On Picket Duty.

Through some misunderstanding Mr. Byington's Letter-Writing Corps targets for the monthly slip to be sent to corps members between the monthly issues of Liberty did not reach me, and so no slips were sent out. Members are cautioned against interpreting this as an abandonment of the fortnightly assignment of targets.

One of the Single Tax organs is making much of a claim that Ella Wheeler Wilcox is a believer in the Single Tax. Does it not know that Ella Wheeler Wilcox believes in everything that comes along? No fleeting fad, no passing folly, is so silly to command her adhesion. But lately she was mad over Cheiro, the palmist. Now it is Henry George that this poetess of passion adores.

My statement that Canovas del Castillo had asked for a catalogue of my publications was an error, for which the messenger that came to my office from the Spanish consulate is responsible. He said that the request came from the Spanish premier. I now learn that it came from a Spanish ex-premier, Segismundo More y Pendergast,—quite as notable a man as Canovas, but belonging to the Liberal party, and of course not now a member of the government.

Comrade Fulton's "Age of Thought" carries the good work valiantly on, and I wish to bespeak for him once more the cooperation of all libertarians. From the craftsman's point of view his paper is scarcely well edited, but there is thought in its pages. And the right spirit. It doubtless will cast off much of its crudity and disorder as its editor's difficulties diminish, and even now this brave little weekly is a mighty good dollar's worth. Send a dollar for a year's subscription to E. H. Fulton, Columbian Junction, Iowa.

It is dangerous to publish cheap literature. Your motives are liable to misconstruction. For instance, an angry Single Taxer told a friend of mine the other day that, in publishing and selling my pamphlet attack on Henry George at the low rate of eighty cents per hundred copies, I thereby demonstrated beyond peradventure that I did so to satisfy some feeling of personal animosity. As a matter of fact there never have been any personal relations between George and myself that could possibly develop any personal feeling. I made his acquaintance many years ago, when he called on me in Boston. We had a few moments of brief and hurried, but entirely agreeable, conversation, and since that day we have never communicated either by spoken or written word. Never have I had the smallest private grievance against this man, whom I despise solely because of his palpable public dishonesty, manifested in mere ways than one.

It is either remembered or forgotten that some time ago I notified all readers of Liberty who had sent me money with orders for books that, if dissatisfied with my necessary delay in filling these orders, their money would be sent back to them on demand and by return mail. Since the appearance of that notice I have had about four unsands for such return of money, and in one instance the demand has been complied with promptly. Such an offer ought to set at rest all suspicion that I am either dishonest or willfully neglectful in this matter. Nevertheless it has come to my knowledge that even old and tried friends of Liberty are writing letters in which these motives, if not directly charged, are at least hinted at. It seems to me that they might be in better business.

At first thought it may seem to some of my readers that to give my approval to the article of Arène Alexandre on "The Lady of the Beaux-Arts" is inconsistent with the position, taken by me in a previous issue, that it is better to encourage art than to build hospitals. But such is not the case. The thing that M. Alexandre condemns is a mistaken method of encouraging art. It is an encouragement that does not encourage. To afford individual art students the means of stifling their originality in routine is one thing. To pervert the artistic atmosphere with ideas tending to strike down routine and indirectly develop originality wherever it may appear is quite another thing. The latter is the real encouragement of art. With M. Alexandre's position I am in full sympathy, except that I think that there has been an occasional exception to his sweeping rule that genius is never stifled by poverty.

The newspapers are making much of the fact that William Morris left none of his fortune of $875,000 to the cause of Socialism, but bequeathed it all to his family, like any ordinary bourgeois. But has it ever occurred to these snar editors that William Morris left behind him, not only a fortune, but also a Socialistic family, and that possibly he had an understanding with his heirs, or had confidence without such understanding, that a due proportion of their inheritance should be devoted to the ends to which he and they were alike devoted? What better trustees for a Socialistic fund could William Morris have asked than his daughter May and her husband, Halliday Sprangle,—both ardent Socialistic workers? I do not speak by the card, but I think it is too early to positively assert, or even hint, that Morris forgot in dying that which he stood for, living.

Secretary Morton is not as great a humbug as the typical secretary of agriculture usually is, but his ardent professions of democracy have little value, in view of his obvious ignorance of what democracy is. Of course he is for sound money, honor, civilization, gravitation, and everything else that is dear to a gold-bug, but he is clear not for democracy. "Nearly always when they have an opportunity," he says dolefully, "the people vote for schemes and devices to destroy public credit and bring financial dishonor." This means that popular governance is a farce and sham, and that Mr. Morton is not a believer in democratic institutions. He is right in asserting the ignorance of the people, but wrong in imagining that they would do better to follow the experts who prate about honor and credit. Their schemes and devices mean nothing but speculation, rascal-ity, and robbery. Let Mr. Morton read what Dana has to say about usury and the present financial system.

In his farewell message to the Illinois legislature Governor Altgeld suggested, as a partial solution of the difficult problem that the growing practice of libel presents, that no action, either criminal or civil, should lie against the authors or publishers of signed articles, but that heavy penalties should be imposed on publishers of libellous articles bearing no signature. It is a practical suggestion from an eminently practical man. A libel has little or no influence when signed by an irresponsible or disgraceful person, and may therefore be disregarded. On the other hand, statements made over the signature of a person of high character are never malicious and very rarely false. It is the anonymous attack that is to be dreaded and deplored. The thing chiefly desirable, argues Governor Altgeld, is the prevention of unsigned libels, and his suggestion, if acted upon, would probably be effective to that end. Of course, it would not settle the question whether libel is non-invasive and therefore to be let alone, but it would allow greater liberty of the press than now prevails, while at the same time insuring a greater decency of the press.
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"In abiding rent and interest, the last outlay of old-time slavery, the Revolution obligates at one stroke the record of the emancipation, the seal of the magnates, the habit of the policeman, the cause of the extinguisher, the evening-knife of the department clerk; all those tabloids of Politics, which young Liberty grinds beneath her heel."—PROCTOR.

The Feather That Felled Me.

