

POLITICAL ESSAYS.

OCTOBER 1, 1851. NO. 1

PUBLISHED HALF-YEARLY.

The New-York Association for the gratuitous Distribution of Discussions on Political Economy, beg leave to offer to their fellow citizens of this State and of the Union, and to their brethren throughout the world, a copy of this, the first of a series of periodical essays intended to appear half yearly. In doing it they entertain the desire, if it be in their power, to discover and make known the elements of a political system capable of securing not only "the greatest good of the greatest number," but of the whole. They believe it is within the intellectual power of man to make such discovery; and being made, that it is in his *moral* and *physical* power to reduce it to practice. In other words, they believe that man, in his social capacity, is master of his own happiness.

What the system shall be, that may be found capable of assuring such a result; how far it may depart from, or how near resemble any existing system, is at present the problem to be solved. For themselves, they can think of nothing so simple and intelligible to their own understandings, with which to illustrate their ideas, as that of imagining a republic, where every human being of mature age has, and has ever had equal power in the creation and administration of the laws, and where it has always happened that parents were able to give, and *did* give to their children as they arrived at manhood, and womanhood, and at that time only, an equal and reasonable amount of property. By this we wish to be understood as meaning that each parent, without inconvenience to himself, has been able to furnish his children, male and female, successively as they arrive at the age of maturity, as much of property as any other parent could or did furnish to his; and that previous to this period, the same equal opportunities for instruction in all that is valuable in knowledge, and the same equal exercise of some pursuit of industry, were afforded to the child of one man as to that of another. We wish it still further to be understood that this amount, so given to each individual, should be equal to an equal proportion of all the property left, annually, by the dying, divided among those annually coming of age; and that the whole world had ever contained nothing but such republics.

We are aware that this supposition could never have been realized among mankind. We are sensible, as every one else is, that had the first inhabitants of every country from the earliest to the present age, whether native or alien, when they divided for the first time the soil of the state, made such division equal among all its adult inhabitants, as nature and justice evidently require, it never could have happened that all parents were able to give to their children a like amount of property. Even if the same number of children were born to each

Read and lend. Read and lend again.

pair of parents; death, by destroying during their minority more of these in one family than in another, would render it wholly impossible for the individual children of one parentage to receive the same amount as would be afforded to another.

But tho' it is manifestly impracticable to cause the *parents*, (being the first inhabitants of any country which at any time has made private property of land) to be able to give an equal amount of property to their children, one family with another, for the reason just stated, *even where the first division was made equal*; and altho it would be still *more* impracticable, where this first division was made *unequal*; still it is in our power and in the power of the reader, and it may be to his and our profit to contemplate what would be the operation of such a state of things, were it found possible to put it in practice. We may, perhaps, draw strong analogical arguments to show that *another* system, which is capable of being carried into execution, has precisely the same strong claim to our approbation which this would be found to possess, could it be shown to be practicable.

But before proceeding to speak of the operation of a system which should give the same equal food, clothing, instruction in science and knowledge in and experience of labor to every human being, previous to arriving at the age of maturity, and, at this age, an equal amount of property; *and all this, from some supposed ability on the part of parents, each for their own families, to confer these equal advantages on their own children, and not from any arbitrary regulations of government*; it may not be amiss to observe, that had the first adults of the state of New-York, for example, been placed in equal possession of its soil, as it is evidently right they should have been, the *children* of the first parents must necessarily have had unequal patrimonies every other circumstance being as we could wish it, merely by the chasms in families which the operations of death produce. The second generation, commencing more unequal than did the first, would leave its successors still more unequal; a third generation would see the disparity greater yet, and so on, till some great civil convulsion took place and destroyed the state altogether, or till some remedy were found for the evil. It is thus, we think, that we trace the prominent cause of inequality of property among men, and of course, at least of a very great portion if not the entire mass of the misery that exists throughout the human race.

Be this however as it may, we proceed to ask our readers, each for himself, what objection he could find to a state of things if such a state were possible, in which *every parent* made his children good and useful citizens by proper mental and physical cultivation during non-age, and on arriving at maturity, gave them such an equal amount of property as we have already named? Would he think it *wrong* that the child of one parent should have a sufficiency of the same good, may even luxurious food that was afforded to the child of another? Would he think it *wrong*, that he should have the same tender care and protection? Would it be *wrong*, that all children should

be exempted from any necessity to labor *at all*, till age and strength and education had given their sanction to its propriety? Would it be *wrong* that all should have good and equally good clothing and an abundance of it? Would it be *wrong* that all should have equally spacious, airy, comfortable and healthy dwellings? Would it be *wrong* that all should lodge with equal comfort and cleanliness? Would it be *wrong* that all should have equal opportunities and facilities for acquiring a general knowledge of all that is useful to man, and a special and practical knowledge of some particular trade, pursuit or occupation? Would it be *wrong* that, male and female, the children of one family should have given to them, by their parents, on arriving at the age of maturity, as much of property with which to commence their career in life, as the children of another? Would it be *wrong* that, following the impulse of nature, these should unite their destinies in early and congenial marriage, and live and be happy, as we think most assuredly they would, where no difference of rank existed to poison public and private happiness? Would it be *wrong*, that, in this state of things, those who have arrived at mature age should be under equal necessity to supply their own wants by their own industry? Would it be *wrong* that all were compelled to labor, and that none were obliged to toil from two to five times as much as they otherwise would be? Would it be *wrong* that one was not compelled to make himself a hireling to another? Would it be *wrong* that there were no journeymen and no masters or employers? Would it be *wrong* that every business that cannot be carried on by a single person, should be conducted by association in which all the members put equal property and from which all draw equal profit, or such other proportion as they all agree upon? Would it be *wrong* that sailors, under these circumstances, brought up to be as good citizens as any others, notwithstanding there may be those who now think them otherwise, should own the ship they navigate? Would it be *wrong* that a hundred or other number of ship-carpenters should in like manner possess their ship-yard with its materials and thus in mutual benefit build ships for those who want them? Would it be *wrong* that those who by hundreds and thousands spend their miserable lives in manufactories, should own these establishments and work them on their own account? Would it be *wrong* that no individual person would then be able to purchase whole cargoes and warehouses of imported and other goods? Would it be *wrong* that all or nearly all the concerns of commerce would then be conducted, as very much of it is now, by commission merchants, with small capital in property, but with great capital in integrity, skill, and knowledge of business? Would it be *wrong* that, among such a people as this, every man would be, not only a preserver of all knowledge in existence contemporaneously with him, but a contributor to its increase? Would it be *wrong*, that such a people were eminently virtuous and good? Would it be *wrong* that under such circumstances insurance of property against injury or destruction from any cause whatever

could safely be made by the state? Would it be *wrong* in such an event, that no one could lose by fire or by shipwreck, since the state would always be able and willing to make good the loss? Would it be *wrong* that the state could insure health as well as property, and thus guarantee the property itself of each individual from injury by the inroads of infirmity and disease? Would it be *wrong* that a tax laid on property for the support of all in sickness, operating as a premium paid by each person for the insurance of his own health, should thus protect him from the sufferings of want? Could it be *wrong*, in such a state of things that there would be no debt, since all would be able to pay, and none would be able or willing to trust, at least to any extent? Would it be *wrong* that bank note paper, which is only another description of debt due by the bank to the holder, would cease to exist altogether; the government of the country transferring to distant parts without charge to individuals all monies necessary to effect exchanges? Would it be *wrong* that such an equality and comfort and happiness of condition should banish all internal and external wars? Would it be *wrong*, that private law would cease almost altogether, carrying out of existence lawyers, judges, sheriffs and almost all legislation? Would it be *wrong* that in such a state of things entire security should exist for all of enjoying, almost in opposition to their will to the contrary, if this were possible, all that their nature can desire.

