

— JOHN WOOLMAN — AND THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

by David Morse



*Sponsored for distribution by
New England Yearly Meeting's
Committee on Prejudice & Poverty*

David Morse, a member of Storrs (CT) Meeting, is the author of *The Iron Bridge*. He can be contacted via his website: www.david-morse.com or at dmorse@downcity.net.

Skip Schiel, of Friends Meeting at Cambridge, is a photographer, concentrating on a series about a pilgrimage retracing the African slave trade. You may find him thru his website, www.ccae.org/~schiel or at schiel@ccaec.org.

The Committee on Prejudice and Poverty of New England Yearly Meeting can be reached thru one of its co-clerks, Rob Yager, at 603-641-2949 or at robbyager@hotmail.com.

The Photographs:

The first two, by author, David Morse, show students in Middletown, Connecticut, preparing for "Mobilization for Global Justice" held in Washington D.C., in April 2000, and the large demonstration against the WTO in Seattle, in December 1999.

The next set, beginning on p. 1, are from a rally in Cambridge Massachusetts, organized by the Eviction Free Zone. A local manifestation of the global economy—maximizing profits at the expense of human rights—high rents and frequent evictions plague the community. Children chanted and spoke out for housing justice. Skip Schiel is the photographer.

And the final set, beginning on p. 9, also by Skip Schiel, are from the Interfaith Pilgrimage of the Middle Passage, a journey examining the history and legacy of the African slave trade. All these photos were made in the United States, mostly the South, between July and November 1998.

In addition, see David Morse's article, "The Message of Seattle" in *Friends Journal*, March 2000. Also various articles in *Peacework*, the journal of New England Regional American Friends Service Committee, on the web at www.afsc.org/peacewrk.htm.

Our New England Yearly Meeting committee, Prejudice and Poverty, feels this writing by David Morse is useful in considering the question of global economics, so, with his permission, we've published it along with photographs from him and Skip Schiel. We hope you will consider carefully the arguments he makes for opposing the hurtful practices of the World Trade Organization, World Bank, International Monetary Fund and other agencies, along with allied global corporations.



Organizing opposition to global trade organizations

He ponders what a present day John Woolman might do in the face of such domination: Oppose wrong action and ideas and correct them, while seeking the larger picture. "Look first of all within," as Mr. Morse puts it, drawing a primary lesson from John Woolman.



Text (publication pending) and two photos on this page:
David Morse, © 2000

Remaining photos and booklet design:
Skip Schiel, © 2000
(version July 2000)

Drawing (p15):
Tom Feelings ©

Wealth desired for its own sake obstructs the increase of virtue, and large possessions in the hands of selfish men have a bad tendency, for by their means too small number of people are employed in useful things, and some of them are necessitated to labor too hard, while others would want business to earn their bread, were not employments invented which, having no real usefulness, serve only to please the vain mind.

—John Woolman, *A Plea for the Poor* (1793)



Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. a mural at Dexter Avenue Baptist church, Montgomery Alabama, 1998

What you can do:

Organize a tenant rights movement in your neighborhood—contact Eviction Free Zone, 617-354-1300, 11 Garden St., Cambridge, MA, 02138 for suggestions.

Read socially engaged literature—try *Peacework* at www.afsc.org/peacewrk.htm or *The Witness* at www.thewitness.org for analysis.

Form a committee at your meeting dedicated to social examination and change—contact Friends for Racial Justice at Friends Meeting at Cambridge, 617-876-6883, 5 Longfellow Park, Cambridge, MA, 02138 for inspiration.

JOHN WOOLMAN AND THE GLOBAL ECONOMY

by David Morse

An English friend writes from a rural market town in Shropshire:

Even the Chinese takeaway in Broseley has a big notice stating that to the best of their knowledge all ingredients used are free from GM [genetically modified] products. In Britain it is law for food to be labeled, giving details of content. Anything which states 'may contain some genetically modified soya (or whatever)' usually remains on the shelf. Shoppers everywhere seem to be reading the small print.

