

## CHAPTER V

### COMMERCE

THE next chapter of the great work continues the analysis of the broadly defined subject of manufactures. Intra-national trade having been treated, international trade is next considered. To it the freedom of trade thesis is applied. The dean-philosopher appears and calling up his fundamental principle that religion, government and commerce are in essential harmony, he argues that a truth of religion is therefore applicable to commerce. He proceeds to apply the golden rule to commerce

“And then monopolies would immediately be at an end; a general encouragement would be given to the diligent and industrious of all professions; a general emulation would excite their genius and improve their abilities; and every man would find his own account in doing to his neighbor as he wishes to be done to himself.”<sup>1</sup>

Like many other passages in Tucker's works, this one may be interpreted to indicate that he championed free trade in the full present day signification of the phrase. But freedom of trade, when applied to commerce between nations, means to him just what it means to him when applied to inland commerce, i. e. that individuals or corporations shall not be given exclusive charters—this and no more. The injunction

<sup>1</sup> *Seventeen Sermons*, pp. 140-141.

“give universal freedom to trade, and do not confine it by guilds, or companies, or corporations, or fetters of any kind,”<sup>1</sup>

is fairly typical of his thought. In harmony with his whole writing, with his evident intent as judged by contexts, it must be interpreted to mean simply that the conditions of the trade, so far as the government is concerned, are the same for all who desire to engage in it. In other words, Tucker does not advocate complete trade freedom. He is a believer in bounties and in duties as will be clearly shown later. It seems difficult to understand how one who is so truly cosmopolitan in the spirit of much of his writing, who states so forcefully the many advantages of exchange between nations, who condemns trade jealousy and war for trade's sake in unsparing terms, who claims to be a foe to all monopoly, who makes out so overwhelming a case against the British exclusive companies for foreign trade, who eulogizes the duty-destroying career of minister Walpole, who proclaims the advantages of trade, untrammelled by customs or duties of any kind, between England and Ireland, and who several times asserts the perfect parallel of intra-national and international trade—it is difficult to understand how such a man failed to follow his thought to the conclusion that should make him an advocate of complete freedom of trade between nations. But he does fail. There are more than glimpses of this full trade freedom in his writings, sometimes a phrase or a sentence seems to state it, but the context invariably shows that the writer pleads only for an abolition of special, chartered, privileges to individuals or to companies. *General* interference, by the government offering bounties to all who care to enter a given industry or levying duties upon all imported goods, whoever may be the importer, finds a staunch supporter in

<sup>1</sup> *Genl's Mag.*, vol. 1, pp. 132-133.

Tucker. In short, as will be shown farther on in this chapter, he lacks little of being a full-blooded mercantilist.

It is in place to call attention to the type of statement in Tucker's writings which seems to declare complete freedom of trade but which, interpreted by the spirit of the whole passage in which it occurs, clearly means no more than opposition to exclusive privileges:

"All merchandise should be free and open; . . . no impediments should lie in the way of commerce, but everything be calculated to promote and extend it."<sup>1</sup> "All trade ought to be laid free and open, in order to induce the exporters to rival each other, that the public may obtain the general good of their competitorship."<sup>2</sup> He hopes that "the time will come when English trade is entirely free from shackles of all kinds."<sup>3</sup>

In each of these cases the context unmistakably points opposition to special privileges in trade, and to this only.

Some passages showing that Tucker was far on the way of arriving at the full freedom of trade thought are:

(1) He pays a glowing tribute to Sir Robert Walpole declaring that

"his plan of commerce was manly and rational; that his endeavors to prevent an infatuated people from quarrelling with their best customers were truly patriotical. . . . He did more for general trade promotion than any other minister of the world, not forgetting the Sullys, Colberts, and Fleury's of France."<sup>4</sup>

(2) He condemns the Navigation Act, as has been shown

<sup>1</sup> *Letf. on Naturalization*, Mss. p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> *Essay on Trade*, 3rd ed., p. 82.

<sup>3</sup> *Appendix to Turkey Trade*, p. 26.

<sup>4</sup> *Four Tracts*, p. 79.

in presenting his thought upon monopolies, and argues that

“it is highly absurd to prefer the interest of the single waggoner<sup>1</sup> to that of the whole community. . . . Confining the freight of goods to one set of waggons is evidently a monopoly,”<sup>2</sup> and therefore objectionable. Great Britain should rather trust competition between seamen, and there will be an adequate and acceptable supply of vessels.

(3) Most striking of all of Tucker's passages, which seem to lead directly to full free trade, are those with reference to the trade relations between England and Ireland:

“It is since the year 1759 that we have repealed that very injudicious tax, which discouraged, and in a manner prohibited, the importation of butter, tallow, lard, and other articles of like sort, from Ireland into Great Britain. . . . Since a permanent repeal, . . . the mutual intercourse of England and Ireland hath prodigiously increased; and, of course, our shipping and navigation have greatly increased likewise.”<sup>3</sup>

“The present clamors for protective duties and prohibitory laws would cease (another good circumstance)—clamors which betray a total ignorance of the true interest of that country, because Ireland ought always to excite an emulation, among her mechanics and manufacturers, to excel her rivals, instead of checking and preventing it by monopolies, pains and penalties. . . . Each county and each part of the island must enjoy their own peculiar advantages, natural or artificial, without let or molestation. At this instant, Yorkshire is getting the clothing trade from the west of England by means of its superior frugality, economy, mechanic skill and industry. . . . The west must adopt the like measures, and police with the

<sup>1</sup>Tucker illustrated with land carriage by wagons and applied the conclusion to vessels as “sea-waggons.”

<sup>2</sup>*Present Posture—Further Thoughts.*

<sup>3</sup>*State of the Nation.*

north, or deservedly suffer for their folly. . . . And above all, Ireland should never use such a conduct towards other nations, especially towards the English . . . as would provoke them to retaliate the injury upon herself with redoubled vengeance.”<sup>1</sup>

It is something of a mystery how a keen and logical mind, prone to bold generalizations, could write these lines and yet embrace mercantilism. Perhaps being a citizen of out-port Bristol, Tucker through his patriotic efforts to break down the exclusive chartered privileges of London companies was led unconsciously to expend all of his energy in emphasizing but half of the truth. Or, it is barely possible that the above statement represented his changed view, late in his life. *Union and Separation*, in which this passage occurs, was written in 1785. It is conceivable that Tucker may have read the *Wealth of Nations* and may have been converted to a belief in full freedom of trade. But the facts (1) that he was at this time seventy-two years of age, an age at which few men change creeds, and (2) that he had worked out the mercantilist thoughts satisfactorily to himself and had championed it for more than thirty years, make this hypothesis very improbable, as well as the farther fact that he has nowhere, in publication or in letters, indicated that he had read, or had even heard of, the *Wealth of Nations*.

