

YOU ARE THE TRUE ECONOMISTS

Introduction

In published writings, speeches and parliamentary debates, the evidence is overwhelming that the economic experts who feel competent to advise society on its many complex problems have renounced any concept of the economy as a natural self-regulating organism.

As a result they have taken refuge in a terminology similar to that which characterised medicine in its primitive stages when certain ills of the flesh were diagnosed as 'a flux of the bowels'. The economy has been degraded to the level of a mere political integration to be manipulated by bureaucratic planners subject to the will of financial and other pressure groups who are the ultimate wielders of power. Society is thus forced to muddle along under a bewildering array of conflicting opinion on such vital issues as wages, prices, trade, taxation, inflation and many more in a climate that rules out any meaningful communication and logical discussion on economics. The end result is that the profusion of ideas and fancy notions now littering the economic highway, leaves little hope of solution of the crucial problems affecting the economic health of the nation.

The Economy is a Natural Organism

What must be recognised is that the **economy is society** considered from the aspect of its productive activities — the production of wealth — whose circulation, so to speak, is the life-blood of society. And just as society is a natural phenomenon so the economy is a natural organism growing out of the natural inclination of its members to associate through market exchanges for mutual benefit. It sustains every member of society, releasing and regulating the number of persons needed to perform all the non-productive tasks in areas such as education and government, all of whom are dependent on the economy for their material needs. The economy therefore, like every natural phenomenon is governed by the laws of its nature and does not have to be and indeed cannot be planned by human will. It was the economy and not political planners that put Man on the moon! It emerges as a natural growth wherever people engage in social co-production. A moral organism arising from human nature, which is rational and free, since it is by virtue of instinct and reason that human beings naturally live in social groups, in a natural urge to save effort, by diversifying their productive activities through specialisation of function and exchange. As a result of their economic exchanges they produce a common good, or profit of association, as each receives more value than he gives, and any interference in these exchanges by the State — such as price fixing — is fatal to the health of the economy and the common good of all.

What is Economics?

Economics therefore, is the science concerned with human behaviour in this exchanging mode of getting a living, and **nothing else**. And as such, far from being the pseudo-science for which its practitioners are always apologising, it is superior to all other practical sciences. And, since society is in principle a self-governing organism capable of being run by its citizens and not designed to be organised by specialists such as scientists and philosophers, and as its status depends on the mental and moral condition of its members, people, particularly in a democracy, must think for themselves where their economic well-being is concerned. Not that everybody should become expert on 'economic affairs', but that they should understand that economics is not the special preserve of experts, but a matter of simple common sense applied to the day-to-day economic activities of society, so long as the economy is allowed to function naturally, i.e. left alone, free of interference by the State. Nowadays society is at the mercy of all kinds of would-be specialists, economists, businessmen, political commentators, even theologians, all contributing to the general chaos of thought, not unlike the proliferation of quacks on the fringe of medicine, without real knowledge of how the economy works naturally if left to itself.

Confusion Among Economists

The really sad thing about the present situation is that economists as a body appear unconcerned at the confusion and uncertainty in their ranks, attributable to their failure to establish fundamental concepts and definitions. With economic ignorance prevailing at all levels it is only to be expected that the market — the very heart of a social economy — has become the field for an anti-social struggle to acquire wealth without effort, replacing the natural pursuit of wealth through its production and exchange. Indeed it would be foolish to expect otherwise when it is considered how the development of the economy is distorted by 'powerful vested rights', tariffs and taxes, subsidies, special licenses, cartels and defective land tenure. The fact, that in a democracy, all large political questions are related to economics, and power depends on popularity, makes it so much harder to disseminate economic truth, for the technique of party politics is to harden economic conflicts into political issues designed to stifle thought. Instead of guidance from real leaders for those seeking answers to questions, party machines prevent people from even seeing the questions, the counting of heads becomes more important than the use of them, and the party machine is paramount. Even worse is the fact that colleges and universities, which should be directing society towards economic health, still have no proper presentation of economics, their objective being to teach students how the economy functions under the distorted conditions that now strangle it. There is therefore, an urgent

need for all who would conscientiously use their votes to take stock of the deplorable state of uncertainty in economic theory and demand that economics be elevated to a more useful and dignified position in the academic world. Meanwhile, the economic life of the community continues to suffer from the influence of economic quackery on economic planners and economists who, instead of filling their proper role of economic guides and rectifiers, continue to cast their endless horoscopes on the future behaviour of an economy that is very highly diseased — a practice that savours of the elaborate system of cycles and epicycles employed by Claudius Ptolemy before astronomy gained scientific stature through Copernicus.

