

# The Open Court

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and the Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea

Editor: DR. PAUL CARUS.  
Assistant Editor: T. J. McCORMACK.

Associates: { E. C. HEGELER.  
MARY CARUS.

---

---

VOL. XIV. (NO. 4)

APRIL, 1900.

NO. 527

---

---

## CONTENTS:

<i>Frontispiece.</i> Psyche at Nature's Mirror. After PAUL THUMANN.	
<i>Money.</i> COUNT LEO N. TOLSTOI. Translated from the Russian by Paul Borger . . . . .	193
<i>Criticism of Tolstoi's "Money."</i> PROF. J. LAURENCE LAUGHLIN, of the University of Chicago . . . . .	221
<i>The Seal of Christ.</i> With Illustrations from the Religious History of Antiquity, Mediæval and Modern Times, and with Supplementary Matter on the History of the Cross. EDITOR . . . . .	229
<i>Gospel Parallels from Pâli Texts.</i> Translated from the Originals by ALBERT J. EDMUNDS. Second Series . . . . .	246
<i>Hindu Prayers for Professor Max Müller</i> . . . . .	251
<i>The Psychology of Religion.</i> JAMES H. LEUBA. . . . .	251
<i>Immortality.</i> A Poem. RABBI J. LEONARD LEVY . . . . .	253
<i>Book Reviews</i> . . . . .	253
<i>Notes</i> . . . . .	255

---

---

CHICAGO

The Open Court Publishing Company

LONDON: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd.

Per copy, 10 cents (sixpence). Yearly, \$1.00 (in the U. P. U., 5s. 6d.).

# THE MONIST.

A QUARTERLY MAGAZINE

Devoted to the Philosophy of Science.

PUBLISHED BY

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING COMPANY, CHICAGO, ILL.

MONON BUILDING, 324 DEARBORN STREET. POST-OFFICE DRAWER F.

Annually \$2.00 (9s. 6d.). Single Copies, 50 cents (2s. 6d.).

## AGENTS AND TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION.

	SINGLE COPIES	YEARLY
LONDON: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road	2s. 6d.	9s. 6d.
LEIPSIK: Otto Harrassowitz	M. 2.50	M. 9.50
ROTTERDAM: H. A. Kramers & Son	—	Fl. 6.60
TURIN: } PALERMO: } Libreria Carlo Clausen	—	Lire 12
MILANO: Ulrico Hoepli, Librario della Real Casa	—	Lire 12
BOSTON: Damrell & Upham, 283 Washington Street	50 cents	\$2.00.
NEW YORK: Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway	50 cents	\$2.00.

Postpaid to New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland, Tasmania, and New Zealand, and all countries in U. P. U., for one year, \$2.25.

## Recent Features:

The New Bible and the Old. *Prof. C. H. Cornill*, Königsberg.

The Polychrome Bible. *Rev. W. H. Green*, Princeton, N. J.

The Last Decade of French Philosophy. *Lucien Arréat*, Paris.

On the Man of Genius. *Prof. G. Sergi*, Rome.

The Food of Life and the Sacrament. *Dr. Paul Carus*.

The Conditions of Human Progress. *Principal C. Lloyd Morgan*, Bristol, England.

On the Theory of Nerve-Activity. *Prof. Ewald Hering*, Leipsic.

On the Foundations of Geometry. *Prof. H. Poincaré*, Paris.

The Philosophical Fragments of Bernhard Riemann.

On the Education of Children. *Dr. Paul Carus*.

General Review of Current German, French, and Italian Philosophical Literature. By *Prof. F. Jodl*, Vienna  
*M. Lucien Arréat*, Paris, and *Prof. G. Fiamingo*, Rome.

## SOME RECENT CONTRIBUTORS:

### In General Philosophy:

PROF. KURD LASSWITZ  
PROF. RUDOLF EUCKEN  
PROF. F. JODL  
THE LATE PROF. J. DELBŒUF  
PROF. C. LLOYD MORGAN

### In Logic, Mathematics, Theory of Science:

CHARLES S. PEIRCE  
PROF. FELIX KLEIN  
SIR ROBERT STAVELL BALL  
PROF. ERNST MACH  
PROF. HERMANN SCHUBERT

### In Biology and Anthropology:

PROF. AUGUST WEISMANN  
PROF. C. LLOYD MORGAN  
PROF. JOSEPH LECONTE  
PROF. MAX VERWORN  
DR. EDM. MONTGOMERY

THE LATE G. J. ROMANES  
PROF. C. O. WHITMAN  
DR. PAUL TOPINARD  
DR. ALFRED BINET  
PROF. JACQUES LOEB

PROF. ERNST HAECKEL  
PROF. TH. EIMER  
PROF. E. D. COPE  
PROF. C. LOMBROSO  
DR. JAMES CAPPIE

### In Psychology:

PROF. TH. RIBOT  
PROF. JAMES SULLY  
DR. G. FERRERO  
DR. J. VENN  
DR. ERNST MACH  
PROF. C. LLOYD MORGAN

### In Religion and Sociology:

DR. PAUL TOPINARD  
DR. FRANCIS E. ABBOTT  
PROF. HARALD HOFFDING  
DR. PAUL CARUS  
PROF. G. FIAMINGO  
PROF. E. D. COPE

THE OPEN COURT PUBLISHING CO., CHICAGO  
324 Dearborn St.,





PSYCHE AT NATURE'S MIRROR

AFTER PAUL THUMANN

Frontispiece to *The Open Court*.

# THE OPEN COURT

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

**Devoted to the Science of Religion, the Religion of Science, and  
the Extension of the Religious Parliament Idea.**

---

VOL. XIV. (NO. 4.)

APRIL, 1900.

NO. 527

---

Copyright by The Open Court Publishing Co., 1900.

---

## MONEY.<sup>1</sup>

BY LEO N. TOLSTOI.

I.

**M**ONEY! What is money? Money represents labor. I have met well-informed men who go so far even as to assert that money represents the labor of the man possessing it. I must confess that formerly I also shared, in a vague manner, the same opinion. But having decided to find out once for all what money really was, I turned to science.

Science says that, in itself, money involves nothing unjust or harmful, that it is a natural instrument of social life. It is necessary (1) for the convenience of exchange, (2) for the establishment of standards of value, (3) for the effecting of savings, (4) for facilitating payments.

The patent fact that, having three superfluous rubles in my pocket, I have only to whistle to collect about me a hundred men in every civilised city ready to do my bidding and to perform acts the most hazardous, shocking, and degrading, that, I say, comes not from money but from the complex economical conditions of society. The domination of a certain set of men over others comes not of money but is due to the fact that working men receive incomplete compensation for their labor. The undervaluation of labor is caused by certain peculiar attributes of capital, rent, and wages, by their complex correlation as well as by certain errancies in the production, distribution, and consumption of goods. To use a Russian adage, men who have money can twist ropes of those who have it not.

But science says, all this is wide of the mark. In all produc-

<sup>1</sup> Translated from the Russian by Paul Borger.

tion, it contends, three factors participate—land, capital, and labor. The different correlations of these three factors of production, the first two being out of the hands of the workingman, and their consequent complex combinations are the cause of the enslaving of one set of men by another. What is it that has produced this moneyed kingdom which so shocks everybody by its injustice and cruelty? How is it that one set of men has come to dominate another by its money? Science says: because of the separation of the factors of production and of the combinations thus created acting adversely to the workingman.

