

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_164090

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 170 14437 Accession No. 2109

Author 'Heard, Gerald'.

Title 'Ethical Morality'. 1937.

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below

THE 'THIRD' MORALITY

Other Books by Gerald Heard :

NARCISSUS

THE ASCENT OF HUMANITY

THE SOCIAL SUBSTANCE OF RELIGION

THE EMERGENCE OF MAN

THIS SURPRISING WORLD

THESE HURRYING YEARS

SCIENCE IN THE MAKING

THE SOURCE OF CIVILIZATION

THE THIRD MORALITY

By
GERALD HEARD



CASSELL AND COMPANY LTD.
London, Toronto, Melbourne and Sydney

FIRST PUBLISHED - 1937

Printed in Great Britain
at
The Chapel River Press, Andover, Hants
P.1136

TO
CHRISTOPHER WOOD

FOREWORD

This book is called *The Third Morality* because in man's history he has had three main moralities, three general ideas of conduct based on the three world-pictures he has so far made. The first world-picture, and its resultant morality, was Anthropomorphism, the belief that the universe was the expression of individual persons, and then of one such supreme person. The second world-picture was Mechanomorphism, the belief that the universe could be explained as a huge machine. Men have tried to act on that—for as you believe things to be, so you must try to behave—but it has never worked. You cannot make a true morality from the belief that the universe is nothing but a machine. Nevertheless, until this generation, Mechanomorphism has been the accepted world-picture, even among the religious, and the majority of men to-day are trying still to act in accordance with that picture, because they are sure that it is true. This attempt so to act—however inconsistent and however unethical—must then be classified as the Second Morality. It is a Morality which has never really succeeded in functioning, but it must be recognized as a phase, just as, between the First Napoleonic Empire and the Third, Bonapartists placed the Second, though the Second Napoleon remained all his life an Austrian ward. The Third Morality is the gradually defining impress which is to-day beginning to be made by the third world-picture, that world-picture which is now taking the place of Mechanomorphism. The following essay attempts to trace in outline the conduct indicated to us by this third world-picture, that conduct which must finally take form as the Third Morality.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	I

PART I

CHAPTER	
I ARE ETHICS ENOUGH ?	13
II IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY OTHER SANCTION ?	48
III THE EVIDENCE TO DATE : I—Post-Mechanist Physics	80
IV THE EVIDENCE TO DATE : II—Post-Mechanist Biology	91
V THE EVIDENCE TO DATE : III—Post-Mechanist Psychology	113
VI THE EVIDENCE TO DATE : IV—The Post-Mechanist Outlook	129

PART II

THE ACTUAL ETHIC

VII THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION	157
VIII THE COURSE INDICATED (THE ATTITUDE)	185
IX THE COURSE INDICATED (THE ACTION)	205
X TRAINING	238
XI ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS	271
INDEX	315

INTRODUCTION

THIS is a practical book. By that is meant a book the findings of which have already been put to use, lived out in use and are offered for such use. It is a series of "readings" made as nearly as possible up to date in all the subjects which are relevant, and next a series of "deduced reckonings" plotted from these readings. It is, first, a chart made from soundings and bearings, and then on this chart are entered the records of the log actually run. Here is clear water; there reefs; further, strong currents are met; at that point contrary winds. Hence the voyager at this point should push ahead; at that he must steer carefully; further on, must use full sail; further again, must run close hauled. And, beside chart and log, it is also a rough specification of the kind of craft which may be built and could carry out such a voyage.

The writer has been driven to answer three questions: What is the nature of the actual contemporary world we are now in? How should we act in view of that knowledge? How can we get ourselves so to act? Everyone ought to compile such a book for themselves. The fact is, hardly one of us does. We have lived in a fool's paradise, either imagining someone would do it for us or that it need not be done.

Why we have lived in this delusion and why it has let us down to-day the first chapter of this book discusses. Here it need only be said that the present writer searched for many years to find such a book prepared by a contemporary expert, one who was informed, had co-ordinated

INTRODUCTION

his information and had deduced the action such information implied. Such a book must set out clearly and broadly the facts now available to our generation and then, having made that outline, would set out as plainly the action which such facts require of us. He failed to find such a book. He found instead two gravely disquieting things. When he began his search he discovered that almost all who were making the New Knowledge were hostile to applying it. Specialization—knowing more and more of less and less—dominated research. The use of history, which Heine had confined in his epigram: “The only thing we learn from history is that men never learn anything from history,” was wholly dismissed by Bury when he concluded: “The only thing which your research can add to the discovery of history is to add yet another document (the notes of your research) to history.”

