

VIII. SOCIALISM: WORLDLY UTOPIANS AND A MENDICANT PROPHET

"A hungry stomach makes a short prayer." Paiute

"Take only what you need and leave the land as you found it." Arapaho

Any discussion of mundane thinkers after the economists of the New Frontier except Henry George involve – to stay within our previously used metaphor – the stepping back from the broad daylight into the eternal night and shadows of the Platonic cave. Hence it is appropriate to discuss following thinkers only to the extent to which they admit glimpses of daylight within their economic philosophy however important they may be considered in other Histories of Economic Thought. Why return to the cave and futz around among the flickering shadows and darkness of ignorance in the first place once we have seen the light of day?

In a history of Social Science between the late Classical Economists, the Americans, and the doctrines of Socialism Jeremy Bentham would have to be mentioned, the man who comes down to us as having first thought in terms of Utilitarianism and "the greatest good for the greatest number of people". As far as we can see he has contributed exceedingly strange thoughts to Political Science, legal philosophy, and penal reform but except for an abominably reactionary essay in defense of usury he has contributed nothing to the Science of Political Economy proper. In addition he is with the exception of Nietzsche the only thinker sometimes by rash and superficial people given the label of "philosopher" who is completely mentally imbalanced, hence he might make an interesting case for a psychopathologist, but he has nothing lost among the generally rather sober and down-to-earth tribe of the economists.

Bentham influenced James Mill and John Stuart Mill, the later of which enjoys high esteem as the most lucid economist until the end of the 19th Century even in the eyes of George. The reasons why we are considering him here but briefly are simple. In our quote of Native American wisdoms we have headed the chapter on Smith with the doubtlessly pertinent recognition that if you "have one foot in the canoe and one foot in the boat" you "are going to fall into the river". Mill in all his superficial brilliance does not only have "one foot in the canoe and one foot in the boat" he also tries to hold on to the land with one hand while using an oar in the other to try to row away from it. It takes no genius of foresight to predict that he may end up fully submerged with greater certainty than our previous illustrious friend. On top of it like his predecessor if you agree strongly with everybody in sight, even with people who most strongly disagree amongst themselves chances are that you find yourself not only between a rock and a hard place but that you get yourself a serious pair of black eyes from all you agreed with.

Mill was not a 'mother's boy' but a 'father's boy' who never overcame or outgrew that fact that his father treated him like a robot and calculation machine not a human being. He wrote an extremely shallow book on Liberty while he should have worked on his own independence and while taking over the job of senior administrator of the East India Company from his father. A job that makes them both the erstwhile colonialists of Great Britain after the Queen. To write insipid Sunday school truisms on Liberty while in practice supporting a racist colonialist imperialism is not enough to offset the negative balance of a life-time. Further Mill adheres to most of the tenets of the Classical Economists of Smith and Ricardo while flirting with the nascent utopian Socialism of Fourier and Owen. His ideas on Socialism were not published – mind you – until after Mill's death. Perhaps Mill was trying to avoid the unmistakable impression that he – again staying with our previous metaphor – had actually not only gotten his feet wet but at this point fully lost his balance and fallen into the water.

Lastly and most strongly a man who can write Malthusian non-sense like that the "the niggardliness of nature not the injustice of man" be responsible for social ills and the greater and except in extremely rare pathological cases outrageous anatomical nonsense that "mouths born into this world are **not** [emphasis added] born with two hands to feed themselves"[sic!] belongs again in a gallery of psychopathological cases but it does not contribute one whit to the understanding of the development of economic thought expect if you are interested in cul-de-sacs, dead byways, or blind alleys. Which we may exempt ourselves from being.

The missing link between Smith, Ricardo, the Enlightenment aspect of the New Frontier economists and Lassalle, Proudhon, and Marx that really sustains the transition is hence not Utilitarianism but Hegel. It is too often forgotten that the Hegel not only kept a life-long adherence of the Ideals of the French Revolution and did a Life of Christ exegesis along enlightenment lines much in the vain of Jefferson he also studied and commented extensively the writings of the last Mercantilist thinker James Steuart. Without having these comments before us at the time of writing we may safely assume that they were neither psychopathological nor foolish. To study Hegel as an early enlightenment economist would be an extremely exciting and precious task for an undergraduate or graduate study.¹⁶

