

The Sixteenth Annual John Bonython Lecture

THE CENTRE FOR
INDEPENDENT
STUDIES

The End of Chaos

GLOBAL MARKETS AND THE INFORMATION ERA

Jerry Jordan

The Centre for Independent Studies is a non-profit, private sector policy research institute. Its major concern is with the principles and conditions underlying a free and open society. The Centre's activities cover a wide variety of areas dealing broadly with social and economic policy. It emphasises the role of markets and other voluntary processes in providing many of the goods and services normally supplied by the compulsory methods of government.

The Centre meets the need for informed debate on issues of importance to a free and democratic society in which individuals and business flourish, unhindered by government intervention. In encouraging competition in ideas, The Centre for Independent Studies carries out an activities programme which includes:

- research
- holding lectures, seminars and policy forums
- publishing books and papers
- issuing a quarterly journal, *Policy*

For more information, see the inside back cover.

Executive Director
Greg Lindsay

The Centre's research work is assisted by a Council of Academic Advisers

Professor H.W. Arndt
Professor Ray Ball
Professor Jeff Bennett
Professor Geoffrey Brennan
Professor Lauchlan Chipman
Professor Kenneth Clements
Professor David Emanuel
Professor Ian Harper
Professor Max Hartwell
Professor Warren Hogan

Professor Helen Hughes
Professor Wolfgang Kasper
Professor Kenneth Minogue
Professor R.R. Officer
Professor Ross Parish
Professor David Robertson
Professor Steven Schwartz
Professor Judith Sloan
Professor Peter Swan
Professor Geoffrey de Q. Walker

PO Box 92, ST LEONARDS, NSW 1590 AUSTRALIA
Ph: (02) 9438 4377 • Fax: (02) 9439 7310
World Wide Web: <http://www.cis.org.au>

PO Box 5529, LAMBTON QUAY, , 3785, NEW ZEALAND
PH: (04) 499 5861 • FAX: (04) 499 5940

The End of Chaos?

GLOBAL MARKETS IN THE INFORMATION ERA

Jerry Jordan



1999

THE END OF CHAOS?

GLOBAL MARKETS IN THE INFORMATION ERA

Jerry Jordan

THE SIXTEENTH ANNUAL JOHN BONYTHON LECTURE
SHERATON ON THE PARK, SYDNEY
24 NOVEMBER 1999

CIS Occasional Paper 72



Published January 2000 by
The Centre for Independent Studies Limited
PO Box 92, St Leonards, NSW 1590
E-mail: cis@cis.org.au
Website: www.cis.org.au

Views expressed in the publications of The Centre for Independent Studies are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Centre's staff, Advisers, Directors or officers.

National Library of Australia

Cataloguing-in-Publication Data:

Jordan, Jerry, 1941-.
The end of chaos : global markets in the information era.

ISBN 1 86432 048 6

1. Information technology. 2. Forecasting.
3. Globalization. I. Centre for Independent Studies
(Australia). II. Title. (Series : John Bonython lectures ;
16th). (Series : CIS occasional papers ; 72).

338.91

©2000 The Centre for Independent Studies
Cover and book design by Heng-Chai Lim
Printed by McMillan Press
Typeset in Garamond 11pt.

Chairman's Welcome

Alan McGregor

Chairman, CIS Board of Directors

As Chairman of the Board of The Centre for Independent Studies, it is my great pleasure to welcome you all to the Sixteenth Annual John Bonython Lecture. In particular, I would like to welcome our members and their guests, and our speaker for the evening, Mr Jerry Jordan.

I would also like to thank Macquarie Bank who have been very generous in sponsoring this event this year and also in 1998.

The John Bonython Lecture was established in 1984 as the Centre's annual gathering to celebrate the ideas behind a free, open and responsible society. The lecture was named after John Bonython of Adelaide, one of those who helped establish the Centre.

Tonight's speaker, Jerry Jordan, who will be introduced by Greg Lindsay, joins in this tradition and his contributions to the free society are many and continuing. I'm sure that we will all benefit from his views on global markets in the information age,

As most of you know The Centre for Independent Studies exists to carry out research and to publish it on matters of public policy. It is the premier non-government organisation in the field in Australia. It makes a major contribution to the formulation of public policy in this country, as the Prime Minister and the Premier of New South Wales said on the occasion of our twenty years celebration.