The authorities in the Natural Sciences taught: All facts are equally valuable; the task of the researcher is not to adjudge their use, still less speculate as to their meaning, but simply to observe, note and classify.

This was, of course, to assume that those who knew did not have to live and those who lived did not have to know. And, as a matter of fact, the dichotomy of the researcher and the practical man was actually attempted. The scholar-researcher was to be a kept creature. His pay, his lodging, his board, his library, his laboratory—yes, even his subject—were to be provided for him. He was to have no real contact with life, but, caught young by a special scholarship, he was to have an existence half-way between the monk's and the queen-bee grub's—a curious creature celled in and fed on a diet which made it everyday more peculiar. The practical man kept this oddity, paid for its upkeep and won for it livelihood—

INTRODUCTION

why? Partly because of tradition. Such mental and physical oddities have always been kept by practical men. To do so feeds their none too sure sense of superiority. It reassures any doubts they may have as to whether there is any knowledge worth having beyond their rule-of-thumb knowledge. Partly also because of the still older tradition that such further knowledge had been and can be obtained by detached thinkers. Partly, again, because some of the detailed finds which the specialized researchers made were able to be applied by the practical man to increase his means.

That was the state of affairs in contemporary knowledge twenty years ago. The specialist alone was informed, but he never summed up, still less acted. The man of action was never informed. General knowledge for a complete and consistent way of life had been abandoned. After another twenty years that condition has become critical. Specialization has increased a hundredfold. Not only has the distance which separates researcher from practitioner so enlarged, but gulfs now yawn between one researcher on his particular ridge and what a decade ago were his comrades. As has been said, every expert outside his own subject is a layman, and his own subject grows increasingly, and ever more rapidly, microscopic. Instead of the man who knew but did not act and the man who acted but did not know, we have to-day men whose particular knowledge is so minute that it could not give them a line of action, however much they might wish to act, and, correspondingly, men of action who, even if they should consult such experts, could get no information which could be employed to shape complete action.

This critical condition to-day has led to the most serious consequence. Men of action, men who have to

INTRODUCTION

live and to deal with things on a life-size scale, realize they can no longer live by tradition, by rule of thumb. More and more they have been using, piecemeal and for menial purposes, the findings of specialized research. So they have altered their circumstances and their powers. It is these radical changes in their conditions and their resources which have driven them to see that they can no longer carry on with their inherited conventions and unquestioned habits. Means dictate ends. 'The men who did' were content to be empirical, practical people who did the next thing and didn't think about principles, provided things worked. But in this adding to efficiency they suddenly found themselves compelled to think about purpose. New means employed for old ends nevertheless compel the discovery of new ends. The man of action is forced to ask: What is the principle, what the general underlying truth, on which specialized research is working? Whether the specialized researcher knows it or not, it must be there—and the man of action is compelled to find it. In short, to-day the arrest of eighty years is over. As the earlier chapters of this book will outline, for nearly three generations all practical people have been trying to think one thing and do another. They have tried to use science to increase their means and yet to prevent science from constructing their ends. Science was to be true for particular practice but not true for general principles.

Hence to-day we see everyone going back to principle. All practical people, and even a significant amount of specialists, are rousing themselves, waking up to the fact that as you think, as you estimate the whole thing to be, as you judge what the whole going concern means, so you must order your action. You must add up your findings and see what sum they make and you must act

INTRODUCTION

on that summary. It is no use remarking that such a summary must be provisional and incomplete. Of necessity it must be, but equally of necessity must you act with such knowledge as you have. The choice, we all now see, is not whether to act with incomplete knowledge or to abstain from action, waiting quietly in a vacuum till we know enough. That is not offered to us. We cannot abstain. Act and live we must. The only choice is whether we will act on a clear system or act at random, sometimes by one system, sometimes by another, sometimes by none.