If all these things would be wrong, and many more might have been named, it would be, either because they are the *parents* of these children who confer on their offspring this equality of condition, or because of some other reason. For ourselves we think that it is not the present age, with its present opinions, that would look upon such a state of things, *if it were possible to exist*, to be undesired and undesirable. It is not the present generation which would consent to change it. Yet if they would, they must be of opinion that the very reverse of what we have *supposed* to be good is the *real* good which society ought to strive to attain. They must think that *inequality* is the greatest of blessings; that the children of one man should have less food than the children of another; that it should be less in variety, and inferior in quality. They must think it *right* that they should *not* have the same tender care and protection; that they should *not* be exempted from labor till age, strength and education had rendered it appropriate; that they should *not* have the same and equally good clothing; the same spacious, airy, comfortable and healthy dwellings, the same comfortable and cleanly lodgings; that the education of science and of practical life should *not* be alike at the command of the children of one parent as of another. They must think it *right*, that at the age of maturity all should *not* possess an equal amount of property, male and female alike, *altho furnished by their parents*; and that of course it would be *right* that some should have *enormous* patrimonies, while others had none. They must think it *right* to *prevent* early and congenial marriages by placing all property in few

hands, and thus introducing those moral disorders into society which are the bane of half its happiness. They must think it *right*, that all should not be under equal necessity to supply their own wants by their own industry; that some *should* be exempted from toil and others be compelled to labor from two to five times as much as they otherwise would; that one *should* be a hireling to another; that there *should* be masters and journeymen; that all business requiring more than one man to conduct it, and which could nevertheless be carried on by association in which the members of it should have equal shares of the profits made by it, should *yet* be in the hands of a single proprietor to whom the workmen under him should be tributaries of wealth, as much as his horses or his cattle. They must think that sailors for example, should *not* own the ship they navigate; that ship-carpenters should *not* equally own their ship-yards, materials &c. and build ships for their customers; that those who by hundreds and by thousands spend their miserable lives in manufactories should *not* own these establishments and work them on their own account; that some men *should* be able to purchase whole cargoes and warehouses of imported and other goods; that commerce should *not* be wholly carried on by agency, as much of it is now done. They must think that an equal people, *as supposed to be made so by the fortunate condition and wise conduct of their parents*, would *not* tend to make every man a preserver of knowledge and a contributor to its increase; and that such a people would *not* be eminently happy, virtuous and good. They must think it *right* under such circumstances that the state should *not* insure against loss of, or damage to property by fire, shipwreck &c. and that health, the first of all blessings to man, should *not* be guaranteed by the state; and of course that the present precarious system of securing property to its possessor should *not* be superseded by a better. They must think it *right*, that all necessity for debt should *not* be abolished in any of its thousand various forms, the source of innumerable frauds and miseries in society; that wars should *not* as they might, be put a stop to; and that lawyers, judges, sheriffs, &c. should still be permitted to make their ravages on the happiness of man. All these and a thousand other things must *they* pronounce to be *right, just and proper*, who could persuade themselves that an equal state of society, *brought about*, let it be understood, as we have supposed, *by the good fortune and wise conduct of parents and of parents only*, acting in some measure as parents do now act, or would wish to act were it in their power, was wrong.

If therefore it had happened that every parent *could* have given to his children an education wise in science and useful in practice, as much so as that given by any other parent to *his* children; and if too he *could* have given to them property on arriving at manhood and womanhood, equal to that which should be given by any other parent; and if after that they lived under equal laws, it seems self-evident to this association, and they think that it will seem equally

evident to every reflecting man, that nothing more would be necessary to secure, beyond the reach of casualty or accident or power, of any kind, an equal and unmixed happiness for man forever.

If there be any human being who would object to such a state of things, provided it were now in existence, we beg to ask him if he duly considers what he must necessarily propose to do? Would he prevent one parent from giving as good food and as much of it to his children, as was given by another? Would he compel him to give less and inferior clothing, inferior and less comfortable lodgings; less spacious airy and healthy dwellings? Would he compel him to give less instruction, and perhaps none at all? Would he send them furnished with little or no property into the world? Would he, in one word violate what is now considered the established right and duty of parents, and bring again into existence the relation of master and slave, of wealth and dependance?

Such, certainly, is what he must propose to do who would object to that equality of condition which we have supposed, for example's sake, might be found to have existence among men.

We have presented our ideas of what *would* be the happy condition of man in society, as it is now constituted, were it possible, in the present order of things, that each parent *could* give to his own children an education moral, scientific and practical, equal in value to that which should be given to the children of any other man, and at mature age the same amount of property. And we have done it, not that we think that parents *as such*, can ever accomplish so desirable a result; but that it is fully in their power to do it, *as citizens*. We have done it, also, for another reason; and this is, to show, that if, to those who love human liberty and happiness, such a picture as we have drawn, could it represent real life, is all captivating and endearing—that which, in this essay, we have to propose to the candid consideration of the reader, and which is, as we think, decidedly and speedily practicable, is not less so. This picture will give us the advantage of being very easily understood by our readers; for the operation of the system of government which we could wish to see introduced, is precisely the same in every respect as if all fathers were able to give to their children, one family with another, that equality of knowledge and possession which we have supposed. If then, *our* system be wrong because it gives to all under age, the same abundant and good food, clothing, instruction, and practical knowledge of some one or more of the arts of life; so would be the *imaginary* system we have drawn of parents doing the same thing. If *our* system be wrong because it proposes, (and points out the way in which it can be done,) perpetually to set forward the new generation, without distinction of sex or color, with an equal and competent amount of property as they arrive at years of discretion; so would it be wrong that parents, if they were able, should do the same thing. If *our* system be wrong, because (being universally introduced) it would lead immediately to the extinction of wars throughout the

world, by placing every human being on a level as to property and every thing else, and thus rendering it impossible for any man to consent to be a soldier for the purpose of aggression; so would it be wrong for *parents* to produce such a result by placing their children in the same equal condition one with another. And in like manner might we continue the comparison of effects flowing from the two systems, but these we deem sufficient for the present, being fully convinced that he who would object to one system would object to both; and he who would accept either, would also accept the other.

