power to tax involves the power to destroy. Which
remark is as true as it is brutal, but it takes for
granted the power to tax. Its author is the same
John Marshall of whom Lynden Spooner said that
he "would have been a great jurist, if the two funda-
mental propositions upon which all his legal, political,
and constitutional ideas were based had been true," these
propositions being, "first, that government has all
power, and, secondly, that the people have no
rights," and the rightfulness of taxation is one of those
false assumptions in the light of which Mr. Spooner de-
clared him an adept. As far as liberty-loving people
are concerned, Mr. George might as well try to justify
his scheme by citing the authority of the Czar of Rus-
ins as by citing that of John Marshall.
I would never have believed that the local column
of a newspaper published in a village of no special in-
terest to me could have been made to command my at-
tention, but somehow or other Editor Finney of the
Winnetka "Press," with whom I recently conducted a
lively talk, contrived to drive out my mind of the little
borough in a style which I cannot resist. Thus it
happens that my eye light, in a recent number, upon a
paragraph reading as follows: "We call attention to the
fault at hand and make it so vigorously, you think insupport-
able to human welfare as soon as an Anarchist simi-
larly smiles."

"John Swinton's "Paper is publishing a series of
articles entitled: "Wage-Slavery as Viewed by a Wage-
Slaver." They are written by A. S. Lathe of St. Louis.
In the seventh of the series he says: 'The free money
theory here becomes ridiculous. If every shoolmaker
could run a little cobbleisher shop independent of every
other fellow shoolman, and other trades the same, then
the 'everyone-his-own-banker' theory might be carried
out; if two or ten thousand are to combine in a co-
operative manufacturing, using all the modern labor-
saving machines applicable to the trade, then the
mediation of exchange, money, must be based upon the
same cooperative principle." This shot flies well
over the mark. I have yet to meet the advocate of free
money who insists that every one shall be his own
banker or who objects to the issue of money by coope-
ration. If Mr. Leitch has ever met such a person and
will tell me how to reach him, I, as an advocate of free
money, will endeavor to show him the error of his
ways. What the friends of free money are fighting
for is the right to form co-operatives and to cooperate
to issue money when and as they choose, and what they
are fighting against is the laws which in any way
make it impossible for either individuals or coope-
ratres to exercise this right. This, d nothing else,
is the free money theory, and Mr. Leitch says that it
there becomes ridiculous" becomes ridiculous himself.

Henry George was recently reminded in these
columns that his own logic would compel him to lay a
tax, not only on land values, but on all values growing
out of increase of population, and newspaper properties
were cited in illustration. A correspondent of the
"Gunston," has made the same criticism. Lamenting,
instead of a newspaper, "Cruzo's boat which rose in
data when a ship appeared on the horizon." To this
correspondent Mr. George unner answer that, while
"Cruzo's boat might have acquired a value when other
people came, because value is a factor of trading,
and, when there is no one to trade with, there can
be no value," yet "it by no means follows that growth of
population increases the value of labor products, for a
population of fifty will give as much value to a desir-
able product as a population of a million." I am ready
to admit this of any article which can be readily pro-
duced by any and all who choose to produce it. But,
accepts as Mr. George says, it is true of land, and it is as
emphatically not true of every article in great demand
which can be produced, in approximately equal quality
and with approximately equal expense, by only one or
a few persons. There are many such articles, and one
of the most important, is a popular newspaper. Such articles are of
small value where there are few people and of immense
value where there are many. This extra value is un-
earned increment, and ought to be taxed out of the
individual's hands into those of the community if any
unearned increment ought to be. Is it to be
be honest? Let us see whither your doctrine will lead us.

