

## IS MONEY BASIC?

By WILLIAM J. HARRINGTON (Madison, Wisc., U.S.A.)

IN NEWSLETTER FEB 1972

It has been said that money is basic. A few moments' thought will show that it is quite superficial. One should see that it is not an economic element, or factor, as commonly considered.

We will begin with the view that the reader of these lines already knows of money as a universal abstraction with the sole purpose, in its use, of the acquisition of the wealth of others. This presupposes the antecedent production of wealth, and its distribution, as taking priority. Following distribution of wealth as an economic process we find true exchange, or barter, taking precedence over the use-of-money which is used only in the redistribution of wealth, not as an economic process but as a contractual situation occurring between individuals. This relegates the use-of-money to a solely philosophic process in the consumption of wealth. Thus, in the use-of-money as a great convenience in the acquisition of wealth the laws of philosophy must apply with increasing complexity, to the exclusion of economic law. The vagaries of human emotion add to the confusion throughout, suggesting that the more clear the understanding of money and the more dependable its origin, the less confusing will be its use.

The perpetuation of the false notion of money as a tangible substance has proved disastrous on many occasions. Attempts to make it appear as basic and economic in nature will only lead to future disasters. While it has been shown that money is superficial in its relation to fundamentals, it can also be shown that as a human contrivance it has many inherent human weaknesses. E.g., money is a natural universal concept that is part of human nature, in which the human contrivance for its use is commonly considered as money itself, which is false. It is difficult today to separate money in one's mind from the mechanism of its use, the monetary system. No part of the monetary system is money, but the system is essential to the use-of-money. Without it money cannot be used.

Further complications in the use-of-money through a monetary system tend to further weaken any claims to the basic nature of money. In the beginning it is a human fallible decision that makes an arbitrary choice of a standard. This is also true of a standard unit of measurement. If this were not enough we have added all the human variables in the choosing and making of a currency as presumptive evidence of money. Any part of the monetary system can be readily changed almost at the whim of a demagogue. Parts may be removed, making it non-functional in relation to money. The situation lends itself to prolonged periods of the use of a mere facsimile of a monetary system for the acquisition of large amounts of the total wealth of a country. The annual destruction of sixty or more monetary systems over the world supports this contention.

While money is important as a universal abstraction, and in its use is a great convenience, we must not allow ourselves to be led into a quagmire of confusing terminology the purpose of which is to lead the unsuspecting to give up their wealth for false evidence of money.