The answer has always seemed to me strange, not only because it slurs over the one important aspect of the question,—the rôle of money,—but also because it makes a subdivision of the factors of production which to every unsophisticated man must appear extremely artificial and unsatisfactory. Three factors, it is asserted, participate in all production,—namely, land, capital, and labor,—and it is assumed that the products (or their value, money) are distributed naturally among the persons possessing the several factors: rent—or the value of land—to the land owner; interest to the capitalist; and wages, for labor, to the workingman.

Is this really so? Is it correct that three factors only participate in production?

As I now write, there is a production of hay going on around me. What enters into this production? I am told: the land which grows the hay, the capital (the scythes, rakes, pitchforks, wagons etc., requisite for the gathering of the hay), and, lastly, the labor of the hay-makers.

But I can see that this is wrong. Apart from land, there participate also in the production of hay, the sun, water, that social and political order which preserved the fields from trespassers etc., the skill of the workingmen, their ability to communicate with one another, and many other additional factors which somehow or other are not considered by political economy. The energy of the sun is just as much a factor of production, if not more so, than the land. Situations actually occur where men (in cities, for instance) assume the right of excluding the sun from others, by means of walls and trees; why, then, is it not included among the factors of production? Water is another factor quite as indispensable as land. It is the same with air. Public security is also an indispensable factor, as are also the food and clothing of workingmen,—a fact admitted by some economists. Education, enabling one to apply oneself intelligently to work, is also a factor.

I could fill a whole volume with similar omitted factors of production. Why, then, are these three particular factors of production alone selected as the basis of economical science? Why are not the sun's rays, water, food, and knowledge also regarded as factors of production? It may be because men assert only in rare cases their claims to utilise the sun's rays, the air, or the water; whereas we constantly assert our claims to the use of land and implements of labor. I see no other basis for it, and I regard, therefore, the subdivision of the factors of production into three only as altogether arbitrary.

Possibly this subdivision is so characteristic of human affairs that wherever economical relations have developed, these three factors of production have of necessity made their appearance. Let us see if this is really the case.

I shall take as my illustration the Russian colonists.

Those colonists come into a new district, settle down, and begin work. It never occurs to them that the man who is not actually using the land has any claim to it, nor does that land in and of itself advance any distinct claim. On the contrary, the colonists consider the land a common property and consider everybody as having the right to cultivate whatever part of it he pleases and as much of it as he needs. In cultivating their land and their gardens, and in building their houses, the colonists use implements of labor, and here again it occurs to no one that the implements of labor of themselves are capable of producing revenue; nor do these implements themselves, in the shape of capital, set up any claims. On the contrary, the colonists are quite conscious of the fact that the acquisition of any increment accruing on the implements of labor, on the loan of capital or of food, would be an injustice. The colonists work on free land either with their own, or with tools borrowed without charge from others, and either everybody works for himself, or else all work in the common interest. In such community no rent or interest on capital or labor for wages is to be found.

In speaking of such a community I do not indulge in fantasies, but describe what actually has been and is taking place at present not only among the Russian colonists but everywhere where men's natural tendency is not displaced in some way or another. I describe what to every mind appears natural and wise. Men settle on a piece of land and everybody selects his proper occupation, and, having arranged the necessary requisites for his task, begins work. If it suits their convenience, they form associations; but

neither in separate households nor in association are there any other distinct factors of production, than labor and its necessary conditions: the sun which gives warmth to all, the air which men breathe, the water which they drink, the land on which they labor, the clothing for their bodies, the food for their stomachs, the spade, the plough, and the various other tools with which men work; and it is evident that neither the rays of the sun, nor the air, nor the water, nor the land, nor the clothing covering their bodies, nor the implements with which they labor, can belong to any one but those who utilise the rays of the sun, who breathe the air, drink the water, eat the bread, cover their body, work with the spade, for the reason that all this is necessary only to those who can utilise it. And whenever men act in this wise it is because it is characteristic of men to act so, that is, to act intelligently.

Thus, in examining the evolution of the economical relations of men I fail to see that the subdivision of the means of production into three factors is inherent in men. On the contrary, it is foreign to them, and it is unwise.

But possibly with the growth of population and the progress of culture this division may be unavoidable; and since this division has actually taken place in European society, we have got to acknowledge it as an accomplished fact.

Let us see if this is so. We are told that in Europe this division of factors is already accomplished; that some men own the land, others the implements of labor, and that still others are deprived of both. "The workingman is deprived of land and of the implements of labor." We are so accustomed to this assertion that its oddity no longer strikes us. But if we look into it, we instantly see its injustice and even its absurdity. The expression is a hopeless contradiction. The idea of a workingman involves the idea of the land he is living on and the implements he is working with. If he did not live on land (or on the earth) and had no implements for work, he would not be a workingman. There never was nor ever could be a workingman deprived of earth and of the implements for work. There can be no such thing as an agriculturist without land to work on, without a scythe, a cart, a horse; there can be no such thing as a shoemaker without a house on the land, without water, air, and tools to work with. If the agriculturist has no land, no horse, no scythe, and the shoemaker has no house, no water, no awl, it means that somebody has ousted him from his land, taken away or cheated him of his scythe, cart, horse or awl; but it does not at all signify that agriculturists can exist without ploughs, or shoemakers with-



out awls. A fisherman is inconceivable on dry land and without nets, unless it be that he has been driven off the water and deprived of his nets. Men can be driven from one spot of the earth to another and can be deprived of the implements of labor and be compelled to work with other men's tools in the production of things they do not want, but it does not follow from this that such a state of things reveals the true and actual properties of production; it simply signifies that there arise occasions when the natural properties of production are disturbed.

If we must accept as factors of production all those things of which the workingman may be deprived by another man's violence, then why should we not consider the claim to the person of a slave as a factor of production? Why not accept claims to the sun's rays, to the air, water, etc., as such a factor? A man can erect a wall that bars the sun from his neighbor, another man can divert a river into an artificial basin and contaminate its water, another may consider every man his property; but neither the first, nor the second, nor the third can ever possibly make of his pretension a basis for the division of the factors of production, even if such a pretension were forcibly put into effect. And therefore it is just as unjust to regard the fictitious pretensions of men to land and to the implements of labor as factors of production, as it is to regard an imaginary exclusive right to the sun's rays, to the water, to the air, or to another man's person as factors. Men may *claim* the exclusive right to land and the implements of work just as men have asserted pretensions to the workingman's person; and just as men have claimed for themselves the sun, the water, and the air, so men have driven the workingman from place to place and deprived him of the results of his labor as those accumulate, and of the implements of that labor, and have compelled him to work not for himself but for a master, as is the case in factories. All this is possible. Yet there can be no workingman without land or implements, just as there can be no man that is the property of another notwithstanding all the assertions to the contrary in times past. And just as the assertion of the right of property in a man's person could not deprive a slave of his innate property to seek his own happiness and not his master's; so now the assertion of the right of property in land and in the implements of the labor of other men cannot deprive the workingman of that attribute which is inherently characteristic of every man, namely, to live on land and to work out with his personal implements or those of the community, whatever he may deem useful for himself.

All that science can say in the present economical situation, is that there the pretensions of certain men to land and to the implements of the workingman's labor actually obtain, and that, therefore, for a certain portion of those workingmen (not all, by any means) the proper conditions of production have been violated, and not that this casual violation of the law of production is the actual law of production itself.