¹⁶ . Older sources like Georg Lukacs, 2 volume *Young Hegel*, state that said commentary is believed to be lost. Short of the commentary itself a comparative extrapolation of Steuart's work & Hegel's early writings down to the *Phenomenology* would be highly instructive

Meanwhile we can follow the Hegel School usually denoted as the “Hegelian Progressives” or “Hegelian Left” while keeping in mind that this writer holds that Hegel himself and not the Marx teachers Gans or Feuerbach was its main and first principle exponent. The Hegelian Left descended into an again severely pathological solipsism with Stirner and Schopenhauer on one hand, a ghastly and rabid Anti-Semitism with Bruno Bauer, and a kind of heavy-handed, badly hung-over, obtuse Teutonic Materialism with Gans and Feuerbach which pretty much penetrates every line of Marx’s writing and makes it together with its abstruse wording and cumbersome grammar not quite mastered from three languages all but unreadable.

Engels, Marx’s friend and industrial sponsor did have a lightness and brilliance of style, among other writings best expressed in his work *Anti-Duehring* - a refutation of the Berlin academic anarchist Eugene Duehring - but he did follow Marx unfortunately in his obtuse, dogmatic, Teutonic Materialism. The man who did precede both, not quite in time, but in early activism and effectiveness and who with a lithe and luminous style retained the best of the “Hegelian Progressive” without descending into materialist obscurity was Ferdinand Lassalle, a man much esteemed by George and many other progressive thinkers like e.g. the contemporary German economist and quasi-Georgist Herman von Berg. Had Lassalle’s life not been cut short tragically in a duel we would today not have to deal with the severe wreckage of Marxism-Leninism and the former Soviet Union territories and elsewhere but we would have a Lassalleism which well might have proven itself as a truly viable Third Way between the inveterate vagaries and extravagances of Communism and Capitalism along the line of Henry George. Not a ‘soft’ truly democratic Socialism with a “human face” that still disregards the natural laws directing any economic process but a framework to establish and safeguard wealth and social justice for all.

Ferdinand Lassalle [April 11, 1825 – 1864] is generally credited even by his enemies with being the arch mason of the German labor movement and the German Labor party called Social Democrats. Born in Breslau, today the Polish Wroclaw, he studied there and in Berlin Hegelian Philosophy and Law. The son of a prosperous Jewish wholesale merchant he retained the cosmopolitan outlook of his class and visited other European metropolitan areas like Paris while still in his youth. Lassalle became the early leader of the movement organizing armed resistance in a tax revolt against unjust taxes sanctioned even by the otherwise rather obsequious and authority-prone Prussian national assembly. He was sent to six months imprisonment on that account in 1849. With Marx and Engels he spearheaded the extreme left of the budding labor movement. Both their significant theoretical differences in outlook as well as their differences of style

and personality – Marx and Engels were mere desk perpetrators to this charismatic activist philosopher who did not mind to act upon his philosophy even if it meant sullyng his hands – prevented them from ever forming a working relationship.

Lassalle retained the first principles of Hegelian dialectic without standing it materialistically on its head like many other early socialists but he demanded a total overhaul of Hegel in its practical applicability. Taking the most progressive work of Hegel published still during the great minds life-time, his *Philosophy of Law*, [1821] which proceeds from the Rousseauian enlightenment concept of natural rights often non-sensically and erroneously translated as Philosophy of Right, Lassalle developed it further in his *System of Acquired Rights*, [1861] giving it a critical historical analysis which emphasized much akin to the Georgist analysis of property rights the injustice of many of those “acquired” that is decidedly not God-given rights. For Lassalle property, hereditary rights, the middle-class society or family are no timeless logical concepts but functions and ancillaries of the essential spirit of a people, a concept that later degenerated in the more superficial zeitgeist concept, subject to historical processes and change! If then law as well as in a strange logical non-sequitur natural law according to Lassalle are only byproducts of historical developments the envisioning of a simultaneously pre- and post-lapsarian¹⁷, quasi-millennial, quasi-paradisical state of a society without class, gender, national, or state barriers and limitations becomes possible.