Cart and horse are all one to Henry George. He
puts either: first to suit his fancy or the turn his ques-
tioner may take, and, no matter which, he places in the
lead, he "gets there all the same"—on paper. When
he is asked how taxation of land values will abolish
poverty, he answers that the rush of wage-laborers to
the land will force the supply of labor and send wages up.
Then, when somebody else asks him how wage-labor-
ers will be able to rush to the land without money to
take them there and capital to work the land after-
wards, he answers that wages will then be so high that
the laborer will soon be able to save up money enough
and start with. Sometimes, indeed, as dimly perceiv-
ing the presence of some inconsistency lurking between
these two propositions, he volunteers an additional
suggestion that, after the lapse of a generation, he will
be a phenomenally unfortunate young man who shall
have no relatives or friends to help him start upon the
land. But we are left as much in the dark as ever
about the methods by which his relatives or friends,
during the generation which must elapse before the
young men get to the land, are to save up anything
to give these young men a start, in the absence of that
intrinsic value of wages which can only come as a conse-
quence of the young man having gone to the land.
Mr. George, however, has still another resource in res-
serve, and, when forced to it, he tosses it out,—namely,
that there being all grades between the rich and the
very poor, those having enough to start themselves up
on the land would do so, and the alight poor, no
longer having them competitors, would get higher
wages. Of course one might quiz him about these diminu-
tive gradations, or even how ever can go to the land if
they choose, since there is plenty to be had for but little
more than the asking, refrain nevertheless from at
once relieving an overstocked labor market; but it
would do no good. You see, you can't stamp Henry
George. He always contrives to think. He
knows he has a real tongue and a facile pen, and
in these he relies to carry him safely through the maos
of misrepresent.
CHAPTER IV.
VALUE DISTINGUISHED FROM COST.
129. The second grand result from the principle of Equity — Cost the Limit of Price — is that the value of labor or of a commodity has nothing whatever to dolegitimately with fixing the price of the labor or commodity. This proposition would be deplorable if it ever has been and is not more explicitly stated and more coarsely demonstrated. It is, as well as the result considered, a chapter in relation to natural skill or talent, quite new, and therefore surprising.

130. There is certainly something more reasonable, according to existing ideas, than that "we ought to bring what it is worth." No provision could be more seemingly incumbent upon the face of it than that. (15.) There is no statement upon a sin conspirator which mankind would more generally devour, and yet that statement covers a fallacy which lies at the basis of the prevalent system of speculation or civilization. It is precisely at this point that the whole world has come to a definite opinion, which is the foundation of this proposition to prove that error so obviously that it can no longer look in obscurity even in the most enlightened mind. To that end I beg the especial attention of the reader to the technical distinction between Value and Cost,—a point of great importance to this whole discussion.

131. "What a thing is worth" is another expression for the Value of a commodity or labor. The Value of a commodity or labor is the degree of benefits which conform upon the person who receives it, or to whose use it is applied. The Cost of it, on the other hand, is the degree of burdens or the prevention of the commodity or the performance of the labor imposed upon the person who produced or performed it. They are therefore by no means the same. No two things can possibly be more distinct, and this is the great and true reason why Value has nothing very little, or ever come. In the case of an exchange or transfer of an article from one person to another, the Cost relates to the party who makes the transfer, the burden of the production. But the Value is the benefit or the degree of benefits which conform upon the person who receives it, or to whose use it is applied. The Cost of it, in the case of the last of the two, shows the relative value of the commodity or of the labor imposed upon the person who produced or performed it. They are therefore by no means the same. No two things can possibly be more distinct, and this is the great and true reason why Value has nothing very little, or ever come. In the case of an exchange or transfer of an article from one person to another, the Cost relates to the party who makes the transfer, the burden of the production. But the Value is the benefit or the degree of benefits which conform upon the person who receives it, or to whose use it is applied.

132. But although Value is not the legitimate limit of Price nor even an element in the bargain, nevertheless, the principle is sometimes put in the form of an equation, or the image of a thing to be acquired which determines the purchaser to purchase. It belongs to the same class of ideas as the bargain. The buyer or producer, estimating for himself, as we have seen, the amount of burden he has assumed, he adopts a price which he considers adequate. He alone knows it, and he alone, therefore, can determine it. It belongs, on the other hand, to the estimate of others for himself the cost of the commodity or labor to him. He alone can do so, for he alone knows the nature of his own wants. By the settlement of the first point—Cost to the producer—there must be assumed an estimate of the burdens of the person to whom the other party will purchase: otherwise, not. Hence the Value, though not an element in the bargain, is an element in the bargain. The value of a horse is fixed by the buyer, and the value a consideration wholly for the purchaser.

