


87-15



0370

A
VINDICATION
OF
COMMERCE
AND THE
ARTS, &c.

Price Two Shillings.

A VINDICATION
OF
COMMERCE
AND THE
ARTS;

Proving that they are the SOURCE of the
Greatness, Power, Riches and Populoufness
of a State.

B E I N G

An Examination of Mr. BELL's *Dissertation* upon
Populoufness, read in the Schools, and honoured
with the Lord Viscount *Townshend's* PRIZE, by
the UNIVERSITY of CAMBRIDGE.

Wherein Mr. *Bell's* Calumnies on TRADE are an-
swered, his Arguments refuted, his Sytem ex-
ploded, and the principal causes of *Populosity*
affigned.

With a large APPENDIX,

Containing REMARKS on that part of the Estimate of the
Manners and Principles of the Times, which relates to
TRADE and COMMERCE.

By I— B—, M. D.

Æquè pauperibus prodest, locupletibus æquè. HOR. Ep.

L O N D O N :

Printed for J. N O U R S E at the *Lamb* opposite
Katherine-Street in the *Strand*. MDCCLVIII.

TO THE
RIGHT HONOURABLE

THE

Lord Visc^t. *Townshend.*

My LORD,

YOUR extensive knowledge of
commerce, your generous at-
tempts to introduce the study of it
into one of our universities, and your
glorious efforts in the senate to esta-
blish laws for its enlargement, not
only render you the object of the
esteem of every wise and good man;
but also seem to constitute you the
Patron of all commercial essays, which
shall be written with the same pub-
lic-spirited views by which you are
actuated. You are well apprised that

[vi]

numbers of people are the strength of a state, and you have bravely dared to encounter common prejudices, by standing up as an advocate for a general naturalization of all foreign protestants; and by attempting to abolish all corporation-exclusions in trade.

It appears likewise, from your assignment of prizes for the purpose, you are desirous, that one of our universities should instruct the people in the advantages resulting from commerce and populousity. How far your expectations have been answered, I shall not pretend to determine; but I flatter myself, that the following essay is as worthy of your patronage, as the Dissertation, which occasioned it, was of your money; and this vanity has emboldened me to inscribe it to your Lordship.

Though your Lordship's generous endeavours have been opposed by ignorance, maligned by self-interest, exclaimed against by malice, traduced by faction, and defeated by a combination

I

[vii]

combination of all these foes to virtue; yet your noble struggles for the public welfare must render you for ever the object of the esteem and approbation of every good patriot, and your memory dear to posterity. It is true, the opposition to your scheme, from the enemies of our happiness, has robbed you of the glory of doing a signal piece of service to your country, but they cannot deprive you of the satisfaction of having designed nobly, nor of the honour all wise and good men will pay to your virtues and merit. The attempt was glorious, though it failed.

I doubt not but some judicious *historian* in futurity will record in our annals a paragraph to this purpose.

“ The *English* had, from time im-
 “ memorial, laboured under a ridi-
 “ culous prejudice against foreigners,
 “ according to the observation of *Ho-*
 “ *race*, *Britannos hospitibus feros*, and
 “ carried it so far as even to refuse
 “ to receive their persecuted protest-
 “ ant brethren: but this year * a no- * 1752.
 “ ble-

A 4

[viii]

“ bleman of eminent parts, and of
 “ distinguished zeal for the public
 “ welfare; a statesman profoundly
 “ skilled in the interests of com-
 “ merce, and the most refined po-
 “ litics, animated with a patriotical
 “ fervour and zeal for the glory of his
 “ country, and to advance its riches,
 “ power, and splendor, as well as
 “ out of humanity and compassion
 “ to the persecuted and oppressed for
 “ the sake of their religion; by name
 “ Lord Townshend, appeared an ad-
 “ vocate for a general naturalization
 “ of all foreign protestants, and for-
 “ warded a bill in the house of lords
 “ to abolish all corporation-exclusions,
 “ &c. which he supported with a
 “ masterly eloquence, that worked
 “ conviction and conversion in that
 “ house; but which, notwithstanding,
 “ had the misfortune to be rejected
 “ afterwards in the house of commons
 “ by a faction which laboured to raise
 “ a clamour without doors against it;
 “ by appealing to the passions of the
 “ rab-

[ix]

“ rabble, and deceiving them with spe-
 “ cious arguments calculated to affect
 “ them in point of private interest,
 “ through which that noble design
 “ was rendered abortive!” Thus I
augur the Lord Viscount *Townshend*
 will stand characterized to future
 ages.

When I reflect on your generous en-
 deavours to serve your country, I find
 myself brimfull of admiration, gratitude,
 esteem, and reverence. I have no other
 way of making it known publicly, but
 by offering to your lordship this small
 Present, which I consider as a tribute I
 owe to your merits. If my talents were
 equal to your virtues, the offering should
 be more worthy of the shrine; but such
 as it is, I trust your candor will accept
 it.

The French use every art to rob us
 of our trade in order to rob us of our
 liberty. Their great men encourage its
 study as a science, and its practice as
 an honour; but who, saving your lord-
 ship, has prompted to its study, or given
 it

[x]

it any public marks of favour among us.

In regard to myself, I am conscious of the purity of my intentions, and the uprightness of my views; and as to what *ignorance, faction, or malice*, may say of the sheets which I inscribe to your Lordship, I value not, provided they meet with your approbation; for I shall receive more satisfaction from thence, than from the loud huzzas of the rabble, or from the *Eulogiums* of the *great* vulgar and the *small* combined.

I am, my Lord,

Your Lordship's most humble servant

The Author.

P R E-

P R E F A C E.

THE religion and liberty of this nation have such an intimate connection with the flourishing state of its trade and navigation, that every true lover of his country cannot help considering an *Essay* artfully calculated to depreciate commerce and the arts, as a premeditated design and attempt to undermine and destroy those most invaluable blessings which we enjoy. Whoever considers the present state of Europe, the manners and customs which prevail, and the state of this island, will clearly perceive that agriculture is not so necessary for the nourishment of our bodies, as commerce and navigation is to the protection of our liberties, the defence of our properties, and the security and preservation of our religious institutions.

The Author we have examined in the subsequent pages, represents agriculture and a beastly rusticity, as the most effectual means of rendering a state free, independent, populous, virtuous and happy; while he reviles the

[xii]

the cultivation of commerce and the arts, as having an immediate tendency to depopulate a nation, and as the inlets to all manner of vice and debauchery, which will terminate in its destruction. To avoid those evils, he proposes an equal division of lands, and a retirement into the country. The purport of his doctrine seems to be contained in the following speech.

Gentlemen and Countrymen,

The only way to become free, virtuous and happy, is to renounce commerce and the arts, and to stick only to tillage and husbandry. I would advise you therefore to leave your smoaky cities, your trades and manufactures, and to build you huts in the country, and apply to the plough and the spade. To be sober and temperate, you must leave off the consumption of exoticks; and in order to have a proper support for yourselves, you must restrain and prohibit the exportation of all native commodities. It will be proper therefore, to burn all your ships; that you may be under no temptations to the use of foreign luxury, or to the practice of navigation, an employment destructive of health, and the populousness of a state. By the practice of this advice, your numbers will so increase, that at last your lands

[xiii]

lands will be unable to furnish nourishment sufficient for them. When you have brought this to pass I would advise you to adopt commerce and the arts, in order to lessen your numbers; which they will effectually do, and at last bring you to certain destruction. A very pretty scheme truly! which one should have rather expected from Pere Hardouin and St. Omers, than from a protestant university.*

But our Author in order to induce us to follow his instructions, tells us that the Jews became a very populous state, by neglecting commerce and the arts, and addicting themselves to husbandry. This example seems a little unfortunate, for we find by this conduct, they were almost in perpetual servitude to one or other of the neighbouring states; one while to the king of Mesopotamia, then under the Moabites, Canaanites, Midianites, Ammonites and Philistines, to this last, for forty years together. But at length emerging from barbarity and this rustick life, they chose a king, under Solomon adopted commerce and the arts, asserted their liberty, and figured as high as the neighbouring states. Here one might ask, What is there in this account that can induce a wise people to renounce the arts, and apply solely to husbandry

* His System amounts to this, though in the beginning he says otherwise, and contradicts himself at last.

bandry and tillage according to the advice of this politician?

If this scheme were to be put in practice we should soon become tributary slaves to France; and make a very pretty exchange of liberty for the phantom of populousity. But we hope, that we have fully proved, in the following pages, that however favourable a rustick life may be to fecundity and health, yet that it cannot be reckoned among the principal causes which contribute to render a nation populous.

We are informed in the title page, that the Dissertation examined, was read in the publick schools in the university of Cambridge, on Friday July 26, 1756, and that my Lord Townshend's prize was adjudged to it.

As a thorough knowledge of the interests of commerce is necessary to a profound skill in politicks; and as our noblemen and gentlemen receive the first rudiments and principles of the political science in the schools; what politicians are they like to turn out when the first university in Europe can give the stamp of approbation to such a crude and superficial performance?

But this gentleman is not the only one of his university, who has been liberal of his invectives against trade and commerce; for his predecessor Mr. Baker, in his reflections upon learn-

learning, after shewing the insignificancy of it, the imperfection of human knowledge, and the vanity of the sciences; and after labouring obliquely to introduce universal scepticism, could not quit his subject without speaking of commerce with contempt, though it is a matter of the greatest consequence to the state, and of the highest importance to his country. But by his treatise, he has recorded his knowledge of trifles, and his ignorance of the most useful politicks. The sciences are of no manner of service, but so far as they aid and assist commerce and the arts, which contribute to the increase of general happiness, and to the relief of the miseries to which human nature is incident. The settling the text of an author, and whether an ac or an et be the right reading; whether an Etruscan letter was ever written this way or that; what is the true reading of an inscription upon an antient coin; how the Romans made their fibula, and what was the usual form of it; what sort of pans they used in their close-stools, &c. are matters of no manner of consequence to society: and yet what volumes have been written upon these subjects, and with what importance and solemnity have they been treated? Are the poor creatures in the hospitals in Moorfields who assume airs of dignity when straw'd-crown'd monarchs in mock majesty, so ridiculous

[xvi]

as multitudes of those who are called learned, that spend their whole lives in unravelling trifles, clearing up frivolous mysteries, and in discovering things which if they had continued profound secrets to all eternity, would have been no injury to mankind? The noble architecture of card-houses and dirt-pies among children is of a piece with such learning.

In Spain a jesuit has lately recommended commerce to his countrymen in order to pull down heresy. In France it was the study of the great Huetius; and a canon of St. Maur wrote its panegyric in Savary's dictionary. In England lord Castlemain, a papist, a hundred years ago, traduced it. He tells us foreigners carried on our traffic formerly, yet then we conquered France. We know his lordship's design, but our university's Mr. Bell's and Mr. Brown's we can only guess at.

But let this be as it will; 'tis commerce and the arts alone which humanize mankind, make the difference between the Moors on the Niger, and Britons on the banks of the Thames; and which lift brute nature to contemplations of Deity.

I INTRO-

INTRODUCTION.

AS the strength of a nation, all other things being the same, is in proportion to the number of its inhabitants, it behoves every prince, practical statesman, senator, and legislator to be thoroughly acquainted with the causes, which principally contribute to render a nation populous. It is likewise the duty of the rulers of every commercial state, carefully to consider what effect the populousness of a nation has on its trade. The noble lord who proposed this subject, and allotted a prize or prizes to the authors of the best dissertations on it, is a *senator, legislator, statesman* and *patriot*; no doubt, but his zeal for the public welfare prompted him to instigate by rewards one of the great luminaries of this nation, to throw its light upon it, and to thoroughly canvass an affair of so great importance, so highly interesting. I presume his lordship and the public have received as little satisfaction and instruction from the Dissertation which has been published as myself.

But if the increasing the populousness of a state by certain measures would render it more powerful in one respect, and yet reduce its strength, and make it more feeble in proportion in another, the populousity of the state ought to be sacrificed to its political strength and general safety: For people alone are not the strength of a state, or, it does not consist only in its numbers. If this kingdom were a nation of
B husband.

[2]

husbandmen without navigation and commerce, without arts and manufactures, whose wealth consisted only in corn and cattle, there is little reason to believe it would preserve its independence long; but on the contrary would soon become a prey to a neighbouring ambitious state. It is therefore weak to recommend a system of police, which is not in the least adapted to the present state of things, or manners and customs, which now prevail in *Europe*: And to enlarge on speculations which are not adapted to practice, and omit those that are, is no more at best than ingenious trifling.

The learned author of the Dissertation seems to have set out in a most unfortunate manner by mistaking the question, or wilfully deviating from it. And therefore the bestowing the prize upon him was a misapplication of his lordship's generosity, and an abuse of his bounty, which demands correction or reparation. Instead of expatiating upon the causes which principally contribute to render a nation populous, the learned writer has rather given us a Dissertation on this question, viz. *What causes principally contribute to promote propagation, and render a nation prolific? And in, what respects does commerce tend to render a people less prolific, and diminish their numbers?* But as he has treated the subject, his Dissertation is a satire upon commerce, and a panegyric upon agriculture and a rustic life; but explains none of the principal causes which render a nation populous; nor clearly traces the effects,

1

which

[3]

which the populousness of a nation has on its trade.

In order that we may not fall into the same mistakes, we shall endeavour to explain the question, and to learn the noble lord's intention in proposing it.

In the first place it is necessary to enquire, what is meant by the populousness of a nation?

2dly, What are the principal causes which contribute to render a nation populous in the sense of the definition. The word populous is in its self vague and equivocal. Without defining it, and shewing what is meant by it, all that is said may be either true or false, as people shall please to accept the word. We must therefore suggest what idea the noble lord had of the word populous, when he proposed the question; and this we conceive to be what is commonly formed and entertained, when people talk of the populousness of a country.

First then, we understand by the word populousness, an abundance of people crowded into a small territory or compass of land; so that the towns and villages stand thick and near together, and are full of inhabitants. When a country is thus inhabited, we say the country is populous.

But on the other hand, where there are large tracts of land with few towns and villages scattered here and there with few people residing in them, we say such a country is not at all populous; or that it is thinly inhabited, and has but few people.

B:2

Having

[4]

Having acquired some clear idea of the word populous, it will be necessary to have an adequate idea of what is meant in the question by the *principal* causes which contribute to render a nation populous?

There is reason to believe that the noble lord who propounded the question perceived that there were a few *principal* causes which contributed to render a state populous; and that there were a multitude of subordinate causes; to specify and treat of all which, would be tedious and irksome; and therefore that he designed the declaimers on the *thesis* should omit the minor causes, and confine themselves to the *principal*. Our learned author seems so little to have regarded the instruction and limitation in the question, that he has left untouched the *principal* causes of the populousness of a nation, and has expatiated largely on some of the lesser causes which promote propagation, and tend to render a people prolific; and assigned them as the *principal* causes of the populousness of a state; not considering that the politician who takes no other method to people a state thinly inhabited, besides what arises from enforcing the practice of temperance, and the affording all possible encouragement to propagation, is a bungler in his profession; since other methods may be pursued a thousand times more certain and expeditious.

In a country without an extensive commerce, two or three bad harvests would go near to depopulate it by starving the people, and causing migrations.

I

[5]

migrations. But in a country, where great stocks of money and commodities are heaped up by the industry produced by commerce, there in such case, a state may subsist, and keep its people together, partly by the credit it has among neighbouring states, and partly by the money and superfluities it has accumulated, by practising the arts and encouraging commerce among its people.

The causes of the populousness of a state may be divided into *natural*, *political*, *commercial*, *religious* and *moral*. The most expeditious means of making a country populous is conquest. If a prince possess a large tract of country thinly inhabited, the quickest means of peopling such a country is by transplanting and bringing conquered multitudes from other countries, and assigning them lands in his own.

2dly, Another *principal* means of rendering a nation populous, is the establishing the best laws, forming the most just and equitable government, and the rendering the person and property of every individual safe and secure. This will tempt and invite people into such a state.

3dly, Another *principal* means of rendering a nation populous, is an universal toleration of all religions; so that no one be disturbed in the exercise of his own particular ceremonies, which are innocent in themselves; and that every one be indulged in the profession of his own particular principles or opinions, provided he is guilty of no breach of the peace of the state,

B 3

but

[6]

but demeans himself soberly and quietly in the community.

4thly, The fourth *principal* cause of the populousness of a state, is the encouragement given to foreign commerce; the honouring industry, the enforcing labour; the preventing idleness by good laws; and the taking due care to administer all manner of necessaries to the poor, who cannot provide such for themselves.

5thly, After establishing a good police at home, such as is recommended above, the *principal* and most expeditious means of rendering a state populous is a general naturalization act, inviting all foreigners to reside in it; and as to *England*, to tempt all protestants to come and settle amongst us, affording to them all the privileges of citizens as to person, property, and trade.

6thly, Another cause of the populousness of a state, is the healthiness of the climate; and the people's not being afflicted with wars.

7thly, Another cause of the populousness of a state, is the hiring mercenary troops from other nations to fight its battles, and encouraging some few persons to serve in foreign wars, to learn the art and to officer its own people, and discipline them at home when necessity requires.

8thly, And finally, another means of increasing the numbers of the people, is the keeping as small a standing army as is consistent with the peace and safety of a state, and permitting soldiers to labour and marry.

These are the *principal* ways of rendering a state populous in an expeditious manner; not one

[7]

one of which the learned writer has taken notice of: Or if he have, it is with such limitations and restrictions, as destroys in some measure, the force and efficacy of the means he proposes. From whence it follows, that his Dissertation is foreign to the question proposed, and the adjudging the prize to him, is an abuse and misapplication of the public spirit and generosity of the noble lord, who bestowed the reward for a discourse on the subject.

But the learned author's mistaking the question, or deviating from it, by treating of the minute concurring causes of populousness, instead of the *principal*, is not the only fault and defect in his treatise; for he has also been guilty of many gross errors, false representations, and injudicious remarks; and has advanced many inconsistencies, puerilities and absurdities, in his animadversions upon, the causes of depopulation and the effects of arts, the refinements of civil life, and the commerce at present carried on among mankind.

To say that agriculture, or that ploughing and sowing wheat is a principal cause of the populousness of a nation, is as dry and as little to the purpose, as if any one were to assert that

Eating was a principal cause of the populousness of a nation.

It is true that in most countries, agriculture is necessary to the sustenance of a people. But as a nation may, by sundry other causes, be rendered so populous that the produce of its lands will not feed half its inhabitants, it is manifest,

B 4

that

[8]

that agriculture cannot be one of the principal causes of the populousness of a nation. The internal police, or political institutions of such a state, if any such there be, or ever were, must of course furnish us with some of the causes which principally contribute to render a nation populous.

But were there no such state, reason itself dictates the causes as we have enumerated them above.

Though by agriculture wholesome food be produced, yet poisons may be raised by the same industry; or wholesome foods and grain be converted into poison by the intemperance, wickedness and luxury of mankind. And thus our learned author proposes to cultivate the earth, and establish such a police, as will tend to destroy all order, industry, and sobriety, and to depopulate a state, though he weakly pretends and imagines, that the practice of his rules will render a nation populous.

Agriculture is a healthy exercise, but it does not furnish out employment for one fourth of the people of a state; and therefore if the arts were wanting, the people would be idle, debauch, and luxurious in a low mean way, or starve. If a whole people could be employed in agriculture, and kept from debauchery, to be sure (*cæteris paribus*) such a life would be most favourable to propagation. But this cannot be; and therefore the arts must be introduced to prevent the evils of sloth and debauchery. But if a country life and husbandry
be

[9]

be most favourable to propagation, this does not argue, that it is therefore one of the causes which contribute principally to render a nation populous, because other causes may be assigned which will contribute more expeditiously to the peopling a state, as will be shewn in the sequel.

In the introduction to his discourse, he complains that there are but few inhabitants upon the earth in proportion to what it can nourish: and attributes this thinness of people to the badness of the political institutions among mankind.

But it may be replied, that wars, famines, pestilence, and contagious distempers, make great havock among mankind. What political institutions can guard against these calamities? The more populous the world is, the more those two great destroyers of mankind, *war* and *famine*, are likely to prevail. Great crowds of people bordering on each other under different princes, frequently occasion wars and famines: A mutual interest arising from commerce, is most likely to prevent and relieve the pernicious effects of both. To say, that if all the world conformed to the rules of virtue, and lived according to the precepts of religion, the earth would be more populous, is a mighty important discovery truly! To remark to us, that temperance and sobriety, and following the dictates of nature, conduce to the peopling a state, is a trite observation for which no one owes the learned author any thanks.

S E C T.

S E C T. I.

One of the great obstacles to the natural increase of mankind; our author says, * is the great difficulty men experience in procuring support for themselves and their families; and 2dly, from hence that people avoid marriage.