Probably most public speakers, especially those who, like myself, speak but occasionally and are never so ill at ease as when on their feet before an audience, have at some time passed through the unpleasant experience of being thrown into utter confusion when called upon to answer a question of so simple a character as to surprise one out of his wits. Such was my sorry plight one evening two or three weeks ago, at a meeting of the Sunrise Club; and I shall tell the tale as a sort of penance for my own stupidity, partly in the hope that it will be read by some members of the club whom I supposed to have been the victim of a keen and searching questioner rather than of my absence of mind, and partly as a bit of economic elucidation that may prevent others from being puzzled as I was.

The Sunrise Club, then, be it known, is a New York dining club of about one hundred members, of all shades of opinion, who dine together, on the "Dutch treat" plan, every second Monday evening throughout the winter season, and then spend an hour or two in discussion, the opener thereof and the subject being selected in advance. At the particular dinner now in question the opener was Mr. Ernest H. Crosby, who had chosen as his topic, "The Issue of Honesty in the Late Campaign." I shall report here only so much of his brief discourse as relates to the point of my subsequent criticism. After declaring his intellectual conviction that the Republicans had the right side of the money question in the campaign, he admitted that his sympathies had been with their opponents; and, inquiring what could be the cause of this strange discrepancy between his thought and his feeling, he concluded that the campaign must have involved a question of deeper honesty than the mere honesty or dishonesty of the currency.

The claim of the holder of money upon the labor or service of others is, he said,—or seemed to say, at any rate; I cannot give his exact words,—inferior, in point of honesty, to the obligation of every man to work for his living; and he found the cause of his sympathies with Mr. Bryan and his followers in the campaign in the fact that they represented the men who work for their living as against the men who buy their living with money. Then, to make plain the inferiority of the merely monetary obligation, he supposed the case of a shipwrecked party cast upon a desert island, some of the party being millionaires, some being moderately well-to-do professional men, and some being penniless laborers. There being no means of shelter, and shelter being a necessity to all, it would be necessary to build a shelter, in which case, Mr. Crosby claimed, it manifestly would be less honest for one of the millionaires to take a ten-dollar bill from the pocket and hire one of the laborers to do, in addition to his own share of the work of building, the share of the millionaire also, than to take off his coat and engage with the laborers in the task at hand.

"The superiority of the workman," Mr. Crosby further said, "is of the essence of manhood, because the hands that make are as valuable as those that do the making. The money, in fact, is not the real obligation; the work is the real obligation, the labor is the real obligation; and, in the way in which that labor is done, the real extenuation of money."

"I trust you will understand," he said, "what I mean in this the nation's interest, and that the interest of the nation's interest is the interest of the people's interest."

Toward the close of the discussion that followed the opener's address, I was called on for a few remarks, and, responding, I directed my criticism at the position outlined above. Putting aside all question of the manner in which the cast-aways must have originally got their money, and assuming that their company represented actually what paper money alway represents in theory,—service previously performed and as yet unpaid for except by paper title,—I took the ground that the millionaire who should pay a ten-dollar bill to a laborer to put a roof over his head would be quite as honest in his conduct as though, instead, he should build his house himself. I held that the possession of a ten-dollar bill is the millionaire's pocket was evidence (assuming it to have been obtained under free conditions, and by neither dishonesty or tyranny) that he had already done his part toward the building of the shelter by rendering an equivalent service previously; and that to insist that he should do his part again—that is, bear a double burden—in order that the laborers might escape with the performance of less than their proportionate share of work would be dishonest in the extreme. The inferiority of one obligation to the other I denied, maintaining that the obligation of the individual to work for his living can never exceed the always exactly equivalent obligation to furnish him his living which falls upon those for whom he has worked.

At this point the opener asked permission to put a question,—a request which I indiscreetly granted. "Will you tell us," then asked Mr. Crosby, "what would happen on the desert island if each member of the shipwrecked party were the possessor of a ten-dollar bill?" Now, incredible as it may seem, this question, which the merest tyro in economics should be able to answer without a moment's thought, floored me completely. The words had hardly fallen from Mr. Crosby's lips before the audience laughed as though a triumphant point had been scored against the terrible Tuckers, and I was bound to confess that the sheepish attitude of the aforesaid one went far to justify their glee. After a moment's embarrassment, I managed to stammer out that in that case it would be necessary for all the shipwrecked persons to go to work together, each doing his share toward the building of the shelter; which answer, of course, was true, but unfortunately, on its face, seemed to bear out Mr. Crosby in his original contention rather than sustain my criticism thereof. Then Mr. Starr Hoyt Nichols suggested that in the case supposed those who had the least money would work for those who had the most,—a suggestion which I, regardless of the fact that it involved an assumption violently at odds with the case supposed,—that hypothetical case being now one of equality in monetary wealth,—frantically clutched at as a drowning man clutches at a straw. Then Mr. John H. Edelman, a Communist, perceiving, I presume, that my situation was becoming desperate, also, inquired why it would not be advisable to come down to a natural basis and assume that all men would desire to work in the presence of such conditions,—a truth which I should have characterized as irrelevant had I not been "rattled," but to which, as it was, I extended a not too reluctant hand. Nobody else coming to my rescue, I rambled aimlessly for a few seconds more, and then subsided. The chairman, noticing the abruptness with which I had first lost the thread of my argument and then cut it off, asked me if I had quite finished, thereby supplying the one thing needful to make my discourse flabby. Yet, to tell the truth, I consider that the chairman was a touch too lenient. Had he, in the exercise of his brief authority, ordered Mr. Crosby and myself to turn our faces to the wall and so remain until the hour of adjournment, Mr. Crosby for having asked so simple a question and myself for having been even temporarily unable to answer it, we should have had only our deserts.