133. As this is also, a point of great importance, let us state it again. If you require and desire to obtain one year or one year's nay services, or the results of those services in commodities, which is the same thing, it is a matter which does not concern me,—it is impertinent on my part, myself, with the idea of the degree of benefit you will derive from such services. That is purely a question for your own consideration, and determines you whether you can afford to give me the price or not. I have no advantage over him, be he who cost to me,—that it determines the descent. Your estimate of that value or benefit of yours may be based on considerations obviously to others, or upon a mere whim or caprice to the gratification of which others would attach no weight, which belongs to the sovereignty of the Individual to gratify even one's whims or caprices without hindrance or interference from others, at his own cost, which is, when the services of others are required to that end, by paying them to the cost of them out of his own property. In the other hand, it is equally an impertinence for you, in the case supposed, to attempt to set out me the degree of attraction or repugnance which there may be to the services which you require. No one else but myself can possibly know that. No one else can therefore in such a case, and in such a state of want as I do, bring upon me such a charge.

134. But the cost, in both cases, is the degree of benefit which conforms upon the buyer or producer, and the value is the degree of burden which conforms upon the seller or employee. The buyer may have a prejudice in himself, which is the condition of the exercise of the Sovereign. In all cases, if you overestimate the value to your own services, you add to the cost or degenerate consequence of your mistake or error. If I, on the other hand, underestimate the cost or expense of the performance of the service, I add to your expenses in setting out for the government or for the convenience of the person who, on the contrary, has a prejudice in himself, the opposite effect. In either case, the cost of the service is determined by the consumer.
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Father McGlynn.

How funny it all reads,—the "excommunication," cursing McGlynn inside and out! What a stringent of heavy, hard, cold emptiness! I’m afraid the world is encreasing that generation. But not a terror, it would seem. Nobody’s afraid. McGlynn goes on serenely, and the thousands who packed the Opera House in Philadelphia last Sunday night, and the thousands who have waivered by their membership in the church that does not recognize it, permit it, or have ought to do with it, except to put it down.

And the people who come from these McGlynn "Roman Catholic..." in all matters of religion concerning the church we submit. But not as to our politics in America, or our views on social problems here.

But, alas! for them, the Roman Church knows no such distinction. It is all "religion" with the Roman Church. Could it maintain the power, verily, little else would be left to a world that the Christ is to bring to his feet by means of this his Church, as the Church claims.

But Father McGlynn insists that it is not so, and he is still as good a Roman Catholic as ever.

At the same time both he and Mr. George dwell upon the fact that the great social struggle now begun for the industrial emancipation of the people is pre-eminently a religious one. In all their meetings they sing, "Nearer, my God, to thee," and other religious hymns. You cannot, they affirm, divorce religion from life.

Now, all Pope Leo has done is to say, "Just so, and therefore I propose, as Christ’s vicar, to regulate your life, the solitude of..."

Father McGlynn.

Simply to fall back upon his own human right to regulate his own life for himself and let the Church go.

What appears to be trying to do is to reduce the Church to a mere salvation-insurance agency for the future world, denying it all pretence for dealing with the world now.

But everybody sees in this age of approaching common sense that the Church, so bened of function, would become absurdly an affair of very little import. No, Pope Leo must be filtered and mingled with the Church and social and political activities.

The Church is political and social. It is quite as much for this world as for any other; you move so.

How much more Father McGlynn and his insurgent brethren must be ashamed! And is it consistent with the Church consistent? if it can claim divine authority over Father McGlynn’s soul, why not also over the body that for the time being holds that soul? How can the Great Shepherd guide the flock into heaven, if he lose sight of it in its most perilous wanderings on earth?

Verily, the Good Shepherd is not so remiss in his duty. It seems, then, that Father McGlynn must submit wholly, or not at all.

As an American, a man, let the decision be, "not at all."

Neither is pope nor kings, or kings, or we, nor, liim submit. His only refuge is in the Sovereignty of the Individual, the individual and supreme control of his own affairs.

Contract or Organism, What’s That To Us?

