arguments for a nonhereditary succession are striking and unique enough to warrant close attention.

Stemming from a tradition of radical Whig ideology, the first of Charles Blount's arguments on the succession debate was his *Appeal from the Country to the City*, an intensely anti-papist tract that made several important assertions. Blount, who came from a long line of politically active freethinkers and radical leaning republicans,²⁷ wrote this work in 1679, soon after the supposed Popish Plot, yet still early in the Exclusion debate. Charles Blount's *Appeal* was a jarringly urgent warning to his fellow Englishmen to "Wake...and prevent your Doom."²⁸ Like many of his fellow countrymen, Blount was appalled by the threat of a Catholic invasion, and the prospect of a papist king only exacerbated this fear. For those living in seventeenth century England, religion and politics were inseparable; therefore most people, including Blount, equated Catholicism with the liberty-abusing absolutism exemplified by the reign of the god-king Louis XIV of France, England's all-to-near neighbor.²⁹ In this sense, Blount and his contemporaries' fight against popery became inextricably tied to the notion that English subjects, unlike their French counterparts who were forced to obey the Crown blindly, enjoyed natural rights that were to be recognized and protected by their Protestant government.

²⁷ Redwood, "Charles Blount, Deism, and English Free Thought," 491.

²⁸ [Blount], *Appeal from the Country*, 4.

²⁹ Zook, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics*, xvii.

Couched within his admonition against a Catholic heir, Blount also made some striking assertions about the nature of royal succession. Rather than submit to a Catholic, whom Blount derisively named “Heretick[sic] Dogs,” he surprisingly declared that a foreign ruler, even a French conqueror, would be preferable to a papist hereditary succeeding to the throne of England.³⁶ In a statement prophetic of the Dutch prince William’s ascension to the throne in 1689, Blount asserted that a sovereign alien to the line of succession would be much more likely than an English papist to preserve the religious and civil liberties of the People.³⁷ For Blount, a Catholic heir would be a traitor to the ancient rights of all Englishmen, and thus having “...violated the Laws of Nature, in fighting against his own Subject,” that ruler would be unfit to fulfill the royal duties of the Crown.³⁸ In a view shared by many of his contemporaries, Blount believed that there was a natural balance of power between a king and the people – any act on the part of the king or the polity that upset that equilibrium placed the community in an unnatural and undesirable position. Blount’s assertions reinvigorated a debate on the nature of government and the relationship between the king and people that had been fiercely argued since the English Civil War of the 1640’s.³⁹

Blount continued his discourse on the dangers of a Catholic successor by offering an alternative, namely the legitimization of the Protestant bastard James, Duke of Monmouth. Although Blount hailed Monmouth as a paragon of Protestant virtue, the essence of his justification for the Duke’s right to the throne was that “...his Life and Fortune depends upon the same Bottom with yours [the common man].”⁴⁰ In other words, Monmouth would have been much more inclined to protect the interests of the people, because rather than the benefit of

³⁶ [Blount], *Appeal from the Country*, 8.

³⁷ [Blount], *Appeal from the Country*, 8.

³⁸ *Ibid.*

³⁹ Knights, *Politics and Opinion in Crisis*, 243.

⁴⁰ [Blount], *Appeal from the Country*, 37.

hereditary proximity to the Crown, he had only the support of popular consent to keep him on the throne. His truly revolutionary position was a marked divergence from the traditional structures of sacred kingship, and yet it was also much more extreme than many of the other Whigs of the time, making Blount a unique voice in the heated succession debate.

However, Blount was not fully satisfied with just proposing a nonhereditary king, further solidifying the hatred of divine right advocates. Blount went so far as to proclaim that a king with less familial right to the throne was in fact superior to a strict hereditary successor: "And remember the old Rule is, *He who hath the worst Title, ever makes the best King*, as being constrained by a gracious Government, to supply what he wants in Title..."³⁵ Blount was proposing a radical shift in the political paradigm of the time. In defiance of those who held that kings were given their authority by God alone, Blount argued that ascension to the English throne should be based on the needs of the people, thus making the succession pliable to human forces. In contrast to a divine king, Blount proposed that "...instead of God *and my right*, his [the king's] Motto may be, *God and my People*."³⁶ Blount used his support of Monmouth to break with the tradition of sacred kingship he believed was so indicative of absolutist doctrine, and to lend his hand to the creation of a revolutionary culture that ultimately raised a foreigner to the throne, at the expense of the hereditary line of succession.

It is important to note, however, that in his *Appeal from the Country to the City*, Blount was not breaking with the ecclesiastical doctrines of his faith, simply their application to temporal situations. Although Blount did hold very unorthodox religious beliefs, his attack on the divine ordination of kings was not an attack on the sovereignty of God, or the importance of providence in human affairs. Rather, just as many other Whigs of the same period, Blount was

³⁵ [Blount], *Appeal from the Country*, 32.