I am unable to account for the connection between the seat of a chair and the mental condition of a man whose brains are properly located, but certain it is that I had scarcely taken my seat when my scattered wits began to gather; so that presently I saw clearly that Mr. Crosby had unwittingly given me the opportunity to clinch my criticism of his position, and that I had stupidly wasted it. Of course, in answer to his question, I had only to point out that the reason why the shipwrecked men, if equally rich in money, would all go to work is to be found in the fact that their respective ten-dollar bills cancel each other and therefore become as nought, in order to confirm my criticism and overthrow Mr. Crosby's position; for bills cannot cancel each other, unless each bill is a thing that can be canceled, and where there is no obligation there is nothing that can be canceled. And, as I go on, a paper promise to pay is an obligation,—an obligation to pay for labor or service rendered, and, as such, not inferior or superior, but exactly equal, to the counter obligation to perform labor or service,—which is the proposition that Mr. Crosby attempted to disprove.

One of the purposes of this confession of mine will have been fully accomplished if by it any doubting reader shall be convinced that the issue of honesty in the late campaign was not between those, on the one hand, who work for their living and those, on the other, who buy their living with money, but between those, on the one hand, who buy their living with money that they earn and those, on the other, who buy their living with money that they steal.
pickers or into little dresses for the babies that sported last night between the pavements of Belleville, it would have been but a mouthful and a bit of linen in the consumption of a city in which there are so many old and hungry ragpickers, and so many little two-footed nurseries sown by one knows not who. Such a course would not have been original; it would not have represented twenty-four hours of assistance; but it would have been better than to compromise the future of three able-bodied young persons in the way of whose success nothing stood.

These three young persons had everything in their favor: they were poor,—that is, obliged to earn their shelter; they were admitted to the Beaux-Arts school; and, finally, they were "meritorious," that is, had good marks, and were correct and docile young persons who had been taken under the protection of their masters, and will go to Rome by the shortest of the innumerable roads that lead thither, the road of the Prix de Rome.

And now you abruptly put in their hands that for which are still struggling so many men already advanced in age and whose efforts, disappointments, and successes are past counting,—a rent-receipt.

You resemble the too generous godmothers who lavish on their godsons, at New Year's, expensive playthings which they are not yet capable of using,—a magnificent hunting rifle, a precious Stadilvarius, or a compound microscope. At the end of a fortnight the microscope is hopelessly out of order, though in the meantime the class has discovered no new microbe, the old violin is in the condition of a four-cent fiddle, and the rifle has cost the gardener an eye.

So it probably will be with your three godsons, my lady of the Beaux-Arts. You will have given them too soon the plaything which even experienced men find the most difficult to handle and at the same time pursue their tasks,—the absence of fruitful anxiety. You extend your aid to false distresses, and it is a great pity that you have not been better informed. When one is a pupil in the Beaux-Arts school, one is somebody, one is many things, one is enormous. "Pupil in the Beaux-Arts school,"—why! that can be put upon a visiting-card which, if one know how to use it, will open almost any door. One is already ticketed, classified, an aspirant for something. It is salvation in a country where one is looked at askance if he has not been at least once a candidate, and where, when one knows a thing, it is a great misfortune to have learned it all alone. These three young persons, however poor they may have been, were the larvae of mandarins.

You do them a bad service in accentuating them to a shelter which they have neither paid for or really earned; you wrap their feet in wadding, and you fatten their livers. If the villiger is located to them for life, you make them privileged persons to the detriment of many others who have not perhaps their good marks, though having more merit. If you lodge them temporarily, then they will not learn how one pays his rent and how one does not pay it,—the two greatest stimulants to talent.

Again, there they are, stamped, celebrated, quasi-phenomenal, almost ridiculous. People will say of them: "These are the three poor young people of Neully." If, perchance, they pine away and do not yield the results that their masters expect of them, their failure will be the more remarked. If they achieve even a passable success, it will be "because of the lady."

Since you wished to find young people to protect effusively, perhaps you would have found them outside of these quasi-official surroundings, in spots where no official dreams of looking for them. You would have had to inform yourself, to scour the popular districts, to explore the primary schools, to make your way into holes and havens, and to unearth among the crowds some rare and admirable head of a child. Of a child, I say, for a young man is too far advanced; a young man has no need, and should have no need, of aid. If he is incapable of executing without a springboard those perilous leaps which are necessary to one who wants to walk on his feet, he deserves no interest, still less that exceptional interest which it is your desire to manifest in the trio of Elisa of the Roi Bonaparte.

And though you had found, far away from the Beaux-Arts school, the three white blackbirds in the act of breaking their wings and splitting their beaks, perhaps they would have refused your protection, at least in the form in which you offer it, had they been genuine, fast color blackbirds. "If you find that I have talent," each would have said, "set me at work. Buy my painting, my sculpture, if you think it worth anything, and I will look out for my lodging." The poor good lady, these are very disagreeable things that I am saying to you, and not in this fashion is it usual to extend thanks for charitable acts and intentions. It was your aim to do good, and you said to yourself that you would grow three magnificent plants in your little Neully hot-house. But for your cuttings you have gone to gardeners who know absolutely nothing, and who are capable of giving you Brussels sprouts for lilies and hips for roses. You have requested the professors of the Beaux-Arts school to pick out the three pupils whose future seems to warrant the deepest foundations, though there is no known instance of an official professor who could tell a gooseling from an eagle.

Furthermore, your classification is so artificial! The three poorest and at the same time the three most meritorious! But what if, at the particular moment, the three most meritorious are the three richest? And what if the three poorest are the three proudest? And what if they have a legitimate horror of favor? Ah! my poor good lady, you have rushed into a blind alley, and are in danger of having very ordinary tenants. Who knows even if they will take your good-will kindly? Is there a janitor in your villa? Will they be allowed to receive women there? Your error lies in supposing that it is necessary to encourage youth.

The legends of youthful genius stifled by poverty are rimearoles by which you, as a sentimental and respectful person, have suffered yourself to be caught. But there is no instance where genius, or even real talent simply, has not successfully buffeted winds and waves. Real human values are ineradicable. Undoubtedly at all ages there are storms, miseries,
Macdonald, the Truth-Shunner.

