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*ThE WAY*

it is upon the Trunk that a gentleman works. — Analects of Confucius, i. 2

The practical result of education in the spirit of *The Green Book* must be the destruction of the society which accepts it. but this is not necessarily a refutation of subjectivism about values as a theory. The true doctrine might be a doctrine which if we accept we die. no one who speaks from within the *Tao* could reject it on that account: έν δε φαει και ὅλεσσου. but it has not yet come to that. There are theoretical difficulties in the philosophy of Gaius and Titius.

however subjective they may be about some traditional values, Gaius and Titius have shown by the very act of writing *The Green Book* that there must be some other values about which they are not subjective at all. They write in order to produce certain states of mind in the rising generation, if not because they think those states of mind intrinsically just or good, yet certainly because they think them to be the means to some state of society which they regard as desirable. it would not be difficult to collect from vari- ous passages in *The Green Book* what their ideal is. but we need not. The important point is not the precise nature of their end, but the fact that they have an end at all. They must have, or their book (being purely practical in intention) is written to no purpose. And this end must have real value in their eyes. To abstain from calling it good and to use, instead, such predicates as ‘necessary’ or ‘pro- gressive’ or ‘efficient’ would be a subterfuge. They could be forced by argument to answer the questions ‘necessary for what?’, ‘pro- gressing towards what?’, ‘effecting what?’; in the last resort they would have to admit that some state of affairs was in their opinion good for its own sake. And this time they could not maintain that ‘good’ simply described their own emotion about it. for the whole purpose of their book is so to condition the young reader that he will share their approval, and this would be either a fool’s or a villain’s undertaking unless they held that their approval was in some way valid or correct.

The WAy in actual fact Gaius and Titius will be found to hold, with com- plete uncritical dogmatism, the whole system of values which hap- pened to be in vogue among moderately educated young men of the professional classes during the period between the two wars.1 Their scepticism about values is on the surface: it is for use on oth- er people’s values; about the values current in their own set they are not nearly sceptical enough. And this phenomenon is very usual. A great many of those who ‘debunk’ traditional or (as they would say) ‘sentimental’ values have in the background values of their own which they believe to be immune from the debunking process. They claim to be cutting away the parasitic growth of emotion, religious sanction, and inherited taboos, in order that ‘real’ or ‘basic’ values may emerge. i will now try to find out what happens if this is seriously attempted.

let us continue to use the previous example—that of death for a good cause—not, of course, because virtue is the only value or mar- tyrdom the only virtue, but because this is the *experimentum crucis* which shows different systems of thought in the clearest light. let us suppose that an innovator in values regards *dulce* et *decorum* and greater love hath no man as mere irrational sentiments which are to be stripped off in order that we may get down to the ‘realistic’ or ‘basic’ ground of this value. Where will he find such a ground? first of all, he might say that the real value lay in the utility of such sacrifice to the community. ‘Good’, he might say, ‘means what is useful to the community.’ but of course the death of the community is not useful to the community — only the death of some of its members. What is really meant is that the death of some men is useful to other men. That is very true. but on what ground are some men being asked to die for the benefit of oth- ers? every appeal to pride, honour, shame, or love is excluded by hypothesis. To use these would be to return to sentiment and the innovator’s task is, having cut all that away, to explain to men, in terms of pure reasoning, why they will be well advised to die that others may live. he may say ‘Unless some of us risk death all of us are *certain* to die.’ but that will be true only in a limited number of cases; and even when it is true it provokes the very reasonable counter question ‘Why should i be one of those who take the risk?’ At this point the innovator may ask why, after all, selfishness should be more ‘rational’ or ‘intelligent’ than altruism. The ques-
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The AboliTion of MAn tion is welcome. if by Reason we mean the process actually em- ployed by Gaius and Titius when engaged in debunking (that is, the connecting by inference of propositions, ultimately derived from sense data, with further propositions), then the answer must be that a refusal to sacrifice oneself is no more rational than a con- sent to do so. And no less rational. neither choice is rational — or irrational — at all. from propositions about fact alone no *practical* conclusion can ever be drawn. *This will preserve society* cannot lead to *do this* except by the mediation of *society ought to be preserved*. *This will cost you your life* cannot lead directly to *do not do this*: it can lead to it only through a felt desire or an acknowledged duty of self-preservation. The innovator is trying to get a conclusion in the imperative mood out of premisses in the indicative mood: and though he continues trying to all eternity he cannot succeed, for the thing is impossible. We must therefore either extend the word Reason to include what our ancestors called Practical Reason and confess that judgements such as *society ought to be preserved* (though they can support themselves by no reason of the sort that Gaius and Titius demand) are not mere sentiments but are rationality itself; or else we must give up at once, and for ever, the attempt to find a core of ‘rational’ value behind all the sentiments we have debunked. The innovator will not take the first alternative, for practical principles known to all men by Reason are simply the *Tao* which he has set out to supersede. he is more likely to give up the quest for a ‘rational’ core and to hunt for some other ground even more ‘basic’ and ‘realistic’.

