On Picket Duty.

The New York "Home Journal" of August 7 contains a three-column editorial defence of the abolition of "justification" in type-setting introduced by Liberty more than a year ago. Those interested to read it can secure a copy by mailing five cents in stamps to the "Home Journal," 231 Broadway, New York City. Slowly, but surely, this reform will make its way.

The most important use of gold, according to the "Evening Post," is "the support that it gives to credit." Whose credit is supported by gold? Not the merchant's or landlord's or manufacturer's. None of these has any gold reserve to support his credit. Does gold support the banker's credit? If so, what becomes of the support in times of panic? Whenever exigency or suspicion or any other motive impels people to test the value of this alleged prop, it is found to be wholly imaginary, the system that is said to be supported collapsing utterly. What would be the value of a bridge that could not be put to actual use without grave danger?

In the personal controversy between Mr. Kitson and Mr. Whittick that has grown out of the standard-of-value discussion I take no part. In fact, I wish to be understood that, although I have found it necessary to speak in contemptuous terms of the non-standard theory, it has not been my intention to denounce my opponents in bitterness of spirit. Mr. Whittick especially is a valued friend of mine; I regard him as one of the best of men, and in most matters a very sensible man. Personal acquaintance with Mr. Kitson and Mr. Ward is not my privilege, but I have no reason to doubt that they are worthy of similar commendation. If I have used strong language concerning their financial heresies, it is because I wish to leave the public mind in no manner of doubt as to the distinctness of my separation from them on the standard-of-value question. I am well aware that it is no argument to brand a proposition as a piece of lunacy, but it is an effective way of making people understand that one not only does not accept the proposition, but considers it too irrational to be entertained for a moment.

When I said in a previous issue that now Mr. Kitson is an almost deserted man, I meant that his Anarchist adherents are very few. Certainly I had no intention of claiming that the thousands of governmentalists who were no standard men before Mr. Kitson was ever heard of had been stripped of their delusion. Of the men whom he mentions in another column as sharing his view only one is an Anarchist,—Mr. John F. Kelly. And regarding Mr. Kelly I make bold to say that, whenever that gentleman shall see fit to emerge from the retirement with which he has maintained these many years, and shall announce in explicit terms his views regarding the necessity of a standard of value, it will be found that, however enthusiastic the general terms in which he may have endorsed Mr. Kitson's book, he really believes in the necessity of an absolute unit of value as thoroughly as I do, and utterly rejects the idea of an irrevocable unit of value. The unqualified approval which he has given to Mr. Kitson's book is simply one of those most hasty of "bad breaks," which he will never be able to defend for a moment after he has made it possible for me or any other critic to place his views in contrast with the propositions in Mr. Kitson's book which its author has acknowledged as central in his theory. Mr. Kitson can claim Mr. Kelly as an ally only as long as Mr. Kelly shall remain in the shadow. As to his other Anarchist adherents, I doubt very much whether the two plumed-line Anarchists, known as such among the comrades, can be found in the whole country who will declare their disbelief in a standard of value.

A writer who seems to have been on friendly terms with the late Professor Huxley says that in his last years Huxley often spoke of the futility of individual efforts against the power of conservatism, and of the small weight of stolid ignorance, the influence of personal interest, and the female instinct of subordination as potent allies of superstition. Huxley's own career shows that individual efforts, far from being futile, sometimes achieve wonderful results. The potent allies of superstition have received some very crushing blows during Huxley's lifetime, and he himself nearly demoralized them. The allies of superstition are not as potent as they seem. They surrender entrenchment after entrenchment, fortress after fortress, without realizing their defeats. Their policy is one of retreat and flight, but they never admit that they have lost ground. But they do lose it, and it falls into the power of the Huxleys and other aggressive fighters of the "potent allies." Since Huxley's death I have greatly enjoyed reading the estimates of his personality and work published in the religious newspapers. What do I find? Only the Catholic and a few of the smaller Protestant newspapers venture to speak disparagingly of him. All the important and influential papers add a few lines of perfunctory and half-hearted criticism to columns of high praise and laudation. Of their most aggressive and brilliant enemy they lack the courage and "vit to say something emphatically adverse. Even of the dead how they seem to be afraid, so vivid is their impression of his might and their own abjectness in his presence. No, individual "flots are not futile, and cons. vatism is not impregnable. Unlike the Bourbons, conservatism, learning very little, forgets very easily. Today it refuses to recognize its position of yesterday, and, if you destroy its most sacred belief, it will at once turn to some new idol and worship it as blindly as the old. That propensity, however, does not diminish the glory of your victories.

The London "Bimetalist" publishes in full the interesting discussion on the subject of bimetalism recently held at the London Institution. The leading speakers were all distinguished men,—bankers, prominent members of parliament, and so on. A careful reading of the long report shows that the deca. sers failed to agree on any point except one. They differed on the question whether industry is depressed, whether gold has appreciated or depreciated, whether bimetallism means one standard or two, whether standards affect prices or not, whether there is a scarcity of gold or not, whether a gold standard is possible for the world at large or not, etc. The point on which there was curious unanimity was this: the first speaker supported his bimetallist argument by the findings of a committee of the house of commons to the effect that an industrial depression existed in all gold countries and that the cause "would probably be found in currency disturbances." Mr. Currie, the great banker, in his reply, provoked great laughter by saying about this report: "Having had some experience of the resolutions of that honorable house, I am bold enough to say that I do not attach them with any great respect, nor am I strongly impressed with their authority, but the history of this particular resolution must be known to many who are now present. I suspect that this resolution was allowed to pass unchallenged as a tactical move in order to conciliate some agricultural supporter of the government or some Lancashire member with a doubtful seat." Not one of the speakers who followed Mr. Currie ventured to defend the report of the house : no one, while one of them parenthetically remarked, with the approval of the gathering, that the house of commons seemed to be "rather on a discount here." The first thing knowing people do in attempting to deal with important questions is to brush aside all political contributions to the matter as so much rubbish. Is this the way to treat our august legislators and rulers? Such contempt is fatal to their authority and influence.
The appearance in the editorial column of articles by other signatures than that of the editor indicates that the editor approves their central purpose and general tenor, though he does not hold himself responsible for every phrase or word. But the appearance in other parts of the paper of articles by the same or other writers by no means indicates that he disapproves them in any respect, such disposition of them being governed largely by motives of convenience.