But if Tucker did not go the full length that his thought seemed to lead him, he was forceful and aggressive in presenting and applying the truth which he did see. His endeavor in the *Elements* chapter on *Foreign Trade* is expended in demonstrating the

“right notion of national industry and riches, and in confut-

<sup>1</sup> *Union or Separation*, pp. 18 and 19.

ing the popular errors concerning the balance of trade and the nature of money.”<sup>1</sup>

He concentrates his attacks upon the chartered companies and is a powerful and persistent pleader against their special privileges. His plea is given especial force by the fact that his judgment is not a sweeping *a priori* one but is delivered against the existent companies and for particular reasons. He takes up the argument he had begun against these companies in his *Essay on Trade*. In that *Essay*, with an impartiality and breadth of view, well illustrative of his historical sense, he does not for all time and all places condemn exclusive trade companies but he allows

“that in certain cases, and at certain junctures, exclusive companies might have been a prudent institution, calculated for the public good, as: (1) To intrude arts, sciences and manufactures among a barbarous people, *e. g.*, the Czar of Muscovy . . . gives such extraordinary privileges . . . to over-balance the temptation of self-interest for residing elsewhere. (2) To induce skillful artisans to come and instruct an ignorant people, *e. g.*, England granted so many privileges and exemptions to Flemish and other foreign manufacturers 200 years ago. (3) To conquer deep-rooted laziness of people, . . . bringing an example of industry before them, *e. g.*, the Spanish court is now desirous to bring foreign manufacturers to Spain. (4) In order to have large capital to embark a hazardous undertaking calling for great sums. (5) When the government credit is not good—may incorporate a body from which to borrow money.”<sup>2</sup>

But while he thus recognizes the possible good reasons for exclusive companies he cautions that

<sup>1</sup> *Elements*, p. 93.

<sup>2</sup> *Essay on Trade*, 3rd edition, pp. 66-68.

“In the course of time the reasons for continuing them cease, and the trade should be laid open.”<sup>1</sup> “The establishment of exclusive companies, . . . be the motive what it will, . . . may be compared to the hedgehog in the fable, . . . a most humble petitioner for a night’s lodging, but once in possession, sets up bristles, and too strong to be removed.”<sup>2</sup>

He notes that these companies always have special “pretenses” to offer in justification of a retention of their privileges. These pretenses he considers *seriatim*. (1) To the pleas that these companies maintain forts necessary for trading in foreign lands he replies, that either forts are unnecessary altogether, or that wherever really necessary, since the consumers of company goods pay for them anyway, the nation had better erect and man the forts, guaranteeing protection to any of her citizens, desirous of trading with the foreign people.<sup>3</sup> (2) He freely condemns the companies when they plead that they are enabled to sell British goods dearly and to buy foreign wares cheaply. His reply is that more British goods would find market if sold more cheaply, and that the fact that companies purchased foreign goods cheaply was no guarantee that they would sell them cheaply in Great Britain. (3) He points out the error of the argument for prevention of bullion export. (4) He regards the maintenance of state and of strength unnecessary, citing successful trade with China, etc., without this. (5) To the claim that exclusive companies must be right because all nations have them, and what is universal is reasonable, he replies, that according to this there could be no progress

<sup>1</sup> *Essay on Trade*, 3rd ed., pp. 66-68.

<sup>2</sup> *Elements*, p. 110.

<sup>3</sup> The full argument here briefly summarized is in *Elements*, pp. 94-113.

and that a study of the origins of the companies will amply disprove this claim.

He then enters upon a consideration of the British exclusive companies actually engaged in trade at that time. These companies appear to him to be relics of Gothic despotism in government :

✓ “ We still want that glorious revolution in the commercial system which we have happily obtained in the political. Then, indeed, and not till then, may we be said to have abolished all the remains of ancient despotic power and Gothic barbarity. For as long as these charters and exclusive companies remain, we bear about us the marks of our former slavery.”<sup>1</sup>

The companies he particularly opposes are the Turkey Trade Company,<sup>2</sup> the Hudson's Bay Company,<sup>3</sup> and the East India Company.<sup>4</sup> The arguments against these three companies are extensive and exhaustive, and no brief summary can do them any justice. The trend and flavor of the extended treatment may, however, be suggested by citing some characteristic passages.

He begins the attack upon these companies in his *Essay on Trade*. A single paragraph of this early and bold assault upon huge, established monopolies conveys its spirit and illustrates its power and its comprehensiveness :

“ Our monopolies, public companies, and corporate charters are the bane and destruction of free trade. By the charter of the East India Company, at least 9,999 British subjects out of 10,000, without having committed any fault to deserve such a

<sup>1</sup> *Elements*, pp. 88-89.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 113-119, for extended argument.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 120-132.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 132-133. He calls the East India Company “ the most unwieldy monster of them all.”

punishment, are excluded from trading anywhere beyond the Cape of Good Hope. By the charter of the Turkey Company, a like or greater number are excluded from having any commerce with the whole Turkish empire. The Hudson Bay Company engrosses all the fur trade with the Indians in an extent of country almost as large as half of Europe. Thus the interest of 9,999 fellow-subjects is sacrificed in so many respects for the sake of a single one. The whole nation suffers in its commerce, and is debarred from trading to more than three-fourths of the globe, to enrich a few rapacious directors. . . . And as to corporate charters and companies of trade, they are likewise so many monopolies in the places to which they belong, to the great detriment of national commerce.”<sup>1</sup>

This paragraph simply outlines his field of operations against the chartered companies. He deals with them in great detail. Nearly a hundred pages of this same *Essay*<sup>2</sup> are devoted to an argument against the Hudson’s Bay Company, in which every plea of that company is analyzed and refuted and a long list of well sustained charges is brought against it. Two editions of the tract<sup>3</sup> on the trade to Turkey denounce the privileges granted to the Turkey company. In the *Elements* he returns to the attack upon both of these companies and adds a stinging paragraph against the East India Company. In opening this argument he thus characterizes the oppressive practices of these companies :

“ Introduced in the ages of ignorance, tyranny and barbarity, and settled by long custom, covered with the sacred dust

<sup>1</sup> *Essay on Trade*, p. 45.

<sup>2</sup> *3rd edition*, 1753.