She encloses with the letter a small color brochure in which Iceland Frozen Foods ("Food you can trust") boasts "NO GM ingredients, artificial colours or flavours."

I write back in chagrin that

we Americans are pretty much oblivious to issues surrounding genetically modified foods, even as our government tries to force

them upon Europe through the mechanism of the World Trade Organization. On this side of the Atlantic,

GM still means automobiles. The fact is we've been eating GM foods for a decade without even knowing it.

How different the situation would be, I find myself thinking, if we had experienced our own version of the outbreak of *bovine*

spongiform encephalopathy ("Mad Cow" disease) that raised a panic in Europe four years ago and forced Britain to

destroy its entire herd. (A Swiss friend, visiting us at that time and confessing he felt beef-



Children arrive



starved, took advantage of the opportunity to wolf down an American burger—though I pointed out that our own meat-factory approach, intensely dependent on antibiotics and hormones, is ripe for a comparable disaster.) Thus far our

pathologies have manifested more subtly, as in occasional outbreaks of salmonella, and in the chemical allergies some of our population are developing which are more difficult to link to the food we eat. (In England, researchers at York Nutritional

Laboratory found a staggering 50 percent rise in soy food allergies in 1998, coinciding with a large increase in genetically engineered soy imports from the U.S. In this country, where GM labeling is nonexistent, we have no basis for scientific comparison.) We have yet to experience Mad Cow disease; so far, we have succumbed only to the sacred cows of industry.

How different, too, our public awareness might be if our own country were not so huge, if

we had not—partly as a matter of USDA policy—put so many of our small farmers out of business; if millions of acres were not monopolized by a few huge corporations such as Archer Daniels Midlands

("Supermarket to the World"), and by a single seed company, Monsanto, which has staked its corporate future on the aggressive promotion of genetically engineered crops.

Americans, increasingly alienated from the land, tend to compartmentalize human health as distinct from the health of the environment. In Europe, a holistic view comes more easily. My English friend explains the British caution about GM crops such as Monsanto's Bt corn, which has proven harmful to monarch butterflies, ladybugs and lacewings, and its

Roundup Ready crops, which may give rise to "superweeds":

We live in such a small country. The fields are so close, and amongst us, and the pollen drifts from one field to the next.



In Britain, government-supervised GM corn-planting projects have drawn the ire of public figures including the Prince of Wales. Militant activists such as Lord Melchett, executive director of Greenpeace, have gone to trial for destroying portions of the experimental fields. The British media are full of such news.



Our own media are largely uncritical of the government view, which is essentially the corporate view. An outbreak of salmonella is reported as an isolated phenomenon; no connection is made to factory farming or to the brutal working conditions in modern chicken processing plants; we are urged to accept irradiation of our food to protect us against salmonella: these appear as unrelated news items, atomized on the back pages. How different it might be, I wonder, if our broadcast and print outlets were not themselves owned by a handful of large conglomerates.



But those are a lot of *ifs*. The consequence of all these circumstances is that we Americans are ignorant of issues being debated passionately elsewhere—many involving global trade—even as we are exhorted to revere the global economy. Lulled by our media and coerced by a government increasingly beholden to corporations, we are on a collision course with the peoples of the world.

Why, beyond any of these single issues, should Americans get involved in the rarified world of global trade? Our concerns may be many, the dialogue complex, but at a very simple level it comes down to this: We should share the world's concern for globalization simply because the global economy, as it is being constructed by powerful transnational corporations, puts profits above choice. Not just consumer choice, but moral choice.

These corporations, operating behind a curtain of international bureaucracies comprised

of the WTO, World Bank, and IMF, as well as regional trade agreements such as NAFTA, are all designed to facilitate international trade and accelerate corporate globalization. To the public, the movement toward a single global economy is portrayed as orderly, advantageous, and inevitable. We are assured that it is "the future," and that there is no resisting it.