Law versus Justice.

It appears from the comments of the legal journals that the question in regard to the province of the judge in criminal cases was only recently settled by the supreme court of the United States. In the decision in the case of Sparf vs. the government, it was laid down, as the law of the land, that the jury judges of facts alone, the judge declaring the law. Two or three judges, it is stated, strenuously fought this doctrine and adhered to the view that the jury is entitled to judge of the law as well, but I have not seen their opinions and do not know what arguments they used in support of their contention. The opinion of the court, written by Judge Harlan, attempts to show that both precedents and principles are opposed to the idea that the jury may disregard judge-declared law and become a law unto itself. Arguing in favor of his own view, Judge Harlan, among other things, says:

Under any other system of courts, although established in order to declare the law, would for every practical purpose be eliminated from our system of government as instruments devised for the protection equally of society and of individuals in their essential rights. When that occurs, our government will cease to be a government of laws, and become a government of men, governed by law is the underlying principle of our institutions.

Such an argument is calculated to impress many superficial people, to whom a "government of men" sounds rather ominously, reminding them of tyranny of monarchies or oligarchies. As a matter of fact, however, the alleged argument is merely a catch-phrase, which hides a fundamental misconception. In the first place, there are at the present day several American States in which "government of men" exists instead of government of law, and neither their own citizens or the citizens of other States have ever heard that sort of government in any way inferior to the government of laws championed by Judge Harlan. Whether those states realize that they are "mere" governments of men is immaterial; the point is that, under the definition, they are such, and that, notwithstanding this condition, their administration of justice compares very favorably with that of the States enjoying Judge Harlan's kind of government. To the average man an ounce of fact is of more value than any amount of abstract reasoning, and the phrase "government of men" will cease to worry them as soon as they discover that Ireland, France, and some other States actually permit the jury to be a law unto itself and to disregard the judge's instructions as to the law of the case.

Those, on the other hand, who are in the habit of saying: "propositions will ask themselves whether the government of men which results from investing juries with the power of judging the law is the same kind of government of men as that which they have learned to distrust and abhor. Government of men is objectionable when it is the government of some men; and to escape the capricious tyranny of individuals, Marshall and some other distinguished statesmen and lawyers, which liberty permits beneath her ban." -平思义.

LAW

SLEEP FROM THE GROUND UP.

At the meeting of the council of the National Educational Association in Denver, Kent Barger, of Stanford University, said: "A knowledge of Christian theology is absolutely essential to an understanding of our art, our literature, as well as that which gives purpose to the world." He asked whether the "natural tendency in children did not make them liars, Communists, and Anarchists." The Stanford University is the most gigantomonument to humbug that even this age of humbug has produced. It was built with Pacific Railroad money, the getting of which from the government is one of the most stupendous frauds of modern times. Senator Stanford's son, who died during boyhood, and whose preacher Newman compared to all the celebrities in the calendar, from Jesus Christ to Michael Angelo. It stands, therefore, for about as much sham and hypocrisy as we can find in a day's work: it is not strange, then, that its representative should carry out its cherished dictations by grouping children, liars, and Anarchists together.

The belief in Christianity which enables us to understand art and literature, and the purpose of the world, in the Stanford sense, means the art of money-grabbing. But the teachers at the Stanford University cannot hope to so instruct the students that they will be able to follow in the footsteps of its founder. Rich as
Uncle Sam is, in his power to rob, he cannot give the students fifteen million dollars each, as he did Stanford.

An American Academy.

Some months ago a rumor went the rounds of the papers that an American Academy was to be started, on the same plan as the French Academy. It struck us at the time as an excellent idea, and we wonder that it was not thought of before; we certainly have the raw material for more than forty immortals,—many more.

On hearing the rumor, we immediately put ourselves in communication with the great Mahatma, Hoky Poky, who at our request examined everything connected with the proposed academy in its astral form. He assures us that it will be established, and sends not alone the names of the first fillers of the faculty, but also the books which gained their admission.

Here is the list:

- **Chaucerbury M. Deewey.**
  "The Stomach's Pooze: over Thought."
  C. A. Dana.

- **Eating Crow as a Fine Art: A Poem.**
  John Waniahpaker.

- **The Bargain Counter, or, The Special Sale.**
  A thrilling romance of Market Street. WARD MCAILLISTER.*

- **Cooking a Ham: A gastronomic idyll.**
  CARDINAL GIBBON.

- **Scientific Proof of the Immaculate Conception, or, How the Exception Proved the Rule.**
  EDWARD ATRIKIN.

- **The Stop Barren as a Factor in Political Economy, or, How to Live on Five Cents a Day.**
  T. DEWITT TALMADE.

- **How the Meek can Live on $99,000 a Year.**
  R. T. ELY.

- **The Gas Question: Proof that college professors can furnish gas even cheaper than municipalities.**

Further than the above our Mahatma cannot see clearly at present, but he thinks the Cowbow Rhymey, who has recently been appointed Poet-Lariat of Colorado, stands a good show, and the man who translated "Trilly" into French is not far behind in the race.

We will back Hoky Poky against all the spook contributors of the "Arena" and give odds.

The Land of the Altruists.

If you start from the South Pole and sail due north, you will come to a wonderful country inhabited by the people called Altruists.

They are called so because they prefer other people's happiness to their own.