We, therefore, proceed to exhibit our views of the change which we think government should order to take place before man, as a *citizen*, can accomplish for himself that substantial equality of possession and of happiness, which would certainly be his, could he possibly do that which he cannot do, but which, for supposition's sake, we have imagined him to be able to do, as a *parent*.

Government then we think, and by government we mean in this instance the whole people at the polls, ordering by their votes the special enactment of such a law; the whole people, we say, should declare all property to be the property of the state; thus dispossessing every man. They should order the state to be divided into a great number of small districts; the property in each to be appraised, and its adult and minor citizens registered and numbered, with their name, age, sex, color, occupation and parentage. A copy of the appraisement and census of each district should be taken to the Capital of the state; the amount of the value of the property and of the number of citizens who should be of, and over the age of maturity, ascertained, and by dividing this amount by this number should be ascertained also the sum it would amount to for each individual. They should order report of this sum to be sent back to every district; and so soon as this was done, the auctions (one kind of property only being sold at a time, tho' in any number of different places; to commence. Each person is ordered and authorized to bid for what he likes best to an amount not exceeding nor falling short, say 5 or 10 per cent under or over the dividend made for each individual at the centre of the state, he being considered as having a debt due to him from the State for that amount. They should order, so soon as the sales are done with, that each district should send a return of the amount of its sales to the Capital. This being done, the whole amount is ascertained; it is divided as before among all people of full age, and the actual amount is made known which is due to each individual. If he have purchased to an amount greater than this, he owes to the state something and his property remains mortgaged till paid; if he have bought less, the State owes him and will make it good. Till the sales are all done, no property to be delivered to the purchaser. In the mean time, while all this is going on, all people may be supplied by the State, with all the necessaries of life, and this, we think, need not be longer than some three or four weeks.

They, the people, should order the property of those who die in any one year to be divided equally among the native born children of the state, who, during the same year come of age, without distinction of sex or color, and this forever after the General Division has once taken place.* This patrimony to be all that each individual is ever to receive from the State, except it be insurance for property lost and destroyed, for services rendered, or for relief from distress arising from accident, infirmity or disease. All burials at the public expense. It should be added that at the General Division of all property, foreigners who have previously become citizens should, with their children, be on the same footing with the native-born—but those coming afterwards cannot expect it. The children only which may be born to them after they do come, can alone be considered as citizens entitled to support and patrimonies as herein recommended to be ordered.

They should order all children to be fed, clothed, instructed and taught some useful pursuit at the public expense; but in doing this, there is no occasion to separate children from parents till they are of an age to commence the acquisition of the knowledge of some useful occupation; and often not then. All family ties it will be seen, under this system will remain then as they are now; and there will be no exception unless it be in cases where parents do not take proper care of their children. Taxation on property is that which is to enable the State to furnish all these supplies to the rising generations.

Were government modified on principles like these, it is apparent the condition of every man's children would be exactly the same as it might be if every parent had been able to give his offspring the same education and property as another could give his. There is this difference, however, in the two cases; that in the system we recommend, the property of the *dying* only, and of course, of *those who have no further use for it*, is annually divided among those annually coming of age. Nothing would be taken from the living, whereas in the other case, parents would be obliged to part with that which is or may be of the utmost importance to their welfare. Admitting every other circumstance in human society as now constituted to be right, one thing must evidently be acknowledged to be wrong; and this is, that parents must part with property which they cannot spare without inconvenience and injury to themselves, as often as their children arrive at maturity, or their *children* must spend the best part of *their* lives surrounded with all the distresses and difficulties which a want of property is sure to inflict upon them. How very desirable then, even in this respect, would be a better system for the transmission of property from one generation to another!

We ask the reader now to imagine with us that all families thro^t our country possessing the same number of children and the same amount of wealth were to get together and make an arrange-

* *Husband or wife dying first the other has half of their whole property.*

ment, that the property of those who first die should be handed, as their sole and only patrimony, forever, to those among the children who should first come of age. On such a supposition does he not see, that each person arriving at age would receive exactly the same amount as if it had been given him by his father? Does he not see that no father while living would be called upon to part with any thing however small, and that if the possession of property be of any importance and the happy situation of his offspring afford any pleasure to him, that this is the way in which to make the most of it? Does he not think that the sons and daughters of these persons of wealth would consider, *so far as THEY were concerned*, that such an arrangement would be eminently better for them? If then, the condition of both parents and children would be better, where shall we look for objections? It may be said indeed, that there exists among these parents now supposed to be equally wealthy and to have an equal number of children, no certainty that they would *continue* equal, and that therefore for this if for no other reason such arrangement could never be made. It is true, in all countries, that there are and ever have been great fluctuations in the possession of property brought about almost wholly by artificial, arbitrary and unnatural causes; but these, in our opinion are capable of being sooner or later destroyed. Besides, the *operation* of such an arrangement can as well be understood when it is theoretically as when it is practically considered. Who then, we beg leave to ask the reader, would object to it? Would it be the father? Would it be an oppression to him that his children, at the best possible time of life were furnished with property as much as he could ever hope to leave them without expense to him? Would he mourn at their *opportunity* at least, for prosperity? Would the children themselves deplore their situation, and prefer to struggle with young and growing families through all the evils of poverty, waiting for the father's death? Should we hear such lamentations over the advantages which such an arrangement would place in their hands, as we hear over the system that proposes to give equal property to all at mature age, such as that it would destroy all inducement to exertion? Strange indeed to our comprehension would be such an objection; when, as every one must perceive however property may be acquired, that it is preserved, increased squandered, or turned to good or bad account according to the dispositions and habits of the person acquiring it—and that these dispositions and habits are, in each individual as the state of things around him has made them.