The language used to describe globalization is often deceptive. The word *liberalize*, as applied to trade, has nothing to do with liberal values. Similarly, the words *free* and *fair*, as applied narrowly to trade, refer not to democratic or egalitarian values—much as we might wish they did—but to the diametric opposite: a scheme designed to give corporations free access to markets, at the expense of local concerns and preferences, as well as basic human rights.

In reality the process of globalization is proving anything but orderly. Evolving in a climate of deregulation and



privatization, this so-called system has brought chaos to the lives of rural people worldwide and reintroduced to cities and factories a return to barbaric labor conditions that have been outlawed in the industrialized countries for the better part of a century.

In New York City, following the Triangle Waist Co. fire in 1911, when 146 workers were killed—mostly young immigrant women—building codes and labor laws eliminated sweatshops from New York and other garment-making centers. But today sweatshops have returned, from Los Angeles to New York—operating in secret and exploiting young immigrant women.

The brutality of the new global system is seen in the series of fires that has been taking place regularly in Asian factories. The worst so far was in 1993, at a toy factory outside Bangkok, where the official body count was 188; but many more young workers were likely incinerated in the four-story

building, whose doors were kept locked while they produced Sesame Street muppets and Bart Simpson dolls for Toys-R-Us, Fisher-Price, and J.C. Penney. News of the tragedy, the worst factory fire in the history of capitalism, made it only into the back pages of American newspapers.

Our indifference to this brutality is perhaps even more disturbing than our complaisance about the food we eat and the natural habitats we destroy. It belongs to the larger inertia that seems to be governing us as citizens of the sole remaining super-power.

Seattle was instructive. It is possible that we may be witnessing in this country the onset of a movement toward global justice. Commentators have tried to dismiss the demonstrators in Seattle and Washington D.C. as motley, the seeming diversity of their concerns as confused, the alliances between teamsters and turtles as doomed to failure; but

they are missing an important point. The movement now taking shape is based on these three intersecting concerns: environmental, consumer health, and human rights. And this triad, as a basis for organization, shows a very sinuous strength.

How then do these concerns get translated into action?



We might consider the example of John Woolman, an eighteenth century Philadelphia (sic-New Jersey) Quaker who acted individually on his opposition to slavery. I can think of no historical figure who offers a clearer antecedent to the moral oppo-

sition to sweatshops sweeping college campuses today. Indeed, it is not overstating the case to suggest that if John Woolman were alive today he would see the global economy as the slave system it is: a deregulated, profit-maximizing colonial system in which transnational corporations freely exploit the cheapest labor available—jumping from Bangladesh

to Indonesia or El Salvador at the drop of a tax-incentive, to whatever workforce is cheapest, and wherever repressive regimes can be bought.

Woolman saw the world in some complexity. He saw that the exploitation in his own era went beyond the kidnapping of

Africans that lay at its very heart; it included a whole body of complicity, a slavery-based colonial economy that



had its tentacles in New England textile merchants, in the manufacturers of chocolate candy, rum, and indigo dye, and among all the minor functionaries who supported the system. He understood that he himself was complicit, and that the task of rooting it out began first and foremost within himself and with his own actions.

His first revolutionary act was one of refusal. Asked to sign a bill of sale involving the purchase of another human being, he vowed to never place himself in that

position again. The scope of his refusal grew. He refused to sleep overnight in homes where slaves were owned. He refused to wear traditional gray Quaker clothing because the indigo dye supported the slave plantations; he wore plain, undyed fabric instead, and his plain white hat

became a personal trademark, an advertisement to other Quakers. His refusal widened further. When

he visited England in 1772, he was so moved by the brutality of the stagecoach operators, who ran their horses to death and endangered the lives of the young post boys, that he refused to ride on coaches. He walked,



when he had to. He made a moral choice—a personal choice—but one that touched the lives of his fellow Quakers

and the world beyond.