That is becoming widely accepted to-day. It is, however, far from a reassuring decision. It is inevitable, but by itself it may only precipitate chaos. In fact, it is the underlying cause of our present suddenly-increased peril. Men find themselves driven to discover a system. They have to arrange the present facts in an interpretation, an order of meaning; they have to have a world-picture. Unfortunately, though driven to produce such a system, they shirk the labour of themselves making such a one from contemporary facts. They look about, hoping to find it ready prepared for them—circumstances explained and action indicated. The present writer has made that search. He agrees with common opinion : no such contemporary summary for action has been made.

We are ourselves, therefore, compelled to face this task. That is the only honest conclusion, though it is undoubtedly difficult. Therefore most people will not face it. Compelled to find a system to live by, refusing to construct one from the current facts, failing to find such a contemporary construction made for them, they fall back on earlier systems.

That is the source of our peculiar danger to-day.

INTRODUCTION

Men are retreating onto systems which, whether true or false, adequate or inadequate in their day, are not contemporary. These systems may allow you to live for a little while with the sense of being part of a complete process and believing you are in co-ordinated, purposive action with your conditions, but they will break down, because they omit, as they must, important facts discovered since they were framed.

Three such systems from the past are now popular. At the moment the most radically successful, not because it is the latest, but because it incorporates a greater number of observations of the outer world, is the Marxian cosmology. It cannot, however, lead to anything but fresh cataclysms, for two reasons. In the first place it is not sufficiently true. It is based on the science of almost a century ago. It is only true of that aspect of reality which may be rendered in mechanic terms. Science has moved far since then. Hence many of the fundamental Marxian philosophic deductions are no longer valid. In the second place, even if science had not moved (as the following chapters point out), the mechanistic cosmology on which Marx tried to base his ethic does not give rise to an ethic. As is always being pointed out, if all the processes of history are determinist and inevitable, then human freewill is a myth, morals an impossibility (for moral conduct assumes volitional freedom) and, incidentally, as the Revolution is guaranteed by this necessitarianism it will take place of itself and no one need work for it.

Hence the Marxist cosmology only satisfies those whose wish is so strong that they will accept a system which is based on a half-truth (the Mechanistic cosmology) which stultifies all action. Where Marx was, of course, peculiarly happy and effective in his time and attack

INTRODUCTION

was that with a shrewd estimate of the economic system of the Europe of his day (so shrewd that it nearly came true) he combined an even shrewder appeal to the emotions of those caught in that system. He canalized as a dogmatic faith that tide of mixed emotion which hates success as much as it is touched by failure. It was right to love the poor and equally right to hate the rich.

The inadequacy and obsolescence of Marxian theory should, of course, have roused its critics to put in its place a system which was more contemporary, which included the facts which he had overlooked or which were then actually unknown. All too sad to say, this was not the reaction of the unconvinced. On the contrary—making our confusion worse confounded—they did not go on, but back to an even more rudimentary cosmology. The only other two world-pictures which opposed themselves to the Marxian were the picture of the divine race and the sacred nation-state with its God-given mission to order and civilize the world—the philosophy of Fichte*—and the Thomist cosmology, an even less contemporary world-picture.

* That J. G. Fichte is the philosopher-founder not merely of German but of all metaphysical nationalism is recognized by thinkers, if his work is insufficiently known to the politicians outside Germany. A good summary of his cosmology and its ethic is given by Albert Schweitzer, who points out, in his latest book, *Indian Thought and its Development*, Fichte's important influence in our present crisis. Dr. Schweitzer says: "According to Fichte, God cannot rest in the state of pure Being because he is infinite Will-to-Action. Therefore he sets himself a limitation of himself in the material world in order to be constantly overcoming it and in order thereby to become conscious of himself as the Will-to-Action. . . . The duties which in his (Fichte's) opinion stand in the front rank are not as would be in harmony with the spirit of his age (the early nineteenth century), the general duties based on the ethical nature of man, but those which result from his social position (nationalism), his profession and his special endowments."

This, of course, is the philosophy of nationalism in an earlier and even more crusading form than in Hegel's identification of the State as the expression, in time and space, of the Absolute.