³⁶ *Ibid.*

saying that God ordained government but left the exercise of that institution in the hands of humans. The divine was not removed by Blount as the originator of all good government, yet as the historian Howard Nenner observed, “Because God was solicited to explain everything, in the end he explained nothing.”³⁷ Blount was not so bold as to contend that God did not play an integral role in government, but he did draw a distinction between the institution of government and its practical workings in English society.

Charles Blount was not alone in his critique of divine kingship and the doctrine of passive obedience on which it depended. Samuel Johnson was an Anglican clergyman and a radical Whig who wrote forcefully on the issue of succession and the nature of royal authority.³⁸ In one of his most widely read and criticized works, *Julian the Apostate*, Johnson used the example of the heretical Roman emperor Julian, who succeeded to the Imperial throne of the Christian empire a pagan, as a parallel for the problem of the Duke of York in his own time.³⁹ Written in high Whig style, *Julian the Apostate* sought to assure seventeenth century Christians that their faith was not a means to deprive them of their natural rights, meaning that a king, be he divinely ordained or not, could not use Christian authority to require his subjects to give up their rights in the course of obedience.⁴⁰ Johnson’s argument required that allegiance to authority of any kind be predicated on the human laws that protected the fundamental rights of the people. Any demand to obey that ignored or even broke a law, was so far from Christian dutifulness to God that Johnson likened it to the total subservience required of the heretical Islamic faith.⁴¹

Johnson shared Blount’s distaste for the absolutist’s unquestioning obedience to a divine monarch, and like Blount he placed kingly authority in the hands of human forces. Citing the

³⁷ Nenner, *The Right to be King*, 1-12.

³⁸ Yook, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics*, 56-57.

³⁹ Johnson, *Julian the Apostate*.

⁴⁰ Johnson, *Julian the Apostate*, 59.

⁴¹ Johnson, *Julian the Apostate*, vi.

early Christian bishop Eusebius, Johnson argued that a king ruled by the “Edict of Nature,” which he considered to be an expression of divine will and therefore a true Christian model of government.⁴² Johnson found the idea of a sacred king to be so absurd, he mocked its proponents, saying, “...I know not what measure of Divine Right will serve...unless they would have a Crown to drop from the Clouds.”⁴³ Both Johnson and Blount saw divine right and passive obedience to be debilitating diseases for the natural rights of mankind. If the king’s prerogative was, as Johnson phrased, a “...boundless, bottomless Pit of Arbitrary power...” then there was no recourse but to obey – the defense of individual liberties became irrelevant next to such an omnipotent will.⁴⁴ However, Johnson asserted that this was certainly not the case in England. Like Blount and many other Whigs, he cited numerous examples from history to prove that the English people had long reserved the right to define their government. Rather than an all-powerful monarchy, the authority of the English Crown was “...limited, stated, and certain.”⁴⁵ Samuel Johnson, like Blount, saw the English government as an expression of the people’s will, not an arbitrary power in opposition to it.

Another notable Whig to advocate the same ideals as Blount during the Exclusion Crisis was Thomas Hunt, a royalist who became disenchanted with James and eventually wrote powerful and widely read tracts on social contract and popular sovereignty.⁴⁶ Perhaps his most famous work was his *Postscript*, in which he synthesized the major themes of Whig ideology into one cry against absolutism and a Catholic king.⁴⁷ Just as Blount had done in his *Appeal from the Country to the City*, Thomas Hunt argued that since the throne was given to a king by the

⁴² Johnson, *Julian the Apostate*, 13-14.

⁴³ Johnson, 14.

⁴⁴ Johnson, *Julian the Apostate*, 44, 52.

⁴⁵ Johnson, 52.

⁴⁶ Zook, 41-42.

⁴⁷ Hunt, *Postscript*.

consent of the people, they could gift the Crown to any person they wished, regardless of birthright.⁴⁸ Therefore, the succession to the English monarchy was unequivocally commanded by the "...express limitation of the People in their conferring the Royal Dignity."⁴⁹ And as Blount had also written, Hunt asserted that even an "alien born" prince would be preferable to a papist king.⁵⁰ Hunt saw the birthright of a prince as irrelevant in comparison to the will and needs of the people. Any ruler, hereditary, foreign, or otherwise, was both legal and fitting if the people decided to invest them with royal authority over the kingdom.

In order to better understand the importance of these nascent Whig arguments, it is necessary to understand the ideologies to which they were diametrically opposed. One of the foremost proponents of sacred kingship was Sir Robert Filmer, whose writing was so abhorrent to Blount and his contemporaries, many of them, including John Locke in his now famous *Two Treatises of Government*, wrote extensively in direct refutation of his work.⁵¹ Filmer's most influential tract was *Patriarcha*, an ardent defense of an absolutely supreme, divinely ordained, kingship.⁵² In this treatise, written in the 1630's but left unpublished until it was utilized by the Tories as ammunition against the Whigs in the 1680's, Filmer dismissed the growing emphasis on individual liberties as unnatural, maintaining that the greatest liberty any people needed was a strong monarchy to rule them.⁵³ For Filmer, all other freedoms were simply "...several degrees of slavery..." in disguise.⁵⁴ Filmer also used his *Patriarcha* to assault the radical ideology of a social contract between the king and people. In words infuriating to Blount and others who

⁴⁸ Hunt, 200-201

⁴⁹ Hunt, 200.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ Zook, 18-49.

