

4291

IS ECONOMICS  
A SCIENCE?

Must We Always Guess?  
Or May We Know—and  
Know that We Know the  
Answer to the Problem

Of Commercialized Vice?  
Of International Peace?  
Of Labor and Capital?  
Of Crooked Politics?  
Of Racial Prejudice?

Does Mother Nature (God, if  
you prefer?) know as much  
about economics as about the  
shop sciences?

Copyright 1939 by  
L. D. BECKWITH

SAMPLE PAGES: Secs. 1 to 30 only

INDEX

	Sec.
Chaos vs. Order	30
Definitions of terms	13
ECONOMICS: The science dealing with the distribution of our product to those who produce it.	
Economic Planning Illogical	14
Economic Compulsion	10
Exceptions in Nature?	20
False economics, how come	8
Human Factor and Its Part	11
Individual vs. Society	27
Law of the Jungle	19
Moral Law Department	25
Natural Law Department	29
Relief, a Fallacy	5
Rights, Natural	22
Rights, Individual	21
Social Security, Guaranteed	23

"These first 30 sections are scientific, beautifully and clearly written. . . . forceful, direct. . . . the greatest thing of its kind ever written and, so far as I know, the first text-book on economics. . . . there is no 'ism' in it."  
—R. J. OTTO, University of Oregon.

### FROM KNOWN TO UNKNOWN (1)

Sometimes, because we are shamefully slow to make use of what we already know, we make painfully slow progress in gaining the knowledge we covet.

This, rather than the alleged intricacies of the subject, explains the fact that, in an age of almost miraculous progress in the sciences of production, we have failed miserably in the distribution of the wealth that we produce.

### PRODUCTION and DIVIDENDS (2)

There is scandalous injustice in the way our product is apportioned to those who produce it.

We produce wealth today more abundantly, more rapidly, and more easily than ever before; yet although it is true that the producers get more than ever before, they get a smaller share of what they produce.

This, of course, means that others are profiting more at their expense.

We have solved the problem of production, but appear not to understand the first principles of the matter of declaring a proper dividend.

### IGNORANCE NO DEFENSE (3)

Ignorance, however, is no defense when one is dealing with Nature. In her court one cannot plead extenuating circumstances.

But great as is the financial injustice of denying men their share of our product, the social evils that flow from this are infinitely worse.

These are infinitely worse because they affect an infinitely larger number of people, and because so many of these people are innocent victims.

### CUMULATIVE PENALTIES (4)

Because of this faulty distribution of our product, the total buying power of the producers is not sufficient to enable them to buy their total output.

A portion of the product remains unsold, business slows down and men are laid off who are not only physically fit, skilled and trained, but are anxious to work.

This reduces still more the buying power of the producers and slows up business still more and throws more men out of work.

Many who are accepted as authorities in this field have given up hope of getting these men back to work.

The belief gains ground that from now on we shall be confronted with the problem of providing relief permanently to several million men who are idle against their will.

But economics is not accepted as a science; hence this problem is not attacked as a problem in science.

Our moralists and economic planners look only for palliatives.

Among the suggestions offered is the suggestion that the government provide work for the unemployed.

### THE FALLACY OF RELIEF (5)

cost less than a dollar.

Some one must supply that dollar.

As those on relief lack the means to pay this bill, that cost must fall upon those who still have means.

The danger that this will, in time, impoverish the rest of us is realized, even by the moralists and the economic planners.

For this reason, they have devised what they call "work relief," in the belief that this enables those who are on relief to earn what they get.

But even if those on relief do earn what they get, injustice is done unless the wealth produced in this way goes—all of it—to those who furnish the labor and the capital.

That is, unless all the wealth that is produced by relief projects is distributed pro rata, so that every one who has contributed in any way, by taxes, or otherwise, shall get his just share.

This "otherwise" is important, because the cost of this relief is not limited to the amounts paid to official tax-collectors.

Among the indirect and unofficial exactions we suffer is the sacrifice made by both employees and employers where the work week is shortened to "spread employment."