Over the years, its practical focus has been on the primacy of free-markets, deregulation, smaller government, and the importance of coherent policy making. Overall, it works within the framework of promoting all that goes to make up a free society. So there are a diverse range of issues covered from time to time such as education, shopping hours, foreign investment, corporate takeovers, and health policy to name a few.

Whilst continuing its central work in the areas of economic and fiscal policy, current activities of the Centre include:

- phase two of the Taking Children Seriously research programme, which includes issues such as declining education standards, youth unemployment, juvenile crime, and the neglect and abuse of children;
- the Religion and the Free Society programme which is now entering its second year and has already gone some way to achieving its aim of creating among clergy, theologians, church workers, and lay people an understanding and appreciation of the principles and workings of a free economy; and

the Liberty and Society seminars, which are weekend gatherings designed to expose future leaders in various fields to the theories and policies that underlie a liberal society. We are joined tonight by a number of beneficiaries of this programme.

The CIS relies entirely on the financial support of individuals, corporations and foundations to carry out these and other activities. It does not seek or receive government funding. Independence is the Centre's hallmark and one of its greatest strengths. The price of independence is the need to raise our income from those who believe that the purpose is worthy and the product gives good value, I am pleased to say there are more donors as we go forward but we need more still if we are to promote the service that Australia needs. I believe that it is appropriate to look upon supporting the CIS as an investment in our future. That is surely something we all value.

It is one of our aims to widen the debate about policies that takes place primarily among the political parties. Once we understand, like our American counterparts, that it is good ideas that are the foundations of good policy and a functioning democracy, then organisations such as The Centre for Independent Studies will have a wider audience and appeal to more people as worthy of support.

I hope you all enjoy the evening.

ict

Greg Lindsay

Executive Director

The Centre for Independent Studies

I am delighted to introduce Jerry Jordan to you tonight. Jerry has been a friend for 15 years or so, both of us being members of the most important international organisation supporting a free society, the Mont Pèlerin Society.

Jerry has spoltten at a CIS function once before. In fact it was just 10 years ago yesterday when he participated in a forum on the transition from socialism that we put together following the fall of the Berlin Wall. As with his lecture tonight, his remarks ten years ago were insightful and prescient.

Jerry Jordan has been President and Chief Executive Officer of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland since March 1992.

He has worked in government, academia, commercial banking, and previously in the Federal Reserve System. After receiving a Ph.D. in economics at UCLA, he was employed at the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, rising to the position of senior vice president and director of research. While at the St. Louis Federal, he took leave and served as a consultant to the Bundesbank in Frankfurt.

Jerry's commercial banking experience includes five years at Pittsburgh National Bank and seven years at First Interstate Bancorp in Los Angeles. He served as a member of President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisers in 1981-82, during which time he was also a member of the U.S. Gold Commission. Preceding and following his service in Washington, he was Dean of the R.O. Anderson School of Management at the University of New Mexico.

In 1997, Jerry received an honorary doctorate in economics from Denison University. As I mentioned, he is a member of the Mont Pèlerin Society, the Academic Advisory Council of The Institute of Economic Affairs in London, and the Business

Advisory Board of the Reason Foundation. He is also an adjunct scholar at the Cato Institute and a past president of the National Association of Business Economists.

It is my very great pleasure to invite Jerry Jordan to present the Sixteenth John Bonython Lecture.

About the Author

Jerry Jordan has been President and Chief Executive Officer of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, USA, since 1992, and is a senior member of the United States Federal Reserve System which is responsible for formulating and implementing U.S. monetary policy.

Graduating from UCLA with a Ph.D. in economics, Mr Jordan has worked in government, academia, commercial, and central banking. He has held senior positions at the Federal Reserve Bank of St Louis, Pittsburgh National Bank and First Interstate Bankcorp. He has consulted to the Bundesbank in Frankfurt.

Mr Jordan served as a member of President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisors, and was a member of the U.S. Gold Commission.

Mr Jordan was Dean of the R.O. Anderson School of Management at the University of New Mexico for a number of years, and is a past president of the National Association of Business Economists.



The End of Chaos?

Global Markets and the Information Era

Governments have long pursued policies that determined the degree to which markets have been permitted to operate. But with the rise of global capital markets, we have learned that the opposite is also true—markets can affect national economic policies.