They are a very industrious, hard-working, uncomplaining people, forever toiling from daylight to dark, making all kinds of useful and luxurious things; yet so unwilling are they to enjoy the fruits of their labor, so anxious for somebody else to be happy at their expense, that they have made this very ingenious and complete arrangement to secure that result.

They have ordained that everybody who has produced a thousand dollars' worth of goods shall receive from the rest of the community sixty dollars a year; he who has made or obtained in any way ten thousand dollars' worth shall receive six hundred dollars a year; and so on in proportion.

Now, it is easily seen that, as the people to whom these stipends are paid are at liberty to go on working and making enough to live on, they are able to lay by the amounts paid to them by the community. After awhile these amounts become so large that they need not work at all, for all the rest of the Altruist community are pledged to support them, their children, grandchildren, and great grandchildren, not only till death, but forever.

Such sweet and unselsh dispositions have there Altruists.

There are getting to be a good many now of these people who are supported by the Altruists. Two or three million at a guess in every twenty or thirty million families do not work, but are paid because they have so much already. They are getting very bosse, too, these stipendaries of the workers, and begin to hold themselves very loftily, and despise the unselsh workers as dirty, ignorant, low creatures, un- mindful of the fact that it is only because the workers are Altruists that they enjoy providing luxuries for others rather than for themselves.

It is getting to be rather hard scratching, too, for the workers, Altruists though they be, who enjoy hunger and suffering; for to the objects of their care the supported class provided, have given, not only all the houses and furniture, and all but a little of the butter and meat and bread, but the very land itself, so that now, when the Altruist workers want to work still harder and to cultivate more land to support the rapidly-growing numbers of the Aristocrats, they find themselves forbidden by these very Aristocrats to use the land which they have given them.

Clearly a catastrophe must occur. Although the Altruists enjoy starving as long as they have the pleasure of seeing the Aristocrats, as they call those whom they support, have plenty, there is a physical limit to the process of starva- tion, and, when the Altruists begin to diminish in numbers, the Aristocrats must also dwindle.

What the outcome will be no man can prophesy,—a relapse into slavery at least, which the Altruists would no doubt enjoy even more than their present arrangements; but there is a chance that their natures may change; they may become Egyptians, and no longer take pleasure in giving to those who give nothing in return. Then there will be no Aristocrats, and everybody who is not an Altruist will have a much better time.

JOHN BREVERLEY ROBINSON.

Two More Victims.

The problem which I recently set Mr. Arthur Kitson and all old or opponents of reason in finance proves, as I expected, a Gatling gun. Mr. Kitson fell at the first fire, mortally wounded; and now Mr. William A. Whittick and Mr. George C. Ward, who valiantly ad- vanced to fill the gap, have similarly paid the penalty of their indiscrution. Their letters, printed in this issue, tell the story of this weapon's destructive power.

Let me recall the problem briefly. To those who deny the necessity and even the possibility of a standard of value, I said: Given certain exchange relations between commodities on a certain day; given the value of the monetary unit in each of these commodities on that day; and given certain new exchange relations between the same commodities on a subsequent day,—please calculate for me the value of the monetary unit in each of these commodities at the later date, without permanently relating the unit to a definite quantity of commodity. And I gave, as the first set of exchange relations: 48 ounces of silver—1 ounce of gold—200 ounces of copper, on April 20, 1895; and, as the second set: 48 ounces of silver—3 ounces of gold—300 ounces of copper, on April 20, 1896. As the value of the unit on the earlier date I suggested the value of 1 ounce of gold,—that is, that the unit be assumed to be equal, on April 20, 1295, to 48 ounces of silver, to 1 ounce of gold, and to 200 ounces of copper.

Mr. Kitson, it will be remembered, in his attempt to solve the problem, did indeed, by a perfectly legitimate and accurate process, find certain values for the unit, in silver, gold, and copper, on April 20, 1896; but, to do this, he was obliged to violate the essential condition of the problem,—he was obliged, that is to say, to permanently relate the unit to a definite quantity of commodity. His purpose being to "solve" the necessity of a standard of value, he gained his own case by adopting a standard of value. The standard which he adopted was a multi-commodity standard expressed as follows: 16 ounces of silver + 1 ounce of gold + 66‡ ounces of copper. Those who wish to refresh their memory will find his solution in Liberty, No. 315.

That Mr. Kitson had thus placed himself hors de combat by adopting a commodity standard Mr. Whittick, up to that time his most intimate comrade in the no-standard crusade, promptly bore testimony in No. 316; and now his testimony is "reluctantly," but emphatically, confirmed by Mr. George C. Ward, another "Arena" financier and bearer of the no-standard flag. "Yes, you downed Kitson easily enough," each of these gentlemen seems to say, "but you won't have any such picnic with me."

Well, let us see. I will begin with Mr. Whittick. With his theoretical considerations, which to me are an absolutely meaningless conglomeration of words impossible for the mind to grasp, I shall not deal, but proceed straightway to examine his proffered solution of the problem. It is exceedingly simple. Using the word "copper," not as an equivalent quantity of commodity, but simply as a unit for the monetary unit, he tells us, without a smile, that, if 48 ounces of silver have, on April 20, 1896, fallen to 50 cents (instead of the dollar which they represented on April 20, 1895), then the value of the dollar will be 6 ounces of gold or 600 ounces of copper. Whittick, my good friend, I learned all that at school, before I was eight years old. Of course, to find the monetary value of any one of these three commodities is to find at the same stroke, since their exchange relations are given, the monetary value of each of the other two. The crucial point is to find the monetary value of some one of them. This result I asked you, not to assume or "suppose," but to calculate from the data given you, which data comprise all the data that would be given in actual commerce.

If silver has fallen 50 per cent. between the two
given dates, the fact can be calculated from the exchange relations posited, or else it cannot be calculated at all. What I want you to demonstrate is that the data show silver to have fallen 50 per cent. rather than, say, 55 per cent. or some other figure, and I cannot allow you to beg the question by "supposing" that it has fallen 50 per cent, and supplementing the supposition by working a sum in the rose of three.