1. Of what use is this observation to us, where all the necessaries of life are attainable by common industry; and its common calamities to be guarded against by a little foresight and œconomy? Seven parts in eight of the people are labourers, and are guided in their pursuits by hunger and lust. The consideration of the cares of a family does not prevent one in a thousand from marrying. When does the fear of hunger extinguish the incitements and allurements of lust? It is no easy matter to find a young couple in high health, who having an affection for each other, are kept from marrying through the fear of the cares of a family, and the dread of hunger. The man who imagines that this is ever the case, knows little of human nature, and has attended very little to the manners of men. If among the rich now and then a monster of this kind is seen, it is very seldom.

We find that the *Hebrews* lived under a hard slavery in *Egypt*, and were rewarded for all their toil with only onions and garlick. And yet those hardships did not destroy their fecundity or prevent marriages,
for

* Page 3.

for they grew and multiplied exceedingly, and became so formidable to the *Egyptians*, that *Pharoah* commanded all the *Hebrew* midwives to strangle every male child at his birth. And though they lived under the dread of this cruel law, this did not prevent either marriages, or prompt to the using any arts to prevent fecundity or propagation. They continued to marry and beget children, though they were conscious that half their innocent babes would be strangled as soon as they saw the light. This is a strong proof of the weakness and inconclusiveness of our author's argument, " that the difficulty of acquiring sustenance for a family in nations which cultivate the ornaments of civil life, prevents propagation." This shews too, that the strong inclination and propensity to a union between the sexes, is not to be extinguished by the most severe hardships and distressed circumstances. The same may be said with regard to the *Helotes* among the cruel *Spartans*, and to the multitude of slaves among the *Athenians* who were twenty times as many as the citizens: As likewise of the vast numbers among the *Romans*, who increased to such a degree, as to wage war with their masters with great success. But if a simplicity of manners tend to render a country populous, why are not the vast tracts of fertile lands from the *Apulacian* hills to the *South Seas*, and from the lakes of *Canada* to the gulph of *Mexico*, the most populous countries in the world? If we examine the various scenes of the globe we shall

shall find those countries the most populous, where the arts, commerce, and the ornaments and refinements of civil life prevail: That is all other things being equal. It is true, if a particular country through its natural poverty and barrenness and advantageous situation, has been so happy for a long course of years, as to avert war from its territories; and through its good police to prevent famines, such a country probably may grow more populous than its neighbours, who have been plagued with wars and domestic feuds. We learn from the first book of *Thucydides*, that the poverty and barrenness of *Attica* secured it from wars and invasions, and rendered it a sort of asylum to those who loved ease and a quiet life, which made it populous.

2. *Our learned author says* whatever serves to create or improve labour and industry in a state, tends to promote the speedy and great increase of a people.*

The industry recommended here, appears repugnant to the ease of acquiring the support of a family represented before as necessary to render a nation populous. In a country where all the arts, ornaments and refinements of civil life take place, or are introduced and prevail, as in *England*; it is computed that near seven eights of the people labour for their bread. Here a labourer may acquire all the necessaries of a family by his constant work. His ambition never rises above coarse food and rayment, and the means of a low debauch. If the

* Page 6.

the lower class of people can acquire these necessaries by labouring three days in a week, they will not work four. Necessity must therefore be created before industry can be introduced and excited.

3. A plenty of provisions and a general industry are incompatible. In order that this may appear more clearly, it may be necessary to observe what is generally understood by a plenty of provisions. If we have not clear and distinct ideas of the terms we use, our reasonings may be both true and false, according as the terms we make use of, shall be accepted and defined.

By a plenty of provisions, we mean such a small price for them, that a common family may acquire all the necessaries and luxuries that the poor usually consume by the family's labouring three or four days in a week, or only a part of the time usually allotted to labour. When this is the case we say that the price of provisions is low, and that they are in plenty.

Again, on the other hand, when the price of provisions is so high, that though a man and his family labour six days in a week, the usual time each day, yet such family cannot purchase the necessaries and superfluities it used to consume in common, then we say, there is a scarcity.

To suppose then provisions to be at a low price and plentiful, that is, the support of a family to be obtained by working three or four days in a week, and at the same time to suppose,

[14]

pose, that a general industry may be practised, and that the mass or bulk of labourers will work full six days in a week, is to suppose a moral impossibility, what is contrary to common experience, what never was, nor ever will be, and shews a great ignorance of human nature, and little attention to the manners of the populace, as well as little acquaintance with the observations of the judicious.

On the contrary, Sir *William Temple* observes, that the poverty and laziness of the *Irish*, are owing to their great plenty of provisions; and their being able to procure all the necessaries they want with labouring two or three days in a week. Sir *William Petty* makes the same observation, and says, they can subsist by working only two or three hours in a day from their great plenty, and to this ascribes their great poverty and laziness. To suppose then a great plenty and great industry to exist together, is absurd and repugnant to the very nature of things. In truth they are moral contradictions. The great plenty of provisions in *Ireland* and the cheapness of land, seem to place the country in the state of an infant colony, and yet we do not find that mankind multiply in that nation, faster than in *England*; nor have they half the industry. The people live in a mean, nasty, lazy manner, and content themselves with coarse necessaries which may be easily acquired.

Land is cheap and provisions plentiful enough in *Wales*; but the people do not multiply faster than in *England*, neither are they so industrious.

4. Our

[15]

4. Our learned author from page the 1st to page the 8th, seems under a panic, lest people should neglect to marry; which in page the 8th, rises to a sort of enthusiasm, and occasions him to talk of *the prevalence of a corrupted taste, which may put a stop to marriage among the bulk of the people.*

The desire of union between the sexes, is so strongly implanted in mankind by the wise Author of nature, that a man may with as much reason expect to see the laws of vegetation suspended, as marriages to stop among the bulk of the people. If through a dissoluteness of manners, some few in high life shun the marriage state, such conduct cannot, nay has not, much influence among their own class; this daily experience testifies. The *rich* are not one in a thousand, and not one in a hundred of them lives unmarried: And of those who do, perhaps not one in a hundred but has offspring. But that sobriety and temperance should render a people prolific, is such a common, trite, and puerile observation, that we presume the noble lord who propounded the question at the head of our remarks, never dreamt that he should see the prize adjudged to a writer, who could rank temperance and sobriety among the principal causes which contribute to render a nation populous.

S E C T. II.

1. Page 8, our learned author recapitulates, and gives us a summary of the principal causes which

which contribute to render a nation populous. And says,

These therefore appear to be certain and effectual methods of rendering a nation populous.

“ 1. The procuring a great plenty of every thing necessary to their support.

“ 2. The diminishing the number of their imaginary wants.

“ 3. The universal encouragement and increase of industry.

“ 4. And the restraining debauchery, &c.”

But surely though it should be allowed that these may conduce to increase mankind, yet they are not the *principal causes*, which contribute to render a nation populous. This learned author must think mankind very weak and ignorant, if he conceived he could palm such trifling remarks on them for the *principal causes*, which contribute to render a nation populous.

The three first of these observations are repugnant among themselves, and militate with each other; and the last with the first and third.

2. If the diminishing the number of the imaginary wants of mankind tend to render the support of a family more easy, to promote marriage and increase the numbers of a people; certainly it must tend still more to promote the same great and beneficial ends, if all the imaginary wants of mankind were cut off and extirpated from society; and the greatest simplicity and frugality of manners were restored. If such frugality and simplicity were revived or established, and

and nothing but what was absolutely necessary to life, was manufactured and cultivated, there could not possibly be any room for exerting general industry. If mankind confined themselves to the use of the bare necessaries of life, labouring one hour in a day in each family would procure them all: Where then, and how could universal industry be exerted? It is manifest that a simplicity of living and universal industry are incompatible and repugnant to each other; and what the learned author has advanced, is very crude and superficial.

Further, if men were to labour no more than what is sufficient to procure them bare simple necessaries, this would be so little, that they would soon contract a habit of sloth, and from an idle life and a habit of sloth sink into barbarism. Nothing can preserve a disposition for labour, but the daily and constant practice of it. The more a man labours, the less irksome it becomes; the less he works, the more burdensome the task. Sir *William Temple* thinks the change from constant labour to constant ease, as difficult and disagreeable as from constant ease to constant labour; of such force and prevalency are use and habit.

3. Nay he observes farther, that in *Holland*, labour by practice, becomes not only necessary to the health of the people, but to their entertainment. And though such bread as our poor eat in *England*, is commonly at three-pence per pound, flesh at nine-pence, and wages only one shilling and two-pence per day, I could never find, that it

C

was

[18]

was any obstruction to their marrying. It is certain it does not hinder them from being populous, nor from receiving a constant accretion of strangers. And all this must be ascribed to their good police, their toleration in religion, and their attention to commerce. From whence it follows, that a cheapness of provisions and a want of the ornaments and refinements of civil life, are not any of the principal causes, which contribute to render a country populous. And consequently that what our author has said on these topics, is not to the purpose, but quite beside the question.

4. It would be difficult to account for the barbarism of the *Africans* upon any other principles. The tropical fruits which are the spontaneous production of nature, are delicious, cooling and nourishing. Little or no raiment is there wanting, and houses are almost unnecessary, the climate is so warm. From hence the inhabitants are under little necessity of labouring, or of any regular police for their support. This first produced idleness, which degenerated into sloth and terminated in barbarism and a savage life. But should two or three great geniuses arise among their princes, succeed each other, and incline to refine the people, and bring them under a good police, it would be absolutely necessary to introduce a great number of imaginary wants among them, in order to establish the arts, and bring them under a regular government. If you would introduce any innocent gratifications and pleasures

[19]

ures above what brutes enjoy, you must first create and introduce imaginary wants.

5. If you find in a country, treatises upon metaphysics, geometry, astronomy, policy and rational discourses, upon the being and attributes of a God, you will certainly in such a country, find the ornaments and refinements of life and a thousand imaginary wants, which in general are of great use to society, by keeping mankind employed. It is a general observation among moralists, *that the next step to having nothing to do, is to do ill.* The arts and sciences likewise yield innocent amusement, pleasure, and entertainment to those who labour in them; as well as to those who possess the works of great masters, and have cultivated a taste.

6. We learn from history, that *Phœnicia* was happy in a fruitful soil, but commerce drew vast multitudes of people into the country, encouraged the arts, ornaments and refinements of civil life; and at last filled the country so full of inhabitants, that they were in want of corn, as appears from the letter of *Hiram* king of *Tyre* to be seen in *Josephus*. They carried navigation, traffic, manufacture, dying, architecture, and all the elegancy of life, to the highest pitch of perfection. At the same time philosophy was cultivated among them, as appears from the doctrine of *Moschus* the famous writer, who was a *Phœnician*, and the founder of the atomical philosophy*. But it was not agriculture that made the country populous,

C 2

but

* See *Cudworth's Intellectual System*.

[20]

but commerce and the arts, which filled the country so full of people, that a rich soil and the powers of agriculture were insufficient to support them.

7. Imaginary wants are therefore so far from being injurious to mankind, that they are highly useful for the reasons just assigned. If there were no other advantages and pleasures *innocent and rational*, which arose from the arts and refinements of civil life, but that they employed the attention of mankind, and kept them out of idleness and mischief, this alone would render them highly eligible.

8. To want nothing is the existence of a post, or a God. One wants nothing because it perceives nothing. The other because it perceives, and commands all things. To want what may be innocently acquired is no crime. To be in pursuit of what is innocent, to strongly desire it, and to have a moral certainty of attaining it, is one of the highest degrees of human felicity. It is no hurt to have wants and desires, but to indulge and gratify irregular and vicious ones, at the expence of our own real happiness, and that of others.

9. The *Chinese* have carried the ornaments and refinements of civil life to the highest degree, are the most luxurious people upon the face of the earth; provisions are often very scarce there, and yet they are the most populous nation in the world. We do not find these circumstances obstruct marriage, though it is said they are often obliged to expose their children

[21]

children because they cannot provide for them. If they planted colonies and carried on a large foreign commerce, they would be under no necessity of practising such inhumanities. But though they labour under such disadvantages, it does not prevent marriages and propagation. From hence it is manifest, that our author needs not entertain any chimerical notions, that fear of want is an obstacle to marriage and propagation in *England*. From what has been offered, it appears to every unprejudiced reasoner, that banishing imaginary wants from society, would be an injury to it, and is more likely to depopulate a nation than fill it with people.

II. That the diminishing the imaginary wants of mankind, creating a great plenty of provisions, and at the same time enforcing a general industry are morally impossible; are incongruous, repugnant and militate with each other.

I. After our author has contended for the banishing all imaginary wants, and stinted us to the use of bare necessaries, he proceeds to treat of agriculture and the arts necessary to life. We cannot help observing here, that this term *necessaries* is of very equivocal, vague and uncertain signification. If we apply to a prince of the *Hottentots*, a chief of the *Laplanders*, a king of the *Negroes*, or a Sachem of the *Canadese Indians* for a catalogue of their necessaries, we shall find it very short. On the other hand, if to a citizen of *London*, or even a porter, we should have a long list of particu-

C 3

lars

lars that the others would laugh at as ridiculous superfluities. As this gentleman deals only in generals, we cannot therefore divine what he means, by such a plenty of the necessaries of life as is requisite to promote marriage and increase mankind, so as to render a nation populous, or be a *cause which principally contributes to it.*

2. Agriculture is justly in esteem among all civilized nations in the world, and in every place where the spontaneous productions of nature are not sufficient for the nourishment of the people, it is considered as a necessary means of their support and preservation, not as a cause which *principally contributes to make a country populous.*

3. But in order to render the necessaries of life cheap, and thereby promote marriage and increase mankind with greater expedition, this learned author proposes to banish imaginary wants and commerce. But if commerce and the ornaments and refinements of civil life render the necessaries of families dear and difficult to be come at, how comes it about, that people fly from countries where there is little commerce, little refinement, few arts, and a simple way of living prevails, to settle in a country where commerce and arts are practised? It is clear this could not be, if people did not find it easier to support themselves in such countries, than in states where there is little commerce, few arts, few refinements, and where husbandry is the principal employment. People migrate to mend their

their condition. It is not therefore at all likely, that mankind find themselves so much at ease where husbandry prevails, and there is little commerce, as where the arts, ornaments and refinements of civil life are in esteem, and commerce is cultivated and honoured.

4. Besides where commerce prevails most, and is in highest esteem, the lands are always well cultivated, and their produce becomes an object of commerce.

S E C T. III.

Our learned author says, page the 10th, *that the state of agriculture in a nation, prescribes limits to its populousness.*

1. It may be observed too, that the consumption of a people, where there is no commerce, prescribes limits to its agriculture. Don *Jeronymo Ustaritz* informs us, that a plentiful year in *Spain* reduces the price of corn so low, that it ruins the farmer, and produces the succeeding year a famine. From whence it is plain, that there must be a certain proportion between the quantity grown and the consumption, otherwise a plenty destroys itself, if we banish commerce. There is nothing but great riches or great exportation can prevent this evil. Thus a plenty destroys itself, and produces a scarcity: And thus the cheapness our author dreams of in page 11, appears a chimera; and when a crop fails a dreadful famine ensues, which starves the people and depopulates a state.

Our *histories* shew this to have been our case formerly, once in about twenty years; and sometimes it continued for two or three years together, and made great havock among the people*.

2. Page 10. Our learned author remarks, *that a general application to agriculture, &c. that is a general industry, must evidently produce a vast plenty of all the necessaries of life, so that every single person will be able fully to supply his wants with the utmost ease.*

1. The author of these remarks apprehends that the learned writer of the Dissertation had no clear, determinate, precise, and distinct ideas of a general application, or industry. If he had, we must confess ourselves so dull as not to be able to perceive it; and so ignorant and stupid as not to be able to understand or comprehend his meaning. If he mean by a general industry, that all in a society shall work, it will be necessary immediately, that all the lands and property of the kingdom should be equally divided. This would be a pretty scheme truly, but is as impracticable as *Plato's* republick.

2. Besides there is a manifest repugnancy and contradiction in what our author proposes. By a general industry, is commonly understood, every man's labouring in his particular craft as much time as his health, spirits and strength will permit. And yet he proposes and declares, that by this industry every man shall be

* See *Stow*, and *Bishop Fleetwood*.

be able fully to supply his wants *with the utmost ease*. This is a palpable contradiction in terms.

3. If he had said, "in case every one in the community laboured equally, and all imaginary wants were abolished, then each individual might procure all the simple and coarse necessaries of life in plenty, by labouring a small part of his time," there would have been some sense in it; but to talk of the practice of general industry in a country, and yet at the same time propose *the acquisition of all the necessaries of life with the utmost ease*, is rank nonsense. It is likewise absurd and nonsense, to talk of banishing all imaginary wants out of a community, and yet at the same time propose the universal practice of industry. When all these wants are expelled from society, what are the people to be employed about? It is proposed to prohibit the practice of commerce, so no foreign consumption could engage and employ their industry. Truly when this fine scheme and these political *Lycurgic* institutions are reduced to practice, you will have little or nothing to do, but to follow the example of the disciples of the *Spartan* legislator, that is, to sing, dance, fiddle, wrestle, run, eat black broth, live in huts, and wear sheep-skins, and in the issue, be extinguished or made slaves of by your invading neighbours. But there can be no place for the practice of general industry.

4. The

[26]

4. The institutions of *Lycurgus* were far from being favourable to populousity, though he enjoined an equal division of the lands. In the time of *Agis* king of *Sparta*, we find there were but seven hundred *Spartan* families left out of thirty nine thousand, among whom their great founder or legislator had divided the lands, and not above a hundred of these possessed estates. So little favourable was his system to populousity. War destroyed the original *Spartans*, they were too proud and vain to admit of naturalizations, disdained strangers, puffed up with a conceit of themselves; and thus in the issue, spilled their blood to defend a state for the posterity of their slaves to inherit*.

5. But if property be equally divided, how is each individual to be made perform his share of the general fund of labour necessary to support the community in the simple way proposed? Where one man is idle or impotent, and another is industrious and vigorous, and the first has an inclination to alienate his property, and the other to purchase it; what is to be done in this case? How is this to be prevented? Here is an end of your political institutions at once.

6. If general industry and œconomy, if prudence and frugality, could be enforced among our labourers, they might all, as things stand at present, be furnished not only with all manner of necessaries, but also with superfluities, and the means of gratifying their fantastical and imaginary

* *Vide Plut. in vita Agis.*

[27]

ginary wants. But if this conduct cannot be enforced as things stand at present; what reason have we to expect it when property has been put on a level? In short, our author's scheme tends to destroy all industry and to lessen labour instead of increasing it.

7. The best spur to industry is necessity. The mass of labourers work only to relieve the present want, and are such votaries to indolence, ease and voluptuousness, that they sacrifice all considerations to the pleasures of the present moment, regardless of sickness and old age. Nay some declare it a crime to provide for either and rely on the parish. Mr. *Locke* observes, that they live only from hand to mouth. To this purpose Sir *William Temple* remarks, *All men prefer ease to labour, and will not take pains if they can be idle*: That is, unless by practice and habit their disposition be altered. The author of *the causes of the decline of our foreign trade*, Sir *Josiah Child* and others observe, "that in cheap times of provision our poor do not work half their time; that they are paid extravagant wages at all times," &c. If this be the case, as most certainly it is, what other reason but the want of industry and œconomy can be assigned, why all the labourers in the kingdom have not a full supply of all their wants? And that too at all times; in both good and bad seasons? But our author's scheme is impracticable, as well as absurd and contradictory.

8. Nothing

[28]

8. Nothing but necessity can enforce industry. We must take human nature as it is: But what is necessary to make one family industrious would starve another. And what wages would be sufficient to supply a family with all the necessaries of life after a common harvest, and with many of the luxuries after a plentiful, would not afford ~~an~~ a living support after a bad one. There is no making provision for numerous families, sickness, old age, frosts, floods, rains, wars, want of employment, fires, dearths and other distressing accidents, but by œconomy. But not one in a thousand is possessed of this œconomy, but live as *Mr. Locke* observes *in diem*, from hand to mouth.

9. It has been observed that those nations have excelled most in industry and commerce, which have laboured under the greatest disadvantages from soil and scantiness of territory; and that their necessities from those inconveniencies have whetted their invention and spurred their industry. As for example, *Phœnicia, Athens, Tyre, Carthage, Venice, Marseilles, and Holland.* Why may not then wants created by the arts of the politician, if judiciously introduced, produce the same effects as those arising from nature? But it requires great dexterity and finessè in governours to conduct such matters so as to attain the end desired; and whenever it is carried into execution, its progress must be gentle, and its approaches almost imperceptible, and especially in a popular state. It is as unnatural to expect men should labour, when they have

[29]

have no real nor imaginary wants, as it would be to expect matter to act contrary to the laws of gravitation and attraction. The greater the weight to be moved, the less the velocity in mechanics, when the moving power is feeble. It is the same in morals and politicks as in physicks.