By his assertion that this division of the factors of production is the fundamental law of production, the economist is in the position of the zoölogist who, from his observation of many sparrows living in cages and having trimmed wings, would conclude that trimmed wings and the cage with its little cup of water were the fundamental conditions of birds' existence, and that their natural life was exclusively composed of those three factors. But no matter how many sparrows with trimmed wings live in cages the zoölogist has no right to regard cages as the essential characteristic of birds. And no matter how many workingmen have been wrested from their places and deprived of their products and their means of labor, the natural characteristic of the workingman is still to live on land to produce with his implements whatever he needs.

The pretensions of certain men to the land and the implements of the workingman exist now, just as in the ancient world the pretensions of certain men to the persons of others existed; but just as now the division of men into masters and slaves after the manner of the Ancient World is impossible, so also now is the division of the factors of production into land and capital after the fashion of the economists of the contemporary society impossible. Yet these unlawful pretensions to the liberty of others science condescends to call *natural* properties of production. Instead of laying its foundation in the natural properties of human societies, science has founded itself on a private and special case and, in its desire to justify that case, has actually sanctioned one man's exclusive right to land which yields food for another man, and to those implements of work which another man must use, for this purpose, i. e., it has placed its sanction on a right which never existed, which never could exist, and which involves a contradiction on the face of it, because a man's right to land which he is not cultivating is essentially a right to use land which he does not use; and an exclusive right to implements is a right to work with implements which he does not work with.

Science, by its division of the factors of production, asserts that the workingman's natural condition is the unnatural condition we see him in; exactly as in ancient society it has been

asserted, by the division of men into citizens and slaves, that the unnatural condition of slaves was a natural attribute of man. This division then, which has been accepted by science to sanction an existing evil which it has made the foundation of its researches, explains why science seeks in vain for explanations of the existing phenomena and, refusing the clearest and the simplest answers to the pending questions, gives answers which are utterly meaningless.

The question put by economical science is this: How is it that men who have land and capital possess the power of enslaving those who have neither the one nor the other? The answer dictated by common sense is that this state of affairs is caused by money, which actually possesses the power of enslaving men. But science denies this, and says: it is caused not by any property of money, but is due to the fact that some men have land and capital, while others do not have it. We ask why it is that those having land and capital can enslave those not having it, and they tell us, "Because those not having land or capital, do not have it. But this is just what we are inquiring about. The depriving men of land and of capital is itself the act of enslaving. Their answer reminds us of the famous maxim: *facit dormire quia est in eo virtus dormitiva*. But life incessantly thrusts forward this vital question, and science is beginning to see it and essays to answer it, but is unable to do so, having to quit its basis, and is thus turning round and round in its enchanted circle.

In order to arrive at an answer science must, first of all, renounce its false division of the factors of production, i. e., its mistaking of the consequences of the phenomena for their cause, and must seek, at first, the nearest and then the remoter cause of the phenomena which form the subject of its research. Science must answer the following question: What is the cause of the fact that some men are deprived of land and of the implements of labor, and that these are in the possession of others? Or, what is it that produces the alienation of land and of the implements of labor from those who cultivate the land and work with the implements? As soon as science will put its question in this form, new considerations will present themselves which will controvert all the axioms of the old quasi-science which is turning in endless circle of its assertions that the miserable situation of the workingman is caused by misery.

To the simple people it is manifest that the most immediate cause of the enslaving of certain men by others is money. But science denies this and says that money is only an instrument of

exchange having nothing to do with the enslaving of men. Let us see if this is so.

## II.

Whence does money come? In what conditions of society does money always exist, and, again, in what other conditions of society is money never used?

Imagine a little tribe in Africa or Australia living after the fashion of the ancient Sarmatians, or Slavs. This little tribe ploughs, raises stock, and cultivates gardens. We hear of them from the beginning of history. History generally commences with an incursion of conquerors. These latter invariably do one and the same thing: They deprive the people of everything they can: their stock, grain, and clothes, make captives of some of them, and depart. In a few years the conquerors return, but the little tribe has not yet recovered from the former devastation and there is nothing to take from them, so the conquerors devise a new and a better means of utilising the energies of the little tribe.

The means are very simple and come naturally into the head of every man. The first method is individual slavery. But this method has the inconvenience of necessitating the management and feeding of all the working individuals of the tribe, and there naturally presents itself a second method; viz., to allow the little tribe to remain on its land while appropriating that land and partitioning it among the invading force and thus utilising the produce of that tribe through the medium of the conquering force.

But this also has its inconveniences. The force or detachment has to superintend and care for all the processes of production, and so a third method is introduced, just as primitive as the first two, the method, namely, of periodically levying a ransom. The conqueror's aim is to levy as much as he can of the products of the labor of the conquered. Evidently, in order to levy as much as he can, the conqueror must take such articles as have the greatest value for the tribe, but are not bulky and admit of being easily preserved,—articles such as skins and gold. And thus the conquerors impose a certain tax on skins and gold on every household, or tribe collectively, and by means of this tax they avail themselves in a very convenient manner of the productive powers of the tribe in question. Skins and gold disappear almost entirely from among the tribe and, consequently, the conquered must again sell to the conqueror and his host for gold everything they still have: their property and their labor.

This took place in ancient times, in the Middle Ages, and it is also in operation at present. In the Ancient World, with the frequent conquests of one people by another and in the absence of the idea of human equality, individual slavery was the most universal method whereby one set of men dominated another, and individual slavery was the centre of gravity of that domination. In the Middle Ages the feudal system, i. e., the landed interest, connected with serfdom, partly replaced individual slavery, and the centre of gravity of domination now shifts from persons to land. In modern times, with the discovery of America, the growth of commerce, and the influx of gold, which is the accepted implement of exchange, monetary taxes, along with increase of governmental power, becomes the principal means for enslaving men, and on these last all the economical relations of men are now based.

I have lately read an article by Prof. Yanjoul on the recent history of the Fiji Islands. If I had to invent the vividest picture possible of the way which the obligatory exaction of money assists in the enslavement of one group of men by another, I could imagine nothing more vivid and convincing than this actual and truthful piece of history, based on facts that have taken place but recently.

There lives on certain islands of the Southern Pacific, in Polynesia, a little tribe, called the Fijians. The entire archipelago, according to Professor Yanjoul, consists of small islands covering some 7000 square miles. One half of this territory is inhabited by a population of some 150,000 natives and 1500 whites. The aborigines issued from their wild state long ago, are distinguished for their ability among the other natives of Polynesia, and are a people capable of development, which they have proved by becoming excellent agriculturists and stock-raisers. The people prospered, until in 1859 the new kingdom found itself in a predicament: the people and its representative, Cacabo, wanted money. The kingdom of Fiji stood in need of 45,000 dollars for the payment of an indemnity to the United States of America for an outrage claimed to have been committed by natives on some American citizens. With this end in view the Americans sent a squadron which seized some of the best islands as security and threatened the bombardment and destruction of the villages should the indemnity not be paid within a certain time. The Americans and their missionaries were the first colonists in the Fiji Islands. Selecting and possessing themselves of the best portions of the archipelago, under one pretext or another, they hired, through special agents and iron-clad contracts, gangs of natives for the establishment and cultivation of

cotton and coffee plantations. Collisions were thus unavoidable between the planters and the natives who were regarded by the former as slaves, and this led to the matter of indemnity.

