On Picket Duty.

Henry George sees in the free-silver movement, not interest in the money question as such, but simply an expression of industrial discontent. Behind it he sees the land question and the Single Tax. Yes, George, it is behind it, and a long way behind it; and that's what's "worrying" you, if I may borrow the expression of my friend and your disciple, Mr. Bolton Hall.

Ed. Boyce, of Idaho, who was sent to jail by the courts for his participation in the Cœur d'Alene strike, and then to the Idaho senate by his fellow-miners, and who was recently elected president and general organizer of the Western Federation of Miners, has been converted to mutual banking by reading Colonel Greene's work on that subject, and is doing his utmost to make the doctrine familiar to his fellow-workers.

For months after Altgeld liberated Fielden, Schwab, and Neebe the "Sun" dinned in its readers' ears that the Illinois governor had not a friend left in his State outside the Anarchist and criminal classes, and that he would be sent into oblivion at the first opportunity. But nowadays the "Sun" devotes much of its editorial space to rebuking reminders to the Democrats of Illinois that it is much easier to take up a man like Altgeld than to drop him, talk about "stuffed prophets"! Why, Dana's chock full of sawdust. And he's liable to spill some of it this year, now that he and his brotherhood of thieves are on the run. I tell Dana that he will hear from the Anarchists before this campaign is over.

American newspapers land the Transvaal president for the clemency exercised by him in dealing with the English prisoners convicted of an attempt to overthrow the government, and refer impressively to the fact that, when a deputation called to thank him, he pointed to a large Bible lying on his isle 3e and remarked that that book was his only "guide and authority. What transparent humbug, what miserable hypocrisy! Had Oom Paul followed "that book," he woold not have imprisoned the rebels at all, and would not have tried them or exacted pecuniary compensation from the South African Company. Nay, more, had he followed that book, he never would have ruled over his people, and the whole question of political privileges would never have arisen. No, Oom Paul does not follow that book any more than the American editors follow it. They who praise Kruger for his Christian mercy, violently assail Altgeld for his alleged abuse of the pardoning power, and, if he should point to "that book" as exemplifying his clemency, they would demand his confinement in a lunatic asylum. When he liberated the "Chicago Anarchists," his howling and shrieking assailants never thought of "that book," and denounced him as an enemy of society and dangerous ally of criminals. Oh, what a sickening lot of humbugs these editors be!

The New York "Evening Post's" somersaults are so numerous in these days of stress and political excitement that it is impossible to preserve a complete record of them. Only the other day it sneered at the American habit of overriding authority and proclaiming opinions about the most abstract matters without the slightest regard to scholarship and scientific culture. In art as well as in political economy the American doctrine, it said, seems to be that no preparation, knowledge, or special fitness is essential, and that one man's opinion is as good as another's; and it called upon us to listen to the voice of scientific authority and put away crude notions. Now, in discussing, for the fifteenth time, "the root of the trouble" in finance, and expressing its very latest and newest view, it says that Mr. Whitney and others are trying to force upon the people a currency system concocted by dry savants, and that gold rather than bimetallism would be chosen by the masses under a state of perfect freedom. It says: "The true work of philosophers about currency is not to concoct theories of currency of their own, but to observe the play of the popular mind, and predict what will happen. . . . The whole silver movement is, in fact, an attempt to get governments to override the people's understanding of its own interests, and set up by force an artificial standard of value which the community, left to itself, would reject. It is melanchoaly to see American statesmen, or politicians either, of all men in the world, advocating such a scheme and citing unknown scientists in its favor. If the nation were left to itself tomorrow, and an end were put to 'legal tender,' and every man left to make his own bargains and contracts, and all this mad confabulation, called the 'silver movement,' were to cease, in what currency, should we, as rational men, do business? Why, gold, to be sure. So, then, the ignorant victims, who do not know the ABC of finance, are more competent to decide what the currency system shall be than the political economists and trained financial writers! This view, as already said, conflicts with very recent utterances of the "Post" on the question of authority versus puerile ignorance. So anxious is Godkin to belittle the significance of economic bimetallism that he forgets that hundreds of thousands of American voters demand free silver, and that a single platform has been adopted by the victorious party which recommends gold as anything else than a makeshift and temporary expedient. The most radical gold platforms declare for national bimetallism, and advocate gold pending the establishment of that arrangement. However, if Godkin is so sure that gold would be selected as the basis of currency, why doesn't he come out boldly for the abolition of the legal-tender law and all the governmental provisions for gold redemption? Perhaps it is because he knows that next week he will have a different opinion to offer to the public.

Altgeld's nomination for a second term by the Illinois Democrats without a fight of any kind is gratifying to all lovers of fair play. The plutocratic press is, of course, furious and frantic. The length to which it goes in misrepresenting the situation must astonish every sensible man capable of viewing the matter rationally. So silly lying, so stupid accusations, so reckless, wholesale indictments cannot but disgust people with the pillars of law and morality. If the newspapers are to be believed, the overwhelming majority of the Illinois Democracy is against property, order, government, and law. Altgeld is a revolutionary disturber and friend of rioters and violent Communists, and his friends and supporters like him because of this attitude of his. Even a lot of school-girls would know better than to take such ravings seriously. Those who daily assume to represent religion, morality, and honesty have the audacity to reiterate the malicious falsehood that Altgeld believes in freedom to kill railroad conductors, burn cars, destroy property of all kinds, and starve trade and commerce. This is their way of stating the fact that Altgeld does not admit the right of the president of the United States to send troops to a State for the suppression of violence without the consent of the State authorities. Well, let the heaven rage. Six months ago the plutocratic press puffed-puffed the suggestion that there was any possibility of Altgeld's renomination, so confidently predicted that he would be emphatically repudiated by the party which, they alleged, he betrayed and disgraced; now that he has been nominated by acclamation, in spite of hearse-man's wishes, they are reduced to the wretched and palpable absurdity of imputing revolutionary sentiments to the entire Illinois Democracy.
not all the gold nor the west all the silver, and, wiser
may be the best money, the people of one section
are as much interested in getting it and using it as
can be the people of the other.