This he will probably feel that he has found in instinct. The preservation of society, and of the species itself, are ends that do not hang on the precarious thread of Reason: they are given by instinct. That is why there is no need to argue against the man who does not acknowledge them. We have an instinctive urge to preserve our own species. That is why men ought to work for pos- terity. We have no instinctive urge to keep promises or to respect individual life: that is why scruples of justice and humanity — in fact the *Tao* — can be properly swept away when they conflict with our real end, the preservation of the species. That, again, is why the modern situation permits and demands a new sexual morality: the old taboos served some real purpose in helping to preserve the species, but contraceptives have modified this and we can now
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The WAy abandon many of the taboos. for of course sexual desire, being instinctive, is to be gratified whenever it does not conflict with the preservation of the species. it looks, in fact, as if an ethics based on instinct will give the innovator all he wants and nothing that he does not want.

in reality we have not advanced one step. i will not insist on the point that instinct is a name for we know not what (to say that migratory birds find their way by instinct is only to say that we do not know how migratory birds find their way), for i think it is here being used in a fairly definite sense, to mean an unre- flective or spontaneous impulse widely felt by the members of a given species. in what way does instinct, thus conceived, help us to find ‘real’ values? is it maintained that we must obey instinct, that we cannot do otherwise? but if so, why are *Green Books* and the like written? Why this stream of exhortation to drive us where we cannot help going? Why such praise for those who have sub- mitted to the inevitable? or is it maintained that if we do obey instinct we shall be happy and satisfied? but the very question we are considering was that of facing death which (so far as the in- novator knows) cuts off every possible satisfaction: and if we have an instinctive desire for the good of posterity then this desire, by the very nature of the case, can never be satisfied, since its aim is achieved, if at all, when we are dead. it looks very much as if the innovator would have to say not that we must obey instinct, nor that it will satisfy us to do so, but that we *ought* to obey it.2

but why ought we to obey instinct? is there another instinct of a higher order directing us to do so, and a third of a still higher order directing us to obey *it*? — an infinite regress of instincts? This is presumably impossible, but nothing else will serve. from the statement about psychological fact ‘i have an impulse to do so and so’ we cannot by any ingenuity derive the practical principle ‘i ought to obey this impulse’. even if it were true that men had a spontaneous, unreflective impulse to sacrifice their own lives for the preservation of their fellows, it remains a quite separate question whether this is an impulse they should control or one they should indulge. for even the innovator admits that many im- pulses (those which conflict with the preservation of the species) have to be controlled. And this admission surely introduces us to a yet more fundamental difficulty.
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The AboliTion of MAn Telling us to obey instinct is like telling us to obey ‘people’. People say different things: so do instincts. our instincts are at war. if it is held that the instinct for preserving the species should always be obeyed at the expense of other instincts, whence do we derive this rule of precedence? To listen to that instinct speaking in its own cause and deciding it in its own favour would be rather simple-minded. each instinct, if you listen to it, will claim to be gratified at the expense of all the rest. by the very act of listening to one rather than to others we have already prejudged the case. if we did not bring to the examination of our instincts a knowledge of their comparative dignity we could never learn it from them. And that knowledge cannot itself be instinctive: the judge cannot be one of the parties judged; or, if he is, the decision is worthless and there is no ground for placing the preservation of the species above self-preservation or sexual appetite.