Despite their prosperity the Fijians preserved even down to our day the forms of natural husbandry so called, the same as prevailed in Europe in the Middle Ages. Money there was none among the natives and their trade was of the nature of barter; goods were exchanged for goods and many communal and governmental taxes were paid in kind. What was there for the Fijians and their king, Cacabo, to do in the face of the categorical demand by the Americans for \$45,000, under penalty of the gravest consequences in case of non-compliance? The very figures presented something incomprehensible in the eyes of the Fijians, to say nothing of money which they had never seen in so large an amount.

Cacabo, on consultation with other chiefs, decided to turn to the English and to petition them to take the islands under their protectorate and, later, under their dominion. But the English were cautious and slow in rescuing the half-savage king. In place of a direct answer they, in 1860, sent a special expedition to explore the islands and find out whether it would pay to annex them and satisfy the American demands.

In the meanwhile the American government insisted on the payment and kept possession of some of the best points as security; then having gotten a better view of the native wealth, the original 45,000 dollars grew to 90,000 dollars and a further increase was threatened in case further delay occurred. In this tight fix, poor Cacabo, not familiar with European methods of credit, and acting on the advice of some European merchant colonists, looked to Melbourne for money, and expressed his willingness to accept any conditions whatever even to the extent of surrendering his kingdom to private persons. There was immediately formed in Melbourne a commercial stock company. This organisation, calling itself the Polynesian Company, concluded a contract with the King on conditions highly favorable to itself. Assuming the payment of the American indemnity in instalments, the company receive at first 100,000 and later 200,000 acres of the best land, a perpetual immunity from customs and taxes for all its factories, operations, and colonies, and an exclusive right for an indefinite time of establishing in the Fiji Islands banks with unlimited powers of issue.

From the time of that contract, which was definitely concluded in 1868, there rose alongside of the native government with Cacabo, another power, a mighty trading company, with vast

estates on all the islands, and with a predominant influence on the administration. Up to that time the government of Cacabo met its wants with such material means as could be found in taxes in kind and in a small customs' revenue. With the consummation of the contract and the establishment of the powerful Polynesian Company, the financial conditions changed. The greater part of the best lands went over to the company, consequently the revenue decreased; on the other hand, the company had secured for itself the free import and export of merchandise, and here again the revenue decreased. The aborigines, i. e., 99 per cent. of the population, had always been bad payers of customs' duties, for they used next to nothing of European wares, if we exclude a few textile goods and certain metal articles, and now added to this came the absolute exemption of the Polynesian Company and of all the well-to-do Europeans from customs' duties,—a state of affairs in which the income of King Cacabo was reduced almost to a minimum.

And in this predicament, our Cacabo again seeks the counsel of his white friends as to the means of averting the calamity, and at their suggestion introduces the first direct tax in the islands, which, in order to save himself many inconveniences, he levies in the form of money. The tax was universal and amounted to one pound sterling on every man and four shillings on every woman in the Islands.

As we have said, even to our day, natural husbandry and barter in commerce prevail entirely in the Fiji Islands. But few natives have money. Their wealth consists exclusively of raw products and of stock. But the new tax demands of the natives a payment of money at stated periods. Up to this time the natives were not accustomed to individual obligations towards the government except personal service; all dues, as they came round, were paid up by the communities or villages and in the products of the fields which were the sole source of income. There was but one issue for the natives: to seek money among the white settlers, i. e., to turn either to the trader or to the planter. To the first he had to sell his staples at any price whatever, since the collector of taxes demanded the money at a given date, or else he had to borrow on the future crop, of which the trader availed himself and charged an exorbitant interest. Or, again, he had to turn to the planter and sell his labor, i. e., to engage as a laborer. But, in consequence of the great simultaneous offer of labor, the wages on the islands were very small, no higher, according to the showing of the present administration, than one shilling a week for an adult man or two

pounds, twelve shillings a year, and, consequently, in order to raise the money requisite for his own ransom, not to say for that of his family, the Fijian had to abandon his home, land, and island and, emigrating to some distant place, bind himself into slavery to some planter for at least six months in order to gain one pound to pay his tax with. And in order to pay the taxes for his family he had to seek other means.

The result of this state of affairs is evident. From his 150,000 subjects Cacabo succeeds in collecting about 6000 pounds, and now begins the forcible collection of the taxes, a thing unfamiliar to the people so far. The local administration, incorruptible heretofore, very soon combines with the planters who are now ruling everything. For the non-payment of taxes the Fijians are arraigned in court and are sentenced, with costs, to confinement in jail for periods of not less than six months. The prison is replaced by the plantation of the first white man who will pay the fine and the costs of trial of the prisoner. In this manner the whites get an abundant supply of very cheap labor. This compulsory labor was permitted at first for periods not exceeding six months, but later the venal justices found it possible to extend the terms to eighteen months and, afterwards, to renew the sentence.

In the course of a few years, the picture of the economical life of the Fijians changed entirely. Populous and flourishing districts became deserted and impoverished. The entire male population, excepting the old and the feeble, was working for the foreigners, for the white planters, simply to earn the money required for the payment of their taxes and the appendent costs. The Fijian women never do any agricultural work and, therefore, in the absence of the men, their households went to ruin or were abandoned. In a few years half of the native population was converted into slaves of the white planters.

In order to ameliorate their condition, the Fijians again turned to the English government. A new petition appeared covered with the signatures of the most noted personages and chiefs begging for annexation. The petition was handed to the British Consul.

By this time England, through its scientific expeditions, had succeeded not only in exploring but also in surveying the islands, and had come to look upon this beautiful spot of the Globe, with its rich resources, as a valuable acquisition. For these reasons the negotiations were crowned with success and in 1874, to the great dissatisfaction of the American planters, England entered officially into possession of the islands. Cacabo died and to his heir was



assigned a small pension. The administration was entrusted to Sir William Robinson, the governor of New South Wales.

In the first year of the annexation the archipelago had no separate administration but was under the control of Sir W. Robinson who appointed a local administrator. In taking the islands under its wing, the English government had a difficult problem to solve. The natives first, of all, expected the abolition of the hated personal tax, while the white colonists (partly Americans) mistrusted the English administration, and another portion of them (the English) counted on all sorts of favors, as, for instance, the sanction of their ownership of the natives, the confirmation of their land grabs, etc. The English administration proved, however, to be worthy of its high task and its first act was the abolition of the individual tax which had brought about the enslavement of the natives for the benefit of a few planters.

But Sir W. Robinson met right here a difficult dilemma. It was imperative to abolish the odious personal tax which drove the Fijians to seek English annexation, and yet, according to the rules of the English Colonial policy, the colonies must support themselves, i. e., they must find resources for meeting the expenses of the administration. After the abolition of the personal tax the revenue of the islands (from customs' duties) did not exceed 6000 pounds, whereas the expenses of the administration amounted to 70,000 pounds yearly.

In this exigency Sir W. Robinson, having abolished the personal tax, devised a labor tax which the Fijians had to pay, but this new tax did not bring in the 70,000 pounds required for the maintenance of Sir W. Robinson and his lieutenants. A new governor was appointed, a Mr. Gordon, who, in order to collect from the population the money necessary for his own and his officials' support, hit upon the idea of not collecting money until a sufficient amount of it became diffused over the Islands, but, instead, demanded of the inhabitants their products, which he sold.

