

to our observation, but that we are at all times open-minded and wide-eyed, seeking for the new things which can be developed which might work for the constructive benefit of that with which we are primarily concerned.

The favorite figure of the philosophers for all times with respect to close-mindedness has been blindness. One of the most suggestive poems in our language is Zangwill's poem, "Blind Children"—I think that is the title—in which he pictures the possible joys of a group of children who have always been blind if only suddenly as they came to maturity they might have their eyes opened to the beauties of nature all about them. William James wrote one of his greatest essays on "A Certain Blindness in Human Beings," and the particular figure in regard to blindness which seems to me, perhaps, most important of all is the statement of Seneca in regard to his wife's fool, who was blind, in which Seneca said that the tragedy of the fool's blindness was not that she was blind but that she therefore thought all the world was black. In some such way those of you who have to do with industrial management, those of you who have to do with trying to convince people who are not interested in the desirability, or necessity, of new methods which shall carry them on to an advanced technique and the opportunities of increased production, realize that one of the most fatal things which we have in the industrial situation is that certain blindness,—the blindness of the limited intellect in a man who has come to industrial power, which renders it impossible for him to see and makes him think that all the world is black outside the range of what his limited vision covers:

Then also there is the danger in scientific management, and in the development of the science of anything, of incomplete generalizations and the acceptance as true of things which are handed down to us in the way of axioms, or platitudes to which they have degenerated. We need, for instance, possibly to differentiate between a refusal to work and a refusal to accept employment under prescribed conditions.

There was an article written shortly before the war in one of the philosophical reviews—I forget which one—in which the query was made: "Is liberty a sufficient motive for state action?" And in that the question was frankly faced as to whether or not the

world is the gainer by a sense of freedom except as that freedom is utilized for constructive purposes. I think this is a fair question to ask. What is the advantage of freedom if we are not to utilize that freedom for something? And in our own great nation, with all that it signifies to us and all that it promises to us, we have been given the opportunity of freedom from tyranny and autocracy of every sort in a mental and spiritual and physical sense; and under this we have had the opportunities of developing rounded strength such as the world has never seen.

Now we come to the question as to the way in which that freedom is to be used. We have had the freedom from, and now we come to the issue of what that freedom is for? In this connection I was tremendously impressed, on the political side, by a statement of Ramsay Muir's recently, in which he courteously refrained from naming the United States, but in which he said that the whole world at the present time is represented by the analogy of a group of Alpine climbers roped together. All but two of them have fallen over the face of the precipice; one of these is with difficulty maintaining his balance upon the edge, while the most capable and strongest of all is busily unwinding the rope from his waist.

If as a national attitude this is in any way true, or if it is true in any way of us in our individual dispositions toward the problems of the day, it simply means that with all the blessings which we have had, with all the freedom we have had, still we have not acquired the sense of responsibility, the noblesse oblige, which makes it right that we should have this *freedom from*, because we are not as yet disposed to utilize it for the constructive purpose, interpreting it into terms of *freedom for*.

But, personally, I don't believe this is the sense of the nation. I don't believe this is the sense of the industries of the nation. I don't believe this is the sense of the American people as individuals. But I do think that we have constantly to be on our guard lest in some chance moment, or in the crowded business of all things about us, we forget the responsibility which we have at the present time and fail to devote ourselves to making a proper accounting for the liberty which is ours.

In the same way, I think that the scientific spirit is endangered all too frequently by the insufficient importance which we attach to rapidly changing condi-

tions. The world is a far smaller place at present than it ever has been before. I was impressed recently in looking into the history of our own college. The founder of Dartmouth College came up from northern Connecticut to northern New Hampshire, and that trip across a small portion of New England at that time took as long a period of time as it takes at present to cross the Atlantic. Distance is not a matter of miles. Distance is simply a matter of time that it takes a person or an idea to get from one place to another. Returning to the analogy of the Colonial days, the district within the range of man's interest and activity who was in a given period of time able to go only two hundred and fifty miles, at the present time is replaced by a sphere of influence which is world-wide. We have, therefore, brought within the range of intimate responsibility of each one of us the whole gamut of permutations and combinations of international and the inter-racial questions and all that goes with the conflicts and the associations of people abroad and at home; we have all of these brought within the necessity of our daily consideration as against what was the parochial influence of the small community of former days. Therefore, it becomes necessary for us to consider as never before not only the relations of man to man, but the relations of country to country and of continent to continent.

In the study of any such relationship, we necessarily come to another fundamental principle in the development of the social science of the present day;—that the problems which were individual problems in the past are replaced now by what we may call mutualism or cooperation; and that except as we recognize this, we are not in a position to recognize or to appraise the importance of what is taking place about us.

There was in the year 1785, or thereabouts, an elderly settler, the only one, in a brook valley in what is now the township of Union, New Hampshire. He had made his clearing in the forest. He had erected his buildings. He had gathered stock about him and he had become well-to-do. Then another man moved into the brook valley five miles below, and every morning the old settler got up and looked down the brook valley and saw in a wisp of smoke the evidence of his neighbor. One morning he got up and started to pack, and he gathered his stock

together to drive it a hundred miles north into the wilderness. And responding to query as to what he intended to do, he said he was moving out because "the world had not become so small that he had got to see anybody's smoke."

Of course we have therein the spirit of individualism, which was necessary to its time for the settling and development of this country. It was necessary that the spirit of individualism be rampant in men's hearts and minds if they were to cross the Atlantic and settle this continent. It was necessary that the spirit of individualism rage always within them if they were to cross the Appalachians, to subdue the plains, to cross the Rockies, and finally to gain the Pacific slope, fanning out meanwhile to South and to North.

There comes a period, however, within the history of every nation when physical impediments having been overcome, and when material obstacles having been conquered, civilization turns back upon itself; when the conflict which has hitherto been held with nature from then on becomes a conflict between men and between classes; and except that conflict in this great United States can become transmuted into cooperation and a thing of mutual concern to find the right solution, we have to reconcile ourselves to the fact that sooner or later our nation goes the way that other nations have gone, under circumstances not very different. It is for this reason, it seems to me, that we need to put our attention as never before upon the affairs of the world as inclusive rather than exclusive; and that instead of emphasizing the points of difference which exist among us and which exist among the peoples of the earth, it is necessary for us to put our emphasis upon those things which bind all together, excluding consideration of minor things until we may give our attention to them as a united group.

I have been talking in very large generalizations—I realize that—but still we are making some approach toward inclusiveness. We at the present time find our lawyers gathered together in bar associations. We find our doctors together in medical societies. All professional men have their professional groups. And likewise, the industrial leaders combine in manufacturers' associations and the workingmen combine in labor unions. And even more than that;—we have combinations within the communities and the combinations of community delegation of their responsibilities,—the police responsibility, the fire responsi-