<sup>3</sup> Postlethwayt in his *Universal Dictionary of Trade and Commerce*, 2nd Ed. (1757), selected this tract of Tucker’s as the best representative of what had been argumentatively urged for opening the Turkey trade and abstracted it. See vol. ii, pp. 384-86.

of time, a multitude of arguments have been coined to gloss over these practices.”<sup>1</sup>

Tucker rounds off the argument refuting the company pretenses of right and reasons, by tracing the history of monopoly in England from the days of Elizabeth. He quotes<sup>2</sup> Townshend's *Historical Collections* to show the prevalence and despotism of monopolies under the good Queen Bess and cites at length<sup>3</sup> the report made in the 3d of James I by Sir Edward Sandys against the vicious monopolies of the day. The conclusion he draws from this historical review is that

“Every plea, pretense, or apology urged at this day in defense of these things, is nothing else but a nauseous repetition of the same idle, canting story which hath been confuted a thousand times over.”<sup>4</sup>

His appeals against these entrenched companies are often artfully made. The following, for example, is a skillful description of the immortal tactics of legislatively privileged classes:

“Whenever an attempt hath been made to free the nation from this destructive and impolitic restraint, great is the cry of Demetrius and his craftsmen: ‘Sirs, this is the artifice by which we have our wealth; by which we are freed from disagreeable rivals and competitors, and can secure the trade of the kingdom to ourselves, and put what price we please on our commodities. But, as this is not proper to be publicly avowed, therefore let us apply to the passions and foibles of our coun-

<sup>1</sup> *Elements*, p. 82.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 137 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 154 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 167.

trymen, and harangue upon such popular topics as may keep them still in the dark. For, if they were to know the true state of the case, how soon would all our schemes be rendered abortive? And how quickly would the popular odium fall upon ourselves?"<sup>1</sup>

Tucker has full hope that a new era will come when special trading privileges will be abolished and this hope he voices thus:

"Mankind begin to see more and more into the base and slavish original and present iniquitous chicane of all exclusive charters; nor will they be led blindfolded much longer by those whose interest it is to deceive them."<sup>2</sup>

A leading thought running through this entire discussion is that trade supremacy comes to that nation which can sell the best goods for the least money. This is an idea which he emphasizes many times in his works. The whole of *Tract II* is devoted to an argument to prove, contrary to a popular notion, championed even by historian Hume,<sup>3</sup> that a rich nation can undersell a poor one. A strong statement for the need of good, cheap goods to the nation that would win world-trade appears in his letters addressed to M. Necker. He says that there is only one of three things which can be done in competition with France:

"(1) Knock all Frenchmen on the head wherever met with, because of their unpardonable crime of making goods cheaper than the English. (2) Knock all customers on the head,

<sup>1</sup> *Letter upon Naturalization*, Mss. p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> *Appendix to Turkey Trade*, p. 32.

<sup>3</sup> This tract was the result of a correspondence with Hume in 1758. Tucker claimed Hume as a convert to his view on this subject. See *Preface to Four Tracts*.

native or foreign, who dare to buy such goods instead of purchasing at the English shops. (3) Make goods better and sell them cheaper, as a means of attracting the general course of trade to ourselves, without doing violence to our neighbors.”<sup>1</sup>

He suggests that the first two are immoral and dangerous and that the third only is left as the rational choice for the “shopkeeping nation” Great Britain.

The topics, suggested by the outline above given and broadly enough treated in Tucker’s works to deserve especial presentation in connection with foreign trade are: I. The philosophy of exchange; II. Trade jealousy between nations; III. Mercantilism; IV. Bounties; V. Colonies and VI. Statistics.

#### I. PHILOSOPHY OF EXCHANGE

Tucker develops a complete philosophy of exchange. He observes that different peoples have aptitudes for different kinds of production and that they are environed by differing resources, the two factors which make for specialization in production. He observes also the factor which makes for universality in consumption, viz., the wide range of human wants. These three facts indicate to him that the world-plan demands an exchange of products. He thus sees accurately that exchange alone solves the contradiction between universal wants and endowments for specialized production. The passage which most clearly and fully presents these thoughts is in the second of the *Four Tracts*. In part it reads:

“In the natural world our bountiful Creator hath formed different soils and appointed different climates, whereby the inhabitants of different countries may supply each other with

<sup>1</sup> *Cui Bono*, p. 35.

their respective fruits and products, so that by exciting a reciprocal industry they may carry on an intercourse mutually beneficial and universally benevolent. Nay more, even where there is no remarkable difference of soil or of climate, we find a great difference of talents, and, if I may be allowed the expression, a wonderful variety of strata in the human mind. . . . Moreover, the instinct of curiosity and the thirst for novelty; which are so universally implanted in human nature, whereby the various nations and different peoples so ardently wish to be customers to each other, is another proof that the curious manufactures of one nation will never want a vent among the richer inhabitants of another, provided they are reasonably cheap and good.”<sup>1</sup>

## II. JEALOUSY OF TRADE

The second of these special topics is jealousy of trade between nations.

Tucker was a citizen of the world as he consciously strove<sup>2</sup> to be. He was truly cosmopolitan in his views upon commerce. His religious thought was, in part, responsible for this, or at least, it supported him in this attitude. Witness his words:

“ But surely the benign Saviour of all mankind hath nowhere enjoined that any person, because he happened to be born on one side of a river, a mountain, or an arm of the sea, should not freely negotiate business or purchase a piece of land on the other. . . . Have we not all one Father?” &c.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Four Tracts*, pp. 75 to 78. Similar passages in *Ibid.*, pp. 50–51, and in *Essay on Trade*, p. v and vi.

<sup>2</sup> See quotation from *Cui Bono*, in chapter on *Life*, etc.

<sup>3</sup> This is from a note, in Tucker's handwriting, upon the margin of the Mss. of the *Letter on Naturalization* (p. 11) in the British Museum Library. See *Mss.* number 4207, 2.

His application of religious thought to politics and to commerce, his cosmopolitanism and his hatred of war are all in evidence in a striking passage condemning that spirit of bellicose patriotism so characteristic of the nation-building era and not altogether extinct to-day :

“ The love of country hath no place in the catalogue of Christian virtues. The love of country is, in fact, a local affection and a partial attachment ; but the Christian covenant is general, comprehending all mankind within its embraces. Judge, therefore, with what propriety such a narrow, contracted passion can have any place in the diffusive, benevolent scheme of Christianity—a passion, however glittering and glorious in appearance, which hath been productive of more injustice, barbarity and bloodshed in the world than any other disgrace of human nature—a passion, in short, fit only for the enthusiastic rage of an old Roman robber, when cruelly exulting over the unhappy victims of his lust of power and dominion—but altogether unworthy of the breast of a Christian, who is commanded to regard all mankind not only as his countrymen, but as his brethren, doing to others as he would be done by, and helping and assisting even his enemies in distress. Indeed, so far as the love of country means no more than a principle of self-defense against invaders, so far it is justifiable, and so far hath Christianity provided for due exertion of it, by inculcating obedience to the respective powers set over us. But as to the ideas of honor, and glory, and conquest, and dominion, and the other fine things usually implied in the love of country, they are so foreign to the Christian plan that in this sense the love of country neither is, nor ought to be, a part of the Christian scheme of universal love and benevolence. And let the infidels make what uses they please of the concession.”<sup>1</sup>