Thus far has this Association reasoned with its readers in an analogical manner. They propose now to take a more direct method. They desire now to meet the most powerful and popular objections; and they trust they will be able to do it in a manner satisfactory to every candid mind. There are many we think, there is in our opinion, a majority in this city who would be in favor of an equal division of property in the manner proposed in this essay, did they not

believe that it would soon become as unequal as ever. And they triumphantly ask, if property was once equally divided, *How long it would remain so? How long would it be before the thousands of prodigals on the one hand and the ignorant on the other would be reduced to their former condition?* We answer never. We answer, emphatically, NEVER. Let those then, who *think* to the contrary, make good their position. Let them show how the profligate, for example *could* accomplish his purpose? Suppose a division to be made. Those who desired to be farmers will have taken their share, as it is natural they should in land, in agricultural implements, in dwellings, in furniture, clothing, provision for a year or more, their equal proportion some ten or twenty dollars each in money, &c. No doubt their money they could soon dispose of; but this is a trifle. What could they do with their farms? There is more of land than all *can* cultivate who choose to be farmers. Will the prodigal farmer offer to sell to the prudent farmer? He may indeed, but when he has done so, what inducement is there to buy, when the prudent farmer has already more land than he can plough, and when there are no men of labor, *as such* to be hired? Will he offer his plough and his harrow, his scythe and his axe? Of these the prudent farmer has as much as the other, and all that he can use. Why then should he buy? Will he sell him his ox? Oxen he has too, as many as he can work; and therefore would have no occasion to buy unless indeed it were to fatten him for the butcher; and the prodigal could as well do this as the other. But supposing him inclined to purchase the ox; can he spare of his small amount of money? Will he not have occasion for its use in small sums that are indispensable, long before he can prepare the article he has purchased for the butcher? There is no question in our minds that he would, and that the prodigal farmer could find no purchaser. He would therefore see that the only way in which he could hope to obtain the means of gratifying his desires, was by preserving his property and employing his industry upon it; raising the *fruits* of the earth which all men want, rather than by attempting to dispose of the earth *itself*, of which all who wish any of it, have all that they desire. In one word, instead of killing or selling the goose that lays the golden egg, he would feed it, nourish it and grow rich.

It is to be said, perhaps, that there may be an exception to all this; that there may be and probably is a deficiency of some kinds of *personal* property; that, as a consequence, a profligate might find it much more practicable to make disposal than we have supposed; and that therefore, the prodigal farmer in question, might be able to sell a few articles of a personal kind. But this would be all; the great mass of his possessions would still be of such a nature that they could not easily find a purchaser. He therefore who wished to obtain the means of indulging in profligate pleasures would find the best way to do it, would be, to be as industrious and as economical as his neighbours. If, of the *fruits* of this industry, economy &c. he after

wards made bad use, we do not see how it is to be prevented but by the punishment which excess and profligacy always inflict on those who practice them, or by the substitution of a new race of human beings brought up in habits altogether good.

Let us now see how far it would be possible for the profligate and prodigal in our cities to squander that which they should receive at the General Division, as their own equal share. Let us take the sailor. Of money he would have only his own proportion, some ten or twenty dollars at most. This would be of small consequence in the pursuit of immoral pleasures. Of intoxicating liquors, it might be so arranged, as in the case of money, that every one, the sailor among the rest, should be allowed and compelled to receive only his own equal share; or if the public law ordered it, they might be destroyed altogether. The sailor then would find himself, like every one else, compelled to choose the kind of property in which he would have his own equal portion. What more natural than that it should consist, if he had a family, of a house on shore, and a portion of a ship, purchased in company with such a number of his fellows as might be sufficient to navigate her? Well, if such were the kind of property he chose, and he afterwards desired to sell for the purpose of dissipation; to *whom* would he sell? To his brother sailor? This could not be, for, especially right after the division had taken place, his brother would have nothing with which to purchase. To the Mechanic or Manufacturer? What would these want of it, even supposing *them* to be able to purchase? It would be of no use to them unless they could find hireling sailors to man it afterwards. This they could not hope for, unless indeed they imagined the *whole class of sailors* would be disposed to dispossess themselves for a song; and this we do not believe, of them any more than of any other class of society. Besides, inasmuch as, in such a state of society there are no *wills*; all instruments of this kind being considered criminal, so would *gifts* be considered, since they are nothing but wills by anticipation, and of consequence a man who should sell and another who should buy an article of property, a ship for example, at a price decidedly and manifestly below that at which it could be made, would both be sentenced to criminal punishment by the criminal laws, and held in odium by public opinion. The one, therefore, could not dare to offer property at a sacrificing price, nor the other to accept it; and of course the sale could not take place, except by collusion between the parties; and this, when public opinion shall be so far changed as to consider such an act quite as criminal as is now considered a conspiracy to rob or defraud, will be as seldom, nay, more seldom done than it is now. The truth is, the sailor, like our supposed profligate farmer, would discover that by going to sea as the owner in whole with his fellows of the ship he sails in, he has much better means of acquiring disposable property with which to pursue what he calls pleasure, than in any other way. When, indeed, a new generation shall have been born

and brought up under a system of equality like this, we think it rare to assume that *none* would be found negligent of their own rational welfare, in the smallest degree whatever; and even as things are now, it would be almost impossible to spend any portion of that share of property which is essential to his employing his industry without giving a portion of its value to another, for the reasons above stated.

Suppose again, the sailor, or indeed any other person wishing to sell his dwelling. Who again we ask will buy? Will it be he who already has his own dwelling if he wishes one at all? Of what use to him would such a purchase be? There are no tenants, and why should there be landlords? Or if there be tenants, they can be those only who would turn themselves out of doors, for purpose of profligate pleasure;—and who would want such tenants as these? Besides, who does not see that public opinion would operate powerfully against those who should appear to wish to dispose of essential property for improper objects, and thus restrain them in a great measure from all such attempts, and also those who in any degree should countenance them. Indeed, when we consider this supposed possibility of a man's spending his share of equal property after it once shall have been given to him, this Association looks upon it almost as impossible as it would be for a man who has just eaten a hearty dinner, to sit down and eat another. In the one case the man has eaten all he can eat till his stomach be emptied; in the other the man has purchased all he has the means of paying for; or if this be not so to the fullest extent, he has in possession, all that he knows what to do with.

This Association have followed out further probably than was necessary this argument; and it has been pursued on the supposition that the same tendency to immoral conduct would exist in the equal as in the unequal state. But it is evident that this is not the fact. The two prominent evils of society as now constituted are the illicit and impure intercourse of the sexes and intemperate drinking. Now it is plain, that if all persons of mature age were put in possession of an equal amount of property upon the plan we have named, they would see the means by which families would, all without exception, be rendered comfortable and happy, and marriages would universally take place. And every one knows that this with scarcely any exception would lead to entire purity of morals in this respect. As to intemperance in drinking, those who think more of it would prevail than prevails now, forget that the very lowest and poorest in society as it is now constituted, *if they wish to throw away their lives on the bottle*, can command the means to do so. The cheapness of the intoxicating liquors is such that no one can be without the means of purchasing all that is sufficient to destroy him. An addition to his means then would not enable him to indulge *the more* in this respect; but, as it would give universal encouragement to a course of good and respectable conduct, it would reclaim a nu-

sands from the fascinations and miseries of the cup, who take to it only from the influence of discouragement and despair. In what is called *high* life also, those who are elevated above the level of nature's standard, to whom toil is unwelcome, not because when it is moderate it is in its nature unpleasant, but because it is considered dishonorable, thousands, as the expression is, kill their time in the 'flowing bowl;' when in an equal and happy state of things, it would never 'hang heavy on their hands.' To those, therefore, who trace much of the evils of society to the existence of intemperance, this Association addresses itself, with the earnest wish that they would deeply consider whether an equalization of condition is not their only effectual remedy. We sincerely believe it is.