With his usual inability, when unwilling, to understand the English language, George Macdonald, in replying to my article, "A Cry and a Lie," assumes that I base my charge of treachery against Henry George on the fact that he approved the decision of the supreme court against the American Communists, and declares that, since George may have been sincere in such approval, the charge of treachery is not proved thereby. I have explained over and over again, and so clearly that every reader except Macdonald understands it, that I base my charge of treachery, not simply on George's approval of the court's decision, but also and mainly on George's deliberate, careful declaration, as a reason for such approval, of the absolute impossibility of error in a unanimous agreement of the supreme court. As it is inconceivable that a man of George's sagacity should be a believer in the fallibility of judges, the fact that he declared such belief to bolster his cowardly attitude at a time when he was running for office can be explained only on the ground of insincerity and treachery. "But Macdonald, in discussing the matter, will never attempt to meet this point, because his failure would demonstrate the correctness of my attitude, and, rather than admit that, he will be as dishonest as George himself. Upon the absolute lack of parallel between this proof of George's dishonesty and Macdonald's lame effort to convict me of treachery in the Venezuelan matter I do not conceive it necessary to insist further, despite the fact that Macdonald reiterates his ridiculous contention, while carefully refraining from letting his readers know the reason why I accused him of lying. Failing to make out a case for either George or himself, Macdonald next offers anything but helping hand to the dying reputation of the truth-loving Putnam. By his head he has gone off into a silly Putnam, it seems, was not editorially at home when the letter of compliment to him in which it was proposed that all Anarchists be converted into corpses and exposed in that state to the public view was printed, prominently and without protest, in the editorial columns of his paper, "Freethought." The responsibility for that bit of infamy his wicked partner, Macdonald, tries to take solely upon himself. But again he makes a wretched failure. Putnam, whether at home or not at the time, returned shortly after, learned all about the matter, and, as far as I know, never in any way disowned the act, though, as chief or joint editor, he was either chiefly or jointly responsible. That responsibility cannot be thrown off his shoulders after his death. In declining to disown the dirty act he became to all intents and purposes the doer thereof, and his reputation must stand the consequences.

Macdonald professes to think that these consequences will not be serious, because my "brand" is getting burnt out. Bearing upon this point, I may quote a recent conversation with a gentleman of the highest integrity, who is an intimate friend of Macdonald, was an intimate friend of Putnam, is a great admirer of Putnam, and is, withal, one of the best-known "plumb-line" Anarchists. Talking with him of Putnam since the latter's death, he reminded him of the facts in the matter of the "Freethought" letter, and asked him two direct questions: "Was Putnam's conduct in that matter decent?" "No," said he. "Was it honest?" "No," said he. And I am sure that the same honesty that compelled him to make these admissions, so damaging to his friend, will prevent him from acquitting him of guilt on the plea of an acti. Now, if a man braced by strong friendship found thus much virtue in my "brand," it may be found not entirely ineffective with persons who can view the matter impartially. At any rate, it appears to me most instructive that Macdonald is not prepared to take such a degree of alarm that he appears to some indefinable person to inflict physical vengeance upon me. At least, so I interpret his closing remark that somebody ought to accommodate me with justice, since I ask for justice. This remark is characteristic. It reminds me of those revolutionary editors who sit quietly in their offices and advise others to throw bombs. Macdonald, to all appearance, is an able-bodied man, weighing several hundred pounds and capable of doing his own fighting. Why does he seek a substitute?

It is announced that County Clerk Henry D. Purroy, the bolding Tammany leader, purposes to run Henry George as his faction's candidate for the mayoralty of Greater New York. I counsel Mr. Purroy to look about him a bit before taking a step that will prove fatal to his political scheming. If Henry George is ever again a candidate for the New York mayoralty, it will not be my fault if a copy of "Henry George, Traitor," is not placed in the hands of every workingman in the city. There are laborors in this city ever now who are endeavoring, by the distribution of this pamphlet, to make amends for their error in having voted for George in the past. Their number will be greatly multiplied if he ever makes a new bid for their votes.

The Value of Money and Its Volume.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Seeing that value depends upon volume, an inquiry into the causes and effects of the variation of the one is necessarily also a discussion of the circumstances pertaining to fluctuations of the other. If the quantity of gold available is small, its quality will be dearness; and, if the quantity of, says be great, their quality will be cheapness. Conversely, it can rigorously be inferred that, if the quality of a commodity be cheapness or dearness, its quantity is great or small respectively.

Exchange is a mutual transfer of two commodities between two parties. The media of the exchange are the commodities. But the quantities of the exchange of the other any more than the kind is of the first. If one's tailor hands over a coat upon credit for two guineas, then the coat buys the right to be paid, just as much as the duty to pay buys the coat. One wants the coat; the other wants the right to payment more than he wants the coat. Hence the exchange. Each obtains something which is to him more useful (consequently more valuable) than what he alienates from his own possession.

But, if it may be answered, "one wants the coat to wear—to consume; while the tailor wants the right, in order that he may shortly obtain the guineas, and he wants the guineas, not to consume, but merely to sell for things which he will consume such as bread, shoes, coal, or cloth, as the case may be. Hence, it will further be urged, the debt is here the medium of exchange, the guineas are the standard of value, and "one exchanges at Mr. X's shop to conceive of media of exchange and standards of value . . . . as two distinct classes of things." The idea seems to be that consumable things are not media of exchange, and that media of exchange are not consumable things. This is explicitly admitted, but it seems to be tacitly involved in the arguments of Mr. Badcock and others as to the scarcity of the medium of exchange. It is absolutely unquestionable that "there is only one money, and that is gold. The price of gold is gold. Gold and money are not merely at par. They are identical and homogenous." Fractional coins, tokens, promissory, are not money. They may—just is, some of them may—be at par with the money they represent, and this is always dependent upon habitual, constant, and invariable convertibility; in fact, upon a popular belief that no interruption or delay in convertibility need be taken into account.

Money is, then, a consumable commodity (namely, gold), and debts, tokens, etc., are liabilities to tender gold on demand or upon a named date. The debt is a representative of a specific value; the gold has the value utility in itself. No one can say that the tailor wants to consume the two guineas which he one day is to obtain in redemption of the debt for which the coat was exchanged. He desires to exchange again. This is the quantity of gold going to him merely a medium of exchange. But among the things he will buy are cloth and trimmings to make garments which he will not consume. These he uses in their turn as media of exchange for more gold. When he buys cloth, he values cloth more than the gold he sells it for. When he sells raime, he values more the gold it buys.

