

In the month of 1888 London was disturbed for weeks by tumult in Trafalgar Square. Pro-
 ceptions growing continually in number and in violence came ^{from the East End} by various routes to their point of con-
 centration in Trafalgar Square. The full force of the Police was gathered both in the Square & the dense surrounding
 streets. ~~Engaged~~ Many conflicts between them and the crowd followed: many were seriously in-
 jured many arrested. Finally the Guards were called out and the Life Guards patrolled the
 Square. All these precautions did not protect ^{the shops in} the Strand and South ^{Street} from the breaking
 of windows, & the robbery & destruction of property. And yet all this began in the herding
 of a few homeless & homeless creatures by night in Trafalgar Square. It began in the want &
 misery of paupers & outcasts: it grew into a political strike led by popular orators and Members of
 Parliament, and ^{such} an exhibition of Police & Soldiers ^{and London has never seen since that [something]} who could have dreamed such a growth from
 an outset so ~~feeble~~ and contemptible. Who can say what might not have been the end. The show of
 armed force was ^{happily} enough: but what if the show had ended in its actual use? Any madman or
 malefactor might have rendered the employment of force a duty. We were told indeed that these
 tumult mongers were only loafers, striplings, and boys. But they were met by military forces both horse & foot. And
 they might have brought on a public conflict ending in bloodshed.

In the month of September 1889 30,000 men, not striplings, loafers ^{or} vagabonds, but the
 bone & sinew of our manhood were for four weeks on strike. Their wives & children ^{were} suffering
 severely from all kinds of privation. The Port of London was stagnant. There was no movement on the
 river, ^{Thames only} but the tides. Ships laden with cargoes could unload nothing. The river was crowded by them but not
 a barge was a hand moved: the traders on either bank of the Thames had ~~no~~ no sale for their goods
 & provisions ^{expected} given the streets day by day: on Sundays a procession of those who marched to
 St. James Park. Meeting on Tower Hill & elsewhere were ~~expected~~ ^{gathered} by their leaders with a
 the fire of natural oratory. The excitement grew ^{greater every} day. And yet not a pane of glass was
 broken. The Recorder of London when the Great Strike ended spoke as follows:

And yet at any moment a madman or a malefactor, or a reckless fool by some act of destruction
 might have kindled a fire that would have been hard to extinguish. ~~This all the more being~~ If thirty thousand hungry
~~and the peaceful, and honourable action & spirit of the men.~~ men, irritated by the refusal of what they believed to be just might have broken out into violence
 police & soldiers might have cut them down but it would have been a dark record in the
 history ^{not} of Engl. London only but of England. And yet we were on the eve of such a disaster.

While this anxiety was weighing on the least reflecting and the most ^{self} confident minds there was a great silence, Public opinion, & popular sympathy at home & abroad were ^{resolutely on the side of} ~~with~~ the men. We heard little of freedom of contract, ~~as of the Political Economy~~ which teaches that between Master & man, even when the safety of London is at stake no one may intervene. Capital is the Supreme factor of human Society: a labour is its servant. The will of Capital is Sovereign. Labour has its will of its own. Labour is bound to work for what it can get, and Capital is free to buy labour in the cheapest market. "The labourer is worthy of his hire" that is of the minimum left ^{after} ~~of~~ competition. Labour has ^{rights} ~~not~~ a human life but only ^{to} an economic ^{life}. All this which ^{before} ~~was~~ so loud & dominant ~~before~~ ^{during} four or five years was silent & ~~meditative~~ ~~and~~ ~~passive~~. The storm ended: ~~the~~ ~~peace~~ returned & fear passed away. Soon the old voices were heard again. The modern Political Economy refuses all arbitration. There are only two parties ~~it~~ ~~takes~~ ~~it~~ ~~in~~ ~~the~~ ~~dispute~~ ~~the~~ ~~Master~~ ~~&~~ ~~the~~ ~~Man~~. They forget that ^{outside of a Dark or a Light} ~~the~~ ~~whole~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~country~~ ~~is~~ ~~watching~~ ~~anxiously~~ ~~for~~ ~~the~~ ~~solution~~ ~~of~~ ~~these~~ ~~distressing~~ ~~&~~ ~~dangerous~~ ~~contentions~~. This third party is in number, freedom, & authority able to make itself felt. It has no need of leave or permission from any man, ^{It has a right & a power} to make its voice heard in the disputes which threaten the peace & safety of the country. It is absolutely independent, & impartial. It does not assume to be an Arbitrator; but if possible to be a Peacemaker or failing this to protect the public welfare from the disorders which ~~the~~ ~~disputants~~ may

at any moment ^{may} bring upon it.