Some very interesting and valuable discussion is going on in the London "Jus" concerning the question of compulsory versus voluntary taxation. In the issue of June 17 there is a communication from F. W. Read, in which the following passage occurs:

The voluntary taxation proposal really means the dissolution of the State into its constituent atoms, and leaving them to reimburse in some way or way, just as it may happen. There would be, let us imagine, the existence of six "States" in England, and members of all these "States" might be living in the same home! The proposal is, as one may see it, an idea in the vulgar sense of the word. But what do you mean to say that it is not? It is a similar idea to the "original contract" theory. It was thought the State must rest upon a contract. There had been no contract in historic times; it was therefore assumed that there had been none.

The voluntary tax hill says there never has been any contract; therefore the State has never had any ethical basis; therefore we will now make a contract. The explanation of the whole matter, I believe, is that given by Mr. Wordsworth Donisthorpe, in his "States is a social organism, evolved as every other organism is evolved, and not requiring any more than other organisms to be based upon a contract either original or contemporary."

The idea that the voluntary tax hill objects to the State precisely because it does not rest on contract, rests without any "original contract." Unless he can demonstrate some one of the States is, or ought to be, founded on contract. This would be true if the words which I italicized should be omitted. It was the insertion of these words that furnished the writer a basis for his otherwise groundless analogy between the Anarchists and the followers of Rousseau.

The latter hold that the State originated in a contract, and that the people of today, though they did not make it, are bound by it. The Anarchists, on the contrary, deny that any such contract was ever made; declare that, had one ever been made, it could not impose a shadow of obligation on those who had no hand in making it; and claim the right to contract for themselves as individuals or in concert. Each makes his own contract, far from being analogous to that which makes him subject to contracts made by others, is its direct antithesis.

It is perfectly clear that voluntary taxation would not necessarily "prevent the existence of five or six States in England," and that "members of all these States might be living in the same house." But I see no reason for the explanation point after this remark. What of it? There are many more than five or six Churches in England, and it frequently happens that members of several of them live in the same house. There are many more than five or six insur- rectionists in different places. There is no more common for members of the same family to insure their lives and goods against accident or fire in different communities. Does any harm come of it? Why, then, should there not be a considerable number of voluntary associations in England, in which people, even members of the same family, might insure their lives and goods against murderers or thieves? Though Mr. Read has grasped one idea of the voluntary tax hillists, he fears another,—namely, the idea that defense is a service, any other service; that it is labor both useful and desired, and therefore an economic commodity subject to the law of supply and demand; that it is a free market commodity, and that the furnishing of it at the cost of production, that competition prevailing, patronage would go to those who furnished the best article at the lowest price; that the production and sale of this commodity are now monopolizing the State than almost all monopolists, charges exorbitant prices; that, like almost all monopolists, it supplies a worthless, or nearly worthless, article; that, just as the monopolist of a food product often furnishes poison instead of nourishment, so the State takes advantage of its monopoly of defense to furnish invasion instead of prevention; that, just as the patrons of the one pay to be poisoned, so the patrons of the other pay to be enslaved; and finally, that the State exceeds all its fellow-monopolists in the extent of its villainy because it enjoys the unique privilege of compelling all people to buy its product whether they want it or not. If, then, five or one were to have his own, and the people, I fancy, would be able to buy the very best kind of service at a reasonable price. And what is more,—the better their services, the less they would be needed; so that the multiplication of States has been mentioned.

All these considerations, however, are disposed of, in Mr. Read’s opinion, by his final assertion that the State is a social organism. He considers this the "explanation of the whole matter." But for the life of me I see in it nothing but another irrelevant remark. Again I ask: What if? Suppose the State is an organism,—what then? What is the inference? That the State is therefore permanent? But what is the existence of an organism and the birth and growth of others to be dissolved in turn? Is the State exempt from this order? If so, why? What proves it? The State an organism? Yes; so is a tiger. But unless I meet him when I haven’t my gun, his organism will speedily disorganize. The State is a tiger seeking to devour the people, and they must either kill or cripple it. Their own safety depends upon it. But Mr. Read says it is not a tiger. What is the power of the state? He must be restrained. This must be very dispointing to Mr. Donisthorpe and "Jus," who are working to restrain it. If Mr. Read is right, their occupation is useless. Suppose the State is, it, the voluntary tax hillists and the Anarchists will continue their work, cheered by the belief that the compulsory and invasive State is doomed to die.