We beg the reader to understand that in all our reasoning, showing, as we conceive we have done, the almost total impossibility of a man's spending his equal proportion of property, we have considered the question as though *the whole world* had adopted our system at one and the same time. But if it be considered that only our own country may have adopted it, the case becomes different. It would then be possible to make sale of entire patrimonies, if not to others, at least to foreigners. But then, as happens among us now, laws might be passed appointing guardians for those who should in the opinion of a jury of their countrymen, be manifestly and evidently unfit to have charge of their property. This would remedy the apprehended evil. And this remedy might also be resorted to with some advantage perhaps, were the whole world prevailed upon to adopt the equal system in question.

We think, therefore, we have shown that it would be, as it were, physically impossible for a man to squander that which is *essential* to his happiness; for, if it may be said that a man is physically restrained from selling, who lives at a time and under circumstances in which there is absolutely no one in *existence* to buy; so also is he in like manner physically restrained, who *wishes* to sell, and around whom are abundance of human beings like himself, but who have and *can* have no ability or motive to purchase. The case is precisely the same, whether men do not exist at all for the use of him who has to sell, or existing, will not or cannot buy.

It has indeed sometimes been urged that a prodigal and profligate person might dispose of his farm, for example, to a person of a contrary description; and that the latter would consent to buy, on the expectation that the seller would shortly be in a situation to sell his labor to the purchaser, as now, for less than its worth. But let us take care how we mistake ourselves in the new situation of things. A person of profligate and idle habits is not exactly that description of character which prudent men wish to employ. We think therefore that few or no persons would be found to purchase property on such an expectation as this. But let us suppose the contrary. If *one* prudent person would desire such a laborer, so would another. What security then would any particular purchaser of a prodigal's

property have that *he* would monopolize his services? Would not his neighbor farmers as naturally desire them as himself? And where the number of the prudent compared to the imprudent, as is the fact, is certainly very great, would not the prodigal whenever he *chose* to labor, be able to command the full value, or very nearly the full value of his services? If the full value were given, it would turn out that the sale of his property had not injured him, but that by labor he had mutually benefitted himself and those for whom he labored.

Thus far we have shown, we think, that persons of dissipated habits could not injure themselves or add to the possessions of others, through the medium of selling their property. It remains for us to show that the cunning could not impose upon the ignorant to produce such an effect, or if they could, it would be to a very unimportant degree.

In the proposed new state of society, all would have the means of prompt payment. There would be no credit, no debt, or if any, very little indeed. Articles, of whatever kind, would be paid for on the spot. And even if it be supposed that there were probably some inclination to give and take credit, all laws for the *collection* of debts might, as we think they should, be repealed, and this would render it still more improbable that debt would exist at all. What then would be the natural course of trade? Would not those who had occasion to buy any thing, as now, call upon many venders, compare qualities and ascertain prices? And having done so, would not the ignorant determine as correctly as the wise, which of all the articles offered it was most to his interest to buy? Could not the commonest of men judge of the quality of sugar, for example, as correctly as the profoundest, but at the same time, the most knavish of philosophers? And is any man so ignorant as not to know, where quality is the same, that six cents a pound is cheaper than seven? In one word, could not the slave of Mr. M'Duffie of South-Carolina, for instance, sell cotton, sugar, tobacco or any other article for as high a price, if he had it to sell, as could his master? Could he not *purchase* as cheap, whatever he had occasion to purchase? And more especially *would* not every man purchase as cheap as another, when he had such an amount of the *means* of purchase as would enable him to buy a six months' supply; thus making it of sufficient *interest* to him to take time enough thoroughly to ascertain the lowest possible price, and thus breaking up what may be called the small retail business forever, except it be in quickly perishable articles? We think most decidedly, that in all matters of trade those who are called ignorant are as wise as those who pretend to scorn or to pity them, and that with all their superior pretensions to knowledge over them, in an equal state of things, they could not possibly overreach them.

It is to be said perhaps that instances *might* occur in which a scientific knave could prevail upon the credulity of ignorance to engage in the pursuit of chimerical undertakings upon such terms as to be sure to terminate in loss to the latter and gain to the former. But

As all expenses are paid on the spot, and solely out of the results of the labor of those who embark in them, a pursuit of this kind could not involve others in misfortune, and would soon, through the lessons of experience, become its own corrective, so that, at the worst, any adventurer of this kind could only lose his entire possessions, and this would very seldom happen. And even when it did happen the injury inflicted on the sufferer would be very little if any thing more than the mere loss of labor embarked. For the number of the imprudent of this description, or indeed of any other, compared to the mass of society, is very small. Any one, therefore, who should see himself reduced to poverty, would also see his labor in demand by almost every one around him, and this competition to employ him would give him as great returns nearly, if not quite, for his labor as he could obtain, had he his property still, and were able to employ himself.

Under these views of the subject, we beg leave to press home upon the good will of such of our readers as have had their minds made up to approve of this system of equal education and equal property, but for an idea that this equality cannot be substantially maintained, the importance of reconsidering their objections. Let them do so, (for an *exact* equality we ourselves do not expect to be kept up,) and if any thing we have here said shall have shown these objections to have been unfounded, we trust and hope they will not be slow to join us, and thus strengthen our means to extend still further a knowledge of our principles.

Much has been said in opposition to these principles; such as, that the people are not fitted for such a state of things; that they should be educated first, &c. &c. Let us feel the weight of this objection. In the first place, what do we expect of the people, and particularly that portion of them who are thus proposed to have denied to them the possession of an equal amount of property, at the same time that it is thus indirectly admitted that they have the right to it? Do they not know, theoretically and practically, better how to produce the good things of this life, than those who now monopolize all possession? Do they not know *equally as well* how to purchase what they have *occasion* to purchase, on terms as advantageous to themselves as any others, when they have equal means? Can they not *sell* as well? Do they not understand how to plan and execute all public works with as much regard to the public welfare as the high and lofty in life? Can they not make as judicious a provision for the education of the young, and the support of the aged and infirm? Why then is it to be pretended *on this account*, that the great mass shall not have equal possessions? Besides, how has it been ascertained that they actually do know less than others, at least of that which is worth knowing? Has equal opportunity been afforded to all classes in which to *display* their knowledge? If it has not, how has it been ascertained that the one class is wise; the other ignorant? Until, for example, the white lords of the South

and their black slaves shall enjoy equal personal liberty, equal possession of property and equal civil advantages, it cannot be told who of the two possesses most valuable knowledge. But when this equality shall prevail, we venture to say, that the colored population will live better and happier on the same amount of labor, and exertion than will those who shall have previously been their masters. And if this be true of them, how much more is it true of the free white man of the Northern, Western, and Middle States? What fact, then, could better establish the superiority to be in favor of those now affected to be despised, than this?