- 1. Policy
- 2. Society
- 3. Remedy.
- 1. Harmon.
- 2. Domestic.

I am afraid that I have ventured to speak invidiously not so much of Political Economy as of Political Economists. I have believed myself all my life to be a Free trader & Political Economist. Sixty years ago, when another future was before me, I not only read the older Political Economists; but also I knew personally some of the leaders of the School. I remember dining at the Political Economy Club where I saw and heard ~~the~~ ^{the} great ones. Sir Henry Parnell, Archbishop Whately and many more of that date. At that ~~date~~ ^{moment} a heaven was working in Political Economy, which has now gained the ascendant. Between the old Political Economy, and the New there is a great interval. The old was broad, sympathetic & humane; ~~it was humane, with appearance after~~

For the present I will only say that ^{the modern} it does not seem to me broad, or sympathetic, or humane. These are strong words but

I will justify them.
Par.

~~the law of the household or the administration of the~~
houses at home. It embraces all the members of the family and ^{and all their needs that is want} their safety ~~and~~ ^{want} & welfare in its fullest sense, the feeding, clothing, instruction, all needful provisions for ~~safety~~ ^{care} & health & in sickness. The ~~word~~ ^{first intention} meaning of economy is essentially ~~domestic~~ ^{the} administration of a home.

It is a metaphor to speak of Political Economy. The State or City or Commonwealth is a family or household because it is the aggregate of the homes & domestic life of a people. But it is also the aggregate of the duties and obligations of the domestic life of the people. ~~Under~~ Political Economy therefore comprises the safety, the physical & moral needs, ~~of the State~~, the public order, the defence of the State, the administration of Justice civil & criminal, distribution & commutative, and under this last will come the exchange of values. As domestic economy

is coextensive with the obligations of the household, so political economy is coextensive with the obligations of the Commonwealth. It was in this sense that the older Political Economists understood their subject. The modern Political Economists occupy themselves chiefly if not wholly with the exchange of values the ~~most~~ narrowest, least sympathetic & humane functions of economy namely the management of money and the payment of liabilities, the bills of the households. It was in the wider & more humane sense that the older Political Economists wrote. This has ^{briefly but} been well thought out by Mr. Rae in two articles of the Contemporary Review for ^{and still more} elaborately by Dr. Ingram in his very able and complete work "The History of Political Economy".

But we are told that whatever be the distress of the deserving unemployed men the only remedy (4.
to be found in is the progressive law of commercial prosperity which must employ its surplus ^{capital} in the employment of
hands, thereby ~~attaining~~ extinguishing distress, and bringing in the golden age, when no man shall be
without work. How long it will take to accomplish this paradisaical change when every man shall
sit down under his own vine and under his own fig. tree we are not told. Since Adam Smith we
never had a hundred years of Political Economy but three generations of men have passed away
before the dawn of universal wages. It is difficult to write gravely without writing sharply of such
heartless treatment of human suffering. A leading Political Economist, whom I knew well, when I
pressed him by asking what is to become of men, women & children while the abstract economical
laws are slowly reaching their realization, answered "They must leave the country or cease to be."

But this compels me to enter upon the moral foundation of the Droit au travail, or the right to subsist or sustenance without work as recognized in the Poor laws of Elizabeth. This is the popular delusion which I have countenanced. We have already seen that Mr Mill declares this right to be founded in the law of nature and to be a moral axiom. But his opinion should be regarded as singular, or merely speculative, I will quote the teaching of one of our most moderate and careful Professors of Political Economy the late Henry Fawcett. His teaching has a double weight because he was not only a Professor of signal excellence, but a Statesman of mature judgment.