Not furnishing this demonstration, you have not solved the problem, but have gone to keep Kitson in his grave.

In passing, it should be noticed that, while Mr. Kitson, in his attempt to solve the problem, finds that silver has appreciated 50 per cent., Mr. Whittick, in his attempt, "supposes" that silver has depreciated 50 per cent.

Picnic No. 3 will be pretty nearly a repetition of picnic No. 2. Mr. Ward, like Mr. Whittick, gets at the value of the unit in gold and in copper by first attributing to it a certain value in silver. For Mr. Ward, however, it is to be said that he does no: "suppose" a value of the unit in silver, he ascribes this value as a positive fact. Unfortunately he does not inform us on what ground he bases his assertion; and, furthermore, his assertion labors under the disadvantage (or advantage, I don't know which) of differing from Mr. Kitson's calculation on the one hand and from Mr. Whittick's "supposition" on the other. In fact, it lies just half-way between them; for, while Mr. Kitson calculates (from an equation that violates the chief condition of the problem) that silver has risen 50 per cent., and while Mr. Whittick "supposes" that it has fallen 50 per cent., Mr. Ward asserts that it has not varied at all, but remains stationary. Such are the results of "A Scientific Solution of the Money Question."

Although as I have said, Mr. Ward does not tell us why he asserts that silver has not changed in value, his reason for thinking so is perfectly obvious to me. He thinks that, because the figure 48 appears in conjunction with silver in both sets of exchange relations, whereas the figures placed in conjunction with gold and copper differ in the two sets, silver has not, like gold and copper, undergone a change in value. This is a beautiful instance of the superficiality of no-standard reasoning. Any one looking below the surface sees at once that these sets of exchange relations are simply ratios, and that either set could be changed by dividing or multiplying each term of that set by the same number without in the least modifying, except to the outward eye, the data of the problem. By this method I might today have prevented the appearance of 48, or any other number, in both equations. I took no pains to do this, for it did not occur to me that my opponents could possibly be misled by so utterly immaterial an appearance. It turns out, however, that I overestimated their intelligence (and did not place them on a level with Newton at that).

Suppose, now, that, instead of

48 ounces silver=1 ounce gold=300 ounces copper,

I had chosen the following equation for the expression of the second set of exchange relations:

24 ounces silver=1 ounce gold=150 ounces copper.

This equation is precisely equivalent to the other, being obtained by a division of each member by 2. But, comparing it with the first set of exchange relations,—viz.,

48 ounces silver=1 ounce gold=300 ounces copper,

we see that neither the figure 48, or any other, now appears in both. I ask Mr. Ward to look at these two equations, and tell me which, if any, of these commodities remains stationary.

Again, I might have expressed the second set of exchange relations by this equation:

32 ounces silver=2 ounces gold=80 ounces copper; or this one:

16 ounces silver=1 ounce gold=100 ounces copper.

All these equations are equivalent. And yet, if I had used the former, probably the reappearance of the figure 320 would have convinced Mr. Ward that silver and gold had changed in value, that one or the other is not stationary; while, if I had used the latter, he would have been equally sure, from the reappearance of the figure 1, that gold was the stationary factor, and that silver and copper had varied. At any rate there would have been precisely the same ground for these conclusions that there now is for his assertion that silver has remained stationary. Of course the truth is that the second set of exchange relations tells us nothing whatever as to whether they result from a decrease in the supply of silver, or from an increase in the supply of gold and copper, or from both, and there is no slightest warrant for asserting that silver, or any other of these commodities, has remained stationary. Yet it is on such an assertion that Mr. Ward rests his case. But, after all, is it not to be expected that a man who sees so much in the figure 1 as Mr. Ward does should see at least 48 times as much in the figure 48?

I must beg my reader's pardon for devoting so much attention to these puerilities, and especially for printing the long article by Mr. Ward, who has taken advantage of my desire to print any solution of my problem that may be offered, to secure the appearance in these columns of a considerable portion of his silly book. Let me now announce, then, that I shall insist that further contributions in opposition to a material unit of value, with the possible exception of one more article from Mr. Kitson, shall deal exclusively with my problem. That problem solved, there will be no need of further discussion with me, for I shall be a convert. Until it is solved, it remains useless to discuss the question theoretically.

Occupancy-and Use As Bait.

In another column appears the explanation of Mr. Louis F. Post regarding his declarations at Cincinnati in favor of occupancy and use as the only true title to land. Liberty's recent comment on Mr. Post's attitude was sent to him by Mr. George A. Schilling, who has kindly forthcoming, to me for publication the reply which he received. Mr. Post admits the utterances attributed to him, and then proceeds to emancipate them.

It appears that the phrase occupancy and use is used by Mr. Post simply as an equivalent of the right of possession. In that case it is nonsensical to talk about the single tax or any other measure as the best method of reaching the occupancy-and-use title, for in Mr. Post's sense that title already exists. To lay the occupant of land is its possessum, in right and in fact. The aim of the occupancy-and-use agitation is not to secure for the occupant a possession which is already his, but an ownership and control which in most cases is not his, but his landlord's,—an ownership and control which shall end when occupancy and use end, but which shall be absolute while occupancy and use continue.

In another part of his letter Mr. Post virtually denied—equivalence of occupancy with possession by declaring that landlords, even those who rent land and build on it entirely, are occupants and users. If this is true, then the Astor estate is occupying and using a very large portion of the city of New York. But to assert that the Astors are either occupants or possessors is an utter misuse of language. Besides, if the Astors are occupants and users, and if the single tax will virtually compel the Astors to relinquish their lands, then the single tax, instead of being a means of getting an occupancy-and-use tenure, will be a means of destroying such tenure. Mr. Post's position bristles at every point with inconsistency and absurdity.