Let us then conjure our suffering brethren not to be carried away by the *ignis fatuus* of education as a *remedy* for our distresses. When they hear it stated that the people are not prepared for such a state of things, let us ask them to consider whether it may not be that the *aristocracy* are not prepared, since they are afflicted with the vice of wishing to shun the performance of their own just proportion of labor, and of laying it upon the shoulders of other men.

Besides, equal education we look upon as being out of human power to bestow, until every relation in life is equalized; till there be equal food, equal clothing, equal instruction, *equal parentage, equal necessity to labor, &c.* Till all these and more be at hand, an equalization of feeling, so to speak; an equal estimation of labor as honorable; an equal *choice* of the pursuits of life, will never prevail; and *they* hug a treacherous deception to their bosoms as we believe, who think there ever can or will.

The question of the advantage to every member of a community, of an increase of its population by births or otherwise, is one that has not been publicly discussed as much as it ought to be. It is easy to see, where such increase consists of good citizens, that every member is a gainer in his own happiness by every augmentation of the number of the community. It is a principle well established, that a division of labor—that is, the practice of one making one thing, another another, and so on throughout the whole circle of occupations, is that by which any given number of men, for example, the citizens of any state, can do more work in a given time than they otherwise could. The greater the number be of the citizens of any community, the greater may be the extension of the application of this principle. Thus the copy of a book, among a population of one hundred thousand people, must evidently cost more than if it were printed and published among a hundred millions. For the greater the number sold, the smaller is the price at which a single copy may be furnished, and more will be sold among one hundred million, than among one hundred thousand. And the same is true of every department of industry. Thus, to take an extreme case. If it were possible that a state of things existed in which the entire labor of one man's life consisted in cutting out, assisted perhaps by machinery, one only of the several pieces of leather which compose a common shoe, another cutting another piece, and so on throughout as

many processes as it would be possible to make the formation of a shoe to consist of, it is evident that the price of such shoe would and could be much lower than under any other circumstances. And the same is true, to a greater or less extent, of all other occupations. Yet nothing can be more certain of profit than that each individual should be enabled to execute the greatest possible quantity of work in a given time. This being accomplished throughout any community, all have much with which to purchase the productions and fabrications of others, and all can sell cheap. Nor *in this respect*, does it make any difference whether a particular producer or consumer be a good or bad citizen. In regard, therefore, to the mere operation of an increase of the number of producing and consuming citizens, the father of a bad citizen bestows as great a benefaction on his country as the father of a good one.

But if in either case, or rather in both cases, every citizen is benefited by an increase of our numbers, especially in a government where all shall actually be equal, is not every citizen indebted to all parents for the number of children they bring into existence and rear to maturity? We think it is self-evident, and that the indebtedness to every such parent is in exact proportion to the number of his children. Shall not then the debt be paid? And how pay it better than to tax every man in the State for the maintenance of all children, and with the money pay every man for feeding and taking care of his own children, furnishing them with clothing at the same time and with schools of the best kind at the expense of the State,—never in any case separating parents from children, until the latter go to acquire knowledge of some useful occupation, unless such parents oppress, or render them vicious. What more natural and reasonable than that society should adopt such an arrangement as this? What more unnatural and unreasonable than that parents should consider their children as a species of property, rather than as their equal but young fellow-citizens? Our offspring are surely not to be regarded in the light of domestic animals which we raise for our own individual profit. They do not stand in the same relation to us as does a sheep, a hog, or an ox, whom our labor has raised for the knife. On the contrary, they are our equals, our friends, and, in the future, our benefactors, and as much so to one man as to another. While, therefore, we cheerfully accord a share of tax, each to the support of all the children of the State, let us feel that we shall cross no feeling of our nature, since each parent, as is natural, will taste, as he does now, of more pleasure in the company of his own than in those of another; and since, also, this pleasure will be heightened by the reflection that by such a system of mutual support other children as well as his own, will enjoy the same enviable happiness and be alike completely protected from want.

We may add force to these remarks by observing that if all ought equally to pay the expense of raising good citizens, (and among these we consider all the industrious and the virtuous, however hum-

ble be their stations and pursuits,) because they are all equally benefited by their existence; how much more have they the right, and is it their duty to prevent the bringing up of bad citizens, who will alike injure all? Every good citizen, therefore, of mature age, we think, will not only freely consent, but ardently desire to place in the hands of the government the power to adopt such a system as will permit no more bad citizens to spring up among us. This, we think, consists in the plan of civil society marked out in this publication.*

But the great question of all comes at last. *What right have you, what right has government to dispossess every man of all that he has?* For until this be done, property cannot be equally and universally possessed; and this cannot be until the moral conviction exist or be established in the minds of a very great majority of men that it is morally proper to do it. Of this we are fully convinced, but we are as fully convinced also, that in strict moral right, no man has a just claim to any thing he holds beyond that which any and every other man holds to the same. If therefore, one man has as good a right to another's possessions (as the latter calls them) as he has himself, and if the whole or a very great majority can be convinced of this supposed fact, it is certain they have the *power* and no doubt will have the disposition to exercise it, to dispossess all as we propose, and make equal dividend of the same.

It has been said by Locke, that no man has a right to any thing which another has a right to take away. This is so plain a proposition, so self evidently true that we shall take it for granted, and shall not weaken it by attempting to give it support. Another equally self-evident proposition is, that in the rude and savage state of nature, the earth and all it contains belongs in equal right to all. So long as it remains in common, the enjoyment of all it furnishes is equally at the *command* of all. How then comes it to pass if such be the fact, that the successors—at least the very distant successors of these have not the same equality of right? The first of all people, supposing them to be more than a single individual in number, had right to make equal division of the earth, their equal and common property, and they had *no* right to make it otherwise. No individual, for himself, knowingly, had right to accept of less than his own equal share. None to accept of more. These may seem strange positions. But we hold them nevertheless to be true. We hold that no man has a right to make a gift, since the effect attendant upon the existence of the practice of making gifts, is no less than that of a man's making himself a voluntary slave. This, even the laws of the country little as they seem to consider slavery a grievous evil, absolutely forbid. Under them, a man cannot indent himself as a slave. Or if he does, he can free himself whenever he chooses, by merely pay-

* See more fully "The Rights of Man to Property," by T. Skidmore, New York, pp. 400. 12mo. 1829. price \$1.25.

ing such damages as may be adjudged on account of his *breach of contract*.

It may be said, perhaps that on a first division all would have more than they could use; that a man might give of his own, without injury to himself; and that, therefore, such an act could not be wrong. We reply to this, if the fact were that the giver did not injure himself, that in like manner the receiver was not benefitted—and therefore there was no gift.