⁵² Robert Filmer, *Patriarcha: The Natural Power of Kings Defended against the Unnatural Liberty of the People. By Arguments Theological, Rational, Historical, Legall*, in *Patriarcha and Other Writings*, ed. Johann Sommerville, Cambridge Texts in the History of Political Thought (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

⁵³ Filmer, xxxii.

⁵⁴ Filmer, 4.

idealized the People's role in government, Filmer declared them to be a "multitude" of "ill judges," when it came to determining the succession.⁵⁵ Unlike the Whig polemicists, Filmer regarded the people as irresponsible and unfit to define the government of such a kingdom as England.

Filmer also assailed the legitimacy and importance of representative government in his *Patriarcha*, where he argued that Parliament, far from being the outlet for the People's will that the Whigs portrayed it to be, was in fact nothing more than the king's "court," an extension of the Royal Prerogative with little or no autonomy.⁵⁶ This argument was anathema to Blount and his fellow Whigs, as their debate over the exclusion of James, Duke of York was dependent on the free powers and authority of Parliament and the people to alter the succession.⁵⁷ Robert Filmer further contended another fundamental tenet of Whig philosophy, that the Great Charter (*Magna Carta*) was the ancient source of all English liberties and imbued the People with civil and legislative power.⁵⁸ Instead of a fountain of liberty, Filmer argued that the medieval document was nothing more than a gracious concession of the Crown, the result of an absolute sovereign deigning to include the people in his government.⁵⁹ This issue was of paramount importance to the succession debate, as the relative powers of both king and subjects determined whether Parliament could in fact bar the hereditary heir from ascending the throne.

Therefore, in the context of a response to Filmerian dogma, Whig ideology took on the hue of a desperate struggle to win the minds and hearts of the English people. If the subjects of the Crown were to be obedient to their prince, regardless of his religion, than the anti-papist

⁵⁵ Filmer, 32-33.

⁵⁶ Filmer, 57.

⁵⁷ Zook, 83.

⁵⁸ [Robert Ferguson], *A Brief Justification of the Proceedings of Orange's Descent Into England and of the Kingdom's Late Recourse to Arms, with a Modest Disquisition of what may become the Wisdom and Justice of the Ensuing Convention in their Disposal of the Crown* (London, 1689), The Internet Archive, <http://www.archive.org/details/briefjustificati00fergunft>.

⁵⁹ Filmer, 57-58.

Exclusion movement was sinful treason. By the same token, if the monarchy was in fact infringing on the natural, God-given rights of the People, then they had a duty to defend their ebbing freedom. Radical Whigs such as Charles Blount and Thomas Hunt based their lives and writings on the assumption that the People and their Parliament were entitled to fundamental authority over government – without this prerogative firmly established there could be no legal opposition to hereditary succession.⁶⁰

Yet, in Thomas Hunt's mind, the validity of Parliamentary power was obvious and unchangeable. Using language purposefully similar to Filmerian doctrine, Hunt insisted that in fulfilling its proper duty, the "...preservation of the Community and Polity," Parliament enjoyed "unrestrained and unlimited" power.⁶¹ Hunt used absolutist dogma to argue that the people, being assembled in Parliament, had supreme, divine authority to enact and preserve all aspects of government. Just as Blount's *Appeal from the Country to the City* had highlighted the importance of participatory government, Hunt's *Postscript* placed the mantle of power squarely on the shoulders of Parliament, and subsequently the people, for the effective administration of the kingdom. Noticeably absent from this model was the Royal Prerogative; the king was in no way necessary to the preservation of the people's liberties. As Hunt wrote, "...the Polity is not destroyed if there be no king," a clear assertion that the monarchy depended on the people for its purpose and existence, but not vice versa.⁶²

However, despite the best efforts of radical Whigs, the Parliamentary fight for exclusion ended in failure – James did in fact succeed his brother on the throne in 1685, to the horror of Blount and his fellow exclusionists. However, the Whig faction was not willing to submit to a papist so easily, especially when they had a Protestant alternative in the Duke of Monmouth.

⁶⁰ Nenner, 120-146.

⁶¹ Hunt, 132.

⁶² Hunt, 43.

During the Exclusion Crisis, most radical Whigs sought to prove that the king had actually married his mistress, Monmouth's mother, thereby making the Duke a legal alternative to the papist brother.⁶³ Yet by the time of James' ascension, Whigs were content to support Monmouth simply for his Protestant orthodoxy. Issues of legality bordered on the irrelevant when the imminent threat of papist supremacy became a very near reality. Whig polemicists turned to Monmouth, a prince wildly popular with the people,⁶⁴ as a rallying point for anti-Catholic dissent, and in doing so provided yet another opportunity for radicals like Blount, Johnson, and Hunt to assert their controversial ideals.

