

Address by Admiral Ben Moreell on the
Occasion of the Dedication of The Harold R.
Staff Science Hall, Wilkes College, 1957 September 27

2.17

For Admiral Harold R. Stark
with deep affection -

Ben Moreell

Address By Admiral Ben Moreell
On The Occasion Of The Dedication Of The
HAROLD R. STARK SCIENCE HALL
WILKES COLLEGE
Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania
September 27, 1957

9/30/57

SCIENCE, INDUSTRY AND EDUCATION

I am honored indeed to make the dedicatory address for the Hall of Science at Wilkes College. And when this structure bears the name of a great American Naval Officer, with whom I have been privileged to serve and for whom I have the most profound respect and affection, then surely I am warranted in saying with the Psalmist, "My cup runneth over."

For among my most treasured possessions are the memories of my close association with Admiral Harold R. Stark, United States Navy, retired, during those trying years immediately preceding our entrance into World War II, when we were neither wholly at peace nor wholly at war, when we were bending every effort to prepare for any eventuality.

Most of you are aware of the Admiral's notable Naval career. It spans the period of the two great World Wars; and thus the difficulty of compressing even a brief account of that career into the time available to me today. I shall, therefore, confine myself to the highlights.

Harold Raynsford Stark was born in Wilkes-Barre in 1880, the son of Benjamin Franklin and Frances Warner Stark, native Pennsylvanians. He graduated from the Wilkes-Barre High School and Harry Hillman Academy and entered the United States Naval Academy in 1899 where he graduated in 1903. In 1907 he

- more -

married Katherine Adele Rhodes of Wilkes-Barre, his childhood sweetheart, with whom he used to sail on Lake Carey. This circumstance no doubt accounts for his early love of the water and of sailing, two attachments which remain with him to this day.

Until World War I, his duties followed the normal pattern of service at sea and at shore stations. Soon after we entered that War he was assigned to command a division of five Destroyers, which he was ordered to bring from Manila to Gibraltar at the height of the southwest monsoon. For this notable feat, accomplished with a high degree of professional competence, he received the Distinguished Service Medal, the first of many honors which marked his career.

Admiral Sims, then Commander of United States Naval Forces in Europe, had issued orders that on arrival in waters within his command, Commander Stark was to be detached and ordered to London for duty as Aide and Flag Secretary on his staff. In this capacity Commander Stark served during the remainder of World War I, returning to the United States with Admiral Sims at the end of that War.

His assignments subsequent to World War I, ashore and afloat, were those of an outstanding officer who had won the high regard of his superiors and who was rapidly establishing a Service reputation for great ability and devotion to duty.

In 1934 he was appointed Chief of the Bureau of Ordnance with the rank of Rear-Admiral. On the completion of this duty in 1937, he returned to sea as Commander of a Cruiser Division, and subsequently Commander of Cruisers of the Battle Force. From the latter duty he was appointed by President Roosevelt to be Chief of Naval Operations with the rank of full Admiral, thus becoming the Ranking Officer of the Navy.

Admiral Stark's notable service in this office, from 1939 to 1942, earned for him his second Distinguished Service Medal and fixed his place in Naval history as an administrator of exceptional competence.

In 1942 he was designated as Commander of United States Naval Forces in Europe. His Command covered the Azores Islands, as well as the Mediterranean and Northwest Africa. He remained in this assignment until 1945. During this period he played a vital role in the events which led to the final victory in Europe. For this service he was awarded a third Distinguished Service Medal by the Navy, and General Eisenhower conferred upon him a Distinguished Service Medal on behalf of the Army.

Admiral Stark was retired in 1946 after 47 years of active Naval Service.

In addition to the ~~four~~² Distinguished Service Medals already mentioned and numerous campaign medals, he received decorations from many of the governments allied with us in the Great War, some twenty in all. While Chief of Naval Operations he received the honorary degree of Doctor of Civil Law from Bucknell University and later he received a similar degree from Oxford University in England.