There are silver people in the east as there
are gold people in the west, but, having regard
to the prevailing, dominant sentiment alone, it
is clear that the question presents itself in sec-
tional guise. Why, then, is it that the major-
ity in the west is for silver, and the majority in
the east for gold? Mr. George continues:

The true reason is that the west, as a whole, stands
to the east, as a whole, in the position of debtor to
cr?ditor. But there is nothing in soil or climate
or occupation, or in the character and habits of the
people of the two sections of one country, to account
for this. It may at first seem that it is due to a con-
stant flow of capital from the older to the newer
sections of the country for investment. But this is not
large enough to account for the unusual amount of
real capital—that is, of real wealth (the products of
labor)—used in the production of more wealth, the
flow from the east to the west cannot be much, and in
the aggregate the flow is really from the west to the
east.

The real explanation lies in our treatment of land as
though it were a product of labor. The land of the
west, the natural element to which the labor of the
west must be applied to render its value, is largely
owned in the east or in Europe, and of the
land of the east very little is owned in the west.

The country, as a whole, is tending toward
Europe as a whole—tending toward the relation of
Irish tenants to English landlords. The rich men
of the west constantly move toward the east, the
rich men of the east constantly move toward Europe,
for, by an irresistible law, like seeks like. This is
the true explanation of what the people of the west
are first to complain of, but which in reality concerns
the whole country.

In brief, the theory is this: the land of the
west is owned by eastern or European land-
lords, and the occupying farmers have to pay
rent for their use of the soil; against this
tribute they rebel, and their talk about silver is
the result of the belief that more or cheaper
money would reduce the amount of their tribute
somewhat. Of course, if they clearly perceived
the nature of their trouble, they would demand,
not a decrease of tribute, but the abolition of
landlordism.

The remarkable thing about this theory is
that not one fact or shred of fact can be ad-
duced in its favor. Everything that is known
about the silver movement in the United States
and Europe is plainly and unquestionably at
war with it. In Germany and in England the
bimetallistic movement is chiefly supported by
the large landowners who exact rent instead of
paying it. All complain that agriculture is
depressed, and that agricultural prices are un-
reasonably low, and all favor bimetallis-
ism as a means of raising prices and aiding
agriculture. On the other hand, the Irish
people—the tenant and rent-paying people ex-
ception—evidence not the faintest interest in
bimetallism. Certainly their land is treated
as though it were a product of labor, and, if
a demand for silver is the first, crude remedy
favored by victims of landlordism, the Irish
must be credited with greater intelligence and
mental power than the American farmers pos-
sess. The Irish do not clamor, and never have
 clamored, for silver; they have been sensible
even to perceive that the enemy is land-
lordism, and the remedy freedom from rent
hardship.

However, the pretense that silver is regarded
by the American farmers as a means of fighting
landlordism can be disposed of in a simpler way.
The statement that the land of the
farmers who clamor for silver is "largely
owned in the east" is entirely gratuitous. The
asserted fact has no existence. These farmers
are not tenants, but occupying owners, holders
in fee simple. They pay no rent at all. What
they do pay is interest, for most farms are
certainly mortgaged to capitalists in the east.
But what has interest to do with treating land
as though it were a product of labor?
Farms are mortgaged because of the lack of
working capital, and the farmers know that,
under the existing monopolistic monetary ar-
rangements, they are forced to pay high rates
of interest for the capital borrowed by them.
They feel that they are injured in two ways,—
by having to pay high rates of interest, and by
having to sell at unnaturally low prices.

But philosopher and economist George re-
gards the financial question as of no con-
sequence. "We Single Taxers," he says,
"would prefer, if we could, to defer any at-
tempt to settle the money question until the
real relations of land and labor are better under-
stood." This is the height of plutocratic
nativism. Even Single Taxers admit that it will
be easier to secure financial reform than a rad-
ical change in the system of land tenure,
and George really represents none but the
fatwists and greenbacks in this position. With
reference to the financial question itself Mr.
George delivers himself of the following solid
wisdom:

In truth, the sort of money used in any country,
considered either as a medium of exchange or as a
measure of value, is a matter of relatively small
importance. Money has served, and as seem, most
important functions in exchange; the men who
were men before there was money, and the further progress
of our civilization is steadily to lessen the use
and minimize the importance of money. Money is really
a mere medium of exchange, a mere means of value
—and its kind or quality is as little essential to the per-
formance of its functions as the kind or quality of a
poker chip is to the game. We can exchange between
ourselves in any medium that we agree upon. . . .
Money, in its domestic use, is merely a local currency
for the facilitation of exchange among men. We do
not eat money, nor drink money, nor wear, nor, except
metaphorically, burn money. Nor yet, save in the
metaphorical way, does the possession of money mean
wealth, or its absence poverty. . . . The real
thing that is exchanged among men, whether between men
of the same country or men of different countries, is
labor,—either rendered labor, in the form of commodi-
ties, or promised labor, in the form of obligations.
Thus the real importance of any change, such as is
now coming into issue, is as it would effect the rela-
tions of debtor and creditor.

The ignorance, the stupidity, the puerility of
these passages cannot be fitly characterized in
moderate language. Fortunately it is not ne-
necessary to make any comment upon them.
No one will read them with greater contempt
than those able and stanch Single Taxers, Mr.
Stephens and Mr. Stephenson, whose pamphlet
on municipal banking we have read with profit. But the amusing thing is
that some excellent gentlemen insist upon re-
versing Henry George as an economist!

v. v.
The silver movement, which has been pronounced dead hundreds of times, is so powerful and successful just now that the gold-basis people are cajoling their brains to devise some compromise to placate and quiet their enemies. Instead of the usual showers and torrents of abuse and ridicule; instead of the familiar decimation of the silver people as cranks, fanatics, revolutionists, traitors, and swindlers,—we are beginning to read conciliatory statements, in which apparently frank admissions are made that there are real grievances, legitimate wants, back of the free-coinage movement, and that the silverites are wretchedly wrong as to the remedies proposed, they are profoundly right a their intense opposition to things as they are. Silver, in a word, is not a craze, a delusion originating in stupid discontent with natural law, but a proper and inevitable protest against an essentially vicious system.