It is so long since I read Mr. George's book that I do not remember whether Mr. Post is right in denying that Mr. George teaches the doctrine of equal ownership of land by all the people. One thing, however, is certain,—that the equal right of all people to every piece of land is asserted by many of the foremost Single Taxers, some of whom are on the national executive committee of the party. And it is on the strength of this that the single tax is defended. How often we hear Single Taxers deploring the name by which their idea is known! "It is wrong," they will tell you, "that our plan is called a tax. It is not a tax at all. We believe in the utter abolition of taxation. Taxation is robbery,—a taking from the producer of his product. We do not propose to rob; in collecting rent we take only what is ours, for that which comes, not from labor, but from land, belongs not to the laborer, but to us, the people." If occupancy and use is not a title to land, then this position is sound; on the other hand, if it is a title to land, then the single tax is robbery.

Mr. Post cannot escape from this dilemma.

If there must be Single Taxers, I prefer those of the Philadelphia sort, who attack occupancy and use with hammer and tonge, maintaining that it is unscientific and diametrically opposite to their fundamental principles. Believe me, pray, of opponents like Mr. Post, who, using my own phraseology in a distorted sense, strive to make it appear to the people that their ideas are mine. Let Anarchists be on their guard. Don't bite at phrases.

The Creed Essential to the Life.

The comment of Mr. Badcock in another column upon "Egoism's" recent criticism of what it supposed to be my attitude regarding the relation of outsiders to parents who maltreat their children was written before he had seen my rejoinder; and I judge that he must have been surprised, not to say horrified, to find me joining the enemy, bag and baggage. With the reasons which I advanced in support of my position I hope he will deal later, since his
present letter does not meet them.

I shall not undertake to say for "Egoism" whether it does or does not how to equal liberty as a fetish, regardless of the sufferings of others that may result. But for myself I repeat what I have often said, that I have no idols. Mr. Badcock has no occasion to discuss with me the propriety or the end at which he aims,—the disappearance of pain. That is my aim also. If I insist on the application of the equality of liberty to every sphere of life, including the relations of parents to children, and of outsiders to both, it is because I believe that it will result in a minimum of pain. If Mr. Badcock denies it, it is incumbent upon him to show that State control, or a mixture of State and parental control, or some other method of provision for children which he may suggest, will result on the whole in less pain than the plan of exclusively parental control. I am ready to listen carefully to anything that he may have to say on this point. But, if he does not deny it, then I can scarcely think it worth while to make an outcry over what seems to Mr. Badcock the call of a measure so long as the Journal favors the very measures which Mr. Badcock and I look upon as calculated to most effectively lessen pain.

Mr. Badcock should remember that "G.," in the articles to which I objected some years ago, went counter to equal liberty in asserting the obligations of children to parents, whereas "H.," in denying the obligations of parents to children, is affirming equal liberty. There is a vital difference between the two. Both "H." and "G." may be cruel, or may be kind; but from a point of the nature of either may well be the deplorable result that the former does not favor measures that increase suffering.

As long as children are unable to make contracts, I know of no reason why they should not be "put on a par with property," especially if putting them on a par with property tends on the whole to lessen their suffering, and if there is no method of dealing with them that does not put them virtually on a par with property. It certainly is very unfortunate that this is an imperfect world, and that there is no system which will absolutely abolish pain; but will not Mr. Badcock and I have to put up with the best system that we can devise, even though it does fall short of our sympathetic requirements? I know people who are so sympathetic that they would rush to save a stranger in danger of immediate destruction, even though by that very act they would indirectly send a dozen friends to their death. As Herman Kuehn said in these columns, when speaking of Rita in Tsen's "Little Eyolf," such persons are really moved, not so much by a desire to make all other people happy, as to satisfy their own desire for an activity prompted by their sympathy. It does not follow that, "if our liberty principles fail and are defeated by our requirements, . . . they must be re-constituted." That depends upon whether it is possible to re-constitute them so that they will be better suited to our purpose.

T.

When the American editor, who is preternaturally ignorant, comes across a difficult problem, which he cannot dispose of in his usual cavalier fashion, he generally winds up his flabby remarks about it by commending it to the "serious care of the public." 

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every reader of Liberty to send in his name for enrolment. Those who do so thereby show themselves to be people of good will, who will not look down on an impoverished fellow, on an anarchist, or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight, and thereby the secretary promises in case of any failure to write to a target (which it is hoped will not often occur), or in case of temporary or permanent disablement from the work, to get another writer, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of performing this very necessary work.

Address, Stephen T. Brinton, 39 W. 15th Street, New York City.

I want it borne in mind that, when, after describing a target, I suggest lines of attack, I do not ordinarily mean that you must adopt them or use them in attacking others; and, when I suggest several different lines of attack for the same target, I do not mean that it will probably be best to include them all in one letter. It is desirable that the letters sent to say targets should all appear to represent the same school of thought, and commonly that they should all appear to have been suggested by the same occasion; but, if they are so closely alike in detail as to appear to have been copied from a common source, they will lose their good effect. My suggestions are merely intended to show some possible key-notes for your letters; if you can think of equally good key-notes of your own, equally applicable to the targets as described, be sure to use them.

A comrade, in offering to join the Corps, says that he would prefer to write in German, if possible. This can hardly be arranged, unless several others will do as he suggests. I would be glad to have such a section, and I herewith ask as many of Liberty's German-speaking readers as can so do to send in their names for enrollment in a section to write in German. At the same time I must ask them, and other friends, to be especially diligent in sending me targets of German papers and German-speaking persons, for I cannot, from my own reading, supply so many targets for this section as I do for the other sections.

Target, section A.—Bolton Hall, editor "Tax Reform Studies," 111 Broadway, N. Y., asks for attacks, from an Anarchist standpoint, on the prohibitory tax of ten per cent. on State banks and local banks. In your letters, call your position by the name of Anarchism.