This tragical episode from the history of the Fijians is the best and clearest demonstration of what money is and what is its importance. Everything has found its expression here: the first fundamental condition of enslavement—threats at the point of the cannon, murder, and land grabbing; and the principal instrument—*money*, which has replaced all the former means. The economical evolution of nations for centuries is here concentrated into a single decade, offering a complete picture of the development of the money-outrage.

The drama begins with the sending by the American government of ships of war to the islands for the purpose of enslaving the inhabitants. The object of the threat is money; this is followed by the levelling of cannon on the inhabitants: on women, on children, on old men,—a phenomenon still repeating itself everywhere, in America, in China, in Central Asia, in Africa. The commencement of the drama, I say, is, “Your money or your life,” a process which repeats itself in the history of all the conquests; at first 45,000 dollars, then 90,000 dollars or a massacre. But there is no 90,000 dollars. The Americans have got them. And here begins the second act of the drama: the bloody, frightful massacre concentrated into a short space of time must be deferred and exchanged for sufferings less obvious although more protracted. The little tribe with its representatives seeks a means of substituting for the massacre slavery through money.

The remedy takes effect immediately, like a well-disciplined army, and in five years the work is completed: the people lose not only the right of using their land, but they lose their liberty as well; they become slaves.

The third act now begins. The situation has become intolerable and the unfortunates are informed that they can change masters. As to delivery from the slavery brought on them by money, however, there can be no question. Thus the little tribe calls upon another master and implores him to alleviate their condition. The Englishmen come and, seeing that the possession of this new territory will furnish them the means of maintaining a number of idlers, take possession of the islands with their inhabitants. They do not take them as slaves of course; they do not even take their land. Such old-fashioned methods are not necessary. A tax only is required, in amount sufficient, first, to keep the islanders in slavery, and secondly to support the idlers. The islanders must pay 70,000 pounds. This is the fundamental condition on which the English will deliver the Fijians from American slavery.

It appears, however, that the Fijians cannot, in their present state, pay the 70,000 pounds. The demand is too great. The English modify, for the time being, their demand and take the contribution in kind, with the understanding that, when money is more widely diffused, a return will be made in the original standard. England acts differently from the former company, whose actions may be compared to the first incursion of wild invaders into the midst of a peaceable tribe. England acts as a prudent subjugator: it does not kill outright the hen that lays the golden eggs: on the

contrary, it feeds the hen, knowing that this is a necessary condition of the further laying of eggs. It gives a loose rein in the beginning only to draw it tighter afterwards and to reduce forever the Fijians into that same state of moneyed slavery in which all European and civilised peoples are enthralled, and from which there is, apparently, no deliverance.

As soon as money is collected forcibly, at the point of cannon, there will infallibly be a repetition of what took place in Fiji, and what has happened everywhere, at all times. Men who can impose their will on others will impose on them such a contribution of money as to render them slaves. And, besides, it will happen, as in the case of the English and the Fijians, that the tyrants, in their demand for money, will rather transgress the limit at which the enslaving is accomplished than stop short of it. Nothing but a moral sentiment will prevent the transgressing of that limit. The governments will always transgress it, first, because a government possesses no moral sentiment, and secondly, as we know, because governments through their wars and the necessity of maintaining their following are always in dire need. All governments are in debt and cannot help carrying into effect the maxim of that Russian statesman of the eighteenth century that "the moujik<sup>1</sup> needs constant trimming." All governments are head over heels in debt, and this debt increases in frightful proportion. In the same proportion grow the budgets, or the necessity of protection against other subjugators, and with both grow the rents. The wages of labor, however, do not keep pace with the growth of the rents, owing to these very governmental taxes, the aim of which is to pluck men of their savings and thus to compel them to sell their labor, and this is the main purpose of every tax.

This manner of exploiting labor is possible only when more money is demanded on the whole than the workingmen can afford to give up without depriving themselves of the means of subsistence. A rise in the workingman's wages would preclude the possibility of slavery and, consequently, so long as there is oppression, wages can never rise.

This simple and obvious domination of one set of men over another is called by the economists an "iron law." The factor which produces this domination is called by them "the instrument of exchange." Money—this innocent instrument of exchange—is required by men in their relations. Why, then, in places where no forcible levying of money-taxes has existed, has there never been

<sup>1</sup> Ru<sup>ssian</sup> peasant.

money in its present sense, as among the Fijians, among the Kirghes, Africans, and the Phoenicians who, like all men paying no taxes, employed the direct barter of goods for goods, or only occasional tokens of value, as sheep, skins, furs, shells? Some single certain money, whatever it may be, becomes currency among men only when it is forcibly demanded of all. Only then is it wanted by everybody to ransom himself from oppression, only then does it become a currency. It is not the article which is the most convenient for exchange that is in demand, but that which is required by the government. If gold is demanded by it, gold will possess value; if pan-cakes are in demand, pan-cakes will have value.

If this is not the case then why issue for the circulation only that instrument of exchange which is the exclusive prerogative of the government? The Fijians, for instance, established their own instrument of exchange; why did not you, the men who possess the power, otherwise means of oppression, leave them alone and not meddle with their medium? Instead of that, you go to work and coin money, forbidding that right to others, or, as with us, you stamp bits of paper with images of czars and with special imprints, and make the counterfeiting of that paper a capital crime. You then distribute that money among your associates and demand the payment of taxes in those coins and bits of paper in such amount that the workingman must give up all his labor to acquire some of those bits of papers and coins, and then you assure us that that money is necessary as means of exchange. All men are free, they are not oppressed by their own kind, they are not kept in a state of slavery, there is simply money in society and an "iron law" by which the rent is increasing and the workingman's wages diminishing to a minimum! The fact that a half (or more) of the Russian moujiks are tied up hopelessly to the landed proprietors and manufacturers through the medium of their taxes, does not signify (what is evident) that the oppression of tax-levying by the government and its assistants, the landowners, keeps the workingman in the slavery of those who levy the taxes. No, it means that there is simply *money*—a means of exchange—and an "iron law!"

Before the abolition of serfdom I could compel John to do any kind of work, and if he refused I could send him before a district judge who had John whipped until he submitted. But if I made John work incommensurably with his strength or gave him no food, I was sure to have trouble with the authorities. But now that men are free, I can still compel John or Peter or Paul to do any work

I please, and if he refuses I will give him no money to pay his taxes with, and he will be whipped until he submits to me; and, furthermore, I can compel the German, the Frenchman, the Chinaman, the Indian, etc., to work for me, by not giving him for his stubbornness money wherewith to buy bread, or rent land, since he has neither the one nor the other. And if I compel him to work without food, in excess of his strength, if I crush him with hard labor, no one will say a word to me; and, besides, if I have read certain politico-economical books, I may remain confident that all men are free and that money does not cause slavery. The moujik knows that a blow with a rouble is worse than a blow with a club. The political economists alone will not see that. To say that money causes no enslaving is the same as to have asserted a few decades ago that serfdom caused no enslaving.

The political economists say that although one man can enslave another by money, money is still a harmless medium of exchange. Why could it not have been said half a century ago that although man may be enslaved by serfdom, serfdom was not an instrument of enslaving but only a harmless method of mutual services? The one side gives its hard labor, the other has in its care the physical and mental well being of the serfs and the management of the work. In fact, this reasoning *was* advanced at the time.