Now, this is an old trick. Whenever the silver movement has displayed special signs of strength, the gold fanatics have changed their tactics and plan of campaign. The trick is not altogether a conscious one, doubtless. Many are doubly really impressed, by the success of the movement, and naturally inclined to inquire more critically into matters which they are generally disposed to pooh-pooh and contemptuously ignore. But, whether deliberate or unconscious, the trick has so often been employed that few can be deceived by it at this late day.

A number of financiers and politicians in the Democratic party are advocating the adoption of a plank favoring untaxed State banking as a compromise with the silver men. The south and west, they urge, are right in demanding more money, more banking facilities, freer credit; let us show them that they can obtain these without free coinage, and they will abandon that plank. In short, the amount of the tax on State banks would afford them the needed relief, and they are fully entitled to that concession.

Of course, it is hardly necessary to say that no real free-banking measure is contemplated. State banks are to be regulated, protected, and rendered "safe" by numerous federal and State restrictions; only the ten per cent. tax is to be taken off. This demand, it will be remembered, was incorporated in the national Democratic platform of 1892 and completely ignored by the Democratic congress elected on that platform. True, in the Cleveland-Carlisle scheme of banking reform, the repeal of the tax was one of the central provisions; but, when that scheme was submitted, congress was no longer Democratic, and the cry of wildcatism was at once raised, not only by the Republicans, but by the majority of eastern Democratic organs as well. The silver movement had subsided somewhat, and there no longer appeared to be any necessity to keep the pledge made during the campaign.

Now that gold has triumphed at the Republican national convention, and that silver appears to be supreme in the Democratic ranks, eastern politicians may be expected to bethein themselves that in the State-banking proposition they have a promising antidote to the silver movement, and it would not at all be prising if the Chicago convention should renew the demand for the repeal of the ten per cent. tax. Such a declaration, however, would be even of less consequence to-day than it was in 1892.

There are some radical Democrats who still hope that by taking the campaign and improved by defeat, may revert to the principles of freedom and assume a bold libertarian attitude on the currency question. There is unfortunately nothing in the facts or prospects to warrant these fond dreams and anticipations.

Meanwhile, the discussion of possible and safe alternatives to free silver has brought out some interesting admissions from financiers and editors. A few have actually got within gunshot of the truth. Thus Banker Clews, in an eye-opening circular issued recently, expressed himself as follows:

"There is, however, an important class among both planters and farmers to whom credit facilities are even still more vital than "more money." It is well worth considering whether arrangements cannot be devised for satisfying those wants, if not under any now existing banking methods, yet through authorizing other lending institutions specifically adapted to affording the smaller credits which this important class so vitally need.

It is assumed here that it is possible to provide greater credit facilities without broadening the monetary basis. It is also assumed that capital is neglecting good opportunities in the south and west. Neither assumption is correct. Arrangements to satisfy the wants specified would have been made long ago, had capital found them an opening. The cause of the lack of banking and credit facilities lies deeper. Those very restrictions and regulations which no politician or financier ventures to call in question, which are to be preserved even under untaxed State banking, make adaptation of bankers' arrangements to the needs of the sections and their special industrial conditions utterly impossible.

The New York "Journal of Commerce" does not agree with Banker Clews that things can be improved without any important change in the present financial system. It says, referring to the condition of the farmer who is forced to pay interest at the rate of fifteen to twenty-five per cent.: Whatever legislation may not be able to do for such a man, it can at least remove any obstacles which legislation has put in the way of him and his kind, securing all the advantages for borrowing money to which their character and industry entitle them. To preach the advantages of saving to a farmer who has to part with the whole margin of profit on his crop for cash when he has no use of the money, is like exalting the delights of freedom to an inmate of a prison. The one patent fact of his position is that it is one of industrial bondage, and he is incapable of seeing by what act or influence of his he can ever mend it. This much seems clear, however, that if he is at any time to save money, he must be relieved of the necessity of paying so much for the use of it, and that such relief must come by the institution of banks specially devoted to supplying his needs. There is a sufficiently profitable and a perfectly safe business in doing this at much lower rates than now prevail, but it will not be done while the national government, by retaining the tax on State bank notes, makes their issues insecure.

In another editorial on the same subject, the "Journal of Commerce" approaches the subject still more closely. It writes:

"What this condition of things calls for is a systematized form of credit, which will serve the agricultural turist and the small trader in lieu of working capital, a rural reinsurance system of credit, which will enable the farmer and the planter to buy their seed and to provide the munition, labor, and implements needful to get out of the land all that is capable of yielding; to recover waste places and to drain or irrigate lands which are now non-productive.

The more removal of the tax on State banks would not supply this need of credit, although it would be a step in the right direction. Banking must be made really and absolutely free,—free not only from taxation, but also from the condition of redemption on demand.

The Condition of the Laborer.

To the Editor of Liberty:

"Wages are rising," say Mr. Yarros. Well! Well! Evidently his much studied and great learning have made him mad. Be that as it may, personally, I am sorry to say, I experience no proof of the assertion. On the contrary, the statistic is such that I can hardly make both ends meet. And, says he, "the hours of labor are decreasing." Precisely, and to such an extent that, when belting and meals are provided for, scarcely anything is left for wearing apparel, results in one being compelled to abjure daylight and acquaintances as much as possible.

Of course, suicide would be the thing; but then, the overcoming of the natural repugnance is another and more difficult matter. And thus it is that I have observed that, when I am out of work and with no prospect of getting any, I am prone to throw liberty to the winds, and draw near to, and view with rap- ture and delight, the then effluent countenance of State rebellion. To be sure, the thing has a different appearance when the situation is more bright, or at least bearable.

No. 342, just received, gives no consolation, for there you state that "times are bound to become worse and worse," if I must be told you actually see how they can become much worse,—then it is about time, I think, to learn, or attempt to learn, to pray,—to pray for the appearance of a virulent pestilence which seeks our presence.

Geo. Peterson.

Chicago, Ill., June 29, 1890.