10. As this is the general disposition of human nature, no wages, not if the present were trebled, would keep the bulk of labourers, or at least a great part of them from want; because they never provide against the times of calamity specified above, which they might all do, if they were as industrious as our author proposes they should be, and banished the imaginary wants he explodes. For this reason his chimerical scheme would be of no use, if it could be reduced to practice, so far as to level all the property of the kingdom; alienations would soon be made, and the old system of things restored or revived.

S E C T. IV.

1. But as our maxim is, that nothing but necessity produces industry; and nothing but an œconomy which the mass of mankind will never practise, can prevent poverty, want, and distress: We will propose by a political institution to obtain all the good consequences of œconomy among the people without the actual or direct practice of it. This institution is much more practicable, than the visionary scheme

[30]

scheme of our author; and with a little management and address, such as beginning to put it in practise in a dearth might be easily established.

1. The institution we mean is to lay a tax on the first necessaries of life when cheap, as well as on the objects of imaginary wants, form a fund of its produce, and pay a certain sum *per* head out of it in a time of sickness, dearth, want of work, or in any other distress. This would prevent the labourers from being lazy in times of high wages and great plenty; and from suffering want in times of scarcity and adversity. A proper workhouse added to this institution, would prevent vagrancy, idleness and beggary.

2. Upon the footing of this scheme, the more a man spent the more he would pay, and the more children he got the more he would receive back again in times of calamity. The poor practise this among themselves in some places, but there are only a few so prudent. The pleasures of the present moment, and the gratification of the present appetite are what govern ninety-nine out of a hundred. Next to hunger and lust, the love of ease is the predominant passion; and in some this governs, and they become beggars. This scheme would certainly and assuredly supply every family's wants, and relieve every ones necessities and distresses, and is practicable; whereas what our author suggests is not. But though this scheme be favourable to propagation

[31]

tion by preserving the lives of poor persons, who would sacrifice them to sloth, indolence, and voluptuousness; and though it would tend more to promote those good purposes than our author's unnatural, visionary, and enthusiastical scheme, yet we are far from thinking that it would be a *cause which would principally contribute to render a nation populous.*

3. But the inconsistency there is between banishing imaginary wants, and the means of general industry, and between a great plenty or cheapness of provisions, and the practice of general industry, are not the only absurdities and contradictions in this learned author's *theory*: there is also another manifest repugnancy, *viz.* between a plenty of provisions, a cheapness of necessaries, or high wages (which are all one and the same thing) and a temperate and sober life, which he so highly recommends as absolutely necessary to render a nation populous. To suppose a general sobriety and temperance to prevail either in town or country, where high wages, or great plenty, are found is absurd. If a labourer can procure by his high wages or plenty, all the necessaries of life; and have afterwards a *residuum*, he would expend the same, either in gin, rum, brandy or strong beer; luxurize on great heaps of fat beef or bacon, and eat perhaps till he spewed; and having gorged and gotten dead drunk, lie down like a pig, and snore till he was fresh. This is the common consequence of high wages and plenty. From whence it follows, that our author's

[32]

thor's scheme would manifestly encourage idleness and debauchery, and furnish the means of practising of both those vices.

4. We do not say these are the necessary consequences of a plentiful supply of provisions or high wages, but we assert that where a populace have the means of sloth and debauchery, that there it is morally impossible that they should be industrious, sober and temperate. Our author is for banishing commerce, which he argues furnishes the means of luxury; and where they are, it will be practised. But our author should distinguish, there is a vicious luxury, and an innocent luxury: Such authors are apt to confound a vicious luxury with a great expence. A porter may be viciously luxurious on fat bacon, tobacco, red herrings, gin, malt-spirits, and with a nasty bunter, or stinking dirty fish drab; whilst a nobleman may be innocently luxurious on ortelans, pine-apples, Tokay and the richest wines, and foods accompanied with a fine lady flaunting in jewels and brocade, and "fragrant as *Chloe* issuing to "an evening mask."

5. To suppose that by industry the people have the means of acquiring, and that they enjoy the liberty of spending, and at the same time to suggest, that they shall not use what they acquire, but in a temperate manner as becomes philosophers, is ridiculous, and only worthy of a monk who lives in a cell. The only way to keep a populace temperate, is to deprive them of the means of debauchery by
paying

[33]

paying them low wages; and to increase their numbers by propagation, to administer all necessaries to them in their distresses, from want of employment, dearth of provisions, numerous families, or accidental sickness, impotence, &c. But where the lands are fertile, it would be worth while to buy people from foreign states, to plant on them if they are not cultivated.

Thus we have proved that the cutting off all imaginary wants, such as the ornaments and refinements of civil life and the use of exoticks would

1. Deprive the people of the means of practising industry.

2. That a plenty of provisions, or a capacity of procuring them with little labour, would take away the obligation and motives to industry.

3. That a plenty of provisions would introduce among the common people voluptuousness and a pernicious debauchery.

4. That the way to render a people sober, temperate and industrious, is to render provisions so dear, as to deprive them of an opportunity to be either idle or debauched.

5. And lastly, to secure them from distress, the best way is to raise a fund by a tax on necessaries in a time of plenty, to bestow on them in a time of dearth and scarcity. But perhaps our author will say, he intends no strong beer shall be brewed, no spirits distilled, no exoticks, such as silk, tobacco, sugar, rum, &c. shall be imported; and that by this means luxury shall be banished, and that we shall become *Mahometans*

D

metans

[34]

metans as to fermented liquors. But if this be the case, how will he prevent gluttony, unless he makes the people all *Pythagoreans* too, and renders flesh odious and abominable? Or if he prohibits the use of spirits and fermented liquors, &c. from being manufactured at home, how without navigation, commerce and a great naval force, will he prevent these from being smuggled in upon us, and the country from being debauched and robbed of its money and the medium of its domestic trade? These reflections shew the ridiculousness of his system.

S E C T. V.

In page the 10th, our author proposes to keep our money, and banish commerce, or to prohibit the practice of foreign trade. He then observes the price of all necessaries must principally depend upon the proportion which the quantity of current money in a nation bears to the quantity of necessaries produced in it. If money increases fastest, these will become proportionably dearer; but cheaper, if it does not.

1. This is a maxim adopted by some political and commercial writers; and it is commonly said that the increase of money is the sole cause of the increase of the price of commodities in general; and that where money increases, the price of commodities rises in proportion. We shall offer a few reasons to prove this doctrine false,

I

When

[35]

When queen *Mary* died, there is reason to believe, there were above four millions of money in the nation. Though queen *Elizabeth* recoined all the old money in 1561, yet we find that there were not above six millions coined during her reign. And there is reason to believe all the gold she coined was transported, so that all the current money at her death seems not to have much exceeded what *Henry VII.* left in the nation at his death. And yet provisions were near eight times as dear, or at least wheat, at the end of *Elizabeth's* reign, as at the beginning of the reign of *Henry VIII.* or at any time of his reign, or of his successors to 1601. At the end of the reign of *James I.* there was not above 5,500,000*l.* of cash in the kingdom, yet wheat was in general at eight shillings or ten shillings a bushel, labour as dear as at present, and other commodities for the mouth very dear. Here provisions, &c. were advanced to six or eight times their former price, and yet money not increased above a third.

3. On the other hand, the coin and paper money of this kingdom is increased to above forty millions, or eight times as much; and yet the average price of wheat is not above half so much, many commodities and manufactures thirty *per cent.* cheaper, and labour no higher if so high as in those days.

4. Again in the year 1715. *Dutot* says, there were about 44,700,000*l.* sterling in *France.* Since 1727, *Debonaire* says, about 52,500,000*l.*

D 2

have

[36]

have been coined, all which money is in the kingdom, as might be shewn by irrefragable reasons, and yet *Dutot* says the price of corn, provisions, labour, salaries and commodities, are not risen; and this might be made appear from the writings of their authors, but the detail is too long to insert here.

5. Here we have proofs on both sides of the question, to demonstrate the falshood of the maxim, *viz.* of a vast rise of commodities without an increase of money; and of a vast increase of money without a rise of commodities. We may add farther, that *Spain* had imported 700 millions sterling of money into *Europe* before there was any material rise on commodities in *England*. We might here shew the true causes of the rise of commodities, but it is foreign to our present design.

S E C T. VI.

Page the 11th, our author advances another false maxim, *viz.* *Necessaries can no sooner grow cheap, but labour will be so likewise.*

1. Here it will be necessary to make a few observations on the relative terms *dear* and *cheap*. When a man can purchase all his necessaries with a little labour, we say they are *cheap*. When it requires a great deal of labour to purchase or provide them, we say they are *dear*. Now if we look back to our histories of antient times, when wheat was in common at about two Shillings a quarter, we find

[37]

find labour so high, that two days work would purchase a bushel of wheat in common. When wheat is at ten shillings a bushel, labour is no dearer in *England* than when it is at two shillings and six-pence. Nay when it is so cheap labour generally rises; the poor not being necessitated to work so much as when dear. Sir *Josiah Child*, Sir *William Petty*, Sir *William Temple* and many others remark this. Such bread as our people eat in *England*, is in *Holland* commonly at three-pence a pound, flesh at nine-pence; but a day's labour is not above one shilling and two-pence sterling. Wheat sometimes pays a tax there, of near a crown a bushel to the state, and flesh is high taxed likewise. From whence it is manifest the maxim is false.

2. If labourers could purchase the common necessaries of life for half the money they usually do, they would work but half the time they do now. Sir *Josiah Child** observes in such times they play and get drunk half their time. Sir *Matthew Decker* † observes that wages are so high, they spend half their time, and spend ^{half} their money in luxury. Cheap necessaries must then raise the price of labour, till it destroys itself. Therefore our author's scheme is impracticable, and absurd.

* See his Discourse on Trade.
of the Decline of foreign Trade.

† See the Causes

D 3

S E C T.

S E C T. VII.

In pages the 11th and 12th, our author advances some absurd reasonings concerning the reduction of the price of provisions, without reducing the price of labour in a proportion equivalent. He concludes his absurd account with this remark.

“ The advantage gained by the great cheapness of all necessaries is equivalent to the decrease of the price of all put together; while the inconvenience resulting from the low price of labour is equal only to the reduction of that one in which each man is employed.”

1. This seems a most strange account of the formation of the price of commodities. If the value of each man's labour be abated one eighth, and the value of labour in all commodities be four eighths; all commodities through the abatement of labour will fall only one sixteenth. In this case the labourer will receive the abatement only of one eighth of labour on four shillings worth of labour, which is six-pence; and consequently will not be able to purchase so many commodities with his labour, as he did before the abatement by one sixteenth or the value of six-pence.

2. But if the value of the land which produced the raw materials of those commodities, and the value of the art, labour and industry, which provide them and bring them to market, be the other half or four eighths of the value of the necessaries the labourer consumes; in
this

this case if the value of land and the brokerage of those necessaries be abated one eighth as well as labour, then the labourer will purchase his commodities two sixteenths cheaper than he did before; and consequently will provide as many necessaries by his labour as he could before the abatement. In both these cases the labourer has no advantage from the abatement of labour.

There remains a third case, *viz.* If the value of the land and brokerage of commodities fall four eighths or one half, and the price of labour remains the same; this will sink the price of the labourer's necessaries only two eighths or one fourth, which is 25 *per cent.* And from hence a labourer who earns at present eight shillings *per week*, on such a fall of the value of lands and brokerage, will be able to purchase as many commodities with six shillings, as he could before with eight shillings, and consequently will be capable to furnish himself with more necessaries by the same quantity of labour. But that man who imagines he would in such case work so much as he did before, knows nothing of the manners of a labouring populace, nor is any more qualified to reason on the subject, than a blind man is to write a treatise on colours. All our histories prove that the lower the price of provisions has been, the higher the price of labour: And that when land was let at a low rate, labour was at a high price, and so high, that two days labour would purchase the annual rent of an acre of land, and a bushel of wheat: And yet

[40]

this high price of labour did not prevent poverty and distress among the poor, nor the low price of land avert the evils of famine.

4. The common conduct of the labouring populace in times of plenty proves, that the easier the means of acquiring necessaries, the less work is generally done: And the dearer necessaries are, the more they labour, if full employment can be procured. Therefore the best charity is that which provides them work, by which they may be capable of relieving their distresses by their own honest industry. If wheat be eight shillings a bushel instead of four shillings, provide the poor with employment to the value of two shillings *per* week more, and they will live as well as they did before. Repairing roads, grubbing commons, draining fens, cutting canals, and making rivers navigable at such times, would be of great use to the community. The labouring hours of the fathers of families, might then be increased, and all the young sent to those public works. At such times, the working hours of single men, and fathers of small families should be lessened by law; and those of the heads of numerous families be increased. But we shall leave this digression, and return to our author.

S E C T VIII.

1. It seems from our author's reasoning in page 11, and 12. that he fancies, if the price of

[41]

of a man's labour be reduced one eighth, or we will say a shilling a week, and he consumes part of the labour of a hundred persons, that he shall save a hundred shillings in his expences by it. This is absurd; but if this be not his meaning, I confess myself so dull as to be unable to fathom it. But as I cannot with all my attention apprehend his reasoning, or fix any clear ideas to his words, I am inclined to conceive he had no distinct ideas of what he has said, and of the arguments he has advanced in those pages.

2. I can most clearly perceive that the value of all commodities or the price, is a compound of the value of the land necessary to raise them, the value of the labour exerted in producing and manufacturing them, and of the value of the brokerage which provides and circulates them.

3. Now vary or alter these a thousand ways, the labourer can receive no advantage, unless it be at the expence of one or both the other two. That is, it must be taken out of the value of the land, or the value of the brokerage. But if the broker's gains do not please him, he will withhold his sales. The farmer will not sow, the manufacturers will leave off their trades, if their employments and occupations produce a loss instead of a profit. When a glut of commodities has produced by their cheapness a stop of trade, how are labourers to procure necessaries? This shews, that a student in a college

[42]

college is not a very proper person to settle the political œconomy of a state.

4. Let us suppose the value of the lands of the kingdom fifteen millions, houses five millions, brokerage twelve millions, labour thirty-two millions, and consequently the whole consumption sixty-four millions. Now supposing all the arable, pasture and other lands of the kingdom were to be sunk half in price, or let at half their present annual value, this amounts to but seven million and a half, and if this sum were abated in the price of all commodities, it would diminish that price, but in the proportion of seven and a half to sixty-four, or less than one eighth of the value of a poor man's consumption.

5. But our learned author ^{says} ~~proves~~ that all people of property, will go on raising and producing commodities with a view to lose by the sale of them, and from this continued and constant loss, that they shall become cheap; a presumption unnatural and absurd; for which reason no consequences can be considered as arising from it.

S E C T IX.

1. From page the 12th to page 13th, he talks of obstacles to marriage arising from the refinements of civil life; which exist no where but in the author's fancy; or at least the obstructions which arise from the refinements are a small dust, that weighs little in the balance; the

[43]

the rich whom it affects being very few; in proportion to the multitude, and few of them under the pernicious influence he represents.

2. It is false that poverty and want are the concomitants of arts, and the ornaments and refinements of civil life. Poverty and want generally prevail where they are not adopted. And where they are, if poverty and want ever appear, they are the consequences of sloth, imprudence, extravagance and folly; not of the arts, for these provide the means of a comfortable support, excite emulation, furnish employment and provoke industry. It is the abuse of these advantages arising from the refinements of life, which causes poverty. Baron *Montesquieu* observes "a man is not poor because he has *nothing*, but because he does not work: " And he that has an employment, is in a better condition than he that has ten acres of land without one*." But if all the lands in the kingdom were to be divided among the people, they would not amount to four acres a-piece. A man is not poor because the refinements of the arts, policy and manners have left him without lands, or rather the folly, luxury and sloth of his predecessors; but he is poor because he spends what he acquires from the arts of refinement in a foolish manner; or neglects from sloth to make so proper and prudent advantage of those arts as he might. If the arts were banished, and the lands let for one tenth of their present annual rent, such persons

* See *L'Esprit des Loix*.

[44]

persons would be more miserable than at present, and much poorer. Every one who has closely attended to human nature, knows this to be true. This is so just a remark, that there are few politicians who have reflected on this subject, but what have joined in the sentiment. The arts and the ornaments of civil life furnish labour, that is food. It is notoriously false to say, where the arts of refinement prevail, that there succeeds a scarcity of all things necessary to the sustenance of the people. The reverse is true; and this makes people croud in flocks to those countries. It is the greater certainty and ease of procuring sustenance which make people leave the mountains of *Scotland*, and *Switzerland*, the woods of *Germany* and the barren rocks of *Auvergne*, to settle at *London*, *Amerdam*, *Paris*, and *Hamborough*.

S E C T. X.

In page the 14th, our learned author observes, *that the populousness of Egypt, Palestine, the Græcian states, and Roman republick was owing to the plenty of things requisite for their sustenance.*

1. We would remark here, that *Diodorus Siculus* informs us, that when *Egypt* was in its most flourishing condition, it had but seven millions of people, and in the reign of *Ptolemy Lagus*, but three millions; so that it appears, it was never half so populous as *England* is at this present time. And yet in this nation
all

[45]

all the arts, ornaments, refinements of civil life, commerce, the consumption of exoticks, and the imaginary wants of mankind prevail; the pernicious luxury our author complains of, and contends ought to be banished out of the state. But in truth, as plenty or agriculture did not render it more populous than *England*, neither did commerce or the arts depopulate it. Nor is there any conclusion to be drawn from the history of that state, which tends to support our author's system or our own. All we can remark from the accounts we have of *Egypt* is, that the arguments our author has drawn from its history, are not founded on facts, and that it was not such a country as he represents it to be. Besides, if *Egypt* had been crowded with people so full as *Holland* has been by commerce, it would have been no wonder, when we consider the conquests of its monarchs, the transplantation of captives, the purchases of slaves that were made there, and that the country was the center of commerce between the *East Indies* and *Europe*.

2. It is recorded of *Sesostris*, that to leave eternal monuments of his memory, he erected a temple in every city in *Egypt*, and other expensive and admirable works, all which were built by the prisoners he took in war, for which reason he caused the following inscription to be made upon all the temples. *None of the natives laboured here.*

3. It is said that *Cephres*, &c. erected one of the pyramids, and fed the people who laboured
at

[46]

at it with herbs, onions, garlick, and that others did the same, &c. that the labour was so hard, and the pay so little, (that is, only a support from the above herbs,) that the people being highly incensed by reason of their cruel labour and toil, threatened to pull them out of their graves, tear them to pieces, and cast their carcasses to dogs; upon which account they directed their servants to bury them privately, and not in the sepulchres they had built. And *Diodorus* informs us, that the people in *Egypt* generally subsisted on herbs, the *lotos*, *papyrus*, kidney beans, &c. He says, they bring up their children with very little cost, and are sparing upon that account to admiration. For they provide for them broth made of any mean poor stuff that may be easily had; and feed those who are of strength able to eat it, with the pith of bulrushes roasted in the embers, and with roots and herbs got in the fens; sometimes raw, and sometimes boiled, and at other times fried and boiled.

4. Notwithstanding the labour and toils of the *Egyptians* were so great, and their sustenance so poor and mean, and their condition so wretched, we have our learned dissertator's word for it, that the country was extremely populous, and that this miserable supply of food did not prove any obstruction to marriages and propagation.

2. Our learned author is equally unfortunate in what he says of *Greece* and *Rome*. *Attica* was a barren country. *Thucydides* observes, that the

[47]

the sterility of its soil screened it from foreign wars, and intestine broils; that it was an *asylum* for the exiles of other states, and a refuge to those who loved repose. That the *Athenians* allowed of a sort of general naturalization, and gave the freedom of the city to all refugees, which at last rendered it so populous, that it was obliged to ease itself by sending colonies into *Ionia*. We find afterwards, by its conquests, its traffick, and the purchase of slaves, it became exceeding powerful, vastly rich and extremely populous.

3. As to the other *Græcian* states, he informs us, that their fertility was their ruin; for it either rendered them obnoxious to conquests from abroad, or seditions at home: And that they had no incitements to the acquisition of riches, being exposed to the depredations of every invader; and therefore cultivated no more ground than what was barely necessary for their support for the present, confiding that they should find in all places sustenance sufficient to serve them from day to day. Thus we find for want of great walled cities to secure them, commerce and the arts to enrich them, the people of those states wandered from one place to another, neglecting agriculture, poor, impotent, in a word, exposed to the insolence of every one who should think it proper to assail them, either from caprice or avarice.

4. Some of the first paragraphs of the first book of *Thucydides* seem to be a full confutation of our author's account of the *Græcian* states;

[48]

states; and in every respect a perfect and complete contradiction of his whole system.