It is unclear to what extent Monmouth was the impetus for his own rebellion, particularly since upon his defeat he wrote pleading letters to King James and the Queen, assuring them that he had been duped by some "horrid people" to revolt against the Crown.⁶⁵ Those contrivers of whom he spoke were almost certainly the radical Whigs who used their ideological power to back his rebellion against the King. Regardless of the Duke's intentions, his insurgency gave rise to some of the clearest expressions of the radical precepts that grew out of the Exclusion movement. Among the most influential Whig supporters of Monmouth was Robert Ferguson, a prolific writer and organizer known as "the Plotter."⁶⁶ Ferguson was a Scottish cleric in the service of the Whig parliamentarian Lord Shaftesbury, which caused him to be under constant suspicion of conspiracy by the government.⁶⁷ And, it was Ferguson who penned the assertive

⁶³ [Ferguson], *A Letter to a Person of Honour*, 2-3.

⁶⁴ *A True Narrative of the Duke of Monmouth's Late Journey into the West: In a Letter from an Eyewitness Thereof to his Correspondence in London*, Duke University, Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library, A-19 Pam 1866.

⁶⁵ George Duckett, ed., *Original Letters of the Duke of Monmouth, in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Camden Society, 1897), accessed on The Internet Archive, <http://www.archive.org/details/originalletters00monmouth>, 4.

⁶⁶ Zook, 94.

⁶⁷ Greaves, *Secrets of the Kingdom*, 19.

1685 declaration of Monmouth, in which he outlined the Duke's reasons for rebellion and placed the blame on the papist James for all of England's ills.⁶⁸

Robert Ferguson, used the Whig ideology that had been developing since the Exclusion Crisis as justification for Monmouth's rebellion against a papist king. In addition to railing at James as a "...Popish Usurper of the Crown; a Traytor[sic] to the Nation; and Tyrant over the People," Ferguson also accused him of breaking the contract he forged with the community upon coronation.⁶⁹ As justification for rebellion, Ferguson asserted that James was a pretender to the throne, since he had spurned the laws of the kingdom with his blatant Catholicism. In this respect, Monmouth's rebellion was seen by his Whig supports, not as an insurrection, but as a Protestant rescue of a hostage crown.⁷⁰ Ferguson viewed James, Duke of York as a papist conspirator against the natural rights of the people, a despot bent on replacing England's limited Protestant monarchy with an absolutist tyranny.⁷¹ It was essential to the Whig cause to solidify this view of James in the people's minds, as the validity of the rebellion depended on popular support for Monmouth and fear of a papist takeover.

Furthermore, Ferguson believed that James had forgotten the very reason he had initially been invested with the royal right. In contrast to Blount's ideal of a prince who ruled for God and the people, James had neglected the prosperity of the community and disregarded their religious and civil rights.⁷² This apparent neglect on the part of James was also cited again in support of Monmouth, this time when the Duke finally declared himself to be the "son and heir apparent" to

⁶⁸ [Robert Ferguson], *The Declaration of James Duke of Monmouth . . . for Delivering the Kingdom from the Usurpation and Tyranny of James Duke of York* (London, 1685), Duke University, Perkins/Bostock Library Microformus, N2377; Reel 769.

⁶⁹ [Ferguson], *The Declaration of James Duke of Monmouth*, 4.

⁷⁰ [Ferguson], *The Declaration of James Duke of Monmouth*, 2-3.

⁷¹ [Ferguson], *The Declaration of James Duke of Monmouth*, 2.

⁷² [Ferguson], *The Declaration of James Duke of Monmouth*, 1.

the late King Charles.⁷³ Whereas the Duke of York had abused his kingly authority, Monmouth proclaimed that he desired the throne to preserve the Protestant kingdom and ensure the "...retief, ease, and safety of our people."⁷⁴ If Monmouth had indeed been cajoled into rebelling as he later claimed to King James, it seems evident that the coercive mechanism was the political dogma of the Whigs.

When Monmouth promised to defend the will of the polity in his proclamation, Blount's enthusiastic endorsement of him a few years earlier was likely seen as validated. Many supporters of Monmouth were sure to have recalled Blount's assurance that "He who hath the worst Title, ever makes the best King," a statement that perhaps took on added significance when the Whig's paragon of virtue recognized the authority of the People and submitted to their collective will. Despite its eventual failure, Monmouth's Rebellion illustrated the intense hopes and fears of the seventeenth century English people, as well as the persuasive power of ideology in shaping religious and political culture.

The anti-Catholic fears and exclusionary politics of the first half of the 1680's had a continuing influence even after the failed rebellion of Monmouth and the ascension of King James in 1685. As the scholar Melinda Zook contends, the ideological framework created by radical Whigs like Blount, Hunt, and Ferguson, was instrumental in the creation of a "revolution culture," that made the events of 1688-89 more coherent and justifiable in the English mind.⁷⁵ Public anger towards James had been smoldering since the Exclusion Crisis, and this radical culture gave many people an outlet for their dissent. Despite broad parliamentary support and a

⁷³ *Proclamation of the duke of Monmouth on taking the title of king, 1685*, in *English Historical Documents 1660-1713*, vol. 8, ed. Andrew Browning (New York: Oxford University Press, 1953), 119.