Anticipating the syndicalist Georges Sorel’s *Sur la Violence* by half a century Lassalle in his addresses *On Constitutionalism* [1862-63] he demanded a parliamentary strike and criticized the middle-class brand of wishy-washy liberalism (which we have just examined in the younger Mill) in his *Worker’s Program* [1863]. Not managing to come up with George’s Single Tax solution to break the social duress of the so-called “iron law of wages” Lassalle nevertheless demanded changes in the legislative and executive procedures of the state to achieve the same. The perpetual remaining of “the average wage on the lowest level to secure the minimum livelihood in accordance with national habits sufficient for the bare existence and propagation of species” was as unacceptable to Lassalle as it was to other social revolutionaries and reformers of the time.

This redressing of economic justice he coupled with the demand for universal suffrage. In the early 1860s at a time the Blue and the Gray were involved in their to-the-death civil carnage and strife over slavery and much of Europe had been riven by social and political revolt in the wake of the 1848 revolution these kind

¹⁷. This technical term borrowed from the Comparative Science of Religion refers to Man’s Biblical “fall” or Latin lapsus from Grace

of level-headed demands for economic democracy did not endear Lassalle to the authorities as can be imagined. A rejection of his demands would demonstrate to the underprivileged classes that neither the governing nor the propertied classes had any interest whatsoever in improving the lots of those not "in" or sorely underrepresented on the distribution of the wealth pie with its disproportionate rent, interest, and wages pieces. This in turn would just foment a social unrest that would lead to an abiding revolution.

The state did not appear to Lassalle as a Hobbesian Leviathan but carried by the universal suffrage and hence expressing truly the will of the masses he saw it then through pink glasses as a "consolidated people", the general vote giving the "monster" its much needed consciousness and conscience. Lassalle also formed a tactical alliance with Bismarck. The latter 'social measures' and even the elements of his policies that have been called Bismarck's 'state socialism', in other words all that is progressive in the "Iron Chancellor", is unmistakably due to Lassalle. While the one did the footwork and provided the sparks of enthusiasm the other reaped the merit.

Had the Boston Tea Party both triggered and inaugurated the American Revolution the same was happening in Europe and Asia and in other continents. With the difference that except for the Russian Revolution 1917 the anti-progressive forces of history prevailed in most places. Had Ferdinand Lassalle not, like Pushkin and Hamilton, met his death in a duel over an amour August 31, 1864 would the course of progressive history have been different? This was one of those times in which a single individual epitomized indeed in his own identity the best of the spirit of the Age, literally the Breaking-in of the Future into the Present and the obliteration of all that is bad in the Past.

In a certain sense we are still waiting for that Breaking-in to happen. The Physiocrats, and the most progressive enlightenment philosophers as well as Thomas Paine, Ferdinand Lassalle, and Henry George mapped out the way of the blue print towards economic as well as political democracy. It is bound, nay in a non-Marxian but natural-law sense, it is inevitable to happen. Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and their various satellites and hatchet men of totalitarian socialism are not a fulfillment of this promise but a horrid retrogression from it. It has been trying to refetter mankind back as troglodytes in our murky and shadow-stricken Platonic cave. The last thing we need at any time, but especially at this time is an increase of Darkness or a renewal of the Dark Age.

One great and provocative mind needs to be discussed at this point. Marx considered him his great nemesis and George as a libertarian economist preferred

him to the latter: Pierre Joseph Proudhon, who was born January 15, 1809 and lived till 1865 roughly the same life-span as Lincoln. He surely is no less liberating and refreshing than the latter. Like Benjamin Franklin and Henry George Proudhon was a printer by trade he acquired a life-long disenchantment with academics while acquiring knowledge in metaphysics, social science and the ancient languages Hebrew, Greek, and Latin that would have floored many a learned professor.

With the increasing impossibility to sweep abundant social conflicts and problems under the carpet into the public subconscious Proudhon in 1840 wrote what really wasn't much more than a pamphlet: *Qu'est-ce que la propriété? – an Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Property*. His paradoxical and anarchic answer is: Property is theft!

He advocated the abolishing of interest and the making available of free credit to all producers. He wanted money to be used productively and not solely financially. As an organizing force of labor in other words and not as a sterile force to engender more paper denominations of its kind. His philosophy he summed up as Mutualism. There is a kinship in economic outlook with the Russian Peter Kropotkin and again with Henry George. With Marx he crossed swords or rather pens in his *Philosophy of Misery* which the former tried to dismantle in his response *The Misery of Philosophy*. While Proudhon had in mind the misery of the people oppressed under an unjust economic system and he argued for the increase of industrial capital and the abolishing of financial capital, Marx had in mind his assessment of Proudhon's analysis and an unexpected plea of the "father of scientific socialism" for financial capital on the grounds that financial and industrial capital could not be properly distinguished.