This is one of the many ways in which victims of our folly who still have something left are taxed to finance those who are more completely impoverished.

### NATURE'S DECREE IS FINAL (6)

All men agree that in matters controlled by Nature the only thing men can do is to study the laws of Nature and learn how to take advantage of them.

And it is agreed that, in scientific fields, any mishaps we suffer are penalties for failure to do this; for Nature, herself, makes no mistakes.

This is why men turned to the serious study of the laws of physics, of chemistry, of botany, physiology, and the other recognized sciences.

If men had studied economics as they have studied those subjects, our economic problems would have been solved long ago. (See No. 4)

### IS ECONOMICS A SCIENCE? (7)

In the sciences, men know; or, if

they do not know, they can find out.

And they can know that they know.

But, according to the accepted authorities in this field, economics is "different."

They hold that, unlike physics and chemistry and the other recognized sciences, economics has no fixed and dependable laws of cause and effect.

Says Alexander Gray in his book, *The Development of Economic Doctrine*:

"Economic science, therefore, if it be a science, differs from other sciences in this: That there is no inevitable advance from less to greater certainty; there is no ruthless tracking down of truth which, once uncovered, shall be truth to all times to the complete confusion of any contrary doctrine . . ."

#### HOW THEY WERE MISLED (8)

Such matters as the ebb and flow of the tides, the changes of the seasons, etc., with which men are in no way associated, are easily accepted as the work of Nature. (See No. 6)

It has been easy for men to believe that economic conditions are humanly controlled and that they are selfishly planned.

One reason that this is so commonly believed is that men are so closely associated with their wages, interest, and rent—the three basic factors of all business equations.

Always, some one offers the wages, and some one pays them; and always someone demands interest, and some one collects it; and some one fixes the rent that must be paid, and some one collects that.

Another reason is that attempts to change our economic set-up are always opposed, and always opposed by the privileged class.

This has been accepted as proof that our economic ills are the result of selfish planning.

#### A MERE ASSUMPTION (9)

Instead of studying economics as a science must be studied, men have merely assumed that economic problems are problems in human conduct.

Not knowing that Nature had set up in this field, also, a protective mechanism upon which we may rely for protection against the mismanagement of men; it has been assumed by moralists and economic planners that we must provide our own protection. (See No. 6)

They admit that, as individuals they cannot control these conditions; but they believe that by co-operative effort of a majority of those interested this can be accomplished.

These men hold that, the way to get this co-operation is to appeal—

1. To the conscience of men.
2. To the police.

Accordingly reformers in and out of our pulpits deluge us with pleas addressed to what they call our civic conscience; and plead with us to cultivate an attitude which is described as social-mindedness.

For the same reason our statute books bulge with statutes that attempt to regulate details of public life and many details of private life.

By what logic do the moralists and planners reach this conclusion that every realm in nature, but one, is orderly; and that that one is left to chaos—except as man may be able to organize it.

If Nature has not reserved to herself the control of the realm of economics, but has left this realm to the management of men, then we have here an astonishing departure from her general rule.

#### A TWO-FOLD MISTAKE (10)

These men know that our economic life is made up of our innumerable agreements and transactions.

Because these bargains were made by men free to refuse to make them, they assume that economic conditions are man-made.

But in this these men are as illogical as they would be if they assumed that, because men are responsible for a chemical mix, they are also responsible for the chemical affinities that operate in that mix.

And they have erred, too, in not noting that the details of these so-called free bargains are often fixed by dire necessity.

The fact that such compulsion exists proves that these details are not the result of selfishness in the persons immediately involved.

To the extent that such compulsion exists, it becomes clear that the situation would be in nowise changed if each of the parties to these transactions were unselfish and eager to do as he would be done by. (See 8,9)

#### THE HUMAN FACTOR (11)

A favorite practice of those who deny that economics is a science as exact as our shop sciences is to argue that it deals with the acts of men, whereas the sciences deal with the acts of Nature. (See No. 8)

The processes of Nature, they say are reducible to rule; hence it is possible to have sciences in those fields which are governed by natural law.