⁷⁴ *Proclamation of the duke of Monmouth*, 120.

⁷⁵ Zook, *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics*, 93.

hopeful spirit of change early in his reign, the new King James' pro-Catholic policies later in his short reign further exacerbated popular unrest in England.⁷⁶

One intimate of the events leading to the Revolution was the diarist John Evelyn, who recorded his dismay at seeing a papist mass performed in the government palace of Whitehall during James' reign. Aghast at what he deemed wanton sinfulness, Evelyn left the ceremony pleading with God for mercy on the English nation.⁷⁷ The famed diarist, and almost certainly the rest of the kingdom, were further appalled and scandalized when James met and even dined with a Papal envoy. Evelyn was shocked that the king would publically, much less jovially, associate with the very representative of the "Antichrist," a common appellation for the hated Catholic Pope.⁷⁸ Whether rebellion against a prince was justified or not, James was certainly not winning any supporters among the radicals with his papist policies; as a result, anti-Catholic fear among desperate Protestants reached its peak in the late 1680's and inevitably transformed into revolutionary political action.

Although James' religious convictions were egregious enough for the Whigs and their supporters, the ultimate offense against the English people was the controversy over the birth of James's son, the Prince of Wales. With the news of the Prince's birth in 1688, English Protestants suddenly began to fear the creation of a Catholic dynasty following James' reign, a prospect that reopened the old wounds of the Exclusion Crisis and Monmouth's Rebellion.⁷⁹ In response, Whig pamphleteers immediately questioned the suspicious events of the birth and the validity of the heir, citing indications of illegitimacy ranging from the intense secrecy surrounding the labor to the conspicuous evidence that the Queen was still menstruating during

⁷⁶ John Miller, *James II*, Yale English Monarchs Series (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000), 120, 136.

⁷⁷ John Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, vol. A, *Kalendarium, 1673-1689*, ed. E.S. de Beer (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955), 534-535.

⁷⁸ Evelyn, 562-563.

⁷⁹ Noyes, *The Right to be King*, 152.

her pregnancy.⁸⁰ As the events of the Exclusion Crisis and the 1685 Rebellion illustrated, many of the English people, armed with the rhetoric of Whig ideology, were jealous for their right to define the succession. Thus, any perceived threat to that prerogative, such as a counterfeit heir, was considered to be yet another vile plot by the papists to subvert the Protestant religion.⁸¹

Interestingly, Charles Blount was among the Whig polemicists to question the authenticity of the birth of the Prince of Wales. Far from the inconsequential scribbler we inherit from Macaulay, Blount was once again heard in the midst of a national debate. In his discourse on the rights of William and Mary to rule England, Blount argued, among other things, that a Catholic heir was essential to the papist's design to hold the throne, as without a male heir the next in line for the throne was James' Protestant daughter Mary and her husband, the Prince of Orange.⁸² If indeed James was involved in a Catholic conspiracy to present a false heir, and for Blount there was no question of this, then he had clearly broken his contract with the people. What little trust many Englishmen had in James was likely finally evaporated by his supposed assault on the right of the English people to choose their government. As James' now meager support began to crumble, religious desperation and long-standing dissatisfaction culminated in the polity once again demanding an escape from the confines of hereditary succession. Harkening back to Blount's assertion that even a foreign conqueror would be preferable to a papist successor,⁸³ the English did in fact invite an alien prince, member of the royal family by marriage only, to ascend the throne of the kingdom. And, as Blount would later declare, that

⁸⁰ *An Account of the Pretended Prince of Wales and Other Circumstances that occasioned the Nobilities Inviting, and the Prince of Orange's Coming into England...*, (1688), Duke University, Perkins-Bostock Library Microforms, N2377: Reel 2, 10-13.

⁸¹ *An Account of the Pretended Prince*, 8.

⁸² [Charles Blount], *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors. or, A Discourse Endeavoring to prove that Their Majesties have on Their Side, against the Late King, the Principle Reasons that make Conquest a Good Title...*, (London, 1693), Duke University, Perkins-Bostock Library Microforms, N2377: Reel 375, 7-11.

⁸³ [Blount], *Appeal from the Country to the City*, 8.

foreigner came as a righteous conqueror to free the Protestant people from their unnatural servitude to a Catholic despot.

Robert Ferguson, the Whig “Plotter” who had been so instrumental in Monmouth’s insurrection, was one of the foremost supporters of the Prince of Orange assuming the Crown of England. His *Brief Justification* was a highly influential tract that almost certainly shaped the decisions of the Convention Parliament that approved the ascension of William and Mary as joint monarchs in 1689. In historian Melinda Zook’s analysis of Ferguson, she identified him as a master weaver of Whig ideology, so much so that, had the Conventioneers read only his *Brief Justification*, they would have found a synthesis of all major radical thought, from Hunt and Johnson to others like Charles Blount, since the time of the Exclusion Crisis.⁸⁴ Parliament had a difficult task in 1689, as the country and government were still unsure of whether James had abdicated his throne when he fled the country before William’s arrival. Furthermore, the issue of whether William was a conqueror or a rescuer determined for many Englishmen if he ruled as king *de facto* or *de jure*, by right of expediency or legality.⁸⁵ Once again, the polemical writings of Whig ideologues provided a framework which Parliament could use to assert its rights in English government.