Business people know very well that market forces do not treat kindly companies that fail to satisfy their customers. Politicians also are now learning that global capital markets treat harshly governments whose policies fail to enhance the living standards of their people. Good business practices and good government policies are both essential to sustained prosperity. But there is an important division of labor. Private firms best enhance public welfare by producing goods and services at lowest possible prices; governments contribute to the common good by establishing well-functioning institutions within which the society operates. Good business practices cannot effectively take root without good government policies.

The choice of monetary arrangements provides one illustration of how market forces can influence government policies. For more industrialized countries, governments help their citizens best by providing a stable standard of monetary value—a national currency. But, as we have seen, the best course of action for less developed and emerging market economies may be to adopt another nation's standard of value. Before I lay out my thoughts on this particular issue, however, I would like to begin with a more general statement of where we find ourselves in the world of political economy and the forces that will guide our future.

Government Presence in the Economy

In last year's lecture, Antonio Martino quoted the former Italian dictator, Benito Mussolini, who in the 1920s had declared: 'If the nineteenth century has been the century of the individual (for liberalism means individualism), it may be conjectured that this is the century of the State . . . that this is the century of authority, a Fascist century.'¹ It certainly has been true that there was a massive increase in the intmsion of governments into economic affairs during the twentieth century. Nevertheless, it is becoming increasingly clear that this wave has crested; the role of the state in economic affairs has begun to diminish. As we approach a new century and a new millennium, a growing share of the world will enjoy the prosperity that comes from the 'century of markets.'

Just over seventy years ago in the autumn of 1929, equity markets around the world entered a period of steep decline—so much so that the label 'crash' is often used to describe the events of 1929-30. Those developments and the ensuing policies brought about worldwide economic depression. Indeed, it is now well accepted that the 1930s was a 'watershed decade' in which economic depression gave rise to public support for the nationalization of entire industries, and what remained privately owned was subject to pervasive governmental regulation. For several subsequent decades, decisions about what to produce, who could produce it, where to produce it, what prices to charge, what wages to pay, and many other economic decisions about interest rates, exchange rates, and even profitability were either made by government agencies or were subject to their approval. Remnants of many of those policies haunt us still.

I suggest the 1980s as another 'watershed decade'—marking the beginning of the withdrawal of the state from economic affairs—and argue that recent trends to strengthen property rights and enhance the economic infrastructure of market economies on a global basis will endure for several decades into the future.

¹ Martino, A. 1998, *The Modern Mask of Socialism*, The Centre for Independent Studies, St Leonards, Occasional Paper 66, 8.

The events that have been labeled 'crises' in this decade largely reflect the breaking up of the old order. Moreover, the vestiges of ill-conceived government involvement in economic affairs will be under continuous attack. Social and political disturbances can be expected—the more highly industrialized countries are not immune—as the relentless pressures of global capital markets confront legacy government programs and agencies. The drive toward greater economic efficiency is an irresistible force, and governmental policies are not, in the end, immovable objects.

Market Forces at Work

From a historical perspective, the age of capitalism is now, at most, a teenager, and it is already evident that the power of unfettered markets to generate wealth is building momentum. Capitalism requires mobility of resources—goods, labor and capital—so they may find their highest valued use. But resource mobility is an idea that is more often than not resisted by most governments, whether democratic or authoritarian. Governments around the globe have long used a variety of methods—with varying degrees of success—to restrict either the entry or the exit of people, goods and capital. The collapse of the Berlin Wall just ten years ago serves as a very visible symbol of the ultimate futility of erecting artificial barriers to at least one type of mobility.

Less visible, but more pervasive, are the countless barriers to the mobility of financial capital. These too have been tumbling down in recent years. The process is still in the early stages, and we have no blueprints for constructing market mechanisms to replace ossified governmental mechanisms. Nevertheless, just as the global political environment has changed dramatically in the decade since the Wall crumbled, so too the global economic environment has started to move rapidly away from Mussolini's vision of the twentieth century.

The Search for Best Practices

Interestingly, the idea of irresistible market forces meeting seemingly immovable objects is commonplace in the world of business. Innovations continuously bombard the economy, forcing changes in how and with whom we interact. Business leaders are used to the idea that there is a continuous, never-ending search for best practices that can better accommodate new production processes or even produce different goods as consumers' tastes change in unpredictable ways. This is unavoidable because failure to recognize and incorporate superior management processes would prove fatal in the marketplace. People in business know that it is not simply the quality and price of the product that must compete at a point in time, but entire business systems. These systems must compete in getting new products to the market and then getting them to the customer—when the customer wants them, how the customer wants them, and where the customer wants them.