As applied to civil society, organized as we wish to see it, it will be said that the (supposed) criminality of making gifts, would be at war with the practice of hospitality; with all provision made for the unfortunate, &c. &c. We answer no. As it regards hospitality, if men did not live in unnatural relations with each other; if they were not coldly and artificially distant—our civilities of hospitality would balance each other. To-day you would dine with us; to-morrow we should dine with you; and thus would the character of the gift disappear.

The government making provision for the unfortunate in bodily afflictions and each citizen paying his proportion of this provision; what is this proportion but the premium which each citizen pays for the insurance of his own health? A premium which entitles *him* to support also, if disease should assail him? There is, therefore, no gift in this, nor indeed in any other similar and general regulation adopted by government. And since this latter are better able, than individuals, and since it is, besides their duty to make the provision required, private persons ought to be restrained from the exercise of what is called charity, or benevolence, and therefore ought to be forbidden to make gifts at all.

But to return from our digression. No man has the right knowingly, in the first equal division of the soil of nature, to accept of less than his own equal and just share; because this would be to sink his own condition and elevate that of another; and because no man has a right to disregard his own equal claim to an equality with his fellows, or, even by his own voluntary consent, to assign to another more than the same equal claim. To admit that he has such right, and to admit, also, that another has a right to accept it, would be no less than to admit that the one had a right to consent to be a slave, the other a despot. And this we think would be a strange theory of rights, since it could not by any possibility, have, morality for its basis. It would, in fact, be an immoral system of rights altogether.

But if a man have not the right knowingly to consent to accept of less than his own equal proportion of the *soil* in its uncultivated state—and if another have not the right to accept of more—it is certainly true that no man has the right to give away his *labor* to another, nor has that other a right to receive it. As said already, to admit the contrary of this, would be to sanction the establishment of the relations of master and slave between man and man. For what does the slave more than this? To perform more labor for his master

than his master performs for him. This, we take it, is the true character of the slave, whether he be found in civilized society where he enjoys what is called personal liberty, or whether he have a particular person for his absolute and unconditional owner.

But if a man have no right to give any thing to his fellow, (the extending support to children is not a gift—it is merely repaying the debt we owe for similar support given us in our infancy, and otherwise providing for our own future welfare,) it is certainly evident that he has no right to give to those who may live after him. This principle then strikes at the root of all wills. And why should the power of making a will ever have been given to mankind? No doubt it has been done on the supposition that those who first cultivated the earth thereby made it their property forever. But can this be true? The whole of the first generation of adults that may be supposed to have had existence, if they had died altogether on the same day, could they, in justice and in right, declare that no one should have possession of their property forever after? And yet if they truly *owned* it, they would have a right to say so.

But the word *owned* seems not to be duly considered. It has reference only to that state of things in which a living being claims the use of animate or inanimate property. Property not existing, the word *own* would never have been heard of. Life, or living being never having been in existence the same thing would be true. When, therefore, a man dies, the word *own*, so far as he is concerned, ceases to have any meaning. As well might it be said that a man *eats* peaches that grow on a tree after his decease, as that he *owns* them when he is dead; for both these are words that have meaning when applied to him as a *living* being and not otherwise. Had he *never* lived, nor any creature like him, they would never have been known. So also if a man deceased cannot own material property neither can he own any thing else, such as the fruits of his labor. There is no ownership for *him* so soon as he ceases to be. Even then if it were possible to be right for a man to give away his labor and his property before his death, the *use* of such labor and property would belong to the receiver during the life-time of the giver, *and no longer*. But this we think we have shown is also impossible.

We do not rely upon authority as such—yet still we cannot refrain from offering to our readers a passage or two from Blackstone and Jefferson; the one an eminent law author, to whom all men of property look up as the protector of their possessions; the other, one of the greatest statesmen and lawyers of the age. The former says, 'For, naturally speaking, the instant a man ceases to be, he ceases to have any dominion; else, if he had a right to dispose of his acquisitions one moment beyond his life, he would also have a right to direct their disposal for A MILLION OF AGES after him; which would be highly absurd and inconvenient. All property, therefore, must cease upon death,' &c. Mr. Jefferson in a letter to James Madison, dated Paris, Sept. 6, 1789, and lately published in his Cor-

respondence, says, "that *the earth belongs in usufruct to the living* ; that the dead have no power nor right over it. *The portion occupied by any individual ceases to be his, when he himself ceases to be, and reverts to the society.*"

We hold then that inasmuch as the first of our race made the world theirs *as they found it*, so also have any generation the right to do the same thing. This being true, any generation has a right to succeed equally to the possession of what all former generations have left behind them. Nor does it alter the case that our predecessors have given to *some* among their successors their possessions, and what they call the fruits of their industry. They had no right to give them! Others had no right to receive them, even as gifts!—or having *purchased* them with their labor, have no title to that which another had no right to sell!

Thus far have we placed our views before our readers. They are much more circumscribed than we could have wished. But, as we undertake to circulate many thousand copies of the same, without cost to any but ourselves, with a wish, if we are correct, that the minds of others may be made to harmonize with our own, we must do it in strict conformity with the admonitions of our purse. We appeal then

To the Poor!—to come and join their efforts with ours; to assist us to place the means of happiness as much within their own reach as it is or can be within the reach of others; to situate their children not where they may be able to live without labor, but where they shall not be compelled to be the servants of men and of women no better than themselves; where, below the temptations of power and above the necessities of want, they know neither misery nor vice; and where they neither feel fear nor sustain reproach. We ask them to consider that all *have* right to be happy; that no man has right to *desire*, much less to *possess* property for the purpose of exempting himself from his equal share of labor, and if there be any who does, such person cannot, therefore, have any just claims to be considered by you, by others, or himself, as any thing but a bad man. We beg you to consider that you are free men; that as such you have the right for example, to leave your country; that if you were all to do it, those who now live on your, and of course not on their own, labor, allowing them to be equally rich, and allowing, also, that no more poor men came among them, would then find themselves obliged to support themselves on their own individual labor exactly as they would be required to do, if a division of property had taken place; and that if it be right in one way to require all to labor for their living; so is it right in another. We beg you to consider that those who now address you can have no interest in the proposed new modification of society beyond that which will be possessed by every other person, that of having the full value of their labor, if they labor at all and otherwise nothing; that you have the power to bring about even this great change; and that as we have already shown, you have *no right* to give your labor to others without an equal return from them, as