Mr. Badcock's recent essay on "The Money Pan- lune" has been criticized on the ground that he has confused money with wealth. But the fact is that...
money is wealth and power anything else. All wealth is not money, but all money is gold, and gold is wealth. At the same time all gold is not actual coin. There can, therefore, be no money famine. If a man had no gold, and there were some show of reason for the idea that there were not enough cakes to go round, then he might be judged to be face to face with the wolf at the door. But, so long as there is flour and there are cakes, and for cakes does not press him to convert all his flour into cakes, then the allegation of famine is palpably absurd. Man can bake his gold into sovereign cakes free of all cost. Free minting converts all gold minus into monetary terms.

The benefit of checks and other forms of money notes arises not so much from their increasing the volume of money as from their reducing (to the vanishing point) the possibility of the possession of real money. They add to the portability of money, without interfering with its divisibility.(6)

If Mr. Badcock concedes (7) that very wide variations in the value of gold would produce no greater inconvenience than to say, they are not a snafu in this controversy has undoubtedly been made. When he argues that the question of value is not identical with the question of volume, he does not appear to hold that the comparative indifference to its monetary function from great changes in the value of gold is in itself false. He will "not trouble to controvert the assertion." Can it be assumed that he is so mistaken? (8)

The interesting discussion upon monetary restri
tions is sufficiently great to make it worth while to be able to agree with him upon this point, as well as upon the point that the evils of restraint far outweigh its advantages.

The Bank has no liability to pay on demand its own promissory notes ("Bank notes," U. K. dialect; "Bank bills," U. S. A. dialects). It is also liable to pay on demand every check which may be issued by cus
tomers, and the cash behind it is then considered. This latter liability is not restricted by the Bank char
ter act. Hence the Bank actually issues a form of monetary paper, not "against" a metal reserve, but far in excess of which is so equipped. There is, however, a check for the total amount of gold in the bank as will bring into circulation any large propor
tion of this available monetary substitute. This is a further proof that money is abundant, and not scarce. The available issue is never required.(9)

Mr. Badcock complains that possible operations ought not to "prevent our issuing certificates of value upon all [our] property." Neither he or any one else has shown what form of document he proposes should be issued on the value of cotton, or iron, or iron ore, or tin, or lead, or rubber, or jute, or jute, or any other substance. They represent, rather, cases in which gold is cattolized or indenized, as the case may be; that is to say, so much gold is here deliberately demonetized, and its place taken by a check or voucher for gold.

The time has come for an explanation of what these free-money people really want. Is it one-pound notes? Are they to be convertible by issuer on demand? In such a proposal they surely can reckon on the support of all classes, rich and poor, who knew that notes would not do much good. They might, and probably would, do some. In any case they would, under liberty, be issued unrestrictedly, and in many cases not without the consent of any mass of capital or other wealth against which they were supposed to be issued. The scheme of the Mutual Bankists is that some agreement between the shareholders of the mutual bank would provide for the continual circulation of the notes primarily among these members, and, sec
drly, among the public at large. The nature and extent of the liability of these members to sell commodi
ties for these notes has never been formulated.(10)

(10) It is like all the other proposals—left vague. It is never shown how a retailer, merchant, or manufac
turer could use these notes in his business, to any ma
terial advantage. A power to issue one's own checks

upon the Bank would usually be much more conven
tient and useful. The unrestricted issue of notes and tokens would not affect interest in the slightest degree. Prompt check exchange would be possible at all times; for the notes can be exchanged for coin at the currency. Delayed notes must always be at a discount. These do not displace coin, except when made legal tender, and then their depreciation is in direct proportion to the excess in which they are put into circulation.

October 30, 1896.

In Reply to the Foregoing.

(1) From which it follows that the dearess of the monetary accommodation of the world can be reduced by excluding the accommodation. The price now paid, in interest, cannot be lowered to the competitive limit while money is maintained upon the restricted basis of gold, dilluted, as it is, with only roundabout and privileged extensions.

(2) I thought gold was the only medium. Ail I see—gold is the only money, and money is not a medium. (3) I am still in error. (4) Whether "fractional coins, tokens, and promis
ges" are money or not makes not the least difference. Any other name will smell as sweet. But it is the ex
cration and uselessness of these tokens you name that you want enhanced; and it is these things only that I will discuss under the use "money."

(5) From which it follows that the world's accumu
lated wealth (exclusive of gold) is still "habitual, constant, and invariable convertibility" into gold; a position from which the only escape is the invention of money that will facilitate the ex
thange of any kind of wealth for any other kind of wealth with the least possible all for gold or no call at all, as do some extent the check, bank note, and token systems. The old English tradesmen's tokens were worded in terms of the silver penny—the then standard unit—and, in the sphere of the influence, they were (as far as I know) at par with silver, because of the "popularity belief that no interruption or delay in convertibility" of them into broad and trelace and candles, etc., "need be taken into account."

(6) But "checks and other forms of money notes" do increase the volume of transactions (in quantity and number) without a corresponding increase in the volume of gold.

(7) Which he doesn't. (8) It is fictitious to assume nothing. (9) No proof at all. Abundance has to go hand in hand with easy terms to be any relief. Checks do not meet the want of a currency, as already shown by me. As for the Bank of England, its total reserve to its liabilities (jumping checks and note systems) is to day (November 13) 324 per cent., with a discount rate of 4 per cent., and a timidity against this reserve being which, to the extent of which, very little, if that rate is any heavy withdrawals for use took place.

(10) DO CREDIT FOR A BILL. £1. ONE POUND NOTE £1. on The. Free Trade Bank, Limited, THREADNECKE STREET, LONDON. The Opposite of Bank of England. This Crown, which is issued against collateral of not less value than One Pound Sterling deposited with us, which collateral, or other equivalent collateral, or the equivalent gold face not, this note, will be held by us while this note is outstanding. Dated this first day of 19 . For The. Free Trade Bank, Limited. Adam Platts-Mills, Chief Cashier. No. 0000. (4) Hereford Dukermyner. - Accountant. Prudence Eadgale, - Auditor. SUGGESTION FOR A TOKEN.