As to *Palestine* it never contained so many fighting men as *Great Britain*: After *David* had added large territories to his dominions by conquest, upon *Joab's* numbering the people, he found but one million of fighting men; which perhaps is not half what is in *England*. And we learn from holy writ, that the arts and luxury were carried to a very high pitch among the *Jews*. But they owed the acmé of their power, riches, and influence to the commerce under their great and wise prince, king *Solomon*.

Rome was at first a sanctuary afterwards increased by the conquest and incorporation of the *Albans*, &c. At last to increase their numbers, they granted the freedom of the city and a general naturalization to all the world. My lord *Bacon* says, that all states which are liberal of naturalization are fit for empire, and that the *Romans* granted it to whole cities and nations; so that it was not the *Romans* spread upon the whole world; but the whole world upon the *Romans**.

Upon the whole it appears, that the *Egyptians*, *Jews*, *Græcians* and *Romans*, did not owe their populousity, power and riches to agriculture, but to strong cities, good laws, navigation, commerce, conquest and transplanting and purchasing people from other states, to increase the inhabitants of their own. So far

are

* See Parag. the 5th of the XIth Section.

[49]

are the examples brought from history, from corroborating our author's hypothesis. It is no wonder *Switzerland* should grow populous, since it has been so long free from wars, and is secured by its barren rocks and poverty from the invasions of its neighbours, and is also an asylum for the distressed. But is it either so populous as *England* or *Holland*, which have been both drained by large colonies and long wars by sea and land?

S E C T. XI.

In page the 14th, our learned author says, *the second foundation of populousness is the diminution of imaginary wants. That they require the labour of great multitudes and procure them great wages.*

1. Here is a manifest absurdity, that great multitudes acquire great wages by the exercise of the arts, and yet that they introduce a scarcity and penury. Great wages is the same thing virtually as a great plenty of provisions; for great wages, which will not purchase a great quantity of provisions, cease to be *great wages*; such wages are in fact small wages. This every one must see, who does not confound a low value of money with great wages. But did the miserable sustenance arising from radishes, onions, garlick and other herbs, prevent the kingdom of *Egypt* from growing populous, or destroy the fecundity of the *Hebrews*, though both natives and slaves were

E

condemned

[50]

condemned to cruel labours and toils under such wretched support*? Which are most populous, *England, France, and Holland*, where the arts, the ornaments and refinements of civil life prevail, and where large and populous cities and towns are frequent; or the states of the *Caffers, Hottentots*, and the republicks in *North America*, where there are no large stinking cities, and where a simplicity of manners obtains, and the objects of curiosity and expence, art and elegance are unknown?

2. But there may be nasty luxury even among these, as we find from Dr. *Douglas's* account of *North America*; for he says, that after success in hunting, they gorge and gluttonize like dogs, fall a-sleep, and wake to repeat the debauch, and seek no farther till hunger excites them again to the chace. And *Waser* informs us, that on the Isthmus of *Darien*, the *Indians* set their old women to chew ~~maiz~~ ^{maiz} which they throw into a tub of water to ferment; and that this slovenly brewing produces a heady spirituous liquor, with which they get as drunk as *David's* sow. From hence we see it is not abolishing the ornaments and refinements of civil life, that will preserve temperance and sobriety, since there may be a beastly luxury in poverty, or at least where none of the elegancies of life prevail, which may be more abominable, and more destructive of

* According to our author it did not.

[51]

of health, than the more refined luxury among polite nations.

3. A clean shirt and a laced hat are not inconsistent with piety and virtue, nor ortolans and Burgundy with temperance, nor a feather-bed with fortitude, nor a pinch of snuff with sobriety, nor a handsome woman with chastity. A man may enjoy them all, and yet act up to the dignity of his nature, and conformably to the precepts of religion and morality.

Neither on the other hand, does a man's confining himself to the use of fat bacon, *Lacedæmonian* broth, muddy beer, coarse woollens, a leather doublet, a canvas shirt and a thatched hovel upon a common, render him the more pious, temperate, sober, chaster religious and virtuous; for he may confine himself to the use of all these, and yet be a most slovenly sinner and beastly profligate. And it seems, that the refined debauchee is the most eligible character of the two.

Drunkennes was a very fashionable vice among the *Scythians*; nay the *Persians* gave them from that vice, the name of *Sacæ*, or *Sakai*, which in *Perfick* signified a glutton and a drunkard. And yet these people lived a very simple life, subsisting mostly on horse-flesh, mare's milk, roots, &c. without towns or even houses. See *Universal History*, Vol. XX. page 15.

4. Our author in page 16. *inveighs bitterly against great cities as being injurious to health.* This is true; but great cities are not necessary

[52]

to commerce and the practice of the arts. All the ornaments, elegancies and refinements of civil life may be obtained without such large congregations of people. Neither is debauchery and intemperance a necessary effect or consequence of commerce alone. If a country or nation had not two houses standing together; and there were no more than a hundred houses in every town, the people might be luxurious and debauched. And if we had no commerce, spirituous liquors, gin and strong beer might do as much mischief to health as *Burgundy, Arrack, rum, citron-waters* and *French Brandy*. The refinements, elegancies and ornaments of civil life, do not make intemperance and debauchery necessary; neither will the exclusion of them make a people abstemious, chaste, virtuous and sober. A people may be all that is bad without commerce and the refinements of civil life, and all that is good with them. A simple life does not extinguish the force of the selfish and cruel passions; but on the contrary, they appear in more horrible shapes among the *North Americans*, than among the nations which practise refined luxury and cultivate the arts and ornaments of civil life; which certainly restrain in a great measure their ferocity.

5. But it appears from the history of the *Romans* and *Italians*, that they had many large cities, and that arts, trades and manufactures were practised at *Rome*, as well as in the great city of *London*, in the infancy of the state.

Numa

[53]

Numa divided all the inhabitants into distinct societies, according to their several trades and occupations, appointing to each their respective courts and privileges; such as the goldsmiths, carpenters, curriers, dyers, taylor, &c. *Tarquinius Priscus* built the common sewers at *Rome*, which were the wonder of the world. The stately and magnificent temples they built, the ornaments they wore, and the trades they employed, shew that they were no more strangers to the refinements of civil life than the *Londoners* are now. These transactions seem to imply, that husbandry was no more in esteem at *Rome*, and in the *Roman* state than it is now in *England*. The same may be said as to the *Græcian* states and the *Hebrew* commonwealth. And yet our author absurdly speaks of them as if they were a nation of husbandmen. But if *Rome* in her infancy had cultivated commerce she would not have been so often reduced to straits by famine.

6. But as a plenty of provisions and simple necessaries is but another name for *great or high wages*, it seems that our author's scheme tends more to debauch and corrupt the lower class of people, than to render them sober and temperate: and from hence to introduce all the evils he exclaims against and pretends to redress. And we think it would rather depopulate the state, than increase and promote propagation. In short if people will be debauched, there is no preventing of it, but by cutting off the means. One of the best and surest steps towards it, is to enforce industry by ne-

E 3

cessity,

[54]

cessity, so as to deprive the lower class of both time and wages which may admit of luxury, intemperance, and debauchery. But this is the very reverse of what our author proposes.

7. Wages in *Holland* are low in proportion to the price of necessaries, every thing being excessively taxed; the people from hence are exceedingly industrious. And whether from want of the means of debauchery and being constantly obliged to labour, they are more virtuous and sober; or whether their laws are better, or the people more religious, or whatever be the cause, there are not above four malefactors capitally convicted in a year in the great city of *Amsterdam*. This seems to argue that their police is much better than ours at *London*.

8. Here we would ask this author, whether if his scheme is to be put in practice, we must not set *London* and all our other great towns and cities on fire? Whether strong *beer*, *malt*, *brandy* and *gin*, together with eating animal flesh must not be prohibited? And how he proposes to keep luxury from being run in upon us from our neighbours? And if we can do all this, how we are to prevent invasions and a conquest from abroad? Alas! what is it this gentleman means by the publication of such a whimsical scheme?

S E C T. XII.

In page the 16th and 17th, our learned author talks of the virtues of the *Græcian* and *Roman*

[55]

Roman commonwealths, and their sumptuary laws. But had not the *Romans* in the early times of the commonwealth, their *Appius Claudius's*, *C. Marcius's*, *Coriolanus's*, *A. Virginius's*, &c. and a proud, avaricious, and tyrannical senate, that were always struggling to enslave the Plebeians, and aiming to abolish their liberties and privileges? And in regard to the common people, they were much the same as they are now in *England*, as we find from their riots, insurrections and secessions. Here this author is fallen into the fashion of applauding the past times we know little of, and of condemning the present unmercifully, because we see all its vices and imperfections: though it is certain human nature has at all times been pretty uniform; and especially among the common people who have enjoyed liberty.

We may learn also from *Plutarch*, &c. that in the time of *Numa* they had all manner of trades practised among them, that contribute to ornament, magnificence, sumptuosity and luxury*.

As to the *Grecian* states, the *Athenians*, *Corinthians*, &c. they cultivated arts, practised commerce, and carried all the ornaments and refinements of civil life to the greatest perfection and excess; and yet they sent out colonies to *Ionia*, to all the islands of the *Ægean* sea, to *Sicily*, *Italy*, &c. and dispersed themselves all over the world. This does not seem to imply, that commerce and the arts depopulated the

E 4

country,

* See above.

[56]

country, or prevented fecundity and propagation. The *Phœnicians* did the same, and planted *Carthage*, and many other colonies. The people grew too numerous by commerce for their countries to contain them, which necessitated them to lessen the burden and reduce the overstocked hive by planting colonies in other countries. So far are these states, their manners, customs and occurrences from supporting our author's visionary and chimerical system. Commerce drew multitudes to them; colonies eased them of their burthens. In short, our author's discourse serves every where to shew his great ignorance of antiquity, and little knowledge of mankind at present.

2. Page 17th our author says, that a *third cause of populousness is industry; and that no greater encouragement can be given to universal industry than every one's having a certain prospect of obtaining by it a comfortable subsistence for himself and his family; That a moderate proportion of their time and pains may furnish an ample provision for all their demands.*

This is the state of our poor at present, and therefore we cannot conceive why such useless instruction is given here. But our poor cannot only acquire a comfortable support by working only a small part of their time, but also the means of debauchery; and this is the reason why our common people both in town and country are so wicked, debauched and profligate. The only way to make them temperate and industrious, is to lay them under a necessity

[57]

fity of labouring all the time they can spare from meals and sleep, in order to procure the common necessaries of life. That is, to reduce them to a state the very reverse of what this author proposes; as his system tends to nothing but the promotion of luxury, insolence, profligacy and debauchery, by furnishing the poor with the means and temptations to these, *viz.* high wages, a plenty of every thing, and spare time. Besides, how is this consistent with the populousness of *Egypt*, which our author speaks of, and which we have shewn was the consequence of being obliged to subsist on *radishes, onions and garlick?*

3. The reason why the populace in cities are so profligate, is the high wages they receive; the chief reason of the greater sobriety among husbandmen is their low wages. For in the country where manufactures are carried on, and wages are high, the people are as profligate and debauched as in towns and cities. When provisions are dear, so that virtually wages are less, industry and sobriety assume their seat among the manufacturers; and if they have employment they live better than in times of plenty. All our author's reasoning on those matters arises from his unacquaintance with mankind: And what he advances in the contrast, he has drawn between the city and country, he ascribes to wrong causes. Great wages and certainty of employment render the inhabitants of cities insolent and debauched. Low wages

[58]

wages and uncertainty of employment near at hand, if discharged, make the husbandman temperate and humble. Yet this gentleman proposes by cheapness of provisions and spare time, to make this insolence and debauchery general. And if his principle that temperance increases propagation be true, the cheapness of provisions he proposes, tends to depopulate a state.

From what has been offered it appears clearly, that there is a manifest absurdity in all our author's principles, and that they are repugnant to each other.

1. A plenty or cheapness of provisions is manifestly incompatible with general industry.

2. That the diminishing, or abolishing imaginary wants and the consumption of exoticks, takes away the very object and means of industry.

3. A great plenty or cheapness of provisions, and the abolishing the consumption of exoticks, and diminishing or excluding imaginary wants, would introduce an universal sloth and insolence among the mass of the people, which might end in barbarism.

4. That a great plenty of provisions, or high wages, with a diminution of the consumption of exoticks and imaginary wants would make way for universal luxury and debauchery, and furnish the mass of the people with the means of it, and temptations to it; viz. high wages and spare time, by which profligacy, intemperance, insolence, contempt
of

[59]

of order, and all manner of debauchery, like a flood, would overspread the state, and end in depopulation.

S E C T. XIII.

In page the 19th and 20th, our author has advanced the same false principle but inverted, which he had in page 11. and 12; viz. *that as commerce increases money, it increases the price of commodities to the disadvantage of the labourer: Because it augments the price of his necessaries in a greater proportion than it increases the price of labour.*

Our author says page the 20th, *when by an increase of money things grow dearer, it is obvious the whole increase of the price of any one's labour can be no greater, than the advance upon that particular commodity in which every man is employed. But the additional expence of living incurred unavoidably by the same means, must be equivalent to the whole advance upon the price of all the necessaries of life put together.*

1. We have proved above, that the increase of money in a state does not necessarily augment the price of commodities, to which we refer the reader. And we shall here endeavour to demonstrate, that if it does, it will not augment the price of living in a greater proportion than it augments the price of labour, in the manner which our author contends for.

2. Let

[60]

2. Let us suppose that by the increase of money, the price of any one man's labour is increased fifty *per cent*: That he used to earn twenty pounds a year, and that half of his earnings was paid to land and brokerage of commodities, and the other half to labour bestowed on them, that is ten pounds to labour and ten pounds to the other two. If then labour be raised fifty *per cent*. he will receive thirty pounds for his year's labour, instead of twenty pounds: If likewise a hundred persons labour to provide his necessaries, their labour will amount on fifty *per cent*. advance, to fifteen pounds, which cost before but ten pounds. And if the value of the land and brokerage which produces and circulates them, remains as before; in this case the labourer will be able to purchase as many necessaries as he did before the advance, for twenty-five pounds; by which he will be a gainer of five pounds. But if land and brokerage advance fifty *per cent*. likewise, then he must give thirty pounds for the same necessaries he purchased before for twenty pounds; and in this case he will be no loser. If he spent eight shillings a week in the first case, he paid no more than four shillings to labour, though a thousand trades received a part of it. If he spend twelve shillings in the second case, he pays but six shillings a week to labour, though a thousand trades more divide it among them. Nay often, if he spend exoticks, he purchases them cheaper, than he can native commodities of the same kind,

[61]

kind, *viz.* linen cloth, grain, &c. It is from hence demonstratively plain, that all our author has said on this head is absolutely false.

3. Besides since our commerce has been increased to eight times what it was, and our treasure in the same proportion, the price of all our native commodities on the average is sunk not less than thirty *per cent*. An increase of money lowers interest, and falls the price of brokerage in proportion. If money were as scarce as in queen *Elizabeth's* reign when it yielded ten *per cent*. the price of brokerage would be now three times as high as it is. Suppose the interest of money was ten *per cent*. and a commodity passes through three hands, and that at the same time the amount of brokerage is double the value of the annual interest of money. In this case the amount of commodities to the value of a hundred pounds in the first hand, will be raised in the third hand from the maker or importer, to a hundred and seventy-four pounds: Whereas if the interest of money be but five *per cent*. the amount of such commodities would be but a hundred and thirty-three pounds, which makes a difference of forty-one pounds on a hundred pounds laid out by the merchant. But if we may believe many accounts given of the profits of trade when money was ten and twelve *per cent*. there is reason to believe that the price of foreign commodities and home manufactures were advanced three hundred *per cent*. higher than at present. Likewise when the interest of money is high from its scarcity, people can make

make a greater advantage of it by putting it into trade, or out on securities, than by employing it in agriculture, from whence the lands are neglected and in a greater degree. Hence it follows, that where there is a great plenty of money brought in by commerce, and more than the trade of a state can employ, there the lands will soon be improved to the highest degree possible considering the quantity of people. This is the case in *Holland* where their lands have been raised to fifteen pounds *per ann. per acre*. Where the improvement of lands takes place, provision must grow cheap. It is then more likely, that the increase of money should introduce intemperance and sloth among the bulk of the people, than obstruct marriage and propagation, by rendering the necessaries of life dear and its common supports difficult to be acquired. The great exportations of grain shew that this is the case in *England*, and that the lands produce more than we can consume, though we eat great quantities of flesh, butter and cheese, and though the poor consume such vast sums in gin, which require immense heaps of grain for its manufacture.

4. But this author says page 21, *That when money becomes plentiful, necessaries will be more scarce; for the numbers which would otherwise be employed in their production, must be unavoidably diminished by as many as are engaged in commerce and the arts of ornament alone.*

To this it may be answered, that if mankind employed themselves in nothing but the
I productions

productions absolutely necessary to life, seven in eight must be idle, or all be idle seven eighths of their time. And yet they might indulge intemperance, and sink into the beastly vices of slovenly gluttony and drunkenness. And this we find to be actually the case among the *Hottentots*, *North Americans* and the *Mosquetoes* on the *Isthmus of Darien*.

5. If arts, commerce and elegancies were to be banished out of this nation, sloth, intemperance and gluttony, would become universal: that is if commerce be prohibited and all the lands as well cultivated as at present, which our author proposes. But we think the consequence at first would be great poverty and distress among the poor for want of employment, and therefore this argument must be considered only *ad hominem*; or what would arise from our author's own principles, supposing the plenty he contends for would ensue from the practice of his own system: For we do not think such consequences would actually arise, as the price of lands and labour are settled at present. Provisions are so low and wages so high at present, that is in plentiful seasons, or on the average, that these vices have spread themselves through all the lower ranks of people. The excise books will convince any reasonable man, that a dearth of provisions and little employment, are the best curbs to those vices. Whilst through a cheapness of necessaries, high wages and a plenitude of employment, the instruments of excess, intemperance
and

[64]

and debauchery are to be procured, the lower class of people will gratify their appetites. To extirpate vice is impossible; all the ruler can do is to cramp it by obliging the lower class of people to labour constantly to acquire necessaries, which cuts off the sources of intemperance and debauchery. But so little acquainted is our author with mankind, that he proposes to open the sluices of excess, and depopulation, *viz.* high wages and a plenty of provisions, in order to render a people prolifick and sober.

6. When we had but little commerce we had but few people. The lands were in an over proportion to the number of inhabitants, and so of little value. From hence the price of labour and brokerage was high, and the price of provisions low; so low, that a man might purchase a bushel of wheat by two days labour. In *Edward III's* time, wheat was cheap and not above one eighth of the relative value as at present. This made the people very idle and debauched as we find from the statutes of the 23d and 25th of his reign. In his reign for want of commerce there was a most grievous famine, so that the price of wheat was thirteen times as high as in common, through poverty and a want of foreign trade. And though the exportation of wheat was prohibited, once in about twenty years, thousands generally perished of famine.

It must be observed, that we premise in case the arts and refinements of civil life were banish'd

[65]

banished out of society, that letting the lands at a high price would be of no use to their possessors: And therefore that they would be reduced to one eighth of their present value. For if the lands were to be let at the price they fetch now; and the arts were to be banished out of society, three fourths of the people would be starved for want of employment.

7. Our author complains *that the farmers cultivate their lands only in such a manner, that the staple commodities of life may not fail of a high price and quick demand.*

But if we banish commerce upon a bad crop from unseasonable weather, the farmers will have a monopoly against the people, and may make what price they please of their grain. Nay they will have this monopoly against the people at all times. Nothing contributes more to the increase of mankind than the relief commerce affords in times of a dearth of wheat. High wages and a plenty of provisions which admit debauchery, are ~~not~~ fatal to the increase of mankind, as bad harvests and a want of commerce to supply the defect. When we had no commerce and this nation was thinly peopled, one scanty crop destroyed more people in one year, than the practice of all the virtues recruited in a hundred.

Upon the whole, this author proposes to banish commerce in order to procure a plenty of provisions, and with a plenty of provisions to preserve ^{so} ebriety and industry; things the most repugnant to each other in nature. No

F

poli-

political dreamer ever stumbled upon a more inconsistent project.

On the contrary we have fully proved, that by abolishing commerce, by excluding all imaginary wants, by banishing the arts, ornaments, refinements and elegancies of civil life, and as a consequence by rendering all necessaries extremely cheap,

1. All industry will be destroyed, and sloth be introduced, which are likely to end in barbarism.

2. Debauchery, slovenly luxury, and coarse intemperance and insolence will prevail; and sometimes desolating famines ensue; all which are destructive of the increase of mankind, and tend to depopulate a nation.

S E C T. XIV.