But men, they say, are free moral

agents—free to depart from any rule made for them; hence human conduct cannot be reduced to rule and economic conditions cannot be governed by natural law.

The charge that human conduct is unpredictable is admitted.

The human factor is always an unknown.

It is impossible to plan dependably where we are dependent upon men.

But that is not the point at issue.

The issue here is whether or not there are in nature dependable laws of cause and effect by which economic conditions are governed, as is the weather, independently of the conduct and the control of men.

This question cannot be settled by a mere assumption.

It calls, instead, for exactly the same scientific attitude and scientific application that is called for by questions in physics, chemistry, or in any of the recognized sciences. (6)

#### **THAT PROVES TOO MUCH! (12)**

The argument (if it be dignified as argument), that because human conduct is unpredictable economics is not a science proves too much. (11)

According to that "logic," neither physics nor chemistry is a science.

For, so far as the human factor is concerned, there is no difference between economics and chemistry, nor between economics and physics.

In any science, men are free to approach a problem with any motive and to seek, ignorantly or selfishly or understandingly, to carry out any purpose. (See No. 11)

And they may follow through with this attempt studiously and persistently, or half-heartedly and "steady by jerks," or they may give up and quit. (See No. 11)

To this extent, and to this extent only, the human factor does appear in all problems, in all sciences.

But whether or not this unknown factor is present, the natural laws of cause and effect are in no way affected by it. (See Nos. 6 and 11)

The unpredictable character of human conduct has no more effect on the laws of economics than our inability to predict the next play of a baseball pitcher has on the law of gravity that controls a baseball.

Questions of civic, political, industrial and state policy are in no way affected by the uncertainties of human conduct.

What is unknown and unpredictable is not Nature's reaction, but the attitude which men may take with respect to this problem. (See 6, 11)

Let human conduct be what it

may, it is still possible to know exactly what Nature will do in any given situation. (See Nos. 6 and 11)

#### **VICTIMS OF AN ASSUMPTION (13)**

Because it is held that economic conditions are controlled by human conduct and that human conduct is, in its turn affected by the moral attitude of men, it has been held that economic issues are moral issues. (8)

This theory disproves itself.

For bad economic conditions, like bad weather, always affect both the just and the unjust.

Hence, if economic issues are moral issues and our economic ills are the result of selfishness, innocent people are punished for the selfishness of others.

This is a violation of moral law.

If these moralists are correct, then babes in arms are punished by privation for the selfishness of men who are strangers even to their parents.

How can men who, on the basis of a mere assumption have refused to investigate the possibility that Nature has a better plan, believe that they are advancing the cause of morality, or that they themselves are moral, in teaching such a philosophy as this?

This theory of the cause and cure of economic ills is not very complimentary to the Creator for whom some of these advocates of this theory of selfishness profess a reverence.

#### **THEIR THEORY ILLOGICAL (14)**

It is impossible to explain all the facts of this case on the theory that our economic ills are the result of selfish misconduct. (See 10 and 13)

It is certainly inconsistent to imagine that the moral law would deny some men their wages because other men are selfish. (See 2, 3 8, 10, 13)

Yet because they see employers reducing wages (say) from \$1.25 to \$1.00 an hour, these moralists and planners imagine that the wage level is low because employers are selfish.

More scholarly men would seek to discover why the fluctuation in the labor market is between \$1.25 and \$1.00 instead of between \$2.00 and \$1.50. (See Nos. 3, 6, 12)

Until that question is answered, it is illogical to hold that the level of wages is humanly controlled. (8, 10)

As employers and employees are so far as we know equally selfish, it is clear that low wages cannot be the result of selfishness. (See No. 10)

#### **POVERTY AMIDST PLENTY (15)**

The theory of the moralist breaks down whenever it is put to the test.

How, for example, can this theory be reconciled with the fact that poverty and misery deepen in the alley as culture blooms on the avenue?

