

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Electronic Texts in American Studies

Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln

2-1-1848

LABOR: ITS HISTORY AND ITS PROSPECTS [1848]

Robert Dale Owen

Paul Royster (edited by)

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, proyster@unl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/etas>



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#)

Owen, Robert Dale and Royster, Paul (edited by), "LABOR: ITS HISTORY AND ITS PROSPECTS [1848]" (1848). *Electronic Texts in American Studies*. 9.

<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/etas/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Libraries at University of Nebraska-Lincoln at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Texts in American Studies by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

LABOR: ITS HISTORY AND ITS PROSPECTS.

AN ADDRESS

DELIVERED BEFORE

THE YOUNG MEN'S

MERCANTILE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION,

OF CINCINNATI,

On Tuesday, February 1, 1848.

BY ROBERT DALE OWEN.

“Were the benefits of Civilization to be partial, not universal, it would be only a bitter mockery and cruel injustice.”—*Duchatel*.

CINCINNATI :

HERALD OF TRUTH PRINT, WALNUT STREET, BELOW SECOND.

1848.

CORRESPONDENCE.

CINCINNATI, February 2nd, 1848.

Hon. ROBERT DALE OWEN,—

Dear Sir: Believing your Lecture on “Labor, its History and Prospects,” delivered before the YOUNG MEN’S MERCANTILE LIBRARY ASSOCIATION, to be eminently worthy of a public record, inasmuch as its general perusal will greatly promote the public good, we most cordially unite in requesting a copy for publication.

Respectfully,

J. P. FOOTE,

A. RANDALL,

W. D. GALLAGHER.

HARVEY HALL,

JAMES F. PERKINS,

L. A. HINE,

CHARLES CIST,

STANLEY MATTHEWS,

EDW. D. MANSFIELD,

HENRY HOWE,

JAMES F. MELINE,

S. I. KELLOGG

CINCINNATI, February 3rd, 1848.

Gentlemen: I place the manuscript of my Address, with pleasure, at your disposal; and have added, in the shape of notes, certain details and references to authorities, which may serve as evidence that the statements made, startling as some of them may seem, have not been put forth without a careful investigation of the subject. I am, gentlemen,

With much respect,

Your obedient servant,

ROBERT DALE OWEN .

Messrs. J. P. FOOTE. A. RANDALL, &c.

LABOR: ITS HISTORY AND PROSPECTS.

I NEVER stand before an audience, as here to-night—many eyes upon me, many ears listening for what is to be said—without deeply feeling the responsibility he assumes who thus accepts an invitation to engross, if only for a brief season, an assembled portion of the public mind. My ambition reaches farther than to amuse—than merely to interest you for the time. Life is short. Its years pass by, even while we are reflecting how they shall be spent. The little good a man can do in this world, he must do quickly. I pass by, then, what might furnish pleasant theme for the conversation of an hour; I pass by much that might supply subject for literary recreation, matter for scientific research. Not that I love these less; but that there is a subject of broader scope, of wider range, more influential on human destiny; and to that subject I desire to speak to-night.

I desire to speak to you of human powers and of human sufferings; of the powers and the sufferings, not of the selected Few to whom Fortune has assigned property and station, and, along with these, voice and influence in the world's councils; but of the Children of Labor; of the millions, who say little and do much; by whom the world is fed and clothed; by whom cities are built, and forests subdued, and deserts reclaimed. I desire to speak of those whose strong arms, ceaselessly tugging at the oar, have impelled, through all time, the bark of life; and briefly to ask of the Past, how it has treated them; of the Present, what is their actual condition; of the Future, what may be their coming fate.

In an inquiry touching the fate and the sufferings of Labor, I have chiefly looked for my illustrations out of this prosperous valley, beyond the limits of our favored republic. The physician seeks to study the disease there where its type is the most malignant.

Though I speak of disease and the physician, do not imagine that I am going to spread before you systems of sweeping

reform. It is no part of my present intention to preach radical changes in the structure of society. I would indicate the symptoms, not dictate the cure. I seek more to inform than to instruct; not so much to give you my thoughts, as to call forth and lend direction to your own. We cannot think for each other; but we can work for each other. We can collect of the materials for thinking that lie scattered abroad throughout the world. We can condense, collate, promulgate these. This is the extent of my purpose. I place an array of facts before you. My hope is, that they may fix attention and enlist many minds in the good service of inquiry. In the multitude of councillors, it has been well said, there is safety; and no great problem, moral, social, or political, was ever yet worked out in practice, until the minds of thousands had been bent, earnestly and long, to the task of its solution.*

There is a Great Question, unanswered, before the world. It may not be answered to-day, nor to-morrow—this year, nor the next. Yet the answer must come sooner or later. And if to some nations it come not soon, that answer may be in thunder, amid the tempest of a revolution.

It is no subtle question of the schools, no curious speculative inquiry; but a plain, practical, home-striking question; reaching to the hearths of men, touching the lives of some, involving the property of all.

Hardly may a question command the deep attention of the world now, unless it be connected with property. So many millions of mankind expend every thought and energy of a toilsome lifetime, to obtain what they shall eat, and what they shall drink, and wherewithal they shall be clothed; and, of these millions, so many thousands miserably fail, even in that humble effort, that, on the strictest principle of utility, questions regarding wealth and its distribution seem the most important that can occupy the time of the wise and good.

The theorist may call this a sordid view of society. Let him close his books and enter the world. Let him read men, not

* Much of the matter here following was furnished by me, some years since, to an Eastern Review, and there published without my name. If, in consequence, to anyone, many of the details here presented seem familiar, their importance is the sufficient apology for their repetition.

words-men in crowded cities-men in their work-shops, their manufactories; in their garrets, in their prisons. And then sad realities will correct crude theories.

Men, in the mass, cannot be miserable and virtuous. A people contending against famine necessarily become immoral.* While abject poverty broods over men and presses

* The statistics of crime in Great Britain exhibit frightful results. It is continually increasing, in a ratio far beyond the population.

In "Blackwood's Magazine" for May, 1844, is a compilation of statistical tables on this subject, drawn from official sources. Here are the principal results:

"Since the year 1805, when regular tables of commitments first began to be kept in England, commitments have increased *six-fold*. They have swelled from *five* to *thirty-one* thousand. During the same period population has advanced about sixty per cent.: in other words, detected crime has advanced four times as fast as the numbers of the people."—p. 533, 534.

In another portion of the kingdom the increase has been more startling still:—

"In the year 1805, eighty-nine criminals were brought before the whole tribunals, supreme and inferior, in Scotland; but in the year 1842, the committals for serious offences were nearly *four thousand*! During the same period, population has advanced about fifty per cent. So that in moral, staid and religious Scotland, serious crime, during the last forty years, has risen *twenty-five times as fast as the number of the people*."—p. 534.

This would be incredible, if it were not vouched by the actual tables of committals officially kept. The writer in Blackwood adds :

"What renders this prodigious increase of crime in so short a period, in all parts of the British Empire, in a peculiar manner extraordinary and alarming, is, that it has taken place at the very time when unheard-of efforts were made, in every part of the country, for the moral and religious instruction of the people. We are very far from saying that enough has been done in this way; no one is better aware that the vast debt which the prosperous wealth of England owes, in this respect, to its suffering indigence, is still, in great part, undischarged, and that, till it is taken up and put on a proper footing by the State, it never can be completely liquidated;—still, more has been done to discharge it during the last thirty years, than in the whole previous centuries which have elapsed since the revolution."—p. 535.

It would be difficult to find a more striking illustration of the great truth, that the first step towards making a people virtuous is to render their condition comfortable and happy; and that to hopeless misery the preacher preaches in vain.

them to the earth, their minds are crushed and their hearts are withered. But the words of the wisest teacher are spoken in vain to crushed minds and withered hearts. If it be sometimes true of the individual, it is always false of the mass, that sharp adversity purifies and ennobles. The deadliest part of the curse of Cain—the curse on those who toil to live, and live only to die—is, that they are blighted in mind as well as in body; it is, that they lose not only rational enjoyment, but all taste for it; it is that they are deprived not alone of the knowledge that elevates and improves, but of all desire to obtain it. The iron enters into the soul, and corrupts its health, and destroys its beauty.

Therefore a great question of public wealth becomes a great question of public morals.

Upon us, here in young America, the question to which I am about to refer does not force itself; it invites only, not compels, our attention. For in these vigorous States there is, as yet, no famine, and little hopeless poverty. Hardship there is, and occasional embarrassment; but nothing which a strong hand and a bold heart cannot overcome.