These, in briefest outline, are the historical highlights of a distinguished Naval career. They may seem somewhat prosaic to one who does not know the manner of man who stands behind them. I was intimately associated with Admiral Stark during his entire service as Chief of Naval Operations from 1939 to 1942, when I served as Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks and Chief of Civil Engineers of the Navy. His leadership stood out as a beacon for me and for many others who looked to him for guidance. Never have I known another man who matched his ability to instill in his associates and subordinates those attributes which the Country

expects of its military leaders. And he did this not by capricious decisions or peremptory orders, but by the power of his personal example. His devotion to duty, his tireless energy, his sympathetic understanding of the foibles of human nature, his patience and quiet persistence in times of great stress, his wise judgments and his love of country have set standards of personal conduct in the Naval Service which will never be exceeded and rarely equaled.

His record is one of endeavor and achievement far above and beyond the normal requirements of duty. In his person he epitomizes that ultimate measure of devotion ~~to his assigned tasks~~ which has been well described as an obedience to the unenforceable - a willing response to the call of conscience. I salute this great patriot.

SCIENCE, INDUSTRY AND EDUCATION

Our purpose today is to dedicate a Hall of Science to the service of an institution of higher learning. Science and liberal arts education alike have important contributions to make to the well-rounded life. Together with religion, they comprise the major cultural forces in our society. But if science, education and religion are to be effective, they need to be sustained by another element. I refer to business and industry, the economic side of life. All cultural activities are dependent in large degree for their well being and growth on the productivity of American Industry. Our economic activity supplies the means for all our ends. It is fitting, therefore, that we inquire briefly into these things; the nature of science, the functioning of American Industry, and the educational processes which will be nurtured in these halls. I am convinced that an intimate liaison between these three - science, industry and education - is essential if we

are to achieve that measure of social progress without which we cannot survive as a free people.

In recent years there has been a revolutionary change in scientific thought. New knowledge in this area demands that we re-assess our previous views on the economic, political and social aspects of our contemporary life and their inter-relationships. I will sketch briefly some of these developments.

~~First with respect to Science:~~ We are living, it is often said, in an age of science. Improved living standards, increased life expectancy, modern methods of communication and travel, all testify to the enormous benefits we are reaping from science. But science has also introduced some hazards. The scientific method, which has penetrated the human consciousness very deeply, affects our outlook and habits and thoughts so powerfully that we are in danger of accepting its validity in areas where it cannot be decisive.

Science does not deal with the whole of life but only with selected aspects thereof. This fact is emphasized by Dr. Warren Weaver, a recent past president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In an address to the Association Dr. Weaver said, "Science has impressively proved itself to be a powerful way of dealing with certain aspects of our experience. These are, in general, the logical and quantitative aspects . . . We simply do not know yet how far these methods, which have worked so well with physical nature, will be successful in the world of living things." (Emphasis supplied.)

Without question, there is a place for the scientific method in the study of human behavior, individual and social. But the role of science in this area is strictly limited. Dr. Weaver warns us that it is "not at all necessary

that the particular analytical techniques of the physical sciences be forced upon biological or social problems with the arrogant assumption that they can and should make unnecessary other types of insight and experience."

However, this humility was not a feature of nineteenth century science.

Thus, it was only natural that Karl Marx, living when science was thought to be the only avenue to truth, should have called his socialism "scientific"; he pinned the label "utopian" on all earlier socialisms. And from Marx's time to the present we have been plagued by those who, armed with pseudo-science and playing upon popular scientific superstitions, have sought to mold society according to the pattern of their own particular master plan.

Individual liberty has yielded ground everywhere before the onslaughts of the social planners, who adopt various labels, such as Communism, Socialism or Welfare Statism. These people differ among themselves, but they all agree that no individual life shall go unplanned--if they can help it. And they have presented their case persistently, with what seemed like logic and what appeared to be facts. Above all, they appealed to the prestige of science. The methods of science applied to physical nature produced obvious benefits; therefore, they said, all we need do is to apply science to society to have a brave new world!

But the revolution in science has cut the ground from under these arrogant assumptions. True science has now reached the point where it gives more support to man's intuitive desire for freedom than to the pseudo-scientific efforts of the social planners. Science has become acutely aware of the limitations of its method.