In page 22. our author says, *When commerce has thrown wealth into the hands of many, expensive enjoyments will extend to each inferior order, and introduce an extravagant manner of living in all.*

A few pages back, this author represents commerce as rendering all the necessaries of life scarce, but here he says, it will introduce an extravagant manner of living in each inferior order and among all. But how is this possible? There is nothing but high wages and a plenty of provisions can support an extravagant way of living. As necessity is the parent of industry, so it obliges to oeconomy and frugality. But our author

author is so unfortunate as to be always joining repugnancies in friendly concert, and uniting contradictions and inconsistencies.

2. As to celibacy occasioned by employing servants, in the more simple times, as our author calls them, it may be replied, the retainers and servants in great men's families in those times were much more numerous than at present. But the celibacy of the priesthood, which in *France* deprives the state of three or four hundred thousand souls *per annum*, and depopulates *Europe* more than all its wars, and the luxury practised in it, this gentleman has slipped over unnoticed. The removal of this cause of depopulation would prove one of the principal causes of rendering many nations populous. Why he has left this ridiculous superstition unattacked we cannot divine, but he best knows himself.

3. In page 22. he likewise at last confesses, that the commercial arts promote industry and allure foreigners into a country: And that they may make it flourish for a long period of time, but at last will destroy it.

4. Here he has given up his whole system. As to the destruction it produces, he may be asked how comes the republic of *Venice* to have subsisted for one thousand three hundred years, which was the greatest commercial state in *Europe* for many ages? The diminution of its glory has been owing to the diminution of its commerce, which by various accidents has been diverted to other states. *Holland* has maintained

[68]

its power and influence for near two hundred years, and is now the richest and most populous state in *Europe*, and the center of all its exchanges. It is true, its prodigious struggles for freedom, and the wars it has carried on to vindicate its liberty and establish its independency, have involved it in debt, and loaded it heavily with taxes: But yet the people are very rich, very frugal, and their country a magazine of all the commodities of the universe.

5. But how does the ruin he speaks of agree with what he has laid down in page the 35th, *viz.* That when a country is grown so populous, that its products will scarcely maintain them, its end being to procure the very requisites of life, trade will ever be accompanied with a general industry and a national frugality. In one place he says the arts and commerce will destroy themselves, and in the other, that they will produce universal industry and national frugality. Here he avers two opposite effects will spring from the same cause, a manifest contradiction. But it is no strange thing to see an author whose system is not founded in truth, to oppose in one place the arguments he has offered in another.

6. The populousness of *Holland* was owing to its freedom, its good government, and its commerce. This populousness has rendered its lands unable to support their inhabitants, and has been a capital cause of the extension of its commerce still farther, by making the superfluities of other nations necessary to their
own

[69]

own subsistence. Thus other nations give them their superfluous provisions in exchange for the necessary manufactures of *Holland*. If the *Dutch* could not take off their raw materials and provisions, those nations could not purchase *Dutch* fish, spices and manufactures.

7. The reason why commerce seldom flourishes in a fertile country thinly peopled, is because land being there of small value from the scarcity of inhabitants, provisions are cheap and plentiful, and labour dear. *Edward III.* tried to remedy this evil in order to extend commerce, as we find by the statutes of the 23d and 25th of his reign; but his remedy was unequal to the evil, he could not sink the price of labour so low as he intended, and as was necessary to establish a foreign trade; so that for many years after, the *Flemings* bought our wool, paid high custom *out*, manufactured it and paid custom in, and yet sold cheaper than the natives.

8. But if a state thinly peopled, by a good internal police can keep down the price of labour, and thereby establish a large foreign commerce; if its political institutions do not prove obstacles, it will soon be full of people, and have all its lands fully improved. These arguments prove the very reverse of what our author advances to be true; for here a plenty appears an impediment to an increase of people. Our author always presumes, that a nation can never increase in people, but by rendering the inhabitants prolific. This assumption and error tacitly run

F 3

almost

[70]

almost through all his discourse. But it is evident to any man of common sense, that a police which will allure and induce foreigners to reside in a country, may render it more populous in a year's time, than the practice of all our author's maxims would in a thousand years. Therefore agriculture is not the *principal cause of the populousness of nations, as our author suggests*; nay, nor would be, though it was combined with the practice of all the virtues and political institutions he recommends.

The frugality in *Holland* is the consequence of their great taxes; and the dearness of provisions arise from the same source; to which may be added, that the product of their lands must be necessarily dear from the great expence they are at in keeping up their dikes and draining off the waters with which they are flooded. This in some places amounts to near seven eighths of their value, in others to three fourths: And their taxes on grain at the mills to the value of the wheat ground. This of course makes the people laborious and frugal.

9. But according to our author's reasonings in page the 23d, commerce and the arts ought to have introduced luxury, and to have brought on their ruin instead of having introduced *universal industry and national frugality*, which he declares to be the consequence of a people's growing by commerce too numerous for its lands to support.

But those who have closely attended to human nature and to the progress of human affairs,

[71]

fairs, know that commerce naturally leads to justice, temperance, industry and frugality; and if it does not encourage a profuse generosity, at least it cultivates an amiable benevolence and humanity. On the other hand, war and conquest naturally lead to injustice, murder and rapine. Ambition excited by pride and vain glory, avarice prompted by luxury and profusion, insolence swelled by dominion and authority, create a passion for slaughter and plunder. And when men have been used to the exercise of those diabolical arts among their neighbours, it is no wonder if they turn to the practice of the same among themselves. This was the case among the *Romans*, who were a nation of soldiers, not a republick of merchants, as *Venice* and *Holland* are. The empire of the *Romans* founded and established by conquest, did not last much above half the time which the republick of *Venice* has subsisted by commerce.

History does not furnish accounts of any state rendered so populous by agriculture, as *Holland* has been by commerce. Besides the populousness of *Holland* did not take its rise from agriculture, but its improvements in agriculture were the effect of its commerce and populousity. No states were ever rendered so populous by agriculture as *Tyre*, *Carthage*, *Venice* and *Holland* have been by commerce. The lands have never been so well cultivated in any states, as in those where commerce and the arts have been cherished and have flourished. Commerce allures people, people must be fed, necessity

[72]

cessity of food prompts invention, and carries the arts of agriculture to the highest pitch of perfection.

To say that agriculture must first fill a state with people, before commerce should be cherished and encouraged, seems ridiculous. What reason can be assigned why the lands should not be cultivated, if the inhabitants are constantly increased by an influx of people from abroad, as well as if there were no such accretion? Nay, is it not a glaring absurdity to suppose a superfluity of lands should be as soon and as well cultivated by the natural increase of mankind, as by the rapid multiplication and increase produced by the allurements of commerce? And yet this absurdity is the very essence of this gentleman's system.

S E C T XV.

In Sect. IV. p. 23. our author inveighs against great cities as prejudicial to health and morals.

1. Why should this be a disparagement to commerce, since great cities are neither necessary to commerce, nor peculiar to a commercial state? There is a district in *England*, where the houses stand a furlong apart, and yet the people are as debauched as in the city of *London*. But this is owing to high wages, or a plentiful supply of provisions, which our author contends ought to be the lot of every labourer. When a dearth of grain happens, these labourers,

[73]

ers are as sober, humble and temperate, as any thresher in *England*, whose acquaintance is confined to the ploughman and his helper.

Page 24. our author says, dissolute and debauched habits owe their influence to luxury and idleness. And yet he contends for a plenty of provisions. Where wages are low, there it is impossible luxury and idleness should exist. But where they are high, labourers will indulge themselves in both. But when did we ever find celibacy in fashion among the common people, who are the mass of mankind? The bulk of the people want no incitement to the union of the marriage state, Providence has taken great care of that matter. Every wise state will promote marriage and punish bachelors, but no state can prevent monsters. The laws for promoting marriages were original laws among the *Greeks* and *Romans*, and not institutions consequent to luxury and commerce, and so they prove nothing to our author's purpose. They were made to influence the conduct of the rich and great men, not the poor. For they were suffered to expose their infants in order to limit populousity, and restrain the natural increase of mankind.

3. It is acknowledged, that commerce is in some degree prejudicial to health, and that navigation destroys many sailors. But the relief it brings to a country in case of failure of crops from unseasonable weather, there is reason to believe, saves a thousand times more lives than it destroys. The histories of the
dreadful

[74]

dreadful famines in this kingdom formerly as well as in other inland states prove this most clearly.

The *Longobardi* left their country by lot, compelled by famine. The migrations from the North were generally occasioned by famines; but as in our days, commerce alleviates or redresses those evils, there is no reason for such fatal expeditions, which generally produced the destruction either of the emigrants, or the invaded; and must have been extremely mortal to both the assailants *and the assailed*.

4. But whether this be true or false is not to the purpose, for the question is, *What causes principally contribute to render a nation populous*; not whether or no navigation destroys many of the species. This may be the case, and yet commerce and the arts for every one that is lost, may allure twenty more in its room from other states, which do not favour them. And this is actually the case. Cherishing commerce and a peculiar regard to the arts, is therefore one of the causes which principally contribute to render a nation populous, and not a peculiar regard and attention to agriculture; which is diametrically opposite to what our author has advanced.

S E C T XVI.

Page 26. *This gentleman says, that commerce and the arts assuredly beget licentious and vitiated inclinations, and a contempt for institutions the most sacred and necessary to society.*

It

[75]

It has been observed that commerce and travelling soften mens manners, and rub off the rudeness and brutality natural to a rustick life: And that it is a means of banishing bigotry and superstition; and calming the animosity, which people who do not converse with mankind, often entertain against those who differ from them in sentiments of religion and other customs and usages. But that commerce, the arts and ornaments of life tend to beget a contempt for the most sacred institutions, is certainly a falsehood and a calumny that cannot be supported by facts or experience.

But though this gentleman entertains such a great opinion of the temperance, sobriety and purity of manners, which prevail in the country, we fancy if he were to attend to the manners, behaviour and conversation of a crowd of hay-makers, reapers, &c. but one summer, he would be thoroughly convinced that luxury, voluptuousness, sensuality, debauchery, prophaneness, filthy discourse, &c. are no strangers to the country: And that the sobriety and simplicity of manners he talks of, are no where to be found but in the kingdom of *Utopia*.

2. History informs us, that wars, animosities, the passions of pride, lust, avarice, revenge, cruelty, &c. appear as strongly in *North-America* and among the *Negroes of Africa*, as among the *Europeans*, where the ornaments of civil life are cultivated. Nay we may aver, that they appear in more horrible and dreadful shapes. If we lived the simple lives of horses, cocks

[76]

cocks and bulls, we might still suffer all the evils arising from the violence of the passions and selfish affections.

3. In page 26. *Our author says, that a nation which is not fully peopled, will certainly become at length more populous by agriculture, than by commerce.*

We can only say to this, that we believe, that this sentiment never entered into the heart of any other man besides our author, and that this has been sufficiently demonstrated in the preceding pages.

4. But before we leave this subject, we would take the freedom to ask this learned gentleman, whether he thinks, that if the *Dutch* from the year 1567. to the present time had renounced the arts of commerce and addicted themselves to agriculture only, their country would have been so populous, and so fertile as it is at present? It is certain its commerce drew people, and its people increased its commerce, and improved its lands. It is the best cultivated of any country in the world, and the most populous: But its agriculture was not the cause of its populousity, but its populousity the cause of its agriculture, and the arts and commerce the cause of both. *De Wit* and *Sir William Temple* both agree, that the lands of *Holland* were in themselves poor and sterile, and that the present fertility of the soil, is not owing to its natural richness, but to the industry of its inhabitants, and their attention to agriculture. From whence it appears that it is
the

[77]

the populousness of a country enriches the lands, and not the richness of the lands renders a country populous. *England* has increased more in people the last hundred years, than ever it did in any two hundred years before, though we have been drained by long wars, have excluded foreigners by severe laws, and have been very frugal of naturalizations; a conduct full of absurdity, whilst we have so many large tracts of land that lie waste.

5. The antients pursued a different policy often. *Diodorus Siculus* informs us, that the *Trachinians*, having lost great numbers of their people, applied to *Sparta* for a new stock of inhabitants. The *Spartans* sent them ten thousand men, among whom they divided the lands of those who perished.

6. *Timoleon* finding *Syracuse*, &c. depopulated by war, tyranny and faction, invited new inhabitants from *Greece* to people the cities. *Plutarch* says, sixty thousand men immediately offered themselves, among whom he distributed as many lots of land to the great satisfaction of the antient inhabitants.

7. Our political maxims are the very reverse: There are people would bring wealth, arts and industry among us, instead of desiring lands as a reward or allurements to reside with us, and yet we most impolitically refuse to admit them. Is not this madness?

8. In page 26. our learned author says, *that commerce and the arts should not be admitted, till a people are become so exceeding numerous,*
that

[78]

that the whole produce of the country will feed no more.

We believe, that without the aid and succour of commerce and the arts, that there never was such a country in the world, nor ever will be. If the absence or want of commerce and the arts is so favourable to propagation and populousity, how comes it about, that *Russia, Tartary, Arabia, Africa* and *North-America* are not the most populous countries upon the face of the globe? If the arts, ornaments, refinements of civil life, and the most elegant luxury tend to curb the increase of mankind, how comes it that the *Chinese* are the most populous nation in the world? All agree, that they are as luxurious as populous; and that provisions are very dear throughout the country, for the whole subsistence of the lower class of people is only a little rice.

9. A country without commerce and the arts will very difficultly subsist. Famines must often happen in such a state: We find this was the case of the inhabitants of *Palestine*. It seems from holy writ by the charity to the poor so often recommended, that the state was very poor and wretched, till *Solomon* introduced and improved commerce and the arts. Without commerce and the arts, it will be difficult likewise to support their liberty; thus the *Jews* were often carried away captives and made slaves to other nations. The reason now subsists much stronger, as the art of war is much altered.

10. In

[79]

10. In a state where there is great luxury and refinements, there must be great labour and riches among individuals. This luxury and these refinements furnish the labourers with the means of their support. The rents of the lands must furnish the rich with the means of this luxury; without which it cannot subsist: The lands must then be well cultivated. An extensive luxury then implies a large production of all the necessaries of life, and great employment of the people. So that where such luxury reigns among the rich, a full supply of necessaries must attend it among the poor, because it creates great employment. Yet it is true the support a man may receive from his labour, depends on the compound relation between the price of land, labour and money, in a state, which often arises from accident.

11. If so great a number of people be employed in the arts, that the price of labour is raised in husbandry, and necessaries thereby become dearer; this high price of labour in husbandry will draw the manufacturers from arts to husbandry, and occasion more labour in husbandry, by which the equilibrium will be restored, and the price of provisions reduced to their former state. This is easily done, because bare labour in husbandry requires little dexterity, genius and skill. It is not so in the arts; from whence there is no reason to suspect, there will ever be a want of hands in husbandry; or that the price of labour in it will ever advance high. If provisions in general rise much in price whilst there are waste lands, more will
be

[80]

be converted to tillage, and what are in use will be farther improved, so that all these inequalities tend to correct themselves.

This will more especially obtain in a country where money is plenty, because there its interest and brokerage being low, a man will not be able to turn it to any use, so profitable and advantageous as to the culture of lands, if provisions bear but a tolerable price. Thus it appears that the very reverse to what our author suggests, will be the consequence of a great plenty of money, namely a low price for provisions instead of a high one: This theory is confirmed by experience, and by the present price of provisions on the average, compared with what it was a hundred years ago; notwithstanding we sometimes export grain to the value of three millions in one year.

Therefore a great home consumption or luxury in native commodities cannot render them dear. The poor can spend no more than they earn, or is given them by the rich; the farmers and traders save, and the rich cannot spend more than their incomes without becoming poor, upon which the trader and farmer will divide his estate amongst them. The stock of commodities in the nation, which is still increasing, the great national debt, and the increase of plate and jewels, shews that if the publick spend, individuals in the state save. From these reasonings it is manifest, that a great home consumption does not tend to produce a scarcity of commodities. That is
where

[81]

where the lands are not cultivated to the highest degree of perfection. It is only foreign luxury which ruins a state, that is, such a consumption of exoticks as drains us of our cash, turns the poor out of employment, and robs the lands of consumptioners of their product.

12. There are two circumstances in which there may be a scarcity; these are when bad crops of grain happen from unseasonable weather, and when the farmers from their great riches are enabled to withhold a supply from the market, and advance its price. There is nothing but granaries or commerce which can produce a cure for these evils. But in a country where a failure of the crops seldom happens, it would be difficult to manage granaries to any great advantage, for the stock of grain in them would be liable to corrupt and must be sold often. We will not say such an expedient for preventing scarcities is impracticable, but there is reason to think so many difficulties attend it, that such a scheme will never be carried into execution.

The admission of the exportation of grain and the rendering it an object of commerce, is the best method which can be pursued to prevent scarcities from bad crops. If one third of the lands employed in tillage be cultivated for the use of foreigners, and at the same time one third of the crop should fail; by a prohibition of the exportation of grain, the price would be kept down, and there would be enough left for our own use and consumption.

G

In

In case there should not be enough to suffice the inhabitants, a supply might be brought from our *American* colonies. These two circumstances shew the great use of commerce, and how much it conduces to the preventing depopulation in a state; and at the same time they prove the weakness of our author's principles and the absurdity of his system.

S E C T. XVII.

In page 27. Our author says, *An equal division of the lands is necessary to carry his system into execution, and raise it to perfection. We will cite the passage at large, which runs as follows.*

1. "Of all political institutions, none seems more immediately requisite (to promote agriculture) than an equal division of lands. For as soon as the wants of each are satisfied, which in times of simplicity a very small possession will be sufficient for, there can be no farther inducement to cultivate more land. In this case therefore, if the property of numbers is much larger than their wants require, *great quantities of land must remain uncultivated*, and a country be deprived of a proportionable number of inhabitants." Then he says; "whenever this inequality obtains, the *introduction of commerce and elegance is the only remedy for its pernicious effects*. These (that is commerce and elegance) by multiplying the desires of men, will induce such as have large possessions to cultivate them
for

for the purchase of superfluities, and *thus create employment and subsistence for greater numbers than before*. But from what has already been proved at large, they can never increase by these means, as where property is equally divided, and the necessary arts principally attended to. There every one will possess and cultivate enough to satisfy his demands, and the same provision will remain for the increase of each succeeding generation, till the country is stocked with as many inhabitants as its produce can support."

2. This is a strange jumble of reasoning, the first part damns his whole system; the last clause recalls and revokes the sentence again. We will examine it in a particular manner.

Our author in the first place, proposes an *Agrarian*, but in consequence allows, that great quantities of land must remain uncultivated, and a country be deprived of a proportionable number of inhabitants.

3. Then he proposes the introduction of commerce, and all that he had exploded before, in order to remedy *its pernicious effects*. That is, depopulation or want of people, and the lands lying without cultivation. And yet he retracts immediately, and denies that this will remedy the pernicious effects he had acknowledged just before would flow from an *Agrarian*; and in contradiction to the remedy proposed to the pernicious effects, he declares that he has proved at large, that a people can never increase by commerce and elegance, *so much*

[84]

much as they may where the necessary arts are principally attended to.

4. Or thus the argument stands. An *Agrarian* restrains the increase of people and the cultivation of the lands. 2. The *only* remedy for these pernicious effects is the introduction of commerce and elegance. 3. But though the introduction of commerce and elegance be the *only* remedy to the pernicious effects flowing from the *Agrarian*, yet, 4. it has been proved at large, there is a better remedy than the *only* remedy, viz. a principal attention to the necessary arts; though he has declared, that an inattention to the necessary arts will be the consequence of an *Agrarian*.

Good Gods! what a heap of absurdity, contradiction and nonsense! Reason what art thou! Where art thou!

5. An *Agrarian*, or equal division of the lands, is not adapted to the genius of mankind. Neither among the *Jews* or *Romans* did it produce any advantageous effects, nor was the continuance of it practicable. *Licinius Stolo* established an *Agrarian* at *Rome*, that no person should possess above five hundred acres of land for himself, and half as much for every child; and yet broke through it himself, and suffered the penalty. And though at first the citizens had two acres a-piece, they soon transferred their property to the industrious and frugal. This *Agrarian* neither remained long, produced universal industry, nor prevented poverty, either in *Jewry*, *Greece*, or *Rome*, as

most

[85]

most flagrantly appears from their histories. No wise people upon these accounts ought to adopt any such ridiculous institutions. Nay our *Janus faced* author says, page 28. "that where it prevails, great quantities of land must remain uncultivated, and a country be deprived of a proportionable number of its inhabitants." And yet proposes it immediately in the next paragraph as a *cause which principally contributes to render a nation populous*; amazing!