When Mr. Yarros said that "wages are rising," he did not mean the remark to apply as specifically as Mr. Peterson seems to think to the year of our Lord 1896. Rather, he was comparing, we will say, the age of steam and of modern invention to the ages that preceded it, and was contending, in opposition to those who claim that the poor are growing poorer, that, in spite of our wretched economic system, a part of the advantages of our greatly increased and ever-increasing productivity have actually gone to the laborer, rendering his condition, which is, of course, proportional to the purchasing power of his wages, far superior, on an average, to that of the laborer of a century ago. That is to say, the laborer's wages have risen; they are not yet, however, what they ought to be, for the advantages of modern productivity ought to go to the laborer in their entirety, not simply in part. But that they are already his, to an extent, and a considerable extent, no reasonable man can deny.

This does not alter, and has little or nothing to do with, the very real grievance of which Mr. Peterson complains,—viz., that the laborer, despite his improved status as a rule, still lives in utter insecurity, at the mercy of the ups and downs caused by the old distributive abuses that neutralize in great measure the blessings of our immense productive power. Consequently he is often thrown out of work, and his hours of labor, as Mr. Peterson points out, are all too few. But that is no reason why
Mr. Yarros should be assailed for uttering an indisputable truth. And still less is it a reason for turning hopefully toward State Socialism. If liberty is not a cure for economic ills, then Mr. Peterson should not assume it to be such, even in his prosperous and happy seasons. But, if it is such a cure, then there is no time at which he should be so earnestly in favor of it as in the days of his adversity.

Machinery and Rent.

Single Taxers seem to take it for granted that every new labor-saving machine tends to increase economic rent. In fact, Mr. Hoar states this proposition as follows: "As civilization advances, as the sciences, as the arts, and inventions more fully develop, and ability becomes more general,—so will the value of land increase and ore or less keep pace with this advance. Under occupancy and use 'all these advantages would go to land-owners and land-owners only.'"

Now it seems to me that this is an entirely erroneous assumption.

By a labor-saving machine is meant one that enables mankind to produce a greater amount of wealth, with the same amount of labor, applied to the cultivation of land, than could be produced without it. If the demand for the products of labor is the same,—and we must assume this in order to simplify the case,—less labor is required to supply that demand with the machine than without it. If less labor is required, then less land is necessary to apply that labor. The result of a new labor-saving machine is "to make two ears of corn grow where one grew before." I think it will tax the powers of even so trained mental acrobats as Single Taxers to prove that a decrease in the demand for land causes an increase of economic rent. The reverse is the opinion of all think upon the subject.

Professor Francis A. Walker shows the effect of cheaper rates of transportation upon rent, in Chapter II., part 4, of his "Political Economy." It is too long to quote here, but I commend it to the careful attention of all Single Taxers.

The invention of a new process of irrigation, a new fertilizer, or a more economical method of treating low-grade ores results in making land that was previously valueless capable of yielding wealth. This is practically adding to the supply of land, without any corresponding increase in the demand. The effect must be a decrease of the value of the land except that which has just been made useful. It should be noted that such improvements do not result in lowering the margin of cultivation. They cause land which before was incapable of producing as much as the poorest land in use to yield more, and so its productivity is made more than the productiveness of the land at the margin of cultivation. If the demand remains the same, some of the poorest land in use will be abandoned. This will raise the margin of cultivation, and, consequently, the economic rent of land will be reduced all along the line.

Single Taxers always point to the increase of rental values in cities, but it seems to me that this increase is due to other causes than the development of machinery. No one knows better than they that the increase in the value of city property is almost entirely an increase of speculative rent, and is altogether foreign to a discussion of economic rent. They also ignore the fact that the value of farm lands, especially in the older and more thickly-settled districts, is steadily decreasing. I have not been able to obtain statistics of any country save Great Britain. But it is not a little significant to note, according to Mullhall, the entire rental value of England decreased, from 1890 to 1888, about thirteen per cent, and, in Scotland, the decrease during the same period was about fourteen per cent.

F. D. TANDY.

Ein Wunderlicher Suender.

To my article in the last issue claiming that the Communist leaders are opposed to "Liberty," John Most replies in his "Freiheit" at some length and in characteristic fashion. He begins by saying that I am a wunderlicher bleibtiger (which means wonderful sinner), and declares that he had always taken me for a highly-educated man who, when he writes on a subject, knows what he is talking about, but that in this instance I am fighting a man of straw which I have constructed out of my ignorance, if not for something worse. And then he endeavors to establish his opinion.

It will be remembered that I selected, as illogical a fashion as Most himself, the Chicago men, Kroepke, and J. H. Morris. Now, Most takes up the first three on the list, and deals with them as best he can, but totally ignores my citation of Morris's assertion that "holders of private property are invaders." I do not see why he fights shy of this proposition, as it seems to me precisely in harmony with his own view. But let that pass. I will proceed to an examination of his treatment of my assertion regarding himself, and therewith we shall see which of us it is that knows what he is talking about.

My paragraph read as follows: Take John Most, for instance. He says that, after the revolution, if two men cooperate under an agreement that one shall pay the other wages, the arrangement will be terminated by force, even though it be perfectly voluntary.

Of this paragraph Most gives a philosophic translation into German, and here is his version: Nehmen z. B. Most. Derselbe sagt, dass, wenn nach der Revolution zwei Leute die freiwilige Vereinbarung treffen, dass Einer dem Anderen Lohn zahlte und die Einhaltung dieser Uebereinkunft durch Gewalt erzwungen worden muste.

After which translation Most asks where I have heard or read any such nonsense from him, and declares that I have made a fool of myself. Wait a bit. Suppose we try the experiment of retranslating into English Most's German translation of my original paragraph, and see how much resemblance there is between the two.

Take, for instance, Most. Most says that, if after the revolution, two people voluntarily agree that one is to pay wages to the other, the sustaining of this agreement shall be brought about by force.

The translation has been made for me by a German friend of mine, and of its accuracy there can be no doubt. Compare it now with my original paragraph. I had charged Most with holding in that after the revolution all contracts to pay wages, even though the "stary", will be terminated—that is, put an end to, cancelled, suppressed by force. Whereupon, in German, he puts in my mouth precisely the opposite statement, making it appear that I have charged him with holding that after the revolution voluntary wage-contracts will be sustained, upheld, by force.