JOHN BADCOCK, HIS HALFPENNY

(1) Mr. Fisher might just as well predict that, while cash sales of ordinary commodities are at a dis
count, forward sales will always be at a higher figure. There's no rule in the matter. It all depends upon demands and supplies, or the ability of syndicates and private people to resort to a denial of demand for forward delivery in excess of prompt de
delivery (cash part), the price for the former will be the higher—and vice versa.

(2) Read again my essay, and cogitate upon the functions of a banker for another twenty years, and maybe you'll understand.

(3) What a fib! JOHNBADCOCK, JR. LETTON, ENGLAND, NOVEMBER 13, 1896.
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Target, both sections. The "Investigator," 9 Appleton Street, Boston, on December 19 printed the follow

(11) According to this opinion the state, as it is called, is regarded by every intelligent person, the principal, if not the only, business of the state. Even the en
croaching of the law of equal freedom and the adminis
tration of justice between man and man. This law is formulated by the same people, the work, on page 121, as follows: "Every man has freedom to do all that he wills, provided he infringes not the equal freedom of any other man."

According to this theory, the state is not instituted for the purpose of restricting the liberty of any citi
zen, except in so far as that is absolutely necessary to prevent the like liberty of any other. In other words, instead of depriving people of their natu
ral rights, the state is instituted to insure to all of them the full and complete enjoyment thereof; and, whenever it does more than this in re
gard to their personal conduct, it reverses itself into a state of anarchy, and is thus an aggressor. It is wholly imma
terial to any person whether he is deprived of his natural rights and liberties by some other person, or whether the same act is performed by the State, the difference being the same. But this funda
mental principle it follows that whatever is wrong for an individual to do to another is equally wrong for the government to do to the same person.

Consequently, the only control which it can properly exercise over the conduct of its citizens is to prevent him from injuring, or from encroaching upon the rights of, his neighbor. From these general principles it follows that it can have no legitimate control over the monies of any of its citi
zens, so long as they do not violate the law of equal freedom to which we have so far referred, and that, therefore, it ought to confine its efforts simply to the punishment of crimes, and not to the management of mere vice,—the distinction between the two being that the latter is an injury to oneself, and the former is an injury to another. It is no more immoral or criminal to sell liquor than it is to sell gunpowder, dynamite, nitro-glycerin, poison, arsenic, etc., all of which have been legislated against without any public claim that they are legitimate and proper, and may also be em
ployed in the commission of crime. The mere buying and selling of these or any other commodity is not a criminal conduct on the part of either party to that transaction, as the rights of third parties are in no wise affected thereby. It is not justly held responsible for any crime which the vendor may be convicted by any one which have, by buying from him, given them with the knowledge that they are to be used for that purpose; and even in that case it is eminently just to pun
ish only the party or parties of mischief itself, and not as a dealer in those commodities, as the mere selling of them is not criminal according to the true meaning of that word.

Point out how these principles involve the condonation of those laws on which the whole fabric of our government rests. STEPHEN T. BYRNON.

A Convert.

To pretty Anna I proposed, Last night when we were at the tryst; To government she'd be opposed, But she is now an Anna kissed.

Walter Besant.
**Elusive Joys.**

Beauty bideth, 
Nature childeth, 
When the heart is cold. 
Fame and God's outweighing, 
When the mind is sold.

**The State and Education.**

Since the time that we have had organized government in this country, our schools have been operated and controlled by State agencies. These conditions have as long a time as they have been found necessary to speak of our public schools as the great bulwark of American institutions, and most people look upon our public school system as the palladium of republican ideas. Therefore any criticism directed against our schools is not only in small part, but in serious opposition to the system always excites among those who hear it something akin to "conscription fits."

Nevertheless there have been in the past numerous instances where popular opinion was as firmly fixed, and seemingly as securely entrenched, in a position subsequently proven erroneous, and from which it was easily dislodged, as it is now in the matter of public schools.

The principal reason for the strong hold that our public school system has upon the public is the fact of a popular misconception as to its character. We call it a free school system. It is the word free, and the apparent free intempering of the children at school, that give the system its popular strength.

If it was denominated as its real character demands, and called what it is,—a compulsory school system,—it would not appeal so strongly to unthinking, but real, liberty.

Our public school system is wrong because its establishment and maintenance are an invasion of individual freedom. It takes away from parents the free exercise of their children's talents and peculiar mental endowments, by compelling them to make use of school facilities which they do not approve, and to which they are opposed.

Parents are responsible for the existence of their children, and nothing should be done by the State that tend to destroy, that neutralize this responsibility. Therefore every parent should be left free to use such educational agencies and methods as are by him deemed fittest for the education of his children. No one should be in the belief, or practice, of the idea that, however many children be brought into the world, society is bound to see to it that they shall be provided, at public cost, with an education. Personal independence should not be weakened by the cultivation of such feeling. The government should feel that the position of himself and family in society, and the education fitting them for proper occupancy of that position, are due solely to his own efforts, limited only by the natural interdependence incident to our social organization.

Love of offspring is the strongest affection with which we are endowed, and, if left free, its natural promptings will be sufficient incentive to inspire the provision of better educational facilities than are possible in any other way. For instance, a child shows that it possesses faculties indicating a fitness for certain vocations; now these faculties need only cultivation to insure success and advancement in those vocations.

The public school affords no opportunity for special training, and the enforced contributions exacted from parents in support of the public school so weaken the family resources that they are unable to expend their money in the best possible manner.

The very nature of the system limits opportunity in the public school to the established curriculum. With schools such as would naturally spring into existence everywhere, but which was demanded, there would be opportunity to buy the kind of mental cultivation and training that was wanted; nor would time and money be wasted in the acquisition of knowledge not deemed necessary by those most interested in them. With free voluntary education there would be great diversity in the kind and character of schools, and the competition and emulation incident to such a state of things would be conducive to a more rapid growth and a higher efficiency than is possible with the uniform conditions prevailing in our public schools.