Woolman—to continue this parallel—would, I think, pay little credence to the argument that "these people need jobs—

any jobs," which one hears from the IMF and the World Bank, an argument suspiciously close to the one put forward in the 1770s

and later in defense of slavery: that it benefited the slaves. One does not need X-ray vision to see past the bureaucratic

curtain, to the pattern of accelerating abuses—of human rights and worker safety, of the environment and consumer health.

The example of Woolman is particularly inspiring because today we are invited to throw up our hands at the complexity of the world, to feel overwhelmed, and to evade our responsibility as moral beings.

How do we avoid succumbing to this seeming choicelessness, bombarded as we are by cheap goods and trivializing media? How do we live by our convictions?

The choice begins personally, as it did with Woolman, with our own internal revolu-

tion and our own actions. We need to acknowledge our own complicity before we can shape a moral response. We may refuse



to wear Nikes, knowing that Michael Jordan is paid more than the entire workforce engaged in shoe manufacture

throughout Asia. But this is an easy target. More difficult is the acknowledgment that if we drive a car or depend on nuclear power for electricity, we are contributing to the degradation of the environment. In that sense

of personal accountability, nothing has changed since Woolman's day.

At the same time, some distinctions need to be drawn between Woolman's time and our own.

First, it is worth observing that the feeling of helplessness we experience

in the face of global issues did not settle over us accidentally. It is being carefully engineered. We are manipulated by corporate-led opinion-makers and



bureaucratic insiders who substitute their expertise for common decency, who condescend to us on editorial pages, and who define through the power of their advertising dollars what counts as "news."

We are marginalized and infantilized, driven out of the role of citizens and into the role of consumers.

The issues surrounding global trade, while complex, are not as complex as the mainstream media in this country would have us believe. And they would not appear so foreign to our lexicon if

the media and the politicians did not so steadfastly ignore them. That they have scarcely surfaced in the presidential campaign speaks to the larger inertia.

This conspiracy of silence is nothing new. Our country's newspapers and political establishments have often conspired

to support the status quo. During the first half of the nineteenth century, newspapers in



the South censored news of slave rebellions, while in New England, papers supported a racist legal structure and

ignored the Abolitionists for as long as they could. What is new, as we begin the twenty-first century, is the extent to which civil society has been overpowered by corporate values and our lifestyles commodified.

What is new is the velocity of corporate adaptation within an illusory status quo.



Capital now moves

across national borders electronically in an eye-blink: foreign-exchange trading alone amounts to \$1.2 trillion a day, dwarfing national economies. Textile factories and assembly-plants can be loaded into wide-body cargo jets and moved from Alabama to Bangladore in a

matter of days. Transnational corporations have become detached from national loyalties and from communities: they operate outside the reach of governments or labor unions, squeezing their workforce unmercifully, and paying taxes where it is convenient; they outsource to redundant subcontractors whom they whipsaw for the cheapest price; and the subcontractors in turn are forced to squeeze their workers to produce more for less.



The Interfaith Pilgrimage of the Middle Passage at the World Bank, Washington, DC, July 1999

We live in a world far removed from the assumptions underlying Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations*, which appeared four years after John Woolman's death. The very concepts of "free markets" and "nations" that define Smith's theory of capitalism are under attack by today's global oligopolies.



Greed is nothing new. What is new is the disproportion between corporate and civil rule.

In his recent book, *One World, Ready or Not*, William Greider likens the new global economy to a colossal, mobile machine, creating great wealth and wreaking great destruction in its path, sustained by its own momentum and guided by its own appetite, but running completely wild because nobody is at the wheel. That is a more benign view than some, but it captures the essence of corporate irresponsibility.

