



PRICE, FIFTY CENTS.

Economic
Crumbs,

OR

Plain Talks for the People

ABOUT

LABOR,—CAPITAL,—MONEY,
TARIFF,—Etc.

BY

T. T. BRYCE,
Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute,
Hampton, Virginia.



HAMPTON, VIRGINIA:
NORMAL SCHOOL STEAM PRESS,
1879.

Economic
Crumbs,

OR

Plain Talks for the People

ABOUT

LABOR,—CAPITAL,—MONEY,
TARIFF,—etc.

BY

T. T. BRYCE,

Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute,
Hampton, Virginia.



HAMPTON, VIRGINIA:

NORMAL SCHOOL STEAM PRESS,

1879.

HB 171.7
B 9

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1879, by T. T. Bryce, in the office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

CONTENTS.



LABOR.

“ Laboring Classes ”	2
Pig-iron and Watch Springs	3
“ I Want, I Want, I Want ”	4
From the Mine to the Mess Table	5
Coffee and Cotton	6
Nature’s Laws Supreme	7
Labor not Linked with Love	8
Wages fix Themselves	9
Half a Dime, or Half a “ Century ”	10
Property in Labor	11
Plain Words	12
Labor’s Rights	13
When “ Strikes ” Succeed	14
Friends, not Foes	15
Machinery, and its Maligners	16
Multiplying Machinery	17
Labor is Honorable	18
Brutes Work, Men Labor	19



CAPITAL.

Head and Hands	21
Safe Bind, Safe Find	22

IV

Bees and Beavers.....	23
Capital a Coward.....	24
Capital and Labor, Both Free.....	25
Credit's Composition.....	26
Thievish Theories.....	27
“More”.....	28
A Gloomy Picture.....	29

PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION.

One Creator, Many Creatures.....	31
“Changeless Law of Change”.....	32
All Men are Middlemen... ..	33
Ethics of Economy.....	34
Sand Ropes.....	35
“ <i>Ex Nihilo Nihil Fit</i> ”.....	36
How Blankets are not Lengthened.....	37
The Two Sides of a Dollar... ..	38
Owls of Society.....	39

MONEY.

The Contagion of Inflation.....	41
Qualities Money Should Possess.....	42
Continental and Confederate Currencies.....	43
Value.....	44
The Best Dollar.....	45
Units of Measure.....	46
What Varies Least... ..	47
Why?.....	48
A Watch for an Eagle.....	49
What Balances Accounts.....	50
Always Good Everywhere.....	51

V

Bread Buys Dimes.....	52
More Debts, More Taxes.....	53
Definition of Money.....	54

W A G E S .

Why People Give Wages.....	56
Boot Polishers and Railroad Presidents.....	57
Delmonico's Waiters.....	58
Seeming and Being.....	59
\$61 Per Hour.....	60
Birth of Property.....	61
Nothing for Either.....	62
Slave Whips.....	63

LIBERAL TRADE.

A Proud Parentage.....	65
Simplest Form of a Protective Tariff.....	66
Between Two Stools.....	67
Axioms.....	68
A Bit of Buncombe.....	69
Really Raw.....	70
Lung Action of the Nation.....	71
Bill-of-Fare for Bears.....	72
Perpetual Infants.....	73
Sublime Faith in Legislation.....	74
A Flattered Flea.....	75
More Bounties Mean More Taxes.....	76
Old is a Comparative Term.....	77
Malaria a Blessing; Cables a Curse.....	78
Coin and Quinine.....	79
A New Kind of Heart.....	80
Can Yankees "Swap?".....	81

VI

Nature no Niggard.....	82
Ten to One.....	83
Inside or Outside.....	84
Squaring Circles.....	85
Loosen Your Stays, Young Woman!.....	86
Fair Play.....	87
Unity of Design.....	88



PREFACE.

The following articles, (reprinted, except the last, from the "Southern Workman,") were originally written in furtherance of the educational aim of that journal: and are now, at the request of several friends, published in their present form, with the same object in view.

No claim to originality is made, nor is anything attempted, beyond telling, in the simplest way, the plainest truths of Political Economy. A notion seems to prevail, that this branch of knowledge consists of a dead mass of dry abstractions, instead of being a living science, whose phenomena are constantly occurring around us.

It is a little singular, that even among people otherwise well informed, there is only a very misty understanding of such terms as Labor, Capital, Money, Tariffs, etc. If by reading the following pages, these words become live words, with live meanings, to any reader, the object of this little book will have been accomplished.

T. T. B.

Hampton, Va., May 1st, 1879.

LABOR.

LABOR, LABOR EVERYWHERE—ALL MEN LABORERS—MANKIND, A BROTHERHOOD WITH RECIPROCAL WANTS—LAW OF MUTUAL DEPENDENCE—BRUTES AND SAVAGES THE ONLY TRUE INDEPENDENTS—HOW ATOMS OF THE LABOR OF THOUSANDS OF MEN ARE FOUND IN AN IRON POT—DEMAND AND SUPPLY RULE THE PRICE OF LABOR—LOVE AND CONGRESS HAVE NOTHING TO DO WITH IT—MAN'S LABOR HIS OWN—STEALING IT, IS THEFT—STRIKES—HOW PROPER, AND HOW IMPROPER—WHEN THEY SUCCEED, AND WHEN THEY FAIL—TRADES UNIONS—THEIR USES AND ABUSES—ECONOMIC QUACKS—A SYLLOGISM, WITH "LABOR IS HONORABLE" AS A CONCLUSION.

Of all the many wonderful things we can see in this world, if we keep our eyes open, perhaps one of the most striking, is the omnipresence of motion. From the sweep of the most distant planet, in its tremendous orbit, to the disintegration of the hardest rock, there is motion; different in degree, but the same in

kind. Everything about us is in motion, and all motion is work; but it is not with work in general that this paper has to do, but with that small, yet important part of work, called Labor. What is Labor? Labor is any human exertion, voluntarily put forth in exchange for something desired. The Chinaman, who toils all day for two cents, and the eminent advocate, who receives thousands of dollars for a single plea, are both laborers; they both put forth well-defined exertions, to obtain in exchange something they desire.

It is an error, then, popular though it be, to speak of the “laboring classes,” as a distinct division of society. Every man, who puts forth any exertion, in order to obtain something in return, is a laborer; and I fail to see how any living man can be excluded from the so-called, “laboring classes.” If the expression, “laboring-classes” has any distinctive meaning, it means free men as opposed to slaves. The toil of a slave is not a labor, it is not a voluntary exertion put forth with any exchange in view; and scientifically speaking, it differs in no way from the work of a mule, or an ox. Viewing labor in this, the only true light, the consideration of the labor question becomes simpler, for there are no class feelings to irritate, no color line to

fight over. Even with this simplification, the labor question is a vast one, embracing, as it does, every voluntary human effort not put forth from pure selfishness, from charity, or a sense of duty.

Labor forms a greater or less part of everything that is exchanged; therefore the universal laws governing exchanges, can be applied directly to labor. To illustrate what I mean by "labor forming a greater or less part of everything that is exchanged," let us suppose we had a ton of pig-iron: we could exchange it for perhaps fifteen dollars; but if this ton of pig-iron were "worked up" into watch-springs, it could be exchanged for many hundred dollars. Whence comes this increase of cost to the buyer of watch-springs? Mainly from the increased labor, that has been bestowed upon the raw material; which was in both cases, a certain quantity of iron ore. The ton of pig-iron was the result of comparatively little labor; the ton of watch-springs of much labor. When offered in exchange for other things, the result of but little labor is demanded for the former, while the result of a great deal of labor is demanded for the latter.

God has made mankind a brotherhood with reciprocal wants; and in this truth is founded

the grand law of Mutual Dependence. This law is universal; there are no “ifs” nor “excepts” about it; it is based directly on the endless wants God has implanted in men’s natures, which wants are the mainspring of all human activities. Man’s life is a series of wants not even ended by the grave; in the faint cry of the new-born babe; in the last gasp of extreme old age; and in all between, is sounded the refrain, “I want, I want, I want.” Not only has God implanted unnumbered and unending wants in man’s nature; but He has also given endless means of gratifying them; and it seems part of the Divine plan, that our own wants must find gratification through others efforts, and that our own efforts be the means of gratifying the wants of others. This is the law of “Mutual Dependence;” and perhaps I cannot state it better, though the statement is far from perfect, than by repeating the words with which this paragraph was begun, viz.: that God made mankind a brotherhood with reciprocal wants.

Any man who should attempt to gratify all his wants, without the aid of his fellow men, would be a savage, and little better than “the beast that perisheth.” As an example of the satisfying of the three first wants of life—

food, shelter, and clothing—let us imagine a frontiersman, clad in jeans, living in a log-cabin, finishing his dinner of boiled pork, washed down by a cup of coffee. Certainly the picture is not one of luxury; yet atoms of labor on the part of countless men have been put forth, before our frontiersman could even have the iron pot, in which his dinner was boiled. The ore, from which the iron was smelted, was perhaps dug from some deep English mine, where hundreds of brawny workers sold the exertions of their tough muscles for wages; raised to the surface, the ore had to be smelted by another gang of workers, and the pig-iron carried to some town, Birmingham perhaps; where it had to pass through many other hands before it was fashioned into a pot. From Birmingham, it had to be transported to Liverpool or London; and many were the hands employed on the railroads that carried it. From Liverpool or London, it was shipped by some steamer or sailing vessel to New York, in the sailing or steaming of which vessel, many other men were employed. Landed in New York, it had to pass through many fresh hands, before it started to the Far West, on some of the great railroads, which employed thousands of men in merely running

the trains, and in whose construction tens of thousands of workers had been busied. Yet this pot required an atom of labor on the part of all these men, before it could be used to cook the frontiersman's dinner.

Let us take one step deeper, and remember that every one of the many, who shared in the work of putting the iron pot in the log cabin, depended also on the labor of millions of others for the necessities of his daily life. The multitude of laborers thus conjured to our view, is almost beyond the grasp of our intellects, and gives us a faint idea of the universality of the law of Mutual Dependence. This meagre sketch of the atoms of labor that have centered in the iron pot, sufficiently illustrates the law; although the very mention of the coffee brings to our minds another multitude of laborers, who planted, raised, picked, cured, bagged, shipped, handled, ground, and packed the fragrant berry. The cotton fibre in our frontiersman's jeans at once suggests some plantation in our Southern States, and the dusky laborers, who plowed, planted, hoed, picked, ginned and packed the cotton, before it was ready to be sold to some Eastern or English mill, where it was spun and woven into cloth. Again remembering that all these laborers had to be

fed, clothed and housed ; and that for their food, clothing and shelter, they were in turn dependent on millions of others, the brain becomes fairly dizzy, contemplating the multitude arrayed.