Tucker’s cosmopolitan spirit is clearly shown by his op-

<sup>1</sup> *Seventeen Sermons*, pp. 285-286.

position to the current jealousy of trade, especially, that jealousy existing between Great Britain and France. He condemns absolutely "going to war for the sake of trade."<sup>1</sup> His position with reference to trade-jealousy and to the effects of war upon commerce is thus stated:

"But is this spell, this witchcraft of the jealousy of trade, never to be dissolved? And are there no hopes that mankind will recover their senses as to these things? For of all absurdities, that of going to war for the sake of getting trade is the most absurd, . . . so extravagantly foolish."<sup>2</sup>

He holds that "no trading nation can ever be ruined but by itself, by decline of industry."<sup>3</sup>

The thought that had so long been a foundation of a widely prevailing system of trade philosophy he distinctly repudiates. "That one nation can thrive only by the downfall of another, cannot grow rich but by impoverishing another"<sup>4</sup> he classes with illusions. On the contrary, he believes that since nations are mutual customers, they must share in each other's prosperity or decline:

"But to excite that man, whom perhaps they have long called their enemy, to greater industry and sobriety, to consider him a customer to them, and themselves as customers to him, so that the richer both are, the better it may be for each other; and, in short, to promote a mutual trade to mutual benefit; this is a kind of reasoning as unintelligible to their comprehensions as the antipodes themselves."<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>This is the title and opposition to it, the theme, of *Tract II* of the *Four Tracts*.

<sup>2</sup>*Four Tracts*, p. 82.

<sup>3</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 42.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 61.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 97.

Again:

“A private shopkeeper would certainly wish that his customers did improve in their circumstances rather than go behind hand, because every such improvement would probably redound to his advantage. Where, then, can be the wisdom of the public shopkeeper, a trading people, to endeavor to make the neighboring states and nations that are his customers so very poor as not to be able to trade with him? . . . The only possible means of preventing a rival nation from running away with your trade, is to prevent your own people from being more idle and vicious than they are; and by inspiring them with the opposite good qualities.”<sup>1</sup>

The gains to come from open international trade appear to him as natural and as certain as those coming from intranational trade. This argument for the promotion of peaceful commerce between the nations he several times enforces. For example:

“If mankind would but open their eyes, they would plainly see that there is no one argument for inducing different nations to fight for the sake of trade but which would equally oblige every county, town and village—nay, and every shop, among ourselves—to be engaged in civil and intestine wars for the same end. Nor, on the contrary, is there any motive of interest or advantage that can be urged for restraining the parts of the same government from these uncertain and foolish contests but which would conclude equally strong against separate and independent nations making war with each other on like prettexts.”<sup>2</sup>

Especially does he oppose the traditional trade jealousy between Great Britain and France. He argues that it is the true interest of Great Britain

<sup>1</sup> *Four Tracts*, p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 77. A similar passage, *Ibid.*, p. 62.

“to promote the prosperity of France by all just and honorable means. . . . If France should grow poorer, she must be so much the worse customer of England. If richer, probably so much the better. This is so plain a case that one would think national prejudice itself could not be able to prevent such an evident truth from being universally acknowledged.”<sup>1</sup>

Tucker was particularly opposed to war as an alleged means of enlarging trade. His opposition was accentuated by the losses to trade and the resulting general business depression in Bristol<sup>2</sup> during the seven years' war. This was another object lesson from his Bristol environment. Idle ships and standstill trade taught him very effectively that war causes economic loss.

He recognized Great Britain as a trading nation and lamented throughout the whole of his author life, the persistently belligerent attitude of her people. Speaking in this vein he says to the British:

“It is our misfortune to aim at things which are incompatible. Unhappily for us, we are continually wishing to be a nation of heroes and a nation of traders and mechanics at the same time. We expect to give laws to all the world, especially at sea, and yet to be considered by this world as a quiet, harmless, unoffending people. . . . The honors of war and the sweets of peace, the glories of conquests and the rewards of industry, the dissipation of a vast, scattered and unwieldy empire and the economy of a moderate compact state, cannot

<sup>1</sup> *Cui Bono*, p. 46.

<sup>2</sup> Writing to Dr. Forster, May 19, 1756, he says, “Our ships are still tied up in the key, which at this season of the year used to be prosecuting their voyage, and almost every branch of trade is at a stand.” See *Forster Mss.* Brit. Museum. Similar thoughts are expressed in letters to Dr. Birch written Nov. 30, 1756, and Nov. 2, 1761. See *Birch Mss.* Brit. Mus.

be made to unite together.”<sup>1</sup> There is “something ridiculous in the farce that a shopkeeper should bully his customers to compel them to deal with him against their interests.”<sup>2</sup>

When Rome was lauded as a world-conquerer, worthy of Britain’s imitation, Tucker’s reply was :

“ . . . Romans were not so mad as to fight for trade. They fought only for conquest and dominion, which may be acquired by fighting. But to fight for the sake of procuring trade is a species of madness reserved only for Britons.”<sup>3</sup>

And the result of Rome’s centuries of conquest was that her soldier-citizens came to look upon honest industry and trade as degrading and with the exception of a “haughty rich few”<sup>4</sup> they became “illustrious brother beggars.”<sup>4</sup> The lesson of history, as Tucker interprets its message, relative to war for trade’s sake is, that “victors in vanquishing others only prepare a more magnificent tomb for their own interment.”<sup>5</sup> “There is nothing to be gained by war that could not better be accomplished by peace.”<sup>6</sup>

Tucker thinks that the very classes of men who favor war are a standing warning against entering upon it for the sake of commerce. He cites as war advocates<sup>7</sup> (1) Mock patriots, desirous of plunging the ruling ministry, which they oppose, into a costly war (2) The “hungry pamphleteer who

<sup>1</sup> *Proposals for General Pacification, Gent’s Mag.*, vol. 1, p. 222.

<sup>2</sup> *Treatise on Gov’t*, p. 233.

<sup>3</sup> *Four Tracts*, pp. 70-71. Cf. “Rome’s trade was to wage war with the world.” See *Invasions and Subsidies*, p. 21.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 72-73.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 75.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 83.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 83-95, give these classes and comment upon them.

writes for bread—a jackall to the patriot-lion” (3) the gambler of change-alley. (4) Newswriters—“a fourth species of fire brands . . . . This country is news-mad and news-ridden now.” (5) Jobbers, contractors, paymasters etc., in army employ; (6) Some traders who reap individual advantage from public calamity (7) Land and sea officers. War “is their business and their promotions come so.”