This human-factor theory is not sufficient to explain why it is that a few have more than they need; that the rest of us have comparatively little; that great numbers are in want; that some sicken from lack of the necessities of life; that some actually perish of hunger while food wastes for lack of buyers. (4, 10, 14)

The under-privileged are certainly as selfish, on the average, as the Favored Few. (See Nos. 8 and 14)

The under-privileged out-number the Favored Few; and in countries like ours that have universal suffrage, they cast more votes. (See 14)

There must be a reason why, in spite of the selfishness of the wage-earning majority, the wage level always tends to fall. (See 2, 10, 14)

These moralists cannot consistently argue that the Few have more influence than the Many and that this is the reason they fare better.

This would destroy their argument that our economic ills result from selfishness, and would shift the discussion to the question:

Why have the selfish Few more influence than the selfish Masses?

#### **MAN MAKES A BAD GUESS (16)**

Imperfect wealth distribution is an economic condition. (See No. 2)

If, like the tides and the weather, economic conditions are controlled by natural laws, there must be among these laws one that governs the distribution of wealth. (See Nos. 3, 6)

If there be such a law, the imperfect distribution of wealth of which we complain, is a penalty incurred by a violation of that law. (See 6, 13)

If that be the situation, these men made a bad guess in assuming that this problem of the distribution of our product is a problem, not in natural law, but in morals. (9, 11, 13)

#### **LAW, NATURAL AND MORAL (17)**

The key to this problem lies in the dual character of man's universe.

In other fields, our mentors have carefully distinguished between our problems and our attitude toward those problems. (See Nos. 6, 12, 13)

But in this matter both the Academy and the Church, as well as the State and the Market, have habitually overlooked this distinction.

There is the Department of Natural Law, having jurisdiction over our problems; and the Department of the Moral Law, having jurisdiction over our attitude toward these problems.

#### **THE TWO LAWS DEFINED (18)**

**NATURAL LAW.** Man's statement of the manner in which, after careful observation and study, Nature is found to act.

**MORAL LAW.** The requirement fixed by Conscience as the guide for the conduct of the individual, whether with respect to his personal habits or with respect to dealings with others, be they men or beasts.

#### **THE "LAW OF THE JUNGLE" (19)**

We hear much of the "law of the jungle," sometimes called the "law of fang and claw."

The moralists' theory is that, as the strong in the jungle prey upon the weak, so selfish men who are able to do so prey upon weaker men.

That, say the moralists, is the natural result of our animal nature.

They take it for granted that this is natural and should be expected.

They have made no investigation; they merely assume that Nature has made no provision for the protection of the weak from the selfishness of stronger men. (See Nos. 6, 8, 9, 10)

This, they think, is man's task.

These men assume that this is to be done by appealing either to the conscience of men, or to the police

In this these men are most inconsistent. (See No. 14)

They complain that bad economic conditions have a demoralizing effect upon our morals, and yet they teach that we are dependent upon our morality for the control of economic conditions! (See Nos. 10 and 13)

Just how a people, demoralized by bad economic conditions can develop the morality needed to correct the conditions that demoralize them has not been explained by any of these moralists or economic planners. (3)

#### **EXCEPTIONS IN NATURE? (20)**

While it is true that individuals may mistreat other individuals, it is a fact of Nature, discernible in every realm yet investigated, that the processes of Nature are protected inviolably against the misconduct and the incompetence of men. (See No. 6)

In all the productive sciences mankind is protected by the laws of Nature against the possibility that men might interfere with any of the natural processes upon which the welfare of mankind depends. (See 13)

This is at the same time a protection also against the uncertainty that would prevail in our affairs if the

productive processes depended in any way upon the alertness or the ability or the faithfulness of men. (11, 12)

Regardless of their attitude, men are obliged to abstain from interference with these processes. (See No. 6)

They have no choice in the matter, for there is nothing that they can do either to help or to hinder. (See 6)

Men may, of course, by reason of ignorance or incompetence make a mess of their own attempts to use Nature's processes; and they may, by their carelessness of malice, balk the efforts of others to use these processes. (See 3, 6, 9, 11)

But they cannot meddle in any way with any of these processes and impair their dependability.