It is in Europe that the question I refer to rises up, important, imperative; not to be denied, not to be set aside, scarcely to be put off from day to day; knocking at the palace gate, thundering at the council door. For, in the old world, thousands are dying for lack, not of comfort, but of food; and millions are selling their youth, and their health, and their strength, and their leisure, even to the last moment that nature can struggle against sleep; and their happiness, down to the merest and coarsest gratification of animal appetite; and, at last, their short and weary lives;—all for so miserable a pittance, that the wages of a week's slavish toil may hardly suffice to purchase one bushel of wheat.

And it is in England—the proudest, and mightiest, and wealthiest of Europe's Powers—it is in England, whose Briarean factory system mocks at consumption, whose workshops overstock the world—where riches elbow indigence, and industry manufactures famine,—it is in that little island of marvel and misery, where men understand everything, except how to enjoy some moderate fraction of the enormous wealth they produce;—it is there that problem must soon be solved—

by her statesmen or her people, peacefully or violently, in reform or in revolution.

Nor should we delay its examination, until, in turn, it knocks at our doors.

I do not propose here to venture a solution of the problem I have in view; distinctly to state it, is my humbler intention. As a useful preliminary, I propose to touch on some points of comparison between the condition and resources of former ages and those of the present; and as, beyond two centuries past, the ancestry of North America must chiefly be sought in Great Britain, to her early history I first direct my search.

In England, as throughout Europe, during the feudal ages, war was the trade of men. To this, agriculture, commerce, and all handicrafts, were strictly subservient. The soil was held by military tenure; and the protection of the law, such as it was, purchased of the noble by the peasant, at the price of military service. It is difficult to imagine a state of things less favorable to the production of wealth. At any moment the serf might be taken from the plow, to arm in his liege lord's quarrel; or the craftsman called from his bench or his loom, to bear the spear or bend the bow. And the loss of time and interruption of regular labor was but one item, and a small one, in the list of burdens imposed by the spirit of the age. If, spite of all interruption, the seed was sown and the harvest ripened, the chance yet remained, that it might be cut down by the sword of the forager; or trampled under the hoof of the war-horse. The wording of the Borderer's account of a hostile inroad, in Scott's "Lay," is characteristic:

"They crossed the Liddell at curfew hour,
And burnt my little lonely tower.
The fiend receive their souls therefor,
It had not been burnt this year or more!"

It seems a marvel that labor, thus harassed and pillaged, unassisted, too, save by the rudest aids of science to production, should have sufficed to furnish to society the necessaries of life. And, in truth, for one or two centuries after the conquest, the peasantry, or rather *villeinry*, of England, of whom many were but thralls, spoken of and valued as any other personal property, either received no wages at all, except neces-

sary food and clothing, or else a scanty and uncertain compensation. "At this period," says a modern writer, "the food of the laborer consisted principally of fish, chiefly herrings, and a small quantity of bread and beer. Mutton and cheese were considered articles of luxury which formed the harvest home, of so much importance in ancient times." "Their habitations were without chimneys, and their principal furniture consisted in a brass pot valued at from one to three shillings, and a bed valued at from three to six shillings."*

In the course of the fourteenth century, however, the condition of the English peasant became independent and comfortable. During Edward the Third's long wars in France, he was compelled to manumit many bondsmen, in order to recruit his armies. The forced services of villeinage were gradually exchanged for free labor, paid by wages; and, by the middle of the fourteenth century, these wages, made statutable by the ultra-legislation of those days, furnish authentic evidence, when compared with the price of staple necessaries at the same period, that the condition of the British laborer was already far better than it is to-day. Of this assertion let us review some of the proofs.

The act of 23d of Edward III., (that is, in 1350,) commonly called the "Statute of Laborers," fixed rate of wages as follows: For common labor on a farm, *three pence half-penny* per day; a reaper, per day, *four pence*; mowing an acre of grass, *six pence*; threshing a quarter of wheat, *four pence*; and other labor in proportion. In Bishop Fleetwood's "Chronicon Preciosum," a work of reputation, are found various ancient accounts kept by bursars of convents. From one of these, dated in the fourteenth century, the following items are taken: A pair of shoes, *four pence*; russet broadcloth per yard, *thirteen pence*; a stall-fed ox, *twenty-four shillings*; a fat goose, *two pence half-penny*; wheat per quarter, (that is, eight bushels,) *three shillings and four pence*. Sir John Cullum, quoted by Hallam, corroborates these estimates. "In the fourteenth century," says he, "a harvest man had four pence a day, which enabled him in a week to buy a comb of wheat (that is, four bushels); but to buy a comb of wheat, a man must now (he

* Wades "History or the Working Classes," p. 11-12.

wrote in 1784) work ten or twelve days,"* This brings the price of wheat, in the fourteenth century, to four shillings a quarter, or six pence a bushel.

The act of 23d Henry VI. (in 1444) fixes the reaper's wages at *five pence*, and others in proportion. And the account book of a convent, quoted by Sir Frederick Eden, dated between 1415 and 1425, gives us:—wheat per quarter averaging *five shillings*; oxen, from *twelve to sixteen shillings*; sheep, from *fourteen to sixteen pence*; butter, *three farthings* per pound; cheese, a *half penny* per pound; and eggs, *twenty-five for a penny*. Fleta, who wrote about 1335, gives *four shillings* per quarter as the average price of wheat in his day. Hallam, whose general estimates agree with the above, calculates butcher's meat, in the fifteenth century, at a *farthing and a half per pound*. This seems a just estimate; for in the next century, namely, by 24th Henry VIII., it was decreed that "no person shall take for beef or pork above a *half penny*, or for mutton or veal above *three farthings* a pound, and less in those places where they are now sold for less."

Taking the average of these various prices, it would appear, that, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the weekly wages of an English day-laborer would procure for him about half a quarter of beef, or one and a half sheep, or about ten geese, or (the most important item) FOUR BUSHELS OF WHEAT. Manufactured articles were somewhat higher in proportion. Yet a day's labor in harvest sufficed to pay for a pair of shoes, and a trifle over a week's wages to purchase broadcloth enough for a coat.

Cullum, already quoted, reminds us, that towards the close of the last century, about a fortnight's labor had become necessary to purchase four bushels of wheat. How is it now? The exertions of that excellent association, the Anti-Corn Law League, have supplied, as the Westminster Review has expressed it, "an accumulation of facts so incontrovertible, that no person who has any reputation for accuracy or intelligence, will risk it upon the denial of the terrible truth." They inform us, that the average wages of farm laborers throughout Great Britain, are now *rather under, than over, eight shillings a week*; just the average

* "History of Hawsted," p. 258.

price in that country, for years past, of one bushel of wheat. One month's labor now supplies the same quantity of bread to the British laborer as a week's labor did five hundred years ago! *

* The above calculations in regard to the rates of wages, now and in former days, in Great Britain, were originally made by me and published in February, 1844. Since then, I have seen a series of articles, by "a barrister," in the "League" of August 1844, on the subject of agricultural wages, evidently compiled with minute care and accuracy of research; and as the result obtained from the collation of a multitude of authorities, including all the statutable enactments on the subject, from 1349 down, the writer comes to the following conclusions :

"About the middle of the eighteenth century, the laborer could earn 157 pints of wheat, by a week's labor in harvest; equal to about *seventeen shillings* a week at the present time; (that is, August 1844;) but in the reign of Henry VII, (say about 1500,) he could earn two pecks; and in the reign of Richard II, (say about 1380,) he could earn two and three-quarters, or nearly *three pecks* by one day's labor; equal to about *thirty shillings* a week at the present time."—*League of August 31, 1844: p. 788.*

If we put the present average wages of the farm laborer in Great Britain at eight shillings a week, it will be seen, that the above results tally very closely with those to which I had previously arrived. If we make allowance for wages *in harvest*, always somewhat higher than at other seasons, we shall still find the farm laborers' wages in Great Britain, at this day, not more than *one-third* as high as they were four or five centuries ago.

As to wages of operatives in manufactories, their average in Great Britain is variously estimated from eight to eleven shillings a week, when fully employed. In populous districts, their employment is very precarious; and the evidence taken before parliamentary committees opens up to us a state of things, in and about manufacturing towns, that is dreadful to contemplate.

