

more money, we must still ask how it has come about that that branch of industry exists at all, to be used as a means of making money. Is the motive to the acquisition of knowledge always and only the desire to make a better living? I cannot believe that it is so: I think that the desire of knowledge is more fundamental than the desire to make money. Surely there is such a thing as an impulse so strong that, even if less money may be gained, a man would be willing to take less money, if only he could gain more knowledge. I do not find that the men who have advanced science were so overmastered by the desire of wealth, or so overburdened by its possession, that they pursued knowledge solely for what it would bring. If it were so, they would hardly have spent laborious days in the pursuit of knowledge, even when the path to wealth obviously led in another direction. I think Aristotle is right in saying that the desire of knowledge, and of knowledge for its own sake, is a fundamental impulse of our nature, and that beside it the acquisition of money is quite secondary. It is really the nature of man to seek for knowledge, because he has a very strong desire to know what the actual nature of things is. He does not feel that his life is complete without knowledge, and he is willing to devote all his energies to the task of knowing the world in which he lives, and in knowing himself. We might even omit the first object, and say that in all cases man is seeking to know himself. It is a remark of Turgot, I think, that "man never knows how anthropomorphic he is."

Turgot was thinking of the tendency of primitive man to explain the phenomena of nature by attributing to inanimate things the qualities he found in himself; but in a more fundamental sense the pursuit of knowledge is always the endeavour of man to understand himself. For you must remember that, whatever the world may be in itself, it exists for us only as we bring it within the circle of our knowledge; and the desire for knowledge is simply the impulse to bring the world more and more fully within that circle. We desire to make what is opaque and unintelligible to us transparent and intelligible, and so long as this end is not attained our fundamental desire is unsatisfied—the desire to be at unity with ourselves.

Now, if this is so, it is obvious that we cannot be satisfied ultimately with partial knowledge. It is not partial knowledge of which we are in quest, but complete knowledge. For the fundamental impulse to know is not an impulse to know some things; it is an impulse to know—to feel at home—in all that is. There is only one condition under which we can be satisfied with partial knowledge, viz., if we mistake the part for the whole. Then indeed we shall persuade ourselves that we have satisfied our desire for knowledge. But so long as we are clear that we are dealing with only a part, we cannot be satisfied, and must go on to deal with the other parts that go to make up the total organism of knowledge.

There is, then, let us assume, an organism of knowledge, and this means that, strictly speaking, there is only one science. For science is just a