

Lesson Ten: *Political Humor during Ratification*

BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR INSTRUCTOR

Americans historically have liberally used humor in the political arena. The Ratification Period is no exception. Often students of the ratification debate are prone to associate that public discourse with the lofty prose of “Publius” in the Federalist Papers or the Antifederalist writings of the “Federal Farmer” and “Brutus.” Not all of the discourse, however, was of an elevated nature. For many Americans, the issues of ratification were disseminated using the various devices of satire, fictitious letters, dialogues, metaphorical rhetoric, burlesque, parody, allegory, and ridicule. All of these formats had popular appeal.

Dating back to the Revolutionary Era when the British invented the pejorative character Yankee Doodle, Americans were accustomed to seeing themselves as irreverent and uncouth. It is as if Americans proudly took on the caricature and were willing to use this archetype as they engaged in public debate.

Often in the ratification debate, class and social standing was an issue that provided occasions for writers to disparage their opponents through the use of political humor. Even after achieving independence, America was a highly deferential society. Only men who did not work with their hands could be considered a gentleman. Antifederalists leveled accusations against Federalists alleging their aristocratic tendencies were at odds with the democratic principles of the American Revolution. Thus, Federalists were forced to defend themselves against these charges of being elitists. In turn, they countered suggesting that many Antifederalists were demagogues exploiting the ignorance of the masses. These stereotypes would often appear in satires and ridicule.

The authors of the items highlighted in these lessons are examples of such writings. The Federalist writer of “Peter Prejudice” ridicules his opponents as ignorant fools unwilling to accept new solutions to century-old problems in government. The Antifederalist author of “Honestus” mocks his antagonists inferring that they are elitist snobs who fail to understand that working men had the capacity to engage in sophisticated political debate.

Authorship of these essays is uncertain. However, the reprinting in the June issue of the Philadelphia *American Museum* revealed “Peter Prejudice’s was written by “John Mifflin, Esq.” Mifflin was a graduate of the College of Philadelphia (1775) and a prominent lawyer. Postmaster General Ebenezer Hazard, writing from New York City where “Peter Prejudice” had been reprinted in the *New York Packet* on 22 April, thought that the prolific Federalist propagandist Francis Hopkinson was the author. In alluding to the breeches allegory, Hazard in a letter to Jeremy Belknap said “I believe F.H. wrote the Piece about the Breeches.” On occasion, its publication evoked strong reactions among Antifederalists. One such response was “Timothy Takeall” who urged his readers not to accept the new breeches because the tailor had not yet presented his bill. He suggested, “Your taylor told you, when he made the old breeches, that they would last fifteen years without repairing; but after half of that time is expired, he informs you that they are past mending, and sends you a new pair, which he says are calculated for your benefit, but will not suffer you to try them on, and in case of their illy fitting you, to return them; but if you put them on, you must wear them, and pay the bill which he will then exhibit.”

The debate over the ratification of the Constitution in New York began with the publication of two items by the Antifederalist “Cato” and the Federalist “Cæsar” in September and October 1787. “Cato” I had encouraged all citizens of New York to “Deliberate ... on this new national

government with coolness; analyze it with criticism; and reflect on it with candour.” Referring to George Washington, who signed the Constitution, “Cato” maintained that even “the wisest and best of men may err, and their errors, if adopted, may be fatal to the community.” “Cæsar” II countered by suggesting the people in general were “very ill qualified to *judge* for themselves what government will best suit their peculiar situations.” On the eve of the election for the New York convention, “Honestus” asserted that such a disparaging view of the people fails to take into account the wisdom and virtues of workingmen.

The publication of “Honestus” drew an immediate Federalist response. “One and All,” in a broadside dated 29 April, warned his fellow citizens to “Keep a good *Look-Out*. . . . The enemies of federalism know they can do nothing in this City by *fair play*. . . . Honestus; who, under the mask of friendship to the proposed Constitution, insults the whole body of Mechanics, in order to raise their prejudices against it.”