In the "Minutes of Evidence before a select committee of the House of Commons, connected with the woolen and fancy trades of the West-riding of Yorkshire," taken in 1833, Mr. Wm. Stocks, Jun'r, deposed, that he was Secretary of a committee composed of a number of masters, visiting the cottages of the laborers in and around Huddersfield, to ascertain their actual condition. He states the plan pursued, thus: "A committee of masters was formed, and that committee deputed certain workmen that they had confidence in, and that they knew were honest and upright, to take different districts of country, allotted to them by that Committee. When the returns came to me, I sent them to the masters to be examined the masters' books, and when the masters

Nor is the proportion confined to bread stuffs alone. In the fifteenth century, a week's labor purchased sixty-four pounds of butcher's meat. Now (at six pence half penny, its average value per pound,) eight shillings a week procures the peasant hardly fifteen pounds; less than one-fourth what his ancestor obtained. Procures for him, did I say? the estimate is imaginary; for no such luxury as animal food now smokes on the ta-

found any thing they believed was wrong, that was returned to the men who had taken it to go and re-examine; and when the masters pronounced it correct, then I took the calculation." * * * "The result was, that we found 13,226 individuals that averaged two pence half penny (five cents) per day to live on, out of a population of 29,607." * * * "This sum of two pence half penny per day, included all parish relief; and they had not the whole of that applicable to meat and drink, because they had to pay rent and every thing out of it, including the wear and tear of the looms."—*Minutes of Evidence, 28th July and 3d August, 1833.*

The "Report of the Liverpool branch of the Anti-Corn-Law League," for 1833, exhibits a similar picture of wholesale misery in that city. It states, that "in Vauxhall Ward, Liverpool, containing about 6000 families, or 24,000 souls, the number of 3,462 families had but two pence half-penny (five cents) per individual to live on!"

Can we wonder, that, in the midst of the squalid wretchedness, which must result from such a state of things, there should be a frightful sacrifice of human life? Official tables show, that it amounts to *one-half of all that are born.*

Chadwick's well known "Report of the Sanitary Condition of the Laboring Population of Great Britain," gives, among other tables, a statement of the average duration of life, of different classes, in manufacturing districts. In Manchester and Liverpool, where the proportion does not vary materially from that in other manufacturing cities, it is found that the average of life is,

IN LIVERPOOL, 1840.

Among gentry, professional persons, &c. - - 35 years.

" laborers, mechanics, &c. - - - - 15 "

IN MANCHESTER.

Among gentry, professional persons, &c. - - 38 "

" laborers, mechanics, &c. - - - - 17 "

Thus, in these cities, persons in easy circumstances live, on the average, more than twice as long as the laborer does. In other words, half the laboring population are perpetually killed off, by the influence of the circumstances incident to their present social condition.

And Europeans are dreadfully shocked by infanticide in China!

ble of the down-trodden laborer of Britain.* So, if the comparison did not seem like mockery, I might proceed to show, that, instead of *ten* geese, *two* would now absorb a week's wages; that instead of *a sheep and a half a week*, the laborer must now toil *five weeks* for a *single sheep*; that a day's wages will now purchase, not *eight dozen* of eggs as formerly it would, but *two dozen and a half*; not *eight* pounds of cheese, but *two*; not *five* pounds of butter, but *a pound and a half*. *Four* days' labor will now hardly procure the pair of shoes which a *single day* formerly paid for; and *two* week's labor instead of little more than *one*, would be insufficient in our times, to obtain the material for a winter coat; that is, if a peasant should ever commit the extravagance of purchasing broad-cloth for such a purpose.†

If we assume as correct, Hallam's estimate of the relative value of money, which is, that any given sum in the thirteenth century must be multiplied by twenty-four, in the fourteenth by twenty, and in the fifteenth by sixteen, to bring it to the standard of our day; it will follow, that a common laborer's wages in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were equiv-

* An estimate quoted by the "Westminster Review," on the authority of the "Somerset County Gazette," may here usefully be adduced. It is the literal account of the usual weekly expenses of a family of six, taken from the mouth of an honest and industrious peasant.

	s.	D.
Rent of two rooms and a garden, - - - - -	1	4
Peck of wheat, 2s. Grinding and barm, 2d. - - - - -	2	2
Half a bag of potatoes, - - - - -	2	6
One pound of lard, - - - - -	0	7½
Candles, 1d. Soap, 1d. Salt, ½d. - - - - -	0	2½
Milk, scalded, six pints, - - - - -	0	2
	<hr/>	
Total weekly income and expenditure,	7	0

† The following may be considered average retail prices in England at the present day; wheat, 8 shillings a bushel; beef, six pence half-penny per pound; mutton, seven pence per pound; fat sheep, forty to fifty shillings; butter, ten pence per pound; eggs, six pence a dozen; cheese, seven pence a pound; a fat goose, four shillings. A pair of stout shoes costs at least six to eight shillings; and broadcloth, for a strong, coarse, winter coat, probably sixteen to twenty shillings.

alent to at least *five shillings* of the modern English currency, per day; about *four times* what such a laborer actually receives at present. This tallies with most of the preceding data.

The inference to be adduced from the average of the above items would be, that the British peasant could obtain for his labor, five hundred years ago, about *four* times as much of the necessaries of life as he can to-day.

But as the materials for comparison are scanty, and the estimate rests chiefly on the statutable rate of wages, some deduction may be necessary. Hallam says: "Although these wages are regulated, as a maximum, by acts of parliament, which may naturally be supposed to have had a view rather towards diminishing than enhancing the current rate, I am not fully convinced that they were not beyond it; private accounts, at least, do not always correspond with these statutable prices." And Cullum's estimate we must remember, is for labor in harvest.

To guard against all chance of exaggeration, let us deduct even one-half; and the startling fact still forces itself on our attention, that the working classes employed in tilling the garden soil of Great Britain, receive now, as the price of their toil, but *one-half* as much as their rude ancestors did five centuries ago.*

* It should be remarked, however, that this encroachment on the reward of labor has not, in strictness, been regularly progressive. The documents on the subject that have reached us from the seventeenth century, are particularly meager; but if we may judge from those that are still extant, the price of labor in husbandry was, throughout the greater part of that century, very much depressed; sometimes it would seem nearly, if not quite, as low as it is to-day. Indeed, Barton, the author of an "Inquiry into the Depreciation of Labor," in his table of wages and prices, from near the close of the fifteenth century down to 1813, states it in 1610 at only about three-quarters of a bushel of wheat per week. But this is evidently an error. The average wages of farm laborers during the reign of James I, were four shillings a week and upwards; the price of wheat averaged about four shillings and three pence a bushel from 1606 to 1625; and but three and nine pence from 1625 to 1645; and beef and mutton, at the same time, were from three to four pence a pound. (Wade's Working Classes. p. 66.) Yet even those estimates exhibit a scale of wages about as low as that of the present day.

A circumstance mentioned by Wade, induces one to doubt, however, whether wages, even then, had sunk to their present depression.

I speak here of the wages of farm labor. That the *aggregate* wealth of England has increased, in an accelerating ratio throughout these centuries, everyone knows. That the *average* income of the British population is much higher now than it was five hundred years ago, is equally notorious. A portion of the people have accumulated riches, to an enormous extent, during that period. To employ the words of the present Prime Minister of England, "The higher classes have advanced in luxury beyond measure."* It is a feature the most striking and the most revolting in the present condition of Great Britain, that the magnificence of the rich and the sufferings of the poor, have advanced with steps alike gigantic. The abodes of

Justices of the Peace were empowered to fix the price of labor every Easter and Michaelmas, by proclamation; and in these ratings, about 1610, the magistrates calculated half the day's earnings equivalent to diet for one day. A much greater proportion, as Wade justly remarks, would be required at present.

The same remark is made by Sir Frederick Eden, in his "State of the Poor," vol. 1, p. 148.

In the eighteenth century, the price of labor in husbandry somewhat revived. It is stated by Barton, in the middle of that century, at a bushel and a half of wheat per week. It never, however, again reached, nor indeed approached, the rates of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Barton's table goes back no further than 1495, for which year, he gives the wages of a laboring man as equal to upwards of three bushels of wheat.

* Lord John Russel, in a recent speech in Parliament, says: "If we compare the condition of this country (Great Britain) with what it was a century ago, it is impossible not to see, that, while the higher classes have advanced in luxury beyond measure; while the means available for the diffusion of comfort and the enjoyment of life have prodigiously increased; while, if we look to the middle classes and their means of procuring comfort, they have made a very great advance; if we look to the laboring classes—to the men who either till the soil or labor in the factories—if we look to the quantity of necessaries which their wages would buy in the middle of the last century, and that which they can buy now—I think we must be convinced that they have not participated in an equal degree, in the advantages which civilization and increased knowledge have conferred upon us."

This admission of the British Premier, guarded and qualified though it be, is evidence that the Great Problem has suggested itself for solution, even to the rulers of European monarchies.

her nobility and gentry have assumed the sumptuous character of palaces; but her cottages, smiling once with decent comfort and humble peace, alas for them! Far more strictly now, than in the day they were written, do the words of England's sweetest rural poet apply:

"Along the lawn, where scattered hamlets rose,
Unwieldy wealth and cumbrous pomp repose;
And every want to luxury allied;
And every pang that folly pays to pride.
Those homely joys, that plenty bade to bloom,
Those calm desires, that asked but little room,
Those healthful sports, that graced the peaceful scene,
Lived in each look and brightened all the green,—
These, far departing, seek a kinder shore,
And rural mirth and manners are no more!"