Nor can they monopolize a natural process; for, no matter how many others may be using a process at the moment, any number of others may do the same. It will serve them all.

However, it is clear that, if this protection is not extended to include, also, the distribution of the product of these processes, the protection of these processes is nullified.

It is customary for those who are religiously inclined to accept this systematic protection of the public's interest in these productive processes as proof of Divine solicitude for the welfare of mankind.

But what possible purpose could there be in protecting the processes of production, if man is not to be protected, also, in the possession of his product?

It is of course idle to discuss the purpose of Nature, or of the Deity.

All we know about this is that the productive processes are all protected against interference by men.

Upon the basis of a mere assumption, men who profess to believe in an omniscient, omnipotent, and loving Deity, refuse to give that Deity credit for knowing as much about economics as about other subjects.

By what possible stretch of the imagination do these men believe that natural forces are placed at the service of men for production services only—and that men are expected to fight for their product, and to keep it (if they can), by more fighting?

These men show little respect for Nature and no reverence for Deity when, without an investigation, they assume as they do that although we are aided in this way in the production of wealth we must battle with instinct itself to get even a part of what we produce and to keep even that much.

And in this same way they refuse

to give God (or Nature, if you prefer?) credit for having the ability (or willingness) to provide as well for our babies as for baby monkeys.

Monkeys never go hungry as men are doing because food wastes for the lack of a market.

If these men are correct, Nature (or God, if you prefer?) is a blundering incompetent, or inexpressibly malicious.

## **RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL (21)**

The fact that many wild animals devour other animals, that man eats the flesh of so many creatures, and that man himself is sometimes devoured by wild animals has been advanced as proof that there is in nature no justification for a belief in natural rights. (See No. 19)

Those who take this view deny the validity of the rights of man that are set forth in our great charters.

According to these men the Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights section (first ten amendments) of the United States Constitution are purely rhetorical—having no foundation in nature.

The relentless and cruel nature of the "law of the jungle" is admitted.

But that does not justify the conclusions that these men draw from this "jungle law." (See 11 and 19)

The mistake these people make is in not distinguishing between individual rights and natural rights. (17)

The rights that are violated when the lion devours a lamb are not the lamb's natural rights.

They are, instead, the individual rights of the individual lamb.

Individual rights have their origin in one's individuality—that is, in the characteristics which distinguish an individual from his class.

Individual rights are contingent—and limited.

A man's individual rights extend only so far in each direction as they can be extended without conflicting with the equal rights of other individuals.

And the individual rights of human beings can be forfeited by violation of obligations due society.

## **OUR NATURAL RIGHTS (22)**

Natural rights have their origin in characteristics that are the very opposite of individuality. (See No. 21)

Natural rights are derived from natural law. (See Nos. 6 and 13)

They are universal, not individual.

The natural rights of men and of beasts are neither contingent nor are they limited; and they never conflict.

And they are non-forfeitable.

### **NATURE IS IMPARTIAL (23)**

Consider, for example, the natural rights derived from the laws of physiology that govern the digestion of food. (See Nos. 18 and 22)

Nature's laws of physiology serve with equal faithfulness the beast of the jungle and the man of culture and piety. (See No. 6)

Not only is the food digested for each of them and transformed into lymph, but this lymph is distributed in just the right proportions to every organ and fibre of their bodies.

This digestive and distributive service is due as a natural right to each creature. (See Nos. 21 and 22)

### **NAT. RIGHTS GUARANTEED (24)**

We do not need to watch over any of the processes of Nature to make sure that we are served. (See No. 20)

We do not need to give them any thought; they work while we sleep.