Of course it would be quite impossible for me, believing as I do in the right to pay and receive wages, to attribute the same belief to Most as a proof that he does not favor liberty. Yet, of two things one: Either Most's imperfect knowledge of English has led him into a mistranslation from which the smallest knowledge of Individualist Anarchism would have saved him; and in this case he has been engaged for years in discussing, criticizing, and abusing a school of thought of which he knows nothing or very little; or else, knowing that few of his readers would ever see my original paragraph or my answer, he has deliberately and wilfully put into my mouth a statement exactly the contrary of that which I made; and in this case he is a wunderlicher Suenter (wonderful sinner). I am inclined to think that the latter the truer explanation, as Most is probably familiar with and acts upon Goethe's maxim: Verleumde nur recht fremd, etwas bleibt doch hangen.

Really, however, instead of causing mud to stick to me, his epithets "fool" and "ignoramus" have turned upon himself in most unfortunate fashion. He has unintelligently corroborated my contention that he proposes to forcibly interfere with people who choose to work for wages, and is, therefore, an authoritarian.

Is das genug, Herr Most?

Who is to Blame?

To the Editor of Liberty:

Can you tell me when the same "philosophic Anarchists" was first applied to the movement represented by Liberty, and by whom? If you cannot give the information exactly, can you give the approximate date, and tell whether the name originated inside the movement or outside? 

STRAWN T. BRYNEN.

Perhaps some reader can give Mr. Byington the information which he desires. I ought to be able to, but really have forgotten the facts,—perhaps because I have never attached any importance to them. It is my impression that the use of the adjective "philosophic" as descriptive of our movement originated outside. I have never accepted it, and rarely, if ever, have I used it. Every fool thinks himself a philosopher.

Anarchism and the Dictionaries.

To the Editor of Liberty:

I think it is time we stopped professing to find the Standard Dictionary's second definition of "Anarchist" a satisfactory one. This definition is: "One who advocates anarchy or absence of formal government as a social and political idea." Now, it isn't the formality of government, particularly, that we object to. Informal government, like that of White Caps, is as bad as formal government, and a little worse. That word "formal," which was probably inserted to make the definition more acceptable to philosophical Anarchists, spoils it all. By quoting this with approval we imply that we have no objection to government, if only it is informal. 

STRAWN T. BRYNEN.

I quite agree with this, and probably should have said the same thing myself, had I known that the Standard Dictionary's definition is being generally cited with favor by Anarchists. I have seen the much preferable Century definition quoted frequently, but rarely the Standard definition. I can tell Mr. Byington something about this Standard definition. When Means, Funk & Wagnalls were preparing their dic--
tionary, they applied to me for a definition of Anarchist. I framed one with great care, and sent it. Unfortunately, I did not keep a copy of it, and do not now remember it. But I know that it was concise, clear, correct, and exclusive, as all definitions should be. Probably it would not have pleased Mr. Byington, for I think it had the word "invasive" in it, and, whenever anybody says "invasive," Mr. Byington throws a fit. Be that as it may, the definition would serve the purpose of Mr. Funk. He discarded it, substituting the absurdity of which Mr. Byington complains.

The word "formal" was not in my definition, which, in fact, was so framed as to make it clear that the distinction between formality and informality is foreign to the subject. If Funk had any intent whatever in inserting the word "formal," it was to irritate the "philosophical Anarchists," not to please them.

The editor of the "Engineering Magazine" and the New York "Post" are probably not on speaking terms now. Mr. Godkin has heaped ridicule upon Mr. Dunlap's head, accused him of following the rule of thumb in artistic and financial matters, and held up to public scorn as an exemplar of American ignorance and self-assurance. Mr. Dunlap, it seems, has been supporting the faction which has denied to oppose its opinion to the leading American sculptors and artists on the question of the merits of the Sherman statue. The "Post" printed a letter from Mr. Dunlap which it virtually pronounced droll, silly, and empty, and a propositus of which it moralized about the presumptuous critics whose snap judgments irritate men of culture and training. Now this is base ingratitude. In finance Mr. Dunlap has followed the "Post" too unquestioningly and implicitly, as Liberty has noted with pain and surprise. If, now, Mr. Dunlap's faith in the fairness of Mr. Godkin should be shaken somewhat, the cause of rational finance would be measurably strengthened.

The Democrats of Connecticut deserve credit for their decision to introduce boycotting in politics. When it became known that the silver people had a majority of the delegates to the national Democratic convention, the gold Democrats everywhere began to debate the question "to bolt or not to bolt." Some announced that they would certainly bolt a silver nomination, and others declared that they would bow to the rule of the majority. The Democratic leaders of Connecticut, satisfied with neither alternative, hit upon a novel plan. No, they said; "we will neither bolt nor support a silver platform and candidate; we will simply ignore the whole presidential election and all national issues. We will make the fight exclusively on State issues and candidates, and refrain from all mention of national matters throughout the campaign." This is not bolting; it is boycotting. The idea has gained favor in different sections. In the West, notwithstanding the stupid denunciation of boycotting so frequently seen in the most intelligent papers. It is not that the gold papers love boycotting now, but they hate silver more, and tacitly agree to overlook the smaller offence. However, familiarity with the boycott will do more than theoretical reasoning to secure for it general toleration and recognition.

Mr. E. H. Fulton, of Columbus Junction, Iowa, whose conversion from Communism to Anarchism was noted in Liberty of June 27, is proving by his works the ardor of his new faith. He has started an Anarchistic paper called the "Age of Thought," which promises very well indeed. It has eight pages, and is well printed. The page is somewhat smaller than that of Liberty, but, as the type is smaller also, the amount of reading matter per issue is about the same as that which Liberty gives.

It is published weekly, however, and at the very low price of one dollar a year,—to say nothing of a premium offered in books to the amount of fifty cents. The first two numbers discuss at length and in plumb-line spirit the questions of land and money from the Anarchist standpoint, and Mr. Fulton announces that, in the third number, he will begin a department similar to that which Liberty instituted under the heading, "The Beauties of Government." On the whole, I am much pleased with the new venture. Mr. Fulton is to be congratulated upon it, and he should receive hearty letters from Liberty's constituency. My only fear is that Mr. Fulton is beginning a little too soon. In the very few weeks that have elapsed since he began the study of Anarchism he certainly has acquired a firm and intelligent grasp upon its philosophy. Nevertheless, in his expositions, he falls into some very serious errors, which would not stand criticism for a moment, and which, if accepted, would take every particle of virtue out of the economics of Anarchism. I believe that, if he had taken a little more time for the assimilation of the Anarchistic doctrine, he would have avoided these errors. As it is, he must get rid of them as fast as his Topeka grindstone can whittle them.