Robert Ferguson used his *Brief Justification* as a reminder to the people of the ideological battles that had lead to the Glorious Revolution, which he saw as the culmination of Whig struggle against an absolutist, Catholic hegemony in England. Markening back to Blount, Hunt, Johnson, and other notable radicals, Ferguson reasserted the gamut of Whig political thought, from social contract theory to the natural rights of the People to invest sovereigns with

⁸⁴ Zook, 155.

⁸⁵ Nenner, 184-185.

authority.⁸⁶ In addition to praising William as the epitome of a benevolent sovereign, Ferguson asserted the Prince's right to the throne on the foundation that James had broken his legal contract with the community when he ruled as a Catholic king in a Protestant nation, a clear affront to the dignity of the English people who had imbued him with power.⁸⁷ Taking a mocking tone so characteristic of his work, Ferguson scolded that the only reason James was not already a Catholic monk was that he could do much more damage to the Protestant cause as a king.⁸⁸ Using the same anti-papist arguments of the early 1680's, Ferguson cited James' apostasy as the chief cause of his failure to uphold his obligation to the social contract.

Because Ferguson argued that the prerogative of the king rested on the consent of the people, he believed it was obvious that James had lost all authority and right to rule when he broke the social contract and infringed on the fundamental liberties of the people. As a result, Ferguson professed that the control of government reverted back to the polity when an unjust ruler refused to assent to the public good, returning the people to their "sacred and inviolable" ancient freedoms.⁸⁹ In a blatant attack on the Filmerian claim that the *Magna Carta* was simply an allowance of the Crown, Ferguson identified the document as the source of all Englishmen's liberties: "...the Great Charter, in and by which our Rights stand secured, sworn, and Entailed unto us...[was] not the Grant and Concession of our Prince, but Recognitions of what we had reserved unto ourselves in the Original Institution of our Government..."⁹⁰ With this definitive statement, Ferguson placed the power over government firmly in the hands of the people, thereby authorizing Parliament to act with full discretion regarding the succession crisis at hand.

⁸⁶ [Ferguson], *Brief Justification of the Prince of Orange's Descent*.

⁸⁷ [Ferguson], *Brief Justification*, 19.

⁸⁸ [Ferguson], *Brief Justification*, 18.

⁸⁹ [Ferguson], *Brief Justification*, 9.

⁹⁰ [Ferguson], *Brief Justification*, 13.

Continuing with his argument that James, having disqualified himself to rule, had abdicated the throne with his flight from the kingdom, and having shown that the people had the right to chose a new ruler after they broke with an unjust king, Ferguson believed the consequence of his argument to be supremely logical – the body politic had every right to invest William with the royal power that naturally stemmed from popular consent.⁹¹ While in hindsight Ferguson may have been naïve about the virtue and intentions of William (he later rebelled against the king and threw his support behind the deposed James),⁹² in the revolutionary culture of 1688 he saw the Prince of Orange as the only remedy for the woes inflicted on England by the late king. In a view he shared with many of his fellow Whigs, Ferguson believed that the Prince would restore the ancient right of the People and bring king and subject back into their natural balance of power.⁹³ Just as he had done in supporting the Duke of Monmouth a few years earlier, Ferguson argued for the legitimacy of William and Mary using now established Whig principles, the same ideology that had sought to exclude James as Duke of York from the succession, and had supported Monmouth in his abortive bid for the Crown.

Joining Ferguson in his vindication of William and Mary, Charles Blount sought to legitimate the reign of the two sovereigns in his 1693 tract, *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*. Written in response to some subjects who had refused to swear allegiance to the new king, Blount sought to show that William had justly conquered the unjust James and therefore had a shining title to the throne, regardless of hereditary proximity.⁹⁴ Like Blount's other works, this tract was highly controversial, even among many Williamite Whigs in the new

⁹¹ [Ferguson], *Brief Justification*, 36.

⁹² Zook, 156.

⁹³ [Ferguson], *Brief Justification*, 37.

⁹⁴ [Blount], *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*, 4.

government. In addition to a flurry of angry responses to the work, Blount's *King William and Queen Mary* was ordered by Parliament to be publically burnt soon after its printing.⁹⁵

Despite its unpopularity, Blount's 1693 work was a continuation of his argument for the benefits of a nonhereditary succession, first forged in the fires of the Exclusion Crisis, and therefore was an important component of his unique perspective on the structure of the monarchy. Just as he had in his *Appeal from the Country to the City*, Blount wrote during William's reign of the right to the throne being governed by popular need, rather than hereditary requirements. Because the majority of the people had consented to the rule of William and Mary after their conquest of the recusant James, Blount argued that no other claim to the Crown was needed, and all dissenters should support William and Mary as conquering saviors of the kingdom.⁹⁶

However, Blount was careful to point out that William had only conquered the despot James, who had sought to debar him from his claim to the people's consent; William's so called invasion of the kingdom was an assault on another Prince, not on the rights and liberties of the people.⁹⁷ As Blount effused, "...[William] was our Champion and Deliverer. He conquered nothing but our Hearts."⁹⁸ Reminiscent of his resounding endorsement of the illegitimate Duke of Monmouth, Blount's *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors* sought to portray the new sovereigns as worthy Protestant alternatives to the much-hated prospect of a Catholic dynasty in England.