The next great law of exchange, that I would apply to labor, is the law of Demand and Supply. If there be one man with a barrel of flour for sale, and two men want to buy it, the one will get it, who offers the more in exchange. If, however, there be two men, each with a barrel of flour to sell, and only one buyer, who wants but one barrel, he will take the barrel that he can get by giving the less in exchange. If for flour we read labor, the truth is none the less self-evident. If there be two men wanting to buy labor (that is, to hire it), and only one man with labor to sell, it is certain the man, who offers the more in exchange, will secure the labor. If on the other hand, there be two men to sell their labor, and only one to buy it ; it is equally certain, that the one will be hired who will sell his labor the cheaper. This law of demand and supply is a law of nature, and no amount of legislation can change it, any more than it could prevent the earth turning on its axis.

The first deduction, that I draw from this

law of nature is ; that the more employers there are, and the more prosperous they are, the better for the employed. If there be two factories in a town, with sufficient demand for their goods to run them night and day, it is better for the laborers, than if there were only one factory run under the eight-hour law. In like manner, it is better for the factories to have enough "help" to tend all their machinery, than to have to work half-handed. The factory is also benefited by having the same set of hands steadily employed, as the skill of each one in his particular department is increased by constant practice.

Laborers do not hire themselves to capitalists, nor do capitalists hire laborers, *for love* ; not a bit of it—each one looks for some gain from the use of the other, and ever seeks the largest possible gain. A factory will not buy a man's labor for a dollar a day, except it thinks it can sell it in the product of the man's daily labor for more than a dollar. Neither will a man work for a dollar a day in one factory, if he can get a dollar and a dime in another. Dollars and cents (or means to satisfy their respective wants are the objects of both factory and "help." Self-interest makes the bargain on both sides ; love has no more to do with it than a cock-crow has to do with an eclipse.

Labor has its market price, just as corn or cotton; if there be a large supply and small demand, prices will be low; if there be a small supply and a large demand, prices will be high,—and no amount of law making, nor mass-meetings, will prevent it. Everyone tries to buy as cheaply and sell as dearly as possible; the man with labor to sell, will seek the highest price he can get; the man with labor to buy, will seek to give as little as possible; the price they may agree upon, is the market price and neither close the bargain, while they think they can do any better for themselves. Buyer and seller *together* make the price; *neither* can do it *alone*. The Government has no more to do with the price of labor (that is, the rate of wages) than it has with the price of potatoes. No Government can fix the price of labor; that is, it cannot say wages shall be so much or so little. No man can be compelled to employ labor that he does not want; and no man can be compelled to labor for wages that do not suit him. Let us look for a minute and see how futile would be any attempt of the Government to interfere with the price of labor. In the first place, we would have to give the Government the power to say what wages should be paid, which would be a terrible sur-

render of our rights as freemen. Having granted that right to the Government, it could of course fix the rate where it pleased. Suppose it fixed the rate at fifty dollars a day, and passed a law that no man should receive less wages than fifty dollars a day. How many men would be employed? Clearly, only so many as employers thought would give them a service, the product of which could be sold for more than fifty dollars. Again, suppose the rate were fixed at five cents a day, how many men would accept the wages? Clearly, only so many as thought that five cents were all they could earn anywhere else, and were satisfied to work for it.

Every man in every civilized community buys and sells labor. No free man is only either employer or employee. The poor man who sells his labor in the field at twenty-five cents a day, buys others' labor, when he pays his rent, or purchases food and clothing. Mr. Vanderbilt, the great owner of railroads, hires a multitude of men, but is hired by another multitude to carry them and their merchandise on his cars.

We have now got deep enough into the labor question to see that labor has its market price, like corn or cotton; and that every man

is daily exchanging his labor, or the fruits of it, for atoms of the labor of an infinite number of his fellow men. The next point in the labor question that demands attention, is the fact that *every freeman's labor is his own*; it is his property, as much as his purse or his life. Anyone, who attempts to steal another's purse, or deprive him of his life, is liable to be seized and punished by the law. A man's labor is his property; he has a right to the peaceable enjoyment and employment of it, and anyone who attempts to interfere with such peaceable enjoyment or employment, by the use of force or threats, violates the law, and should be punished by it, as much as if he had tried to wrest away his purse or his life. This truth does not seem to be generally appreciated—and many a so-called "strike leader," who would hesitate perhaps to steal a man's dinner, does not hesitate to steal the labor, whereby he got his dinner. All "strikes," or rather all forcible strikes, arise from a misconception of the right of property that is vested in every man, as regards his own labor. Every man has an inalienable right to his own labor; but to nobody else's, except he give something in exchange for it. If I see fit to work eighteen hours a day for sixpence, it is my business, and

nobody else's; if I see fit to give a man a dollar for blacking my boots, that is my business, and nobody else's. In both cases I may be doing foolishly, but I am doing with my own. If a man come to me, and tell me I shall not work for the wages I see fit, but for the wages he sees fit, and I obey; I am his slave, as verily as ever one human being was the slave of another. If one man or a hundred come to me, and by force make me stop work, then they rob me, just as much as if they took the product of my labor. Hence, the conclusion is a plain one, and needs be put in plain words: *people who interfere with others' work by violence or threats are thieves, nothing more nor less.* The whole question of strikes centers in this: if I do not want to work, or am dissatisfied with my pay, I have an absolute right to stop work; but no right have I to make Jim, Pete or Bill stop work, unless they wish to do so.

That all men, with particular interests in common, should unite for mutual protection and encouragement, is most proper; that they should endeavor to get the best pay, or, in other words, the most in exchange for their services, is right and just; but their efforts must be through reasoning, and the means of the market-place—and not through violence or threat-

enings. So long as such organizations simply seek to get the most possible for what their members have to sell, they are following God-given impulses; but the moment they appeal from reasonings to bludgeons, they pass from benevolent beings to bushwackers.

If a certain set of workmen think their employers can afford to give more wages, they have a right to ask for the advance; but the employer has *an equal right* to refuse. They have a perfect right to stop work, but no right to interfere with others, who are willing to take their places. A peaceable strike is only a fluctuation of the labor market, which will adjust itself, the same as a fluctuation in the market for corn or cotton, according to the law of demand and supply. But any violent interference with labor, is a breach of the peace, and should be put down speedily and effectually. That such breaches of the peace often and quickly develop into riots, is well known, and for rioters, there is no sympathy. If a mob grow into rioters, every one present is either upholding or upsetting the law—there are no innocent spectators of a riot.

Labor can never force capital to give employment, unless capital thinks it can make or

save by giving such employment. If, for example, a factory paid a dollar a day to a workman, and could sell the labor in its product for, say, \$1.05, the factory would be happy to continue paying the man a dollar a day. But suppose the man should demand \$1.10 per day, and the factory could only get \$1.05 for his labor in its product, is it not manifest that the factory would decline to pay the advance demanded? No "strike" is ever successful, unless the wages being received by the help are under the market rate. If you are employing one hundred men at ten cents an hour, and they demand an advance of two cents per hour, it is simply a question of market price. If you can get another hundred men to do your work for ten cents per hour, you simply employ them and let your first hundred go seek some other employer. This rule holds good, if the positions are reversed: if two mills "start up" at the same time, and other things being equal, one offers a dollar a day, and the other a dollar and a dime, the first mentioned mill will have no "help" until the last has secured its complement of workers.

The most pernicious quack, who peddles political nostrums, is he, who attempts to excite the multitude, by declaring that "all the ills

that flesh is heir to " come from the employers of labor. People of this sort hold it as an axiom that there is an unending feud between capital and labor; and that the former ever seeks to extinguish the latter. Some of these mischief-makers, assuming this statement to be true, are logical enough to declare that labor should try to extinguish capital. This is the doctrine of communism. Now, if there be two things in this world, between which the utmost amity should exist, and between which the most intimate reciprocal relations do exist, they are Capital and Labor. One is absolutely useless without the other. Ten million willing arms are no better than no arms at all, if there be not the *means* of employing them; and the means of employing two arms or ten millions are useless, if there be no arms to employ. Capital suffers when work is scarce, and work suffers when capital is scarce. The earnings of capital, or interest, and the earnings of labor, or wages, vary directly as each other. When capital is being employed at fair interest, labor is getting fair wages; when capital is earning little or nothing, many willing hands are idle. Wages during the past year have been lower in this country than perhaps ever before, and capital never received so little interest.

The gratification of every one of our wants that God does not gratify without our asking, as air, sunlight, water, etc., requires some exertion on our part. Now it is plain, that any means which enable us to gratify any particular want, with only half the exertion we have been accustomed to put forth in gratifying that want, is a benefit to us. The benefit consists in our saving one-half our exertion, or with the same amount of exertion, gratifying twice as many wants. This saving of labor is just what is done by machinery; yet it is strange to see quite a large number of people in this country, who declaim against labor-saving machinery, as working harm to the poorer classes. They say, that if a machine be invented whereby two men can do the work of five, that three men are injured.

Let us look carefully at this argument; for it is one of those specious pleas, that mislead many candid people; its apparent exactness is just wherein its danger lies. If such a machine were invented, say in the making of shoes; the profit of using it, would be the wages of three men, less the wear and tear of the machine and the interest on its cost. Now the use of every such machine would give the shoe factory a very large additional profit,

and new capital would at once be drawn in its direction; in other words, new shoe works would be started, where much more labor would be required—for capital is argus-eyed, and ever on the alert to invest in those enterprises, which promise the greatest interest, coupled with the greatest security. Now any machine that would reduce the cost of any product to nearly the extent of three-fifths of the labor, that it formerly cost, would start probably ten shoe works where there was one before; and instead of being a demand for five shoe-makers, there would be a demand for twenty. Let us carry the argument a little farther: if the production of shoes increased tenfold, and the cost of them to the maker were reduced by nearly three-fifths the labor formerly put in them, it is manifest, that through the competition of the factories, the price of shoes would fall sharply, and many more people be able to buy better shoes than before the invention of the machine. Again, every machine would require a human mind to guide it,— a machine that thinks for itself, is among the absolutely impossible things. Hence, every new machine that is put in motion increases the demand for skilled labor; this demand can only be supplied by educating the

unskilled workman, and surely it is a blessing, but thinly disguised, that thins the ranks of ignorant toilers, and forces the development of deft skill out of brute force.