I ask my readers, one and all, to send a dollar to E. H. Fulton, Columbus Junction, Iowa, for a year's subscription to "The Age of Thought." He is young and ardent, and, situated as he is in the west, where the financial battle is waging, he will be able to lend most efficient aid to Cohen, Tandy, and other comrades in bringing the solution offered by mutual banking before those who are placing a mistaken reliance upon free coinage and other governmental measures.

At a general convention of Michigan dentists a resolution was adopted in favor of a law for the appointment of a public examiner, whose duty it shall be to examine the teeth of children and enforce such hygienic regulations as may be deemed necessary for the preservation of sound teeth. Well, why not? In this era of curfew ordinances, compulsory education, and inspection of all kinds, why not inspection of teeth? And why not inspection of eyes, hair, lungs, ears, and other necessary and useful organs or features of the body? The example of the brave dentists should be followed by other specialists.

The right of the social organism to enforce regulations looking to moral and physical welfare of the units being tacitly accepted by all governmentists, the only thing to consider is whether Anarchy "works well" in private teeth, hair, eye, ear, and lung inspection. If not,—and there will be no difficulty in finding evidence of neglect, ignorance, and mischief in these important relations,—then State action is necessary.

Anarchist Letter-Writing Corps.

The Secretary wants every one of Liberty to send in his name for enrollment. Those who do so thereby pledge themselves to write, every month, a few words about every fortnight, on Anarchism or kindred subjects, to the "target" assigned in Liberty for that fortnight. The secretary will notify the writer when he has done the duty of writing to a target (which if he has not written will not often occur), or in case of failure to withdraw from the work of the corps. All, whether members or not, are asked to lose no opportunity of informing the secretariat of the fact.

Address, Stephen T. Hyndton, East Hardwick, Vt.

Since its rather hostile remarks quoted in the last number of Liberty, the "Farmers' Volks" has published two more Corps letters,—one from the man whose other letter was given the heading, "Emphatic, If Not Courteous," and the other from one who is not a subscriber to the paper. Neither letter, this time, is an aroused attack on the editor.

From a conservative standpoint in small-town "Advocates," lately mentioned in this column, is now formally closed. J. T. Small, the man who brought it about, writes thus in comment:

How much good will come to our cause from this ten-months campaign may never be known. I do know, however, that there has been considerable interest manifested in the discussion during these last days, and I have been told by several that they were buying the "Advocate" from week to week to read it.

Certainly a large body of readers have been familiarized with the idea that Anarchism was a practical answer for their affairs, with the fact that Anarchists write like respectable people, and with the most important of our fundamental principles. Comrade Small deserves the heartiest thanks of us all.

The Madison Street, Chicago, III., A Congregational Organ. In its issue of June 18 the following were among the editorial notes:

Congress has at last adjourned, and the country can give attention to its other affairs. If we may believe the statement of the Chicago board of education, the compulsory education department is "useless, wasteful in money, and a burden to the board." The member had a strong array of figures and facts to establish the truth of his statement. The real point of the law is that it cannot be enforced by prosecution, and the principle does not seem to be altogether practicable.

Our Wisconsin correspondent's observations on the subject of education, and our paper's communication on the connection between the State university and the high schools, are impressive and worth consideration. It is to the injury of the cause of education and to the youth of the State to send them through the university on "short cut" courses, requiring less work than demanded by the course of the denominational colleges. It is a cheap bait unworthy a great university.

(The statements of the Wisconsin correspondent were that the University of Wisconsin was in the habit of "accrediting" certain schools, so that their graduates should be allowed to enter the university without examination; that the "accredited" schools regarded this as a valuable certificate of high standing, when in fact, in many cases, it only admitted students to certain special courses in the university, the regular course requiring of them that the inspection on which the accreditation was based was so careless as to be often merely nominal; that the result was a very low educational standard in some of these schools, whose graduates were not only ready to pass examinations at colleges like Ripon and Beloit; and that the motive was to gain students for the State university by getting the favor of the preparatory instructors.)

Show how much reason there is for wanting to be rid of government, how much reason there is for regarding this as practicable, and how unreasonable it is, considering the acknowledged evils of government, to throw Anarchist out of court without an unprejudiced hearing.

Section B.—W. A. Croft, 104 B Street, N. E., Washington, D. C., formerly an editorial writer on the Washington "Post," a vigorous advocate of liberty from a conservative standpoint. Show how much we yet lack of liberty, how much harm this lack does, and why we should hopefully work for complete liberty.

Stephen T. Hyndton.
post of vantage, to secure as much money as possible. This is the proximate and, for most youths, the ultimate end and aim of education. While the perfecting of themselves as individuals, by the bringing into use of all their faculties, that they may be enabled to appreciate existence in all its manifold and stand on their merits as physiological entities, is a less serious consideration,—put off, perchance, until the time is yet too late,—realizable only by those whose lives have been a bit easy through ancestral endowments, or by those who have injured their teeth, earn a living, and get a good grip on the earth, despite all obstacles and without all their energies being consumed in the process.

Even the Christian and sympathetically-active people afford evidence of a substantial part played by money. They know well how difficult it is to propagandize or help the needy without the intermediation of money. So they give money, and pass round the hat for money, to get a government’s distributive machinery in motion, whatever “thirty pieces of silver” sentiments they may give utterance to when they go to church when they go.

See the eagerness, the unfailing persistence, with which everybody, almost, pursues money! But how strikingly does this eagerness-to-get-contract with their long-standing apathy respecting the essential nature of money! an apathy now, however, giving place to inquiry.

