

Five centuries ago it became common knowledge that all the sciences (except

the social sciences – ethics and economics) are entirely governed by natural, not human, law (nomos, not lex) although millennia ago Aristotle, and two centuries ago the Physiocrats, showed that they also are both governed by nature, not by human will. Today nobody believes that dictators or rulers have any influence on the physical, chemical or mental world. But confused professors, politicians and the public still believe, in a mixed and frustrated way, that ethics and economics can be controlled or influenced by human beings, particularly by governments.

Your correspondent Doug Fenwick (*March Gazette*) believes that ethics are not governed by unchangeable natural law, but by human practices and decisions, e.g. – that under legal slavery no right to freedom or equality existed. And, of course, that if slavery is re-enacted what dreamers fondly imagine is a natural right to freedom will again vanish, having never really existed.

In contrast, I believe that ethics is an unalterable and eternal social science which sternly and logically decrees that we are all social individuals with the RIGHT to live, and to satisfy our desires, and to use the earth, in accordance with the golden rule.

Our knowledge though limited is increasing towards a full understanding of nature and natural law, and in the meantime the inhuman and disastrous philosophy that Might is Right still prevails in many quarters.

In short, to accept Might is Right is to abandon the concept of natural rights and of ethics as a science, including the natural right of the producers to own the things produced by their labour.

W. A. Dowe,
Marrickville, N.S.W.

(Both in "University of Sydney Gazette", June 1992.)