In page 30. our learned author observes, *that the very being of republicks is founded upon a general equality of possessions.*

6. But we would ask whether there was ever any republick or state in the world where there was such an equality prevailed? There was no such equality either at *Rome*, in the *Grecian* commonwealths, or in *Jewry*. The history of our own country shews, that the power of alienation of lands and the cultivation of commerce and the arts, is the best way to diffuse possessions, and distribute property in the most equable manner; as well as to promote industry and frugality among the mass of the people. The laws of *Moses* and the institutions of *Lycurgus* were far from answering this valuable end. *Moses's* prohibition of usury was by no means favourable to industry, or to a large consumption, and a terrible hardship upon orphans and widows.

7. In page 30. paragraph the second, our learned author says, *the cultivation of agriculture*

[86]

culture and the necessary arts alone founded on an equal division of property, &c. is the only means capable of increasing a small people to the full extent of those numbers which their country can conveniently support.

8. And yet in the last paragraph of page 27, &c. he tells us, "that if the lands be divided in this manner, great quantities must remain uncultivated, and the country be deprived of a proportionable number of inhabitants." Strange! how do those things agree?

9. *Holland* is the most populous state in the world*; but *Holland* did not owe its populousity to an equal division of the lands, nor to the cultivation of them: But it owed its people to its commerce, and its agriculture to its fulness of people. The badness of its air would soon depopulate *Holland*, if it were not for a constant influx of strangers. But its government which secures liberty and property equally to every man, its strict justice and equality in taxations, its toleration in matters of religion, its free naturalization, and its great commerce constantly allure people from all parts, to settle in the country, though wages are low and provisions exceeding high. It was these arts raised a few fishermen seated among unhealthy morasses in small villages, to be the *high and mighty states of Holland*. This drew crowds of people to them from all parts, and raised insignificant hamlets into great cities. By this they took pastures out of the sea, and fattened the dry land. *Neptune* stood amazed, beheld

[87]

beheld the daring robbery, but connived at the theft, struck with the wonderful industry of the people.

S E C T. XVIII.

In page 31. our author comes to consider the principal effects of the populousness of a nation on its trade. He seems as unfortunate in his reflections upon this part of his question as he was upon the first.

His first remark is, that while the numbers of a people are small in comparison to the extent of country they are possessed of, it has always been found that their employments and inventions continue limited to the satisfying a few natural wants and the acquiring such conveniences only as are common among themselves.

This is not true; *Spain, Portugal, and Italy* are but thinly inhabited, and especially the dominions of the church in the last; and yet they consume a vast quantity of exoticks.

Page 34. our author says, the productions of art have been discoveries of the finest geniuses, and such as do honour to human nature. And again, the contrivances which increase their real usefulness and value, &c.

This writer deals excessively in contradictions. The arts which a few pages back obliterated virtue, ruined society, and destroyed mankind, consequently most pernicious inventions, and one should think begotten in hell, and dictated by Satan, now are represented as

G 4

doing

[88]

doing honour to human nature. The refinements and ornaments of civil life, that were but just now so ruinous and destructive to mankind, are become useful and valuable. Strange inconsistency!

And though our author has throughout his essay suggested and declared, that commerce and the arts tend to depopulate a state, and in the issue will ruin it, yet in page 35. he presumes, that there are means where trade exists, though the country be not full of people, to render it so populous, that the lands may not be capable of maintaining them. This is again a contradiction to the tenor of his whole discourse. Like a *Proteus* or *Camelion* he is always changing shape and colour, and shifting his principles just as the last train of ideas influences, without ever considering whether what he lays down is consistent with his first principles, and what he advanced in the beginning of his discourse.

If after a nation be full of people, and commodities are become so scarce and dear, as to enforce general industry and national frugality; in case a plenty be necessary to render a state populous, how comes it to pass, that a nation under the disadvantages of a scarcity can increase farther? If this be possible, as our author confesses it is, there must be some strong attractive cause to produce this effect; an effect so contrary to his premises, *viz. that a plenty is necessary to populousity*. This cause is the attractions of commerce, which draw people

[89]

ple into a nation under all his pretended oppositions to multiplication arising from scarcity; and which increase a People vastly more expeditiously, than they can in the natural way, tho' they pursued every means, that art, nature, and virtue combined can suggest. Though our author is silent as to the causes, yet he himself allows the effects.

But if this attraction operate in this manner where commerce is, though the country be full of people, and they labour under a scarcity of every thing necessary to life; why may it not operate still stronger where commerce is in a country not fully peopled, and where every thing is in great plenty? It certainly must, upon our author's own principles. If after *Holland* were full, and provisions scarce, people continued still to flock thither, what was it drew them? Not plenty according to this author. It must then be commerce. If so, how much more readily will commerce draw them into a plentiful nation? From hence it is manifest, that our author admits of other causes of populousity which act more powerfully than *plenty, temperance, sobriety, banishing imaginary wants, agriculture and a country life*, all put together.

The principal of those causes is commerce, supported by an equitable government, an equal taxation, a general toleration in religion, and a full security of person and property. These allure people, and naturalization with open arms receives them. When she presents these

[90]

these blessings, the industrious, the indigent, the distressed, the persecuted fly to her for relief. They do not ask whether laughing *Ceres* pours her bounties over the fertile plains, or *Flora* decks the enamelled meads, but whether they can be assured of the enjoyment of the civil advantages specified above. If so, thither people will flock, and soon convert the standing pool and lake into fat meadows, cover the barren rock with verdure, and make the desert smile with flowers. Such O liberty! O commerce! are thy blessings.

The arts and sciences, O commerce! follow in thy train, attended by politeness and humanity; whilst superstition, bigotry, and fiery zeal, fallen from their throne, lie under thy feet chained and gnashing their teeth.

Upon the whole, it is clear from experience, as well as from our author's concessions, that nothing tends to render a nation populous, and to fill it so soon with a multitude of people as commerce supported as above.

Page 35. He falls into a common mistake, that populousness produces cheapness of labour and commodities. In the first place people create employment for each other: But cheapness depends chiefly on the high value of money. This is the case in *France*.

Page 36. Our author says, that a concurrence of circumstances stocked *Holland* with a people too numerous for the country to maintain; that their trade sprung from necessity
and

[91]

and indigence, not choice, and was nuffed in want.

If this gentleman had vouchsafed to have specified to us, what the concurrence of circumstances was, which stocked *Holland* with people, and to have entered into a particular detail, he would have given us a just account of the causes which principally contribute to render a nation populous. Their commerce and naturalization of strangers, and the open arms with which they receive all comers, were not only the first sources of their populousity, but *De Wit* informs us is still the cause of the populousness of the country, which he says, from the badness of its air, would soon be but thinly peopled, were it not for the constant influx of strangers.

As our author began and went on in paradox and contradiction, so he continues to deal in this sort of traffick to the last, and finds out a perfect harmony in destroying commerce to support it, and to advance it to the highest pitch of greatness.

We presume we have fully proved that the means our author proposes to render a nation populous are not at all adapted to promote such an end; and that the banishing commerce and refinement, instead of tending to render a state populous, would depopulate and ruin it: As there are sundry principal causes, which in a state not half peopled, may concur to render it very populous in a small space of time; and as from the common multiplication

tiplication of mankind, it must require a great length of years to fill such a state with people; it is a little surprizing that our author should never animadvert upon one of those principal causes, but should confine his reasonings only to what is relative to the promotion of propagation, and rendering a people prolifick.

After we have so clearly demonstrated the repugnancies in our author's discourse, it is merry to see him go off triumphing in the harmony of the several parts of his system. Though in truth it is a chaos, and

Non bene junctarum discordia semina rerum;

a Tohu and Bohu of jarring elements, and warring matter.

REMARKS.

REMARKS.

PAGE 28, line 22. Though *Phenicia* was a fertile country, yet commerce having crowded it with people, the territory being scanty, it was obliged to have recourse to other countries for part of its support, and particularly for grain.

“ Let us suppose a labouring family earns 8 s. a week, and consumes this sum in necessaries, it will pay,

	s.	d.		s.	d.
To lands and brokerage about	4	6	an $\frac{1}{8}$ abated about	3	11 $\frac{1}{4}$
To taxes, &c. about	0	6	— — — —	0	6
To labour about	3	0	an $\frac{1}{8}$ abated about	2	7 $\frac{1}{2}$
	<hr/>			<hr/>	
	8	0		7	0 $\frac{1}{4}$
	<hr/>			<hr/>	

But labour being abated an $\frac{1}{8}$ it will earn but 7 s. and pay for its necessaries 7 s. $\frac{3}{4}$ f. From whence it follows, that it will receive no advantage from an abatement of labour, by a diminution of the quantity of money, which according to our author p. 11. “ would produce a proportionable fall upon the price of all things.”

P. 41, l. 13. The value we mean there is the natural value of commodities exclusive of taxes.

H In

P. 59. Let us suppose as above, that a labouring family earns 8s. a week, and consumes this sum in necessaries it will pay,

	s.	d.		s.	d.
To lands and brokerage as above	4	6	an $\frac{1}{8}$ adv. about	5	$0\frac{1}{4}$
To taxes about — — —	0	6	an $\frac{1}{8}$ adv. about	0	$6\frac{1}{4}$
To labour — — — —	3	0	an $\frac{1}{8}$ adv. about	3	$4\frac{1}{2}$
	8 0 an $\frac{1}{8}$ adv. makes		9	0	

From whence it follows, that on an advance of labour $\frac{1}{8}$ &c. the family receives 9s. for labour, and pays 9s. for its usual necessaries; and consequently is not in a worse condition than before, which is contrary to our author's assertion.

P. 49, l. 5. When we speak of the poverty of Switzerland, we mean of the soil and people in general; though we know the state has a great deal of money at interest in foreign funds.

P. 62, l. 12. Where the improvement, &c.] Whilst lands go on improving, provisions will become cheaper and cheaper, till either improvements will not pay interest, &c. or the people increase and become in an over proportion to the quantity of territory they inhabit.

P. 68, l. 2. The richest and most populous state, &c.] That is in proportion to its extent of territory.

P. 69.

P. 69, l. 23. Can keep down the price of labour, &c.] That is relatively to the quantity of silver paid for it in other states. France has reduced the quantity of silver paid for labour and other commodities to about half what was paid in the year 1715, by her operations on money and its consequent fixed enhancement. The mark of fine silver is now coined into fifty livres, which used formerly to afford but twenty-four livres. Which hath sunk labour in proportion; for the French give no more livres for a day's work now than they did when only 24 livres were coined out of the mark. Voyez Dutot, L'Abbe St. Pierre, and Gramont.

P. 78, l. 17. Provisions are dear.] That is relative to the price of labour: this must be considered principally with regard to fish, flesh, &c. for wheat is not much dearer than in England; but wages are only 2 d. a day.

P. 85, l. 28. Moses's prohibition of usury, I consider as a piece of policy of his own, that is, not given by inspiration, but advanced *ex proprio motu*.

P. 86, l. 12. Holland is the most populous state, &c.] Perhaps China is near as populous, if we may believe jesuits, who never lie.

P. 90, l. 17. Lie under thy feet gnashing their teeth.] This has been the case of late
M A H 2 years;

[96]

years; though it must be acknowledged, that the *Phenicians* and *Carthaginians* were as barbarous idolaters as their neighbouring states; nay much worse than the *Athenians*.

P. 90. l. 27. But cheapness depends on the high value of money.] That is cheapness in the vulgar and popular sense. Though where wheat yields but 1 s. 3 d. a bushel, and labour is but 3 d. a day, wages are as high or as dear as in England.

P. 91. *De Wit* informs us, &c.] *Janiscon*, in his present state of the United Provinces, imputes their present populousity to the same causes.



A N

A N

A P P E N D I X

CONTAINING

Some REMARKS upon that part of the Estimate of the Manners and Principles of the Times, which relates to TRADE and COMMERCE.

————— *laudator temporis acti.*
Impransus non qui civem dignosceret hoste;
Quælibet in quemvis opprobria fingere sævus.
 Hor. Epist. xv. B. 1.

How black the Guilt! he cries, of *modern* Times,
 Because he sees not *antient* Frauds and Crimes:
 Deny'd Preferment, croft, and peevish grown,
Past Times he praises, and he damns his own.

 By I—B—, M. D.

H 3

APPENDIX,

Containing some Remarks, &c.

SECT. I.

IT has been the custom of mankind, in all ages, to applaud the virtue, temperance, sobriety, Innocence, benevolence, piety, valour, bravery and humanity of past times; and to mourn over the degeneracy, profligacy, impiety, prophaneness, luxury, debauchery, effeminacy, cowardice, craft, dishonesty, cruelty, and wickedness of the present times. Thus when we hear of the reign of Saturn, the golden age, &c. to be sure, the writer never forgets to make his own the age of iron, in which, all manner of vice and wickedness prevails.

Ovid has given us a description of the golden age as well as of the iron times. And if I may judge of those times by his account of them, I fancy the present manners, customs, and police of the Caffers, Hottentots, and Canadese Indians, &c. exhibit to us a true picture of this golden age, so much boasted of by antient writers. 'Tis true Thucydides seems to differ from the poets, and some other writers; for he represents the Aborigines, or antient Greeks, as in a very wretched condition, living without towns, cities, arts, agriculture, or any regular

gular police or civil government: and that when *Pelops* brought money amongst them out of *Asia* they began to form themselves into civil societies, to build towns, constitute laws, cultivate the earth, exercise the arts, and to engage in traffic and commerce.

Horace in his *Epistles* laughs at, and ridicules the *folly* of applauding the past times; and yet in his *Odes* adopts the same *foible*; as we may perceive in the following beautiful climax.

*Etas parentum pejor avis tulit
Nos nequiores, mox daturos &c.*

Our fathers viler than their fires
Bore us a more flagitious race,
When our more impious brood retires,
Sons still much worse shall fill their place. *

Anony.

But when he comes to talk more gravely in his satyrs he observes,

Cum proreperint primis animalia terris
Mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque cubilia
propter,
Unguibus et pugnibus, dein fustibus, atque ita
porro
Pugnabant armis, quæ post fabricaverat usus
&c. S. 3. B. 1.

* Homer seems to have nodded too in this respect, when he lays it down as fact, that

Παῦροι γὰρ τοὶ παῖδες ὁμοίως πάλαι πέλονται
Οἱ πλείους κακίως παῦροι δὲ πολλὰς ἀρείας

For if this were really true all mankind in a few generations would become idiots and poltroons.

Viribus

Viribus editior cædebat, ut in grege taurus. *Ib.*

But here Horace gives us a pretty natural picture of the primitive times, which some have highly applauded.

The antient poets seem to have been the great corrupters as well as instructors of mankind, and have always laboured more, to raise admiration by the *marvellous*, than to cultivate truth by the relation of the *natural* and *simple*. From hence, all that is distant either in *time*, *place*, or *nature*, has been represented, as *great*, *beautiful*, *awful*, *sublime*, and *wonderful*; and thus to excite admiration and draw attention, they have debauched and abused mankind.

But however great the charms of natural simplicity may be, I fancy few wise men would prefer the life, manners and customs of an *Iroquois*, *Canadese*, *Laplander*, *Caffer* or *Hottentot*, who has not been corrupted by art, to the civil police and government which prevail in *England*. I think such a person must have a very *gothic* palate indeed, and his taste very much debauched, who could renounce the *civil*, and adopt the savage life.

'Tis true, if the *savage* life extinguished the violent and selfish passions, and affections, and formed the man into an amiable temperament of universal benevolence and humanity; though refined minds lost the pleasure of the nobler contemplations, they would be no great sufferers, because they would exchange them for a sweet simplicity, calmness and innocence. But this is far from being the case, for we find, that all the

[102]

the violent and selfish passions, incident to human nature, appear among these uncorrupted sons of earth in the most horrible and dreadful shapes. *Pride, ambition, avarice, cruelty and lust*, produce melancholy effects among these simple untaught children of nature, as well as in artificial society. Wherever the word enemy is, there the more uncivilized the people are, the more horrible the effects of the violent and selfish passions.

The terrible devastations made by war in North America about their limits of hunting, have almost depopulated the country. The cruelty they exercise towards their prisoners taken in battle is shocking, and is the effect of ingenious barbarity sublimed by study and art*. But all these scenes of horror are the consequences of *pride, ambition, and avarice*; of a fondness for superiority, and dominion, and a covetous desire of great extent of territory, or as we may say of a large *warren and chace*. The *Iroquois* or five nations seem to be the *Romans* of North America, and to run about like those plunderers of *Europe* robbing, murdering, and making tributary the nations around them.

Yet this life seems to be the life of simple untaught nature, so much boasted of by the poets; and such times as these, the times, so highly applauded by writers, who have had more imagination than judgment, whom I range among the half thinkers. But this folly of applauding the past times, and damning the

* See the baron *La Hontan's* Travels.

want

[103]

present, was not peculiar to ages, when, for want of the art of printing, the history of past times could not be so clearly and universally known, but it has also reached our days: and a writer of the present year has exactly and most pathetically copied the follies of antiquity in praising past times and slandering his own. With what views and motives, is best known to himself; but it seems, that the representing his countrymen in a time of war with a powerful enemy, as *dastards* without *honour, courage, capacity, or military skill*, polluted with every *vice*, and devoid of every *virtue*, can be done with no good design; since it must tend to dispirit our people, discourage our allies*, and animate our enemies; who, if they believe this *slanderer*, must consider us as an easy conquest and a rich booty, which they ought to invade and assail.

But I trust soon by the blessing of God upon our arms we shall convince the world, that the weakness of the head of this writer is equal to the malice of his heart; and that though he delivers himself with great importance, yet he is no *oracle*.

As I intend in my remarks upon this author, to confine myself chiefly to that part of his libel, which relates to commerce, I shall only point out a few of his contradictions, and drop a few reflections upon the inconsistency of his work in general; and then immediately ad-

* Tacitus says *subsit magis fama quam vi*: if so, what is our author who labours to blast the reputation, honour and courage of his country?

vance

[104]

vance to consider and examine his observations upon commerce, and the influence he dreams, it has upon the *manners and principles of the times*.

Sect. II.

After the writer of the estimate of the manners and principles of the times, has filled 25 pages with proving, that the English are eminent for a spirit of *liberty, humanity, generosity, and justice*, in p. 29 he forgets himself, and in direct contradiction to all he had proved asserts, that their true character is a *vain, luxurious, selfish effeminacy*.

Would not a country school-master have whip'd a boy for such an apparent, obvious, palpable, and sudden contradiction in his theme? — It is surprising, that a man who lays a claim to the faculty of thinking, and sets up to instruct others, should utter such flagrant inconsistencies, and not perceive them.

In the next 120 pages he vomits out a great deal of *filth, froth, and venom* in labouring to make it appear, that our *senate* is a venal cabal; our *gentry* are luxurious, irreligious, effeminate coxcombs; our *clergy* illiterate *drones* and mercenary *sycophants*; our *military* and *marine* ignorant, effeminate cowards without courage or *capacity*, without *honour* or *military skill*; our *merchants* and *traders* a mixture of the *avaricious* and *luxurious*; our labourers *pigmified sots*, and *gin drinkers*, who would fly before men like a flock of *geese* before a flight of *eagles*. He complains

[105]

plains too of general irreligion, *infidelity*, want of *reading*, want of *thinking* and want of *taste*. A fine character of his country for a time of war, truly! And in this manner he disgorges his impostumated broken spleen like a true *Timon of Athens*.

But it may not be amiss to ask this writer, whether that *six editions* of his book in a few months is not a confutation of his reproach, that people do not read? Though his book is a strange chimerical rhapsody or farrago, yet we cannot allow, that the great sale of it is a proof, that the age wants taste, and does not think, because, we find every day, that people out of curiosity give money to see monsters; and that they preserve *toads, moths, spiders*, and other vermin; not for their worth, but because of some remarkable oddities, they perceive in them. The same curiosity excites them to give their money upon a hanging day to see the exits at *Tyburn*. From whence I gather, that the great sale of a book is not always a proof of its excellence.

If our author's book be well written its great *sale* proves a great *mistake* in the writer, viz. *that the age wants taste, and reads no good books*. But if it be badly written, this is no proof of the degeneracy of genius and taste, since we purchase pebbles and shells for their singularity, not for their intrinsic worth, and a doubled headed calf, which like *Janus* looks two contrary ways at once, would be more esteemed and admired than a beautiful fat ox.

Our

[106]

Our author hath represented the *clergy*, as illiterate and venal *sycophants*; and yet has the following remark; after complaining, that the laity despise the clergy, he observes, that "they need not blush to find they are fallen with the fame of their country, nor aspire at truer glory, than to become the contempt of those, who are become the contempt of Europe."

