

The Independent.

VOL. XIV.

LINCOLN, NEB., FEB. 12, 1903.

No. 38.

RECRUITING FOR 1904

Why You Should Assist in Helping to Extend the Circulation and Influence of The Independent

Plutocrats are Always Alert

There may be some who at first thought wonder why they should be expected to assist in helping to extend the circulation and influence of The Independent. A little thought will convince them it is a privilege, almost a duty to do so. Do you realize how thoroughly the money power is organized and how thoroughly it controls every branch of the government at the present time? Only last week the Standard Oil company, with John D. Rockefeller at its head, demonstrated its power and control of congress by delaying, which means ultimate defeat, all anti-trust legislation. President Roosevelt found it necessary to threaten the congress with an extra session unless it should show itself able to pass some kind of a bill to put an end to trust extortion. But the president will be helpless against the combined organization of the trusts so long as the congress is republican and the trusts, through Marcus A. Hanna, control the republican party. The millions contributed by the trusts to the republican campaign funds were not given without some consideration in return. With all these things readers of The Independent are familiar. But the readers of trust literature and the subsidized press of the country know nothing of the real condition of political affairs. The Independent has no trust funds to draw upon. We cannot afford to employ traveling agents to solicit subscriptions. We cannot use the postmasters of the country to boom the circulation of The Independent. It must depend upon the patronage of the plain people whose cause it champions for its support.

The Independent is the leading paper of its class in the United States. It advocates certain principles of government believed to be for the best interests of all the people. It publishes facts without fear or favor and endeavors to furnish the information to its readers necessary to enable them to cast an intelligent ballot. If you believe in the principles advocated by The Independent and that their enactment into law would benefit the nation as a whole it is your duty as a patriotic citizen to do your part in helping to make them law. When the nation needs soldiers in time of war to defend itself from its destroyers and preserve the blessings of our free institutions it is your patriotic duty to volunteer your services as a soldier. If the privileges you enjoy are worth so much sacrifice in time of war, are they not worth the lesser sacrifices of time and attention to preserve them in time of peace? As prevention is better than cure, so it is better to keep the machinery of government moving in such lines that war and revolution will be unnecessary. The citizen who gives time and attention to problems of government in time of peace is as truly a patriot as he who follows the flag in war. The man who studies to improve his country in quiet time is the man who can be depended upon to fight for it when needed. A political coward always makes a "cold-footed" soldier.

The man who PRETENDS to be TOO GOOD to interest himself in political matters and dismisses the subject with a contemptuous sneer that "he don't care" should be reminded that he cannot escape the annual visits of the tax collector and that he and his children will be required to assist in paying the political fiddlers. He should be reminded that he and his family must use kerosene oil and that John D. Rockefeller, head of the Standard Oil trust, has arbitrarily raised the price of that household necessity from 9 cents a gallon to 16 cents a gallon, wholesale, and that the retail price has gone up according from 14 cents to 20 cents in five-gallon lots. That is the tribute he pays to a single trust. In the same manner on every pair of shoes he pays

tribute to the leather trust and down the list on nearly every household necessity. Will he help to right the wrong or suffer the injustice to increase until the burden becomes heavier than succeeding generations can bear and the sword and bayonet become the only cure? He should be reminded that he cannot escape his part in the revolution. If he proclaims his neutrality, then it will avail him nothing, for the government, if need be, would draft him and his children in its service.

The citizen who "don't care" about politics is of doubtful patriotism. He is the political rogue's delight and they only wish that his kind may increase. As Nero fiddled while Rome burned, so the indifferent citizen fiddles while his liberty perishes. He growls a little, but pays the bills and does nothing to check the robberies and political extravagance.

If you believe in the principles advocated by The Independent—the principles of the people's party—it is your duty to help extend its circulation and influence in order that those principles may be made law. It is your duty to assist in electing men who will support and advocate the same principles you believe in. You have read The Independent and know of its loyalty to the cause of good government. Will you do your part in helping to overthrow the rule of Mammon and substitute Abraham Lincoln's government of the people, by the people and for the people?