If God Almighty had not intended all men to work, he would not have made man the most perfect machine the world has ever seen. It is no more evident that he intended birds to fly and fishes to swim, than that he intended man to work. It is not alone in man's physical fitness to work, that we see the Divine intention; but in his being ever filled with ungratified desires, prompting the use of his wonderful physical machinery. How incomplete would God's work have seemed, if man had been made simply a perfect physical machine, uninspired with those desires, which keep the machine in motion; or if he had been filled with such desires, but not possessed of the physical machinery to gratify them. In labor, then, is the creature, man, carrying out the design of his Creator, and in obedience to God there is honor to man. That labor is honorable is thus susceptible of a very complete and direct demonstration. As all labor is the same in kind, varying only in degree, let it not be said that the labor of the lawyer, the physician, or the merchant, is *more honorable* than that of the

fisherman, the farmer, or the smith ; the honor rests in the effort, not in its direction. Honor may vary in degree, but the honor of labor varies only as man uses, wholly or partially, the powers Heaven has given him.

In birds and beasts, as well as in man, God has implanted certain desires, and supplied the means of gratifying them ; but compared with those of men, their desires are few, and their gratification direct. Man, and man alone, gratifies his desires by exchanging his labor for the labor of others ; there never was a dog, nor a horse, so sagacious as to voluntarily seek to give something he had, to some other horse or dog, in order to get in exchange something the other horse or dog had. One horse might steal another's hay, and one dog another's bone, but the idea of exchange is beyond them. In no other way, perhaps, is man's superiority over other animals more completely shown, than in the fact, that other animals work—men LABOR.

CAPITAL.

CRAZY COMMUNISTS—WHAT CAPITAL IS—CAPITAL'S DIET—SAVING IS GAINING—ALL MONEY CAPITAL, BUT ALL CAPITAL NOT MONEY—"CAPITALIST CLASS"—DIFFERENCE BETWEEN MEN AND BEES—CAPITAL A COWARD—PRODUCTION THE OFFSPRING OF CAPITAL AND LABOR—LIBERTY OF LABOR, AND LAW OF LOANS—CREDIT'S COMPOSITION—UNEQUAL DIVISION OF CAPITAL—EVERY MAN FOR HIMSELF, YET BY HIMSELF HELPLESS—POLITICAL ECONOMY A SCIENCE, NOT A POEM—ONLY GENERAL TRUTHS HAVE GENERAL LAWS—WHAT WOULD BE WITHOUT CAPITAL.

A wave of lunacy, such as seems to overflow every country sometime in its history, has been, and is now disturbing the political atmosphere of the United States; and such absurd cries as "Property is robbery," and "Capital a crime," were, and are mottoes of a party, hardly respectable even in numbers, and really dangerous only to the ignorant. This form of lunacy is not a native disease, but no amount

of quarantining has served to check its importation. The malady originates in knavery, and, like the physical diseases, Yellow Fever and Cholera, flourishes best with ignorance and filth as surroundings. Mental sickness of this form is commonly called "Communism," "Socialism," or "Kearneyism," and is an interesting social study; but the object of this paper is not to discuss disease, nor its symptoms, but to briefly consider what Capital really is, its uses, its nature, and necessity.

Going to the root of the matter, capital means "the head" or source; and when we liken capital and labor to the head and hands of the industrial body, the simile is uncommonly apt. I would define capital as anything of value, which has been saved, and from the use of which a profit may be had; or, to put it in a nut-shell, *any means of profit saved*. The bottom idea of capital is, that somebody has *saved* something. If nobody had ever abstained from the gratification of present desires, in order to be able to satisfy some future want, there would be no such thing as capital. A capitalist, then, is not the terrible ghoul painted by demagogues, who daily devours working men and women; but simply one, who has something that has been saved, either by him-

self or some one else. The origin of all capital is abstinence, and until self-control become a vice, capital and crime will not be synonyms.

Capital is not an element, but a product, and labor its prime factor. Man had to labor before he could have anything to save; and the height of absurdity is trod by those would-be-philosophers, who smear labor with fulsome flattery, and damn its product, capital, to depths unfathomed. If two men earn equal wages, and one save a dime a week, while the other spends every cent in the gratification of present desires, the condition of the two at the year's end will be different. One will be a capitalist to the extent of five dollars and twenty cents, while the other will not. This capitalist may exchange his fifty-two dimes for a boat, a chest of tools, a plow, or anything else he may see fit, and be a capitalist, so long as he has something *saved*, from the use of which, a profit may be had.

Money is only one of the myriad forms of capital, and is no more the whole of capital, than Hampton Roads is the Atlantic Ocean. This idea is not half often enough shaken to the surface, and too many people, consciously or unconsciously, confound all capital with pieces of gold or silver, with bank bills, or govern-

ment promises to pay. Old Jupiter, with all his masquerading, never assumed a thousandth of the forms that capital takes. Farms, factories, ships, stocks, railways, bonds, tools, money—are all forms of capital; indeed, any material thing that has been saved, and is saleable, is a form of capital.

In the preceding paper on "Labor," it was pointed out that the expression, "laboring classes," failed to mark any distinct division of society. "Capitalist class" fails almost as signally; for a man, if he has only an extra shirt, is to that extent a capitalist; and any creature who, in the ordinary course of events, has absolutely nothing saved, that is saleable, is fitter to be classed with beasts than human beings. The desire to save, and the willingness to sacrifice present indulgences, to provide against future wants, is an attribute of man alone. The making of such provision by the lower animals, as by bees and beavers, comes from instinct, not from reason. A young bee, which has never seen a snow-flake, will make and save honey as steadily as if it had lived through many a frosty night. The extent of a nation's savings is a pretty sure criterion of its civilization; the lower in the social scale a nation or tribe may be, the less capital, or

things saved, will be found in it. Only in civilized countries do we find much capital in many shapes.

Of all timid things, capital is the most timid; it ever seeks to be surrounded by strong laws, that can be quickly enforced; and at the sound of war or riot, promptly seeks to change its form and abiding place. There must be tranquillity in any locality, that invites capital, or the invitation will not be accepted. A man will risk his life, perhaps, in a country, where he would not buy a farm, nor build a factory; and the summary execution of writs issued by Judge Lynch's Courts, is not the kind of strong law that capital likes. Once frightened, capital is slow to again "screw its courage to the sticking point." There are to-day as many promising ventures, as there were before the panic of 1873; yet capital, not having recovered from that fright, regards them with indifference, and nestles in the bosom of comparative safety, rather than in the lap of even cautious venture.

While capital is always a product, it is also, always a means to further ends; to realize such ends, it must be united with present labor for capital by itself is as helpless as a finless fish. A plane, a hoe, or a fish-hook, is a form of cap-

ital, but utterly fruitless unless united with human effort. Labor by itself is as sterile as capital; but from the union of the two come all the betterments of society. All production equals labor multiplied by capital; cut out either factor, and the result can never be production. Capital is the result of effort in the past—canned labor, so to speak; labor is present endeavor with an object in the future; while credit is the shadow of labor yet to be performed, or of capital yet to be created.

Liberty of labor is guaranteed in this country; so is liberty of capital. A man may labor with the peaceful plow in almost perfect safety, or may risk his life in making nitro-glycerine. So, too, may capital cuddle in the almost absolute safety of a government bond, or blindly venture into the wildest schemes. No man has the right to interfere with either. Labor ever seeks to get the most for itself, that is, the best wages: so does capital seek the best (not always the highest) interest. The degree of risk taken by either enters into the return demanded. A nurse, to take care of a Yellow Fever patient, demands and gets more than one taking care of a healthy child. A sum of money lent on undoubted security earns less interest, than if the risk be great. The law of loans, is

a very simple one. "The rate of interest varies inversely as the security." The security is the sum of the things pledged or collateral, plus the credit of the borrower. If the collateral be very large, the amount of personal credit need be but small; if the collateral be very small, the amount of personal credit must be large. In loans where direct collateral is zero, as in a Government bond, the credit must be high, for it is all the security a lender has. Credit, also, consists of two parts: first, in one's disposition or tendency to do right; second, in one's capacity to use things borrowed to advantage. This second item in the sum of credit is an important one, for no man or State known to lack capacity to use well the thing he or it desires to borrow, can borrow on favorable terms. The first item of credit, that is, the tendency to do right, must be established by deeds, not words. The honor of a state is more accurately indicated by the market price of its bonds, than by the eloquence of its orators.

The division of capital among men is as varied as their desires and powers; and on these diversities the whole world moves. Perfect equality would be perfect stagnation. If all men were equally good lawyers, where would be the clients? If all were merchants

with equal stocks, where would be the customers? If all were equally good preachers, where would be the congregations? Indeed, if it were not for the diversity of men's tastes and powers, where would anything be? The world and its people might as well return to chaos, and in universal nothingness, find the universal equality of property preached by the communist, and practiced by the highwayman.

That some men should have more capital than others is a necessity from the very nature of things; it is no more unjust, than that one man should be stronger, taller, or more healthy than another. The majority of people accept such, as the natural state of things; and the minority, who decline to accept it, are found among the vicious, who have squandered all they had; the improvident, who have never saved anything; and the lazy, who never labor for more than mere existence. Capital and labor are united in wedlock, and all forms of production are their offspring,—but their marriage is no affair of the heart, it is only of convenience. You will not pay a man a dollar for ten hours' work, that you can have done equally well for seventy cents; neither will you give ten hours' work for six pounds of sugar, if six hours' work will buy it. Whenever capital

and labor exchange themselves one for another, rest assured, each one will make the best possible bargain for itself. Political economy has nothing whatever to do with the affections, and any attempt to weave sentiment into an economic web, always results in a fabric, that will neither wash nor wear, fair as its surface may seem. The price of capital and labor depends on demand and supply, they are mutually dependent, and that is all about it. They are parts of an exact science, with no more poetry about it than there is in the multiplication table. No man is ever so content with the pay received for the use of his brain, muscles or capital, that he would not like to receive a little more; this feeling is universal, and will be, while men are made of the materials they now are. Charles Dickens' picture of Oliver asking for “more” was only an individual miniature, a type of all society.

As before stated, capital is anything saved, that when united with labor, is capable of producing a profit; a chisel is as much a form of capital as a thousand gold dollars; and if we attempt to lay down laws to rule capital in general, they must be general, and include all capital; they must apply to the tools of the village-smith as well as to the millions of the

bank of England. It is on this rock that the ignorant agitators of the labor question split; they try to divide society into two classes, laborers, and capitalists; but as no such divisions exist, their conclusions are as impotent as their premises are faulty. No two of them agree where the line should be drawn; one would draw it between those who have bonds, and those who have not; while another would regard the ownership of machinery as the dividing line; and others still, would regard those who have more than themselves, as capitalists. The great difficulty that confronts the believers in this earthquake doctrine, that all property should be evenly divided, is that nobody ever wants to "divide down," as the saying is,—that is, the man with ten cents will not want to divide with the man with only five; nor he, with half a dozen, who have nothing.