*Tract II* closes with expressed fear in his day of “the mob, the bloodthirsty mob, no arguments and no demonstrations whatever can persuade them to withdraw their veneration from their grim idol, the god of slaughter;” but there is hope in posterity:

“A few may yield to these arguments, their numbers may increase, and possibly at last the tide may turn so that our posterity may regard the present madness of going to war for the sake of trade, riches and dominion with the same eye of astonishment and pity that we do the madness of our forefathers in fighting under the banner of the peaceful cross to recover the Holy Land.”<sup>1</sup>

### III. MERCANTILISM

The third topic worthy of particular consideration under foreign trade is mercantilism.

Tucker is a neo-mercantilist. He agrees, in very large measure, with the mercantile thought. In four points he is at variance with the simon-pure early tenents of this system of thought: (1) He is quite clear upon the difference between heaps of gold and national riches. (2) As a corollary to the proposition that bullion is not riches, he condemns prohibitions of precious-metal exports. (3) He distinguishes between a trade balance which is acceptable to an

<sup>1</sup> *Four Tracts*, p. 97.

individual merchant and one which is acceptable to a nation. (4) He takes issue with an underlying principle of old-line mercantilism, viz., that in exchange what one party gains another must lose. In all other points he accepts the tradition of the mercantile fathers. He insists that encouragement should be given by a nation to the export of its manufactured goods and to imports of raw materials and food supplies. He favors duties upon the import of foreign manufactures and upon the export of raw materials. He emphasizes the importance of manufactures, and advises discouragement of any export until the commodity is in its ripest condition, fully prepared for the final consumer. And although he ridicules the idea that gold is, in itself, riches, he still affirms that the ultimate goal of national trade is to secure a balance in gold and silver.

Evidence to show that Tucker was a mercantilist will first be presented, and then the evidence that he took issue with mercantilism in some points will be given.

#### a. TUCKER A MERCANTILIST

To present first his credentials as one of the mercantilist persuasion—a single selection epitomizes the ideas to be found in many of his writings. He gives a criterion for testing whether taxes are properly applied to goods entering or departing from the kingdom in this passage:

“ Let him suppose the state to be a living personage, standing on the key of some great seaport and examining goods as loading or unloading. In the former case, if the goods to be exported are completely manufactured, having undergone the full industry and labor of his own people, he ought to lay no embargo whatever upon them, but to show exporters all the favor he can and to protect them in that good work. Whereas, if the goods are only manufactured in part, or, what is worse

still, if they are absolutely raw materials, he should lay such taxes upon them to check and discourage their going out of the kingdom in that condition as may be proportionate to their unmanufactured or raw-material state. That is, if they are absolutely raw materials, they ought to have the highest tax laid upon them, and, in some cases, even such as may amount to a prohibition. But if they are partly manufactured and partly otherwise, the tax should be lessened in proportion as they recede from the state of raw materials and approach to complete manufactures. In regard to goods imported, his conduct ought to be just the very reverse of the former; that is, he ought to lay the highest and most discouraging taxes upon foreign complete manufactures, in order to prevent their being worn or used in his kingdom, a less discouraging upon others that are incomplete, and still less upon those that are but little removed from the raw-material state. As to raw materials themselves, they ought to be admitted into every port of the kingdom duty-free, unless there are some very peculiar circumstances to create an exception to this general rule. Now, the grounds or foundation of all this reasoning is national industry and labor, because these are the only riches of a kingdom.”<sup>1</sup>

The mercantilist plan for customs-duties could scarcely be more plainly stated than it is here stated. It is of interest to find that, applying the above tests to the British custom-laws of that year of grace 1757, Tucker found but five taxes which he pronounced “strictly bad,” viz., the duties upon imported salt, coals, soap and candles, leather and coarse olive oil. And he comments:

<sup>1</sup> *Instructions for Trav.*, pp. 38–39. In *2nd Lett. on Naturalization*, p. 13, Tucker condemns the policy of the kings before the Revolution because they (1) chartered privileged companies; (2) taxed home manufactures; (3) admitted foreign manufactures freely or at low duties; (4) taxed imported raw materials; (5) had no special care for manufactures; (6) granted no drawbacks on re-exported goods.

“ And having thus finished the present examination, it may not be improper to add, for the credit of our country and praise of the legislature, that, upon the most impartial survey, there seem to be only these five taxes of any consequence which can strictly be denominated bad.”<sup>1</sup>

That Tucker includes articles of food under his list of free imports is shown by this sentence:

“ Rice is free now and should be, for it is a raw material and an article of food, and it ought never to have been taxed.”<sup>2</sup>

Once only, and that in his earliest economic work, Tucker states, as his ultimate thought, the ultra-mercantilist balance of trade view:

“ The science of gainful commerce consists ultimately<sup>3</sup> . . . in procuring a balance of gold and silver to ourselves from other nations.”<sup>4</sup>

He does not repeat this proposition, but, on the other hand, he nowhere later either retracts or refutes it, and it therefore commits him to the mercantilist doctrine as to balance of trade.

This completes the mercantilist creed. The more extended statement given above is from the last important work written during Tucker's economic decade. It, therefore fairly represents his matured view, and should overrule any incidental remarks he may have elsewhere offered.

<sup>1</sup> *Instructions for Trav.*, p. 41.

<sup>2</sup> *Humble Address, etc.*, p. 58.

<sup>3</sup> Tucker makes it clear here that he means that all the trade with all the nations must be accounted, *e. g.*, India and the Baltic nations have a trade balance always against England, but England re-exports their goods.

<sup>4</sup> *Essay on Trade*, p. vi.

Some passages, as has been mentioned in treating of freedom of trade, are susceptible of interpretation as advocating full freedom of trade, but in the presence of the above given clear confession of faith, there seems to be no doubt that Tucker is to be classified as a mercantilist.

b. TUCKER A NEO-MERCANTILIST

Tucker is a neo-mercantilist in the sense that he takes issue with old-line mercantilism in some points: (1) He does not deify the precious metals; (2) he favors the seed-time-and-harvest export of gold and silver bullion; (3) he does not identify the nation's and the merchant's ledger balance; (4) he does not advocate annihilation of commercial rivals.

(1) In regard to gold and silver, he says:

"Heaps of gold and silver are not the riches of a nation. Gold and silver got in the ways of idleness will prove to be destructive likewise; it is wealth in appearance, but poverty in reality. Gold and silver got by industry and spent in idleness will prove to be destructive likewise. But gold and silver acquired by general industry, and used with sobriety and according to good morals, will promote still greater industry. . . . An augmentation of money by such means as decrease industry is a national curse, not a national blessing. . . ." <sup>1</sup> Again: "The capital mistake that money is riches, is the basis of all." \* . . . "Industry and labor are the only real riches, money being merely the ticket or sign belonging to them. . . . If Great Britain hath industry and another country money, the industry of the one will soon extract the money of the other, in spite of every law, penalty and prohibition that can be

<sup>1</sup> *Four Tracts*, pp. 43-44. This will be recognized as an application of one of his theory-of-prosperity principles.