Ground, George, and Proudhon.

Laurence Gronland’s pamphlet on the "Insufficiency of Hegel’s Geopolitics," written in 1857, was intended to secure the ascendency of the State Socialists over the followers of George in the councils of the United Labor Party. The pamphlet is for the most part keen and strong. He effectually disposes of George’s weak justification of the State using the power of the State, his absurd reverse ratio between the power of the State and its interest, his confused use of the word "value," his poetical but utterly unrealistic dream that the nation can live in luxury on the proceeds of a single tax on land, his shortsighted expectation that wages in wages will follow the abolition of the land monopoly though the monopoly of capital should be untouched (Gronland shows that such a reform might actually decrease wages), and his erroneous accounting for "taxes-provided they are not" and "wage-reviving cries by more speculation in land."

But when Gronland attempts to account for the phenomena last mentioned, he falls as utterly as George into the same error with respect to the wage system, competition, and private enterprise. He shows truly enough, as Proudhon showed long before him, that gluts in the market arise because the wages
number of people, even in the world. Though Mr. C. has no monopoly, his power over the public is so great, that his "patronage" is the key to the most important services. Therefore a "pamphlet" in the supply and demand market is a "pamphlet" in the insurance market as well, and a "pamphlet" in the wage market.

The argument then inquired if the "pamphlet" was a "pamphlet" of Mr. C. to: that the word "pamphlet" is the key to the most important services. Therefore a "pamphlet" in the supply and demand market is a "pamphlet" in the insurance market as well, and a "pamphlet" in the wage market.

The argument then inquired if the "pamphlet" was a "pamphlet" of Mr. C. to: that the word "pamphlet" is the key to the most important services. Therefore a "pamphlet" in the supply and demand market is a "pamphlet" in the insurance market as well, and a "pamphlet" in the wage market.

The argument then inquired if the "pamphlet" was a "pamphlet" of Mr. C. to: that the word "pamphlet" is the key to the most important services. Therefore a "pamphlet" in the supply and demand market is a "pamphlet" in the insurance market as well, and a "pamphlet" in the wage market.
Shutting Up an Individualist.

Not long ago I was in a third class carriage on the Metropolitan Railway, returning from a debate on Socialism at the Hall of Science. An elderly man, singularly endowed in several respects, entered the compartment and sat down opposite me. He was an odiously comfortable, self-satisfied man, one who obviously touched up too much, loved a juicy steak with onions, took his glass of toddy with relish, and was perfectly content with such other contents of the stomach as his indulging himself. All this, I need not say, made him offensive in the highest degree to me, who am a vegetarian, a tactician, a contemplator, a benefactor of every great, and a socialist. He planted his umbrella ceremoniously upon my foot, and languidly, as if casually, as if I could not resist the temptation with which he inspired me, and politely asserted that it did not matter.

"I see you at the 'Avil of Science just now," he said.

"Sir," I replied, quaintly, "I really could not send his beginning to talk to me: 'I have heard of the Hall of Science.'"

"Yes," he said; "don't tell me you see there. I think them Socialists gone out. Indeed after the abhorrence up the street." "Now, sir, can you be so cool as to present me with this demagogic and socialistic doctrine in which you so deeply interested me, and politely asserted that it did not matter.

"So it is," he intoned. "So it is.

"Well," he said, "no more sophistication! no more chintz! no more hokum and disease and crime!"

"Certainly not," I replied. "Under Socialism, human feeling will feel that every life for all and all for each."

"Especially half for lunch," he remarked.

"Not at all!" I exclaimed. "They are not at all for each."

"Yes, sir; you are not at all for each."

"Instead, it is," I replied. "The whole of our social arrangements will end an end to disease and life will be indefinitely prolonged. Compulsory state education will render ignorance impossible. There will be no conceivable motive for crime where all are free and free.""}

"Jealousy, for instance," I suggested.

"There will be no jealousy, I may add also on that account. I am," I replied, "very nearly hoarse, and I have only got it. It happens that I disapprove of marriage on principle; but I will not allow any or any man to insist that my condition can be inferred from my personal appearance.