If the dreams of those who would destroy all capital could be realized, the sun would rise on the world's people, naked, homeless, foodless, with nothing saved, not even seed to plant. Compare such a picture with the world as it is, and a faint conception can be formed of the use and necessity of capital.

PRODUCTION AND CON- SUMPTION.



TRANSFORMATION A SYNONYM FOR BOTH—"USE-
LESS EACH WITHOUT THE OTHER"—LIFE NOT A SEE-
SAW—RICH NEIGHBORS BETTER THAN POOR—MAN
NOT A MAKER—LITTLE TO GIVE, LITTLE TO GET—
SALES ARE HINGES.



Man regarded as a physical, intellectual, and moral being, is the greatest wonder of this world of wonders. Yet with all his wonderful powers, man never has made, and never will make an atom of matter: furthermore, he is as powerless to destroy matter as to make it. Humiliating as this may seem, it is nevertheless a sturdy fact. What men vaingloriously call production and consumption (or, in plainer English, making and destroying,) are only two words used to express one idea—viz., transformation or change. Man can only change the matter God has made. God is the sole Creator

or Maker; man is but one of his creatures, who at best, can only change what has been created. More social and economic fallacies spring from considering man as a creator or producer, than from any other one cause. Beyond doubt, man is a wonder, but he is none the less a creature, and as incapable of *making* an atom of matter as a cur dog to construct a phonograph. The object of this paper is to consider man as a transformer, and to point out that he does not occupy an independent point in space, but a point on the circumference of life's great circle, with as many points to the right of him as to the left of him.

The truth, that man can do no more than transform matter, seems beyond the grasp of most of the prating politicians, who are rendering to a people hungry for economic truths, their unripe ideas, concerning what they are pleased to term, producers and consumers. One sect of these would-be philosophers claim, (if we follow their doctrines to the end), that men can have food without labor; and the other, that men can labor without food. One is directly opposed to the other, but both are equally wrong. There is no such thing on earth as a producer, who does not consume; or a consumer who does not produce. Any sys-

tem of government or school of philosophy, which pretends to treat any man or class of men, as purely producers or purely consumers, is bound to be a failure. You may cut a mule in two pieces, and have one half with ears, and the other half with a tail, but you will have no mule. Exactly so is any attempt to divide society in two classes, producers and consumers; the division may be made, but society will be destroyed. Every act of consumption; is hinged on some act of production; and the hinge is called a sale, or an exchange.

The Creator of all things made matter, and man to manage it. Matter by itself is a gift from Heaven; so is the force of gravity, power of germination, sunlight, etc. These are the only absolutely raw materials; and as they have been so lavishly bestowed, man will give nothing for them; they are to be had without even asking. It is only when two or more of God's gifts have been combined by man's energy, that the relation called property springs into being, and other men are willing to give in exchange for it, what they happen to possess.

It is clear, therefore, that absolutely raw materials have no value, as no man will give anything in exchange for them. To my mind, raw material, comparatively speaking, is anything

which any man proposes to change, as to its form, time or place, although it may be, nay, probably is, a finished product to some other man. For instance, cotton is a finished product to the planter, but raw material to the spinner; while, in turn, his yarn is a finished product to him, but raw material to the weaver; and so on through the endless links of industry.

Changing the form, the place, or the time of matter, is what all men are always doing. Farmers and millers change the form of grain, growing and grinding it; merchants change its place, taking it from where it is most abundant, to where it is most in demand; bankers and speculators, change the time of the grain, by keeping it from the period of superabundance to that of comparative scarcity. Every one of the many, who handle the grain, from the plowman to the baker, are middlemen, and the labors of all are necessary to enable the man who eats the loaf to have it. Even he is not a consumer only, for previous labor of his, has produced something, that buys the bread; which something indirectly reaches the plowman; furthermore, eating the bread is not its final consumption; for it reappears in the form of physical strength, enabling the eater to put forth fresh exertions in pro-

ducing other things. Neither can the farmer be called a producer, for although he "raises," the wheat, all the time he is plowing, reaping and threshing, he is consuming food, clothing, etc.; he is no more than a middleman — there have been laborers before him, and laborers shall come after him. Man is like the present, a small space between the great past and the great future, but nevertheless a space.

Granting that men are ever transforming matter, but never making, nor destroying it; that men are links in industry's great chain, whose ends are locked together; it follows that men are prosperous really, only as their neighbors are prosperous. It stands to reason that no man is better off from having all his neighbors poor. The man who has but little to sell, can buy but little; the man who can buy but little, has but little to sell. "Love thy neighbor as thyself" is an economic as well as a moral maxim; for if your neighbor has but little, you can exchange but little with him. Therefore, your property or capacity to exchange, is increased as his property, or capacity to exchange, is increased. Ignorance of this truth is common among all classes of society; but painfully so among the colored people of this country. Mutual jealousy is one

of their weakest social points. How this spirit came about makes no difference; it exists. Instead of rejoicing at the prosperity of any one of their race, they are envious; instead of trying to get up, where he is, the tendency is to try to pull him back, where they are. The feeling of "Comrade, touch the elbow," seems foreign to them, and petty jealousy is one of the heaviest chains binding them. Cohesion is as necessary in a people, as in a bar of iron, if either is to bear any weight. When mutual distrust, or repulsion, so to speak, takes the place of mutual attraction, only a rope of sand binds a community together.

In the economy of nature, nothing is really lost, although apparently something disappears in every change that matter undergoes. If ten thousand cords of wood were burned to ashes, and then scattered in the sea, there would not be an ounce of matter lost: there would have been a change of form, and that is all. The object of transforming any bit of matter, is to increase the utility, or beauty of some part of it: those transformations are best, in which the least apparent loss is noticeable.

Of nothing, nothing comes—so, if a portion of matter has once been transformed,

another similar portion of matter must be found, before a similar transformation can be made. If a man weave ten pounds of yarn into twenty-five yards of cloth, he must obtain another ten pounds of yarn before he can weave another twenty-five yards of cloth. This economic law is generally appreciated by manufacturers and merchants, as in their pursuits, it is self-evident; but many farmers seem ignorant of it; for they go on, year after year, taking away from the soil the many elements that go “to make a crop,” but return to the soil, only a part of what they take away. The laws of nature are inflexible, even if farmers be unacquainted with them; and sooner or later these ignorant ones find their lands worn out, and themselves bankrupts. This State of Virginia is full of examples of this fact, and many a man is wearing his life out, trying to solve the question of how to subtract two from four, and have four as a remainder. If a man cut and split a cord of wood, he cannot expect to feel as fresh and strong, at the end of the job as at its beginning; he has exchanged his strength for the pile of split wood, and cannot have a similar amount of strength, until he has exchanged for it, food, sleep, etc.

All energy is a series of blows; and "to strike" is an active transitive verb. Human industry is the algebraic sum of human energies, and depends on the consumption by one man of the production of another, in order to produce something for a third. To argue that the the second of these, can be benefited by the injury of the first or third, is to argue that a blanket can be lengthened by cutting off one end, and sewing it on the other.

All living men are ever exchanging something for something else; give and take, are the two members of life's equation. The final expression of any equation of this sort, its simplest form, so to speak, is "Labor for labor." It matters not in what form, in how many fractions, or parentheses, the labor may be hidden, it is always labor, labor either past, or present, or yet to be performed, that is exchanged. This is a rugged, homespun truth, that many do not know; and which many, who do know, keep tucked away in the cobweb corner of their brains, where memory and reflection are forbidden to sweep or dust. If every man could have graven on his finger tips, that everything he buys is a sale of so much of his labor, a truer economy would guide many purchases. If a man earn a dollar a day, and buy ten

drinks of whiskey at ten cents a drink, he has worked one day to tickle his palate ten times. If people about to buy anything, would always measure their intended purchases, with hours of labor, instead of dollars and cents, a good deal of folly would be frost-bitten, and Christmas find more people with needful dollars in their pockets. Every dollar has two sides, and is entitled to be looked at twice, before it is spent. On one side, count how many hours' labor it has cost you to get it; on the other, how many hours of your labor you are about to get for it; strike a balance; and keep or spend the coin, as the balance seems in your favor or against you.

This doctrine of "Labor for labor" is one of those genuine truths, coined in words, that contains no sophistical alloy; it will stand unharmed the acid tests of morals, politics, or ethics. Beautifully true as this doctrine is, it is as hateful to some people as a red rag to a bellowing bull; the believers in "Fiat Money," the upholders of the equal redistribution of property, and people fevered with like "isms," hoot at this truth like owls at the moonlight. Nevertheless, even as the moon, in spite of owl hoots, has shone in the past, shines now, and will shine in the future, just so have men in the past, do men in the present, and will men

in the future, exchange "Labor for labor," in spite of the hoots of "ismites," whose "isms" truth won't fit.



MONEY.

MANY KNOW THAT IT IS; FEW KNOW WHAT IT IS—HOW IT WORKS—ITS DUAL NATURE—FACTS AND FANCIES—PROMISES AND PERFORMANCES—THE TOOL OF EXCHANGE AND THE STANDARD OF VALUES—WHY GOLD IS THE BEST MATERIAL FOR MONEY—PROMISES TO PAY MONEY ARE NOT MONEY—ELASTIC YARDSTICKS—WHAT HAS HAPPENED, MAY HAPPEN—PICTURES ARE NOT MEN—THE ABUSED WORD “VALUE”—FIE, ON FIAT MONEY—HONEST MONEY FOR HONEST LABOR—MONEY DEFINED.

There is no commodity so much used, and yet so little understood as money. Ignorance of the nature and functions of money, is not confined to any section or class; indeed the deepest ignorance is often found in the highest places, as the debates and acts of the last Congress of the United States abundantly prove. The country fairly teems with wild theories about money, and the national craze, if I may use the expression, is directly traceable to

the fact, that this generation has used, almost entirely, promises to pay money, instead of money itself: the financial heresies, which are rife among us, are diseases growing out of the tainted atmosphere of inflation, through which we have passed, and in one respect are still passing.

The only difficulty in the way of everybody's clearly understanding what money is, is that it has a two-fold nature; and people are apt to look at money only as a *medium of exchange*, or only as a *measure of value*. Real money combines in itself these two properties, and no money but real money does. Muscle is always muscle; bloat never is.