The Independent has announced a special rate, only \$1.00 for NEW subscriptions to run until after the presidential election in 1904. Recruiting coupon books containing five coupons in each book have been prepared. Each coupon is good for a subscription to The Independent to be sent to any address in the United States until November 17, 1904, twenty-one months from this time. Every reader interested in the cause of good government should send for a recruiting coupon book. No charge is made for the book or coupons in advance. We'll send you the book and when you have sold the coupons send \$1 to The Independent for each coupon sold. Any unsold coupons may be returned. It costs you nothing to try. Send for a book today. Here are those who have already ordered coupon books. Why not have your name added to the list:

O. S. Williamson, Beaver City, Neb.
J. M. Knox, Cambridge, Neb.
A. W. Gingery, Lamar, Colo.
A. R. Cross, Lewis, Kas.
A. F. Parsons, North Platte, Neb.
J. T. Sims, Simsville, Ala.
W. B. Essick, North Benton, O.
J. M. Babb, Clayton, Ill.
James McHuff, O'Connor, Neb.
Ralph Ashton, Emmett, Neb.
J. B. Vaughan, Clifton, S. C.
Neb. Mut. Ins. Journal.
Wm. Bailey, Eldorado, Kas.
August Uhde, Curtis Bay, Md.
William Hancock, Loup City, Neb.
Wm. Surman, Carlinville, Ill.
David Marshall, Milltona, Minn.
H. J. Mason, Fullerton, Neb.
Jerry Johnston, Mioia, Pa.

Mr. Martin's Mistake

Editor Independent: It is incomprehensible how any man who has been reading with attention anything I have said on the subject could have got it into his head that I am in favor of letting the banks, under any possible condition or favoritism, issue their notes as money. The issue of money is a prerogative of government and ought under no possible set of circumstances to be delegated to any individual or corporation. And let me say further in this connection that every dollar of every form of money ought to be a full legal tender.

I hope Mr. John T. Martin will not again misunderstand me on this question.

FLAVIUS J. VAN VORHIS.
Indianapolis, Ind.

Good for The Outlook! In discussing the action of the Chicago city council, deciding by a vote of 51 to 16 to ask the legislature to pass a bill allowing any city in Illinois to purchase street car lines, The Outlook believes that "the amendment providing for a referendum of all considerable extensions of a railway franchise should be urged." That is good populism.

THE VALUE OF MONEY

Mr. De Hart Returns to His Old Love, the Subject of Money

CHAPTER I.

Editor Independent: Adam Smith said: "The word VALUE, it is to be observed, has two different meanings, and sometimes expresses the utility of some particular object, and sometimes the power of purchasing other goods which the possessor of that object conveys.

"The one may be called 'value in use,' the other 'value in exchange.'

"The things which have the greatest value in use have frequently little or no value in exchange; and, on the contrary, those that have the greatest value in exchange have frequently little or no value in use. Nothing is more useful than water; but it will purchase scarce anything; scarce anything can be had in exchange for it. A diamond, on the contrary, has scarce any value in use, but a very great quantity of goods may frequently be had in exchange for it."

Thus spoke Adam Smith, and it would have been a great deal better, if he had said only half as much. What he said about value as being a "power of purchasing goods" was very true, but that part about value as being "utility of some particular object" was certainly erroneous. It is no more correct to say that value is utility than to say that value is wealth. We also need a definition of value that will separate it from price as well as from wealth and utility. Economists are obliged to use these four words and they all should be used, without one being used for the other.

I have quoted all that Adam Smith said about value. The next great political economist coming along was David Ricardo—born in 1772, dying in 1824, in his fifty-second year—and it is a great pity that he could not have had twenty years more. He made great improvements on Adam Smith, and he would have done much more if he could have lived longer. Unfortunately, however, he had a confused notion of value or at least a confused way of explaining it. The probability is that he was more deficient in language than in ideas. He undoubtedly saw clearly the difference between utility and value, although he did not express it clearly. He made a mistake in following too closely the great Adam Smith.

Ricardo commenced the discussion of his political economy by quoting Adam Smith approvingly, and then adding more illustration, in order to show that "value has two different meanings."

He said: "Water and air are abundantly useful; they are indeed indispensable to existence, yet, under ordinary circumstances, nothing can be obtained in exchange for them." Gold, on the contrary, though of little use, compared with air or water, will exchange for a great quantity of other goods."