Nor need we fear that any one will meddle with them while our attention is diverted. (See Nos. 19, 20, 23)

"Consider . . . that the advantages thus provided are available to all, at all times, everywhere, and under all conditions—and that there is not a thing that man or beast can do that will in the slightest degree interfere with the rights that others have under any one of these laws. . . . These are our natural rights. And when the rights of the lion and the lamb are viewed in the light of this understanding, it is seen that they are both assured by Nature of all of their natural rights—and that at all times, in all places, under all conditions. . . . (See No. 20)

"Those are our natural rights—we have no authority in logic, nor in nature, nor in Scripture, to say that we have a natural right to eat or not to be eaten, to live in luxury, or even to live at all. These are not natural rights. Many a man has died of starvation; and many a man has been devoured by wild beasts, or by cannibals. And many have lived in poverty and in pain. None of these things are violations of man's natural rights. They are violations of personal, or individual rights."—*Science vs. Politics*. Broadcast No. 12, by L. D. Beckwith, 1936. (See 20, 21, 22, 23, 24)

We have our natural rights, not because we are what we are or do as we do, but because Nature is what she is, and functions as she does.

### **THE DEPT. OF MORAL LAW (25)**

The universe of the human soul is

governed by the Department of Moral Law. (See Nos. 17 and 18)

The moral law has to do with justice, equity, and what we call fair play. (See No. 13)

The rules of this Court are not so pitilessly rigid as those of the Court of Natural Law. (See Nos. 6 and 20)

In the Court of Morality one may plead good intentions, lack of understanding, lack of education, lack of experience, or other extenuating circumstances.

### **SOCIETY vs. THE INDIVIDUAL (26)**

Moralists and economic planners are unable to think of society except in terms of the individual. (See 21)

They think of society as an aggregation of individuals; and think that social problems are merely extensions of individual problems.

And they think that, as morality is the key to personal character, so morality is the key to social justice.

They think that community cooperation, racial harmony, and international peace are all matters, not of economics, but of morality. (13)

Moralists admit that knowledge of mechanics plus mechanical skill will make a mechanic, even if morality is lacking—that is, the natural laws of mechanics operate independently of our morality. (See Nos. 17 and 18)

But they insist that economic conditions are good or bad as our conduct is selfish or unselfish. (10, 11)

They hold that, in solving problems of society, the most vital need is to curb selfishness; and that this is a problem in morality. (See 11, 13)

### **RELIGION AND MORALITY 27**

Many think that religion is the key to morality. (See Nos. 17, 18, 20)

But, whether religiously inclined, or only moral, these men reject the idea that there are in nature any dependable laws of economics to which we can turn for the solution of problems of civics, of statecraft, and of industrial organization.

To the credit of the moralists, it is admitted by them that it will take a long time to correct bad economic conditions by improving the morals of mankind. (See Nos. 9 and 19)

Whether a few more hundreds of years, or a few thousands, or several millions of years, they do not say.

Nor do they explain very satisfactorily what, if anything, it is to be done to compensate those who (according to this theory of moralism), suffer the wreck of their lives because of this delay in the correction of unjust economic conditions. (9, 11, 13, 20)

### NOT REALLY IRREVERENT (28)

Moralists admit that if we owe the regularity of the tides and of the seasons to the dependability of natural law. (See Nos. 6, 13, and 20)

Those of them that are religious "give God the glory" in acknowledgment of His loving kindness in providing in these ways for their comfort and security. (See No. 20)

But they do not believe He has provided in that way for their social security and their economic comfort.

Indeed, according to them, the situation is even worse than that. (26)

For, believe it or not, they assume not only that man must get along in matters economic without the help of Nature (or God, if you prefer?), but they assume that in these matters Nature (or God?) opposes man at every step. (See Nos. 6, 13, 20, 26)

They are not really as irreverent as this appears—they are not so irreverent as they are lacking in scholarship. (See Nos. 6 and 14)

### DEPT. OF NATURAL LAW (29)

The Department of Natural Law governs the universe outside the soul of man. (See No. 18)

Man's physical body lies within the jurisdiction of natural law; for regardless of our belief regarding the soul of man, we know that man's body is governed, as all animal bodies are, by the natural laws of physiology; and that it is subject to other natural laws, such as the laws of physics, chemistry, etc. (See 22, 23)

Over these laws, whether of physiology, physics, chemistry, or of other sciences, men have not the least control.

Neither as individuals, nor by our mobilized man-power, can we control any of Nature's processes.