The idea that, without appealing to any court higher than the in- stincts themselves, we can yet find grounds for preferring one in- stinct above its fellows dies very hard. We grasp at useless words: we call it the ‘basic’, or ‘fundamental’, or ‘primal’, or ‘deepest’ instinct. it is of no avail. either these words conceal a value judge- ment passed upon the instinct and therefore not derivable from it, or else they merely record its felt intensity, the frequency of its operation and its wide distribution. if the former, the whole attempt to base value upon instinct has been abandoned: if the latter, these observations about the quantitative aspects of a psy- chological event lead to no practical conclusion. it is the old di- lemma. either the premisses already concealed an imperative or the conclusion remains merely in the indicative.3

finally, it is worth inquiry whether there is any instinct to care for posterity or preserve the species. i do not discover it in myself: and yet i am a man rather prone to think of remote futurity — a man who can read Mr olaf Stapledon with delight. Much less do i find it easy to believe that the majority of people who have sat op- posite me in buses or stood with me in queues feel an unreflective impulse to do anything at all about the species, or posterity. only people educated in a particular way have ever had the idea ‘pos- terity’ before their minds at all. it is difficult to assign to instinct our attitude towards an object which exists only for reflective men. What we have by nature is an impulse to preserve our own chil-
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The WAy dren and grandchildren; an impulse which grows progressively feebler as the imagination looks forward and finally dies out in the ‘deserts of vast futurity’. no parents who were guided by this instinct would dream for a moment of setting up the claims of their hypothetical descendants against those of the baby actually crowing and kicking in the room. Those of us who accept the *Tao* may, perhaps, say that they ought to do so: but that is not open to those who treat instinct as the source of value. As we pass from mother love to rational planning for the future we are passing away from the realm of instinct into that of choice and reflection: and if instinct is the source of value, planning for the future ought to be less respectable and less obligatory than the baby language and cuddling of the fondest mother or the most fatuous nursery anecdotes of a doting father. if we are to base ourselves upon in- stinct, these things are the substance, and care for posterity the shadow—the huge, flickering shadow of the nursery happiness cast upon the screen of the unknown future. i do not say this projec- tion is a bad thing: but then i do not believe that instinct is the ground of value judgements. What is absurd is to claim that your care for posterity finds its justification in instinct and then flout at every turn the only instinct on which it could be supposed to rest, tearing the child almost from the breast to creche and kindergar- ten in the interests of progress and the coming race.

The truth finally becomes apparent that neither in any opera- tion with factual propositions nor in any appeal to instinct can the innovator find the basis for a system of values. none of the principles he requires are to be found there: but they are all to be found somewhere else. ‘All within the four seas are his brothers’ (xii. 5) says Confucius of the *Chün-tzu*, the *cuor gentil* or gentleman. *humani nihil a me alienum puto* says the Stoic. ‘do as you would be done by,’ says Jesus. ‘humanity is to be preserved,’ says locke.4 All the practical principles behind the innovator’s case for poster- ity, or society, or the species, are there from time immemorial in the *Tao*. but they are nowhere else. Unless you accept these with- out question as being to the world of action what axioms are to the world of theory, you can have no practical principles whatever. you cannot reach them as conclusions: they are premisses. you may, since they can give no ‘reason’ for themselves of a kind to silence Gaius and Titius, regard them as sentiments: but then you
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The AboliTion of MAn must give up contrasting ‘real’ or ‘rational’ value with sentimental value. All value will be sentimental; and you must confess (on pain of abandoning every value) that all sentiment is not ‘merely’ subjective. you may, on the other hand, regard them as rational — nay as rationality itself — as things so obviously reasonable that they neither demand nor admit proof. but then you must allow that Reason can be practical, that an *ought* must not be dismissed because it cannot produce some is as its credential. if nothing is self-evident, nothing can be proved. Similarly if nothing is obliga- tory for its own sake, nothing is obligatory at all.