No man should be deprived of that which he wants and in which he is interested, so long as he is in a position to expend his energy for things that he does not want or the use of which he cannot approve. There are millions of parents in this country obliged to contribute in the shape of free school funds, to those, who are thereby deprived of the pleasure incident to the exercise of the natural right of affording their children the kind of instruction that they deem most beneficial. Those of them who are able to send their children to other schools are compelled to pay their money in support of the public school, receiving therefrom absolutely no return whatever. The exercise of any power on the part of the State that is, in operation, unprofitable and simply indefensible, but should be utterly condemned.

All parents as individuals have an inalienable right to educate their children in accordance with the wishes and desires of the children and themselves, guided and inspired by individual instruction only by the exercise of equal freedom on the part of every other parent and child. And, while society may have the power to limit and abridge that right, the exercise of such power cannot justly be defended. Every action imposed by society should be founded upon the idea that every member of society is entitled to equal freedom; no other rule can be defended, nor is any other rule justifiable.

Why should anybody be taxed, in order that somebody else may have and enjoy benefits at less than cost? How can there be any justification of the taxation of any individual in support of a system in the condition of which they had no choice or which they do not use.

The tendency of civilization is in the direction of homoegamy as pertaining to aggregations of individvuals, and to a greater homogeneity as pertaining to individuals themselves. Therefore the public school is entirely inadequate to, and wholly unfit for, the proper education of those who are to become the citizens of the future. The public school can bring forth only one kind of children, and that kind alike, as it would be manifestly improper to give any scholar a higher or more expensive form of education than others receive.

Nothing can be shown in a public school system; yet, because of the diversity of future vocation, and therefore diversity of want, the requirements of society demand different educational treatment, and different school facilities, for different individuals. If the State has the power to control the facilities by which our children are to be educated, it has also the right to compel attendance at those schools.

More than that, the State has a right to say when they shall be attended, for the benefit and enjoyment of all.

The right of the State in this respect once acknowledged, all individual right to the exercise of educational liberty is forever surrendered. The State never gives up power once exercised, except at the end of successful opposition, by a movement for change of opinion to change the nature of an unwilling and uncomprehesive mind, so that it will receive and perceive? You can compel them to come to the educational font, but an unwilling recipient is an unprofitable and imprudent. The idea of the usefulness of the mental discipline received in a stultifying process is greatly over-estimated. The only discipline that is worth anything is such as is acquired by experience in ways that enable the recipient to be independent of the useless; the mere memorizing and mechanical recitation of rules lacks the essential qualities of experience.

Most children can attend school but a short time; the natural restraint that is necessary, and that but a limited amount of education is necessary; because of the attempt on the part of the State to furnish every body with more education than is wanted there has been a failure to furnish enough of the kind that is wanted; and the feeble attempt at every place that is not satisfied by a supply will soon wither and die.

Every scholar should receive the kind of education that he himself wants, subject to no influence other than that of the parents, who are the only ones who can have a personal desire for knowledge, and without desire attainment is impossible—will be impelled to sufficient effort, and will incline the parental aid necessary, to enable him to satisfy that desire.

The arbitrary imposition of a fixed kind of education upon anybody by State agencies should not for a moment be permitted. A system of that kind is entirely out of harmony with the principle of separate and independent institutions. Institutions out of harmony with individual liberty tend to weaken and destroy those individual characteristics which are essential to the growth and improvement of the State and moment of the State.

"Oh! but the poor,—what is to be done for them? They ought to be educated. How is it to be done? They cannot educate themselves. Surely, organized society ought to interfere and provide means to enable means to lift themselves out of their present unfortunate condition.

Well, grant that it is true; but how far do you propose going in that direction, and where do you propose ending? Is it not a matter of prime importance that can in no wise be neglected,—that is, that direct obligations to your own children are secondary to the indirect obligations to children generally? And so people are to marry when they feel like it, and bring into the world as many children as they may, and society, not they, must assume the burden and accept the consequences? How far is this from the point where the education of everybody's children is a matter of prime importance that can in no wise be neglected,—that is, that direct obligations to your own children are secondary to the indirect obligations to children generally?

Oh! they say, but something must be done in the name of, and for the sake of, humanity. Well, grant it. Can human sympathy properly expressed be extended to the mass of the people?

Society is not a matter of creation, but it has been, and is, a thing of growth; and its best growth and development are attained in an atmosphere of freedom. From the absence of compulsory measures it does not follow that no provision is made for those who are worthy, but unfortunate.

Voluntary actions induced by the sympathy incident to the natural love of man for his fellows will and must be the outcome of a free people's judgment, of the part of the State. Even if not, would the indiscriminate helping of everybody who is poor be a proper exercise of the best humanity?

Let us see. We assume that society is a society composed of strong, self-reliant, self-supporting members; now, will that be soonest attained by obliging the self-supporting to carry the non-supporting, in order that the latter may live and propagate their kind. Or will it be attained quicker? If the latter, the impudence to suffer is the consequences of their imperfections, in that the race may be the more quickly reach condition of perfection. The best humanity would be that which will achieve the largest and best ultimate outcomes.

Conditions of perfection cannot be brought about by governmental regulations, because people must learn to perceive what is good for them because it is good for them; and they can do this only by being al-
bowed opportunity for the free exercise of individual faculty. Experience is the only school, and experi-
ence is a thing that, in the very nature of things, must be acquired by personal action; it can in nowise be taught by any word. Experience will and as much as you may, the pains and penalties incident to the thorough adaptation of man to con-
ditions necessary to life must be gone through with; and the highest value of personal experience, and insisting that every individual must be self-
supporting and non-aggressive. Every action out of har-
mony with that idea only defers and makes more diffi-
cult the object to be attained; so, by helping you to in-
crease your experience, in order that you may have the proximate seeming benefits, you are not only unjustly burdening the worthy, but you are de-
feating the very object sought.

