

“The Island Of Stone Money”

by Milton Friedman

Working Papers in Economics, no. E-91-3. Stanford, California: Hoover Institution, 1991.

© The Board of Overseers of the Leland Stanford Junior University

Abstract

Large stones quarried and shaped on a distant island were used as money on the Island of Yap. After Germany acquired the island at the turn of the century, its officials had difficulty inducing the residents to repair the footpaths until they resorted to the desperate expedient of taking possession of many of the stones by marking them with a cross in black paint, to be removed when the paths were repaired. The apparently meaningless measure had real results. That was equally true of an eerily similar event that occurred in 1932 when the New York Federal Reserve Bank transferred gold to the Bank of France by earmarking gold in its vaults.

The Island Of Stone Money

From 1899 to 1919 the Caroline Islands, in Micronesia, were a German colony. The most westerly of the group is the Island of Uap or Yap, which at the time had a population of five to six thousand.

In 1903, an American anthropologist by the name of William Henry Furness III spent several months on the island and wrote a fascinating book about the habits and customs of its inhabitants. He was particularly impressed by the islanders' monetary system, and accordingly gave his book the title I have given this chapter: *The Island of Stone Money* (1910).

“[A]s their island yields no metal, they have had recourse to stone; stone, on which labor in fetching and fashioning has been expended, is as truly a representation of labor as the mined and minted coins of civilization.

“Their medium of exchange they call *fei*, and it consists of large, solid, thick, stone wheels, ranging in diameter from a foot to twelve feet, having in the centre a hole varying in size with the diameter of the stone, wherein a pole may be inserted sufficiently large and strong to bear the weight and facilitate transportation. These stone ‘coins’ [were made from limestone found on an island some 400 miles distant. They] were originally quarried and shaped [on that island and the product] brought to Uap [*sic*] by some venturesome native navigators, in canoes and on rafts ...

“[A] noteworthy feature of this stone currency ... is that it is not necessary for its owner to reduce it to possession. After concluding a bargain which involves the price of a *fei* too large to be conveniently moved, its new owner is quite content to accept the bare acknowledgment of ownership and without so much as a mark to indicate the exchange, the coin remains undisturbed on the former owner's premises.

“My faithful old friend, Fatumak, assured me that there was in the village near-by a family whose wealth was unquestioned,—acknowledged by every one—and yet no one, not even the family itself, had ever laid eye or hand on this wealth; it consisted of an enormous *fei*, whereof the size is known only by tradition; for the past two or three generations it had been, and at that very time it was lying at the bottom of the sea! Many years ago an ancestor of this family, on an expedition after *fei*, secured this remarkably large and exceedingly valuable stone, which was placed on a raft to be towed homeward. A violent storm arose, and the party, to save their lives, were obliged to cut the raft adrift, and the stone sank out of sight. When they reached home, they all testified that the *fei* was of magnificent proportions and of extraordinary quality, and that it was lost through no fault of the owner. Thereupon it was universally conceded in their simple faith that the mere accident of its loss overboard was too trifling to mention, and that a few hundred feet of water off shore ought not to affect its marketable value, since it was all chipped out in proper form. The purchasing power of that stone remains, therefore, as valid as if it were leaning visibly against the side of the owner’s house....

“There are no wheeled vehicles on Uap and, consequently, no cart roads; but there have always been clearly defined paths communicating with the different settlements. When the German Government assumed the ownership of The Caroline Islands, after the purchase of them from Spain in 1898, many of these paths or highways were in bad condition, and the chiefs of the several districts were told that they must have them repaired and put in good order. The roughly dressed blocks of coral were, however, quite good enough for the bare feet of the natives; and many were the repetitions of the command, which still remained unheeded. At last it was decided to impose a fine for disobedience on the chiefs of the districts. In what shape was the fine to be levied?... At last, by a happy thought, the fine was exacted by sending a man to every *failu* and *pabai* throughout the disobedient districts, where he simply marked a certain number of the most valuable *fei* with a cross in black paint to show that the stones were claimed by the government. This instantly worked like a charm; the people, thus dolefully impoverished, turned to and repaired the highways to such good effect from one end of the island to the other, that they are now like park drives. Then the government dispatched its agents and erased the crosses. Presto! the fine was paid, the happy *failus* resumed possession of their capital stock, and rolled in wealth” (pp. 93, 96-100).

Unless you are very unusual, your immediate reaction, like my own, will be: “How silly. How can people be so illogical?” However, before criticizing too severely the innocent people on Yap, it is worth contemplating an episode in the U.S. to which they might well have your reaction. In 1932-33, the Bank of France feared that the U.S. would not stick to the gold standard at the traditional price of \$20.67 an ounce of gold. Accordingly, it asked the Federal Reserve Bank of New York to convert dollar assets that it had in the U.S. into gold. To avoid the necessity of shipping the gold across the ocean, it requested the Federal Reserve Bank simply to store the

gold on the Bank of France's account. In response, officials of the Federal Reserve Bank went to their gold vault, put in separate drawers the correct amount of gold ingots, and put a label or mark on those drawers indicating that they were the property of the French—for all it matters they could have done so by marking them “with a cross in black paint” just as the Germans did to the stones.

The result was headlines in the financial newspapers about “the loss of gold,” the threat to the American financial system, and the like. U.S. gold reserves were down, French gold reserves up. The markets regarded the U.S. dollar as weaker, the French franc as stronger. The so-called “drain” of gold by France from the United States was one of the factors that ultimately led to the banking panic of 1933.

Is there really a difference between the Federal Reserve Bank's believing that it was in a weaker monetary position because of some marks on drawers in its basement and the Yap Islanders' belief that they were poorer because of some marks on their stone money? Or between the Bank of France's belief that it was in a stronger monetary position because of some marks on drawers in a basement more than 3,000 miles away and the Yap Islander's conviction that he was rich because of a stone under the water some 100 or so miles away? Or, for that matter, how many of us have literal personal direct assurance of the existence of most of the items we regard as constituting our wealth? Entries in a bank account, property certified by pieces of paper called shares of stocks, and so on and on.

The Yap Islanders regarded stones quarried and shaped on a distant island and brought to their own as the concrete manifestation of wealth. For a century and more, the “civilized” world regarded as a concrete manifestation of its wealth metal dug from deep in the ground, refined at great labor, and transported great distances to be buried again in elaborate vaults deep in the ground. Is the one practice really more rational than the other?

What both examples—and numerous additional ones that could be listed—illustrate is how important “myth,” unquestioned belief, is in monetary matters. Our own money, the money we have grown up with, the system under which it is controlled, these appear “real” and “rational” to us. The money of other countries often seems to us like paper or worthless metal, even when the purchasing power of individual units is high.

Reprinted in Milton Friedman, *Money Mischief*, pp. 3-7. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1992.

10/5/12