that others may possess it." Most men considered inventors to be pretenders who pirated their inventions "from some other country or from some book." The failures of inventors exposed them "to general ridicule and contempt." When they succeeded, they received no reward and recognition, but must endure "envy, robbery, and abuse." His sympathy for the plight of inventors notwithstanding, Franklin continued to believe that inventions and discoveries should be recorded and disseminated. Much of what was known in antiquity, he wrote, had been lost because printing technology was unavailable. In our time "the knowledge of small matters being presrv'd, gives the Hint that is sometimes the Occasion of great Discoveries, perhaps Ages after."[10]

Franklin's approach to the question of the physical boundaries of intellectual property embodied conflicting strands. On the one hand, he favored universal access to mechanical information and had renounced possible rewards for his own inventions. On the other hand he recognized the need to reward inventors for their efforts. He campaigned against the English attempts to suffocate infant American manufacturing even though the republican ideology he subscribed to associated industrialization with social and moral degeneracy. He feared that the technological backwardness of the United States was undermining the peace and prosperity of the young nation, and championed the development of local industry. At the same time, he criticized the social consequences of English industrialization and believed that an agricultural economy could protect North America from following in the footsteps of the corrupt and unjust Hanoverian monarchy. These conflicting approaches came to a head in the debate over immigration.

For most of the colonial period, official British policy encouraged raiding continental Europe for migrants to North America. Parliament and the crown allocated substantial sums to assist Protestant refugees. Alarmed by the outflow of people, every eighteenth-

century European government enacted anti-emigration laws. Unfavorable travelers' accounts were published to discourage those who might consider moving to North America. One such tract warned prospective migrants that economic distress often forced German immigrants to "give away their minor children" who "never see or meet their fathers, mothers, brothers, or sisters again." Those who "suffer themselves to be persuaded and enticed away by the man-thieves," it cried, would join the miserable and wretched life of other German immigrants. In Germany, rulers required that emigrants get permission to leave and demanded payment for the right to be free of feudal lords. These efforts failed to stem the tide, as some 125,000 German immigrants came to North America in the eighteenth century.[11]

From the British perspective, the restrictions on the migration of skilled artisans which had been on the books since the late seventeenth century applied only to artisans moving to foreign countries. Since the colonies were considered an integral part of the Empire, there were no constitutional grounds to prevent English artisans from settling in America. Yet, the crown and Parliament realized that allowing the colonies to develop their industrial technology could undermine the foundations of the mercantile arrangement. Parliament began in 1718 to pass legislation to curb the migration of artisans to the colonies. The centrality of workers to technology diffusion meant that unless the migration of skilled artisans was halted, British efforts to check colonial industrial development were doomed.[12]

Technological breakthroughs in Britain coincided with the rising tensions between the colonies and the metropolis. James Hargreaves's spinning jenny and Richard Arkwright's water frame, developed and patented in the late 1760s, signaled the new age of industrial innovation just after the 1763 Peace of Paris, which concluded the French and Indian War, cemented England's position as