To some it will appear that i have merely restored under anoth- er name what they always meant by basic or fundamental instinct. but much more than a choice of words is involved. The innovator attacks traditional values (the *Tao*) in defence of what he at first supposes to be (in some special sense) ‘rational’ or ‘biological’ val- ues. but as we have seen, all the values which he uses in attacking the *Tao*, and even claims to be substituting for it, are themselves derived from the *Tao*. if he had really started from scratch, from right outside the human tradition of value, no jugglery could have advanced him an inch towards the conception that a man should die for the community or work for posterity. if the *Tao* falls, all his own conceptions of value fall with it. not one of them can claim any authority other than that of the *Tao*. only by such shreds of the *Tao* as he has inherited is he enabled even to attack it. The question therefore arises what title he has to select bits of it for acceptance and to reject others. for if the bits he rejects have no authority, neither have those he retains: if what he retains is valid, what he rejects is equally valid too.

The innovator, for example, rates high the claims of posterity. he cannot get any valid claim for posterity out of instinct or (in the modern sense) reason. he is really deriving our duty to pos- terity from the *Tao*; our duty to do good to all men is an axiom of Practical Reason, and our duty to do good to our descendants is a clear deduction from it. but then, in every form of the *Tao* which has come down to us, side by side with the duty to children and descendants lies the duty to parents and ancestors. by what right do we reject one and accept the other? Again, the innovator may place economic value first. To get people fed and clothed is the great end, and in pursuit of its scruples about justice and good
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The WAy faith may be set aside. The *Tao* of course agrees with him about the importance of getting the people fed and clothed. Unless the innovator were himself using the *Tao* he could never have learned of such a duty. but side by side with it in the *Tao* lie those duties of justice and good faith which he is ready to debunk. What is his warrant? he may be a Jingoist, a Racialist, an extreme national- ist, who maintains that the advancement of his own people is the object to which all else ought to yield. but no kind of factual ob- servation and no appeal to instinct will give him a ground for this option. once more, he is in fact deriving it from the *Tao*: a duty to our own kin, because they are our own kin, is a part of traditional morality. but side by side with it in the *Tao*, and limiting it, lie the inflexible demands of justice, and the rule that, in the long run, all men are our brothers. Whence comes the innovator’s authority to pick and choose?

Since i can see no answer to these questions, i draw the follow- ing conclusions. This thing which i have called for convenience the *Tao*, and which others may call natural law or Traditional Mo- rality or the first Principles of Practical Reason or the first Plati- tudes, is not one among a series of possible systems of value. it is the sole source of all value judgements. if it is rejected, all value is rejected. if any value is retained, it is retained. The effort to refute it and raise a new system of value in its place is self-contradictory. There has never been, and never will be, a radically new judge- ment of value in the history of the world. What purport to be new systems or (as they now call them) ‘ideologies’, all consist of frag- ments from the *Tao* itself, arbitrarily wrenched from their context in the whole and then swollen to madness in their isolation, yet still owing to the *Tao* and to it alone such validity as they possess. if my duty to my parents is a superstition, then so is my duty to posterity. if justice is a superstition, then so is my duty to my country or my race. if the pursuit of scientific knowledge is a real value, then so is conjugal fidelity. The rebellion of new ideologies against the *Tao* is a rebellion of the branches against the tree: if the rebels could succeed they would find that they had destroyed themselves. The human mind has no more power of inventing a new value than of imagining a new primary colour, or, indeed, of creating a new sun and a new sky for it to move in.

does this mean, then, that no progress in our perceptions of
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The AboliTion of MAn value can ever take place? That we are bound down for ever to an unchanging code given once for all? And is it, in any event, pos- sible to talk of obeying what i call the *Tao*? if we lump together, as i have done, the traditional moralities of east and West, the Christian, the Pagan, and the Jew, shall we not find many con- tradictions and some absurdities? i admit all this. Some criticism, some removal of contradictions, even some real development, is required. but there are two very different kinds of criticism.