Now we begin to understand why the misguided effort to apply the methods of science wholesale to society must result in central planning, socialism or communism. If you wish to think in terms of "scientific socialism" you must first reduce men to calculable units, each one very much like any other. Disregard the human equation and the drawing of social blueprints becomes easy. Actually, the individual person is a richly various, many dimensioned, multi-faceted, undivided whole. But in the eyes of the social planner he is only a dehumanized unit, of no interest except as he can be used to confirm a general theory.

We who regard each individual person as a unique being, unlike any other person, find that our conviction in this matter is no longer denied by the best scientific thought. The methods of bringing selected aspects of physical nature under control can no longer be used as justification for bringing people under control. Socialism, where it pretended to be scientific, was always based on a misunderstanding of science. The new understanding of science lends no support to socialism. The social planners can no longer trade on the prestige of science. The climate of opinion has changed, and we can again hearken to the voice of individual conscience which tells us that any effort to reduce persons to abstractions, so that they may be more easily controlled from the top, is wrong and doomed to failure.

THE AMERICAN POLITICAL AND SOCIAL PATTERN

The intent of the Founding Fathers was to establish here a new type of government under which each individual would be free to go as far as his talents permit. Our new understanding of science provides reassurance that this intent is consistent with the nature of the universe.

The revolutionary part of their idea was a new political application of certain concepts which are an essential element of the Judeo-Christian religious tradition.

Basic to this tradition is the concept that God rules the universe; with the corollary that all men are creatures of God. It follows that if men are creatures of God, each man is sovereign in his relations with his fellowmen, and therefore has worth and dignity, as an individual. This concept of individual sovereignty gave birth to the idea of limited government--a government which is itself forbidden to trespass on the rights of the individual and which exists only to prohibit private trespass.

Those who launched this American experiment believed that each of us has an inalienable right to life. The sustenance of life implies the right to control the fruits of one's labor, that is, one's honestly acquired property. Without these corollary rights, the right to life itself has no meaning.

To make these rights secure, the individuals concerned designated a common agency, whose function was to do for all of them collectively but equally, that and only that which each one had a right to do for himself individually.

This agency, "government", was commissioned to defend the lives, the liberties and the livelihoods of the Nation's citizens; to invoke a common justice; and to keep the records incidental thereto. Other than this the people were to be free to pursue their own interests, provided that such pursuit would not lead them to trespass upon the natural rights of others.

MAN'S SOCIAL PROGRESS

Defenders of these fundamental principles enunciated by our political forebears are proponents of progress. They favor social advance; but they believe it can come about only as individuals co-operate freely in all fields of human endeavor, with government limited to the job of curbing all destructive actions. They are neither "liberals" nor "conservatives"; they are "libertarians". They believe that man's true progress cannot be measured horizontally, in any direction; it is neither to the right nor to the left, it is up! In that direction lies man's advancement, his way out of many current dilemmas.

The lesson of history teaches that those who put their trust in man-made political force are condemned to a low level of mediocrity. And this is true whether the political force is wielded by the so-called "left" or by the so-called "right". Libertarians hold that man can advance creatively only as he is free to rise of his own merit, unhampered by the imposition of political privilege for himself or for others.

A CLIMATE CONDUCTIVE TO SOCIAL PROGRESS

If we conceive of "social progress" as the elevation of the intellectual, spiritual, and economic well-being of individuals, it follows that no organization or group can, of itself, assure social progress. Morality does not receive its sanctions from the group or from society; ethical mandates derive from the relationship between an individual and his God. And social progress is attained by a group only to the extent that the individuals who comprise it have progressed morally and socially, as individuals.

The best the group can do is to contribute to the development of a "climate conducive to social progress". Such a climate prevails when economic, social and governmental affairs are so organized and administered as to permit the individual to develop his God-given talents with maximum personal freedom of choice and a corresponding responsibility for the results of that choice.

In such a climate, one would expect the individual to achieve his maximum development in those positive factors which contribute to a good society-- integrity, understanding, reasonableness and individuality. And these, in turn, would provide a firm base to act as a launching platform for the attainment of the higher ends of life--such as scholarship, art, music, charity and worship. But, before the individual can attain the maximum development of which he is capable at any given time he must be free to direct his own creative energy.