Workers are subjected to the same forces, as the demands for what they can do and how they do it change as business changes its way of doing things. In response to the innovations bombarding businesses, the labor market undergoes substantial churning, leading to simultaneous job creation and job destruction. Workers must learn new skills and methods to deliver their services to employers, just as business must learn new processes to deliver its product to consumers. Uncertain and unforeseeable events affect both workers and businesses. There is no escape. Economic prosperity depends on the ability to recognize and react to those forces, whether for an individual in the labor market, a firm in the business sector, and—I contend—a government in today's global economy.

Current management literature asserts the existence of 'business maxims' or 'first principles' essential to business success. In economics, there are also 'maxims' or 'first principles.' One is universally used by economists to argue for the elimination of barriers to the mobility of goods. That principle—comparative advantage—holds that welfare is

maximized where unfettered market forces determine where the opportunity cost of producing a good is lowest.

As trade barriers continue to erode and the principle of comparative advantage becomes universally operative, people are becoming accustomed to the idea of consuming goods produced elsewhere in the world. More recently, they have become used to the idea that various services—such as transportation, communications and banking—may also be best provided by firms headquartered elsewhere on the globe. These trends, of course, reflect the dramatic changes in information and communications technologies that have brought ever lower costs of comparing products and services over larger regions.

Best Practices and the Information Revolution

We all marvel at the new products and services that come from technological innovations. But it certainly is also true that the information technology revolution has accelerated the rate of obsolescence of old ideas, of old ways of doing things. The well-known phrase of the Austrian economist Joseph Schumpeter about creative destruction is something that people in business live with every day; new products and new services render obsolete—or at least reduce the economic value of—old ideas, previous products, previous services, previous ways of doing things.

The half-life of knowledge is getting shorter all the time. What one knows today is becoming out of date faster than ever before. The inverse of this is that new knowledge must be acquired and incorporated much more quickly than before in order to stay in the same relative position. My contention is that political organizations and institutions must also change at an ever faster pace.

There was a time in the not too distant past when people in commerce needed to look only at competitors within their national borders—especially in very large countries like the United States. In smaller, more open economies, business people

learned early on that best practices were often found in other countries and that failure to respond to them quickly produced a possibly fatal competitive threat.

For a while, the expression 'multinational company' was used to describe a company that operated internationally. Its meaning could essentially be boiled down to a holding company in one place owning and operating businesses located in various other places around the world. However, in the early versions there was not much more to it than ownership, since management techniques, labor market practices, factor input sourcing, product distribution systems, and so on remained local and distinct from place to place. Over time, though, the spread of best practices resulted in global companies succeeding over multinational companies. This meant that businesses found what works best in one place works best in every place. The idea of local content or place of national origin became a political obstacle or burden that had to be overcome but not a desirable management best practice.

Ultimately, it seemed to be simply untrue that there were best ways of doing things in Asia and quite different, but still best ways, of doing things in Europe or Latin America or North America, all of which were different from each other. Instead, best practices meant simply that—it was *best* with little regard for local social, cultural or political settings.

Governments and Best Practice

This trend toward borderless commerce means that local political institutional arrangements are coming under increased scrutiny as well, and the reforms that we are witnessing can be thought of as the sometimes grudging adoption of best practices. For most of history, the evolution of institutional arrangements in the political sphere progressed very slowly. Certain democratic institutions have migrated around the world for hundreds of years since the signing of the Magna Carta, but even in the

twentieth century most of the world did not live under what today, in the final months of the twentieth century, would be considered to be best practices of political and economic infrastructure.

There are, of course, many local, institutional and political reasons for the slow adoption of superior political institutions; but the persistent forces arising from capital markets have meant that reform processes accelerate, forcing many of the old structures to crumble in their path. As informational barriers fall—and we have witnessed substantial declines in the cost of acquiring information—it becomes easier to identify and compare different institutional arrangements, including tax policies, regulations, guarantees, subsidies, and so on. This more intense international comparison is the additional force giving rise to institutional reforms. As the costs of acquiring information decline, it becomes more difficult to sustain bad practices. This includes more than just monetary and fiscal policies. The costs of engaging in corrupt behavior—as well as pursuing ineffective economic policies—have risen dramatically. It has long been the case in a small village that 'outlier behaviour' was subject to discipline. Instant global communications extend the 'village effect' into previously isolated places. Inappropriate behavior of both government ministers and business executives now results in 'early retirement,' and maybe disgrace, more swiftly than ever before.

