The colonists' weapon of choice in their battle with England—the boycott of British manufactured goods—tied independence and prosperity to industrial self-sufficiency.[31] When nonimportation and nonconsumption of British manufactured goods were adopted in the late 1760s, the development of home industries became part of the patriotic struggle for freedom. A Massachusetts poet put this new attitude into verse:

> Boston, behold the pretty Spinners here
> And see how gay the pretty Sparks appear:
> See Rich and Poor all turn the Spinning Wheel,
> All who Compassion for their Country feel,
> All who do love to see Industry live,
> And see Frugality in Boston thrive.[32]

As Edinburgh-educated physician and scientist Cadwalader Evans wrote from Philadelphia, "no country . . . can subsist without some manufactures. I am very confident [we] cannot in Pennsylvania, and till we manufacture more than we do, we shall never be able to pay [our] debts."[33]

Franklin, however, did not wholly share these sentiments. He recognized the superior know-how of English workers and urged Americans to develop their own industry. At the conclusion of the French and Indian War, for example, he praised England's superior "sensible, virtuous and elegant minds," that made victory possible and predicted that following peace British know-how would "travel westwards. You have effectually defended us in this glorious war," he declared, "and in time you will improve us." In 1771 Franklin predicted that English clothing production would not be able to keep up with America's demographic boom and therefore America must develop its own textile industry. A few months later he rejected the anxieties of agriculturalists who feared the development of American manufactures might come at their expense, explaining that industrial enterprises raised the value of adjacent land, and it was

"therefore the Interest of all our Farmers and Owners of lands, to encourage our young Manufacturers in preference to foreign ones imported among us from distant countries."[34]

It was precisely because Franklin recognized the frailty of both union and independence that he understood the need to create an integrated North American economy. To be sure, Franklin was prone, like many of his revolutionary compatriots, to make statements about the ethical superiority of farming and about the need to preserve the virtuous colonial agricultural political economy. England, he explained to a Philadelphia friend, "is fond of Manufactures beyond their real value," and he insisted that only "Agriculture is truly *productive* of *new wealth*" while "Riches are not *increased* by Manufacturing." In 1771 Franklin toured the mill towns of England and Scotland, saw much misery and poverty, and concluded that England's industrial production was "pinch'd off the Backs and out of the Bellies of the miserable Inhabitants." Franklin's 1784 pamphlet against migration similarly echoed republican clichés about the relationship between morality and agriculture. He declared: "Great establishments of manufactures, require great numbers of poor to work for small wages; these poor are to be found in Europe, but will not be found in America, till the lands are all taken up and cultivated, and the excess of people, who cannot get land, want employment."[35]

Yet, Franklin's republicanism was tempered by his recognition that the construction of an integrative, self-sufficient North American economy depended on industrial development. True, Franklin attacked England's political economy as the imperial conflict intensified, but his rejection of urban and industrial political economy did not transcend the context of the struggle between the metropolis and its colonies. As the conflict between the colonies and London intensified he confidently told members of Parliament: "I do not know a single article imported into the northern colonies, but what