

revolution, founded upon the first of all the laws of nature—the law of self-protection. This right of revolution belongs to the body politic, just as the right of self defence does to the body natural. They are rights only to be used to prevent the destruction of other political or natural rights, as the case may be, and can only exist when the necessity to exercise them exists. If by inherent and unalienable rights, this right of revolution is meant, under the circumstances alluded to, the undersigned feel no disposition to controvert the proposition ; but to any greater extent they cannot go.

In connection with this subject the undersigned beg leave to remark, that the bill of rights no where speaks of the inherent or unalienable rights of the people. It contains no definition of those rights, and we are therefore obliged to look elsewhere to know what is meant by the use of such terms.

The Declaration of Independence places among unalienable rights, “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;” and asserts, that the people in the exercise of these rights, “whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, have the right to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government.” The unalienable rights here spoken of are, “life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,” not the right to abolish the old and to form a new government. As in the bill of rights, so in the Declaration of Independence, this right in the people to alter or abolish an old, and to institute a new government, is alledged to exist only when the ends of government are perverted and the public liberty endangered. The right itself, independently of these circumstances, is not claimed at all ; much less is it claimed as an unalienable right. It is only when the unalienable rights of “*life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness*” are impaired that it is claimed to have any existence whatever. The undersigned are unable to ascertain with any precision, what is meant by those who maintain, that the right of the people to alter and amend the constitution, and to form a new one, is an unalienable right, in the enjoyment of which they could not have restricted themselves. If by unalienable is meant, not capable of being transferred or delegated, then the undersigned would respectfully suggest, that all governments which have been established by the people, acting through agents of their own selection, are formed in derogation of this unalienable right, and therefore not binding on the people. The right to form a new government necessarily includes the right to alter and change the old, and if the one be an unalienable right, the other must be also. If this be so, then no government can be formed at all, unless by the people themselves, collected together in one great mass, acting without the intervention of agents or delegates. The undersigned would desire to know if these doctrines are to be regarded as sound, upon what principle is it, that the advocates of conventional reform claim to have the right to call a convention of delegates from the people?

If the right is an unalienable right it can no more be transferred by the people to a convention than it can be to the Legislature. A convention composed of any number less than the whole, or a