Certainly if the new global economy is running amuck, the sages of Wall Street and Washington D.C. appear not to have noticed. As of this writing, *The New York Times* has yet to run an op/ed piece that fairly represents anything but the corporate view of the demon-

strations in Seattle and elsewhere. The whole alternative economic view espoused by Herman Daly, David Korten, Edward Goldsmith and others—which challenges the assumptions of infinite growth, which places a premium on sustainability and seeks to hold corporations accountable for their true costs—is for the most part ignored. Empire is assumed. Thomas L. Friedman continues to sing the praises of the global economy and to accuse trade unionists of "knee-



Auction block, Fredericksburg, VA, July 1998

jerk protectionism." Meanwhile, the myopic eye of television sees what it wants to see: youthful whites; violence wherever it occurs. Commentators gloss over the broader nonviolent protest, along with the ideas behind it.

This bias is echoed around the nation: editors of local and regional newspapers echo *The*

New York Times or *The Los Angeles Times* (which has just been bought by the Chicago-based Tribune Co.); they cut costs of news-gathering by relying increasingly on the wire services, and insist that their readers are not interested in international affairs. Thus the climate of isolationism is perpetuated, and business goes on as usual.

Far more than in Woolman's time this inertia is dollar-driven—partly the result of advertising, directly and indirectly. This year [2000], a consortium made up of Monsanto and other bioengineering companies announced the launch of a \$50 million advertising campaign aimed at overcoming consumer resistance to GM foods. Millions more are being spent lobbying Congress.

The inertia is dollar-driven at another, more personal level. We face it individually every



time we deliberate whether to buy the cheap pair of shoes made in China, the grapes grown in Chile, the easy-peel shrimp of uncertain origin. Often we don't know how workers are treated in a particular factory, what pesticides are used in the vineyards, at what environmental cost the shrimp were caught.



Stocks, Williamsburg, VA, July 1998

I may happen to know—because of official steps recently taken by the Indian government—that my theoretical purchase of an Indian carpet will not condemn a child artisan to a lifetime of servitude and abuse, as it does in Nepal. But in general our field of moral choice is being powerfully eroded under the new trade rules enforced by the WTO. We may do enough research, if we have the luxury of time, to acquire some inkling of a company's performance this year, as measured by environ-



mental or human rights yardsticks. But what about next year? And what happens when that company is bought up by another, or chooses next month to outsource its production to Kuala Lumpur? The yardstick is gone.

Are we then corrupted by the endless array of cheap goods dumped at our doors?

It would appear so, despite our good intentions. Most often we are left to choose in ignorance. The can of tuna that was once labeled "dolphin-safe"—following a decade-long consumer boycott of albacore and carefully arrived-at agreements with major packers—is it still "dolphin-safe"?

Under the new guidelines designed to liberalize trade, the WTO makes its rulings in Geneva on the basis of trade alone—without consideration for the concerns being voiced by

citizens around the world: consumer health, human rights, and environmental standards. Any of these value-based preferences constitute "non-tariff restraints of trade" and can trigger heavy penalties. European objections to hormone-treated beef from big U.S. beef producers fall into this category, as do Canadian efforts to bar suspected carcinogenic additives from imported gasoline, and the American public's resistance to sweatshop-produced clothing.



Woolworth's lunch counter, Greensboro, NC, August 1998

At the level of individual choice, in our roles as consumers, there is a psychological dimension to the inertia which works something like this: the WTO savages our ability as consumers to honor our own values; unable to make a moral choice, we feel driven or at least strongly encouraged to make an amoral choice; we know we are



Slave mart museum, Charleston, VA, July 1998

complicit, and this disconnection between belief and practice becomes part of the inertia.

We can try to wrench free from the system, as John Woolman did. But the position of a John Woolman is in some ways more difficult today. Such a person, confronted with today's cornucopia of shoddy and demeaning goods—sweatshop-produced clothing from the developing world; hormone-injected beef from the U.S.; pesticide-laced bananas from South America—may manage to boycott certain of its products.