⁹⁵ *An Account of Mr. Blounts late Book, Entituled King William and Queen Mary Conquerors, Ordered by the House of Commons, to be Burnt...*, (London, 1693). Appalachian State University Microfilm Collection: Boone, North Carolina, SIC II, Unit 43, Reel 1273.

⁹⁶ [Blount], *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*, 3.

⁹⁷ [Blount], *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*, 31.

⁹⁸ [Blount], *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*, 33.

In response to the nonconformists who maintained that William and Mary were *de facto* monarchs only, Blount assured them once again that the legitimacy of kings was rooted in the needs of the people. As he so confidently asserted, "...if it [the Revolution] was necessary, then it was lawful."⁹⁹ For Blount there was no question that William and Mary were the true rulers of England; unlike King James II, they were defenders of the Protestant faith and had affirmed the ancient liberties of the English people. Relying on the foundational Whig tenet that the protection of the Community was the primary duty of the king, Blount reassured dissenters that it was just and necessary to transfer allegiance to a sovereign who could defend the People's rights, should the old king fail or be unable to do so.¹⁰⁰ And, as James had fled the country and therefore abdicated his throne, it was only natural in Blount's mind to consent to obey the new sovereigns, "...our glorious Deliverers."¹⁰¹ Although Blount received no thanks from King William III for his strong support, the parallels between Blount's ideology and the events of the Glorious Revolution may have been justification enough for his work.

The seventeenth century for England was a long story of political and religious upheavals, but the tension between royalists and radicals, Catholics and Protestants, reached its zenith in the war of ideology fought during the 1680's. Beginning with the Parliamentary effort of the late 1670's to bar a papist heir from succeeding to the throne of England, and culminating in the Glorious Revolution against a Catholic king in 1688-89, religious conflict during this time created a stage for a political drama to unfold. Among the Whig party, those in favor of excluding a Catholic heir, radical apologists emerged to mold the debate over proper succession into a new ideological framework. Whigs such as Robert Ferguson, Charles Blount, Samuel

⁹⁹ [Blount], *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*, 21.

¹⁰⁰ [Blount], *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*, 41.

¹⁰¹ [Blount], *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors*, 53.

Johnson, and Thomas Hunt used the exclusion debate to develop and test their nascent theories of a contract between king and people, and the fundamental right of popular sovereignty in the English polity.

The 1680's were truly a revolutionary time in English history as radical Whigs utilized new ideological power and anti-papist paranoia to dismantle the power of sacred kingship in English society. This assault on traditional political and religious paradigms eventually resulted in the Glorious Revolution, a marked departure from strict hereditary succession. As the astute diarist John Evelyn quipped in 1689, "...it looks like a Revolution."¹⁰² And so it was, for the radical ideology of the pre-Locke Whigs had succeeded in creating a revolutionary culture that challenged the established order of absolute obedience to a divine king. Without the influential work of Blount, Ferguson, Hunt, and Johnson to redefine the nature of government in England, the events of the Glorious Revolution would likely have never been possible in the political culture of seventeenth century England.

¹⁰² Evelyn, *The Diary of John Evelyn*, 609.

Bibliography

Primary

A True Narrative of the Duke of Monmouth's Late Journey Into the West: In a Letter from an Eyewitness Thereof, to His Correspondence in London. Duke University, Rare Book, Manuscript, and Special Collections Library. A-19 Pam T866.

An Account of Mr. Blounts late Book, Entituled, King William and Queen Mary Conquerors. Ordered By the House of Commons, to be Burnt by the hand of the common Hangman on Wednesday Morning next, at Ten of the Clock, in the Palace-Yard Westminster. (London, 1693). Appalachian State University Microfilm Collection; Boone, North Carolina. SIC II. Unit 43: Reel 1273.

An Account of the Pretended Prince of Wales and Other Grievances that Occasioned the Nobilities Inviting the Prince of Orange's Coming Into England: To which is added, a short Account of the Murder of the Earl of Essex. Clearing his Lordship from the malicious Slander of Murdering himself. (1688). Duke University, Perkins/Bostock Library Microforms. N2377: Reel 2.

An Act for Securing of the Protestant Religion by Disabling James, Duke of York, to Inherit the Imperial Crown of England and Ireland and the Dominions and Territories Thereunto Belonging. In *English Historical Documents 1660-1714*. Vol. 8. Edited by Andrew Browning. 113-114. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.