Yet even now, notwithstanding the tacit recognition that money, as a medium of exchange, is a necessity of existence, proposals for allowing the sources of supply of this necessity, to be free from civil and legal restrictions are considered absurd and extreme, and meet with scant sympathy. The average educated subject of Her Most Gracious Majesty will most likely tell you (when tackled upon this subject), in a tone of conviction that would send an ovation Arrowsmith’s convert’s first sermon pale by comparison, that it is not money, but roo, that is wanted to relieve the prevailing distress, and you are expected to perceive, at once, the absurdity of the interference with the money can prevent the end being attained. Just as if the taking away of a farmer’s ploughs and other tools could possibly affect the yield from his land, or as if an interference with mere exchange could possibly reduce the quantity of bullion exchanges in effect the equity of exchange! Oh! dear no, quite the other way about. We should all be in a muddle without laws—and so on.

The apathy of the outside public (c. i.e., outside the circle of financiers who are in the “know”) regarding the working of the laws that regulate the money supply—due partly to ignorance of the multiplicity of effects which follow upon any interference with supply and demand, and partly to the being of mind, with a demand that is boundless for an article or accomplishment the supply of which is drastically limited, and partly to the teaching of political economists—of the guarantee of quality is a first essential of a sound money system and quantity an important detail—has led to State regulation of money and banks to an astounding ex-

ternal, culminating, in England, in such decrees as the Bank Act, 1844.

And be it enacted that from and after the passing of this Act no person other than a banker who on the 6th day of May, 1844, was lawfully issuing his own bank note, shall make or issue bank notes in any part of the United Kingdom.

And be it enacted that . . . it shall not be lawful for any banker to draw a draft in England or Wales any bill of exchange or promissory note or engagement for the payment of money payable to bearer on demand, or to borrow, owe, or take up . . . any sums or sum of money on the bills or notes of any such bank, true and exact, and except that it shall be lawful for any banker who was on the 6th of May, 1844, carrying on the business of a banker and lending his own bank-notes, under the authority of a license to the effect, to continue in being and under the conditions hereinafter mentioned, but not further or otherwise.

And be it enacted that no banker in any part of the United Kingdom who, after the passing of this Act, shall render himself become bankrupt, or shall cease to carry on the business of a banker, or shall discontinue the issue of bank-notes, either by agreement or otherwise, or by the Bank of England or otherwise, shall not be lawful for such banker at any time thereafter to issue any such notes. —Bank Charter Act, 1844: Clauses 3, 8, 9, 11.

No piece of gold, silver, copper, or bronze, or of any metal or mixed metal of any value whatever, shall be made or issued, coined or coined, as money or currency, or as a token for money, or as purporting that the holder thereof is entitled to demand any of the above denominations. Every person who shall make use of a contrivance of this section shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a punishment of not less than three months in prison.

A tender of payment of money, if made in coins which have been issued by the mint in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall be a legal tender,—in the case of gold coins, for a payment of any amount of money not exceeding forty shillings, but for no greater amount,—in the case of bronze coins, for a payment of an amount not exceeding one shilling, but for no greater amount. Nothing in this Act shall prevent any paper currency which, under this Act, is or shall hereafter be declared to be of a like tenor.

Every contract, sale, purchase, bill, note, instrument, and security for money, and every transaction, deed, matter, and thing whatever relating to money or the purchase or sale of anything for money or the giving in charge of any money or in any way connected with money or the purchase of anything connected with money or the purchase of anything, shall be void if made in contravention of this section.

Further: By the bank charter act of 1844 the privileges granted to the Bank of England include a monopoly of issue for so many miles round London, and the right of issuing notes up to £14,000,000 against joint securities and independent of the gold stock. The profit upon this latter issue being divided between the Bank and the government. The Bank may extend this kind of issue (notes against securities) to two-thirds of the issues which country banks may from time to time reissue, the rest going all to the government. Further any note issues can be made only against gold and a limited quantity of silver bullion.

Then there are the trick acts, which declare likewise—

That in all contracts hereafter to be made for the hiring of any artificer in any of the trades heretofore enumerated, or for the performance by any artificer of any of the labors of any of the trades, such contracts shall not be lawful, unless in such contract the whole or any part of such wages shall be payable in the current coin of this kingdom, and that, if in any such contract, the whole or any part of such wages shall be payable in any manner other than in the current coin aforesaid, such contract shall be, and is hereby declared, illegal, null, and void. —Trick Act, 1851: Clause 1.

The laws regulating the currency now in operation are but the last of a long series by which the trade of banking has been limited, licensed, taxed, and controlled in its details. The meddlesome State has at one time limited banking to corporations of not more than six persons, and at another has supposed that all notes not worded in terms of payment in gold on demand. It has suppressed all notes of denominations under £5 for England and Wales, refused to allow the benefit of limited liability to bankers in respect of their debts, and arranged note issues and amalgamations of banks shall be made up. These are evidences of the exercise of the royal prerogative. The issue of money was always assumed to be a kingly function,—a monopoly which could be granted to favorites and others (for a consideration), as when in 1612 King James granted a patent to Lord Harington for the manufacture and issue of farthing tokens, with a promise that whenever the State wanted any of private tokens, either made or to be made, be it of any other tokens than those made by his Majesty’s authority; or as when in 1697 King William III gave to the Bank of England the privilege of being the only coiners of tokens. These were permitted, commuted, suffered, counterfeited, or allowed by act of parliament within this kingdom.

It is apparent that the monopoly of a necessity of existence can only secure a people no end and in subjection. A true and adequate cause of bad times—a lever which can be used to that end—is at once seen to lie in money-monopolization.

For now, this monopoly, acting through a monetary age, not only affects money and prevents the course of true exchange from running smoothly, but, by relieving the individual from the necessity of using his judgment upon the merits or demerits of the
various modes of exchange that might come before him, prevents him from finding out, by the only sure and experimental way, the most serviceable kinds of money for his particular requirements. Thus, by preventing him (if, in fact, there is any condition of value exchange, absent), the monopolists maintain a check upon his complete understanding of the nitty that money plays, or can play, in the world, in making the man armed with the informed tool upon this most vital factor that affects his interests. Such is State education.