However, the act of refusal has become more complicated, more costly in money and in time for research. The original John Woolman was a tailor of modest means. His act of individual conscience was extraordinary by any measure. But he may not be the best model, for several reasons. First, the

comparable refusal today would require a degree of leisure beyond the means of most working people struggling to make ends meet. Second, the act of refusal demands more education on the part of others simply to be understood. Third, in a world as cluttered and noisy as ours, Woolman's quiet act of refusal would be unlikely to carry the same resonance. Considerations such as these are beside the point at the level of pure conscience, but they are relevant if we hope to change the system.

We might ask *How many John Woolmans will it take*

to effect change? Obviously some sort of critical mass was attained to require labeling of GM products in Europe and Japan. How many John Woolmans will it take to get our own government to respond?

But this is where the John Woolman model becomes problematic. Woolman himself had only a modest impact on events. Even among Quakers, few followed his example. The international slave trade persisted

officially for more than a quarter-century after his death, and ended only as a result of strenuous political efforts in Parliament, détente with Spain, and environmental destruction in the West Indies—chiefly the loss of topsoil from deforestation and subsequent decline of the plantation system. Slavery as an institution continued for another three generations in the American South.

John Woolman remains for me a guiding consciousness in confronting the global economy. But his act of refusal was only a starting-place, and remains so now. If we confuse his individualism with political action, it is a dangerous model.

All this argues for the more active and collectivist approach being used today. A crucial barrier was breached when, in the spirit of Greenpeace, some prominent leaders of organizations deliberately broke the law and were brought to trial—as when Lord Melchett in England, and Jose Bove in France, destroyed GM



crops. Their actions challenged the legitimacy of corporate-dominated government and helped reverse the tide of public opinion.

Seattle and subsequent demonstrations—with their many heroes and heroines, their nonhierarchical collectivism, their acts of nonviolent civil disobedience, their blend of confrontational tactics with coalition-building—offer another model. We can learn a lot from the style of planning that has preceded these actions, and from the idealism that propels them. If this energy can move into political campaigns and town halls, it will be a formidable political force. Whether that will happen remains to be seen.

We need to attend to the various strains of anarchism that help energize this movement. They include not just the Black Bloc window-breakers in Seattle, but a wide spectrum of committed individuals struggling less visibly—some of them middle aged women, solid citizens—who identify themselves as anarchists of one stripe or another, as they work with the homeless and the battered in an

effort to address the failures of large-scale postindustrial society. We need to hear their essential message, because in various ways they are addressing the task before us all—of making government and corporations accountable.

The so-called "blue-green alliance" between blue-collar workers and environmentalists, which began with the struggle against NAFTA and captured some imaginations in Seattle, continues to broaden. But in some respects it is a marriage of convenience—as when the move

Private:
 secluded from sight
 not available for public use
 From the Latin: *privare*—to deprive, release, [i.e., steal]
 (American Heritage Dictionary)

to deny China permanent member status in the WTO drew support from groups in fundamental conflict: human rights advocates and die-hard protectionists; internationalists and isolationists. The potentially powerful pact between labor and environmentalists remains tenuous, demanding understanding and concessions on all sides if it is to become a stable political force. Fear of job loss has prompted some unions, such as the United Mine Workers, to support the mine-owners resistance to reducing carbon emissions. Sierra Club climate-change specialist Dan

Becker warns that it will be difficult for unions and environmental groups to work together if they disagree on something as basic as global warming. Grassroots education will have to take place on both sides of the alliance, if they are to draw together in common cause. If labor is expected to embrace a "greener" agenda, then environmentalists must support the concept of a Just Transition to protect workers and communities dislocated in the effort to protect the earth.

"People before Profits" has been the rallying cry common to nearly all these constituencies. It is the lowest common denominator of the triad. But while the movement has an undeniable anti-corporate tone, it is reformist at its core—not revolutionary. It seeks to curb corporate power, to prevent this runaway machine from exploiting human beings and wrecking the environment; but it does not seek an end to capitalism. Indeed, corporate critics as radical as David Korten and Jerry Mander argue for a return

to the market capitalism which the transnational oligopoly has supplanted. It is worth keeping in mind that certain corporations may come to see these reforms as in their best interests. Rather than tar all businesses with a broad brush, we should be seeking allies.