As we have seen Marx took over uncritically the confusion and fudging of that term from Smith and it is small wonder that he carried it on into this new debate. Rather than learning from others Marx had to be always right, even if he wasn't. Millions of dead later one wonders if the 'great minds' who do make gargantuan mistakes hadn't done better to stay out of the field of mundane economics. A wrong theory on the famous Caro-Kann opening or the equally legendary Sicilian variation in chess after all might upset some grandmaster's strategy, and a wrong computer program might crash a few computers, but it does no other physical harm. A computer virus on the other hand that affects millions of terminals might cause as much damage. *Liberating Economics* hence may be seen as an "ideological firewall".

Bertrand Russell himself quite a firebrand in the tradition of Thomas Paine, and no mean progressive all this life nearly spanning a century wryly and correctly observed after acknowledging his debt to and the influence of St. Karl and St. Friedrich E. on his own philosophy that Communism did not advocate a “master race” like Nietzsche and Schicklgruber’s henchmen, but de facto in spite of all the gooey talk of the classless society a “master class”, i.e. the working men adjusted, averaged and maxed-out out of individuality by the polit-bureau commissars. Now if you and I happened not to belong to this class the gulag like his freak monster-cabinet brethren the death camp, don’t particularly help in life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, or do they?

What is the best of Karl Marx? How can a system that promised a classless society and a veritable paradise on earth for all and ended after the bloodiest purges in the history of mankind and the worst prison system after the Nazis with way over 20.000.000 dead, a greater number deported, not counting the dead of WW II, how can such a system be taken on its high side. Well, as paradox and terrifying as it sounds, it can, albeit, with great caution. Not all its initial ideas were wrong or bad. Trying to establish social and economic justice was and is a necessary and true goal. Today more than ever:

An aphorism of the French Baroque philosopher Francois de la Rochefoucault may illustrate the depth of the problem: “Les crimes deviennent innocent, meme glorieux par leur nombre and par leur qualites; de la vient que les voleries publiques sont des habilites, and que prendre de provinces injustement s’appelle faire des conquetes. La crime a ses heros ainsi que la vertu.”

[Crimes are made innocent and even virtuous by their number and qualities, hence public robbery is political talent and the wrongful seizure of a province is called a conquest. There are heroes in crime as well as in war.]

So it is a necessary and true goal to root for and champion the insulted and the injured, the salt of the earth, in other words the underdog, those who are always left out and never find an adequate representation. Marx, whatever his other considerable flaws were, here has the moral highground over practically the entire field of classical and neoclassical economics, because a half-starving world population does not even enter into their hedonistic calculus of the rich. Like Malthus Marx identified the right problems of the future and he managed to ask the right questions: Economic justice and a more equitable distribution. Like Malthus, albeit, he did not give the right answers. Had they both been right we – not just you and me, but the entire world population, meaning truly all of us, would long be dead.

Now were exactly did Marx go off? Why did his justified wrath of the pentateuch prophet did not smash the fiends of social justice and 'the all-sidedly developed personality' of man, but got shipwrecked on the shores of that very selfsame world history he felt he had so well deciphered?

Marx prided himself of standing Hegel on his head. Who he really stood on his head was not Hegel but Adam Smith and since there are serious flaws, confusions and mix-ups in the pioneers groundbreaking work standing it on its head really doesn't help any, does it? And the consequences of mistaking the basic principles of Political Economy are far worse than mistaking the moon for a green cheese, that after all might just be excused as the foibles of two splenetic and mild-mannered Scotch country gents.

To distinguish between the three factors of production land, labor, and stock - as Smith initially called capital - as Smith does and as Marx follows him in doing and then to forget all about it and call land capital, labor, capital, and capital capital, and to confuse everything else under and above the sun together and subsume it under this generic term, and then to throw in the kitchen sink for good measure - which by an irony of the history of the mundane thinkers for once indeed under certain conditions actually does constitute real capital - does not help terribly in establishing a new science and clarifying precisely those matters that lead to the social injustice in the first place! Smith does all this and Marx follows him with painstaking Teutonic accuracy in this confusion. Stood on its head some coins may fall out of the pockets of Smith's figurative effigy, but at this point, coins, "specie" as they were called in Hume's days, or currency - as money is not wealth - do not help matters either.