### III.

If this fictitious science, political economy, were not preoccupied with what all the law sciences are preoccupied, with namely, with the apology of oppression, it could not help seeing immediately the odd fact that the distribution of wealth and the deprivation of one portion of men of land and of capital and the enslaving of one set of men by another is connected with money, and that it is through the medium of money that some men enjoy the labor of others, that is, enslave them.

I repeat it that a man with money can buy up all the bread and starve to death his neighbor, or he can enslave him for the price of bread. This actually takes place before our very eyes to a vast extent. The phenomenon of the enslavement plainly seems to be connected with money, but science boldly asserts that money has nothing whatever to do with it.

Science says: money is as much a commodity as anything else which represents its cost of production, but with this difference that this kind of commodity is chosen as the most convenient means

of exchange, of saving, of payments, and is a measure of values: one man makes shoes, another produces wheat, a third raises sheep, and in order to effect exchange more easily, they introduce money representing the corresponding share of their labor and through it they exchange a pair of shoes for a piece of sheep and ten pounds of flour.

The apostles of this imaginary science are fond of picturing such a state of affairs; but there never was such a state of things in the world. A condition of society of this kind implies a primitive, pure and uncorrupted human society, such as the old philosophers were fond of fancying. But such a thing never existed. In all human societies where money has existed as money there has always been oppression of the weak and unarmed by the strong and armed; wherever there has been oppression the tokens of value—the money, whatever it may have been, cattle, furs, skins, metals—invariably lost that significance and assumed the character of a ransom. Money has, undoubtedly, those harmless properties which science attributes to it, but it can have such properties only in a society where the oppression of one man by another is impossible; and that would be an ideal society which would not need money as a common measure of values. In all known societies where money exists, it has the meaning of a medium of exchange only by virtue of its being an instrument of oppression. Wherever there is oppression money cannot be a just medium of exchange because it cannot be a measure of value. It cannot be a measure of value because as soon as one man can deprive another of the products of his labor, that measure is instantly disturbed. Assuming that in a stock market there is a traffic going on in cows and horses raised by certain owners but misappropriated by others, it will be evident that the value of the cows and horses in this market will not correspond to the labor of raising those animals, and the value of all the other commodities will be affected correspondingly, and money will not express the value of those commodities. Furthermore, if it is possible to acquire forcibly a cow, a horse, or a house, it is possible by the same force to acquire money and, through it, any commodity desired. Such money, acquired by force and employed in purchasing goods, loses every semblance of a means of exchange. The oppressor who took the money and gives it for the products of labor, does not effect exchange but simply takes with his money whatever he wants.

Even if there had ever existed such an imaginary, impossible society in which, without any governmental imposition, gold and

silver had the nature of a measure of value and of a means of exchange, even in such society money would lose its significance with the first appearance of oppression. Let us say that a subjugator appears who appropriates the cows, the horses, and the houses of the inhabitants; this form of possession being inconvenient to him he takes from the inhabitants everything that has the quality of value and that can be exchanged for all sorts of commodities, namely, money. Money, then, as a measure of value, loses its significance because the measure of value of all the commodities will always depend on the oppressor's pleasure. That commodity which is the most desired by the oppressor will have the greater value, and *vice versa*. And thus, in a society subjected to oppression money acquires the nature of a means of oppression in the oppressor's hands and retains its quality as a means of exchange among the oppressed only in so far and in such proportion as suits the oppressor. Let us imagine this procedure on a small scale. The serfs are supplying the landlord with linens, poultry, sheep, and a certain amount of labor. The landlord substitutes money for these contributions in kind and puts a price on the various articles of his revenue. The man who has neither linen, bread, cattle, nor hands, may contribute a certain sum of money. It is evident that in this community of serfs the value of commodities will depend on the landlord's pleasure. The landlord uses those commodities, of which some are more and others less desired by him, and, accordingly, he fixes their prices higher or lower. It is evident that it is only the landlord's pleasure and his needs which establish the prices in this community of serfs. If he desires bread mostly he will accept at a smaller valuation linens, cattle, labor; and, consequently, those who have no wheat will sell to those who have, their linen, labor, etc., for wheat to satisfy the landlord with. If the landlord wishes to reduce his dues to the basis of money, then, again, the price of commodities will not depend on the cost of labor but, first, on the amount of money demanded by him, secondly, on those particular commodities produced by the peasants which are the most desired by the landlord, and for which he will pay more.

This levying of money from the peasants by the landlord would influence the price of articles among the peasants only in case the peasants lived apart from all other men and had no intercourse save among themselves and with the landlord, or secondly, in case the landlord employed that money only outside of his village. Only under these two conditions would the price of commodities,

although changed nominally, remain comparatively normal and money have the sense of a measure of value and exchange. But if the peasants had economical relations with the surrounding inhabitants, then the prices of their products as compared with those of their neighbors would depend on the greater or less extortion of money by the landlord. If less money were levied from their neighbors than from themselves, then their commodities would sell cheaper than those of their neighbors. If the landlord put the contributed money again into circulation among the peasants by buying their products, then, evidently, the relation of the prices of the various articles in that community would be constantly changing, according as the landlord bought this or that article. Supposing that one landlord levies a high tax while his neighbor a low one, then, manifestly, articles will be cheaper in the first community than in the second, and the prices in either community will depend on the raising and the lowering of the taxes.

Such is the influence of oppression in prices. The second influence, which flows from the first, will consist in the relative price of all the articles. Suppose that one landlord is fond of horses and pays dearly for them; another one likes linen and also pays well for it. It is obvious that in the domains of the two landlords horses and linen will have a high price, which will be entirely disproportionate to the price of cows and wheat. To-morrow the lover of linen dies and his heir prefers poultry, the price of linen will fall and that of poultry will rise.

Wherever in society there is oppression of one man by another the nature of money as a measure of value is subordinated to the oppressor's will, and its importance as a medium of exchange for the products of labor is commuted into a convenient means of exploiting men's labor. The oppressor wants money not for exchange nor for the establishment of measures of value (he establishes that himself), but for the convenience of oppression, as money can be accumulated and a greater number can be held in bondage thereby. It is inconvenient to take from the people all their stock, so as to have a sufficient supply at all times, for the simple reason that this necessitates their feeding; the same cause operates with grain: it may spoil; the same with labor: sometimes a thousand workingmen may be required, and, again, none at all. But money demanded of those who have it not saves one from all this inconvenience and yet supplies all that is wanted.

Furthermore, money is wanted by the oppressor to enable him to extend his exploitation of labor to all men needing money, and



not to certain persons only. In the absence of money a landlord could exploit only the labor of his own serfs; as soon as two adjoining landlords agreed to levy money from their serfs who had none, they both commenced to exploit indiscriminately all the labor on either estate.

Therefore the oppressor finds it more convenient to assert his demands on another man's labor in the form of money. As to the oppressed who is deprived of his labor, he requires no money, neither for exchange (he effects that without money, as all races did); nor for the establishment of measures of value, because that is done without consulting him; nor for the purposes of saving, since the man who is deprived of his labor has nothing to save; nor to effect payments, because the oppressed pays more than he receives, and whatever he does receive is in goods, whether it be in the store of his employer, or outside, in articles of actual necessity. This money is demanded and he is told that unless he gives it up he will have no land, nor bread, his horse and his cow will be taken from him, and he will be cast into jail. His deliverance is in selling the products of his labor, his work and the work of his children. And he sells his labor and its products at prices established, not by a regular exchange, but by the power which demands the money.