A theorist about language may approach his native tongue, as it were from outside, regarding its genius as a thing that has no claim on him and advocating wholesale alterations of its idiom and spelling in the interests of commercial convenience or scien- tific accuracy. That is one thing. A great poet, who has ‘loved, and been well nurtured in, his mother tongue’, may also make great alterations in it, but his changes of the language are made in the spirit of the language itself: he works from within. The language which suffers, has also inspired the changes. That is a different thing—as different as the works of Shakespeare are from basic english. it is the difference between alteration from within and alteration from without: between the organic and the surgical. in the same way, the *Tao* admits development from within. There is a difference between a real moral advance and a mere innovation. from the Confucian ‘do not do to others what you would not like them to do to you’ to the Christian ‘do as you would be done by’ is a real advance. The morality of nietzsche is a mere innovation. The first is an advance because no one who did not admit the validity of the old maxim could see reason for accepting the new one, and anyone who accepted the old would at once recognize the new as an extension of the same principle. if he rejected it, he would have to reject it as a superfluity, something that went too far, not as something simply heterogeneous from his own ideas of value. but the nietzschean ethic can be accepted only if we are ready to scrap traditional morals as a mere error and then to put ourselves in a position where we can find no ground for any value judgements at all. it is the difference between a man who says to us: ‘you like your vegetables moderately fresh; why not grow your own and have them perfectly fresh?’ and a man who says, ‘Throw away that loaf and try eating bricks and centipedes instead.’

Those who understand the spirit of the *Tao* and who have been
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The WAy led by that spirit can modify it in directions which that spirit itself demands. only they can know what those directions are. The out- sider knows nothing about the matter. his attempts at alteration, as we have seen, contradict themselves. So far from being able to harmonize discrepancies in its letter by penetration to its spirit, he merely snatches at some one precept, on which the accidents of time and place happen to have riveted his attention, and then rides it to death — for no reason that he can give. from within the *Tao* itself comes the only authority to modify the *Tao*. This is what Confucius meant when he said ‘With those who follow a different Way it is useless to take counsel’.5 This is why Aristotle said that only those who have been well brought up can usefully study ethics: to the corrupted man, the man who stands outside the *Tao*, the very starting point of this science is invisible.6 he may be hostile, but he cannot be critical: he does not know what is being discussed. This is why it was also said ‘This people that knoweth not the law is accursed’7 and ‘he that believeth not shall be damned’.8 An open mind, in questions that are not ultimate, is useful. but an open mind about the ultimate foundations either of Theoretical or of Practical Reason is idiocy. if a man’s mind is open on these things, let his mouth at least be shut. he can say nothing to the purpose. outside the *Tao* there is no ground for criticizing either the *Tao* or anything else.

in particular instances it may, no doubt, be a matter of some delicacy to decide where the legitimate internal criticism ends and the fatal external kind begins. but wherever any precept of traditional morality is simply challenged to produce its creden- tials, as though the burden of proof lay on it, we have taken the wrong position. The legitimate reformer endeavours to show that the precept in question conflicts with some precept which its de- fenders allow to be more fundamental, or that it does not really embody the judgement of value it professes to embody. The di- rect frontal attack ‘Why?’ — ’What good does it do?’ — ’Who said so?’ is never permissible; not because it is harsh or offensive but because no values at all can justify themselves on that level. if you persist in *that* kind of trial you will destroy all values, and so destroy the bases of your own criticism as well as the thing criti- cized. you must not hold a pistol to the head of the *Tao*. nor must we postpone obedience to a precept until its credentials have been
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The AboliTion of MAn examined. only those who are practising the *Tao* will understand it. it is the well-nurtured man, the *cuor gentil*, and he alone, who can recognize Reason when it comes.9 it is Paul, the Pharisee, the man ‘perfect as touching the law’ who learns where and how that law was deficient.10

in order to avoid misunderstanding, i may add that though i myself am a Theist, and indeed a Christian, i am not here at- tempting any indirect argument for Theism. i am simply arguing that if we are to have values at all we must accept the ultimate platitudes of Practical Reason as having absolute validity: that any attempt, having become sceptical about these, to reintroduce value lower down on some supposedly more ‘realistic’ basis, is doomed. Whether this position implies a supernatural origin for the *Tao* is a question i am not here concerned with.