Even local judicial systems are not immune. If a country does not have a well-functioning legal system in place that protects property rights, businesses must offer a higher rate of return in order to attract—or hold—capital into the country. This increases the cost of capital, resulting in lower rates of investment, which will affect profits and the pace of real growth. That means fewer consumption goods and lower income per capita.

As it becomes easier for the populace to recognize where and how resources will earn their highest return, I conjecture that the half-life of bad government policies will become ever shorter. That is to say, global capital markets can have a major

say in determining how long before a poorly performing government is forced to reform or is turned from office.

Institutional investors in global capital markets conduct a continuous plebiscite on political and economic policies and developments in the numerous nation-states of the world. Seemingly, no economy is immune from these forces. Advances in communications and information technologies have been revolutionizing all the financial markets: equity, debt, credit, capital, and currency. Adverse judgments by participants in such markets can quickly and dramatically change the price and availability of funds to any borrower, large or small. In the United States in the late '80s and early '90s, one heard references to 'bond market vigilantes.' I am sure that most countries of the world have in the past, and will in the future, feel that they have come up against the capital and currency market vigilantes. It is becoming apparent that governmental promises and guarantees—whether in the form of pegged exchange rates or in the form of deposit, loan or investment guarantees—are on the endangered species list.

The idea that tangible manufactured goods must compete not only in the local shops but also increasingly in the global town square is obvious. Yet the thought that institutional arrangements are constantly being tested against others in the international arena is not so well understood. Ideas must face competition no less than goods and services. Politicians have long known that they must compete, but their focus was on rivals in their own party or other political parties in their country. What has changed is the competition that they face from policies and institutional arrangements in other countries. The voters are not only the citizens at the local ballot box, but also the financial asset managers in global capital markets.

We are witnessing the difficulty of winning and maintaining the support of these two quite different groups of voters. Domestic ballot-box voters respond well to politicians who try to satisfy their craving for wealth-sharing programs. Capital-market voters survey the world for those who pursue the best wealth-creation policies. Gaining the support of one is almost surely to diminish support from the other.

Countries whose futures loom bleak due to bad policies, such as massive unfunded pension liabilities, double or even triple-digit inflation, lack of well defined property rights, and so on, will not attract or keep the resources necessary to foster significant increases in their standard of living. Their destiny is to fall farther and farther behind in terms of per capita wealth, until the pressures for reform become overwhelming.

Crises and the New Order

In the news reports, it is common to see people lament the apparent increased frequency of crises, especially in financial markets over the last decade. To repeat a point that I touched upon earlier, a different way of looking at the phenomenon we are witnessing is that a crisis is a breaking down of an old order and the creation of a new one. The evolving order is conducive to the rapid adoption of new processes and institutional arrangements that are superior to those they are replacing.

Apparently, this is what the President of Korea had in mind earlier this year when he said that there is a 'silver lining' to the Asian currency crises. The reforms and restructuring of banking institutions now occurring in some Asian countries will leave them better off. It would have taken much longer to implement these reforms without the 'crisis atmosphere.' As a result, these nations may soon have better credit risk analysis, better asset and liability management techniques, be less subject to politically connected banli lending, and develop both effective internal audit and external supervision that is essential to sound banking.

In a world with highly mobile resources, the lessons learned in a crisis invariably lead to changes in behavior that prevent a repeat of the conditions that led to the crisis. Once a crisis atmosphere has subsided, we rarely see re-institution of the practices and arrangements that gave rise to the crisis situation.

This interpretation of what we are observing would suggest that the frequency of these so-called financial crises is evidence that the pace of adoption of new and better ways of doing things has accelerated. Borrowing from Schumpeter, just as

there is a creative destruction in goods and services as new and better products come onto the market, so too in political and economic matters, the replacement of obsolete arrangements with more effective practices is a wrenching process.

It is essential to understand that, in a partial sense, wealth creation simultaneously involves wealth destruction. The true meaning of the expression 'creative destruction' is that when something new and better comes along, the old—whether goods, services or distribution methods—loses value. This means that its economic or market value declines. When a new upstart firm—for example, retail-distributor-dot com—comes along and finds a better way of getting the product to the consumer in a less costly, more timely way, then old methods of distribution are of less value and firms engaged in the old methods lose market capitalization.