To speak of money as a medium of exchange and a measure of values is, to say the least, strange, seeing the influences of taxes and levies on values, influences working everywhere and at all times, in the narrow circle of landlords and in the wide circle of nations, influences which are as obvious as the springs which manipulate the marionette of a Punch and Judy Show.

#### IV.

Every enslavement of one man by another is based on the fact that one man can take another man's life, and thus, without quitting his threatening position, he imposes his will upon him. If a man gives up all his labor to others, if he starves, if he suffers his little children to do heavy work, if he devotes all his life to a hateful and unnecessary occupation, a thing that occurs every day in this world of ours (which we call enlightened because we live in it), we may say with certainty that all this happens because the penalty of a man's non-submission is the forfeiture of his life.

The present method of enslaving men was invented five thousand years ago by Joseph the Beautiful, according to the Bible. This method is the same as is used in taming wild animals in our menageries. It is hunger.

### This is how the Bible describes it:<sup>1</sup>

"And he gathered up all the food of the seven years, which were in the land of Egypt, and laid up the food in the cities: the food of the field, which was round about the city, laid he up in the same.

"And Joseph gathered corn as the sand of the sea, very much, until he left numbering; for it was without number.

"And the seven years of plenteousness, that was in the land of Egypt, were ended.

"And the seven years of dearth began to come, according as Joseph had said: and the dearth was in all lands; but in all the land of Egypt there was bread.

"And when all the land of Egypt was famished, the people cried to Pharaoh for bread; and Pharaoh said unto all the Egyptians, go unto Joseph; what he saith to you, do.

"And the famine was over all the face of the earth: and Joseph opened all the store-houses, and sold unto the Egyptians; and the famine waxed sore in the land of Egypt.

"And all countries came into Egypt to Joseph for to buy corn; because that the famine was so sore in all lands."

Joseph, eschewing the old-time method of enslaving men with the sword, gathered corn in abundant years in the expectation of bad years which usually follow after the times of plenty as all men know without any of Pharaoh's dreams, and thus, by hunger, he enslaved all men, far and near, and much more effectively than with the sword. When people commenced to feel the effects of hunger, he arranged things so as to keep the people in his power forever—by hunger. In Chap. xlvii it is described thus:

"And there was no bread in all the land; for the famine was very sore, so that the land of Egypt and all the land of Canaan fainted by reason of the famine.

"And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought: and Joseph brought the money into Pharaoh's house.

"And when money failed in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, all the Egyptians came unto Joseph, and said, Give us bread: for why should we die in thy presence? for the money faileth.

"And Joseph said, Give your cattle; and I will give you for your cattle, if money fail.

"And they brought their cattle unto Joseph: and Joseph gave them bread in exchange for horses, and for the flocks, and for the cattle of the herds, and for the asses; and fed them with bread for all their cattle for that year.

"When that year was ended, they came unto him the second year and said unto him, We will not hide it from my lord, how that our money is spent; my lord also hath our herds of cattle; there is not aught left in the sight of my lord, but our bodies, and our lands:

"Wherefore shall we die before thine eyes, both we and our lord? buy us and our land for bread, and we and our land will be servants unto Pharaoh: and give us seed, that we may live, and not die, that the land be not desolate.

<sup>1</sup> Genesis, xli.

“And Joseph bought all the land of Egypt for Pharaoh; for the Egyptians sold every man his field, because the famine prevailed over them: so the land became Pharaoh’s.

“And as for the people, he removed them to cities from one end of the borders of Egypt even to the other end thereof.

“Only the land of the priests bought he not; for the priests had a portion assigned them of Pharaoh, and did eat their portion which Pharaoh gave them: wherefore they sold not their lands.

“Then Joseph said unto the people, Behold, I have bought you this day and your land for Pharaoh: lo, here is seed for you, and ye shall own the land.

“And it shall come to pass in the increase that ye shall give the fifth part unto Pharaoh, and four parts shall be your own, for seed of the field, and for your food, and for them of your households, and for food for your little ones.

“And they said, Thou hast saved our lives: let us find grace in the sight of my lord, and we will be Pharaoh’s servants.

“And Joseph made it a law over the land of Egypt unto this day, that Pharaoh should have the fifth part; except the land of the priests only, which became not Pharaoh’s.”

Formerly, in order to avail himself of the people’s labor, Pharaoh had to compel them to work by force of arms; now, when all the supplies and all the land were Pharaoh’s, he had only to guard by force those supplies and the land, and he could compel the people to work for him by hunger.

In a scarce year everybody, at Pharaoh’s will, may be starved, as can in a year of plenty all those who through casualties are lacking wheat.

Thus a second method of enslavement is created, one by which the strong compels the weak to work, not through the threat of murder, but by capturing his supplies and guarding them sword in hand.

Said Joseph to the hungry: I can starve you to death, for I have all the supplies; but I grant you your life on condition that, for the bread I give you, you shall do my bidding.

In the first method of enslavement, the strong must keep a large number of warriors constantly watching the inhabitants and exacting their submission by threats of death. In this case the oppressor must share with the warriors.

The second method, besides the warriors, requires other assistants—small Josephs and big Josephs—managers and distributors of bread. The oppressor must share with them and give the Josephs costly garments, gold rings, servants, as also bread and silver to the brothers and relatives of the Josephs. Furthermore, the very nature of this form of oppression makes accomplices not only of all the managers and their relatives but also of all those

who own the stores of wheat. As in the first method, which was based on the force of arms, every armed man was an accomplice in oppression, so in the second method, which is founded on hunger, every one who has supplies of wheat participates in the oppression and dominates.

The advantage for the oppressor in the second methods consists in this that (1) he is not compelled to resort to force to compel workingmen to do his bidding, the workingmen come and deliver themselves into his hands freely; (2) fewer men escape his oppression. The disadvantage is that he has to share his plunder with a larger number of men. The advantages to the oppressed are that they are no longer subjected to the harsher forms of brutality, are given a slight degree of freedom, and may hope, under favorable circumstances, to pass in their turn into the ranks of the oppressors; the disadvantage is, that they can never again avoid a certain measure of oppression.

But even this mode of enslaving is not entirely satisfactory to the oppressor in his endeavors to despoil the greatest possible number of men of the products of their labor and to enslave the greatest possible number, and thus a new, a third, method is elaborated.

This third method consists in the recourse to ransoms or taxes. This new method, like the second, is also based on hunger, with the difference that, in addition to the pangs of hunger, resort is had to other primal necessities. The strong man assesses his serfs in tokens of money which he alone has to such an amount that they must give him not only supplies of wheat in a greater amount even than that demanded by Joseph, but they must also give to him other articles of primal necessity, as: meat, hides, wool, clothing, fuel, buildings; thus the oppressor retains his serfs not only by fear, but also by hunger, cold, want, and other hardships.

In this wise is instituted the third form of slavery, the moneyed slavery, in which the strong says to the weak: "I can do with every one of you whatever I please, I can kill you outright with a gun, I can kill you by taking from you the land which gives you support, I can buy up all the bread with the money which you owe me and I can sell it to strangers and thus exterminate you by hunger; I can strip you of all you have: of your stock, your dwellings, your clothing. But this is both disagreeable and inconvenient to me; therefore, I will allow you to dispose of your labor and your products at your own will, but you must give me as many tokens of money as I deem it fit to assess you for, either *per capita*, accord-

ing to your holdings, your food and drink, your clothes, and your buildings. Bring me these tokens, and you may then fight it out among yourselves as best you can ; but you must know that I am not going to protect or succour your widows, your orphans, the sickly, the old, or the victims of fire ; I shall only preserve and perpetuate the regularity of circulation of the tokens of money you give me.