Section B.—The "Star and Kanaus," Independence, Kansas, a while ago: Abolish all laws for the collection of debt and all laws making any kind of money a legal tender, and you would see the "intrinsic value" of gold coming out of the banks out of a little revival in the inflations and deflations and judges prohibit the sale of soda water on Sundays in obedience to vague laws strained in the interest of "order."

Some professors and historians have recently been discussing, in magazine articles, the question whether the "people," under popular government, are competent to deal with complex questions of finance and commerce, and the answers have been very flattering and pleasing to the "apostolized public." (To use Spencer's expression.) They find that, in spite of what they call temporary crazes, such as greenbackism, in the long run the common sense and sturdy honesty of the great mass of voters have led to the triumph of sound ideas and wise policies. What the simple-minded professors and historians overlook in this delightful argument is the necessity of proving that the triumphant ideas and policies are sound; we have nothing yet put past their own test for it. Surely such a transparent fallacy ought not to deceive anybody. First the professors assume that certain things are right; then they show that these things are on top; finally they shout eureka, and ask us to congratulate ourselves on the evidence of the people's wisdom. It is necessary to remind them that the first assumptions have yet to be justified.
A Personal Explanation.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I very much regret that the unwarrantable intimation of Mr. Whitlock in the discussion over my book necessitates reiteration of my relations with him,—an explanation which can scarcely be of much interest to the majority of your readers, but which I feel, in justice to myself, compelled to make. Since his letter contains certain statements regarding my position that are both false and misleading, I must ask your indulgence while I briefly correct them.

All the knowledge and information which Mr. Whitlock had to contribute to the “Solution of the Money Question” will be found in his pamphlet entitled "The Money Question." This is the extent of his capacity as my "teacher." In that pamphlet you will read as follows (page 10): "Gold may be a standard of values." This is Mr. Whitlock's original position. The idea of attaching the element of time to the purchasing power of a commodity and using this as a unit,—whether a brilliant or ridiculous conclusion, which the reader of the pamphlet did not occur to him, but, when I read to him the chapter in which I had suggested this idea, he ridiculed it as preposterous. So that, from the standpoint of Liberty, Mr. Whitlock's "original position" was wholly false and either as such as he acknowledged it returned to it, he stands side by side with 'the editor of Liberty.' He is in right in saying "we were quite harmonious as to the conception of 'economic value,'" for I found many of his ideas on this subject crude indeed.

In the republication of the Money article in "Bomba," Mr. Whitlock submitted part of his pamphlet to me and wanted to eliminate the phrase "Gold may be a standard of 'value,'" which he did.

As to his connection with the production of my book, the story is very brief. I had, at the request of some friends, written the main part of a lecture delivered before the Single Tax Society in Philadelphia upon this question. This paper had grown from a lecture into a 40-page pamphlet of several chapters. Wishing the option of some radical, and as Mr. Whitlock was the only one who called upon him and read him his work. He became extravagantly enthusiastic, and declared that some of these ideas were similar to those that had been slowly revolving in his mind in a confused sort of way for years, but he had never been able to express them, or grasp them coherently. He urged me strongly to develop the work, and it was, as I have stated in the "preface, largely through his enthusiasm that I expanded what was originally written as a merely a preface into a book of over four hundred pages. As I concluded each chapter, thereafter, I generally read it aloud to him. This led to discussion and frequent opposition, but his great interest and careful study served to stimulate thought; and, as a general rule, our discussions ended in his agreeing with me. Towards the conclusion of my task Mr. Whitlock said he would like to have his name in some sort of way mentioned in the book. A few days before publication with wish or solicitation on my part—dedicated his "Bomba" to me, he asked me if I would pay him a similar compliment? I replied that I should certainly mention his name and give him all the credit to which he was entitled. Before the publication of the book I read him the preface just as it now appears, especially the part acknowledging his aid and which you quote, and he was very pleased to receive a most generous notice,—more, in fact, than he deserved. He has mentioned this to several others, who have repeated his remarks to me.

After publishing, as I know for a fact, and as he has several times acknowledged, carefully read and revised and studied my book, he has for several months past been advertising and selling it. He has distributed a considerable number of copies, and quoted and defended it freely. In the "Liberty" of July 15, 1893, his letter of June 16 is simply amazing in its brazen effrontery. If he were as instrumental in its production as he intimates, why was it necessary for him to "carefully read Mr. Littton's book" and to refer to it as such?

The old Mr. Whitlock furnished me, and for which I have given ample and hearty thanks, was assisting me in making the proof and revising certain sentences, and cutting out certain parts in which I had indulged in repetition. As to any original ideas, I know of none outside of the pamphlet to which I refer. The evident thins for notoriety which has prompted Mr. Whitlock to use such expressions as "nationalization of land," "townshiplization of land," "etc., as many of us have done, from which the idea of equal ownership might be inferred by one unfamiliar with "Progress and Thrutput," which I have referred to in Liberty upon this subject. It is solely on account of Mr. Whitlock's name appearing in my book that I have taken the trouble to offer this explanation.

Yours truly,
Arthur Kimon.
Philadelphia, July 2, 1893.

P. S.—Do not deceive yourself, Mr. Editor, as to my being almost a descent man. I can well afford to excuse a few of ollutes for such men as Dr. Ross, John F. Kelly, Professors Kawaler, and similar well known scientists, the former of whom wrote: "I accept your work from pages 108 to 302. Scurrry a week claps with out my receiving similar testimoni nals, which now number into the hundreds.

Mr. Post Explains.

My dear Mr. Schilling:

Thanking you for your request for an explanation regarding a clipping I sent you from Liberty, I am glad of an opportunity to define my position in the matter.