Must not a thinking man be at a loss to know whether our author designs this as a reproach or a compliment to the people of *England*? If the clergy be such illiterate drones and venal sycophants, as he paints them, the good people of *England* shew their good sense, taste, worth, and virtue in despising them. When a people *contemn* a contemptible clergy, they must of course become the esteem of all *Europe*. They need not blush at the fact, nor aspire at truer glory. 'Tis said the government of *Venice* connives at the profligacy of their clergy, that they may be abhorred by the people, and unable to create disturbances by their influence. From whence it follows, that a contempt of the clergy may be a mark of the power of religion and virtue among a people. But the truth is the *English* clergy are the best preachers, men of the best sense, and the purest morals of any in *Europe*; and possess the greatest degree of rational esteem among the people of any *priesthood* in the world.

Our author has not been contented to belch out his filth and venom on his own countrymen alone,

[107]

alone, but has also discharged his slander and gall on a neighbouring nation the *Dutch*,

But all the slander and calumny thrown by him upon that people, serve only to shew his ignorance of the religion, police, manners, customs, trade, commerce, soil, territory, situation, policy and genius of the *Dutch*. I would therefore advise him to read *Aitzma, de Wit, Sir William Temple, Le Clerk, Basnage, Guicciardine, Fresnoy, Huet, Schoockius, Grotius, de Laet, Junius, van Leeuwen, Boxhornius, Romyn, de Hooghe*, and *Janiscon's* Present State of the United Provinces. And after this go and reside among them, and converse with them one 12 months. When he has done this, I will answer for it, that if he have a grain of modesty and probity, he will blush and write a recantation, unless he likes the *French* religion better, than he does the *Dutch*; as he does *French Honour* &c. better than *English*.

On the other hand, our author extols the *French* to the skies, though *Machiavel* says, that they are naturally covetous, and desirous of other peoples goods, which they will lavish, and squander as prodigally as their own: a *Frenchman* shall cheat or rob you, and in a breath meet, and eat, and spend it as merrily with you, as you could have done yourself. This is the *French* honour our author is so fond of. See *Machiavel* his state of *France*.

The *French* guaranteed the pragmatic sanction, and *Silesia* to *Prussia*; how inviolably they have kept their solemn contracts! how religiously they

they have observed their treaties ever since the peace of the Pyrenées!

In p. 207. *Our author represents the French traders, as persons who are zealous to preserve the honour and dignity of their state.*

This gentleman is so unfortunate here as to mistake French vanity for honour, and to represent the dignity, importance, and magnificence of a state, as depending upon a *raree shew* of barges with a white flag. It is scarce possible to read such puerilities without a horse laugh.

O! but the French “*hold the honour of a nation to be its truest interest; while we hold the interest of a nation to be its truest honour.*”

What a pretty *antithesis* this is! what a pity it is, that it should be an unmeaning sort of a jingle! Can any one guess at what the author intends here by the word honour? I confess myself so dull, that I am at a loss to find out his meaning. If by the honour of a nation he means its faith in keeping its treaties with its allies, and its strict observation of the rules of justice with its neighbours; or governing its self in its political conduct according to the law of nations or *jus gentium*; any one may see, that he is mightily mistaken, who will give himself the trouble of consulting Mr. *Postlethwaite's dictionary* under the word *Plantations* p. 476, Vol. II, or a little pamphlet lately published, entitled, *the Progress of the French in their views of universal monarchy*, wherein he will likewise clearly perceive what French honour is. Ever since the

beginning of the administration of cardinal *Richelieu*, what *Thucydides* said of the *Lacedemonians* may be justly applied to the French, viz. that they hold for just what pleaseth, and for honourable what profiteth; so that *fides Punica* and *fides Gallica* are taken for the same terms, or of like import. How great must our author's ignorance of history be, or his want of honesty to vent such trumpery!

We need not search farther than the French authors themselves to be thoroughly apprized of French virtue and honour.

Cardinal *Perron* observes, that fifty Spaniards would not commit so many excesses, nor do so much mischief in a foreign country, as four Frenchmen; that the French have neither discipline, honour, nor courage; that all the courage among them is in their nobility, the inferior people having none at all, nor being capable of it. That they are insufferably insolent, and though at the first onset *more* than men, yet in the end they are *less* than women. He remarks too, that the French are perfidious; and never spare any thing, not even religion itself, to obtain their intended revenge*.

Monf. *Savary* says, that the pieces of money called in France *Louis de cinque sous* were called in Turkey *Timmins*, and in great demand among the Turkish women for ornaments, from whence the French merchants made *cent. per cent.* profit of them. But this not satisfying their avarice they made them of copper instead

* Voyez *Perroniana*.

[110]

of silver, and gilded them over; and in this manner defrauded the Turks to a very great degree, which occasioned the French to be hated, insulted, and stigmatized for their villainy. And though to palliate the roguery of the French, he mentions, that several other *European* merchants did the same, he does the English merchants the honour to leave them out of this black list of villains*.

A very late author observes, that the greatest part of the captains of their merchantmen are raised from the dregs of the marine, receive their sword from the hands of avarice, and believe they have a right to make others pay for the dangers they encounter.

They are, says he, void of humanity, and judge of the value of human blood, by the little regard they have for their own. They conceive that to stifle sensibility, is to stifle timidity; and breathe nothing but blood and lucre. Cruelty is the very essence of their character, and is esteemed by them a virtue. They are soldiers without commission, whom danger has rendered daring, and the allurements of gain rash. As clemency characterizes the brave, so murder, injustice and cruelty mark these wretches. It is a sort of inhumanity to give the command of vessels to such barbarians, who have always both the power and inclination to commit every cruelty and excess †.

* M. Savary dict. de Comm. conquête de Minorque. a Cittadella.

† Les avantages de

But

[111]

But if any one would see more of the character of this most excellent people of whom our author is so fond, and whose virtues he so highly extols, he may find it at large in *Murali's* letters in French.

In p. 131 our author tells us, that "the influence of the leading people in every state forms its character." See p. 181. 191. 211. 221.

But in p. 11. we are told, *that superficial observers think they see the source of all our public miscarriages in the misconduct of individuals: And (p. 12.) that the malady lies deeper, and that it is owing to our manners and principles.* And yet p. 181. we are told again, *that the strength of a nation depends on the MANNERS and PRINCIPLES of its LEADING members;* and p. 191 that *the essential strength of a state consists in the manners, &c. of the leading part.* Nay, in p. 211, *a rising patriot shall give a check to the progress of national manners, &c. and alter the constitution and principles of a state, or people, and save it from destruction.* How happy should we be then, if we had but a good Leader? The team would jog on safely and gloriously, notwithstanding the general colour of the character of *the manners and principles of the times.* We are told; that *Homer* nodded; but one would think that our author was dreaming, when these inaccuracies, nay, contradictions drop'd from his judicious pen.

12

Sect.

[112]

Sect. III.

After venting a multitude of paradoxes, contradictions and absurdities, adorned with the pretty words *colourings, characters, mix'd characters, delineations, &c.* in order to shew his extensive knowledge, he comes to consider the effects of *exorbitant trade and wealth* on manners.

In p. 151. he observes, that in estimating the strength of the kingdom, the question hath been for many years, "What commerce and riches the nation is possessed of?" A question he says, "*which an antient Lawgiver would have laughed at.*"

Thucydides happens to differ from this great politician, and informs us, that the *Greeks* lying so long before *Troy* was owing entirely to their want of money. When *Pericles* excited the *Athenians* to the *Peloponnesian* war, he enumerated to them the wealth they had in their treasury, what they might draw from their confederates, &c. what they might take out of their churches, and from their gods in case of necessity. He fondly imagined that riches were necessary to carry on a war; but had he lived in our days, he would have met with a refined politician, who would have given him better instructions, and have taught him *the art of carrying on a war without money.*

But some people would be glad to learn from our author, who those antient *lawgivers* were, who taught the art of carrying on wars without money. If he will be so kind as to communicate

[113]

to our ministers but some fragments of the treatise in which this art is unfolded, I will engage to procure a *pair of lawn sleeves* for him upon the next vacancy, though it should be *Lambeth*. To be sure he would never have so boldly asserted, that *antient lawgivers would have laughed at the above question*, if he had not obtained from *Herculaneum*, or some other place, such a valuable *manuscript*. But has money had no hand in the present operations and conduct of the *Swedes, Russians, Dutch, States of the Empire, Danes?* &c. Did *Philip of Macedon* get nothing by the use of money, nor *Perseus* lose any thing for want of it?

In p. 195 and 6. *Our author complains, that commerce has raised the price of provisions, and distressed the poor.*

How does this agree with his clamour of luxury among the poor, and their intoxicating and enervating themselves with gin? &c. If they can find money to expend in pernicious luxuries, surely they have more than sufficient to purchase necessaries. But this is of a piece too with the rest of his crudities and inconsistencies.

He adopts any vulgar, superficial, and popular invective against the administration, in order to raise disaffection and clamour, and joins any trumpeter of sedition to vilify his country. But his assertion is so far from being true, that if any one will please to examine those affairs, he will find, that on an average, the necessaries of life are now above thirty *per cent.* cheaper than

[114]

than they were 120 or 30 years ago, even tho' some of them are tax'd. See *Fleetwood's Chronicon Pretiosum*, *Postlethwaite's Dict.* &c.

Besides we may ask, how is a general dearness of labour and commodities consistent with the great trade and exorbitant wealth brought in by it, which is so much the object of his spleen? These things are incompatible: commodities must be at a reasonable price, or they could not find a market abroad. But our author scarce ever makes a step without plunging into a mire of absurdities. If one were not acquainted with the weakness and vanity of human nature, one should be amazed, to consider how it is possible such superficial half-thinkers should take upon them to write of politics, commerce, and the œconomy of a state. But he is not the first *witling*, who possessed of a lively imagination, has thrown off the reins of judgment, and ran resty; and who because he can rumble in bombastic verse, write in numbers, string a multitude of epigrams together, and then call them a play; thinks himself qualified to write upon politicks and commerce.

A man of a lively imagination may be capable of describing the passions in a lively manner: yet never have attended to those principles in human nature upon which alone a right judgment of commerce is to be founded. He must dissect and anatomize the human mind, and trace the influence of manners and customs among the vulgar very nicely, before he will be capable of investigating and developing its true principles. He

[115]

He must likewise be well acquainted with history, and the minute transactions of former and present times to form a right judgment of its nature and connections.

The *French* writers seem to have succeeded better in this study than our *English* authors.

Machiavel seems to have said more in one sentence, than all our modern *English* writers put together; where he observes, *Homines non se recte gerere, nisi necessitate cogantur: quoniam, si liberum iis sit uti licentia, statim omnia jura perturbant: quo fit ut recte dici soleat, paupertate et fame industrios homines, legibus autem bonos effici.* Disput. L. i. cap. iii.

Of late we have had most pathetic complaints of impending ruin to our commerce, and the state, from our national debts. All this imaginary terror arises from a want of a thorough knowledge of the nature of commerce and political œconomy; and a proper attention to human nature and the affairs of our neighbours. In the year 1672 the *Dutch* were burdened with a greater load of debts, than we are now, yet, what sums have they raised, what wars carried on since! They are heavily loaded, but are they ruined? They have been heavier loaded than we are now, for 100 years past, why were they not then undone 100 years ago? Why must destruction be the consequence of our state debts now, any more than it has been to them for so long a succession of years past? This reflection may serve to calm our fears a little, if duly chew'd on. The *Dutch* pay six times the taxes

[116]

we do now, considering all things, yet possess great riches and a great trade: nay, we complain of them as our rivals. How do our terrors and these facts agree?

The nature of *price*, and how it is formed, the different value of *silver* in different parts of *Europe*, its consequences and effects upon commerce, together with its influence upon politics; are things, which seem to be little understood by our late writers. On the contrary many idle opinions have been broached, and argued from as fundamental maxims, and the causes of many phenomena mistaken. Tho' commerce is a science of more importance to the community, than many other studies of humanity, which have professors assigned them, yet it is not at all cultivated or known in our universities; where insipid useless disputation, and unintelligible jargon have usurped the place of that important study. But people who live in the cells of an university, and are little acquainted with life beyond a college gate, are little qualified, I must confess, for reasoning upon politics and commerce: tho' I conceive it possible, that commerce may be formed into a science upon indisputable axioms, if a genius turned for the study were to use in a proper manner all the materials Mr. Postlethwaite has exhibited to us, without paying any deference to his reasonings; *which at best are only beating about the bush.*

In p. 153, 154, &c. We are told of *three periods of commerce*: One *frugal not ungenerous.*

A

[117]

A second providing *conveniencies, and diffusing happiness.* A third *producing avarice and luxury.*

The benefits of the two first stages are acknowledged. The dangerous effects of its excess have not been (our author says) sufficiently developed. But he, like the great *Columbus*, is going to discover this new world to us. But alas! suppose all his account should be only a description of an *Utopia*, that exists no where but in his own *pericranium*, how greatly we should be disappointed! I fancy this will appear to be the case.

We should have been glad, if our author had pointed out to us, the beginning of those three different *stages or periods of commerce*, that we might have argued more precisely.

But tho' we do not know, when each began, he assures us, that we are in the last stage (p. 159) where commerce is in its highest period; that its "*members retain their habits of industry and avarice*; and that thence the natural character of the landed ranks, the nobility and gentry, is that of a *vain, luxurious, selfish effeminacy.*" And that all this evil, &c. is the effect of "*exorbitant wealth brought in by commerce.*"

What pity it is, that the three *periods* of commerce, of which our author talks, with exorbitant wealth in the last, should be all *dream and vision, phantom and chimera!*

I am at a loss to know, when this last period began; and therefore must argue a little vaguely. But it could not be in the reign of *queen Eliz.* because he applauds those times. Yet he must give

give me leave to tell him, that I know of no period since, that has been more luxurious and bauch than her days.

Ascham, Shakespeare, and Camden all strongly assert this doctrine. Yet our author says (p. 189.) as "temperance is the ruling character of the middle stage of commerce, so is intemperance of the highest."

It seems, that we have good reason to consider the reign of this *queen*, as the MIDDLE stage of commerce between *Edward III.* and the present time. If so, this stage was the very reverse of what our author dreams.

Camden says of these times: Summus vestium luxus his temporibus in Angliam se infuderat, &c.—In hunc luxum cum regina observasset magnam vim pecuniæ ad sericum et alias exoticas merces quotannis è regno, publico reipublicæ incommodo, evehi; et plures ex nobilitate qui usui essent reip. aliosque, ut nobiles viderentur, privato damno non solum patrimonia profundere, sed ita æs alienum conflare, doloque malo uti et rebus novis studerent, cum sua prodegissent.—Sed temporis malignitate leges superbo huic luxui paulatim cesserunt, qui semper insolentior renascebatur; unaque conviviorum luxuria irrepsit, et edificiorum splendor, &c. pars ii. p. 278. Ed. apud Eliz. Vid. etiam p. 332.

Anglos qui ex omnibus septentrionalibus gentibus minime fuerant bibaces et ob sobrietatem laudati ex his Belgicis bellis didicisse immodico potu se proluere, et aliorum saluti propinando suam

suam affligere. Adeoque jam inde ebrietatis vitium per universam gentem proserpsit, ut legum severitate nostro tempore primum fuerit cohibitum. P. 357.

P. 279. Anglis, qui sub Edwardo Chestero, et Gainsfordo in Hollandia militabant hoc anno aliis virtus, aliis successus defuit. Qui enim ad Valkenburgum in præsidio erant, stationem deferuerunt, et postea se dediderunt.—Alii—ex improvise ab hoste qui flumen transnatarat, oppressi, et de præsidio deturbati, ducentis cæsis, et tribus signis captis.

P. 332. In Belgio Joannes Norrius Præfectus Anglis, et Olivarius Templeus cum aliquot Belgarum cohortibus Mechliniam opulentum Brabantiae urbem scalis primo diluculo admotis multa civium et religiosorum strage ceperunt; aliqua sane fortitudinis laude, sed quam fæda rapacitatis et sacrilegii insolentia diripiunt, sed etiam in templa sacra, sepulcra sævierunt, vim mortuis inferentes. Vidimus enim (pudet dicere) plures sepulchrales lapides inde in Angliam transmissos, et venum expositos, ut impietatis publice profarent argumenta.

Here we have a picture of the most excessive luxury in eating, drinking, apparel, furniture and building, ruinous to the state and private families; which prompted public commotions and private frauds; neither to be restrained by royal example nor royal authority, but like a flood stopped, when opposed by laws, it the more outrageously deluged the land. And here we see, that those *golden days* had their *Bradocks*

[120]

docks and their *Bings*, that is the *careless* and the *coward*, as well as the present: and that shameful rapacity and avarice extended more widely their sway, than in our days. Nay, *Shakespeare* tells us, that luxury and avarice descended even to the very footmen in diet and dress, who would wear nothing but the finest cloth of the most beautiful and costly colours, and eat and drink nothing but the richest foods, and who likewise demanded excessive wages.

In order to evade the force of this history, will our author say this was the last stage or period of commerce? Or will he be obliged to acknowledge, that this is the period when it is *frugal* not *ungenerous*; or when it provides conveniencies and diffuses general happiness (p. 153) that is the *middle* stage of commerce when temperance is the ruling character, as *intemperance* is of the *highest* (p. 189?) Good Gods! what a fine thing it is to be a wit, and like second sighted men to see what others cannot; nay, to see something by force of imagination, where there is nothing!

But the times were not only debauch and luxurious, but selfish and avaricious; for *Rapin* observes, that *Eliz.* had not one friend about her, that regarded her interest, excepting *Cecil*; or that served her from any other motive but that of their own interest.

In this reign the lands were farmed by their proprietors chiefly, and their products were raised to 6, 8 and 10 times the value they bore in the

[121]

the reign before*; from whence the gentry fell into the greatest luxury in *eating*, *drinking*, *wearing*, *building*, and *furniture*; and the middling people followed their example; money was ten *per cent.* so that the gains of trade might well be deemed twenty *per cent.* and some have went so far, as to say in the days of Sir *Thomas Gresham*, that 300 *per cent.* profit was often made by merchandising. Whereas Sir *Matthew Decker* informs us, that a merchant at present will be satisfied with six or seven *per cent* †.

We learn from *Camden* likewise, that our trade was in the beginning of *Elizabeth's* reign above three millions *per ann.* ‡. If then the profits of mercantile trade were only thirty *per cent.* and

* Rustici licentia rem frumentariam exportandi facta acrius quam antea in agriculturam incumbere ceperunt, sola quæ ex omni memoria inculta jacuerunt subigendo, Cam. Annal. p. 65. See likewise Fleetwood, Stanley and others of the price of wheat.

† See causes of decline of foreign trade, p. 181.

‡ *Camden* says twelve millions *Aureorum*. The question is what the value of the *Aureus* was? Some weak writers have imagined it to be *Florins*. But it seems ridiculous, that he should be supposed to call a piece of silver money *Aureus*. The least gold coin we had at that time was the half *Angel* of *Edward VI.* value 5 s. From whence it follows, that our trade to the *Netherlands* only amounted to 3,000,000 l. sterling *per ann.* at least. Suppose to all other places it amounted to but half so much more, here was a trade of 4½ millions *per ann.* But the luxury of the times was so great, that it is a question whether the cash of the nation increased half a million during her reign. I am the more inclined to think that *Camden* meant a gold crown by the word *Aureus*, because *Strada de Bello Belgico* uses the same word to signify a gold crown, value 5 s. which he checks by the number of *Florins*, he says, was in the sum of crowns he mentions. With such a trade how excessive must the luxury of the times have been, that the coin increased no more in a reign of above 44 years! especially as *Spain* had by that time brought into *Europe* near 1200 millions sterling.

a commodity passed through three hands, the brokerage of $4\frac{1}{2}$ millions imports would amount to above five millions: but if our present trade in imports be eight millions, and common profits, according to Sir *Matthew Decker*, six per cent. our present gains make but a small sum, for the whole brokerage to the consumer amounts at twenty per cent. but to 1,600,000*l*; and at twenty-five per cent. but to two millions. The same may be said, as to exports and home consumption.

From hence it follows, that there is not the least probability, that it should be in the power of merchants and traders now, to acquire such exorbitant wealth as heretofore, or live so profusely in general. What fortunes did the *Philpots, De Cœurs* and *Medici* make formerly?

Let us say that the people in *Elizabeth's* days were $\frac{2}{3}$ of what they are at present; that the rents of lands were six millions, of houses two millions; from hence we may calculate the profits of trade at that time.

Land 6,000,000 <i>per ann.</i>	houses 2,000,000	—	—	8,000,000
Labouring families 1,225,000 at 15 <i>l.</i> <i>per family</i> ,	or 6 <i>s</i> <i>per week</i> , labour was	—	—	} 18,000,000
Brokerage of foreign trade	—	—	5,000,000	
Brokerage of home consumption thro' all hands,	money being 10 <i>per centum</i> 30 <i>per centum</i> on	—	—	} 10,000,000
31,000,000	—	—	—	
Total national consumption	—	—	—	41,000,000

Here are then fifteen millions to be divided among traders for the brokerage of consumption, which

which in proportion to the number of people must amount to eighteen millions more profits in trade than what are made at present.