Governments are as powerless in this matter as individuals. (See 9)

A League of Nations is as powerless to over-ride a decree of Nature, or even to evade it, as is a minor official of the smallest village. (9)

Because natural laws are always dependable; men can by resort to them solve problems arising in the fields to which these laws apply. (6)

If economics is also a science as exact as any science, with dependable laws of its own, then men can by resort to the laws of economics, solve their problems in civic, political, and industrial policy, as they solve problems of the shop, farm, and kitchen by resort to other sciences (See 6.)

If, on the other hand, economic problems are moral problems and solutions depend upon the conduct of

men, our economic fate is still left to chance—and to economic chaos.

For then economic stability would depend upon the slight chance that the solution be known, that this information could be imparted to the people, that they would understand it and approve the plan and want to adopt it, and that they would be able to do the right thing in the right way—and to do all this in time to save themselves.

Economic stability is possible only, if, when, and to the extent that economic conditions are dependably controlled. (See Nos. 11 and 29)

Human conduct is undependable.

Hence economic stability is impossible, if it depends upon the uncertain conduct of men. (See No. 11)

If society is ever stabilized, it will be stabilized by some agency independent of the uncertain human factor and by an agency that is in itself thoroughly dependable.

Natural law is such an agency.

### CHAOS or ORDER, WHICH? (30)

One of two things must be true:

Either there are, or there are not, dependable laws of economics.

If no such laws exist, the relations of economic cause and effect are not fixed and dependable.

If in economics there are no fixed and dependable laws of cause and effect, then no man knows, or can ever know, the solution of our economic problem, and we are doomed to economic chaos.

If economic conditions are governed by dependable natural laws, economic maladjustments are the result of the violation of those laws.

If that is the case, the correction of these conditions is a problem in natural law, not in morals; and it can be solved with the same certainty that a mechanic corrects a faulty adjustment in his shop machinery.

And this can be done whenever we understand Nature's laws. (See 6)

If that is the case, we could obtain social security by resort to the natural laws of economics just as we stabilize a motor by resort to the natural laws of physics. (6, 20, 23)

That, if true, means that we can have good economic conditions just as we have good automobiles, without waiting for men to reform or to be reformed.

The teachings set forth here have been described by ex-Mayor Wheeler of Stockton as "everything or nothing!"

For your sake and your children's sake, you should find out which it is.



## FOR FREE DISTRIBUTION

For years I have taught in my papers, in the columns of other papers, on the platform, on the air, in formal debates, by daily conversation, and by letter to correspondents on four continents, that we can have wholesome civic conditions, honest politics, democratic government, social justice, racial harmony, and international peace, just as we have good automobiles, good airplanes, and good radios—without waiting for men to reform or be reformed.

For years I have submitted to the questions of friends and critics, catch as catch can—any question, by any one, any time, any place.

The book, the first sixteen pages of which are in your hand, is the result of this experience. Can you find weak link in the argument?

This pamphlet carries the reader only to Section 30; but a study of these thirty sections will enable the reader to decide whether this is, as I maintain, the most momentous issue that men have ever debated.

The book is being pushed to completion and will be published in book form as soon as my finances permit.

If the teachings of this book stand up under the criticism that will be directed against them and they are accepted, the greatest revolution in thought the world has ever known will result; for that will mean that men will have to change completely their present approach to problems involving their policies in civics, politics, industry and statecraft, and in pedagogy and in character-building.

Dear Mr. Beckwith:

"I have just finished going over your last proof of 'Is Economics A Science?' carefully and must tell you that I like it immensely. It is scientific and does not deviate from its purpose. It is beautifully and clearly written. It is forceful and direct. It is kindly. It is the greatest thing of its kind ever written and, so far as I know, the first text-book on economics. . . . Finally, your book is exactly the kind of volume I would like to hand to friends, college professors, to economists, editors, business men, and politicians; for there is no 'ism' in it. Congratulations.—R. J. OTTO, Univ. of Oregon. (March 23, 1939.)

L. D. BECKWITH

1325 East Poplar  
STOCKTON,

Ph. 2-0526  
CALIFORNIA