Convincing evidence that economics is now in a state of intellectual disarray was provided recently when Professor Piggott of the Australian National University writing in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, said in reference to recurring economic booms and busts: "We (economists) don't yet fully understand them and until we do there can be no consensus on policy. . . . We don't really know enough to suggest cures with much confidence. The best we can offer is informed speculation and judgement". Society must expect this groping in the dark by economic forecasters, since they have never appeared to have any suspicion that there is or can be a science of economics, despite the scholarly foundation laid by Adam Smith. It is understandable that Smith only saw the reality of a natural economic order rather darkly and left many traps for the unwary. But every science must crawl before it can walk and Smith seems more like a sprinter when contrasted with the long line of economic muddlers who have followed him. The straw splitters, who usually follow in the wake of a genius.

The Subsidiary Role of the State

As a first step towards economic sanity, our educators need to realise that civilisation is antecedent to the State; that the State is only the political expression of a civilisation already constituted; that the relation of its citizens to one another proceeds from their relation to the State; that the relation of citizens, as economic units, to one another proceeds from their relation to the economy, whose soul is price; that civilisation, the great good generated and secured by human association, is completely dependent on an efficient economy. Unfortunately, in a developing society the attention is first arrested by the State, the social tends to be confused with the political and the economic not only tends to be overlooked, but tends to be relegated to subservience to a powerful State whose meddling regulations and restrictions give it the character of a neurotic 'nanny'.

In this we have the root cause of all the problems that infest society. The remedy lies in freeing the economy from the mischievous invasion, at the behest of its hoard of economic pundits and planners, of its natural

functions by the State. The economic organism is easier to comprehend once it is seen that society, because of the difference of its cells, is different from all other natural organisms. For example, the cells of a tree are for the good of the whole tree and have no proper end in themselves. They are merely parts. But society is totally for the good of its cells or members who profit, through the greater freedom gained from the domination of matter — a profit of association over and above what they contribute, as economic units, to the economy. A profit which is as much a bounty of nature as the sun and the soil. Hence the paramount duty of the State is not to meddle with this delicate organism but to succour and support it.

The Nature of the Market

The key to this 'profit of association' is in the market exchanges, where the exchangers seeking only their own benefit, unwittingly construct a social economy based on a natural price system regulated by competition. For price is, as it were, the socialising element among products, being the natural measure of value and, as the distributor of market rewards, the natural means for preserving justice between a multiplicity of producers. Therefore, any attempt to fix prices by human will is a contribution to economic chaos. ***A fixed price in the market is no less dangerous than a fixed thermometer in the hands of a doctor.***

The foundation of a science of economics was laid by Adam Smith in his 'Wealth of Nations', in which he demonstrated that the economy was a natural growth in society. When, for example, he saw that man "by directing his industry in such a manner as its produce may be of the greatest value, he intends only his own gain, and is in this, as in many cases led by an invisible hand to promote an end that was no part of his intention." Unfortunately, modern economists who scoff at any suggestion of natural law guiding the economy and tend to sneer at Smith's 'invisible hand', have relegated him to the rank of a respectable has-been, while they wage interminable and futile disputes on the pros and cons of an economy directed by political planners. However, since the State does not appear as an institution until long after the emergence of the economic organism, it acts against its nature as the body politic when it seeks to promote the good of some, and not of all, as it now does through controlled exchange rates, currency manipulation, tariffs and taxes, and everything destructive of competition which is the natural regulator of rewards to those who supply the market, either as labourers or as the investors of capital. A market ruled by competition as the distributor of resources and regulator of prices is far more efficient than any rule by government which, when acting outside the proper area of government is necessarily inefficient.

Competition, the Beneficent Regulator of Rewards

In common speech, competition is seen only as a contest for some prize, and this has led socialists into seeing it as an evil — a principle of

anarchy in the economic arena. However, in the economic analysis, competition means something vastly different, being a term used to signify a principle which allots prizes to *all* producers in proportion to the importance of their contribution in goods and services. For while it is true that citizens are born with equal rights they are not born with equal talents, and under free conditions some will draw more out of the economy because they have contributed more and not because of any cost to other producers. Competition is the only means whereby society can ensure equitable rewards to those who have earned them. The dream of the Marxists, to establish equity in the distribution of wealth through a political re-distribution, can only end in disaster.