Vigorous attempts will be made to destroy the movement, to drive wedges between constituencies, to co-opt its more vulnerable elements. But if it can keep its coherence, the movement has a deep moral appeal. Having witnessed the orgy of corporate hegemony that followed the end of the Cold War, a great many people around the world—and now finally Americans—have begun to realize that we must correct an essential imbalance.

To correct the situation requires us to do collectively what Woolman did alone—to look first of all within. In this country it means cleaning up the present corrupt campaign practices and making government accountable to the people. It means empowering localities,

rather than overpowering them. It means holding corporations accountable for their actions. It means letting go of empire, supporting international law, and pursuing foreign policy and trade policy that is humane and projects the best American values, not the worst. It means

respecting human dignity and respecting the planet. For now, it means forging a coalition of such coherence and moral force that it cannot be ignored.

© David Morse, 2000



From Tom Feelings' book, The Middle Passage



*Interfaith Pilgrimage of the Middle Passage
at the World Bank, Washington, DC,
July 1998*

*By the agreements and contracts of our predecessors, and by our own doings,
some enjoy a much greater share of this world than others; and while those
possessions are faithfully improved for the good of the whole, it agrees with equity;
but he who, with a view to self-exaltation, causeth some to labor immoderately,
and with the profits arising therefrom employs others in the luxuries of life, acts
contrary to the gracious designs of Him who is the owner of the earth; nor can
possessions, either acquired or derived from ancestors, justify such conduct.
Goodness remains to be goodness, and the direction of pure wisdom is obligatory
on all reasonable creatures.*

—John Woolman, *A Plea for the Poor* (1793)

A Plea for the Poor

John Woolman (1720-1772)

In the latter part of the 18th century the Quaker minister John Woolman preached throughout the American colonies. His essays influenced social thought in the United States and in England. "A Plea for the Poor" relates poverty to wasteful consumption and calls for simplicity as a style of life. The following article is the tenth chapter of that essay. Readers of his Journal have noted the relevance of Woolman's insights to their own time.

...where that spirit works which loves riches, and in its working gathers wealth and cleaves to customs which have their root in self-pleasing—this spirit, thus separating from universal love, seeks help from the power which stands in the separation, and whatever name it hath, it still desires to defend the treasures thus gotten. This is like a chain, where the end of one link encloseth the end of another. The rising up of a desire to obtain wealth is the beginning; this desire, being cherished,

moves to action; and riches thus gotten please self; and while self has a life in them it desires to have them defended. Wealth is attended with power, by which bargains and proceedings, contrary to universal righteousness, are supported; and hence oppression, carried on with worldly policy and order, clothes itself with the name of justice and becomes like a seed of discord in the soul. And as this spirit which wanders from the pure habitation prevails, so the seeds of war swell and

sprout, and grow, and become strong, until much fruit is ripened. Then cometh the harvest spoken of by the prophet, which "is a heap, in the day of grief and desperate sorrows."

Oh! That we who declare against wars, and acknowledge our trust to be in God only, may walk in the light, and therein examine our foundation and motives in holding great estates! May we look upon our treasures, and the furniture of our houses, and the garments in which we array ourselves, and try whether the seeds of war have nourishment in these our

possessions, or not. Holding treasures in the self-pleasing spirit is a strong plant, the fruit whereof ripens fast.

A day of outward distress is coming, and divine love calls to prepare against it. Hearken thee, O ye children who have known the light, and come forth. Leave every thing which Jesus Christ does not own. Think not his pattern too plain, too coarse for you. Think not a small portion in this life too little. But let us live in his spirit, and walk as he walked; so shall we be preserved in the greatest troubles.

With thanks to the New Works Interchange, a publication of Northwest Yearly Meeting of Friends (Quakers) Board of Evangelism

www.nwfriends.org/NewWorks/newwkjan00.html