As we know money is not wealth but only represents wealth and in analyzing money first and foremost without heeding the other factors in their separation, and the same goes for analyzing capital for that matter does not lead us one iota closer to the understanding of the true causes of maldistribution of wealth or towards the redressing of social and economic justice. It is no accident that George spoke of Marx's "vicious terminology" really inherited in all its inaccuracy and laxness from Smith and it does not help towards Marx's declared goal.

In de facto excluding land from the analysis and focusing on a much overstrained one-size-fits-all rubber-term "capital" the ecological catastrophe in the states behind the former Iron Curtain was actually pre-programmed with near certainty and perfection. The capitalist states were only less environmentally damaging and polluting to the extent to which they had not suspended human rights and freedom

of expression as the totalitarian states had. Thus a measured resistance against environmental destruction could be organized.

In another form the “best of Marx”, meaning his self-stylization as the avenger of the downtrodden and disinherited of the earth, the redressing of the horrid social injustice of the day carried mindlessly in the wake of the industrialization which after 200 years is carrying on into the last hamlets of Africa, Asia, and the islands of Polynesia with its two-edged sword of product plethora, specification on the one hand and environmental devastation and social and economic alienation on the other, the “best of Marx” he himself expressed in what has come down to posterity as his Theses on Feuerbach.

Many young, impetuous, revolutionaries full of fire in their bellies, and tired of stern fathers, and boring, rigid, moralizing teachers read with delight in the 3rd thesis “that the educator himself needs to be educated.” Never mind that the master himself criticizing every thing and every one till they were livid in the face could stand not the slightest criticism or “education” himself. “Do what I say not what I do!” is a time-honored excuse of teachers on the left and on the right to escape the criticism they themselves dish out so liberally. and in the 11th thesis we read: “The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways, the point, however, is to *change* it.” [Emphasis in the original]

Together with the flaming indictment from his Manifesto: “Religion is opium for the people” you have here all the fury, all the anger, all the indignation, all the fire of the old-testament prophet in face of social ill, evils, and injustices. Much is made by Marxists of the dichotomy between matter and spirit and the precedence of the former over the later like the precedence of the worker over the capitalist, “matter” being a prerogative of the former and “spirit” and “religion” being the apologists, in Marx eyes of the injustices and exploitation of the latter.

Bernard Shaw and Upton Sinclair, although they are certainly classified as left-wing extremists and radicals, are among those thinkers who go a long way with Marx on practically everything else including the “expropriation of the expropriator” and the socialization and communization of the “means of production”, Shaw and Sinclair, however, do not follow Marx in perpetuating that dichotomy. Russell, who is otherwise not shy to pronounce an extremist opinion here for once sits on the fence or rather tries his turn with “one foot in the boat and one foot in the canoe” with result predictable after we have regarded Adam Smith’s and John Stuart Mill’s fate.

Russell declares: He mayn't know whether there is a Spirit or not and he expresses himself in a term that sounds less like a copout: He is an agnostic. Translated back from the Greek, however, it means literally the same thing and falls just as flat.

Materialism in the early 19th Century was a dirty word which was synonymous with greed; you find it in that sense still in the otherwise lucid writings of Mrs. Eddy and other spiritual writers. Marx declared himself an atheist, hence "one who is against God" or denies "God's existence". As if to punish Marx for his impunity his followers in the former Soviet Union and the Soviet territories have elevated Marx to the position of a deity! We now come back to our paradox of the skinny cook or the empty restaurant. Chances are that if the restaurant is mostly empty and the cook is really skinny that the food isn't that good. Our "mendicant prophet" who leaves preciously little good to say about any other economist or thinker expect himself comes up with solutions that have been tried out on a near global and gargantuan scale since 1917 and they have spectacularly and peacefully crashed 1989. Millions have been killed in the service of most painstakingly carrying out his solutions. Chances are that there was something wrong to begin with. To ask the rich man how he got rich may not serve as he may have obtained his wealth by large scale larceny.¹⁸ To ask a poor man the same thing might assure integrity of spirit. It might not assure a just acquisition of wealth as a natural opportunity for all.