Defective Land Tenure System — Negation of Competition

Unfortunately, although economists give some recognition to the importance of competition, their vision is still flawed, otherwise they would not fail to see how a defective land-tenure system now superimposed on our so-called capitalist system, is a fundamental negation of competition, as well as being the cause of a major social evil, the evil of *land speculation*. Not only is there now competition in the goods market, but also a competition in the labour 'market', arising from the struggle among labourers (producers) for access to land — for the opportunity to engage in production. Which explains why a huge continent like Australia, occupied by a handful of people, has such a large army of unemployed. It is futile to hope for any improvement while society muddles along under a form of 'capitalism' which pays only lip service to free enterprise, that has to struggle against monopoly and other legal privileges that destroy competition. Even as far back in history as Elizabeth and the Stuarts, producers were protesting against the injustice of such legal burdens, and their expropriation from the land under The Enclosures of the nineteenth century was the final great robbery that converted real capitalism into protalitarianism. Until economists discover how real capitalism depends on an understanding of how members of a society can live decently on the work of others through a free market without living at the *expense* of others, society is doomed to wander in the economic wilderness.

The Reality of 'Welfare'

Much of the current muddle in economic thinking arises from the confusion of the common good with 'social welfare' or social security. The latter may be justified but only as a desperate means for the rescue of those suffering needless hardship. For 'welfare' has the radical defect of all pauper legislation of being a robbery of private good by taxation, for the purpose of extending public good to the poor through States doles. Doles are no answer to poverty, nor is the remedy to be found in the costly antics of arbitration courts and other wage-fixing tribunals. The latter are only an

expensive farce while legal violence, through special licenses and other privileges, continues to flourish in the market. The most that society can look forward to is the day when workers will realise how they have been fooled by their leaders into impoverishing themselves through industrial warfare against capitalists, when the real villains plundering the economic cake are not capitalists but land speculators and 'investors' of spurious capital, reaping where they have not sown.

The Evil Consequences of Keynes

In recent times, J. M. Keynes was hailed as a star in the economic firmament when he introduced his doctrine of extending the money supply as an economic panacea, a doctrine which bewitched and misled economists, politicians and bureaucrats alike into advocating and pursuing policies which today are bearing such disastrous fruit. Nothing has contributed more to the evil of world-wide inflation than Keynesianism. As The Economist said in 1974: "It took Ghengis Khan years of rape and pillage to achieve the chaos to which inflation has brought the world's economies by stealth". Keynes was afforded almost reverential respect by the profession for his captivating notion that governments, through financial juggling, could tame wayward economies — even make them jump through hoops — and politicians by manipulating the currency would be armed to manage economic affairs more efficiently than does the free market. Fortunately, this financial sleight of hand which hoaxed the economic world has now been pushed out of favour, if not rejected, everywhere except in 'affluent' Australia, where it is still only a second income from a working wife that enables families to make ends meet. Unfortunately, the world still awaits the economic wisdom which is to undo the damage of Keynesianism, the latest panacea, 'Monetarism' having proved to be little more than an attempt to reform Keynesianism without going to the heart of the real problem.

Economists in Retreat

Having accepted failure to solve any of their real problems, economists now take refuge behind a wall of arid scholasticism where nobody can be proved wrong. Any notion of a formal object, so essential to the formulation of their theories, has been so lost sight of that some years ago Professor Lionel Robins was constrained to write an 'Essay on the Nature and Significance of Economic Science', wherein his fellow economists were told "we all appear to be discussing the same things, but we have not yet agreed what it is that we are talking about". All this confusion and uncertainty could have been avoided if, in the nineteenth century, the search for a precise definition of the term 'wealth' had not been abandoned. As it is, those accredited with the possession of that special knowledge which entitles them to teach students and guide legislators, have thoroughly confused wealth with both 'money' and 'value'.

What is Wealth?