yet how can the modern mind be expected to embrace the con- clusion we have reached? This *Tao* which, it seems, we must treat as an absolute is simply a phenomenon like any other—the reflec- tion upon the minds of our ancestors of the agricultural rhythm in which they lived or even of their physiology. We know already in principle how such things are produced: soon we shall know in detail: eventually we shall be able to produce them at will. of course, while we did not know how minds were made, we ac- cepted this mental furniture as a datum, even as a master. but many things in nature which were once our masters have become our servants. Why not this? Why must our conquest of nature stop short, in stupid reverence, before this final and toughest bit of ‘nature’ which has hitherto been called the conscience of man? you threaten us with some obscure disaster if we step outside it: but we have been threatened in that way by obscurantists at every step in our advance, and each time the threat has proved false. you say we shall have no values at all if we step outside the *Tao*. very well: we shall probably find that we can get on quite com- fortably without them. let us regard all ideas of what we ought to do simply as an interesting psychological survival: let us step right out of all that and start doing what we like. let us decide for ourselves what man is to be and make him into that: not on any ground of imagined value, but because we want him to be such. having mastered our environment, let us now master ourselves and choose our own destiny.
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The WAy This is a very possible position: and those who hold it cannot be accused of self-contradiction like the half-hearted sceptics who still hope to find ‘real’ values when they have debunked the tradi- tional ones. This is the rejection of the concept of value altogether. i shall need another lecture to consider it.

noTeS

1 The real (perhaps unconscious) philosophy of Gaius and Titius becomes clear

if we contrast the two following lists of disapprovals and approvals.

A. *Disapprovals*: A mother’s appeal to a child to be ‘brave’ is ‘non- sense’ (Green book, p. 62). The reference of the word ‘gentle- man’ is ‘extremely vague’ (ibid.) ‘To call a man a coward tells us re- ally nothing about what he does’ (p. 64). feelings about a country or empire are feelings ‘about nothing in particular’ (p. 77). b. *Approvals*: Those who prefer the arts of peace to the arts of war (it is not said in what circumstances) are such that ‘we may want to call them wise men’ (p. 65). The pupil is expected ‘to believe in a democratic community life’ (p. 67). ‘Contact with the ideas of other people is, as we know, healthy’ (p. 86). The reason for bathrooms (‘that people are healthier and pleasanter to meet when they are clean’) is ‘too obvious to need mentioning’ (p. 142). it will be seen that comfort and security, as known to a suburban street in peace-time, are the ultimate values: those things which can alone produce or spiritualize comfort and security are mocked. Man lives by bread alone, and the ultimate source of bread is the baker’s van: peace matters more than honour and can be preserved by jeering at colonels and reading newspapers.

2 The most determined effort which i know to construct a theory of value on the basis of ‘satisfaction of impulses’ is that of dr i. A. Richards (*Principles of Literary Criticism*, 1924). The old objection to defining value as Satisfaction is the universal value judgement that ‘it is better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a pig satisfied’. To meet this dr Richards endeavours to show that our impulses can be arranged in a hierarchy and some satisfactions preferred to others without an appeal to any criterion other than satisfaction. he does this by the doctrine that some impulses are more ‘important’ than others — an important impulse being one whose frustration involves the frustration of other impulses. A good systematization (i.e. the good life) consists in satisfy- ing as many impulses as possible; which entails satisfying the ‘important’ at the expense of the ‘unimportant’. The objections to this scheme seem to me to be two:

(i) Without a theory of immortality it leaves no room for the value of noble death. it may, of course, be said that a man who has saved his life by treach- ery will suffer for the rest of that life from frustration. but not, surely, frustra-
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The AboliTion of MAn tion of *all* his impulses? Whereas the dead man will have no satisfaction. or is it maintained that since he had no unsatisfied impulses he is better off than the disgraced and living man? This at once raises the second objection. (2) is the value of a systematization to be judged by the presence of satisfac- tions or the absence of dissatisfactions? The extreme case is that of the dead man in whom satisfactions and dissatisfactions (on the modern view) both equal zero, as against the successful traitor who can still eat, drink, sleep, scratch and copulate, even if he cannot have friendship or love or self-re- spect. but it arises at other levels. Suppose A has only 500 impulses and all are satisfied, and that b has 1200 impulses whereof 700 are satisfied and 500 not: which has the better systematization? There is no doubt which dr Richards actually prefers—he even praises art on the ground that it makes us ‘discontented’ with ordinary crudities! (op. cit., p. 230). The only trace i find of a philosophical basis for this preference is the statement that ‘the more complex an activity the more conscious it is’ (p. 109). but if satisfaction is the only value, why should increase of consciousness be good? for consciousness is the condition of all dissatisfactions as well as of all satisfactions. dr Rich- ards’s system gives no support to his (and our) actual preference for civil life over savage and human over animal—or even for life over death. 3 The desperate expedients to which a man can be driven if he attempts to base value on fact are well illustrated by dr C. h. Waddington’s fate in *Science and Ethics*. dr Waddington here explains that ‘existence is its own justification’ (p. 14), and writes: ‘An existence which is essentially evolutionary is itself the justification for an evolution towards a more comprehensive existence’ (p. 17). i do not think dr Waddington is himself at ease in this view, for he does endeavour to recommend the course of evolution to us on three grounds other than its mere occurrence, (a) That the later stages include or ‘compre- hend’ the earlier, (b) That T. h. huxley’s picture of evolution will not revolt you if you regard it from an ‘actuarial’ point of view, (c) That, any way, after all, it isn’t half so bad as people make out (‘not so morally offensive that we cannot accept it’, p. 18). These three palliatives are more creditable to dr Waddington’s heart than his head and seem to me to give up the main posi- tion. if evolution is praised (or, at least, apologized for) on the ground of any properties it exhibits, then we are using an external standard and the attempt to make existence its own justification has been abandoned. if that attempt is maintained, why does dr Waddington concentrate on evolution: i.e., on a temporary phase of organic existence in one planet? This is ‘geocentric’. if Good = ‘whatever nature happens to be doing’, then surely we should notice what nature is doing as a whole; and nature as a whole, i understand, is working steadily and irreversibly towards the final extinction of all life in every part of the universe, so that dr Waddington’s ethics, stripped of their unaccountable bias towards such a parochial affair as tellurian biology, would leave murder and suicide our only duties. even this, i confess, seems to me a lesser objection than the discrepancy between dr Waddington’s first principle and the value judgements men actually make. To value anything simply because it occurs is in fact to worship success, like Quislings or men of vichy. other philosophies more wicked have been devised: none more vulgar. i am far from suggesting that dr Waddington practises in real life
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The WAy such grovelling prostration before the *fait accompli*. let us hope that Rasselas, chap. 22, gives the right picture of what his philosophy amounts to in action. (‘The philosopher, supposing the rest vanquished, rose up and departed with the air of a man that had co-operated with the present system.’) 4 See Appendix. 5 *Analects* of Confucius, xv. 39. 6 *Eth. Nic*. 1095 b, 1140 b, 1151 a. 7 John 7:49. The speaker said it in malice, but with more truth than he meant.

Cf. John 13: 51. 8 Mark 16: 6 9 *Republic*, 402 A 10 Philippians 3:6

TRAnSCRibeR’S noTeS

*Cuor gentil* - a noble heart ‘εν δε φαει και ‘δλεσσου - ‘*en de faei kai dlessou*’ roughly “in the light you perceive

it [light]” (?) *Dulce* et *decorum* - sweet and seemly, from the Roman saying *dulce et decorum est*

*pro patria mori* it is sweet and seemly to die for one’s country. *humani nihil a me alienum puto* from Terence: *homo sum; humani nihil a me alienum*

*puto*: “i am a man; and nothing of man is foreign to me.” nietzschean ethic - an ‘ends justify the means,’ ‘win at any cost’ philosophy; the starting point his philosophy is his own desire instead of reality; he is a nihilist. olaf Stapledon - a famous science fiction writer (1886-1950) whose most famous

works include *Last and First Men, Darkness and the Light*, and *Star Maker*. Theist - a believer in one or more gods, e.g. Christians, Jews, Moslems, hindus,

zoroastrians