Let us first consider money as a medium of exchange. If a man, who had a jackknife, wanted a bushel of wheat, and could find a man with a bushel of wheat, who wanted a jackknife; the two could exchange their commodities without the use of money. But suppose, the man with the jackknife could not find anybody with a bushel of wheat, who wanted a jackknife; then, he would be forced to adopt some other way to obtain the bushel of wheat. Just here, comes in the use of money. The man with the jackknife must find somebody who wants the jackknife, and who

can offer, in exchange for it, something, which the man with the jackknife knows, the man with the wheat will take in exchange for it. This something is called money. It is evident this something we call money, must be made of some lasting material, or it would wear out in the constant passing from hand to hand. Again, it must be of some substance so rare, that its bulk will not be unwieldy; for instance, iron dollars would never answer the purposes of active trade. Thirdly, it must be something, that all civilized men desire, and for which they are willing to exchange other things they possess. Fourthly, it must be of such material as can be readily and accurately divided and sub-divided, for the convenience of commerce: for example, the purchase of our daily necessities would be almost impossible, if we had no other denomination of money than dollars. The material, out of which money is made must have certain other qualities; but these four are the leading ones. The experience of centuries has convinced civilization, that gold and silver are the only materials, out of which *real* money *can be made*; and that no paper can be used as an equivalent, unless it can be converted *on demand*, into these precious metals. Money *could be made* of anything, if

civilization would agree on that particular thing; but civilization *has agreed* on gold and silver, and it is idle to speculate on what it might have agreed, if it had not agreed on these two metals. By the unvarying laws of trade, this question has been settled in the Supreme Court of Commerce, and the legislation of no one nation can reverse the decision. Paper by itself, is not, cannot be, money: it can be a *promise to pay money*, but it is no more money, than any promise is its performance. The Continental Congress, and the late Confederate States, issued thousands of pounds weight of paper, and called it money; but calling it so, did not make it so, any more than calling a picture a man, would make it human. What are called Greenbacks are not money; they are bills of credit; they represent the plighted faith of the Government; they are promises to pay money, but are not money any more than eggs are chickens. Greenbacks are debts of the Government, and the only way these debts can be paid, is by taxing the people. When demagogues cry for "more greenbacks" they cry for more taxes; and as taxes are finally paid by labor, it needs no profound wisdom to see how staunch friends of the working men, are those people, who urge that

the best way to pay debts, is to double or treble them.

Let us now look at money as a measure of value. This word, *value*, is about the best abused word in the English language; accurately defined it is the "relation of mutual purchase established between two services by their exchange." If, for instance, I sell a day's work for a barrel of potatoes, the value of my day's work is a barrel of potatoes; and the value of the potatoes is a day's work on my part. Value, then, is a relation, not a substance; you cannot weigh value in the grocer's scales, nor say it is white, black, or copper colored; neither can you say it is a foot high nor a yard long.

The only appreciation of value that is possible, is our ability to compare two things with a third, or to measure one thing by another of the same sort. If I know, that I can buy a coat that I want, for five dollars, and can sell a barrel of flour that I have, for five dollars; it is evident my barrel of flour will buy me a coat. If I sell my flour to Mr. Jones for five dollars, and then give the five dollars to Mr. Smith for a coat, I have simply exchanged my flour for the coat. In another sense, the five dollars were a measure of values, for with it were

measured both the flour and the coat. It would make no difference to me, if I received one dollar or a hundred dollars instead of five, for the flour, if the coat could be got for a dollar, or for not less than a hundred. The usefulness of money is not in its name, nor in its quantity, but in its purchasing power. The best dollar is the dollar that will buy most, in the greatest number of places.

As all other commodities are measured by money, and as all men are willing to take real money in exchange for what they have, it is natural that money should be desired by all of us. Although this desire is universal among civilized men, the majority of people do not appreciate the fact, that they do not *desire money for itself, but as a means of procuring whatever else they desire.* One cannot eat money, drink money, wear money, nor use it as building material; yet these and all other physical wants can be gratified, if one has money to offer in exchange for their gratification. Only misers want money for money's sake, and as their name indicates, they are miserable beings. Money is a mean, not an end—men desire it, not for itself, but for what it will get.

When we speak of measuring anything, we mean that it contains some arbitrary unit

of measure so many times, as a foot, a pint, a pound, a dollar. In every measurement, the unit of measure must be of the same nature as the thing to be measured: for example, we do not measure length with a unit of capacity, nor capacity with a unit of weight; we do not say it is so many bushels from Washington to Richmond, but so many miles; we do not say that a horse weighs so many feet, nor that a man is so many pounds high. That, with which we measure length, must have length; that, with which we measure capacity, must have capacity; and in like manner, that, with which we measure values, must have value. While the unit of measure of value must have value, it must be remembered that value itself is a relation, and therefore its unit of measure must be relative, not absolute. By themselves, neither gold, nor silver, nor paper have any value; it is only when they can be, and are compared with other things, that the relation, we call value, springs into being. If one man were out in a boat, in the middle of the ocean, with nothing on board, but a thousand pieces of gold, the gold then and there, would have no value. But let some other man come alongside, with water, food, and means of safety, then, the gold would have value, for it

could be exchanged for something desired.

All absolute units of measure, as of length, capacity, time, weight, etc., must be constant—that is, they must always be the same. But as values are relations, their unit of measure cannot be absolutely unvarying; therefore, that thing has been selected, as a unit of value, by the commercial world, which compared with other things, *varies least*; and that thing, is a grain of pure gold.

The necessity of steadiness in a standard or unit of measure is self-evident; what sort of estimates could a farmer make, if a ton should mean 1,500 lbs. to-day, and 2,400 lbs. to-morrow? Herein lies the danger of having anything but gold as the standard of values. Compared with gold, silver has varied, in a single twelve month, as much as eighteen cents per ounce, and what has happened before, may happen again. Still this question need not be considered at present, for in a few years silver will be our only standard, for the poorer currency always drives out the better. The majority of men will not pay their debts in gold, if they can legally discharge them with rags or other rubbish.

To show the necessity of having for money, that, which compared with other things, is

steady; let us carry a little further the illustration of the man, who sold a barrel of flour and bought a coat. Let us suppose he sold his flour, and received five bits of coin, each marked one dollar, which he put in his pocket, concluding not to buy a coat at that time. A year after, however, he wants to buy a coat, and going to the tailor, asks the price, and is told, seven dollars. He naturally inquires why the price has been raised two dollars, and is told that there are so many of these dollars now, that it takes more of them to buy anything than it did. The tailor has to pay more for his cloth, more for his labor, and more for everything he has to buy, so he must ask more for everything he has to sell. This man would appreciate how dangerous it was, to have a measure of values so liable to change. If he had kept his flour, or sold it for gold, either would have still bought the coat; but instead, he exchanged his flour for a commodity, that had no fixed value in the commercial world, and had to suffer the consequences.

The stamp on a piece of money is only a certificate, that it contained, when coined, so many grains of pure gold or silver; it adds but little to the exchangeable power of the coin, and its main use is, that people handling

it, can tell at a glance, exactly its denomination. If a man sell a watch for a ten dollar gold piece, he does not exchange the watch for the eagle on the coin, but for the exchangeable power that is vested in the bullion, on which the eagle is stamped. If the United States should make a coin, containing only 11.61 grains of gold, and stamp it a dollar, it would not be the gold dollar we now have; neither could it be exchanged for more than half as much as could a standard dollar containing 23.22 grains. Calling a pint a peck, or a peck a pint, does not make it so. If Congress should conclude to stamp all gold dollars, "one cent," it would not materially affect their buying power. The name of a coin has hardly more to do with the coin itself, than a man's Christian name has with his manhood. Money in old times was always counted by weight, a practice still continued in the Bank of England. The fineness of the work on coins is to make counterfeiting more difficult; but when they are to be melted, to make jewelry, plate, or other coins, the fineness of the work goes for absolutely nothing, and it is only the bullion that counts.

The amount of actual money in the world is an extremely small fraction of one per cent. of

the exchanges that yearly take place between individuals and nations. The practical use of money in commerce is to balance accounts. If a planter receive from his factor one thousand dollars worth of provisions, and send exactly one thousand dollars worth of cotton in return, there has been an exchange of commodities, each one of which could have been exchanged for one thousand dollars ; but which, in point of fact, have been exchanged for each other, without the intervention of a dollar. If the planter should send eleven hundred dollars worth of cotton, it would require one hundred dollars, or some other commodity worth one hundred dollars, to balance the account. This law applies to nations, as well as to individuals.

Money being so important a thing, as to be the adjuster of commercial differences, and the measure of value of all other things ; it follows that the best is none too good ; and any man is a fool, who says that "so and so" is good enough money for him. A very dangerous theory is now afloat in this country, that the Government can stamp bits of paper, call them dollars, and give them to the people in exchange for their labor or the products of their labor. If a man give anything of use, he is

entitled to receive something of use in return ; the reverse of this doctrine is unromantically called *theft*. Plain as this matter is ; viz., that honest labor should be paid in honest money, thousands of unthinking people, of the very class that will suffer most, are clamorous for a condition of affairs, under which they will be paid in poor money instead of good. A man, who does a day's or a month's work, is entitled to be paid in money, that is good to-day, to-morrow, and every day ; good in the place he earned it, and good in any other place, where he may wish to exchange it. By good money, I mean that thing, which compared with all other things, will vary least in the course of a life time ; and which has a known purchasing power in the great markets of the world. To declare that labor or anything else should be paid for, by a thing, which, compared with a gold dollar, may to-day be worth 80c., to-morrow 75c., and next year 35c., is to declare in favor of the grandest kind of grand larceny. During the war there was a kind of hair oil, the wrappers of which resembled greenbacks. Unscrupulous persons gave these wrappers to the ignorant freedmen, in exchange for chickens, eggs, services, etc., paying what seemed enormous prices. The poor freedman, when he

tried to exchange one of these dollars (?) for something he wanted, discovered how he had been swindled. The inflationists to-day, want the people to take "wrapping paper" for money ; but self interest is more eloquent than inflation orators.

All languages have two different words to express the idea of exchange. In English we say, we buy and we sell: but in reality we mean, we exchange. No man can buy unless somebody else sells, and *vice versa*. If a man buy a loaf of bread with a dime, the baker buys a dime with a loaf of bread. If dimes become relatively more abundant than loaves of bread, the baker will ask more dimes for his bread ; in other words, bread will be higher. If bread become relatively more abundant than dimes, the baker will get fewer dimes for his bread ; in other words, bread will be lower.