The same is true of ideas and political and economic institutional arrangements. When new and better methods compete head-on with previous, less effective methods, the old institutions must evolve or they will perish. Foreign trade will be severely hampered in countries whose courts will not enforce the contracts and protect the property of domestic citizens. Banks that engage in unsound local lending practices cannot sustain the risk-adjusted rate of return sought by foreign investors—unless government guarantees are involved. Governments with unsustainable fiscal policies, such as promising overly generous pensions to citizens, will find it increasingly difficult—or impossible—to raise taxes sufficiently or issue new debt to meet their commitments. The discipline exerted by global financial markets is beneficial in that it erodes local resistance to more efficient domestic markets.

Brand-Name Capital

The erosion of the barriers to trade in goods and services offers clues to what we can expect in monetary affairs. Today, brand-name recognition and identification are more important than ever. When a company like Sony produces a new product—a

CD player—that is better and less costly than other brands, consumers will want to buy it. Consumers everywhere are the same—they want the best product for the lowest price! Only barriers to trade will prevent a superior product from gaining global market share.

Such 'brand-name' identification of goods—which has made the national origin of production irrelevant to consumers—is becoming evident in financial and monetary affairs. Lack of global specialization in the production of goods was due to governmental and technological constraints. International brand identification evolved as these constraints diminished. As we are now seeing in the monetary arena, brand identification of standards of value—money—also becomes more pervasive as falling costs of information and communications technologies make it increasingly easy to compare the quality dimension of standards of value.

International monetary developments in recent years can be explained in the context of powerful economic forces challenging ossified domestic institutions. Among the twentieth-century institutional arrangements coming under increasing scrutiny are central banks and national currencies. While there are vested interests in maintaining local governmental monopolies over the issuance of the national media of exchange, history demonstrates that national currencies inevitably must compete in the international financial arena.

Countries whose monetary policies have resulted in large fluctuations in the value of the currency have come under pressures to adopt a system to prevent such behavior; however, this is just the 'brand-name' argument—people want the best product or service. Currency boards and 'dollarization' are two outcomes forced on many governments by their inability to provide a stable purchasing power of the domestic currency. That is, the 'brand name' of currency used to denominate contracts and trade assets is more important than the 'local content' or 'national origin' of the standard of value.

It seems natural to extend such arguments to forms of government. There are a number of different models of government, just as there are numerous models of successful

business operation. And, as best practices in governing evolve, those countries not adopting such practices will lose 'capitalization'; that is, they will fail to attract and hold a share of the world's investment capital, culminating in much lower standards of living.

The expression, 'vote with their feet', is still relevant for many less developed places on earth. Oppressed and impoverished people still flee bad governments in search of opportunity for prosperity. That long-time tradition is now supplemented by the powerful forces of capital markets.

The crumbling of the barriers that have corralled the movement of goods, labor and capital tells us that the role of government in economic affairs continues to ebb. An economic infrastructure that best encourages entrepreneurship and wealth creation is becoming more commonplace. Integral to these changes is that fiscal and monetary policies are also becoming less activist and more predictable.

In the final analysis, sustainable long-term prosperity, whether at the global or the local level, occurs when human action is focused on converting productive resources into marketable goods. It is no longer useful to think of the government's relationship to its citizens as that of an architect, engineer, carpenter, or any other metaphor implying activism. Instead, the role of the state is to nurture an economic garden--cultivating the soil to allow growth to take root, warding off pests that seek to feed off the budding crop, and keeping weeds from suffocating the plant before it achieves its potential. Simply espousing the virtues of a market economy, without establishing the proper economic infrastructure is like planting one seedling in a rocky, infertile ground. We would not expect either to survive for very long.

Vote of thanks

Michael Darling

I'm Michael Darling, Deputy Chairman of The Centre for Independent Studies, and it's my pleasant task tonight on your behalf and on behalf of my colleagues at the CIS to thank Jeriy Jordan for the delivery of this lecture.

Jeriy is a person in the United States who's very well known as the President of the Federal Reserve Board of Cleveland and has a big reputation as a banker. In today's world, when half the investment community across the world spends all their time 'Fed-watching', this is not an unimportant activity. But, in addition, he's also had a reputation in the United States for some time as someone who has been prepared to contribute to the wider debate. He's always been an original and scholarly thinker—someone who thinks outside the box.