The truth is that wealth, as an economic term, cannot mean other than **products of labour impressed on matter** — material things having the capacity to satisfy human desires. On the other hand, 'value' is only an index of the difficulties or obstacles (natural, or the result of bad government, or of custom) that stand in the way of production. Society naturally aims at an increase in **wealth** and a decrease in 'value'. Because of the growth of science and technology the natural obstacles to production present no problem, but the political obstacles resulting from economic ignorance impose ever increasing burdens on producers that increase 'value'. To make matters worse, the community at large tends to accept such politically created values as, for instance, 'land-value', as a necessary prop to the burden of debt that has present-day society reeling. It is these values that form the basic security for all the money-lending institutions that flourish and fatten as an integral part of modern economies. Despite the misery of industrial depressions, caused by these anti-economic 'values', they are actually a blessing in disguise, in the sense that they are the natural **nemesis** that catches up with the growth of all the spurious elements in the economy, bringing them back to levels at which production can survive until their malignant growth creates yet another depression. For in simple language, a depression is nothing more than a stoppage of production and trade. Industrial depressions are not caused by natural disasters of flood or fire but are due entirely to the reigning confusion among economists of **wealth** with **value** and their failure to recognise that what may be wealth to the individual, may or may not, be wealth to the community.

The Taxi License Racket

For example, the current outlay for a city taxi-plate in N.S.W. is roughly \$60,000. Of this amount less than \$15,000, the cost of the motor vehicle, is an investment in production. The balance of \$45,000 is invested in nothing more than a piece of paper (license) on which is printed an edict granting some citizens the exclusive right to operate a taxi service. The cab — an item of wealth — gets its value from the labour required to produce it, whereas the value of the license is not from any cost of production but from the legal obstruction that prevents competition from other members of society who desire to render the same service. Yet, in today's bewildering economic analysis, no distinction is made between the real capital invested in the vehicle and the spurious capital 'invested' in the license. The investor is rightly entitled to a market return on the taxi as his property is being consumed by other members of society. The spurious capital invested in the license is not entitled to any market return as it makes no contribution to the market, being merely a parasitical element in the economy, and the unearned income it commands gives

rise to its anti-social 'capitalised value', a value on which most of the great fortunes of the world are founded. An earned income cannot be capitalised into a selling price.

The harsh reality is that the market is riddled with such opportunities to command legal tribute at the expense of the returns due to labour and capital, who must continue to suffer until society becomes educated to the distinction between real and spurious capital. The failure to make this distinction is the reason for all the woolly talk by socialists and others who regard capital as a social evil and economic interest the great robbery. Of course, the term interest is yet another fruitful source of economic confusion when a distinction is not made between a charge for money loaned, and what is received from the market when such money is invested as capital in the form of machinery, for example, that aids production. What is paid for money borrowed is only a price for money and may best be described as commercial rather than economic interest. It is not an economic factor (agent) in production.

The Truth About Capital

Capital is the great economic good in society, and capitalists, provided they are not also monopolists through some politically created economic privilege, are to be seen as the true socialists in society. None the less, while capital rightly fills a prime role in production, the real agent in production is labour, despite the fact that it is now degraded by many economic scribblers to a 'cost of production' or the 'work force'. ***The wages of labour are not an economic cost but an economic reward!*** It is in order to classify them as a cost in accountancy but fatal to do so in economic theory.

The mounting uncertainty so obvious among economists in their definitions and concepts moved Professor Lindley Fraser to write his 'Economic Thought and Language'. Its purpose, as he explained in the preface, was "to assist students of economics to think clearly and logically about the fundamentals of their science, by exposing some of the main sources of error and confusion with which it is surrounded". However, the incredible extent of the lack of agreement and precision prevailing among the teachers of economics that Fraser unearthed, made it more likely that students, however brilliant, would be driven to a state of despair by his revelations. The term which caused the good Professor the most bother was 'capital'. This particular chapter required no less than eighty-four pages to cover the various senses in which the term was used as an economic tool. Little wonder the author felt obliged to say in the preface, "the chapter on capital got completely out of hand and I can only apologise for its monstrous length".

The Labour Versus Capital Syndrome

In reality, there cannot be any conflict between labour and capital as each produces its own reward. The real war, as we have seen, is between capital and spurious capital, or capitalised usury, arising from legal privileges that generate a scramble for unearned incomes. Unfortunately, labour is the factor that suffers most from this war in which the economy, instead of being the natural social means of subduing the earth in pursuit of wealth, becomes perverted into a means for exerting power over the subduers.