There is also the possibility of establishing a climate which inhibits social progress. Most people would agree that conditions which permit the restriction of individual liberty by coercive force, which promote prejudice and bigotry, or which set a premium on irrational behavior will impede or prevent social progress.

OUR INDUSTRIAL SOCIETY

Our society is highly industrialized. This is true not only of the business sector of our economy; it is also true of our basic agricultural production. This system provides livelihoods for 170 million people on this continent who, in turn, help support much of the rest of the world. Furthermore, with the raising of the general level of prosperity of this Nation, mass production, distribution, and consumption of goods and services has been paralleled

by mass ownership of industry. How can we account for this? Our people are no more talented than those of the countries whence they came. Our country is no more favored than many others in natural advantages. Furthermore, our resources lay for centuries relatively unused, supporting fewer than a million inhabitants. We are blessed materially beyond all other people.

Wherein do we differ from them? Even a casual consideration of this question leads to the conclusion that there was established here a society based on certain concepts which have as their ultimate effect the minimizing of that coercive force which inhibits social progress.

This, then, is the larger pattern of our society into which American business must be fitted harmoniously.

The question at issue is whether American business and industry, and all that is comprised under the label "Capitalism", contributes to the conservation of "a climate conducive to social progress". If so, what steps should be taken to assure a progressively increasing effectiveness of that contribution?

At the outset let me disavow any claim that business can do more than contribute its share to the strengthening of our culture. There are other important segments of our society which have equal or even greater responsibility. And once the proper social climate is established, it is up to the individual to "upgrade" himself. For, only he can do it!

It is generally conceded that an individual is most productive when he has a maximum of freedom from restraint, whether his energies find an outlet in religion, in writing or in thought--or whether he is engaged in the production and exchange of goods and services. And, as a matter of fundamental

principle, there is no more warrant for attempting to clamp political controls on a man's energies in his shop than there is to put his energies under political control in his church, his classroom, his editorial office or his study. If freedom is good in any one of these places, which I believe, it is good in every one of these places,--which I also believe.

It is unfortunate that not enough businessmen have real convictions about the social conditions which are essential if business, as a relatively autonomous activity, is to survive. They think their job as businessmen is done if they are able to pay wages and salaries to employees, and dividends to shareholders and maintain a going concern. But if we accept the thesis that each of us has a duty to preserve the cultural, social, governmental and economic structures which made our national preeminence possible, it follows that if business is misconceived as an undiluted effort for more money to the exclusion of other values, business is not good for society as a whole. In fact, it is ~~now~~ ^{not} even good for itself!

Without a reasonable assurance of profits, the businessman could not long continue as a businessman. But there is more to his responsibility than profits. Perhaps it can best be summarized by saying that he has an obligation to keep alive and healthy the goose which lays the golden eggs.

SOCIETY AND THE MARKET PLACE

It is an interesting concept that the development of society is collateral with that of the market place. The human community develops as men are able to exchange their surplus energies in the form of goods, services and ideas. If every man were self-sufficient, society would be inconceivable. The fact of

human interdependence, as men are now constituted, implies the existence of media whereby this interdependence is manifest.

A society is impossible unless there be some exchange, and it is rich and complex in the degree to which these exchanges multiply. And they will multiply unless they are sabotaged. So we need political government to protect exchange against sabotage. But time and again this protective function is perverted and government itself becomes the saboteur.

American businessmen should know that the concentrations of power and responsibility lodged with them must be exercised in the context of American life; that if private business does not assume community responsibilities, a social vacuum is created and government steps in; that government bureaucrats are very adept at avoiding or submerging restraints which the electorate attempts to place on them; that American business must act as though it has a soul--and this is even more important in the case of the huge corporation than in that of the individual businessman. We who are in business should know that what we think, what we say, and, more importantly, what we do during our working hours cannot be divorced from the responsibilities we must assume as members of society, and that those responsibilities can be discharged only as we participate to the extent of our abilities in the whole life of our community.