Did it not serve to further aid to improv-
ience at the expense of providence that they propose exactly the thing that was the cause of the improvi-
dent’s present condition,—that is, sacrificing the ulti-
mate good in order that present gratification may be enjoyed.

The best humanity does not consist in increasing the evil sought to be cured. Then there are those who say that “the interest and judgment of the people most interested are sufficient guarantees of the good-
ness of the commodity.” That is to say, they do not know what they want; therefore it is, and of right should be, given to those of us possessing long heads and high vision, and for whom the welfare of the community, and oblige the recipients to partake. Now, inasmuch as personal experience is a prime essential to the growth and development of a discriminating intelli-
gence, how long do you think it will be necessary for the self of the school to do what is required? It is rem-
ant many before the latter become sufficiently intelli-
gent to act and judge for themselves? Furthermore, supposing that these people should take it into their empty heads only what they want for themselves, but that you do not know what you ought to have for yourselves, and should institute schools to their own liking and oblige you to support them and partake thereof,—what would you think of the wisdom that did thus? Nor is it ever to those of you who believe in the teleologi-
cal origin and disposition of things that there are millions of people who regard religion as of more im-
portance than all other things put together? Sup-
pose it was insisted that everybody should be obliged to partake of religious instruction and training in our schools,—would not the end justify whatever means might be adopted in enforcement thereof? Is not something better than that which is supposed to be all time im-
portant than anything that relates only to our lim-
ited stay upon earth? It is no answer to say that re-
ligious liberty must be interfered with, for re-
ligious things are the same everywhere and are secondary privileges as to freedom. If it is right that men should have and enjoy religious freedom, it is right that they should have and enjoy educational freedom. If the best interests of society demand that men be free to worship or not worship God, according to the dictates of their own consciences, the best interests of society also demand that men be left free to educate or not educate themselves according to the demands of their own interests, and neither the state nor the country and proper respect for its laws are not best sub-
curred or preserved by arbitrarily obliging people who believe religious instruction necessary to support schools in the same manner. Now, let us look in another direction. Man was not, nor is he, created, but, like everything else on

earth, is a thing of growth; smoothing away the rough places and making things easy for him are not co
ducted in the same manner as the development of an organism. He must learn by experience what is best for his growth and advancement; there is no other way of find-

ing out. Physical nutrition is required, and men-

tal nutrition is not less necessary. If you are to

grow until the stomach is full; you cannot fill the

head before you fill the belly. Now, if it is incum-
bent on the State to furnish mental nutrition, it is not a

greater and more urgent duty that bodily nutrition

be first supplied.

Without going further, it may well be asked how can the State supply a want that the people composing the State cannot supply? Whatever may be done

must be done by the expenditure of energy. The State is without force, except as it gathers it from the people through the tax-gatherer; and, however much the State may gather, the force will always be subject to the energy of those who are taxed and how they use the energy of those who are taxed and insisting that every individual must be self-
supporting and non-aggressive. Every action out of har-
mony with that idea only defers and makes more diffi-
cult the object to be attained; so, by helping you to in-
crease your experience, in order that you may have the proximate seeming benefits, you are not only unjustly burdening the worthy, but you are de-
feating the very object sought.

Did it not serve to further aid to improv-
ience at the expense of providence that they propose exactly the thing that was the cause of the improvi-
dent’s present condition,—that is, sacrificing the ulti-
mate good in order that present gratification may be enjoyed.

The best humanity does not consist in increasing the evil sought to be cured. Then there are those who say that “the interest and judgment of the people most interested are sufficient guarantees of the good-
ness of the commodity.” That is to say, they do not know what they want; therefore it is, and of right should be, given to those of us possessing long heads and high vision, and for whom the welfare of the community, and oblige the recipients to partake. Now, inasmuch as personal experience is a prime essential to the growth and development of a discriminating intelli-
gence, how long do you think it will be necessary for the self of the school to do what is required? It is rem-
ant many before the latter become sufficiently intelli-
gent to act and judge for themselves? Furthermore, supposing that these people should take it into their empty heads only what they want for themselves, but that you do not know what you ought to have for yourselves, and should institute schools to their own liking and oblige you to support them and partake thereof,—what would you think of the wisdom that did thus? Nor is it ever to those of you who believe in the teleologi-
cal origin and disposition of things that there are millions of people who regard religion as of more im-
portance than all other things put together? Sup-
pose it was insisted that everybody should be obliged to partake of religious instruction and training in our schools,—would not the end justify whatever means might be adopted in enforcement thereof? Is not something better than that which is supposed to be all time im-
portant than anything that relates only to our lim-
ited stay upon earth? It is no answer to say that re-
ligious liberty must be interfered with, for re-
ligious things are the same everywhere and are secondary privileges as to freedom. If it is right that men should have and enjoy religious freedom, it is right that they should have and enjoy educational freedom. If the best interests of society demand that men be free to worship or not worship God, according to the dictates of their own consciences, the best interests of society also demand that men be left free to educate or not educate themselves according to the demands of their own interests, and neither the state nor the country and proper respect for its laws are not best sub-
curred or preserved by arbitrarily obliging people who believe religious instruction necessary to support schools in the same manner. Now, let us look in another direction. Man was not, nor is he, created, but, like everything else on

earth, is a thing of growth; smoothing away the rough places and making things easy for him are not co
nducted in the same manner as the development of an organism. He must learn by experience what is best for his growth and advancement; there is no other way of find-

ing out. Physical nutrition is required, and men-

tal nutrition is not less necessary. If you are to

grow until the stomach is full; you cannot fill the

head before you fill the belly. Now, if it is incum-
bent on the State to furnish mental nutrition, it is not a

greater and more urgent duty that bodily nutrition

be first supplied.

Without going further, it may well be asked how can the State supply a want that the people composing the State cannot supply? Whatever may be done
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SLAVES TO DUTY.

By John Baddock, Jr.

A unique addition to the pamphlet literature of Anarchism, in that it contains the necessary appendices as the foundation of the various schemes for the expropriation of mankind. It is a work of much importance and of the greatest value to those who are interested in the study of labor and society.

Price, 15 Cents.

MAIL ORDER.
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