*Book II: 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 various 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 ‘progressive’ or ‘efficient’ would be a subterfuge. They could be forced by argument to answer the questions ‘necessary for what?’, ‘progressing 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.

In actual fact Gaius and Titius will be found to hold, with complete uncritical dogmatism, the whole system of values which happened 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 other 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 martyrdom 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 others? 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 question is welcome. If by Reason we mean the process actually employed 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 premises 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 forever, 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 posterity. 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 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 unreflective 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 innovator 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.

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.

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 instincts themselves, we can yet find grounds for preferring one instinct 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 judgement 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 psychological 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.

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 ‘posterity’ 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 children 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 instinct, 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 projection 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 kindergarten in the interests of progress and the coming race.

The truth finally becomes apparent that neither in any operation 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 premises. 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 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 obligatory for its own sake, nothing is obligatory at all.

To some it will appear that i have merely restored under another 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’ values. 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 posterity 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

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 nationalist, who maintains that the advancement of his own people is the object to which all else ought to yield. but no kind of factual observation 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 following conclusions. This thing which i have called for convenience the Tao, and which others may call natural law or Traditional Morality or the first Principles of Practical Reason or the first Platitudes, 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 judgement of value in the history of the world. What purport to be new systems or (as they now call them) ‘ideologies’, all consist of fragments 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 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, possible 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 contradictions 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 scientific 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 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 credentials, 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 direct 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 criticized. 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 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.

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 conclusion we have reached? This Tao which, it seems, we must treat as an absolute is simply a phenomenon like any other—the reflection 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 accepted 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 comfortably 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.

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 traditional ones. This is the rejection of the concept of value altogether. i shall need another lecture to consider it.