<sup>2</sup> *Elements*, p. 162.

framed. . . . Suppose a country, separated from all the world, and yet abounding in . . . gold and silver, and the inhabitants of it (may be) much poorer than the poorest beggar in our streets. . . . Suppose that the inhabitants are . . . industrious: . . . let us suppose that all the gold and silver was annihilated in one night, and what would be the consequences but plainly this, that the inhabitants would then devise some ticket or counter for the exchange of mutual industry.”<sup>1</sup>

(2) Tucker’s opposition to prohibition of precious metal exports is thus stated:

“The continuance of the prohibition against the exporting coin or bullion is another absurdity and tyrannical imposition. It is an absurdity because the chief call for money in Turkey, according to the Company’s own account, is to purchase raw silk and mohair yarn. Judge, therefore, which deserves the preference among a manufacturing nation, a lump of gold or silver, or a bale of merchandise. . . .”<sup>2</sup> “If the bullion is carried out to purchase raw materials for the employment of our people, the trade is good and beneficial to the state.”<sup>3</sup>

These pleas for freedom of bullion export are strongly mercantilistic, since they are made on the ground that the bullion brings back the raw material, and thus affords the glorious opportunity for the British, by hard labor, to work this raw material up into a finished product and export it for more raw material and a further opportunity to labor, and so on. The “ultimate” balance of trade looms up back of all this.

<sup>1</sup> *Elements*, pp. 99 and 100. Similar statements are in *Elements*, p. 103, *Invasions, Subsidies, etc.*, pp. 38-46, *Union and Separation*, pp. 20 and 21. Spain is cited here as a decadent nation whose decadence is due to heaps of gold and silver which begot idleness.

<sup>2</sup> *Elements*, pp. 118-119.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 99.

(3) Tucker's leading caution, with reference to the balance of trade, is that the national balance of trade and the merchant's balance of trade are not the same:

"The business of the merchant is to get as large (profits) as he can upon small exports, . . . but the interest of the nation is to promote general industry and labor at home; which consists in exporting the greatest quantities at the smallest profits. . . . The views of the merchants are merely and solely for money. If he can get this by employing the fewest hands, he thinks it so much the better; whereas the views of the nation should be wholly and solely to promote industry, and then national industry will always command as much cash and credit as are wanted."<sup>1</sup>

(4) Tucker is positive upon the proposition that rival nations may both gain by their exchanges. He says:

"We may lay it down as a universal rule, subject to very few exceptions, that an industrious nation can never be hurt by the increasing industry of its neighbors. . . . All people . . . have a strong bias towards the produce and manufactures of others, so it follows that . . . the respective industry of nation and nation enables them to be so much the better customers, to improve in friendly intercourse, and to be a mutual benefit to each other. . . . Where can be the wisdom in the public shopkeeper, a trading people, to endeavor to make the neighboring states and nations that are his customers so very poor as not to be able to trade with him?"<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Elements*, p. 162. A similar distinction is made in *Four Tracts*, p. 44.

<sup>2</sup>*Four Tracts*, p. 43. In *Ibid.*, pp. 61 and 62, Tucker develops the thought that as neighboring towns or districts wish each other to thrive so should neighboring states. In *Cui Bono*, pp. 58 to 62, he applies this thought particularly to England and France.

## IV. BOUNTIES

The fourth important topic relating to foreign trade is bounties.

Tucker<sup>1</sup> considers Great Britain the habitat of the bounty; "more<sup>1</sup> (bounties, premiums and drawbacks) being introduced into our commercial system, within these sixty years, than are to be met with in all Europe beside." He classifies these as of two sorts, the first used to promote the export of manufactures, and the second to promote the import of raw materials. He defines and distinguishes between the bounty and the drawback:

"The one being a sum actually given or paid by the people in general to particular exporters; the other being no more than a return of that tax or duty upon exportation, which was, or would have been levied upon the goods if used for home consumption."<sup>2</sup>

The nature and use of the bounty is well developed by him. He recognizes

"Four ways of turning trade into new channels and stopping up the old one: (1) Laying additional duties on the commerce of one country and not of the other . . . to be used with wari-

<sup>1</sup>Tucker catalogues these thus: "Commodities entitled to bounty now are corn, spirits distilled from corn, fish and flesh, gunpowder, coarse linens, sail cloth and some sorts of silk manufacture and a peculiar case of bounty on tonnage of ships in the Royal British and Greenland fisheries. Commodities entitled to drawbacks are refined sugars, soap, candles, starch, leather, leather manufactures, paper, ale, mum, cider, perry, spiritous liquors, wrought plate, gold and silver lace, glass, foreign silks, calicoes, linens and stuffs, if printed, painted, stained or dyed in Great Britain. Bounty on raw materials from Colonies are pitch, tar, turpentine, naval stores and indigo." *Instruct. for Trav.*, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup>*Instruct. for Trav.*, p. 33.

ness . . . every such additional duty put upon the commodities of a foreign country will be looked upon by that country as an act of hostility committed upon its trade . . . which it will be sure to revenge . . . incline the scale gradually . . . violently high duties and the favored country . . . not ready for a time to supply the increase wanted. (2) More commodious and less exceptionable way . . . to grant certain privileges and exemptions . . . which shall continue until . . . the merchant can find it worth his while to engage in it without being paid at the public expense. (3) Bounty upon importation. (4) Personal premium to the merchants importing most and best.”<sup>1</sup>

The changed trade-channel referred to here is evidently in an import class of goods. It is to be noted that Tucker here expressly prefers “special privileges and exceptions” to duties as a means of obtaining the desired end. Elsewhere he as expressly prefers bounties to chartered privileges. In connection with his statement of this last mentioned preference he completes his analysis of the bounty by recognizing that it is a burden upon society, endured for the sake of expected future gain from the stimulated industry. In this passage he argues that if private persons will not voluntarily embark in an enterprise

“the better way would be to give a bounty or premium to encourage all adventurers, rather than to grant exclusive privileges to a few. For both the one and the other are a charge upon the public; but the monopoly is by much the worse, the dearest and the most difficult to be broken through.”<sup>2</sup>

He is careful to warn frequently against the danger of continuing too long the aid to any given kind of industry.

<sup>1</sup> *Essay on Trade, 3rd ed.*, pp. 100-102.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 3rd ed., p. 67, note.