The rents of the lands, it is true, are increased twelve millions, but then near eight millions are paid in taxes, out of the national income; and not less than 6,000,000 of this by the people of property, of which the landholders pay three millions and a half.

<i>The national income in 1600 from</i>		<i>The national income in 1757 from</i>	
Rents of lands 6, of	Mill. 8	Rents of lands and houses	20
houses 2 =	—	Brokerage	16
Brokerage =	—	Labour	36
	15		22
	23		—
Labour =	18	Taxes	58
	—		6
	Total 41		64
People $5\frac{1}{2}$ millions.		People 8 millions.	

If then the people of property pay six millions of the taxes, which it is certain they do, there is left for the traders and landholders among eight millions of people only thirty millions to expend on a consumption of sixty-four millions. This is not so much as twenty-three millions on a consumption of forty-one millions among $5\frac{1}{2}$ millions of people, by near eighteen millions.

But this is not all, trade has diffused money and lands into more hands; and though expence among the people of property may be increased fifteen or sixteen millions; yet as money is increased

creased greatly, and people one-third, there must be near as many traders again; among whom to divide about sixteen millions brokerage, as there were in queen *Elizabeth's* time to share fifteen millions; consequently the profits cannot be half so much to each.

Again as to the lands, there is reason to believe, that where there was one *freeholder* in queen *Elizabeth's* time, there are more than two or three at present. Plenty of money and commerce have diffused property more equably. There are fewer vast overgrown estates and more middling ones, perhaps five, nay ten to one. Every one who knows any thing of our affairs, and attends to the present power of the house of commons, must be sensible of this. Our author seems well apprized of their power, but quite ignorant of its concomitants.

Our lands may be twelve or fourteen millions more in value, but perhaps diffused into three times as many hands: stock and coin twice as much; we will suppose both together four times as much as in 1600; and diffused into three times as many hands. What is the consequence of this? why instead of exorbitant wealth in the hands of individuals in trade, there is not much more than formerly. Suppose a man has four hundred a year now. Is this equal to 350 in queen *Elizabeth's* days?

If the wealth of the nation be quadrupled, since queen *Elizabeth's* time, and the annual income be increased, as specified in the above estimate; this could never introduce such
extra-

extraordinary effects as our author ridiculously imagines. I know the wild computations of *King, Davenant* and *Hooke*, but look on them as visions of the same kind with our author's. If we consume sixty-four millions *per ann.* and our traders are divided into three classes, who have each a year's consumption in stock, that is, first, into merchants and manufacturers, secondly wholesale dealers, thirdly into retailers, computing the farmers, &c. to have three stocks, this would make the *whole stock* to amount to but $64 \times 3 = 192$ millions. Suppose we allow $\frac{1}{20}$ for household goods and furniture among people of property, this will not amount to above ten millions: and if we compute the value of five pound for each labouring family on 1,750,000 families, this sum will amount to but 8,750,000 *l.* So that the account will stand thus:

Stock in trade and farms	— 192
Stock of tradesmen in furniture	— 10
Stock of poor in furniture	— 9
Stock of shipping	— 9
Stock of cash	— 30
	—
	Total 250 Mil.
	—

But is it possible there can be such a stock of goods and cash, when 222 millions in trade at ten *per cent.* would produce a brokerage of twenty-two millions? are the profits of trade
K on

[126]

on a consumption which goes through three hands so little as 20 *per cent*? what must the consumption of the nation be, if the brokerage be 44 millions?

SECTION IV.

From all these reflections, it is manifest, that the *excess* of wealth which our *author* talks of, as flowing from trade, and enabling the people to live in such luxury and riot, as would form a national character for the practice of those vices, above or beyond what appeared 150 years ago, is all *dream, vision* and *chimera*; and to be found no where, but in his *addled* brains. But let us suppose every family in the state possessed of wealth, which had formerly 10*l.* in cash, stock or lands, to have now 15*l.* and the number, possessed of such wealth, to be doubled; in this case the wealth of the state, 'tis true, would be trebled; but what extraordinary room would from hence arise for excess, riot and corruption of manners? a man whose brains are turned may see uncommon inlets for such misfortunes and vices; but a man in his sober senses will find none.

Now though I must acknowledge, that all our author has said appears to me, to be dream, vision, chimera, sublime nonsense, and the phantoms or figments of a warm imagination; that is, to me, a poor dull mortal of common sense; yet

[127]

yet the refined genius may perhaps like that noble chemist the bee draw divine sweets from those visionary flowers with which our author abounds; and prepare a sublime repast for *angelic* minds. But however this be, for my own part, I am not ashamed to acknowledge, that I consider our author's work, as one long and great *dream*, but like the dream of a sick man, confused and incoherent; and not half so innocent, entertaining and consistent as the noble dream of that *sublime* author and excellent *dreamer* John Bunyan.

Upon the whole: there is reason to believe that before *Henry* the seventh's reign $\frac{2}{10}$ of all the lands of the kingdom were in the hands of the church and *great men*; that not above $\frac{1}{5}$ are in their hands at present: and that the rest are divided among at least 200,000 free-holders more than were at that time. It is formerly, therefore, that we must look for great luxury and exorbitant wealth, and all their consequences; and not in our Days*. This fully proves, that all our author's pretended facts of exorbi-

* It may not be amiss to mention one example of the great profits of trade, made when money was at a high interest. A certain person worthy credit, told me some time ago, that in conversation with a noted merchant, who left an estate with a *baronet's* title affixed to it, the titled merchant said, "that he carried on the *Irish* trade in yarn, 'till he could not gain above 40 *per cent.* by it, so many *youngsters* push'd into the trade, upon which, says he, I did not think it worth my while to engage in it any longer, so drop'd it". This seems to have been between 1676, and 1684.

[128]

tant wealth at present are only figments of his own brain; as well as the consequent *luxury*, *manners* and *principles* he has assigned to the present age. From whence it follows, that his whole system is the dreams or reveries of his own wild imagination. His piece discovers little knowledge of our history, commerce, and manners in the times he applauds. The picture he has given of those times is as much unlike the original, as what he has drawn for the present. In short he is a bungling dauber, and fit only to draw monsters for sign posts.

The conduct of our author brings a story to my mind. A painter had taken a disgust to a gentleman; however he sat to him for his picture. The painter drew a hideous figure, wrote the gentleman's name under it, and set it up in his room among other pieces. The gentleman heard of the abuse, met him at a *rout*, gave him a *footman's discipline*, and all the world applauded his conduct.

SECTION V.

In page 216 our author says again, that the evils of the age have arisen from our trade and wealth.

The vices he complains of as reigning now, are the vices of human nature, which have reigned at all times in all free states, and will reign in such as long as the world endures.
Our

[129]

Our political divisions are the consequence of our freedom; and if we would avoid *one*, we must lose the *other*. British valour never appeared with more *eclat*, than in our last wars. And we have seen above, that his golden days were tarnished with *luxury*, *cowardice*, and *avarice*, as well as the present times. But it has always been the custom of vain conceited *half thinkers*, to damn the present times, and applaud the past. Such consider manners and principles in the same light, as *Horace* says some persons did poetry, who could relish nothing but the works of antiquity. He gives us a description of one of these in the following lines,

*Qui redit ad fastos, et virtutem æstimat annis
Miraturque nihil nisi quod LIBITINA sacravit.*

But to conceive, that our vices and follies arise from our trade and commerce, shews a consummate ignorance both of the past and present times; and the writing upon this subject, with only such superficial qualifications, as our author appears to be possessed of, discovers the most consummate vanity. He would employ his time much better if he confined himself to the duties of his function, and the offices of his curacy, and left *political* and *commercial* subjects to those, whose province it is to supervise and direct those affairs; or whose avocations naturally lead them to those studies. I would
K 3 therefore

[130]

therefore leave the old *adage* with him as a useful and charitable piece of instruction, viz. *Ne futor ultra crepidam.*

Effeminacy, luxury, avarice, cowardice, loss of the principle of honour, irreligion, faction, and the want of patriotism and love for our country, are by this gentleman imputed to trade and commerce. But suppose none of those vices should be more eminent now, than they have been in times past? nay suppose their baleful influence should be less diffused than in some antecedent reigns, what will become of our author's system? but all he has said upon this head, is nothing but what that mercenary scribler Dr. Davenant retailed in the reign of king William, only cooked up in another form, and set to table with a different garnish.

But as our author harps so much upon the degeneracy and corruption of the times, I would desire him to lay his hand on his heart, and answer to himself the following questions.

1. Whether he thinks the present times more corrupt than the reign of Charles the second, when our king was a pensioner to France, and when an eighteen years parliament, manufactured by him, were pensioners devoted to his pleasure, his slaves and drudges, whilst he was a slave and drudge to Lewis the fourteenth †?

† Charles II. se avisa de gagner la pluralité des suffrages dans la chambre des communes, seule en droit d'accorder des subsides en gratifiant les uns de pensions, et les autres, d'emplois considérables. Voyez monsieur D——, *du commerce maritime*, p. 26.

2. Whether

[131]

2. Whether he thinks the present times more corrupt than the reign of king William, when Voltaire informs us, that the French king sent over 250,000l. § sterling, to be distributed among the members of a British parliament, which was actually received by many of them at that time, from the hands of monsieur Poussin, the French agent here; from whence they were called *Poussineers*, a list of 163 of whom, I have now before me? these glorious patriots received those fees from the king of France, to do his dirty work, and betray their country. Among these venal wretches, was that *Billingsgate* scribler doctor Davenant, who bellowed so loudly against the irreligion, prophaneness, luxury, cowardice, effeminacy, degeneracy, venality, and corruption of the times, during the reign of our glorious deliverer, and all because he thought his great merits not sufficiently taken notice of. Who is his second?

3. Whether he thinks the present times more corrupt than the year 1713, when near 200 members voted for the French commerce bill, which would infallibly have ruined our trade, and have rendered us an easy conquest and prey to France? in the list of those patriots we see many of the good Englishmen, and worthy senators, who condescended to enrich their country with the beneficence of monsieur Poussin.

After answering these questions, if our British censor be not a Birmingham case-hardened

§ Tindal says above a million.

K 4

finner,

finer, he must blush 'till his face becomes a lighted torch.

Aye, but says our author, *we are torn by factions, rent and split into parties, labour under divisions, and have no union among us. And all these contentions arise from a lust of power, and the auri sacra fames, the lust of money.* p. 102, &c.

But these divisions are the natural and genuine offspring of liberty, and if you would be free from *one*, you must surrender the *other*. Oppositions in a state are of use, they curb the arbitrary inclinations of a prince, awe the conduct of a minister, and influence the behaviour of every servant of the public. They clip the wings of royal power, and restrain the flights of ministerial authority. Whilst the union under an absolute monarch, is, as *Montesquieu* observes, only the *union of dead men in a grave*. † *Machiavel* is of the same opinion; and my lord *Molesworth* remarks, “ that slavery creates a kind of laziness, and idle despondency, which puts men beyond hopes and fears: it mortifies ambition, emulation, and other troublesome and active qualities, which liberty and freedom beget; and instead of them affords a dull kind of pleasure of being careless and insensible”. *

This is the union of the *French*, and from these principles the harmony of their state arises.

† *Voyez les Causes de la Grandeur, &c. des Romains.*

* See his account of *Denmark*.

ses.

ses. Whilst, if we may believe one of their late writers, *les differens partis qui divisent l'Angleterre constituent sa force*; the strength of the British state is the result of its different parties*. For the opposition are eagle-eyed sentinels, who watch over the conduct of the administration, and never suffer the slightest fault to escape unpunished, or without the severest censure. The opposition points out the errors, which have been committed, exposes weak designs, proposes feasible attempts, censures the waste, profusion, and embezzlement of public monies, and proves not only a watchful dragon over the national treasure, but a severe check and sharp critic on the conduct of all in place and power. But if they should labour to deceive, *Machiavel* observes, the *people, though ignorant, are capable of truth, and do easily submit to it, when delivered by a credible person: Nam etsi populus ignorantia laboret, tamen capax est veri, si id per aliquem probatæ fidei virum, ei aperiat*. *Disput. Machiav. l. 1. cap. vii.*

Our author seems to consider avarice as inseparable from commerce; and effeminacy and cowardice as the necessary and natural issue of avarice. But all this is but the dreams of a distempered imagination, for the *Athenians*, *Corinthians*, and *Syracusians* were as famous for commerce, as for arts and arms. And when their military glory was in its highest splendor,

† *Voyez Essai politique sur les avantages que la France peut retirer de la conquête de l'Isle Minorque.*

their

[134]

their commerce was in its most flourishing period. And if we may judge of the *Romans* by the treatment of their *debtors*, and *slaves*; as well as from their arbitration between the *Aricians* and *Ardeans*; and the plunder they brought from the nations they subdued, and the tribute they exacted, they were the most avaricious, as well as warlike nation, that ever existed in the world.

The virtuous *Cato* was sent to plunder *Ptolemy* of *Cyprus*; *Numantia* was sack'd and ruin'd by *Scipio*. Avarice prompted *Metellus* and *Mummius* to destroy *Corinth*. In short, the avarice of the *Romans* pushed them on to conquest, devastation and plunder, wherever there was any thing to be gotten.

Lucius Florus seems so sensible of this, that he oftentimes mentions their victories with shame and regret; and though a *Roman*, he blushes at those villanies of his countrymen, which moderns have celebrated as heroic achievements.

In short, there was scarce ever a more covetous people than the *Romans*, or a more martial. They sold right and justice, cheated and defrauded every one who trusted them, went about cutting throats and plundering the world, excited only by avarice and the lust of prey. And this was not only their true character in the days of *Jugurtha*, but also in the early times of the common wealth. *Cicero* * in his oration

* Referta Gallia negotiatorum est, plena civitatum Rom. nemo Gallorum

[135]

oration for *Fonteius*, tells us, that all the trade in the cities of *Gaul*, was carried on by the *Romans* settled there. From whence, it seems, that a spirit of *trade*, a *martial* spirit, and a spirit of *avarice*, all flourished at one and the same time among them in the highest excess: though the two *first* seem to have been the genuine offspring of the *last*; as they did not confine their desires of gain to the honest and laudable arts of industry; but ran about the world plundering like *banditti*, as well as trading like *merchants* and *factors*.

From hence it follows, that an exorbitant desire of wealth, or *avarice*, is not peculiar to a *spirit of trade*. It is certain the love of plunder excites to *martial* deeds †, as well as the desire of *gain* to the pursuits of commerce. If this were the case among the *Romans*, what becomes of our author's theory? Here we see *valour*, *trade*, and *avarice*, united in the same republic, and the two first flowing from the same sources; from whence the people became excessively rich; but neither *trade*, *riches*, nor

Gallorum sine cive Romano quicquam negotii gerit. Nummus in Gallia nullus sine civium Romanorum tabulis commovetur.

From hence it seems that the *Romans* carried on a great trade in the conquered provinces, and had a very extensive commerce; and that their avarice prompted them to use both the arts of conquest and commerce to enrich themselves. Where nothing was to be got they never sought to conquer. See *Cicero's Oration. pro Fonteio*.

† I bone quo virtus tua te vocat, I pede fausto,—ibit. Ibit eo quo vis, qui zonam perdidit, inquit, *Hor. Ep. 2. L. 2.*

avarice,

[136]

avarice, destroyed their *martial* spirit, but rather invigorated their desires of war. And yet our author says, “ *wealth that never existed, has made us cowards.* Trade has produced *avarice*, *avarice* riches, and riches *effeminacy*; and that these vices and all our evils are the “ *genuine offspring of commerce.*”

But nothing can appear more ridiculous to an intelligent man than what our author has suggested on this head. Whoever closely examines history will clearly perceive, that valour is not incompatible with *avarice* and trade; but on the contrary, that it is their natural issue. Do satisfaction, contentment and humility excite to martial deeds and military glory? Did not Cæsar thieve to squander, and sack to lavish, *alieni appetens, sui profusus*, as covetous of other people's as profuse of his own. He robbed the Roman treasury and the neighbouring states to expend the ill-got wealth in riot, corruption and debauchery; and yet Cæsar was brave. What that was *heroic* was left unperformed by *Athens, Corinth, Syracuse, Carthage, Rhodes, Venice, Genoa, Florence, &c.* when they were in the zenith of their commercial splendor?

Upon these reflections it is amazing, that there should be a *witling* weak enough, to inveigh against commerce in the manner our author has done; and to impute to it the visionary evils which he has laid to its charge, and which have no foundation in, nor necessary connection with its nature.

To

[137]

To conclude. Our author's suggestion, that the vices and evils of *avarice, cowardice, discord, effeminacy, &c.* are owing to commerce, and are its natural effects, is refuted by the whole tenor of the histories of the *Romans, Corinthians, Athenians, Syracusians, Rhodians, Venetians, Dutch, &c.* And that those vices are more eminent among us at present, than they were in the days of queen *Elizabeth*, or in fundry latter reigns, has been demonstrated to be equally contrary to truth by the concurrent testimonies of our own histories. All he has said upon this topic only proves, that he has been dreaming awake. In short, our author's volatile imagination has carried so much sail, that it has overset his judgment, wreck'd his memory, and sunk him to the bottom of a gulph of stupidity in a shatter'd crazy *theory.*

I flatter my self no man can justly reproach me with having treated this author too harshly or freely, who has treated every order, *rank, class* and *degree* in the kingdom from the prince to the peasant, with the utmost freedom, insolence, and indecency. Therefore I shall take my leave of him and the reader, without making any apology for the liberty assumed in these remarks. *Mibi qui multum cessat fit Chœrilos ille.*

F I N I S.

E R R A T A.

*D*edication, page x. l. 2. adde;? Preface p. xii. l. 14. r. are.
 p. xiii. l. 20. r. these. l. 24. dele the. p. xv. l. 28. r. straw.
 p. 1. line 10. read may have. p. 3. l. 11. adde;? l. 23. r. ter-
 ritory. p. 4. l. 9. r. was. p. 7. l. 3. r. destroy. p. 8. l. 9. for as,
 &c. r. which we have enumerated above. p. 12. l. 6. r. have.
ibid. l. 28. r. eighths. p. 28. l. 8. r. them. p. 32. l. 3. dele of.
ibid. l. 10. dele and. p. 34. l. 20. r. increase. p. 35. l. 25. r.
 are increased. p. 37. l. 24. r. idle away half. l. 25. r. spend
 half. p. 38. l. 27. after Commodities, adde, together with the
 brokerage, which circulates them, be one half or four eighths.
 p. 39. l. 5. adde, but just as many. p. 40. l. 14. r. a poor fa-
 mily. p. 41. l. 11. r. millions. l. 17. r. presumes. p. 44. l. 18.
 r. Amsterdam and Hamburg. p. 46. l. 31. r. in p. 48. l. 13.
 dele, the. p. 50. l. 21. r. maize. p. 51. l. 16. r. chaste. p. 53.
 l. 18. r. for a nation, nations. l. 30. r. debauch. p. 54. l. 19.
 r. be. p. 55. l. 12. r. time. p. 56. l. 26. dele can. l. 28. dele
 only. p. 58. l. 18. r. take. l. 23. dele an. l. 29. dele and de-
 bauchery. p. 61. l. 30. r. prices. p. 62. l. 4. r. lie unculti-
 vated in a greater degree. l. 24. r. requires. p. 64. l. 24. dele
 want of commerce. l. 30. r. after prohibited a comma. p. 65.
 l. 22. r. not so fatal. l. 32. r. sobriety. p. 70. l. 10. r. were.
 l. 14. r. arises. l. 22. r. all this. *ibid.* l. 30. r. their.
 p. 72. l. 8. r. be. p. 73. l. 24. r. these last. p. 76. l. 8. dele
 that. p. 78. l. 3. dele that. l. 7. r. be. l. 29. adde, for a people
 to support. p. 80. l. 26. r. their estates. l. 29. r. shew. p. 85.
 l. 17. dele there was. p. 86. l. 29. r. this conduct. p. 88. l. 22.
 dele if, and be, and r. after a nation is full of people. p. 89.
 l. 17. r. was. p. 90. l. 20. adde, so populous. p. 91. l. 13. r.
 are still. p. 93. l. 7. add page 38. p. 94. l. 6. r. her. p. 95. l.
 20. add dearer. p. 105. l. 7. dele that. p. 108. l. 32. dele like-
 wife. p. 117. l. 6. dele But. p. 118. l. 3. r. debauched. l. 30. for
 farmed, r. occupied. p. 119. l. 8. r. deseruerunt. *ibid.* l. 19. r.
 Macula inquinant. Etenim non solum civium opes omni præ-
 dandi insolentia &c.