It is not concerning the quantity, but the quality of the currency, that our people need worry. If we were on a purely gold basis, and more money were needed for our commerce, more money would come; for money is merchandise, and is governed by the same laws of supply and demand, as are other sorts of merchandise. If flour be twenty dollars a barrel in London,

and ten dollars in New York, flour will go from New York to London, until the equilibrium be restored. If money be worth 7 per cent. here, and 2 per cent. in England, on equal security, money will come from England to America, as surely as unrestrained water will run down hill. We read a great deal about the duty of the government to make money plenty. How can the government make money plenty? If the government coin a dollar, somebody has to earn the dollar before it gets into circulation. If it prints a promise to pay a dollar, somebody has to be taxed to redeem that promise. In either case, the coin or the promise, has to be earned; the government cannot give money without an equivalent, any more than it can give food, clothing, shelter, or gold watches. If citizens could get paper dollars from the government for nothing, they certainly would not give each other anything in exchange for them. Who will pay for anything, when they can get exactly the same thing for nothing?

It is boldly asserted by the Inflationists that the government should issue, what they call, National Money; that is bits of paper, stamped so many dollars, and declare them legal tender; then, they argue, this money would per-

force become the currency of the country. To this scheme, there are two insuperable objections; first, the Constitution forbids any ex-post facto legislation; so this National Money could not be used to pay debts, contracted before its creation. Second, the government cannot make people trade, and no man of sense would exchange valuable things for valueless things: in other words, they would not sell for this sort of money; and whatever of it got into circulation, would be what was paid to the poor and ignorant, who either could not help themselves, or who had not learned by experience what a dollar was. Suppose a man were paid one thousand of these dollars for a day's work, and these thousand dollars would not buy an ounce of bread, would that be prosperity? Yet it is the kind of prosperity urged on the workingmen by the Inflationist leaders. Honest labor should be paid in honest dollars; and the dollars of sophistry reserved for the sophists who claim to be satisfied with them. In conclusion, I would define money as, *the tool whereby exchanges are effected, AND the standard to which all other values are referred.*

W A G E S .

WAGES A RICHER WORD THAN SALARIES—WHAT THEY ARE—WHO BUYS THEM AND WHO SELLS THEM—CONFUSED IDEAS ABOUT WAGES—DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SEEMING AND BEING—“KEEP AND CLOTHING”—WE MUST GIVE TO GET—MUCH FOR MUCH—LITTLE FOR LITTLE—WHERE WAGES ARE UNKNOWN—RATES OF WAGES DETERMINED BY “HIGHER LAWS,” THAN CONGRESS—LABOR FREE—WEAK POINT IN TRADES UNIONS.

Some squeamish people affect to think the word “wages” a trifle vulgar; and if themselves in receipt of wages, refer to them as “salaries.” In this, thin-skinned daintiness overleaps itself; for the English language contains no more poverty stricken noun than salary: it really means enough to buy one’s salt; and was used to express the pitiful sum given a Roman soldier, with which to buy that cheap necessity. Wages is a good honest Saxon word, and means *anything exchanged for labor.*

In this definition there are two technical terms. An exchange is the mutual giving and taking of two things by two persons ; and labor is any human exertion put forth, in order to obtain something in exchange for itself. Using this definition of wages, it is manifest that in all free, civilized countries, every man is either a wage taker, a wage giver, or sometimes, both. Wages are given for men's exertions alone ; interest is paid for capital ; and hire for the use of machines and beasts. Difference of individual preferences and self-interest, underlie all wage giving and taking, as they do all other exchanges. There is no more sentimentality about wages than about oxsleds. A man gives wages, because he prefers the services of the wage-taker, to what he gives ; otherwise he would not give it ; so, too, the wage-taker prefers what he gets for his services, to keeping them for himself, else he would not exchange them. There is no obligation on either side ; in a free country, A is no more compelled to pay B wages, than B is compelled to render service to A. No clear understanding of wages can be had, unless the idea of exchange be kept constantly in view ; that is, that wages and labor are offsets of one another. Looked at in this light, the question of wages

becomes simplified; and the same principle applies to all cases, whether the things exchanged be great or small. If a man agree with a boy, to give him a dollar a month, in exchange for his services as bootblack, or if a railroad agree to give a man \$25,000 a year to conduct its affairs, the same principle is involved.

People who forget the idea of exchange, are apt to have a confused idea, that the account between wage-taker and wage-giver, is not settled by the performance of services, and the payment of the stipulated wages; they seem to think, that in some way, they know not how, there is some obligation outstanding on one side or the other. This confusion is needless, and arises from an ignorance of what wages are. If a man go to a baker, and exchange five cents for a loaf of bread; nobody thinks there is any account open between them: neither is there between two men, one of whom has put forth certain exertions for the other, and been paid by him a certain amount for them; both illustrations are examples of exchanges, and the law of exchange governs both.

Large wages are the offsets of large services; small services are offset by small wages. The

rate of a man's wages depends mainly on two things: the kind of services he can render, and the demand there is for them. If the services a man can render, are of a kind, that many men in the same place can render as well as he, the rate of wages will be low. If, however, his services be of a kind that few can render, or if he can render them in an exceptionally good manner, then his wages will be high; *provided, there be a demand for them.* The kind of services a man renders, and the manner in which he renders them, depend to a great extent on himself; but there is something beyond himself to be considered, and that is, how much other people want his services. The demand for any kind of service has as much to do with fixing the value of the service as the supply. The most skilful butcher, that ever lived, could not obtain high wages from Hindoos, who eat no meat; nor could the most expert waiter of Delmonico, get high wages from a band of Comanches.

Articles of merchandise of the same kind often vary in degree; as, for instance, one piece of silk is more valuable than another. Degree in merchandise is called "grade;" degree in labor, is called skill. Man alone can possess skill; for skill is the dual power of

perceiving and performing, which man alone possesses in a high degree. Machines can perform, but cannot perceive; beasts may perceive, but cannot perform. Man's powers of both perception and performance, are increased by practice or education; but neither practice nor education, can give value to a service, for which there is no demand.

To obtain high wages, a man must be able and willing to do something which everybody else cannot, or is not willing to do; and yet, which somebody, who is willing and able to pay for having done, wants done. These conditions give a man a general opportunity; but his particular opportunity, will only come from his ability to do the particular thing as well, or better, than any other man, who is willing to do the same thing.

Whether wages *be* really high or low, or whether they *seem* high or low, are two very different things; although many people never look beyond what *seems*. Man's prime necessities are food, clothing and shelter; and a glimmer of the truth is contained in the popular expression of a "man's working for his 'keep' and clothing." Every man who labors, labors for his "keep and clothing" *and something more*. Wages are really high or low, if

this "something more" be much or little. The real highness of a man's wages, is what they will buy over and above his necessities. If a man earn 50 cents a day, and his necessities cost him 40 cents, he is really receiving higher wages, than if he were paid \$5.00 a day and his necessities cost \$4.90. In one case, he can capitalize about twenty per cent. of his labor; in the other, only about two per cent. Men are too prone to look at the *name* of their wages, instead of at the wages themselves. A man who is paid a dollar a minute, and whose "keep and clothing" cost \$61.00 per hour, is on the highroad to bankruptcy. This is only another way of proving, what has already been shown; that the best dollar for the laboring man is the dollar, that will buy most, in most places.

As there can be no value to any exertion, except it can be exchanged for something, and as the chance to exchange varies with the skill with which such exertion can be put forth, it follows, that being able to supply wants, which are ever present, is the best ability for the majority of men to possess. This is a fact as much as a theory; for one-half the world's inhabitants are devoted to cultivating the soil, thus providing for two of life's prime necessi-

ties, food and clothing.

In savage societies wages are unknown; every man does everything for himself; but soon as a race emerges from barbarism to civilization, the relation of property springs into being. Then some men, becoming possessed of property or capital, find that this capital requires more present labor, than they themselves can give, so they seek the assistance of other men. Naturally, these other men will not give their assistance without compensation, and this compensation is called "wages." It makes no difference, if we approach wages from the standpoint of the wage-giver or the wage-taker, the result is the same; viz., something for something. A does not give B wages, except for the purpose of increasing or saving something that he (A) has; and B does not give A his services from any love of A, or A's property; but because he wants what A will give for his services, more than he wants his own time and powers.

It should not be forgotten that wage-givers have as much right to form unions as wage-takers; and as they are fewer in numbers, are more wieldy bodies. Both unions, however, are subjects of Demand and Supply. If the keepers of summer hotels, for instance, should combine,

thinking it for their interest, and resolve to pay their waiters not more than \$10.00 a month; and the waiters should combine, and resolve not to work for less than \$20.00; both would be exercising an undoubted right.

Which side would win, would depend to a great extent, on which could hold out the longer. While both held out, no wages would be earned, nor services rendered. The great disadvantage, under which such wage-takers labor in times of "strikes," is that their unions are not large enough; that is, that there are plenty of men, who do not belong to the unions, who may be employed by the union of hotel keepers. Again, very few wage-takers have saved enough to afford many weeks' "keep and clothing," without daily labor. Mention has already been made of the crime of one man preventing another from working, if he see fit. Such acts are the complete development of the spirit of slavery. If a working men's union say to A, who has a sick family, "You shall not sell your labor to B, because he will not buy our labor at our price," and force A to obey; A is just as much enslaved, as if B should seize him and force him to toil for nothing. Involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, is

theoretically dead in this country and England ; but in the last few years, many a workman in both countries, has found his Trades Union to be as tyrannical a master, as “ ever worked a gang.”



LIBERAL TRADE.

NATIONAL TAXES SHOULD BE LEVIED FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD, AND NOT FOR PRIVATE ENDS — THE GREATEST GOOD TO THE GREATEST NUMBER, THE SOUNDEST POLICY — TARIFF SIFTED THROUGH THE SIEVE OF PHILOLOGY — PIRACY PROTECTION'S ANCESTOR — LABOR A MEAN, NOT AN END — INCOMPATIBILITY OF REVENUE AND PROTECTION — SOME PLEAS FOR PROTECTION WITH THEIR MASKS OFF — WE MUST BUY TO SELL — A PROTECTIONIST'S DILEMMA ; HOW TO EAT ONE'S CAKE, AND HAVE IT — COLUMBIA'S CHINESE CORSETS — AMERICA NO LONGER A MINOR — HOW BEARS' PAWS PROVE POOR DIET.

Between absolute freedom and liberty, there is as wide a gulf, as between liberty and absolute despotism. This truism as to the body politic is equally a truism as to the body industrial. If man were perfect, he would need no government; absolute freedom might be his: but he is not perfect, hence has to submit to some restraint. If this country were abso-

lutely debt free, absolute free trade would be best for it ; but it labors under the incubus of a great debt, a debt owed by all the people ; hence it is only fair, that all the people contribute to its liquidation—importers, exporters, farmers, manufacturers, bankers, brokers, professional men, and all. No graver mistake could be made, nor greater injustice contemplated, than proposing that our foreign trade be wholly exempt from taxation. No people pay taxes to support their government, more willingly than the Americans : but among the majority of them, there is a growing dislike to the payment of taxes, direct or indirect, for any other purpose than the support of the government. It is not the object of this paper to offer any infallible dogma, or panacea for “hard times” ; but to state a few facts about tariffs in general, and ours in particular, with the hope of clearing up some points, on which the people sometimes seem a little befogged. It must be borne in mind, that the masses of the American people of this generation, have had no occasion to study the theory of tariffs, howsoever much experience they have had of their practical workings.

