

MONEY—MONEY.

A writer "X" in another column asks some questions we would like our neighbor the *Times* to answer. A question sometimes states a case clearer than an argument—it is in fact the Socratic method of teaching. Many of our readers ask us why we do not "go for" the *Times* in its latter-day crusade against the people and the West. The platitudes of that new organ of the brokers of the East and of Europe have not said anything that has not been answered a thousand times, and our time and space is too valuable to notice stereotyped repetitions.

Argument on finance is like that on religion—generally a repetition of fixed opinions, without any intention or desire to be convinced. There are, however, a few propositions that are axiomatic:

1. Any kind of money depends for its use as such on the fact that the law of one country or of all countries recognizes it as a debt payer.

2. If gold or silver is to be money, a certain bulk of it must by law or consent have a fixed value for that purpose.

3. If only one metal is so used, it is easier for money owners to control its supply—and to make the world pay tribute.

4. If two metals—as gold and silver—are made money it is harder to "corner" both than one.

These propositions are plain enough for the world to understand. Certain brokers in Europe and this country own most of the gold and gold mines of the world—and the national debts held by them alone far exceed the gold supply of the world, to say nothing of other forms of indebtedness in bonds—all payable in gold. A child can see the logic of this situation.

Now, if silver is also added as money, it is harder to monopolize both metals and the business world is less at the mercy of these money and mine owners. That is the marrow of the silver question.

It is monstrous as an economic proposition that individual men should have the privilege of owning the land from which is to be dug the standard of value for all mankind, and to force governments to get from them the material to endow with money power by its own authority. It is a power before which human progress is a slave.

Why not governments make their own money—one way as well as another? We did it during the war and after, and are doing so to-day to the extent of \$346,000,000. Why not make it \$1,000,000,000 if necessary? It would be just as good as now and the people be free from the losses and distress imposed by the gold corner.

One thing must be remembered: The encroachment of gold owners has been such that to-day no business can be done that does not pay interest to money lenders. And with the money of the world hoarded by gold it is only a question of time when its owners own everything.

Take a merchant, a manufacturer, a railway operator, and in twenty years he has paid the gold holder as much as he has made himself—supposing him to have acquired an independence. That of itself will bankrupt the world. Europe to-day is bankrupt—for the labor of its people is taxed to the last farthing to pay interest on debts that nobody ever thinks possible to pay. That is bankruptcy.

There is only one way for future civilization, and that is for the people, society or government, to furnish the money and allow the people, the labor of the people, to have what it earns. The production of the country must first pay interest on the vast indebtedness resting over everything before it is allowed to eat its dinner.

Governments are now run to protect money. The whole power of civilization is now concentrated to make a bill of exchange par all over the world. And as long as gold is the standard money, just so long will the disabilities now felt grow and weigh down the spirit of labor and progress. Money freedom is the needed freedom of future economy.