“ Only that man will be right in my eyes and him only shall I defend him who contributes with regularity the requisite number of tokens of money. How these have been acquired is none of my business.”

The persons in power issue these tokens only as vouchers to show that their demands have been complied with.

The second method of enslaving consisted in this, that Pharaoh, by exacting a fifth part of all the crops and in establishing reserves of grain, put himself in possession of an additional means of subjugating and dominating workingmen in times of famine, his first means having been that of the sword. But Pharaoh's third method consisted in exacting from the workingmen even more money than their original contributions in grain were worth, and thus he and his accomplices acquired a new means of dominating the workingmen not only during a famine but at all times. Under the second method men had still some small reserves of grain left which helped them to tide over the poorer crops without becoming hopeless slaves ; under the third method, with its increased demands, all the reserves of grain as well as of other articles of barest necessity are absorbed, and, with the slightest misfortune, the workingman, having no supplies of grain or anything else to trade off for grain, becomes a slave of those who have the money exacted of him.

Under the first method the oppressor had to share his spoils with his warriors only ; under the second, besides maintaining the necessary guardians of the land and its products, he has to engage collectors and supervisors of his supplies ; while the third method, under which he does not hold the land, requires still more—soldiers for the security of the lands and of wealth, and also landlords, tax-collectors, tax-assessors, inspectors, Custom House employees, and the makers and the comptrollers of the money.

The organisation of the third method is much more complex than the second. Under the second method it is possible to farm out the collection of the grain, as is done at the present time in Turkey, for instance. The assessing of slaves by taxes necessitates a complex administration whose duty it is to see that men and those

of their dealings which are subjected to taxation do not evade it. Therefore, the third method compels the oppressor to share his spoils with a much greater number of men than the second method; besides, by the very nature of the thing, there appear as participants in the third method all people who have money, whether at home or abroad. The preferences of this method over the others are as follows:

First, a greater amount of labor may be taken from the people in this manner and more conveniently than by the old method, for the money tax is like a screw: it can be screwed down very conveniently to the last limit and just short of killing the golden hen. Therefore it is not necessary to wait for the year of famine, as with Joseph. The year of famine has come to stay forever.

Its second convenience is in that the oppression now covers all those landless men who formerly evaded it; now, besides giving a part of their labor for bread, they must give another part to the oppressor as a tax. Under this, the third method, the oppressed enjoys greater personal liberty: he may live where he pleases, he may do what he pleases; he may or he may not sow wheat, he is not bound to account for his work, and if he has money, he may consider himself a perfectly free man. On the other hand, the greater complexity of the third method renders the situation of the oppressed much harder and they are deprived of the greater part of their products, as the number of men availing themselves of their labor grows still larger and their maintenance falls on a smaller number of the workingmen.

All three methods may be compared to screws, pressing the board which presses down on the workingman. The main, the central screw without which the others would be useless is that which is screwed down first and is never afterwards relaxed: it is the screw of personal slavery, subjugation by the sword. The second screw, tightened after the first, consists in enslavement by depriving men of their land and supplies of food, and it is kept in place by a threat of murder. The third screw is slavery through demands of money which people do not possess, and this also is locked up by threats of murder. All these screws are tightened and are never relaxed except through the further tightening of one of them. For the complete enslavement of the workingmen all three screws are necessary, and we actually see them resorted to in our society; they are always tightened.

Personal slavery, slavery at the point of the sword, has never been abolished and never will be so long as the subjugation of one

set of men by others lasts, for on it ultimately stands all subjugation. We all are persuaded very naïvely that personal slavery is abolished in our civilised world, that its last remnants have been wiped out both in Russia and in America, and that only the barbarians at present have it. But we forget one little circumstance, the existence of a score of millions of soldiers, who are maintained by every State and whose disbanding would involve a downfall of the economical structure of every State. Are not these millions of soldiers the personal slaves of the men who command them? Are not these men compelled to do the will of their masters under a threat of death, a threat carried out but too often? The difference is in that their submission is not called slavery, but discipline, and that formerly they were slaves for their life-time, whereas now they are such only for the short period of their service. Personal slavery is not only not abolished in our civilised societies, but it is even intensified through universal military liability, and it continues the same as ever, with slight modifications.

They tell us that these bodies of slaves are necessary for the defense and glory of the country, but this is more than doubtful, as in unsuccessful wars they are the cause of the subjugation and shame of their country, whereas their utility for keeping their own people in slavery is evident. Should the Irish peasants or the Russian moujiks possess themselves of the lands of their landlords, the soldiers will come and will reinstate the landlords. Should you start a distillery or a brewery and refuse to pay the excise, again the soldiers will come and will shut your distillery down. Should you refuse to pay taxes, the same thing will happen.

The second screw is the enslavement by depriving men of land and, thus, of supplies of food. Sometimes the entire land belongs to the estate, as in Turkey, when one per cent. of the crop is taken for the benefit of the State. Sometimes the entire land belongs to a small number of private persons and labor is taxed for their benefit, as in England; sometimes the greater or the smaller part of it belongs to small and large landowners, as in Russia, in Germany, in France. This screw of enslavement is loosened or tightened according to the other screws. Thus, in Russia, when personal enslavement embraced the majority of the workingmen, enslavement by land was superfluous, and the screw of personal slavery was loosened only when the screws of the land and the tax enslavement had been tightened. Having assigned all the workingmen to various communities, having prohibited migration and displacement of every kind, having appropriated the land and distributed

it among its following, the government then "liberated" the working people.

The third method of enslavement—through taxes—is also of long standing, and in our time, with the diffusion of uniform tokens of money throughout many states and with the increase of the governmental power, it has acquired a mighty power. We, in Russia, have passed within our own memory through two forms of slavery: at the time of the liberation of the slaves the landowners, although retaining their lands, feared lest their power over their serfs should vanish; but experience showed that, in releasing their hold on the chains of personal slavery, they had only to grasp the other chain,—that of land slavery. The moujik had no bread, while the landowner had both land and supplies of bread, and, therefore, the moujik remained the same slave. The subsequent transition was that in which the government tightened up the screw by taxes, when the majority of the workmen had to sell themselves to the landowners and the manufacturers. This new form of slavery presses the people still harder to the wall and nine tenths of the Russian workmen are working for landowners and manufacturers only because the demand of taxes compels them.

These three methods of enslavement have always existed, but men are inclined not to notice them as soon as new justifications are found for them.

When, in the ancient world, the entire economical structure stood on the basis of personal slavery, the greatest minds failed to see it. Xenophon, and Plato, and Aristotle, and the Romans thought that things could not be otherwise, and that slavery was a natural consequence of wars, without which the human race was inconceivable. Just so in the Middle Ages men failed to see the significance of the ownership of land and the resulting slavery, on which stood the economical structure of the Middle Ages. And thus at present men fail to see that the enslavement of the majority of men is brought about by the governmental money-taxes collected through the medium of administration and the army, the same administration and army which are maintained out of those taxes.