Historical evidence as to the actual condition of the British laborer, proves that there is as much truth as poetry in these lines, and corroborates the calculations I have made regarding wages and their gradual depression. "There is one very unpleasant remark," says Hallam, "which every one who attends to the subject of prices, will be induced to make, that the laboring classes, especially those engaged in agriculture, were better provided with the means of subsistence, in the reign of Edward III, or Henry VI, than at present." Fortescue, Chancellor of England under Henry VI, and writing, therefore, in the fifteenth century, after stating that the English are "rich in all the necessaries or life," and that they "drink no water except at certain times, on a religious score and by way of doing penance," adds :

"They are fed, in great abundance, with all sorts of flesh and fish, of which they have plenty everywhere. They are clothed throughout in good woollens; their bedding and other furniture in their houses are of wool, and that in great store. They are well provided with all sorts of household goods and necessary implements for husbandry. Everyone, according to his rank, hath all things which conduce to make life easy and happy."*

Fortescue's item about "drink no water," which seems to savor of exaggeration, is somewhat amusingly confirmed by

* Difference of limited and absolute Monarchies," p. 19.

White, of Selborne, the Naturalist, who, in his history of his native village, mentions incidentally a record dated about 1380, and stating that certain men, for their disorderly conduct, were punished by being “compelled to fast on bread and beer.” And the industry of Cobbett, who quotes the above anecdote, has also dragged to light a statute of 1533, the preamble to which, after naming the four sorts of meat, “beef, pork, mutton and veal,” adds: “these being the food of the poorer sort.”*

It is true, and should not be forgotten, that our ancestors in the olden time suffered sharply from occasional dearth, or by scarcity caused by improvident consumption. Yet these were the exceptions, not the rule; and they cannot invalidate the direct proofs adduced, that, in the wealthiest and one of the most prosperous nations of the civilized world, the REWARD OF LABOR to the producer of wealth has, as a general rule, for five centuries past, BEEN GRADUALLY DIMINISHING FROM AGE TO AGE. It has at last sunk down to a point, at which, to employ the words of the Westminster Review, “there is not a step, but simply a handbreadth between the condition of the agricultural laborer and pauperism.” Comfort has disappeared. Famine watches by the door. The peasant feeds his family on potatoes and salt, with a little bread and lard, and a miserable dole of scalded milk. Incessant labor keeps his head just above the rising waters of indigence; and, at the first trifling accident, these close and overwhelm him. For the thousand casualties of life, there is not the scantiest provision. The indisposition of a day curtails the meager rations dealt out around his board, and the sickness of a week threatens with starvation his wife and her little ones.

If we look to one portion of the British Islands, more dark, more utterly hopeless yet, is the picture to be drawn. Talk of war and its horrors! War is mild and merciful, its sufferings and hardships are but as dust in the balance, compared with the fearful blight that has fallen, in time of peace, on Ireland. For every American that has died by disease or in battle, since the struggle with Mexico commenced, ten—ay, more likely twenty—Irish have perished in the same period, not by a death of violence alone—by slow, protracted torture!*

* 24th Henry VIII, chap 3.

Do you recollect that terrible story of the tyrant of Pisa?—of that Ugolino, whose fate has supplied theme for the painter and the poet, has been sung by Chaucer and by Dante? how he, and his sons, and his grandsons, were shut up in a lonely tower, all food denied, the key of his dungeon turned by inexorable hands and cast into the waters of the Arno? how father and children were left there miserably to perish, their cries unheard, their sins unshriven! and how, as the historian has left it on record, “thenceforth the tower was called the tower of famine, and thence shall ever be?” †

The tower of famine!—What shall Ireland be called? A punishment so horrible, that the whole civilized world would revolt against its infliction on the vilest criminal—on the wretch reeking from a hundred murders; on the parricide—that punishment devised by the ingenuity of Italian revenge to pay back the cruelties of a life-time—the punishment of Ugolino, to see expire in torments, before his eyes, the children of his love, even while he struggled himself in the last agonies of starvation;—that punishment of horror was endured last year in that doomed island, not by thousands—by *tens* of thousands of men, of women, without a crime, without a cause of offence!

The recognition of these terrible truths is the first step in the approach to the statement of the problem I refer to. A civilized nation cannot afford bread and meat to the men who produce these! And what nation! A nation restricted, indeed, in her territory at home, yet possessed of colonies and dependencies, some of vast extent, in every part of the habitable globe; a nation whose proud boast it is, that the sun never sets on her island flag; a nation proverbial for an industry that

* The exact number of deaths attributable to the late famine in Ireland, it must, of course, be very difficult to obtain. Mr. H. Grattan recently stated, in his place in Parliament, that “*one hundred and fifteen thousand nine hundred and twenty-nine* persons had died *for want of food* in Ireland, during the late famine.” How many perished by fevers and other diseases, caused by unwholesome or insufficient nourishment, God alone knows. Lord Fitzwilliam stated, in Parliament, that at least two millions of people would require relief this winter.

The famine of last year cost the British Government forty millions of dollars.

† G. Villani, c. 127.

never tires, a vigilance that never sleeps, an energy and an enterprize that have carried her arms and her commerce to the farthest ends of the earth. That nation which now looks on and declares that she cannot rescue her own peasantry from famine, maintained, not half a century since, a triumphant war against the Cæsar of modern times, with half Europe at his back; poured forth, for ten successive years, men and treasure with a profusion that confounded her enemies and astonished even herself; and rising in strength and resources with the occasion, obtained from her own subjects alone, without an effort, in the very last year of that protracted struggle, a sum so vast, that it would purchase, out and out, the fee simple of some half a dozen among the States that compose our own Confederacy.* It is in the favorite abode of art and of practical

* The exertions made by England during the last three-quarters of a century, in carrying on her wars, would be incredible, were they not avouched by official documents. Colquhoun, in his "Resources of the British Empire," published in 1814, has collected and collated these. They form the foundation of the following details: In 1782, at the close of our revolutionary war, England's debt had increased to twelve hundred millions of dollars. Statesmen trembled at the amount; a gloom overspread the country; consols fell, in August, 1784, to *fifty-four*; and the nation seemed on the verge of bankruptcy.

Yet, in 1793, when the French revolutionary war began, England had already taken breath; in an eight years' struggle against republican principles and revolutionary excesses, she lavished upwards of a thousand millions of dollars; and found herself, in 1801, notwithstanding the alleviation promised by Pitt's sinking fund, and the enormous sums exacted by his thousand taxes, loaded with a debt that exceeded two thousand millions of dollars. Yet, after two brief years' interval of peace, England again, in 1803, rushed into a war with Bonaparte and Europe. Great as had been the preceding expenditures, they were cast into the shade by those of this memorable contest. The average taxes levied in the British Isles, from 1803 to 1803, reached nearly three hundred millions of dollars annually; and the amount borrowed in addition averaged over a hundred and fifty millions a year more. As the wars advanced, the expenditures increased. In the year 1813, the net amount realized by taxation was £ 64,979,960, to which seven per cent. must be added for expenses of collection.—Colquhoun, page 198. The loan obtained in that year amounted to £ 64,755,700,

science, in the land where Watt, and Arkwright, and Bolton, first furnished inanimate slaves to mankind; it is there, where the magical machinery of the age more than realizes the story of Aladdin's fabled lamp, and gorges, at its master's bidding, one after another, the markets of the civilized world; it is there, in the very midst of superabundance, with complaints of over-production daily ringing in their ears, that thousands and tens of thousands, among those who create these countless riches, are denied the means to procure the coarsest clothing against the wintry blast, or a single blanket to cover the rude straw bed on which their weary limbs repose!

Nor is this, even, the most startling phase of the marvelous anomaly. England, at the close of a contest unexampled in the history of mankind, was no whit exhausted. The horse-leech cried give! give! and still prompt answer was made to the call. The last year's enormous loan (that of 1813) was negotiated from the surplus of her own citizens alone,* voluntarily seeking investment, without the slightest difficulty. British industry but demanded a market—something to consume, something to destroy, something to swallow up the prodigious resources that flowed forth from her mines and her factories, her workshops and her shipyards; and, fast as one pile of wealth disappeared in the chasm, another sprung up to supply its place. War answered the purpose passing well; but any other popular Moloch of destruction would have produced a similar effect. Had some huge Polyphemus of the deep, prowling around the island, watched her armaments as they put out from port, and, wading after them, had sunk the vessels, and devoured seamen and soldiers as they swam to land, England would have been as rich, except in unproductive glory and bootless ardor, as when the same death and destruction were dealt forth on the battlefield or in the naval action, according to the most approved

"which was negotiated," says Colquhoun, "without any difficulty —p. 275. The two sums united and reduced to dollars, give a total of Dearly *six hundred and thirty-nine millions*, as Britain's public expenditure during a single year!