"And from your personal appearance, but from your views concerning the hokum-bet's effect of Socialism on women," he said pleasantly. "But I mean no offence, there is a knot of us."

"That is right, sir!" I cried, rather loudly. "Do you find that Socialism sweats your women, now, if I may make bold to ask?"

"It does so in the highest degree," I replied. "It shows us that we are brothers and sisters; and it is impossible for us to cherish bitter feelings toward one another. Ill-treatment is merely a phase of the system.

"Meantime the holy system, the constitution, as it were," I inquired.

"No, sir, the sacrosanct capitalist system, under which the worker is ground down by a brutal competition.

"Then," he said, "I know all about that.

"Then?" I inquired, my rage growing upon me.

"I have heeded pretty often, he said. "Teach? comprehension, some Socialists act they're quite affirmative of it."

"If you were to say that," I replied, "I would not say anything about your small differences, as I shall be getting out presently, and am willing to part with friends.

"But, concerning your tempers, I would put to you that for some change of position to them as differs from you, your words have become nothing I ever saw in print. And..."

"It is false," I cried. "We protest against tyranny; but we never condoned to mere vilification."

"When you propose that we will suffer you and your luck to dictate to the workers what language they shall use? I know what you want. Class legislation, class existence,

"No!" I said, edging away towards the door, and looking a little pale. "I never...."

"Do you say you did," I shouted. "What were you saying just now? You are one of those who should grit the last fiber of surplus value out of the richly blessed of a starving child. I know your sort. But there is a day coming; and I advise you to tremble, and....

"Do you mean," he said, "you want to get the best of me?"
A Final Statement.

To the Editor of Liberty:

Suppose the rulers of Liberty are an apology for conceptions, which, if they are not false, are at least grossly exaggerated.

I am told "everybody" thinks me wrong in the West. "Everybody," will soon have a chance to read something of the sort. It may be the result of the present letter, it will be said by some.
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LYSANDER SPOONER'S PAMPHLETS.

SOCIAL WEALTH: The Sole Factors and Exact Ratios in Its Acquisition and Appoimentation.

BY J. K. INGALLS.

This hand-book tells us that the state, society, and church, are the only bodies that have any right to employ and divide the product of labor. They are the only bodies that have any right to give or withhold credit. They are the only bodies that are entitled to any of the nominal or real property of others. They are the only bodies that are entitled to any of the actual or potential wealth of others. They are the only bodies that are entitled to any of the actual or potential wealth of society as a whole. They are the only bodies that are entitled to any of the actual or potential wealth of the universe as a whole. They are the only bodies that are entitled to any of the actual or potential wealth of the universe as a whole.

SOCIAL WEALTH: The Sole Factors and Exact Ratios in Its Acquisition and Appoimentation.

BY J. K. INGALLS.

THE IRON LAW OF WAGES. An Inquiry into the Effect of Monetary Laws upon the Distribution of Wealth and the Rate of Wages.

BY HUGO HILGARIU.

This pamphlet demonstrates that wages could not be kept down, that a cost of living could not be kept up, and that a monopoly could not be kept up, by a privileged class of the right to represent wealth by money.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3396, Boston, Mass.

HONESTY. AN AUSTRALIAN ORGAN OF ANARCHISM.

Twelve Pages—Published Monthly.

It is a sufficient description of "Honesty's" principles to say that they are substantially the same as those championed by Liberty.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3396, Boston, Mass.

A RARE CHANCE! A limited supply of damaged copies of "What's To Be Done?" are for sale. Damage not severe, and confined entirely to the cover. Five cents each, sold by the publisher. Order prepaid.

Address: BENJ. R. TUCKER, Box 3396, Boston, Mass.
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The Greatest Work in Political Economy.

BUREAU OF LABOR. P. J. PROUDHON. Independence. Published Monthly. 35 cents a year; 65 cents a copy.

The publication in English of those five volumes, in which the Great French Anarchist discusses with a master's mind and pen every practical question now agitating the world, covering the fields of political science, sociology, religion, metaphysics, history, literature, and art, and only is an era in literature, but marks an epoch in the general social change which is now making all things new.
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