Thus he is of opinion that the bounty upon the exportation of corn, which had opened up markets in foreign lands and "which in the infancy of agriculture was so essentially necessary, ought to receive at present, very considerable amendments and reductions."<sup>1</sup> But the best illustration of his caution against undue use of national bounties occurs in connection with a remarkably clear presentation of the infant-industry argument. As has been noted above, Tucker, seems to favor the bounty rather than either chartered privileges or customs-duties, as a means for encouraging industry. This accounts for his presentation of the infant-industry argument in connection with bounties. He several times states the complete infant-industry argument. The passage here given in full, is his best statement of it and is so modern in cast that it reads as though it might have been taken from an economic treatise of the last decade:

"Such infant manufactures or raw materials as promise to become hereafter of general use and importance, ought to be reared and nursed, during the weakness and difficulties of their infant state, by public encouragement and national premiums. But it doth, by no means, so clearly appear that this nursing and supporting should be continued forever. On the contrary, it seems more natural to conclude that, after a reasonable course of years, attempts ought to be made to wean this commercial child by gentle degrees, and not to suffer it to contract a lazy habit of leaning continually on the leading strings. In short, all bounties to particular persons are just so many taxes upon the community; and that particular trade is not worth having which never can be brought to support itself. Were all manufactures to receive a bounty (and all have equal right to expect it), this reasoning would appear unanswerable."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Instruct. for Trav.*, p. 18.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33. Similar infant-industry arguments are given in *Elements*, pp. 85-86, and in *Reflect. on Wools*, pp. 24-27.

It thus appears that Tucker believed that the bounty system of Great Britain had worked successfully. He several times proposes new bounties to encourage enterprises he favors,<sup>1</sup> and especially he favors a duty or bounty "to encourage trade in naval stores, . . . not to be too dependent on Sweden, Russia and Denmark in war."<sup>2</sup>

#### V. COLONIES

The fifth leading topic dealt with rather fully by Tucker, in his consideration of foreign trade, is that of colonies. There is development in his treatment of this subject. In his earlier writings he gives rules for maintaining satisfactory relations with colonies. The reasonable implication is that he accounts them beneficial, or, at least, that he is not opposed to them. But when the American controversy arises, he appears as the consistent opponent of distant colonies. The years had increased his aversion to war, and had led him to a belief that trade relations, fully as lucrative to the mother country, will exist with a given district, whether it is a colony or not; that costly wars must be fought for the infant colonies' sake; that emigrants leave the mother country and add to the population of the colony; and, finally, that the colony, in the natural evolution of its new life, inevitably seeks and obtains independence. This development in Tucker's thought concerning colonies, is normal, and may be easily explained.

During his economic decade there had appeared only the suggestions of a coming severance of the American colonies from Great Britain. That Tucker perceived this shadow

<sup>1</sup>*E. g.*, he proposed an export bounty of 3/2d per yard on coarse woollens sent to the Baltic countries, see *Reflect. on Wools*, pp. 17 sqq; he favored "a double premium on fisheries on the north coast of Scotland," see *Essay on Trade*, 3rd ed., *Appendix*, pp. 18 and 19.

<sup>2</sup>*Essay on Trade*, 3rd ed., p. 93.

cast before, seems probable from the fact that he emphasized the need of considerate treatment if the colonies were to be kept subservient. Indeed, he expressly stated in his very first economic treatise, in 1749, that the colonies would seek independence if they saw that they did not need Great Britain's assistance. The statement occurs in the passage where he outlines the policy for treatment of colonies:

"If we fear they may revolt, let us not drive them into independence. . . . This they will seek if they see that they do not need our assistance. If we keep them dependent and subservient to the welfare of the mother country, we must make it to their interest to be. . . . (1) They must not interfere with the mother country in their products. (2) They should be encouraged to send raw materials to England . . . (3) We must permit them to furnish us, under reasonable and easy duty, such luxuries as we are wedded to and must buy elsewhere . . . (4) Even the farthest colonists must be considered . . . and encouraged to do what they can lest they be employed in planning against the mother country."<sup>1</sup>

This is evidently the outline of the accepted eighteenth century policy, based upon the belief that colonies exist for the benefit of the mother country. The counsel is temperate only because a practical man is aiming to point the way to largest results with least friction. There is no hint in the passage that its author believes that it is inexpedient or economically unwise for a country to have colonies; on the contrary, the clause, "if we would keep them dependent and subservient to the welfare of the mother country," evidences that he believed real gain could come from the possession

<sup>1</sup>*Essay on Trade, 3rd ed.*, pp. 96-98. Other early references to colonies are *Reflect. Nat. For. Prot.* Part II, pp. 36 sqq., where he advises that emigration to the colonies be allowed, and *Elements*, pp. 108-110, where he states that conquest without colonization is an absurdity.

of colonies. He goes still further in the *Elements*, and expressly advocates the founding of a colony in the Hudson Bay country, and declares that "such a colony would be most profitably connected with Great Britain."<sup>1</sup>

But the seven years' war had been fought to a victorious ending, and the American colonies were freed from all danger of French domination. Almost immediately the colonies grew openly and menacingly restive. British thought centred upon them more fully, both because of their growing strength and increasing readiness to resent dictation, and because, foreign relations being peaceful, there were no international complications to distract the British attention from intra-imperial conditions. Tucker was one of the earliest to open a pamphleteer consideration of the American colony relations. His attention for the first time was now centred upon the colonies. Before, what he had written concerning them had been incidental to his treatment of trade relations with France, in particular, or with the world in general. He now reviewed the history of the colonies. He realized that the whole heavy expense of the Seven Years' War had come because of them. He foresaw a coming costly, prolonged and hopeless struggle to retain them. He noted that good-class British citizens were going to the colonies to live, thus further decimating the British population, which his studies had led him to regard as already far too small. He applied his self-interest canon to determine trade tendencies, and concluded that any truly profitable commerce would continue even if the new world were independent. He traced the life record of important colonies in history, and concluded that the American colonies were but repeating that history. These thoughts led him to his later and final view, that distant colonies are expensive appendages to any

<sup>1</sup> *Elements*, p. 125.

state, and that Great Britain would be wise if she yielded to the colonies the independence they were beginning to seek, and turned to people and to develop the waste lands within her island borders with the emigrants and soldiers whom the colonial wildernesses were swallowing, and with the wealth she would squander in protecting, coddling, and endeavoring to compel the colonies. This final position is well stated in his *Treatise on Government*:

“Colonies of every sort and kind are and ever were a drain to and an incumbrance on the mother country, requiring perpetual and expensive nursing in their infancy and becoming headstrong and ungovernable in proportion as they grow up and never failing to revolt as soon as they shall find that they do not want our assistance. And that even at the best, those commercial advantages, which are vulgarly supposed to arise from them, are more imaginary than real because it is impossible to compel distant settlements to trade with a parent state to any great degree beyond what their own interest would prompt them.”<sup>1</sup>

Tucker condemns the two parties in the kingdom because they agree in nothing

“but in maintaining and propagating one grand capital mistake relative to the welfare of this nation, viz.: That colonies are necessary for the support, preservation and extension of commerce, a fatal error which has ruined every country in proportion as it has been adopted.”<sup>2</sup>

A detailed argument against the alleged false position of the parties follows the above statement. It maintains: (1)

<sup>1</sup> *Treatise on Government*, p. 253.