KEY IDEAS IN PRIMARY SOURCE DOCUMENTS

Peter Prejudice: The New Breeches, Philadelphia *Federal Gazette*, 15 April 1788

A Tailor (The Convention) Makes an Alarmed Antifederalist an Ill-Fitting Pair of Pants; His Wife and Children (Federalists) Assure and Calm Him

Honestus, *New York Journal*, 26 April 1788

Antifederalists Alleged to be Ignorant and Unsited to Consider the Constitution;
Federalists Spoofed as Elitists

PRIMARY SOURCE DOCUMENTS

Peter Prejudice: The New Breeches, Philadelphia *Federal Gazette*, 15 April 1788

Mr. Editor, I some time since sent a pair of old breeches to a taylor, in order to have them patched; as the breaches, both in front and rear, were very numerous I was obliged to purchase a considerable quantity of cloth wherewith to mend them—Well sir, what do you think the taylor has had the assurance to do? Why, after detaining my breeches upwards of four months, he has presumed to return them unpatched, and has also sent a new pair along with them, and a message, “That upon examining the old pair he had found them so rotten that they were not worth mending, nor could it be easily done, that he had also found that the cloth sent for that purpose was sufficient to make an entire new pair, much better than the old ones had ever been, which he had done accordingly, and hoped for my approbation of his conduct.” He added moreover “that if upon trial they should happen to pinch me in any part, he had left a sufficient space for outlets at every seam.”

Oh height of insult! said I on receiving this arrogant message, what has this fellow done! A conspiracy! A conspiracy! As sure as I’m alive the traitor, his journeymen, and apprentices have *meditated* the ruin of my old breeches, and *conspired* against the liberty of my thighs, knees, and loins, which they have insidiously attempted to confine and cramp by palming this “*gilded trap*” the new breeches on me, “*Curse on the villains!*” they have conspired to lay restraints upon my *free-born* members, which are utterly incompatible with our republican form of government! Here indignation choked my utterance—My dearly beloved spouse and my little children were all gather’d about me by this time, to know the cause of my anger. It was, however, a considerable while before the boiling madness of my rage was sufficiently calmed for me to give them the information they desired; but my heat being somewhat allayed, I at length deigned to answer their interrogatories.

Well my dear (said my sweet partner) I think you are under many obligations to our good neighbour the taylor, who has rendered you very important services on former occasions; and has certainly consulted your interest in this business; for my part, I highly approve of his conduct, and am well pleased that he has made you these pretty new *small clothes*, (for she does not like to say *breeches*) to hide your nakedness, and defend you from the inclemency of the weather. Sure you know how you have been laughed at, wherever you went, this long time past on account of your old pair, which the neighbours all say, are no better than an Indian’s breech-clout; I protest my own modesty has been often put to the blush by the holes in that plaguy old pair—My lovely tormentor was about to proceed in her condemnation of the old pair, and her praises of the new—Hold! hold! said I, let us reason the matter fairly. In the first place, he has disobeyed my orders, which were only that he should repair the old breeches. But has he not made a new pair much preferable to the old? By no

means, I replied, these cursed new breeches would utterly ruin me; they are calculated to enslave my thighs, to confine my waist, and totally to destroy the liberty of my knees, by buttoning tightly around them, they will also render a considerable part of my hose totally useless by buckling below my knees; nor is this all, they will imprison my femoral parts nor suffer them to enjoy fresh air as the old ones do; to be brief, they are *too long* and *too short*, *too strait* and *too wide*, they would *pinch me in all parts*, and *fit me in none*.

Methinks you reason very strangely, my love (replied my solicitous advocate for the new breeches, who was now joined by all the children,) your argument, against being under the restraint and confinement of clothes, is only calculated for a circle of savages, and can never have any weight among civilized and social beings; your objection to the want of breaches in the new pair, for admission of fresh air, is an excellent argument in their favour, and shews that they are well calculated to skreen you from the inclemency of the seasons; your concluding objections are so inconsistent and contradictory, that they fall to the ground without any comment. Further, continued she, if they have faults you know the taylor says they can be easily amended; would not you do well therefore to put them on, in order to ascertain their faults truly, and I shall have no objection to the necessary alterations being made in them.