I find the clipping to contain a correspondent's report that in a lecture given on the 22nd of May I stated that occupancy and use was really the only true title to land; and that, after the lecture, my attention being called to the statement, I explained that my advocacy of the single tax as the method of reaching the occupancy and use title. In Mr. Tucker's comment upon the report to the effect that, if I was not misunderstood, my position involves the rejection of the single-tax theory, and pledges me to the single tax only as a measure of expediency and as a stepping stone. Also the implication in his comment that Mr. George, and prominent single-tax champions generally, deny the theory that land belongs to the occupant and user, and hold that it belongs equally to all the people.

I did assert in that lecture, and I have for years frequently asserted, in substance or in terms, that occupancy and use is the only true title to land. Exactly what I said to the correspondent after the lecture I cannot positively state, though the incident is perfectly fresh in my memory. In the confusions of many conversations going on at the time I may have conveyed the impression reported by the correspondent. Since he says so, I have no doubt of it. But I did not mean to imply that I advocate the single tax as a stepping stone in the sense of a temporary expedient. What I meant was this,—that I advocate the single tax as the only way of reaching a title of occupancy and use. Under the single tax, so it seems to me, there would be no motive for appropriating land to any important extent without occupying and using it. And I can conceive of no other way in which the abstractions of the single tax and its effects can be brought into practical operation. I am aware of the point that, under the single tax, buildings would often be occupied by rent-paying tenants. But, when one man erects a building, he has no right to rent the tenths of it, in whole or in part, it seems to me that in any fair construction of the occupancy and use theory they are partners, in both the occupancy and the use of the land upon which that building stands.

What I believe and have said about occupancy and use I do not regard myself as antagonizing Mr. George. I have always understood him to believe that that is the case, although I do not remember ever hearing him put it into that language. His habit is to distinguish between ownership and possession; opposing the one and advocating the other. But that is the same thing. Any title that gives ownership of land in the same sense as ownership of what we produce is not an occupancy and use title. It is an absolute title. Possession, on the other hand, under circumstances which make it so unprofitable without use that it would be relinquished (and the single tax would have that effect), is clearly a title by occupancy and use. Mr. George has never taught the doctrine of equal ownership of land by all the people. He may at times have used such expressions as "nationalization of land," "townshiplization of land," etc., as many of us have done, from which the idea of equal ownership might be inferred by one unfamiliar with "Progress and Thrutput," which I have referred to with their context, no one would suppose he used them in the sense of common ownership or any other kind of ownership.

Sincerely yours,
L. F. Post.
New York, July 3, 1893.

Mr. Whitlock tries it.

To the Editor of Liberty:

The problem you set Mr. Kimon of positing a unit of value not related to some commodity standard can easily be answered.

Your prior problem (No. 311) posits a material unit of value on April 20, 1893, and utterly rejects it a year later, falling back upon quantity relations instead of giving price relations—the functioning of the unit in the meantime, while the changes in values were taking place, being disregarded; and yet you ask your opponents to follow this false unit through the intricacies of the unknown.

I will now try to demonstrate an invariable unit of abstract value, using your own figures in the process.

On April 20, 1893, the values of 48 ounces of silver, 1 ounce of gold, and 290 ounces of copper are equal. The equivalents of these values might be (not necessarily) ascertainment in all other commodities, and it may be implied that this is done, and that an equivalent value runs through and through exchangeable values. We need an unchangeable value, by which to note changeable values. No commodity possesses this attribute of unchangeability.

We will, therefore, take a certain value at a certain time, and write it from one commodity, so that the influences of supply and demand shall not affect our selected fixed value. We will call this fixed value a unit of value, and use it as a standard and measure of all values. We will call the unit a dollar.

If this unit correctly indicates the slightest change in values, it is a self-demonstrative invariable unit and measure of value.

To function, it must be used continuously and, changes in value must be expressed in prices, not in quantities.

Therefore, the changes mentioned as occurring from April 20, 1893, to April 20, 1896, expressed in quantities, cannot be followed by the rejected or usual unit, adopted April 20, 1893.

We have the alternative of a supposition by which to use our unit, or the creation of a new unit on the basis of values April 20, 1893. (The latter, a very simple operation.)

Let us use the former,—a supposition.

Suppose that the unit had been continuously used, and that under supply and demand the value of 48 ounces of silver had declined from one dollar to fifty cents.

Then 2 ounces of gold and 300 ounces of copper being then in value as 48 ounces of silver, each quantity is worth 59 cents.

The pricometer would read as follows on the two dates mentioned:

April 20, 1893.
Silver: 45 oz. Copper: 485 oz.
Silver: 45 oz. Copper: 490 oz.
Silver: 49 oz. Copper: 500 oz.
Values one dollar each.
Values one dollar each.
Values one dollar each.
Values have thus freely moved under the law of supply and demand, but the unit and measure of such values is unchanged.

The unit is totally divorced from commodity influence, as a necessity of its functional uses, and is un-
related to any commodity-standard. (The expression commodity-standard is absolutely meaningless, because no commodity can function as a standard for another and totally dissimilar commodity.) Nothing but values, expressed numerically, can be a common ground upon which a value-standard may function.

With this ideal unit of ideal values, it will be impossible for abnormal influences to control values; and the insolubles and indecisions, all money but the material or scientific commodity unit (impossible except as an element of evil) would be destroyed.

Wm. A. WHITTICK.

Another Solution.

To the Editor of Liberty.

Upon a perusal of the issues of Liberty of April 20 and June 15, I am forced to reluctantly concede that you and Mr. Hugo Blitzer have decided the best of the argument with Mr. Arthur Kiston in relation to the so-called “real value.” I believe, however, that either you or Mr. Blitzer have advanced arguments by which the theory “of an invariable monetary unit is robbery completely”; your explanation is explained to me, but it is not as satisfactory as Mr. Zinsser’s, who was endeavoring to maintain the practicality of establishing a commodity currency unit that should be invariable. Such a unit is an invariable absurdity, as you well demonstrated.

