ominous game of leapfrog up the ladder of inflation.

THIS BRINGS us to the end of our brief exploratory journey into the realm of economic competition. In the course of that journey, I have attempted to show you another tool of analysis that you may use, if you wish, in your investigation of competition. The approach which I have suggested will furnish you no criteria of what is the most desirable number and size of producers or buyers in the market for a given product or service. But the approach does seek to suggest that the maximum human welfare and progress can be insured if we search penetratingly for and eliminate fraud, theft, coercion, and intimidation in the dealings of people with each other.

I have emphasized that we must not overlook the contamination of competition by means of the coercion that we may practice upon each other *via* our government — the monopoly of legal coercion. I have done so because it is quite human and natural to suppose that if government does something, that thing is thereby rendered proper — even sacrosanct — in a democratic sense. But I remind you that in our land, our government belongs to us. In that sense, it is an extension of ourselves. And if it is wrong for us individually to fine or imprison or intimidate the other fellow to keep him from producing the same thing we want to produce — or to force him to sell or buy something at a price he would not voluntarily approve — then doing the same thing through our government does not make it right. In both instances, it violates the Ten Commandments and the Golden Rule.

The same liberal construction which is required for the protection of life and liberty, in all particulars in which life and liberty are of any value, should be applied to the protection of private property. If the legislature of a State, under pretense of providing for the public good, or for any other reason, can determine, against the consent of the owner, the uses to which private property shall be devoted, or the prices which the owner shall receive for its uses, it can deprive him of the property as completely as by a special act for its confiscation or destruction. If, for instance, the owner is prohibited from using his building for the purposes for which it was designed, it is of little consequence that he is permitted to retain the title and possession . . .

JUSTICE STEPHEN J. FIELD'S dissenting opinion
In Munn *vs.* Illinois, 94 U. S., 113, (1877)

Currency Convertibility

George Winder

Few of us understand the subtle device of currency restrictions used by all governments to deprive their citizens of both freedom and property

THE VALUE OF currencies, like the value of many other commodities, depends upon a thousand factors which cannot be measured. These depend upon the opinions of the thousands of businessmen who want to buy currencies and upon those who wish to buy and sell the goods those currencies can purchase.

No government has a yardstick that can measure the value of the goods currencies can buy, and this means that no government has a standard for measuring the value of currencies and the rate at which they should exchange for one another. The only possible way to ascertain the value of a currency is to place it on the free market and see what people will pay for it.

TO FIX by law an exchange rate between two currencies which will represent the true value of both currencies is impossible. When values depend upon so many factors which cannot be measured, then it is almost inevitable that a fixed rate must cheat one of the parties to every exchange transaction.

Businessmen, if left free to buy and sell currencies, are not powerful enough to overcharge each other. There are always too many sellers in the market. If currencies are to be sold at false values, a power of monopoly, which only a government can wield, is necessary. It is almost certain that there is no history of rings or monopolies in exchange transaction except where governments have interfered to create them.

Until the advent of socialism upset old-established moral laws, the earnings of a British exporter of goods or services were his to do with whatever he liked. He invariably sold his earnings of foreign currency in the free market.

This had very important consequences on the community as a whole. It meant, to begin with, that there was an automatic guide to decide whether it was more profitable for people to be employed in export industries or directly em-