No, no, said I, "*don't think to catch old birds with chaff.*" I'm determined never to draw them on, unless the amendments shall have been first made. Here again I was replied to—How in the name of goodness, said she, can you undertake to have amendments made, before you know that the parts you would wish to have amended are indeed faulty! By such preposterous doings you might spoil their best parts; but would have no tolerable chance of amending even one fault; therefore, I beg you may first try them on, that you may be enabled to discover their faults with precision. Do papa, do try on your new breeches, exclaimed the children with one voice.

Hush! hush! said I once more, I believe the woman and the children are all crazy! Do you think I am fool enough to be gulled thus! If I should put them on, how shall I be able to get them off again? I have no security that they will not cling to my skin, tear away my flesh, break my bones, and boil my marrow, like Hercules's poisoned shirt, which insidiously destroyed him. And all this must be born, without the liberty of even remonstrating against the tyranny of these accursed "*consolidating*" breeches. I say *consolidating*; for they are evidently calculated to supersede the use of every other garment; or at least to "melt them all down into one" general garment; and the taylor certainly intended this to be the case. Do they not already exhibit a specimen of their despotism, by being framed so as to "lord it over" a considerable part of my stockings and shirt? And is it not more than probable, that they would, very speedily, encroach upon the prerogative of *all* my clothes; nay, that they would even extend their sway to my head, and, by closing my mouth, prevent me from expostulating against my "cruel taskmasters?" With these over my face, for a mask, I should appear no less ridiculous, than a modern fine lady with her head in a calash, or in a fashionable bonnet.

Here the whole family burst into laughter, and the dispute ended for that time. I have reason to expect another attack on the same score shortly; for my wife is exceedingly fond of the new breeches, and is supported by all my neighbours in her controversies with me on this subject. As I am nearly exhausted, I will be much obliged to any of your correspondents who will be so condescending as to favour me with a fresh supply of arguments, sufficient to repel those of my spouse in our next rencountre.

Honestus, *New York Journal*, 26 April 1788

Mr. Greenleaf, I was led to the following reflections, by accidentally falling in company, some evenings since, with a number of characters (chiefly mechanics) at an ale-house, who were making absurd comments on the constitution proposed by the general convention; which convention was composed of the greatest and most enlightened characters in this country. It must be considered, that government is a very abstruse science, and political disquisition a very arduous task, far beyond the reach of common capacities; and that no men, but those who have had a liberal education, and have time to study, can possibly be competent to such an important matter, as the framing a government for such an extensive country, as is comprehended within the United States. Whenever men of neither abilities or education, presume to meddle, with such matters as are above the reach of their knowledge or abilities, they will find themselves out of their proper sphere.

The blacksmith will find that he had better attend to his hammer and anvil, and hammer out hob-nails, for country hoof, than concern himself with affairs of state, should he be weak enough to suppose that he has abilities equal to such an undertaking; he will find, that there is a material difference, between welding together two pieces of steel or iron, and that of uniting heterogeneous and jarring interests, so as to make them productive of the public good.

The mariner may very well understand, how to take an observation, and navigate his ship; but he cannot possibly be acquainted with every point of the political compass, or so to steer the ship of state, as to avoid the hidden and dangerous rocks, and shelves, that may lay in the way—and whenever he makes the attempt, he will undoubtedly find himself out of his latitude.

The distiller, brewer and baker, may be perfectly well acquainted with the principles of fermentation, and how to regulate and check the same, so as to answer their particular purposes; but they must be entirely ignorant of the laws and means that will be necessary to prevent a dangerous fermentation in the community, or what steps it may be necessary to take, to check such fermentation, when excited.