*Out of a debt of £ 706,000,000, in 1813, about seventeen millions only (less than one-fortieth of the whole) was owned by foreigners.—Colquhoun, page 295.

system of warlike tactics. Destruction, in some shape, was required. There was too much labor; laborers must die: there was over-production; products must be got rid of. An insatiable customer must be had; and such a customer was war to England. While that customer lived, all went well in the island workshop. Trade thrived, manufactures flourished, agriculture prospered, commerce brought rich returns. But when the curse of peace fell on the bustling land, the glory departed from her. When there was nothing to squander military stores and munitions, to wear out swords, and muskets, and cannon, to burn powder and scatter bullets and balls—when half the army were disbanded, to produce instead of destroying—England sank under the reverse. Her powers were there; but there was no call for them; her energies, but whither should they turn? her capital, but where might it be profitably invested? Her laborers were as willing as ever to toil on; but the disbanded warriors, formerly the customers of labor, now became its competitors. There were more hands to work, and there was less work to do. *Wages fell.*

And if England had never incurred her debt of three or four thousand millions at all—if some powerful and malignant spirit of the air had furnished to her, year by year, the gold that purchased waste of human life and of human property, yet so strangely are the elements of good and evil commingled in these modern days, that one scruples to decide whether, in that case, the situation of the British laborer would have been materially better to-day. The market of war would equally have been closed; disbanded soldiers would equally have sought employment; yes! and even if the debt were cancelled to-morrow by the dash of a pen, although the taxes would indeed be lighter, yet those who now live by those taxes, the great army of fund-holders, disbanded also and cast loose, like their kindred consumers, from the ranks of war, to do something useful for a livelihood, would, like them, become competitors in the market of labor, and, like them, underbidding each other, might still depress, to a lower depth, the poor pittance that goes by the name of wages to the work-people of England. Nay, the very reduction of taxes would be the all-sufficient plea for the reduction of these wages. Labor could be *afforded* for less. And down to the very point at

which it can be afforded—which means to that point on the road to famine, at which men are not starved suddenly, but die slowly of toil inadequately sustained by scanty and unwholesome food—down to that point of bare subsistence, the laborer of Britain is thrust. How? Why? Wherefore? By what legerdemain of cruelty and injustice?

Here, then, our problem begins to loom upon us through the distance. Why, as the world advances, do the prospects and the comforts of the great mass of mankind darken and decline? How happens it that four or five centuries have passed over Britain, bringing peace where raged feuds and forays, affording protection to person and property, setting free the shackled press, spreading intelligence and liberality, reforming religion and fostering civilization—say! ye who would solve the mystery of the age, how happens it that these centuries of improvement have left the British laborer three-fold more the slave of toil than they found him?

If the spirits of the departed might revisit this earth, ere while the scene of their joys and their sufferings, with what feelings would the bold and sturdy peasant, once the pride of “merrie England,” look down upon his pale and toil-worn descendant of the present day? with what emotions, mingled of wonder and of grief, would he regard the changed aspect of his native home! its marvels, of more than fairy-land! the storm’s wildest elements tamed down to man’s service; invisible and imponderable agents trained to do his daily bidding; steam hurrying his person over the earth; the lightning bearing his messages! And from these and ten thousand other bewildering wonders he might turn—

—And his descendant, the living agent in this new world of enchantment, what of him? If the dead could speak, well might his forefather demand: “Where is thy gain in all this? What is thy share from out these countless improvements? Answer!”—

What shall he answer? Poor laws and vagrant acts—the very terms unknown to his ancestor!—the famine fever and a pauper’s grave! *

* From the year 1388 to the year 1530, there appears to have been no legislation whatever, in Great Britain, respecting the maintenance of vagrants and beggars.—*Reeve’s History of English Law, vol. iii.,*

But it is to the cold decree of judgment, not to the impulse of feeling, I would submit this question. Nor has it yet been stated in all its force. There is one item just alluded to, that must be brought forward, in authentic shape, to the foreground.

It relates to the new powers of producing wealth brought into operation within the last century.

When England's statesmen and capitalists sat down, in 1813, to reflect that their island, with a population of seventeen millions, had actually produced and expended, in a ten years' war, some TWO THOUSAND MILLIONS OF DOLLARS, over and above her former extravagant peace establishment,—a sum raised without the aid of foreign capitalists, and demanding an exertion to which the annals of the world furnish no parallel; * and when they saw the elastic energies of the nation still rising to

p. 171; *vol. iv.*, p. 225. The poor law system was first rendered secure and permanent by the famous statute of 43d, Elizabeth, ch. 2, (that is, in 1601.) At this day, *one in every ten* of the inhabitants of Great Britain is a pauper, receiving parish relief. Witness the following:

“In our manufacturing counties every *eleventh* inhabitant, and in our agricultural counties every *eighth* inhabitant, is a pauper receiving parish relief. This, however, by no means represents the whole amount of suffering. The horror of being branded as a pauper is so prevalent among the industrial population, *that thousands prefer death by gradual starvation, to placing themselves on the parish funds.*”—*Report of Liverpool Branch of Anti-Corn Law league, 1833.*

Dr. Alison, of Edinburgh, stated, at the meeting of the British Association held in Manchester in 1842, before the statistical section, that in that capital of 137,000 inhabitants there were actually not less than 23,000 persons (one in six) “in a state of utter destitution.”

* Colquhoun gives the following as the expense of England's Wars since 1775. The average each year during the American war, was £ 17,395,480; during each year of the French revolutionary war, it was £ 33,470,857; and during each year of the war against Bonaparte, the average rose to £ 50,416,813; *in all cases deducting the peace establishment.*—p. 197. The same writer says of the two last wars, that they “occasioned an expenditure, which in point of magnitude and extent, exceeds anything that history records.—p. 252.

Great Britain's entire public expenditure, during the wars of 1803–13, including the peace establishment, averaged about four

meet the emergency, fresh capital eagerly offered on loan, and increasing riches and resources flowing in, to fill the enormous chasms yearly made by wealth-absorbing war,—their wonder exceeded even their self-gratulation. The only plausible solution of the problem seemed to lie in the marvelous powers of production recently obtained from labor-saving machinery. And accordingly the extent of these powers became an interesting subject of inquiry.

It was a great era in the history of the world, the accession of George III to the throne of Great Britain. That weak monarch witnessed the commencement of changes that are destined to work an entire revolution, not of dynasties, nor merely of forms of government, but a complete revolution in the social condition of the masses of mankind. In 1760 he became king; in 1764 Watt commenced his improvements on the steam engine; in 1767 Hargraves invented the spinning jenny; and in 1769 Arkwright obtained his first patent for spinning with rollers. The impulse was given; science and enterprise were engaged; and, wave after wave, the vast tide of improvement has since unceasingly rolled on.

The amount of labor which is saved to man by the various mechanical inventions which have since accumulated in Great Britain, is estimated by political economists at an amount equal to the manual labor of from *four hundred millions to eight*

hundred and fifty millions of dollars annually, thus reaching four thousand five hundred millions in the ten years; *an amount probably equal to the entire property, real and personal, now owned within the United States.* The average wealth in Massachusetts is about \$ 350 per individual; in Indiana, about \$ 150; suppose the average between these two States to be the average wealth throughout the United States, (which may be near the truth,) then \$ 250 is the average for each man, woman, and child, throughout the Union. Multiplied by eighteen millions, we have \$ 4,500,000,000 as the aggregate private property of the United States. Colquhoun states the population of Great Britain and Ireland, in 1811, at 17,096,803 persons, (p. 66.) somewhat less than that of the United States today. The entire property, real and personal, owned in Great Britain and Ireland, at the present day, is estimated at *ten thousand five hundred and sixty millions* of dollars.—*Lowe's Present State of England*; appendix to chap. viii: (the pound sterling converted into dollars at \$4.80.)

hundred millions of working adults.* It is beyond the scope of this address fully to investigate which of these calculations the nearer approaches the truth; but a few particulars of the estimate may be useful and interesting.

In M'Culloch's "Statistics of the British Empire," published in 1837, under the superintendence of the "Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge," are given many details regarding the growth of the cotton manufacture. From a recent writer on the subject, who describes the arrangements of a cotton mill, McCulloch quotes as follows :

"The operations are numerous, and every one of them is performed by machinery, without the help of human hands, except merely in transferring the material from one machine to another. It is by iron fingers, teeth and wheels; moving with exhaustless energy and devouring speed, that the cotton is opened, cleaned, spread, carded, drawn, roved, spun, wound, warped, dressed, and woven. The various machines are proportioned to each other in regard to the capability of their work, and are so placed in the mill, as to allow the material to be car-

* Mr. J. Q. Adams, in his report from the Committee on Manufactures made to Congress in 1832, estimated, that at the conclusion of the war in 1815, the mechanical inventions in Great Britain were equivalent to the manual labor of two hundred millions of persons.