An Impartial Account of Divers Remarkable Proceedings: The Last Session of Parliament Relating to the Horrid Popish Plot. (London, 1679). Duke University, Perkins/Bostock Library Microforms. N2377. Reel 901.

[Blount, Charles]. *An Appeal from the Country to the City, for the Preservation of His Majesty's Person Liberty, Property, and the Protestant Religion* (London, 1695). Duke University, Perkins/Bostock Library Microforms. N2377. Reel 1088.

---. *King William and Queen Mary Conquerors: or, A Discourse Endeavoring to prove that Their Majesties have on Their Side, against the Late King, the Principle Reasons that make Conquest a Good Title: Shewing also how this is consistent with that Declaration of Parliament, King James Abdicated the Government, etc.* (London, 1693). Duke University, Perkins/Bostock Library Microforms. N2377: Reel 375.

Burnet, Gilbert. *Burnet's History of His Own Time: From the Restoration of King Charles the Second to the Treaty of Peace at Utrecht, in the Reign of Queen Anne.* London: Chatto and Windus, 1875.

Duckett, George, ed. *Original Letters of the Duke of Monmouth, in the Bodleian Library.* Oxford: Camden Society Press, 1897. At The Internet Archive, <http://www.archive.org/details/originalletterso00monmrich>.

Evelyn, John. *The Diary of John Evelyn*. Vol. 4, *Kalendarium, 1673-1689*, edited by E.S. de Beer. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1955.

[Ferguson, Robert]. *A Brief Justification of the Prince of Orange's Descent Into England and of the Kingdom's Late Recourse to Arm with a Modest Disquisition of What May Become the Wisdom and Justice of the Ensuing Convention in Their Disposal of the Crown*. (London, 1689). At The Internet Archive. <http://www.archive.org/details/briefjustificati00ferguoft>.

---. *The Declaration of James Duke of Monmouth & The Noblemen, Gentlemen & others, now in Arms, for the defense and vindication of the Protestant Religion & the Law, Right, and Privileges of England, from the Invasion made upon them: & for Delivering the Kingdoms from the Usurpation and Tyranny of James Duke of York*. (London, 1685). Duke University. Perkins/Bostock Library Microforms. N2377. Reel 769.

---. *A Letter to a Person of Honour Concerning the Black Box*. (London, 1680). At The Internet Archive. <http://www.archive.org/details/lettertopersonof00ferguoft>.

Filmer, Robert. *Patriarcha: The Naturall Power of Kinges Defended against the Unnatural Liberty of the People. By Arguments Theological, Rational, Historical, Legall*. In *Patriarcha and Other Writings*, edited by Johann Sommerville. Cambridge Text in the History of Political Thought. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

His Majesty's Declaration to All His Loving Subjects, Touching the Causes and Reasons That Moved Him to Dissolve the Two Last Parliaments. In *English Historical Documents 1660-1714*, Vol. 8. Edited by Andrew Browning. 185-188. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Hunt, Thomas. *Mr. Hunt's Postscript For Rectifying Some Mistakes in Some of the Inferior Clergy, Mischievous to Our Government and Religion: With Two Discourses about the Succession, and the Bill of Exclusion*. (London, 1682). Duke University. Perkins/Bostock Library Microforms. N2377. Reel 816.

Johnson, Samuel. *Julian the Apostate: Being a Short Account of His Life; The Sense of the Primitive Christians about his Succession; And their Behavior towards him, Together with A Comparison of Popery and Paganism*. (London, 1682). Duke University. Perkins/Bostock Library Microforms. N2377. Reel 1465.

Proclamation of the duke of Monmouth on taking the title of king, 1685. In *English Historical Documents 1660-1714*, Vol. 8. Edited by Andrew Browning. 119-120. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.

Secondary

- Ashcraft, Richard. *Revolutionary Politics and Locke's Two Treatises of Government*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1986.
- Cruikshanks, Eycline, ed. *By Force of By Default? The Revolution of 1688-1689*. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1989.
- Earle, Peter. *Monmouth's Rebels: The Road to Sedgemoor, 1685*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977.
- Greaves, Richard. *Secrets of the Kingdom: British Radicals from the Popish Plot to the Revolution of 1688-1689*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992.
- Knights, Mark. *Politics and Opinion in Crisis, 1678-81*. Cambridge Studies in Early Modern British History. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Macaulay, Thomas. *The History of England From the Ascension of James the Second*. Vol. 6. New York: A.C. Armstrong and Son Publishers, 1880.
- Miller, John. *James II*. Yale English Monarchs Series. New Haven, Ct: Yale University Press, 2000.
- . *Popery and Politics in England 1660-1688*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Nenner, Howard. *The Right to be King: The Succession to the Crown of England 1603-1714*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1995.
- Redwood, J.A. "Charles Blount (1654-93), Deism, and English Free Thought." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 35, no. 3 (1974): 490-498. *JSTOR*. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2708796>.
- Schmidgen, Wolfram. "The Last Royal Bastard and the Multitude." *Journal of British Studies* 47 (2008): 53-76.
- Zook, Melinda. *Radical Whigs and Conspiratorial Politics in Late Stuart England*. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1999.