The farmer may have a sufficiency of knowledge to guide and govern the plough, and team; and understand the best method to thrash his grain—but he must be incompetent to the great purpose of guiding the machinery of the state, or to suggest the best and most effectual method, to thrash the enemies of his country.

The carpenter may be a perfect master of his trade, and understand the rules of architecture; he may frame an edifice, complete in all its parts, and sufficiently strong to secure the proprietor from the attempts of the midnight robber; but he will be totally ignorant, how to frame laws for the security of society, so as to prevent the artful and designing from preying upon the ignorant and innocent.

The miller may be a complete artist in his profession, and know how to regulate every thing appertaining to his mill; he may understand extremely well, how to separate the flour from the bran; but he cannot possibly be master of the address, that will be necessary, to distinguish the wheat from the chaff; in the choice of officers, to fill the different departments in the state.

The clock and watch-maker may know very well how to regulate the wheels, and other movements of a clock or watch; but he will be ignorant of the necessary art, how to regulate the complex machinery of government, so as to dispose the different wheels, as will prevent their interfering with, and bearing too hard on each other.

The mason may be an excellent workman, and understand how to lay the foundation of an house or a wall properly—but he will be at a loss how to determine what base will be necessary on which such a superstructure as government should be erected.

The sadler may be a proficient in his business, and may know what kind of curb is proper to restrain an unruly and restive horse—but he cannot possibly be a judge what laws or curbs will be

proper and necessary to restrain the unruly passions of men, so as to prevent their injuring one another.

The turner may be a very expert artizan, but he cannot possibly be acquainted with all the turns and windings, that are used by bad men to evade the laws, and escape the punishment which they justly deserve.

The cooper may know extremely well, how to stop the flaws and worm holes in a cask, and make it so tight as to hold water, rum, or any other liquor; but he will be much puzzled to stop the flaws, and worm-holes in a law; so as to prevent its operating, either to the injury of individuals, or the government.

The barber may know very well how to make a wig, to suit either the priest, phisician or gentleman of the long-robe [i.e., lawyers], or how to shave his customer with dexterity,—but whenever he attempts to meddle with affairs of state, he will find that his razors have lost their edge, and that he is himself compleatly in the suds.

If this production should operate in such a manner, as to prevent people's neglecting their business and meddling with public matters, beyond their capacities, it will be a sufficient compensation to the writer, who has no other object in view, than that of confining every man within his proper sphere.

THE LESSON PLANS—Two Reader’s Theater Lessons

OBJECTIVES OF THE LESSONS

- * Students will read and consider the use of satire as a form of political discourse in the ratification debate.
- * Students will evaluate the effectiveness of ridicule in political debate.

THE LESSONS

A Note to the Instructor: “Peter Prejudice” is a satirical piece that spoofs the Antifederalists and their alleged ignorance. “Honestus” pokes fun at the Federalists’ assumptions about the intelligence of Antifederalists. It is possible to have a class do both of these scripts in one class period. In fact it is preferable since it will expose the students to how both sides used political humor to convey their message. You may want half of the class to be involved in the reading of “Peter Prejudice” and the other half to read “Honestus.”

I. Peter Prejudice: A Reader’s Theater

1. Select six students and assign each of them a character. You may want to select six students prior to using this lesson and have them read the script so they are not reading it in class for the first time.
2. Have the six students present the reader’s theater for the entire class.
3. As the class listens to the presentation, you can have them use the graphic organizer below to organize their thoughts for the discussion portion of the lesson.

Graphic Organizer:

<u>Item in Script</u>	<u>Item Symbolizes?</u>
The Taylor	George Washington or the Philadelphia Convention or Congress
Peter Prejudice	
The Prejudice Family	
The New Breeches	
The Old Breeches	

4. At the conclusion of the reading, you may want to have a discussion using some of the following questions.
 - a) In this piece, what do the following items symbolize?
 - The New Breeches?
 - The Old Breeches?
 - Peter Prejudice?

Mrs. Prejudice?
 The Children?
 The Taylor?