But there is a monetary unit—the only true one, if you please—which is ever immutable, invariable, and just, although it is what you, I presume, call “a value less abstraction.” It is the figure 1, of which, with its multiples and decimals, it is made up, and, if such a unit is used, the embodiment and representative Money is but materialized country. None but those who doubt and distrust the stability of the monetary system attach the idea of money to the money.

Money is a legalized system of comparing and differentiating values, and by the medium of materialized counters. Money coins, or bills, are the material embodiments of the values thus compared, and immaterial natural unit of account—the figure 1—with its decimals and multiplies. Money has, or should have, no “actual value,” its value being legal and arbitrary, consisting partly of the power to count and differentiate all values, but chiefly in the promise of the people, socially and collectively, to receive it in settlement of debts, public and private; such promise being crystallized into law by legislative power. When a country is in a condition of internal condition, all values are differentiated in value, not by comparison with the value, but with the numerical denomination of money. A certain range, or schedule, of articles are all, each of them worth as much as the other, e.g., each of equal value. These values are each worth a unit, or basis value—the number 1—In England, one pound; in France, one franc; in India, one rupee. The multiples of such unit represent the number of units. A basis value, an article of unit value; and thus money is but a measure of comparison by which we differentiate the comparative value of several commodities, in which, and not in the money, the value itself is expressed. These values are each worth a unit, or basis value—the figure 1—called by us one dollar. In England, one pound; in France, one franc; in India, one rupee. The multiples of such unit represent the number of units. A basis value, an article of unit value; and thus money is but a measure of comparison by which we differentiate the comparative value of several commodities, in which, and not in the money, the value itself is expressed.

A unit value can be expressed in the relative exchange values of these commodities, as compared with each other, and these changes are to be expressed in monetary terms through the medium of our money. A commodity system in which gold is the base metal becomes subject to the same laws of supply and demand governing other commodities. With our ideal money we can express and designate what gold is worth.

We compare, differentiate, and express all values in terms of money denominations. Thus we say an article is “worth” one, ten, or fifty dollars, as the case may be. Not so, however, with the quantity of metal coined of gold. It can be obtained for use in the arts for less value, so that millions of gold dollars are annually melted and used in arts. Having thus not given 55.8 grains of standard gold the value of $1, but that the value of $1 is the weight of 55.8 grains of standard gold. Thus, if it be proceeded to measure the value of all other values, as gauged by the supply and demand with other commodities, with the gold dollar thus artificially created by the fiat of law.

The gaseous absorptivity of the metallic filaments can best be recognized in the value of the commodity in its own terms, or by itself. Under our coinage laws we define by law that 55.8 grains of standard gold shall be one dollar, and that every person to whom he shall give a dollar is simply equivalent to saying that a dollar is worth a dollar.

But to return to our problem. On April 20, 1906, you suppose the exchange relations of the three commodities in question to be 48 ounces of silver—3 ounces of gold—300 ounces of copper. Very good. We now take the basis of computation the stationary value, which in this case is silver, gold and copper having both become relatively cheaper, or less valuable. So, then, expressed in terms of ideal currency silver returns worth 41.3 cents an ounce, while gold is worth only 56.66 cents an ounce and copper but 69 cents an ounce. But bear in mind that these values, so expressed, are not the values of money, but the relative values of silver, gold, and copper in exchange with one another for other commodities, to be differentiated and expressed in terms of abstract and ideal monetary units, or value denominators. The value is in the commodities exchanged, and not in the money through and by the medium of which they are exchanged. You sum up in these words:

That is to say, starting with the same data and following two parallel and irreducible lines of argument, we arrive at contrary conclusions. And, by taking other commodities into account and applying the same argument to the case, it is possible to prove that Mr. Kiston’s “invariable” unit, an ounce of gold at any given moment would give a thousand and one different values, all expressed in terms of the same unit or denominator.

In conclusion you are correct, and the only way this result is avoided under the operation of the “law of money” is by giving and affixing to gold, by fiat of law, an arbitrary and fictitious value. The term “worth” cannot apply to money, but is solely applicable to commodities. “Price” is the relative exchange value of commodities, expressed in figures, by a ratio of comparison based upon the invariable unit of account, the figure 1.

Money must be entirely recognized from all ideas of commodity value and be recognized as materialized counters.

Yours for the right.

Geo. C. Ward.

The Life More Than the Creed.

To the Editor of Liberty.

Not every one who has been advanced beyond the barbaric Flavian type, but certainly all who have reached that highly nervous and highly technical stage of development wherein a requirement of existence—as an essential factor in the civilization of the environment of all, at least, the grosser discord of the sympathy and aesthetic feelings, but not regard toward the past but toward the future that appear in the paper called “Egoism” (published in California) with disgust. To show the low plane of egotistical satisfaction that suffices for the wants of the editors of the said paper, I point to an article over the signature “H.” In the last issue (dated June 8) that has reached me, an article that is very similar to previous articles by “G.” which have already been set upon by you. “H.” lays down the law that citizens must allow parents to “beat their children to all but death or permanent disablement,” or to otherwise maltreat them as they think fit, on the ground that parents, as producers of their children, are absolute right owners and disposers of them and all their other products. Children are put on a par with property.

To justly this attitude “H.” purrs forward the principles of liberty and property to prove that he believes them, bowing to the word, under a supposed logical necessity, as to a fetish, without being influenced at all by the sufferings of others. Now, while I am not about to discuss the looseness and baselessness of the application of the principles mentioned, I am concerned about the attainment of the end which these principles are intended to subserve. My sympathies, my well-being, requiring that the infliction of pain shall cease upon the world, the world, in the interests of health and strength and acknowledgment of the limitation of my powers to obtain all I want, I am delighted whenever I find principles formulated, as guides to conduct, which promise a lessening of pain and an increment of pleasure. But, clearly, if any of the principles I hold to for that end can be turned and twisted about as to justify aggressions or give the protection of law to those who tor-
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