<sup>2</sup> *Further Thoughts, etc.* The outline given is of the argument in this tract.

That British trade with other countries is as lucrative as that with colonies. (2) That "keys," such as Gibraltar and Port Mahon

"have never opened one passage to the English, which was not open before nor have they once shut the door against our enemies and our rivals in peace or in war, notwithstanding the immense sums they have cost and the great number of troops stationed there."<sup>1</sup>

(3) That if colonies enable a country to buy more cheaply, Britain should plant colonies in every clime whose products she desired. (4) That if an increase in the shipping is desired, as is the aim of the Navigation Act, the sure way to get it, and the only way to get it, is to increase the goods for export, and thus make a demand for "sea waggons."

(5) "States may be too great as well as too small; . . . added colonies in far parts of the world are exposed to constant attack; . . . the centre is weakened to protect the colonies." (6) It would be better to reclaim England's wastes than to develop colonies.

"Would not a judicious application of one thousandth part of the sums of money which have been lavished in fighting for America, and one hundredth part of the lives sacrificed in the same cause . . . have rendered these English wastes and deserts, some of the best cultivated, the most fruitful and populous parts of the whole kingdom?"<sup>1</sup>

(7) These same wastes, when peopled, will aid in national defence; but America, even had she remained loyal, is too far away to render timely assistance.

In his *Letter to Burke*, he cites Spain's history as proof that colonies enfeeble a land. He argues that

<sup>1</sup> *Further Thoughts, etc.*

“Spain . . . before it was seized with an epidemic madness of settling colonies in America was one of the richest, the best peopled, the best cultivated and the most flourishing countries in Europe . . . But alas, how fallen! What is Spain! Where are its manufactures! Where its inhabitants! . . . Is Spain, with its diminished population and with vast colonies in South America, richer than formerly?”<sup>1</sup>

Tucker’s belief in the inevitableness of colonial independence is best formulated in the following passage:

“There is nothing in our present situation with respect to the American colonies, to amaze the philosopher or politician. Where is the wonder that Americans should forget their obligations to the mother country, and revolt against her authority, when they need no further protection? Or that we should be too weak to bring them back to submission and dependence? If a spirit of national pride and vanity could permit us to reason calmly on these subjects, if it would suffer us farther dispassionately to turn over a few pages of authentic history either ancient or modern we should see that colonies while in their infant state are always humble and modest; and while their very existence results from, and every hope is cherished by, the fostering care of a mother country, make suitable returns of gratitude, duty and affection. But as they rise in strength and approach maturity, they become proud and insolent; impatient even of the most equitable restraints and incessantly aiming at emancipation. And this is but a picture of what every day passes in natural life where the connection is much stronger and more endearing. The child, advanced to man’s estate and in possession of the means of subsistence withdraws from the authority of his parent . . . the stamp act therefore only hastened that struggle which might otherwise have been deferred a short time longer; but must assuredly have taken place before the expiration of many years.”<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Let. to Burke*, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> *Dispassionate Tho'ts on Am. War*, pp. 24-26.

One may approve this theory as a just deduction from history, bearing in mind that it is formulated on the hypothesis that the mother country is to seek to develop, in eighteenth century style, a colony which shall be both profitable and subservient to her.

Tucker's final judgment upon the relations of Great Britain to the American colonies is expressed in a letter to Lord Kames, in 1782 :

“ In short to sum up all at once I look upon it to have been a very imprudent act to have settled any distant colonies at all whilst there remained an inch of land in great Britain capable of further cultivation; afterwards to have been very foolish and absurd to have engaged in their disputes either with the French or Spaniards and to have espoused their quarrels; and lastly, to have been the height of absurdity to have endeavored to conquer them after they had broken out in open rebellion. They were always from first to last a heavy weight upon us; a weight which we ourselves ought to have thrown off if they had not done it for us.”<sup>1</sup>

## VI. STATISTICS

The fifth special topic to be presented is statistics. The topic relates to commerce, as well as to any other of the subdivisions under which Tucker's work is being presented. It really relates to them all.

Upon the subjects with which Tucker dealt, he could secure but little statistical material, and there are very few and minor statistical references<sup>1</sup> made by him. One tract,<sup>2</sup> however, gives an interesting forecast of the modern national census. It was written in 1778. It suggests an outline for an investigation, which Tucker advises the malcontents of

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of Kames*, vol. iii, pp. 180-181.

<sup>2</sup> *State of the Nation*.

the day to make. He prophesies that if a comparison be made between the year 1777 and "the famous era of 1759, that period of glory and conquest, when everything was supposed to go right," it would be discovered that Great Britain had made progress. He suggests a "nine-fold inquiry," and says that "each of these is a proper subject for a Parliamentary inquiry, and all of them, taken together, form the complex idea called 'the State of the Nation.'"

The nine subjects for investigation which he presents are, in his order: (1) population, (2) agriculture, (3) manufacture, (4) land and fresh-water carriage of goods, (5) salt-water carriage of goods, (6) state of our fisheries at home and abroad, (7) tendency of our taxes, (8) the clear annual amount of the revenue, (9) the national debt. Under each of these subdivisions he offers a number of questions. An idea of the whole may be obtained from the questions asked under one topic. The paragraph treating of agriculture reads:

"Here let the inquiry proceed in the following manner: What was the state of agriculture last year, 1777, compared with the year 1759? Has it advanced or declined since then? Are our old farm houses, barns, outbuildings, now tumbling down? Are there no new erections of the like sort? Are our inclosures, hedges, fences, drains, etc., etc., running fast to decay? And are there no new ones making? Is there less land under tillage or used for meadow and pasture at present than in 1759? Is this land less drained or watered, less manured, cultivated or improved? Are our farmers grown poorer than heretofore? Can we get no substantial tenants now to occupy farms? And are there no instances of late years of farmers buying estates for themselves? I will add no more, but any gentleman who trembles with apprehensions that we are now on the brink of ruin, would do well to produce his list of grievances respecting agriculture for the year 1777, compared with the happy days of 1759."

Similar series of questions occur under each topic, and it is evident, from the detailed nature of the questions, that had they been answered in a series of volumes in the year 1778, Great Britain would have led the world in comprehensive and complete inventory of her own population, resources, industry, trade and finance.

Tucker appears to have realized the great value that would attach to such a publication. In the very connection in which he suggested its use lies one of its chief values, viz., that a nation may thereby learn whether it is making progress.

In the "skeleton" of his great work, he had planned a section upon "An Annual Survey and Register of Inhabitants." Judging from the *State of the Nation*, this section, had he drafted it, would probably have been a reasonably complete scheme for a national census.