There has, since then, been a vast increase of productive power. Gaskell, speaking of the influence of machinery on human labor, after stating that wages of operatives, during the last quarter of a century, had not materially varied, adds somewhat vaguely, on the authority of Marshall, "the astounding fact, that the same quantity of work is now performed for *one shilling and ten pence*, for which *sixteen shillings* were paid in 1814."—*Gaskell's Manufacturing Population*, p. 330.

It is not only the introduction of new machines that tends to abridge human labor, but also, and to a great extent, the gradual perfecting of those already introduced. Babbage, in his *Economy of Manufactures*, records the fact, that the machine used in the manufacture of cotton, called a "stretcher," and worked by one man, produced, in the year 1810, four hundred pounds of spun cotton, and in 1832, twelve hundred pounds. "In this instance," says Babbage, "production has gradually increased until, at the end of 22 years, three times as much work is done as at the commencement, although the manual labor remains the same."—*Economy of Manufactures*, p. 338.

ried from stage to stage, with the least possible loss of time. All are moving at once, the operations chasing each other; and all derive their motions from the mighty engine, which, firmly seated in the lower part of the building, and constantly fed with water and fuel, toils through the day with the strength of perhaps a hundred horses. Men, in the meantime, have merely to attend upon this wonderful mechanism, to supply it with work, to oil its joints, and to check its slight and infrequent irregularities; each workman performing, or rather superintending, as much work as could have been done by two hundred or three hundred men, sixty years ago."*

Kennedy, also quoted by McCulloch, stated in 1815, since which time numerous and highly important improvements have been made, that the machines amounted to this, that the labor of one person, aided by them, can now produce as much yarn as two hundred could have produced fifty years ago.†

Farey, in his "Treatise on the Steam Engine," says: "An extensive cotton mill is a striking instance of the application of the greatest powers to perform a prodigious quantity of light and easy work. A steam engine of a hundred horse power, which has the strength of eight hundred and eighty men, gives a rapid motion to fifty thousand spindles to spin fine cotton thread. *Seven hundred and fifty* men are sufficient to attend all the operations of such a cotton mill; and by the assistance of the steam engine, they will be enabled to spin as much thread as *two hundred thousand* men could do without machinery." One man then, in a cotton factory, according to Farey's calculation, produces, on the average, as much as *two hundred and sixty-six* formerly did.

A work published in 1843, by W. C. Taylor, D. D., on the "Cotton manufacture of Great Britain," says: "Machines now enable one man to produce as much yarn as three hundred could produce at the accession of George III."

Dr. Taylor sets down as the wages of "operatives in cotton factories," in 1843, 8,659,000 pounds sterling annually, and estimates these wages to average from eight to ten shillings a week. This would give us upwards of three hundred

* Baine's "Cotton Manufacture," p. 243.

† Kennedy's "Rise and Progress of the Cotton Trade."

thousand operatives; with which the actual returns by the census of 1841, published in 1844, agree. The Parliamentary "Occupation Abstract" from that census gives us 302,276 operatives as known to be employed, in the cotton factories of Great Britain. Of these, a little less than two-thirds may be put down as employed in spinning mills;* say two hundred thousand. Multiply two hundred thousand by two hundred and fifty, the lowest of the above estimates of the power imparted to each of the above operatives by machinery at the present day, and we find that the cotton spinning factories of Great Britain alone turn out an amount of work, which would have required, less than ninety years ago, the labor of fifty millions of adults to perform! †

And yet cotton spinning is but one branch of a single manufacture, however important. In regard to another branch, and a very important one, Dr. Taylor says: "Machines enable one man and one boy to print as many goods, as a hundred men and a hundred boys could have printed at the accession of George III." The entire number of operatives actually engaged in the various branches connected with the manufacture and preparation of cotton fabrics, is rated at eight hundred thou-

* By actual returns made to the "Factory Commissioners," in 1833, of 67,819 persons engaged in preparing and spinning cotton, there were 42,401 engaged in the spinning department, 23,920 in the weaving department, and 1,498, as engineers, mechanics, &c.—*Sup. Rep. of Factory Commissioners*, pp. 123, 124, 136.

† This amount tallies very nearly with an estimate made by Baines, in 1833. He says: "The 150,000 workmen in the spinning mills produce as much yarn as could have been produced by *forty millions* with the one-thread wheel."—*Baines' Cotton Manufacture*, p. 362.

The rate of increase for ten years, from 1831 to 1841, in the population of Great Britain, was, by the census returns; in the department of trade, commerce and manufactures, about fifteen and a third per cent; in fifteen years, then, from 1833 to 1848, it may be taken at twenty-three per cent. Then suppose no increase in the productive power of cotton machinery in that period, the increase of operatives alone would raise the amount of power in 1848, to upwards of *forty-nine millions*.

† McCulloch, in his "Dictionary of Commerce," article "Cotton," sets down "eight hundred thousand as the total number of persons

sand.‡ Then, there are the linen, the silk, and the woollen manufactures, employing between seven and eight hundred thousand work-people;* and all aided by machinery somewhat similar to that employed in the cotton manufacture. When, in addition, we reflect, that there is hardly a department of industry, in which the power of steam or the aid of ingenious mechanism abridging human labor, has not been adopted; nay, that such Improvements have extended even to agriculture,† we shall hardly resist the conclusion, that when considered equal to the labor of *four hundred millions* of adults, the mechanical powers of production obtained by Great Britain during the last century, are not extravagantly rated.

Yet, to cover all inaccuracies, or over estimates, which may be imagined to have crept into a calculation, in regard to which we have not the data necessary for entire precision, let us abate, by one-half, the above result. Suppose the powers in question equal to the labor of two hundred millions only—but four times the amount estimated to be gained in the spinning of cot-

directly employed in the different departments of the manufacture."—*Dict. Commerce*, p. 443.

With this calculation, that of Baines agrees. He asserts, "that the number of persons directly employed in the manufacture (of cotton) with those dependent on them for subsistence, must amount to *fifteen hundred thousand*."—*Baines' Hist. of Cotton Manufacture*, p. 413.

But the actual returns from manufacturing districts show, that out of any given population, wholly supported by cotton factory labor, a little more than one-half are actual operatives. Baines' calculation of the operatives engaged in spinning, weaving, lace-making, embroidery, hosiery and calico printing, is, for Great Britain, upwards of seven hundred thousand; (page 396); and he expressly states, that the bleachers, dyers, calanderers, sizers, and a numerous list of other incidental branches are not included.

* Woolen, about 350,000; Silk, over 200,000; Linen, nearly 200,000.

† The threshing machine is well known; and a recent English writer on the influence of machinery, mentions a peculiarly constructed plough, lately brought into use for ploughing up potatoes, by which "one man and one horse get through as much work as would, a few years ago, have required at least thirty laborers."—Gaskell's "*Manufacturing Population of England*," p. 340.

ton alone—still, how passing marvelous in connexion with the present condition of labor, are the corollaries from that fact!

The population of Great Britain (not including Ireland) by the Census of 1841, was upwards of Eighteen Millions and three-quarters. Suppose it twenty millions to-day. The proportion of families, in that Island, wholly unemployed, is estimated at over one-fifth of the entire population;* and if to this we add the distributors of wealth, it will leave but two-thirds of the inhabitants; less than thirteen millions and a half. Of these, little more than one-third are actual laborers; say, however, *five millions*. Now, in aid of the manual labor of these five millions of human workmen, Great Britain may be said to have imported, from the vast regions of invention, two hundred millions of powerful and passive slaves; slaves that consume neither food nor clothing; slaves that sleep not, weary not, sicken not; gigantic slaves, that drain subterranean lakes, in their master's service, or set in motion, at a touch from his hand, machinery, under which the huge and solid buildings that contain it, groan and shake; ingenious slaves, that out-rival, in the delicacy of their operations, the touch of man, and put to shame the best exertions of his steadiness and accuracy: yet slaves, patient, submissive, obedient; from whom no rebellion need be feared; who cannot suffer cruelty nor experience pain.

These unwearied and inanimate slaves outnumber the human laborers who direct their operations, as *forty to one*. What has been the result of this importation?

If we shut our closet doors, and refuse to take the answer from the state of things as it actually exists, we shall say, that aid, thus sent down from Heaven as it were, to stand by and assist man in his severest toils, must have rendered him easy in his circumstances, rich in all the necessaries and comforts of life, a master instead of a slave, a being with leisure for enjoyment and improvement, a freeman, delivered from the original curse which declared that in the sweat of his brow should man eat bread, all the days of his life. But if, rejecting mere inference, we step out into the world, with our eyes open and our sympathies awake, then we may begin to feel with the British peasant, when he burns up threshing machines, and to comprehend, why the barber of Preston was driven from

* Colquhoun, p. 109. Wade's "Working Classes," p. 549.