- b) What are the arguments proposed by “Peter Prejudice” against accepting the new breeches?
 - c) What are the main arguments proposed by the family in favor of accepting the new breeches?
 - d) In this piece, who are the Federalists? The Antifederalists?
 - e) Would you consider ridicule as appropriate in the ratification debates? Is it effective in this case?
 - f) How effective is the breeches metaphor in describing the Constitution? Would another metaphor be better? If so, what might be a better alternative?
5. An extension activity could be to have students select another metaphor and have them rewrite the script using the new metaphor.

II. Honestus: A Reader’s Theater

- 1. Select 25 students to play a part in the reader’s theater script. If you have smaller classes you may want to assign multiple parts to each reader.
- 2. Have the selected students read the “Honestus” script.
- 3. As the cast reads the script, you may want to have the remainder of the class complete the T chart below.

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Essential Skill</u>	<u>Why skill isn’t sufficient to the task</u>
blacksmith	welding iron and steel	combining the various interests of a nation is harder
mariner		
distiller		
farmer		
carpenter		
miller		
watch-maker		
mason		
sadler		
turner		
cooper		
barber		

- 4. After the class has listened to the reading, you may want to lead a discussion using the following questions.
 - a) Is this item written by a Federalist or an Antifederalist? What would you reference in the script that would lead you to your conclusion? (“Honestus” is Antifederalist attempting to rile opposition to the Constitution among the tradesmen. By creating these “conversations” he hopes the insults to their

intelligence will unite them in their opposition to the Constitution.)

- b) What similarities do you see among the occupations highlighted in the piece?
 - c) Why would the author select occupations in the skilled trades to express an opinion about the Constitution?
 - d) In your opinion, can “Honestus” be accused of creating conflicts between the various classes of society?
5. An extension activity could be to have students add other occupations to the T Chart. Students could then identify the skill(s) used in that occupation and write as “Honestus” as to why that skill is insufficient to the task of a political/constitutional debate. Modern occupations that could be used might be doctors, engineers, computer programmers, garbage men, librarians, plumbers, teachers, computer game designers, etc.

The Script for Peter Prejudice:

Peter Prejudice: Mr. Editor, I some time since sent a pair of old breeches to a taylor, in order to have them patched; as the breaches, both in front and rear, were very numerous I was obliged to purchase a considerable quantity of cloth wherewith to mend them—Well sir, what do you think the taylor has had the assurance to do? Why, after detaining my breeches upwards of four months, he has presumed to return them unpatched, and has also sent a new pair along with them, and a message. . . .

The Tailor: That upon examining the old pair I found them so rotten that they were not worth mending, nor could it be easily done, I found that the cloth sent for that purpose was sufficient to make an entire new pair, much better than the old ones had ever been, which I have done accordingly, and I hope for my approbation of my conduct.

Peter Prejudice: He added moreover. . .

The Tailor: . . . that if upon trial they should happen to pinch in any part, I left a sufficient space for outlets at every seam.

Peter Prejudice: Oh height of insult! said I on receiving this arrogant message, what has this fellow done! A conspiracy! A conspiracy! As sure as I'm alive the traitor, his journeymen, and apprentices have *meditated* the ruin of my old breeches, and *conspired* against the liberty of my thighs, knees, and loins, which they have insidiously attempted to confine and cramp by palming this "*gilded trap*" the new breeches on me, "*Curse on the villains!*" they have conspired to lay restraints upon my *free-born* members, which are utterly incompatible with our republican form of government! Here indignation choked my utterance—My dearly beloved spouse and my little children were all gather'd about me by this time, to know the cause of my anger. It was, however, a considerable while before the boiling madness of my rage was sufficiently calmed for me to give them the information they desired; but my heat being somewhat allayed, I at length deigned to answer their interrogatories.

Mrs. Prejudice: Well my dear . . .

Peter Prejudice: . . . said my sweet partner . . .

