

through the government, which constitutes the framework within which these processes do evolve.

I have sometimes thought, too, that among certain classes of economists there is even an inclination to feel that too close a contact with the conditions of life might endanger like some people who feel that their own perfection, ~~xxxxxxx~~ the best way to keep themselves unspotted from the world is to retire to institutions, where they never see the ordinary man, as he lives in the world outside. As to that kind of life I am not competent to speak, but in the sphere of economics I do venture to say that the fugitive and cloistered type of economics is not of practical value to the business of life. One wants to make a very close and real contact from both sides as between theory and practice. When you talk about economists or economic doctrines in relation to the practical business of life and the formation of official policies, there is one comment made, that economists differ so much that it is impossible for practical politicians or other persons to take guidance from them. Well, I think these differences are really very greatly exaggerated. Of course, it is true that economists differ on many points; if they did not, economists would not be scientists, they would be only engaged in a conspiracy against the layman. Of course it is true, it is natural, that economists, discussing things among themselves, discuss mainly the points upon which they differ and not upon which they agree; it is the points of divergence to which they devote their attention. That is obviously necessary to the advancement of science, but I do think (and here I venture as a practical economist to make a suggestion to economists as a profession), it would be well for