If the nineteenth century economists had not abandoned their attempts to define the term wealth, after it was found that their efforts to eliminate certain inconsistencies in Adam Smith's definition had ended up in even greater confusion, the existing distortions in the economy could have been avoided. Evidence of their dilemma is apparent in the comment made by Professor Perry (1866) when he expressed agreement with the notion that the term wealth should be dropped from political economy so that "the science could be freed from this troublesome term, so that its movements might become free". So the science was 'freed' and has remained 'free' but only in the sense that a boat is free when it loses its rudder.

For wealth is the very subject noun of economics and it must be so defined if sanity is to be injected into economic thought. Then, and only then, will economists come to see that economics is a nature study and not a study of natural laws as amended by parliaments; that the world of the economist has for its originating elements, human effort (labour) and natural resources (land); that it is from the application of labour to land that proceed all those things (wealth) which are the object of labour. Once it is seen that the production of wealth includes all the changes wrought in matter (land) so as better to fit it for the satisfaction of human desires, and nothing more, it becomes clear that the first and indispensable condition in the production of wealth is **access to the earth**.

Money Is Not Wealth

Another common source of confusion and the barrier to sound economic thinking, is the heresy of seeing money as wealth. Money, as everybody knows is simply a medium or economic device for facilitating the exchange of wealth, and as a medium it cannot become a terminus. While money buys everything it pays for nothing, and therefore, cannot be an element in economic demand. The only real demand is supply.

Land Value — A Social Disease

'Land-value' which arises from the stupidity of treating land as a commodity and 'land-value' as the value of land is the most destructive force in the economy. Actually 'land-value' is no more the value of land than moonshine is the light of the moon. It is not the value of a material substance called land but a derived value arising from the legal

obligation imposed on land users to surrender the economic rent to landLORDS as private revenue, when it should instead be directed towards the cost of government as the natural revenue, replacing the stupidity of taxes on production. ***The private appropriation of economic rent is the fertile germ of all the economic contradictions that now strangle the economy and debase society***, because it breeds the evil of land speculation.

Rent, the Social Bounty

Ownership of land as a secure field of employment is a natural desire of individuals, but in the distorted economic order created by the misappropriation of the economic rent, this natural desire has become perverted into a craze for 'land-value' — the desire to profit from allowing others to use land. Not only do individuals have a natural desire to own land, they have a natural **right** to do so, a right that is prior to the beginning of social co-production and a market economy. But this primary right of the individual to land has to be reconciled with the equal rights of all, once production for an impersonal market becomes the accepted social mode of getting a living. How then can society establish appropriate limits in individual rights to land, and at the same time establish the equity of the whole population, including Aborigines, in right to land? The answer is not difficult to see when the term Rent, is used in its economic sense as an indicator of the excess income that is derived from the market by land users occupying superior sites, and not confused with commercial rent or hire charge of a house or a T.V. For Rent is not paid by anybody. It is a social bounty **received** from the market over and above the return in wages and interest for the labour expended and the capital invested. In other words Rent does not arise from anything the individual contributes to the market, but solely from the difference in the communal advantages that attach to the superior sites and such advantages available to producers on marginal sites. If and when, the Rent is assessed and taken from producers it becomes a natural equivalent that offsets the inequalities among producers because of the productive differences in their respective sites. Unfortunately, in its stupidity, society allows the Rent to be appropriated by landLORDS (who may or may not, also be the land users) instead of it being returned to the community that created it, as a natural revenue to meet the cost of its government. To harvest the Rent as public revenue would not, of course, deprive landLORDS of any return that may be due to them for any buildings or other improvements provided on their sites. It would only deprive them of the privilege of appropriating wealth for which they have no moral claim. Appropriation of the Rent by the State would not only establish equality among landusers and provide a natural revenue for governments but would also eliminate the evil of land speculation, as no land owner could afford to hold more land than he could profitably use, in the expectation of speculative gains in the future.

Other benefits that would flow from this natural land and revenue system are:

- (a) The elimination of anti-social taxes on private earnings which amount to the public appropriation of personal and family income, and a violation of the right of property and an impediment to economic incentive.
- (b) The elimination of the morbid speculative demand for land created over and above the normal industrial demand, an anti-productive demand generated by the competition of 'investors' engaged in a miserable scramble to secure the Rent, a struggle resulting in a chronic devitalisation of the economy.