Mrs. Prejudice: . . . I think you are under many obligations to our good neighbour the taylor, who has rendered you very important services on former occasions; and has certainly consulted your interest in this business; for my part, I highly approve of his conduct, and am well pleased that he has made you these pretty new *small clothes* . . .

Peter Prejudice: . . . for she does not like to say *breeches* . . .

Mrs. Prejudice: . . . to hide your nakedness, and defend you from the inclemency of the weather. Sure you know how you have been laughed at, wherever you went, this long time past on account of your old pair, which the neighbours all say, are no better than an Indian's breech-clout; I protest my own modesty has been often put to the blush by the holes in that plaguy old pair.

Peter Prejudice: My lovely tormentor was about to proceed in her condemnation of the old pair, and her praises of the new—Hold! hold! said I, let us reason the matter fairly. In the first place, he has disobeyed my orders, which were only that he should repair the old breeches.

Mrs. Prejudice: But has he not made a new pair much preferable to the old?

Peter Prejudice: By no means, I replied, these cursed new breeches would utterly ruin me; they are calculated to enslave my thighs, to confine my waist, and totally to destroy the liberty of my knees, by buttoning tightly around them, they will also render a considerable part of my hose totally useless by buckling below my knees; nor is this all, they will imprison my femoral parts nor suffer them to enjoy fresh air as the old ones do; to be brief, they are *too long* and *too short*, *too strait* and *too wide*, they would *pinch me in all parts*, and *fit me in none*.

Mrs. Prejudice: Methinks you reason very strangely, my love . . .

Peter Prejudice: . . . replied my solicitous advocate for the new breeches, who was now joined by all the children . . .

Child #1: . . . your argument, against being under the restraint and confinement of clothes, is only calculated for a circle of savages, and can never have any weight among civilized and social beings.

Child #2: . . . your objection to the want of breaches in the new pair, for admission of fresh air, is an excellent argument in their favour, and shews that they are well calculated to skreen you from the inclemency of the seasons.

Child #3: . . . your concluding objections are so inconsistent and contradictory, that they fall to the ground without any comment.

Mrs. Prejudice: . . . if they have faults you know the taylor says they can be easily amended; would not you do well therefore to put them on, in order to ascertain their faults truly, and I shall have no objection to the necessary alterations being made in them.

Peter Prejudice: No, no, said I, "*don't think to catch old birds with chaff.*" I'm determined never to draw them on, unless the amendments shall have been first made. Here again I was replied to.

Mrs. Prejudice: How in the name of goodness, can you undertake to have amendments made, before you know that the parts you would wish to have amended are indeed faulty!

Child #1: By such preposterous doings you might spoil their best parts; but would have no tolerable chance of amending even one fault.

Child #2: I beg you may first try them on.

Child #3: That way you may be enabled to discover their faults with precision.

The Children Together: Do papa, do try on your new breeches . . .

Peter Prejudice: . . . Hush! hush! said I once more. . . . Do you think I am fool enough to be gulled thus! If I should put them on, how shall I be able to get them off again? I have no security that they will not cling to my skin, tear away my flesh, break my bones, and boil my marrow, like Hercules's poisoned shirt, which insidiously destroyed him. And all this must be born, without the liberty of even remonstrating against the tyranny of these accursed "*consolidating*" breeches. I say *consolidating*; for they are evidently calculated to supersede the use of every other garment; or at least to "melt them all down into one" general garment; and the taylor certainly intended this to be the case. Do they not already exhibit a specimen of their despotism, by being framed so as to "lord it over" a considerable part of my stockings and shirt? Here the whole family burst into . . .

The Children and Mrs. Prejudice: raucous laughter . . .

Peter Prejudice: . . . and the dispute ended for that time. I have reason to expect another attack on the same score shortly; for my wife is exceedingly fond of the new breeches, and is supported by all my neighbours in her controversies with me on this subject. As I am nearly exhausted, I will be much obliged to any of your correspondents who will be so condescending as to favour me with a fresh supply of arguments, sufficient to repel those of my spouse in our next rencountre.