In his Manual of Political Economy he says "Any person upon application has a right to demand maintenance from the poor rates." He adds "England alone recognizes this legal right" to be supported by the State. Perhaps he did not refer to the Droit au travail in France because the "Obligations Nationales" having ceased to exist, the principles on which they rested had passed out of sight. It may indeed be true that this right is affirmed only by a legal enactment, ^{in England until about 300 years ago it did} ~~not~~ not become a legal & compelling enactment by the 5 of Elizabeth c. 3. But it is denied in no Christian land, because it is founded in the universal Christian law: as well as the law of nature.

And here it seems necessary to enter fully into this delicate question. I do not mean to omit to remark that the cause liable to abuse by the un instructed especially in times of distress when the unsympathetic language and acts of the wealthy & the well to do drive them to resortments.

The laws of property are founded upon a higher and anterior law, the law of nature.

It is the law of nature that sanctions & may say consecrates the positive laws of property.

omit

(C) The following will, I believe, be found to be an accurate statement of the Christian law of property 5
as it bears upon the question before us.

1. By the law of nature ^{all} men have ^{common} a right to the use of things which were created for their use & sustenance.
2. But this common right does not exclude the possession of any thing as proper to each. But the common right is by natural law, the right of property is by human & positive law: and the positive law of property is expedient for three reasons 1) What is one's own is more carefully used than what is in common 2) human affairs are better ordered by recognized rights of each man. 3) Human society is more peaceful when each has his own: protected by the law of justice: Summ cuique.
3. Theft is therefore always a sin for two reasons first-it is contrary to justice. Secondly because it is done either by stealth or by violence.
4. But the human & positive law cannot derogate from the natural & divine law. According to the divine law all things are ordered to sustain the necessity of man. And therefore the division & appropriation of things cannot hinder the sustenance of man in case of necessity. Therefore the possessions of those who have superabundantly by the natural law are due to the sustenance of the poor. As St. Ambrose quoted in the Decretals says "It is the bread of the famishing that you keep back: & the clothing of the naked that you lay by: ^{the money you bury in chests can't release} the redemption of the miserable."
But this is said of extreme & urgent necessity when life is at stake.
This interpretation of the commandment "Thou shalt not steal" is in the universal law of Christianity from the beginning.

the personally in Capital. The poor possess nothing but their inheritance of natural right.

If the Poor Law of Elizabeth had not been passed the English Land laws would not have survived till now. From Henry VII to Charles II the possession of land has been passing from the ~~few~~^{many} to the few. In proportion to the population it was never held in so few hands as at this day. The Statesmen, & the Yeomanry & the Forty Shilling Freeholders are gone and the Land of England & Scotland is held by

Mr. Fawcett is wisely & firmly opposed to the theory that the State should guarantee employment. But he discusses the question whether transiently almost a special & urgent emergency some intervention of the State be not expedient. His answer is as follows

"Some who agree with the observations which have just been made may be inclined to think that the Government ought to find employment in times of occasional deprivations. Few would presume to assert that in no case could such a policy be justifiable our object is rather to show that the cases which warrant such Government interference are much less frequent than is usually supposed" 1.

He then gives the instance of the Cotton Famine in Lancashire during the American War. ~~But~~ He adds that it must be remembered that trade was improved in Leeds

Bradford, Dundee, & Belfast. But why should the vast manufacturing power of Lancashire with its immense plant of mills, machinery, & hand be broken up? No momentary profits of Bradford & Dundee would compensate the capitalists, and the workers of Lancashire for breaking up a house & home with all the aggravations of poverty and ruin. A wise interference saved Lancashire and all its industries.

Mr Fawcett sums up his opinion in these words "When any extra strain is put upon our poor law system it absolutely breaks down. When the Lancashire operatives were thrown out of employment during the American War all the resources of parochial relief were exhausted, in a few months: loans of money had to be obtained from the Government, & earnest appeals were made to the whole nation"

What compliance of Albion's Necessity was there in all this? And yet the other day nobody asked loans from the Government for the unemployed in London.