It is well to remember that the word “Tariff” has piracy for an ancestor ; being derived

from the name of a little town on the straits of Gibraltar (Tariffa), from which the Moorish Chiefs used to sail out, and rob every passing vessel of part of its cargo. The original signification of the word is pretty much forgotten; but as much as time has softened the meaning of the word, "Tariff" still means taking without giving. It differs from exchange as charities and thefts do, in there being but one thing pass between two people. In exchanges there are two parties, both of whom are at once givers and takers: but in tariffs, charities or thefts, there is only one thing taken from one person by another. Philology is full of surprises, yet perhaps it contains no greater surprise, than in the word "Tariff;" where, in a pirate captain, with a cutlass in his teeth, we find the original of the uniformed gentleman, armed with red tape and sealing wax, who boards every incoming vessel, and takes part of her cargo, or its equivalent in money. Whether we take the word in its ancient or modern significance, it is always a subtraction. This is a rough-edged fact, that no sophistry can smooth.

Coming down to modern times, we find the word tariff applied to two different schemes for extracting money from the people: one of

these schemes is called "Protective," whose object is to prevent the products of labor entering a country, thus making exchanges as few as possible: the other may be called "Revenue," whose sole object is public revenue through private exchanges. Of course it is the policy of the latter to have exchanges as frequent, and in as large amounts as possible, for the greater the volume of exchanges, the greater the revenue.

All tariffs are obstructions to commerce, as much or more so, than wide deserts, high mountains or stormy seas. Now, if these tariffs, these obstacles to trade, have for their object, the lightening of the public burden of debt; they are endurable, nay necessary: but without such object, they are but Chinese walls, or African deserts, thrown around the country. Our present tariff is neither one nor the other; it aims at being both: and like other creatures, trying to sit on two stools, it upsets both, and floors itself between them.

The following conditions underlie a Revenue Tariff, which is indispensable to Liberal Trade: 1st, That we shall produce more of some articles than we can consume, in order that we may have a surplus to exchange for those things we desire but do not produce.

2d, That this surplus be of such things as other nations want. 3d, That we use the same commodity as money, or means of facilitating exchanges, that other commercial nations use. The fertility of our soil, and the ingenuity of our people supply the first two of these conditions: while the existence of the third may be hoped for, within a reasonable period. To frame a tariff, that will yield the greatest revenue with the least friction, is the problem to be solved. Tariff framers always have found, and always will find this difficulty, that every man will think that tariff best, when every man is taxed,—but himself. The following propositions are self-evident. If there be no duties levied, the revenue from duties will be zero: if the duties be fixed so high, that no goods come into the country, the result will be the same. Somewhere, then, between these two zeros, that is, between absolute Free Trade and perfect Protection, will the point of maximum revenue be found. Exactly where this point may be, is hard to say; but it is clear as noon-day, if the rate of duty be fixed so high, that the importation of goods is seriously diminished, then the revenue will be diminished: and unless the rate be fixed at a point high enough to check importation,

there is no Protection: hence, a revenue tariff can never be a protective tariff; for the moment the point of protection is touched, the point of decreasing revenue is found. To talk about a "Revenue Tariff with incidental protection," is to talk nonsense: the phrase is a pure bit of buncombe, a cluster of tinkling words, intended to tickle the public ear, and mislead the public mind. Precisely what the highest rate of duties may be, which will not materially affect imports, must be determined by the experience of specialists, and actual experiment.

Such things as we do not raise at all, or only in comparatively small quantities, and which our people will have, should be made to yield a good portion of our revenue. The volume of imports of any article, like coffee, tea, sugar, etc., which the people are determined to have, and which cannot be profitably produced here, will not be affected by a moderate duty. The simpler the duties, and the fewer articles taxed (a fixed annual revenue being constantly kept in view,) are important factors in a Revenue Tariff: for this plan not only reduces the cost of collection, but prevents the irritating questions, which constantly and in all honesty of purpose arise, under a mixed system, like

the one now in vogue.

There is another point on which "tariff tinkers," and speech makers, display an amazing amount of ignorance; and that is on the subject of what they call "*raw materials.*" To speak of absolutely raw materials is to speak of nothing at all: for any bit of matter, or force of nature, to which any human labor has been applied, is no longer "raw material:" it would be impossible to convey any matter from one country to another without applying some labor to it; so, no absolutely raw materials would ever be imported. If by raw material is meant anything, on which further labor must be expended, before it reaches the point where an almost complete transformation occurs, then there is no article which is not "raw material." For instance, wool is raw material to the cloth maker; but a finished product to the sheep raiser: cloth is raw material to the tailor; but a finished product to the cloth maker; and so on, to the end of the chapter. Raw material, then, both absolutely and comparatively considered, can, with great propriety, be thrown out of the consideration of the tariff question.

The keystone, on which economists of the Protective school rest their theory, is that a

high tariff protects home industry: that it shields American labor from the competition of what, they are pleased to term, the pauper labor of the old world. To show the hollowness of this keystone, it may be well to recite a few primer pages of Political Economy. It takes two to make a bargain. In every sale, there must be a buyer as well as a seller: the two are as necessary to an exchange, as are inspiration and expiration to respiration. If you knock a man's breath out of him, with a blow of your fist, you accelerate his expiration, but do not improve his respiration. If you put a plaster over his mouth, and pump air through his nostrils, you facilitate his inspiration, but do not benefit his breathing. The vital error of the Protectionist school is, that they regard a citizen only as a seller, and not, as he is, both a buyer and a seller. No doubt a high tariff prevents Europe selling to America, but it also prevents her buying from America. Wherein, then, does it benefit America? Any system, which prevents our buying from others, prevents our selling, or in other words, confines us to ourselves for a market. Now if we produced only exactly as much as we consumed, this system might be upheld; and we might get along for a time, like the bear, who win-

ters in a hole, and lives by sucking his own paws. But unfortunately for the theory, owing to the goodness of our soil and the energy of our people, we produce a good deal more than we consume, and having no outlet, this surplus must roll up, rot, and produce "hard times." Production under these circumstances seeks to accommodate itself to consumption; everyone economizes; so the previous rate of consumption is reduced, and when we are ready to throw off the tariff, we are like the bear, when he comes out of his hole, very thin and discouraged in appearance.

The theory, that a high tariff encourages American labor, is another fallacy. Economists of the Protectionist school, speak of a high tariff as an active living force. It is no such thing; it, in no way, increases the volume of labor, it simply changes its direction. If, by the bounty wrung from the people and paid to the iron masters of Pennsylvania, ten thousand miners dig iron in Pennsylvania, instead of gold and silver in Nevada, there are only 10,000 men at work: the direction, not the quantity of labor has been changed.

Another plea for protection is, that ours is a young country, and that its infant manufactures must be protected. They urge, that by a

high tariff, bounties can be taken from the many, and paid to the few; and that it is wise to erect a hot house, in which all industries, good, bad, and indifferent can be forced. The great trouble with this plan is, that these infant industries never mature: they always remain infants: they become bigger and more awkward perhaps, but never strong enough to grow outside in the open air. Ship-building, for example, is an infant industry, that has been protected since the adoption of the Constitution; yet America, as a ship-building country, ranks so low, as hardly to be rateable. One would think, that after ninety odd years of perfect protection, this infant might be able to stand on its own legs: but the fact is, we pay the paupers of Europe, millions of dollars annually in the way of freights, which our ship-builders and ship-owners ought to earn, and which they would earn, if ship-building and kindred industries, instead of being forced in a hot house, had been permitted to make a slower and more natural growth in the open air, where God Almighty intended that they should grow. In the early history of the country, protectionists argued that five years would be long enough to establish infant industries—but alas, eighteen times

five years, finds many protected beings, anxious for at least five years more.

A true national economy looks to the products of a nations labor and their exchange ability: while Protection regards labor as an end, not as a means: it rests satisfied, if it can set a given number of men to work, without special regard to the product of their labor. To excite human exertion is its object, let results be what they may. The object of the wider policy, on which Liberal Trade is based, is to obtain the maximum production of a nations labor; regarding the human exertion expended as only a mean to an end. There are certain natural laws, which Liberal Trade obeys, and of which advantage is sought to be taken. To these laws, Protection gives no heed, and constructs its policy on the theory, that an act of Congress can change an isothermal line.

Another favorite plea of the Protectionists is, that high tariffs afford high wages. A more curious confusion of substance and shadow can hardly be imagined. Any artificial means, as a high tariff when first introduced, which enables one industry to pay high wages to its help, must have the same effect on other industries "protected" in like manner. Now it follows that the products of this labor, must

be exchanged one for another, and the higher wages are added to the cost of all products. "The help," who have received these higher wages, have to buy these goods at their higher cost. So in what respect, but in name, are wages higher? A flea through a microscope may look as large as a turtle, but it is only a flea, never mind what it seems. Reference to the trite Protectionist cry, that a high tariff protects Americans against foreign "pauper" labor, has been made, and its hollowness shown. But granting it to be true, is it a sound policy? If it be wise to shut out the products of foreign labor, it must be equally wise to shut out labor itself. Yet what statesman, except perhaps Dennis Kearney, would advise the exclusion of industrious would-be citizens? This conclusion is forced upon the Protectionists, if they be honest in saying that their object is to protect American labor; for any industrious foreigner, who lands in Castle Garden, is a competitor against those already here. It is held indeed by some Protectionists, that to invite emigration, is one of the objects of high tariffs; if so, their theory is to build with one hand and tear down with the other: they would act the part of political Penelopes, who ravel at night the web they

weave by day.

The action of a high tariff is always restrictive; restriction is always friction; and friction is always a minus quantity in the statement of a sum of forces. If the duty of a blanket equal a bushel of wheat, and the blanket itself cost a bushel of wheat; a farmer protected by tariff, has to pay two bushels of wheat, for what he could buy with one bushel, if exposed to the dangers of facing foreign pauper labor. It does not require a collegiate education to understand that the farmer has not been benefited, even if labor has been protected.

Governments can do a great many things; but they cannot give any man or any set of men, a bounty or subsidy, unless they take it from some other men. A protective tariff is a series of bounties, which the masses pay, not to the government for its benefit, but to make a bounty fund, to be divided among a few. As before stated, the people are getting tired of paying taxes to benefit individuals, instead of the government; and the more they learn about "Protective Tariffs," the less they like them; and the more certainty there is of their dislike taking the form of legislative action. It is small comfort to the masses to know that

the very industries, they have been taxed to protect, are in a wretched condition financially. If the fact afford any satisfaction, it is of that grimly moral sort, which a plaintiff in a libel suit feels, when a verdict of six cents in his favor is rendered.