Traditionally, the John Bonython lecturer chooses a broad topic—in tonight's case 'The End of Chaos? Global Markets in the Information Era'. This topic is rather millennial in its sweep as the impact of this phenomenon affects the future of the world in economic and policy terms. In view of the magnitude of the subject, Jerry has approached it with all the scholarly rigour that's in the best tradition of the Bonython lectures.

For me, the most striking thing to come out of Jerry's lecture is a sense of optimism. Optimism is a rather unfashionable characteristic these days; however, this thesis is extraordinarily optimistic. Although the 'golden age' of capitalism is not going to occur smoothly, Jerry points to the importance of remembering that when problems do arise, 'the force is with you!' It's a very optimistic message.

Jerry also makes a point about the dominant civilising influence of global capital. It's a civilising influence because it is threatening to tyrannies, it's empowering to individuals, it forces engagement rather than isolation, it limits social engineers,

and it probably deflates vanities. It shows, in a way, how the market is ahead of politics. Business organisations by nature change more quickly than political organisations and this vision of prosperity that's being driven by markets is a very powerful one.

We've had an example recently of exactly that. Following all the sabre-rattling between China and Taiwan (they can't sign an agreement because they can't agree what they will call each other in the agreement), we've now had an example of the WTO agreement being signed by the United States and China where issues of access to markets, the rule of law that will apply, and the freedom of trade and finance, have been squarely on the table. A relatively isolationist country has made it a national priority to join a world group. It's a very specific example, and it's exactly the sort of engagement which I find very hopeful.

So Jerry, on behalf of the group here tonight, thank you for raising what is a rather daring proposition: that global markets are ushering in a new age of prosperity. Thank you for the scholarly basis on which you made those remarks and the rigour with which you've expressed them, and I call on you all to express your appreciation.



The Centre for Independent Studies, Australasia's leading private policy research organisation, is financed by voluntary subscriptions and donations from individuals, foundations and companies.

You may assist the Centre in achieving its aims by becoming involved in its wide range of activities.

For more information please photocopy and complete the form on this page.

Alternatively you can visit our World Wide Web site at <http://www.cis.org.au>

PLEASE SEND ME MORE INFORMATION ON THE CIS:

- ☐ Individual Membership
- ☐ Corporate Membership
- ☐ Research programmes (including *Religion and the Free Society*)
- ☐ Publications & Subscriptions (including *Policy*)
- ☐ Lectures/seminars

Name: _____

Position: _____

Company: _____

Address: _____

_____ Postcode: _____

Phone: _____

Fax: _____

Send this form to:

The Centre for Independent Studies

PO Box 92, St Leonards, NSW 1590

Ph: (02) 9438 4377 • Fax: (02) 9439 7310

The End of Chaos

GLOBAL MARKETS AND THE INFORMATION ERA

Jerry Jordan

Governments have long pursued policies that determined the degree to which markets have been permitted to operate. But in the 1999 John Bonython Lecture, Jerry Jordan suggests that markets will, paradoxically enough, be at the heart of a new order of the 21st Century—an age of markets.

In this Occasional Paper, Jordan argues that the 1980s represented a watershed: the beginning of the withdrawal of the state from economic affairs. He also contends that the state's role in the future will be to nurture the economic garden by establishing all the necessary prerequisites for market economies to grow. Those governments who fail to realise this, Jordan claims, will in any event find themselves disciplined by global markets.



JERRY JORDAN has been President and Chief Executive Officer of the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, U.S.A., since 1992, and is a senior member of the United States Federal Reserve System which is responsible for formulating and implementing U.S. monetary policy.

Mr Jordan was Dean of the R.O. Anderson School of Management at the University of New Mexico for a number of years, and is a past president of the National Association of Business Economists. He served on President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisers and has consulted to the Bundesbank in Frankfurt.

THE JOHN BONYTHON LECTURE SERIES was inaugurated by The Centre for Independent Studies in 1984 to honour the founding Chairman of its then Board of Trustees. Each year the Centre sponsors a lecture to examine the relationship between individuals and the economic, social and political forces that make up a free society. The lectures are published as part of the CIS Occasional Papers series.

ISBN 1-86432-048-6



9 781864 320480

THE CENTRE FOR
INDEPENDENT
STUDIES

Occasional Papers 72

ISBN 1 86432 048 6

ISSN 0155 7386

A\$7.95 NZ\$11.95

www.cis.org.au