

Pere says that his beloved A.H. will not defend Mr. Humes history when she is better acquainted with it & will heartily detest him as a Philosopher. What is called his history is allowed to be an apology for the family of the Stuarts & written for that purpose only. The great deceit in his book is that he does not distinguish between the constitution & administration & so supposes that whatever is done by the most wicked Kings or Ministers is constitution. The falsity of this is evident. It is certain that most of the Kings before the Stuarts were as tyrannical as they but you who have read Robertson will easily account for their being so. When the King acted contrary to Law the People being little more than Vassals were not able to oppose him & the Barons supported him for the sake of supporting their own Tyranny, but when he quarrell'd with any of the powerful Barons they pointed out his Arbitrary proceedings & opposed him with Arms & between them the People were constantly oppressed for the Barons no more consider'd their good than the Kings did. Notwithstanding this, the Constitution was all the time quite free as appears not only from ~~the~~ history & Law books most clearly but from express acts of Parliaments then in force & repeatedly renewed in support of Liberty & against arbitrary power: Laws could avail little against force. Thus things continued till by the Civil wars most of the powerful Barons were destroy'd or had forfeited their estates.



Liberty of selling their estates was then given them  
By using that & by other causes they lost their  
power which with their property fell into the hands  
of the People who became considerable enough  
to oppose Tyranny. Now does it follow that  
because the Kings were Tyrants before the  
Stuarts tho' in defiance of the most plain  
& express laws that the Stuarts are justifiable  
in following their example. If the Stuarts  
had not been as ill judging as Tyrannical  
they would have found out that they had no  
powerful Barons to support them. Mr Hume  
is charged with want of veracity in not  
telling the whole truth but only as much as  
serves his purpose by which an action may  
be represented quite contrary to what is  
reality it would appear if the whole truth  
was told. She is humbly advised not to give  
credit to any persons judgment of a book till  
she knows that persons principles or opinions  
because if the Author writes in favour of them  
he will right or wrong be supported & applauded  
As for Mr Humes philosophy he refers her to an  
Essay on truth & its immutability by Doctor Beattie  
professor at Aberdeen in Scotland (1735-1803)



She will get it from a circulating Library in London  
He does not desire her to read more than five or six  
pages where the Author makes a Collection of the  
most diabolical opinions that ever were published  
such as endeavour to overturn Natural & revealed  
religion & all Morality & to establish Atheism  
His favourite doctrine is that we have no knowledge  
of any thing nor even from the evidence of  
our senses We are mistaken when we fancy that  
we see, hear, feel &c He says that if you pocket  
to know or believe anything you are fools & then  
adds as impudently as absurdly that he knows  
with the utmost certainty that his own opinions  
are true You will doubt whether he is most mad  
or most wicked These are in Humes Treatise  
on Human Nature I did not compare the  
quotations with the Original because I could  
not suppose any man so foolish as to quote the  
words of a living Author & refer you to the page  
where they are to be found if the quotations were  
not true He does not quote the meaning of Mr  
Humes words but the words themselves

Mrs H. Junr. may forget how she provoked Mr H. Sen. to give her  
this trouble by saying in her last that let Mr H. Sen. abuse Mr  
Hume as much as he pleases she & Mr Gib. must defend him



85/54