Ricardo continues: "Utility, then, is not the measure of exchangeable value, although it is absolutely essential to it. If a commodity were in no way useful, it would be destitute of exchangeable value, however scarce it might be, or whatever quantity of labor might be necessary to produce it."

What nonsense! How can value be "exchangeable?" If it is a "power of purchasing," as Smith said, how can it be exchangeable? Two commodities may be exchangeable, but two powers of purchasing cannot be exchangeable.

Ricardo then says: "Possessing utility, commodities derive their exchangeable value from two sources: from their scarcity, and from the quantity of labor required to procure them."

He then devotes thirty pages for the purpose of showing that commodities get their "exchangeable value"—he ought to say "value," because there is no such thing as exchangeable value—from two sources: "from their scarcity, or from the quantity of labor required to obtain them."

While Adam Smith could dispose of value by a dozen lines, yet Ricardo required thirty pages to give his notions about it. And it is singular that each subsequent economist devoted more and more space to the subject, before he could come to the discussion of

wealth, the real subject of the science. Ricardo thought that it was very necessary to prove what was the cause of value, namely, labor or scarcity. Adam Smith had said: "The value of any commodity to the person who possesses it, and who means not to use it or consume it himself, but to exchange it for other commodities, is equal to the quantity of labor which it enables him to purchase or command."

"Labor," says Smith, "is the real measure of the exchangeable value of all commodities."

Then we read from Smith as follows: "The real price of everything . . . is the toil and trouble of acquiring it. What everything is really worth to the man who has acquired it, and who wants to dispose of it or exchange it for something else, is the toil and the trouble which it can save to himself, and which it can impose upon other people. What is bought with money or with goods is purchased by labor, as much as what we acquire by the toil of our own body. That money or those goods indeed save us this toil. . . . Labor was the first price, the original purchase money that was paid for all things. It was not by gold or by silver, but by labor, that all the wealth of the world was originally purchased; and its value to those who possess it, and who want to exchange it for new productions, is precisely equal to the quantity of labor which it can enable them to purchase."

I am quoting from the 5th chapter of the Wealth of Nations by Adam Smith, which chapter is entitled "Of the real and nominal price of commodities, or of their price in labor, and their price in money." . . . He takes the ground that "labor is the real measure of value." You notice he does not say "standard of value," a phrase we use so much in modern times. He is looking for something that will serve as a measure of value; and this something he concludes, must be a commodity that is the product of labor. He argues that although labor is the "real measure of value," yet labor cannot be used in every-day life as a measure. On this point he says: "Every commodity is more frequently exchanged for, and therefore compared with, other commodities than with labor. It is more natural therefore to estimate its changeable value by the quantity of some other commodity than by that of the labor which it can purchase. The greater part of people, too, understand better what is meant by a quantity of a particular commodity, than by a quantity of labor. The one is a plain and palpable object; the other an abstract notion, which, though it can be made sufficiently intelligible, is not altogether so natural and obvious."

Exchanges of labor for labor takes place in the infancy of society. Afterwards the people begin to exchange commodities for commodities. This is barter in its advanced stage. Afterwards the community finds that there is some one commodity which is universally useful and which everybody wants. Then those who have more of any one commodity than they can use themselves, begin to exchange it for that one commodity which everybody wants. This one single commodity is called money, and those who have a superfluity of one or more commodities, begin to exchange them for the commodity called money. This commodity becomes acceptable, first, because taxes can be paid with it; secondly, because damages adjudged to be paid by the courts, can be paid thereby; third, fines and all penalties can be paid thereby; fourth, rents are discharged thereby. What the landlord and government will accept for rent and taxes the merchant, manufacturer and labor will accept for their goods and labor.

Smith insists that although labor is the "real price" of commodities, yet money is the "nominal price" of commodities. His idea is, that money (gold or silver) gets its value from the quantity of labor necessary to mine and bring these commodities to market. In this respect both Ricardo and Smith agree. This, however, is a disputed point. Undoubtedly the value of gold and silver ought to depend upon the quantity of labor necessary to mine and bring them to market. But nations are not doing business as they ought to be doing. Mr. Del Mar has made a long and laborious examination of this matter,