What is called the social problem, the labor problem, or the economic problem of the day, being the problem to a wise man's conditions for bringing harmonious relations between individuals in their industrial, producing capacities (differences in the requirements of differently constituted men being admitted), also between the definite importance to the social, labor, and economic reformers should master the working of the monetary systems in use through which products are exchanged and the industrial relations between men settled. For it is by the great monopoly credit that division of labor and specialization of functions yield their gains to people working and trading together on the voluntary plan,—i.e., without compulsory cooperation. Given division of labor in trade and manufacture and industries upon which men live, with consequent indirectness in all exchanges, and it follows that a defective exchange system will injuriously affect some one, and may injure all, and that the monetary resources in every country, and for no other adequate cause of the friction is apparent.

Are our commercial dealings carried out with such an evident fitness to the furtherance of a healthy social state where the men like a fish out of water? Unfortunately, it has to be admitted, the relations subsisting between employers and employed are not generally amicable. A state of strife between them has become chronic. Unfortunately, too, the lines of thought have hung as a sword of Damocles over the empires and living of all who have had the impudence to be born without the all-important silver or golden spoon in their mouths is exceedingly disquieting,—to them, and suggests the possibility of inferior individuals and families being perpetuated behind the bulwark of privilege.

Now look around and see how the wealth that is produced each year is distributed. You will observe that a large proportion of the gain from increased property goes to the employed rich, without any of their riches going back as a return to the producers, while the unemployed poor get next to nothing. And, when you find that, speaking roughly, while the men are hungry to the belly and labor in motion is money, and it is the monopoly of this money that affects all production.

As inquire's have been drawn off the scent as to the real cause of the high prices caused by the silver bug, and silver bugs, by the press and other leaders of the public, upon the insignificance of the element of quantity in money supplies; and the don't matter theory regarding the value of money being much in favor with those who wish to preserve the status quo, it will be needful here to demolish it. This don't matter theory rests upon the argument that, since gold and silver are commodities, and rise in value in proportion to variations in the ratio between supply and demand, like commodities in general; and, since, when used as measures of value in the form of money, their rise or fall in value is known as such only by the equal and opposite fall or rise in value of dollar goods measured and exchanged with them (correct so far); therefore it is assumed and asserted that this very obliging adjustment of volume to value proves that an increase or decrease of the value of the money itself has no effect upon its total purchasing power, or, therefore, upon the general welfare. This means that restrictions or expansions of money affect nothing after prices have adjusted themselves to the new conditions. Push argument home to its resting place, and it will make no difference to any one if the total volume of money be reduced to a three-penny bit, and this locked up in a museum! These people prove that money itself to be a superfluity, or they prove nothing.

But money is in demand,—a demand that is unthinkably apart from the idea of quantity. How is it possible for the mass of people to live on a given quantity of people to be met, except by a quantity of money sufficient to mediate the full quantity of goods and services needing to be exchanged at any given time or by banking credit as extensively as the needs of exchange by exchanges of money, however large the amount, meet the wants of a given number of people, however small their number and however meager their wants, if these people have no access to that money is scored in the strong-rooms of people who won't part with it except on hard terms? Evidently both volume and availability are fundamentally essential to any monetary system whose raison d'être is the facilitation of exchange.

Of course, the same amount of trade can be done with a small as with a large quantity of money, if the small be divided into its proper parts and fractional division of it is also equally easy. But that is a great if. With everything, the smaller and dearer it becomes, the easier it is monopolized and kept out of the open markets,—if money is the base of value. Monopolists depend upon scarcity, and try to lessen the production of the article they desire to corner. With money, the less rare it is of the more interest it will bring in least cost of producing it. If money is scarce, there is no use in the copper, iron, or silver to be made. And the greater the produce will it buy. And rice now, where the measure of value and the medium of exchange are fused together.

Changes in the value of the monetary unit will, as is evident, have no great effect in the majority of cases, according to their holdings in money and their positions as debtors or creditors at the time. Men being unevenly wealthy, changes in the value of wealth will affect them unequally, and the expression of value appreciates or depreciates, so is the hold of the creditor over the debtor tightened or loosened, the nominal amount of the original debt remaining at the same figure. Considering the present huge indebtedness of the community, the world over, to a creditor class,—through government and individual borrowing,—it is clearly seen that the revenue which labor produces and permanently pays to this class is increased or decreased, but not necessarily in nominal amount of money is the monetary unit falls or rises in value. It becomes possible, then, for the class in power to benefit themselves by rigging the monetary system. The silver or gold creditor controls the system, and its self-interest naturally prompts it to keep money on a scarce-metal basis, so that incomes through usury may continue and increase as the metal appreciates. Doubtless, when their dependence is given such a basis of risk losing their monopoly altogether, the gold bugs would prudently yield to the claims of the bimetallists and share the privileges of monopoly with the silver bugs. But bimetallism offers no resting place as a policy, so the money question is and shall remain, as this system does, with the admission that the world is suffering from a money famine, the doubt will be raised, in the minds of many who have not thought much upon that subject before, that the advisability of restricting money at all. If expansion is good, why should not complete freedom prove better? Should the debtor class get into power and understand its own interests, so the monopolists are underestimating them, the Lord only knows what they'll do it.

Putting aside, as outgrown, the old governmental methods, from Roman times down to the present, of inflation and devaluation of the metal, and the treaties which, however much they may have benefited debtors temporarily, left the original cause of usury untouched, did not ease trade (which asks for extension of good, reliable money, and not of bad), and only prepared the way for reactionary restrictions, leaving the times worse instead of better—there remains the only method that offers really novel features to a state and fagged-out world; namely, the honest method, a free currency,—i.e., free from State interference. Let us have free trade in the issue of money. Only under freedom can the merits or demerits of any particular coins and instruments of credit have a chance to be demonstrated, and the best to survive. Good money may be left to drive out bad money unaided. Let it be unhindered.

The free-money men contemplate the establishment of banks of exchange, for the sole purpose of facilitating exchange. These banks would be conducted by the means of notes and other credit instruments issued directly upon the security of savings lodged with the banks by their customers, thus enabling the monetary re- quirements of the average customer to be met with them to be to the extent of such accommodation,—i.e., to the full extent of their exchange requirements,—Independently of gold, silver, or other export luxuries.
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