If there be any wisdom in the policy of protection ; that is, in the policy of preventing our nation exchanging with other nations, it would be wise to amend the Constitution, so as to prevent the States of this Union exchanging between themselves. If the State of Virginia is new and young compared with England, so are Colorado and Nevada new and young, compared with Virginia. Labor and Capital are both nominally cheaper in the East than the West, and the population is more dense. If the policy of protection be beneficial to the United States, then it would be a benefit to every State in the Union, if it could be "protected" from every other State. The maple sugar of Vermont would not have the cane sugar of Louisiana in the market as a competitor ; and the cotton planter of North Carolina, who can only hope for one hundred and fifty pounds of lint cotton to the acre, would be protected against the farmer of Texas, whose acres yield him 400 pounds each. The wheat

grower on the New Hampshire Hills, would be protected from the cheap wheat of Minnesota; and the miners of Nevada would be allowed to mine, and coin their silver into any weight dollar they liked, protected from California gold, and the silver of other States. There is nothing strained about these conclusions: they are simple applications of the principle of protection, which holds that the United States is better off without intercourse with the rest of the family of nations than with it. If this be true, then every State must be better off, protected from every other State; every county from every other county; every village from every other village; aye, every man from every other man.

Looked at through Protection spectacles, every railroad and river is a curse; every telegraph and mail route a disadvantage; for they increase competition: while untunnelled mountains and uncabled seas, are the most potent agents for good, with which a nation can be blessed. A malarious climate is better for laborers than a salubrious one, for fewer people will come to offer their labor in competition.

It is urged in favor of a high tariff, that it tends to keep coin in the country. No doubt money as well as all other commodities are kept at home, but *cui bono*? What evil is it,

if Americans see fit to exchange gold and silver for other things? They don't give their money away: they get something in exchange, which they prefer to the coin, or they would not make the exchange. The tariffmen argue, that every dollar in coin that leaves a country, makes the country a dollar poorer. This glaring error on their part arises from their hazy ideas of what exchange really is: they fail to see that if a man give a dollar, he counts on receiving a dollar's worth of something else. The exports of coin, cotton, or corn are all governed by the same laws of demand and supply. Suppose a man subject to malarial fever exported a gold dollar, and in exchange received two doses of quinine from France; would he be worse off, than if he had paid a protected industry in Philadelphia his one dollar, and obtained in exchange only one dose of the same medicine? To keep coin at home, let America produce so many of the things she can produce best, that these things will be cheaper than money to ship, and then money will stay at home.

That fantastic financial theories should be entertained by the defenders of high tariffs, is not surprising: and in the last political campaign, we found a prominent Protectionist de-

claring in favor of an irredeemable currency, and urging as a point in its favor, that it could not be exported. Rag money and high tariffs both start on the idea, that every man is always a seller or a payer, and never a buyer or a payee. They would make our industrial heart with all veins and no arteries, and wonder why the circulation is imperfect!

Liberty of conscience, of speech, and of political action, are very dear to American citizens, and most jealously guarded. Should not the liberty of labor be equally dear? If a man be compelled to sell his labor, or its product, in one market, when he might have the choice of many, is he not restrained of his liberty? Twenty years ago slaves in the South were fine examples of protected labor. Their masters were their only market: "the peculiar institution" was in the nature of a high tariff, and the slaves, the ones protected: yet who would nowadays call the peculiar institution a blessing; or be wild enough to claim that slavery was liberty? It cost thousands of lives and millions of money, to extirpate the idea that slavery was a blessing; yet the country freely gave this blood and treasure as the price of liberty. Is it not strange to hear any man, in the councils of a nation, which has sacrificed so

much for liberty, declare to American citizens, that their liberty to labor must be abridged, because the markets for the products of their labor must be limited?

Liberal Trade assumes that the American people can hold their own in matters of trade; or in "bargains," if the phrase be more expressive. Protection assumes them to be incompetent, and favors a paternal government which will curb the industrious American in his propensity "to swap."

Liberal Trade holds as undeniable facts; that this country can, and does produce annually more of many things, than it can or does consume: it holds, furthermore, that the ratio of increase of production, is greater than the ratio of increase of consumption. Every machine, that is set in motion, and does with one man the work of three, must be followed by the discovery of two new users of whatever the machine produces, or the process of excessive production has begun. That such users exist there can be no doubt; to doubt it, would be to doubt the symmetry of God's creation. This statement is based on the assumption, that the machine is owned by an intelligent being, free to seek markets where he will, and not tied down to the single one a high tariff permits.

Why is it, that so many are out of employment, or working for starvation wages? Is it because they are lazy; is it because they are less skilful than five years ago; is it that our soil is less fertile? By no means; it is because there is not sufficient demand for the products of their labor within the limits of the United States, and the tariff forbids their export.

Nature is no niggard with her gifts, and has divided this globe into many parts, and made each produce many things, that many men want; but there is no spot on earth, where man can gratify every one of his desires, without exchange, and no legislature can make such a spot. That man should exchange, is as clearly part of Nature's design, as the gifts of Nature indicate a Giver. Art can do a great deal, but it is only the Finite compared with the Infinite. Nature has ordained certain laws, and men had better obey them, than try to make a code of their own, and think Nature will regard it as an improvement, and become a vassal. Man can cover ten acres with a hot house, and force a growth of cotton in the State of Maine, but somebody has to pay the expenses of the hot house. Nature has ordained that cotton should flourish in the latitude of Montgomery, Ala., but not in the latitude of Machias, Maine. As

stated, it can be forced in the latter place, but the labor to produce it, would be measured by perhaps fifty cents per pound of cotton; while at Montgomery it can be raised for perhaps one tenth of that amount. Just here the difference between Liberal Trade and Protection is manifest. Protection argues in favor of cotton planting in Maine, on the ground that ten times as much labor is required to raise the pound of cotton in Maine, as in Alabama; and therefore, that the demand for labor is increased. Liberal Trade holds, that it is better to raise the cotton in Alabama, where the same amount of labor will produce ten times as much cotton as in Maine: the object of labor is results, not mere exertion: with ten pounds of cotton, a man can buy more coffee, sugar, cloth, house rent, etc., than he can with one pound. Another grave objection to the hot house system of protection, is that weeds as well as wheat are forced: bad industries as well as good are fostered; and it must be so: for no man in a tariff ring, is willing to let his neighbor on the right, demand high prices from him, unless he be permitted to demand high prices from his neighbor on the left: and so round the circle.

Liberal Trade denies emphatically that all

exchange is robbery, and that one man must lose what another makes. It holds that by exchange, both sides can be benefited: it also holds to the dogma, that without exchange, the surplus product of every man's labor must rot on his hands, and be an injury to himself and his neighbors. Iowa raises more wheat than her people can eat; Arkansas, more cotton than her people can wear: by exchange the people of Arkansas and Iowa, can be both fed and clothed; whereas without exchange, Arkansas might be half-starved, with an immense surplus of raiment; while Iowa might be almost naked, though fairly gorged with food. Yet the advocates of limited exchanges must hold, that either Arkansas, or Iowa, or both, are injured by the exchange.

If there be a steady demand for any product of industry, the labor of some man or men will be directed to supplying that demand. This is a law of nature. Such industries need a tariff no more than thirsty men need to chew salt to make them drink. Some years ago there arose a sudden and active demand for grotesquely figured calicoes, known as "Dolly Vardens," and straightway our print-works began to produce them in huge quantities. Was there any need of legislation

to prevent these mills making other styles? Did "Dolly Vardens" require any protection? Liberal Trade recognizes in the American citizen an intelligent being, who is able to see for himself what people want, and to supply their wants.

Liberal Trade contents itself with striving after those things which are possible; leaving to Protection the squaring of economic circles.

The action of a high tariff is very like the action of corsets. These articles, which Fashion stole from the Torture Chambers, displace a woman's lungs, prevent inspiration, impede circulation, and keep within the body dead matter, that in the course of nature would be thrown from it. Many are the diseases, that befall women from tight lacing; and America is suffering from all of them, as the result of her sixteen years of wearing those patented stays, called Protection. Corsets give to a woman a very different outline from that which Nature has given; and much as Fashion may admire the lines of the corseted form, they are not the lines of beauty, of activity, nor of long life. To any poor woman, who had become phthisicky or dyspeptic from a long continuance of tight lacing, Common Sense would say, "Loosen your stays:" and this is just the ad-

vice to give to America. "Young woman: loosen your stays: you are young yet, and have a strong constitution; give your lungs free play: permit them to inhale, as well as exhale; the dead matter in your system will be thrown out: your circulation will be improved: your muscles will be nourished: and bounding health take the place of whining valetudinarianism." This figure is not fancy, it is fact. Read export and import, for exhale and inhale; read Tariff for corsets; call dead matter surplus production, and the statement can stand unaltered. The object of corsets, or their practical working at least, is to make one third of a woman's body look as much like a funnel as possible: the object of a high tariff, or its practical working at least, is as much as possible to heap up the population of cities, and to taper off the rural population. Liberal Trade would diffuse population, and it is well to remember, that in the crust of the earth lie the sources of wealth.

A vast amount of capital has been invested in the "protected industries" of this country; and it is not sound policy to rudely shake these investments: hence an immediate or sweeping change in the tariff is not expedient. No doubt when the men, with capital thus invest-

ed, put their money in these protected industries, they did so; because they knew they were to be given a bounty; and it may be urged, that they should have thought, that the power which gave the bounty could take it away. Still, the policy of Liberal Trade is founded on the grand principle of equal rights to all; to laborers, to capitalists, to farmers, to factories, and merchants; and its plan would be, to say through Congress, to these gentlemen, that "On and after Jan. 1st, 1881, the bounties you have been receiving shall be discontinued. If you are engaged in the production of anything the people want, you need no other protection: but if your industry is only followed on account of the bounty you have been receiving, it might as well be discontinued." American industry is a sturdy oak, and should be kept hearty, and free from all parasites.

Liberal Trade holds (to paraphrase a part of the Declaration of Independence) that it is the inalienable right of the American citizen to labor as he will; and to sell the products of his labor, where and for what he will. All else is despotism, or protection.

For many years, probably, American industry will have to bear taxation, and imports pay their share: but let the scheme, by which such

part is paid, be made simple, and have within it but one design; and that, the obtaining of the maximum of revenue with the minimum of friction.







LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 014 052 954 0