

generations. They are instruments the efficacy of which has been demonstrated by the whole history of human civilization. Their establishment in the international world, though accompanied by limitations upon their scope, will not alter their quality nor diminish their prestige. To transplant vines and trees from familiar to unfamiliar environments, is necessarily to cut them back and prune them. To transplant social organisms from the world of individual and group relations to the world of international relations, is necessarily also to limit them and cut them back. Nevertheless, instruments of proven social value taken over from the domestic to the international world carry with them qualities of vigor and of fruitfulness which the limitations placed upon them by their new condition cannot kill. They have behind them an historical momentum and a demonstrated usefulness which mean far more, in terms of ultimate effectiveness, than the precise legal terms by which they are established in their new environment."

However, before these instruments "of proven social value" can function effectively in the international field, there has somehow to be developed the international mind.

The international mind means, in its turn, the re-creation, in some way or other, of the sense of philosophical unity which, with all its defaults, lingered in Europe up to the 19th Century.

In his "Education", Henry Adams recounts how, in 1903, he believed that the new discoveries of science had dealt a final blow to this philosophical unity; how, in fact, science had apparently shattered the universe into a multiverse.

It had become "radioactive"; it was no longer stable and reducible to standard philosophical formulas. Even more terrifying, its technology had so far outstripped our social resources as to create a culture lag in Western civilization that was obviously growing more ungovernable with the passage of each decade. There are times when it now seems to be completely out of control.

Our dilemma, however, cannot be attributed to science and its atomic fission any more than to the law of gravity. Henry Adams was too close to the new discoveries of 1903 to be able to grasp more than a small fraction of their implications. The instability of radio-active elements appeared to him to point to a chaotic universe destroying what had been an orderly society. Today the situation appears rather the reverse. Natural law still reigns supreme, and science still demands a basic unity of operation and control. But it is our present-day society - and especially our national state system - which is basically anarchistic. That is the dilemma which is at the centre of all our contemporary difficulties.

Natural law is obviously no respecter of persons or national boundaries, and science, with its employment of natural law, is no respecter either. Whether we like it or not, science is international. If we attempt to reduce and confine its global potential in national containers, the result will still be international; but international annihilation.

Therefore, present-day science confronts us with a categorical imperative. We must reduce, and even eliminate, the contemporary culture lag existing between science and technology on the one hand, and our political and social institutions on the other. We cannot make scientific knowledge conform to our wishful thinking any more than Canute could make the waves recede; our only alternative is to bring our political and social thinking abreast of the implications of science.

In that essential process toward our world order the Universities - and more particularly their social scientists - can play a vital part. I hope that discussions - such as we are having today - may help them play that part.