That these obligations are gradually being recognized is evidenced by the growing interest of business in education, public health, community development, religion, cultural activities, and charitable works.

BUSINESS AND EDUCATION

Perhaps the most significant evidence of this awareness is in the field of education. Many corporations and individuals now recognize the mutuality of interest between business and education and, what is more important, they are willing to provide the help needed by our educational institutions.

I would like to state here the views of one businessman with respect to the reciprocal obligations which bind business and education together.

We are all familiar with the invaluable direct help which education gives to industry in providing personnel and in research. And I have mentioned the growing sense of responsibility on the part of businessmen for the support of education.

There are, also, certain responsibilities of business management to its stockholders, those who have invested their savings in ^{the} business. Included among these are--

1. Recruiting and training a labor force
2. Procuring sources of raw materials
3. Acquiring efficient tools and equipment
4. Developing economical manufacturing processes
5. Locating profitable markets, and
6. Making a decent profit

But more important than all these is the responsibility for preservation of the value of the stockholders' property.

When "government ownership of industry" ideas are on the rampage, as they are now, and when the only antidote to these are "private ownership ideas", it is

the duty of management to aid educational efforts which promote private ownership ideas". By the same token, it is the duty of management to withhold aid from those educational efforts which support government ownership ideas.

How does "academic freedom" fit into this concept? Does industry have the right to tell educators what they should teach? Not at all. It seems to me that the issue of academic freedom in privately financed educational institutions is not too difficult to resolve. I have no right to interfere with an institution which promotes economic and social ideas which are repugnant to me. On the other hand, there should be no obligation, direct or implied, on my part to support such an institution. Thus, both the institution and I have freedom of choice, with commensurate responsibility for the results of that choice. This is the very essence of libertarianism.

Here, then, is an area of limitless extent where education can contribute importantly to the preservation of those conditions which make social progress under our traditional American institutions possible, i.e., by fostering those ideas which flow from the fundamental principles of the Founding Fathers.

BUSINESS AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

And so it is in all other areas of social activity. For the American social organization is a fabric, the principal threads of which are religion, industry, law, political economy, education, social well-being and the cultural arts. It is not enough that American business should tell the public of its achievements in its own highly specialized sphere of production and distribution. It must contribute importantly to the process of education and to the formation of public opinion in all of the areas I have mentioned.

cut I believe that unless American business moves into these areas at once and vigorously, they will soon be fully appropriated by those who believe and expound doctrines which will ultimately destroy us. The challenge to American business is clear and vital to the future of our country. It is this: Can we establish a conscious and vigorous leadership motivated by the highest moral principles which should govern human relations? I am convinced that, unless we do, the vacuum created by our unwillingness will be filled by those who would take us down the road to complete statism and inevitable moral and social collapse.

I have had much to say about ~~both the politician and his proper job and~~ the businessman and his obligation to assume wider responsibilities for the moral and cultural foundations which undergird our way of life. I have indicated that when man's economic needs are satisfied he is in a better position to satisfy his needs for scholarship, art, music, and worship. These are needs of his spiritual nature, and I believe that no society can long endure which denies or frustrates men in this area.

The custody of man's spiritual nature, defining spiritual nature broadly, is largely in the hands of our educators and our clergy. These two orders of men were once designated alike, as "clerks". A "clerk" was either a man in holy orders, or a lay scholar. Any system of social life which does not include the spiritual dimension and assign an important place to its "clerks" is doomed.

I have a recollection that a Bishop of the early church said much the same thing. He declared that society needs three kind of men; those who work, those who fight, and those who pray, Society needs some one to grow the wheat

and bake the bread. It also needs someone to stand guard to protect the producer against marauders. But in addition to these, it needs those who constantly remind men that there is more to life than growing wheat and protecting the crop in order to grow more wheat next season. Man has a spiritual nature with needs just as real as physical hunger. He has material problems, but these cannot be resolved by materialistic answers. There is a meaning for human life which transcends human life. But that meaning will elude us unless society is founded, as solidly as a three-legged stool, on the three balanced supports of those who work, those who fight and those who pray.

#####