Lancashire, by fear of violence from those who earned a living by the old mode of spinning.*

We shall see, throughout the old world, the new servants competing with those they might be made to serve. We shall see a contest going on in the market of labor, between wood and iron on the one hand, and human thews and sinews on the other; a dreadful contest, at which humanity shudders, and reason turns, astonished, away!

We shall see masters engaging, as the cheapest, most docile and least troublesome help, the machine instead of the man.† And we shall see the man, thus denied even the privilege to toil, shrink home, with sickening heart, to the cellar where his wife and children herd, and sink down on its damp floor, to ask of his despair, where these things shall end? whether the soulless slaves, bred year by year from the teeming womb of science, shall, in very deed, surely and silently thrust aside, into idleness and starvation, their human competitors, until, like other extinct races of animals, the laborer perish from the earth!

Here, then, is another phase of the mysterious anomaly of our day. Mechanical improvements, inevitable even if they were mischievous, and in themselves a rich blessing as surely as they are inevitable—are becoming, by some strange perversion of their use, a cruel and deadly curse. They stand in array over against the laborer, instead of toiling by his side. They overstock the market; prices decline; that lowers profits; and these, in their fall, bring down wages with them.

And yet, will any man, who stands on his reputation for sanity, affirm, that the *necessary* result of over-production is famine? that because labor produces more than even luxury

* Arkwright. In Hargraves' case it went farther than mere threats. "Hargraves for some time kept his invention secret, using his jenny only to obtain weft for his own loom. The vanity of his wife induced her to betray the secret; the neighboring spinners were alarmed; they feared that such an invention would deprive them of employment; a mob assembled, forced Hargraves' house, broke his machinery to pieces, and menaced his life. He removed to Nottingham."—*Taylor's Hand Book of Silk, &c.*, p. 117.

† "The self-acting *mule* has the important advantage of rendering the mill owners independent of the combinations and strikes of the working spinners."—*Baines' "Cotton Manufacture,"* p. 207.

can waste, labor shall not have bread to eat? If we can imagine a point in the progress of improvement, at which ALL the necessities and comforts of life shall be produced without human labor, are we to suppose that the human laborer, when that point is reached, is to be dismissed by his masters from their employment?—to be told that he is now a useless incumbrance, which they cannot afford to hire? But no such point can ever be reached. Very true . . . Yet, as the asymptote to the hyperbola, we are ever approaching it. And if such a result seem flagrantly absurd in the extreme, it is actually experienced in the degree. Men *are* told, that machines have filled their places, and that their services are no longer required.

For a time, indeed, even the vast machinery of England increased, instead of diminishing, the demands for labor. Rapidly as accumulated the supply, still more rapidly increased the demand. England manufactured for half the world; and thus employed both the living laborer and the inanimate slave. But other countries—our own especially—have learned to manufacture for themselves; England's market is curtailed; the English employer must abridge his production by hiring less labor. The living laborer—the expensive one, who eats and drinks and wears, is dismissed. The country, as a writer in a leading London Review has it, is “embarrassed with a superfluity of animal machines.”* Unemployed operatives crowd the market-places and swarm in the streets. And as it will not do, now-a-days, to put these superfluous vagrants to death, as the Spartans did their Helots when they became inconveniently numerous; and as gradual starvation is very horrible, besides being slow in its effects; it has occurred to British statesmen to propose, as a last resort, a pre-

* A writer in the London Quarterly, quoted by Gaskell, says: “We have arrived at a great and most important crisis of social arrangement. We are embarrassed with a superfluity of human labor, of animal machines, which cannot be absorbed in manufacturing operations. What is to be done with this superfluous, or rather disposable fund of human physical power? Shall these men be compelled to eke out a miserable existence, with half employment and scanty wages? or shall they be thrown upon their respective parishes for eleemosynary relief?”—*Gaskell's Manufacturing Population*, p. 338.

mium on emigration. The men cannot be used, therefore they must be got rid of. * To send off the machines might equally answer the case. But what business man would think of such a proceeding? The cheaper and more manageable agent must, of course, be retained.

And to this, human labor is reduced!—to be cast out as a nuisance; to be driven forth, as they send felons to convict colonies!—human labor, from which, in one shape or other, the world receives every thing of good, of useful, of beautiful, that charms the senses or ministers to the wants—to which we owe life and all that makes life desirable;—labor, without which, to give substance and healthy vigor to the character, man is but a fopling, and woman a butterfly! Shall men worship wealth, and yet despise and thrust from them its creator? It has been sometimes said, with much truth, that the grade of true civilization in any nation, may be measured by the position which woman attains in its social circles. A test yet stricter, perhaps, is the degree of estimation in which labor is held there. It is a good sign of a country, when its poets put forth such noble lyrics as that of which these are the concluding stanzas:

Labor is rest—from the sorrows that greet us,
Rest, from all petty vexations that meet us,
Rest, from sin-promptings that ever entreat us,
Rest, from world-sirens, that lure us to ill.
Work—and pure slumbers shall wait on thy pillow;
Work—thou shall ride over Care's coming billow;
Lie not down wearied 'neath Wo's weeping willow;
Work with a stout heart and resolute will.

* British statesmen calculate, with the utmost coolness, to what extent the market is glutted with labor. The permanent surplus of laboring people, in Ireland, is officially estimated at *one-fifth* of the entire population.—*Parliamentary papers*, vol. viii., p. 4; *Sess.* 1830. Ensor calculates it at one-fourth.

In the British House of Commons, Mr. Charles Buller gave notice of a motion for March 14, 1843, “to move the resolutions on the necessity of extensive and systematic colonization, with a view of bettering the condition of the people.”

Droop not though shame, sin and anguish are round thee!
 Bravely fling off the cold chain that hath bound thee!
 Look to yon pure Heaven smiling beyond thee!
 Rest not content in thy darkness—a clod!
 Work—for some good—be it ever so slowly!
 Cherish some flower—be it ever so lowly!
 Labor! All labor is noble and holy!
 Let thy great deeds be thy praise to thy God! *

It is a source of encouragement to the friend of his species, that such sentiments are spreading, slowly but surely, throughout the world. They are spreading in the Old World, as well as here in the New. In proof, let me read to you the following from the pen of one who seems, more than any other of England's modern economists, to have written in behalf of the people:

“There is truly no commodity—if so disparaging an epithet may be applied to Nature's noblest production—so precious as man. Even an untutored Indian from the plains of Africa will fetch a hundred pounds in the slave-market of America; but how much more valuable were a civilized, instructed and indefatigable European? Yet see how he is depreciated! We give nothing for an article with which we are abundantly supplied; not even for air and water, though indispensable to support life. But an Englishman has become less valuable than either element; he is not only without price, but is actually become what algebraists call a negative quantity; something worth less than nothing; and a premium has positively been offered for his expatriation!” †

Do we thank God, that such reasoning applies not to our case?—that we are not as other nations, or even as king-ridden England? Do we point to our sparse population, to our wide-spreading domain? There is, indeed, an element of vast importance in our social condition, that distinguishes, and must long continue to distinguish us from the old world. There, the earth is no longer the heritage of her children—of *all* her children.‡

* “Labor,” by Mrs. Frances S. Osgood; originally published in the “Democratic Review.”

† Wade's “History of the Middle and Working Classes,” pp. 93, 94.

‡ Daniel O'Conner and the “League” estimate the proprietors of

To the favored of birth or of fortune, the children of preference—to them the earth and all her fruits belong. The millions come into a world that is already appropriated, where there is no spot they can call their own; no, not so much as that narrow dwelling-place, where, after the toils of a weary life-time, they are laid to rest at last!

But, in our land, there is an alternative, when the terms of the employer become oppressive to the employed. Here there is always, for the white man, escape from a master's tyranny. When, in the older States, wages no longer furnish comfort, there is room, and to spare, here, in the wide and ever extending West. The earth, that yields her fruit alike to the poor and the rich, is not yet monopolised among us; is not yet denied to him, who would seek, in her bosom, a plain but independent support. Our statesmen have not yet learned the doctrine, avowed by certain European economists, that a man born into a world already occupied and overstocked with labor, has no RIGHT to claim food; that such an one is a being superfluous on the earth, and for whom, at the great banquet of Nature, there is no place to be found.*

land, in Ireland, at ten thousand. If we set down the population of that island at eight millions, it results that seven hundred and ninety-nine persons out of every eight hundred, own no portion whatever of her soil.

By the census of 1831, the population of Ireland was 7,767,401. As to the number of proprietors of land in England, I can find no authentic information. The following paragraph recently appeared in the New York Tribune; but I know not whence the estimate is taken, nor how far it may be depended on:

“The author of a pamphlet recently published in England, states, that the soil of that country, which, in the year 1775, belonged to about 240,000 proprietors, in the year 1815, was owned by 30,000 only; and that there is every reason to believe, that this process of accumulation in the hands of a few has been going on progressively since 1815.”