must be the case if you suffer society to remain unchanged—nor to allow your children to be doomed to the same unhappy condition. We ask you to reflect, that, in this country, nineteen out of twenty read and are able to understand subjects so plain as this; that every man votes; that the number of your own description of people is probably six or seven out of every ten; and that therefore you command the moral and physical power of every community. Unite then your exertions with ours; spare of the wages of your servitude the trifle you can, if you approve our sentiments, to give them a still more extended circulation, knowing full well that many of your brethren have prejudices, as is natural, against the boldness of our views, and, therefore, in the first instance cannot be willing to pay for what they consider erroneous, impracticable, or unjust. Send abroad our pamphlets to distant friends and let these in turn either correspond with us for more at cost price, or republish in their own places. Come also with us at the ensuing election and support a ticket on these principles, if for no other purpose as to any immediate benefit, than that it will tend to make our system more correctly and more widely known. Be not despairing of the accomplishment of so great an object. Hitherto revolutions have been brought about slowly; but hitherto men could not read; hitherto men could not write; nor print; nor vote; and there were few of course to study the science of government. Now, a thousand men, poor men for example, (so cheap is printing,) in five or ten years, could easily themselves furnish to every human being in the United States who can read, all that is necessary for him to read of any system, this or any other, which may be found adequate to make all equally happy. Why then should we despair? Shall men of influence prevail upon us to do this? Let us remember that Jefferson thought, a hundred years of time and the whole resources of the United States would be inadequate to construct the Great Erie Canal! Yet De Witt Clinton, with the aid of New York alone finished it in eight years! Let us beware then how we think the enjoyment of our rights and our happiness is far off! The present condition of the world says no. Undoubtedly there are those who would persuade you to act, not now, and among these, men both of good and bad motive. Let us advise you to beware of both. They say, *let us prepare*. As though a man needed preparation, never more to be called upon by a landlord! Never more to have *part only*, of all that he earns! As though men were not now fitted for that state of society, in which almost the whole business of life would be *producing, selling for cash and buying for the same!* We say, claim at the polls your rights, the rights of your wives, your children and of all future generations! Nor suffer yourselves, like the adherents of a Cæsar or a Pompey, to be attached to the cause of a Clay or a Jackson, since neither of these will do any thing to make your condition equal with their own. They will support no cause that you can call yours. We appeal now,

To the Middling Class!—You who have acquired, either by inhe-

ritance or industry, a competence for yourselves and your children. But though your condition is comfortable, you have no guarantee that it shall remain so. Human life is full of vicissitudes which each individual for himself can only modify, but can never control or counteract. It is for *your* interest then to come into a system, where, happen what will to *you*, your children can never be situated in a condition inferior to the children of any other man. Consider well whether you have any just, moral and parental right, by holding fast to the present order of things, to jeopardize the happiness of those you have brought into the world! Think whether you can be a loser even in a pecuniary point of view. Two parents would receive, on a division being made, something like three thousand dollars each—and having ten children on arriving at maturity also receiving each a like sum, the whole would amount to 38,000 dollars. How many men, by their own industry, without profit on the labors of others, have brought up such a family and saved such a sum? How many men by inheritance have a like sum? And of these two descriptions of men, how many are not sinking down into the class of the poor who have nothing, devoured by the monopolizing operations of still mightier capitalists? We conjure this Middle Class then to save themselves and the class below them by making common cause with us in our effort entirely to re-model the present state of society.

To the Wealthy! To you we say that even *your* true interests are with ours. They cannot be separated. Organized as we wish to see society, all that you enjoy now, you could enjoy then. One head to cover, one stomach to feed, one body to clothe, to house, to lodge, to convey, one mind to cultivate, constitute all your wants. Would you that a man, your equal, your superior perhaps should fan you while you are hot, bathe your feet at night, stand behind your chair at your meals, &c. &c.? All this is surely unreasonable and extremely degrading as well to the master as to the servant—and the state of society which enables you to obtain it, is such as to make these unnatural, nay, criminal indulgences cost you more than they are worth. Better, far better, that you be equal with your fellows; that, then, your country insure your property from loss by storm, by shipwreck, by fire, by sickness; that there be no debt; no wars abroad or at home; no thieves, robbers, murderers; no difference of rank, arising from difference of condition; that your children and children's children enjoy the advantage of the same perpetual system to the latest generation and thus be exempted from the possibility of what happens often enough now—of dying in the alms house. These are your true interests—and though many of you will not listen to them now, the time is fast coming when an all powerful public opinion will demand it at your hands. The time is fast coming when this same omnipotent opinion will consign to an infamy deeper than that which now stains the character of the vilest malefactor, the man who would dare to wish through his wealth to make others support his existence. We pray that among your own class, in America at

least, there may be found none so unreasonable as to oppose themselves to a system so holy, benignant and just.

To the Christian! we also make our appeal. 'Do unto others as ye would have others do unto you.' If ye would that *any* support themselves on their own individual labor, do ye even so yourselves. And let no man be found among you, to desire to have an enormous, or even any amount of property, *for the purpose* thereby (and there *can* be no other purpose) of being able to live without labor, or with less or more agreeable labor than does another. Christian, again we say, 'Love thy neighbor as thyself.' Seek not, therefore, to maintain a system, by which one man labors always and scarcely has any thing, while another has every thing and labors not at all. Seek not to keep up a system by which you may give more to your own children than you would give to those of another. These latter, are they not your neighbors? Strive not then, we say, to do this, since by doing it, and by refusing to assist in arranging things so that all children shall have equal property, you compel the poorer children to labor more for the richer than the richer work for them, and cannot, therefore, love the one as you do the other.

Jew and Christian! We hail you both and call upon you to respect in *practice* as well as in theory, as we do and will ourselves, that most ancient Charter of man's Rights, wherein the Almighty gave to man 'dominion over all the earth; and over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over every thing that moveth upon the earth.' (Genesis 1. 28.) We repeat, we call upon you to aid us in giving to each human being now living, or hereafter to live, his equal proportion of that dominion which is given to man generally, and of course *equally*, by the Creator of the Universe.

Atheists, Deists, Skeptics! we appeal to you also; and since you likewise recognize so much of the Christian religion as is embraced in the foregoing maxims of morality, we call upon you to apply them to the structure of civil society, and thus assist us to obtain for all, equal and unalloyed happiness through all future generations.

In conclusion. This Association has room only further to say, that they propose publishing a document of this kind every half year; that they intend soon, calling a public meeting of all men living on their own useful labor to form a ticket at the ensuing election; and that as this work is stereotyped, they will be ready to furnish copies of the same to those who wish also to distribute them gratuitously, at two dollars per hundred, on application, by letter, post paid, addressed either to our Chairman or Secretary, or otherwise to A. Ming, No. 9 Canal street corner of Elm, to Wm. F. Cisco, 234 Hudson near Spring street, or to Abraham Van Gilder, 207 Broome near Norfolk street. Single copies three cents.

On motion, Ordered, that fifteen thousand copies of the foregoing be printed and circulated. JOEL P. WHITE, *Chairman*.

WM. FORBES, *Secretary*.

Read and lend. Read and lend again.



12079/9/79