The Matter-Spirit dichotomy is not just an abstract metaphysical question with no current or practical interest. It is really all important! If the Spirit or God is just a 'character mask' or camouflage for capitalist exploitation and perpetuation of social injustice on a global scale indeed it should be swept away. There is much in the Bible to support that. Russell in his seminal *Why I am not a Christian* gives an indictment of the narrow religious spirit that is not far removed from what Marx did. There are, however, many passages, notably in Isaiah and Luke, or in what has been attributed as quotes of the Christ himself or in the Gospels called apocryphal or Gnostic, meaning those that were suppressed for millennia by the official editors of the Scriptures, and associated with the name of Thomas that support the other view, a rather radical spiritual communism, in fact.

It is quite legitimate to stir indignation against a widespread injustice to use the much maligned term "materialism" qua greed and turn it into a millennial promise. There is no need, however, to leave the vast field of spiritual experience testified by all cultures and all religions throughout the ages to the rich! They couldn't handle that subject all by themselves if they were paid real money for it.

¹⁸. A term we owe in this context and with its dimensions of economic history to Kenneth Galbraith

As one thing is certain: Had young George struck gold in the El Dorado rush of the late 1840s we would certainly have not been graced with any Progress and Poverty or other lasting works of his, but rather the injunction to gamble and gamble away ad infinitum to gain a fortune that is our's by natural right to begin with would we only be willing to let nature tell us about the secrets of her abundance!

As if Jesus Christ had foreseen that conflict - "there is nothing new under the sun" - he gave us the paradox of the camel and the needle's eye which you may interpret and solve in every way you personally deem fit, the one way it cannot be solved is to maintain that it is a Christian apology of the monopolist. The eminent 19th Century German liberal politician and professor of Medicine Rudolf Virchow boasted that he had "autopsied 100s of corpses" in his day and that he "had never found a single soul". This is another instance of how dumb eminent "smart" people can be. Virchow could have as well claimed "I autopsied 100s of corpses and I didn't find a single life!" This has the charm of the child that looking at you closes his eyes with his hands and proclaims: "You are gone" or its like the story of the man who had lost his keys and was unable to find them in the circumference of the street light answered when asked whether he had lost them there: "No, but if I look where I lost them, I can't see a thing!"

Hegel, who Marx after all did consider as his master, albeit one standing on his head that needed to be turned back onto his feet was cited to have said that studying philosophy one has to go "all the way", going half-way one would turn into an atheist as one would see only "half the picture" going all the way would not lead to a narrow and bigoted outlook that many mistake for true religion but it would lead to a becoming conscious of an awesome Divine that has at least as many liberating aspects as those Marx was trying to harness to bestir the laboring masses.

Marx distrusted competition and hence advocated the appropriation of "the means of production" by what he envisioned to be the worker's representatives who in reality turned out to be Big-Brother-style Polit Commissars. His system in which the state unfortunately never "withered away" because those on top would not give up their extraordinary totalitarian power came down to an old-style command economy practiced throughout history by any run-of-the-mill tyrant. Litmus test for all social and economic change has to be human rights and the political framework given by the enlightenment philosophers. In this sense Marx is pre-enlightenment Middle Age barbarism not definitely removed from Captains Kidd or Blackbeard or Sheik Osama.

George in discovering the economic subconscious or what he called the “Greater Leviathan” of the body economic knew that unlike political processes economic processes – provided the communally generated land value accretions was collected as societal rent-tax! – knew that a command economy could only wreak havoc. He also saw that competition need not be evil but can be turned to advantage again if the necessary social adjustments are made.

As Marx does not understand the true nature of capital and factures land or natural resources out of the equation following Smith he cannot find the proper solution the “Iron law of wages” which is based on land monopolies. He cannot understand that the “tendencial fall of the rate of profits” is really based on the same constriction which upsetting the apple-cart of his class struggle brings “laborer” and “capital-user” onto the same side as producers and which annuls his class warfare further hypostasized into the sky “as the antagonistic [read: unsolvable] contradiction between matter and spirit”.

So we may end with what might be called a 12th Feuerbach Thesis ad St. Karl:
“Would the philosophers care to understand natural law, rather than interpret it, it would be nature instigating the largest and most benevolent social and economic revolutions on behalf of an active all-mankind.”