Welfare and the Feudal System

Free enterprise cannot thrive where enterprisers are compelled to redeem the earth from more 'enterprising' *non-enterprisers* who get in ahead of them in anticipation of reaping unearned incomes — incomes which form the main component of all huge accumulations of wealth.

In Feudal times, before the advent of the modern State, Rent was recognised as the natural communal revenue. Under the Feudal system, which, in this respect, was more of a true exchange system than the so-called capitalism under which modern society struggles to maintain a dignified survival, government was largely local government. Those who were privileged to appropriate the Rent rendered a range of public services, including education, care of the sick, pension for the aged, marriage endowments, and many more. But in these democratically 'enlightened' times all this is seen as mediaeval nonsense, such obligations now being financed by a multiplicity of taxes — arbitrary levies on the earnings of labour and capital and a legal robbery of personal incomes. Tax gatherers are not bound by any principles of equity in their demands, the only 'principle' seeming to be 'grab where you can get the most with the least public outcry'. In their desperation for revenue to finance their socialistic schemes, they even resort to a tax on sales — a tax on exchanges which are the very life-giving element in a social economy.

Inevitably this random plunder of private property has generated the current battle of wits, a modern form of class war, between tax-grabber and tax-victim, as well as fathering all those monopolies and trusts that are the enemy of human association. Not only is taxation of private incomes a plunder of wages and interest but an evil that is aggravated by the cost of an ever-increasing army of inquisitors, assessors and arbitrators to assist firstly in collecting the taxes and then as a consequence, to decree the extent of public charity or 'social welfare' required to rescue those who have been impoverished by this monstrosity, the Welfare State.

Responsibility of Economists

It is incredible that economists can continue in the delusion that investments in 'land-value' are investments of capital. And even more incredible that

producers can remain blind to the huge share of the economic cake being syphoned off through such 'investments', while labour and capital remain locked in never-ending industrial strife over what is left. In an age when so much is being spent on education, it is no less hard to believe that those who preach liberalism and free enterprise are unable to see the absurdity of treating the earth as a **commodity** and its Rent as a return on capital. All of which makes it understandable that economists now find themselves forced to adapt their theories to the economic disorder created by the anti-economic mischief of blundering politicians and their planning wizards. Having lost their way in this crazy economic maze, some members of the profession have now turned to econometrics — a more glamorous branch of their discipline and since it consists of models made up of anything from a handful to hundreds of algebraic equations, a version that is even more mathematic than economic than the orthodox version. This computerised version is aimed, not at getting a better understanding of what the economy actually is, but to test the theories formulated by their economic brethren, ignoring the fact that such theories are no help to society since they are based on the distorted behaviour of present-day economies, suffering from the heavy handed meddling of bureaucrats. After an exciting start, the glamour has been dimmed by the wide divergence of their findings. However, two of these 'juju' boys (a label conferred on them by Ross Gittins, economics editor of the *Sydney Morning Herald*) have achieved some fame by demonstrating in a recent book that the Monetarist theories of Milton Friedman, a winner of the Nobel Prize for economics, and economic adviser to world leaders, are "bunk". The sad reality is that all current economic theories are mostly bunk! Which means that the flood of politico economic content in the media is mostly meaningless.

Because of intellectual pride it is not easy for economists to admit that the intellectual lumber they have acquired during the last century is not only open to question, but is actually 'bunk'. Even so, they should have gained something from the message which Keynes (who, incidentally never gained a degree in economics) imparted in his 'Introduction to the Cambridge Handbooks' wherein he said "There was as yet no complete agreement on principles, that traditional solutions were being questioned and that controversy and doubt had been increased". He went on to apologise to readers for lack of certainty and lucidity, and concluded with the remark that "economic theory is a method rather than a discipline".

Under these conditions the search for social justice from which so many deeply concerned citizens now take comfort, is an exercise in futility as social justice depends on economic justice and economic justice is thwarted by economic ignorance. Social justice therefore, can only become a possibility when society ceases giving credence to politico-economic nostrums that are the cause of poverty and social distress, and recognises the fact that the economy is not a mere political institution planned by a bureaucracy, but a beneficent natural order.

E. B. DONOHUE