The Script for Honestus:

Honestus: Mr. Greenleaf, I was led to the following reflections, by accidentally falling in company, some evenings since, with a number of characters . . . at an ale-house, who were making comments on the constitution proposed by the general convention. . . . To my recollection, their animated and heated conversations went something akin to this . . .

Voice 1A: The blacksmith [is] best suited . . . to his hammer and anvil, and hammer out hob-nails, for country hoof . . .

Voice 1B: . . . but . . . he will find, that there is a material difference, between welding together two pieces of steel or iron, and that of uniting heterogeneous and jarring interests, so as to make them productive of the public good.

Voice 2A: The mariner may very well understand, how to take an observation, and navigate his ship . . .

Voice 2B: . . . but he cannot possibly be acquainted with every point of the political compass, or so to steer the ship of state, as to avoid the hidden and dangerous rocks, and shelves, that may lay in the way—and whenever he makes the attempt, he will undoubtedly find himself out of his latitude.

Voice 3A: The distiller, brewer and baker, [are] perfectly well acquainted with the principles of fermentation, and how to regulate and check the same, so as to answer their particular purposes . . .

Voice 3B: . . . but they must be entirely ignorant of the laws and means that will be necessary to prevent a dangerous fermentation in the community, or what steps it may be necessary to take, to check such fermentation, when excited.

Voice 4A: The farmer [has] a sufficiency of knowledge to guide and govern the plough, and team; and understand the best method to thrash his grain . . .

Voice 4B: . . . but he must be incompetent to the great purpose of guiding the machinery of the state, or to suggest the best and most effectual method, to thrash the enemies of his country.

Voice 5A: The carpenter may be a perfect master of his trade, and understand the rules of architecture; he may frame an edifice, complete in all its parts, and sufficiently strong to secure the proprietor from the attempts of the midnight robber . . .

Voice 5B: . . . but he will be totally ignorant, how to frame laws for the security of society, so as to prevent the artful and designing from preying upon the ignorant and innocent.

Voice 6A: The miller [is] a complete artist in his profession, and know how to regulate every thing appertaining to his mill; he may understand extremely well, how to separate the flour from the bran . . .

Voice 6B: . . . but he cannot possibly be master of the address, that will be necessary, to distinguish the wheat from the chaff; in the choice of officers, to fill the different departments in the state.

Voice 7A: The clock and watch-maker may know very well how to regulate the wheels, and other movements of a clock or watch . . .

Voice 7B: . . . but he will be ignorant of the necessary art, how to regulate the complex machinery of government, so as to dispose the different wheels, as will prevent their interfering with, and bearing too hard on each other.

Voice 8A: The mason [is] an excellent workman, and understand how to lay the foundation of an house or a wall properly . . .

Voice 8B: . . . but he will be at a loss how to determine what base will be necessary on which such a superstructure as government should be erected.

Voice 9A: The sadler may be a proficient in his business, and may know what kind of curb is proper to restrain an unruly and restive horse . . .

Voice 9B: . . . but he cannot possibly be a judge what laws or curbs will be proper and necessary to restrain the unruly passions of men, so as to prevent their injuring one another.

Voice 10A: The turner may be a very expert artizan . . .

Voice 10B: . . . but he cannot possibly be acquainted with all the turns and windings, that are used by bad men to evade the laws, and escape the punishment which they justly deserve.

Voice 11A: The cooper knows extremely well, how to stop the flaws and worm holes in a cask, and make it so tight as to hold water, rum, or any other liquor . . .

Voice 11B: . . .but he will be much puzzled to stop the flaws, and worm-holes in a law; so as to prevent its operating, either to the injury of individuals, or the government.

Voice 12A: The barber knows very well how to make a wig, to suit either the priest, phisician or gentleman of the long-robe, or how to shave his customer with dexterity . . .

Voice 12B: . . . but whenever he attempts to meddle with affairs of state, he will find that his razors have lost their edge, and that he is himself compleatly in the suds.