If this statement may be trusted, things in England must be rapidly hastening to a crisis.

* A French historian has distinguished the true principle: “Avant toutes les lois sociales, l'homme avoit le droit de subsister.”—*Raynal. Hist. des Indes, vol. x, p. 322.*

One portion of mankind have no right to make laws, or uphold institutions, by which another portion, who are willing to labor, are shut out from the means of subsistence.

To the existence of a vast, unoccupied domain, in market at a low rate, more than to any other circumstance, is it due, that labor, in these states, is a commodity, for which the demand, as a general rule, as yet exceeds the supply. An American, to use the language of the British author, is still a positive quantity. As a farm laborer, his wages will obtain for him as much, or more, than the British laborer earned, five hundred years ago; here, in the West, from four to six bushels of wheat per week.

And yet it is an enquiry of deep interest, though it be not of pressing necessity, whether the same causes are not silently at work here, that have brought about so fatal a result in the older country.

The day is indeed distant, when emigration, or speculation, or both, shall have absorbed our vacant lands. But that day must come, at last. And long before it comes, yes, even now while I speak, while our nation is yet in what Adam Smith calls, the progressive state, are not a thousand influences rife and active here, that have elsewhere trodden down labor to the earth? Is not the laborer here, as in Great Britain, a “commodity,” bid for in the market, as wheat or cotton is; of much value, if very scarce; commanding less wages, as population gradually fills up the market of labor, and appropriates the region of vacant land; and thus liable to become, as in England, a negative quality, a wanderer begging for toil, whenever any causes combine to surfeit the markets that are open to the produce of his labor? If his exertions increase, may not the ultimate reward of increased exertion, in his children’s days, if not in his own, be an amount of production that will deprive the producer of employment? If he obey the command to increase and multiply, does not growing population tend to the same result? If the inventive genius of America, no whit behind that of Europe, brings into being machine after machine, to perform the labor, and to take the place of man, is not the laborer, here as in England, thereby liable, at last, to be crowded out of the permission to work for his daily bread? Is it not here, as in older States, a condition under which alone labor is assured of a fair reward, that there shall not be *too much labor*? And is it not the direct tendency of invention and of population, to violate that condition? But is there any reason, *in the nature of things*, why its violation should produce other than the most cheering and de-

sirable results—leisure, comfort, assured competence, independence and social equality? Can there be any reason, other than one artificial and arbitrary, why the producers of the necessaries and comforts of life should then only be secure of their portion of those necessaries and comforts, when the world is *not overstocked with these*? As rationally might we decide, that when a huge goblet of water stands before a man fainting with thirst, he shall not be suffered to put his parched lips to the crystal liquid at all, because he cannot drain the vessel of its contents to the last drop.

It is not the question, whether the evil day is upon us; but whether time, in its ceaseless flight, will see us run the same course, reach the same goal, as other and older States have reached before us. Take New England, with her busy operatives and her splendid machinery. Close to her population the safety-valve of the public lands. Decree, that when her work-people feel the iron hand of competition pressing too harshly upon them, they shall not be allowed to escape to the free woods and rich lands of the Far West. And what assurance should we have, that in Lowell, and Lynn, and Salem, the same scenes would not soon be reproduced that now win our sympathy for the oppressed laborer of Britain?

And then, too, if there be one element of safety, in our particular case; that refuge, namely, which labor finds in the unappropriated lands of the new States; there is an element of danger also, peculiarly our own. There are to be found, in the American market of labor, not alone the inanimate powers of mechanism, but also living machines, recognized by law as property, and whose services can be commanded by their owners, at the cost of maintenance alone. Is it a thing so very certain, that the capital and the skill and the industry now concentrated in manufacturing enterprise, chiefly in the Northern States, may not, hereafter, find profitable field and safe investment in the South? It is but a few months since, that, in the capital of South Carolina, a Cotton Manufacturing Company was organized; and, on laying the corner-stone of their building, the occasion was improved, to deliver to a numerous and influential audience, an Address, in which the speaker confidently predicted, that the South, ever distinguished on the battle-field, was about to enter on a new contest, with the North

and with England; a “strife for manufacturing pre-eminence, for commercial glory.” “That beginning,” he said, “ was but the prelude to great success; to changes, that should convert dilapidated hovels into handsome streets, and cause those who now suffer in poverty to rejoice in comfort.” “Then,” —the orator concluded—“then will this corner-stone be regarded with greater pride than the most splendid obelisk, and held in higher honor than lofty temples or triumphal arches.”

Are you quite sure, that this is but an idle boast? The operations now performed by factory workers are chiefly of a simple and mechanical kind, demanding no special exertion of intellect. A Southern slave of ordinary intelligence can readily be taught to perform them. Slave labor, in many portions of the South, is becoming, as at present directed, daily less profitable to the master. Are you quite sure that the sharp spur of self-interest will not urge it in a new direction? nay, that the “strife for manufacturing preeminence” has not in very deed commenced? And if it has—if it is to produce vast combinations of animate and inanimate machines, coming into direct competition with labor in the Northern market,—then will the American statesman have to deal with a new element in our social condition. Who shall predict its gradual influence? or its ultimate results?

But, in truth, the subject of which I have sketched, briefly and very imperfectly, some of the bearings to-night, is one that rises far above all sectional, all local, even all merely national considerations. It is a world-wide subject; it involves questions having interest and application, wherever man lives and labors. As such, the friend of his kind will regard it and examine it with deep interest; no matter whether he be a subject of some of those old monarchies, now in the waning term of their existence, and reaping in age the bitter fruit of early errors; or a citizen of this vigorous Republic, yet in the spring-time of her progress, fresh with all the hopeful aspirings of youth, yet not absolved from the duty of casting a watchful eye, even to the distant future, before the evil days come not, nor the years draw nigh, when she shall say, “ I have no pleasure in them.”

Alchemists used to expend their lives in search of the philosopher’s stone, which was to turn all baser metals into gold.

Statesmen, in these modern days, have a different task before them; it is to detect that bad and fatal element in the politico-economical systems of the age, that turns all good into evil; that renders plenty a curse; that changes the means of creating wealth into prolific sources of poverty; that makes peace a scourge, and war almost a blessing.

In the prosecution of that task, what vital questions cross the enquirer’s path! Must the working man continue a commodity in the market, underbid by machinery, and crushed down even by the best improvements of the age? For everyone that is benefited by these, must tens of thousands be destroyed? Must civilization have her few selected sons of preference, and her millions of step-children, outcast and forsaken? Must labor, the creator of wealth, lose from age to age, and from century to century, one portion after another of its just and fitting reward?

And if not, what is the remedy?

When that question is answered, then will THE GREAT PROBLEM OF THE AGE be solved.

About the Author

Robert Dale Owen (1801–1877), the son of Welsh socialist Robert Owen, was born in Glasgow, Scotland, and attended school in Switzerland 1820–1823. He came to the United States in 1825 to assist in the founding of his father’s utopian colony at New Harmony, Indiana, and edited the *New Harmony Gazette*. In 1827, he travelled to Europe, and returned to the United States and became a citizen. From 1828 to 1832, with the reformer Frances Wright, he established and edited the *Free Enquirer* of New York City, espousing Democratic politics associated with the Locofoco or radical wing of the party. In 1833 he returned to Indiana and served in the state house of representatives 1835–1838. After two unsuccessful campaigns for the U.S. House of Representatives (in 1838 and 1840), he was elected as a Democrat in 1842 and served two terms, losing his re-election bid in 1846 to Elisha Embree. In Congress, Owen introduced the bill establishing the Smithsonian Institution and later served as chairman of the Smithsonian Building Committee. He was a delegate to the Indiana Constitutional Convention of 1850 and served in the state house of representatives 1851–1853, where he supported greater property rights for women, free common schools, and the reform of divorce laws. In 1853 President Franklin Pierce appointed him Chargé d’Affaires (and later, Minister Resident) to the Two Sicilies where he served until 1858. His famous letter to President Abraham Lincoln, September 17, 1862, urging the end American slavery, is seen as one of the factors leading to the issuance of the Emancipation Proclamation. His later years were devoted to writing and speaking on behalf of social causes and inquiries into spiritualism. He died at his home at Lake George, New York, in 1877.

About the Text

The text of this edition is based upon the first edition printed at Cincinnati. It is taken from a copy of the original pamphlet in the library of Columbia University. The typeface is Georgia, designed by Mathew Carter. Pagination follows that of the original edition; page breaks occur within a few words of where they fell in the 1848 text. A few typographical errors have been corrected, and are listed below:

<i>Page: line</i>	<i>1848 edition</i>	<i>Emended to</i>
17:7	Unwieldly	Unwieldy
32:38	elemosynary	eleemosynary
39:18	anwered	answered

Paul Royster
University of Nebraska–Lincoln
January 3, 2007