INTRODUCTION

These, then, are the three world systems which the ordinary man to-day finds ready for him when he suddenly realizes that have a system of some sort he must, and make one for himself he will not. Two of them, the Marxian and the Fichtean, are to-day attracting millions and generating enormous powers. They can command the enlightened devotion of no mind which will serve only the whole truth. Hence they cannot be prevented from an unrestrained effort to destroy each other. Each contains enough truth to make its followers desperately efficient, deadly effective in means, but does not contain sufficient to enable them to perceive the end. Marxianism has so much that is right in its economics that it can build up a state enormously powerful and awake that missionary devotion that despises the unsaved and offers them *Das Kapital*, tribute or the sword. Fichteism has that much of right in its psychology (human societies are far more like organisms than the rationalistic individualists realized) that it, too, can build up a state probably as powerful as the Marxian and equally inspired with a passion for an Islamic propaganda.

The third world system still current, the Thomine, the cosmology-ethic of the Catholic Church, no longer commands the devotion of crusading millions. It has become a private outlook for personal behaviour. It is a contemporary fact—to be noted without either relief or resentment—that, whereas a Marxian and a Fichtean make a power of public difference in the world to-day, a Catholic does not. The relegation of Catholicism to a private, not a public, activity was defined when Irish Nationalism proclaimed that it took its religion, but would not take its politics, from Rome. This, Rome itself has often confirmed with many concordats, and to-day the Pope, though his congregations are attacked

INTRODUCTION

and their religion infringed, has not laid one leader under excommunication, let alone his people under interdict.

None of the systems offered is, then, contemporary, a summary of present knowledge. There is, therefore, no choice for any free man to-day but to set out as clearly as he can the facts which are known : to bring these into relationship, so as to yield a common basis of knowledge, and from that knowledge deduce the kind of life which should be lived consistent with that knowledge. Then, having so elucidated the conduct, the ethic which such an outline of contemporary knowledge must yield, it is necessary to see how to arrange life so that this ethic can be lived.

That, in brief, is the reason for writing this book, and is its substance. It is a threefold essay : a cosmology—a co-ordinated outline of contemporary knowledge as far as it is known to this writer who has to include every relevant fact known to him ; an ethic, an outline of the conduct which follows the outline of knowledge ; an exercise, an outline of training so as to induce action to conform with information.

It may be repeated : this book is only issued because it is practical. Because the writer could not find the work done by a more competent hand, he had to do it himself. When a ship is sinking and everyone is getting into boats, if you notice that all the boats provided are warped with age and their seams agape, you will hesitate. If, as you hesitate, though you can find no boat on deck that could live in the sea, you find plenty of tackle out of which a seaworthy raft could be made, you will set to making such a raft. Of course it must be makeshift. But, as the great liner of western civilization slowly settles (for she does settle slowly, in spite of the sudden

INTRODUCTION

explosions, as her boilers and engines one after another go out of action), each, if he is in earnest, can try out his raft. This raft has been so tried. It does ride the sea. It has included all the facts known to one typical Westerner and it has yielded a system by which he can live. As the facts brought together are all facts ascertainable by any of us, and as we are all in the same predicament, involved in a civilization which can no longer hold itself together, this practical sketch may be of some use to others. It is not suggested that anyone should adopt this particular system. It is a raft very unskilfully lashed together. It is to suggest to others, looking at the sea and the tilting deck, that there is to hand the material to make other rafts and there is still time to do it, though not long.

PART I

THE THIRD MORALITY

CHAPTER I

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH ?

The Disgusting Crisis

No one can look at civilization to-day without the liveliest concern. That is a truism—a truism so painfully obvious that we have ceased to be able to respond to it. We turn impatiently away—away to our pleasures or our pre-occupations, our amusements or our causes. With Sydney Smith, as he faced the last great upheaval, we are apt to cry: "Short views, for God's sake, short views!" It is no use thinking about our fundamental dilemma. Perhaps the still "going concern" will last our time. Though it has become little better than a series of piecemeal miseries, it is evidently far tougher than pessimists thought. Perhaps our particular causes and specializations will somehow turn out to have been serving a great cause aimed at a great end—a "one far off divine event to which the whole creation moves." There is evidently more unconscious direction in the whole thing than Rationalists imagined. So the irresponsible and the responsible both refuse to think any more about the general question—does the whole thing mean anything, or have any direction, and can we intentionally co-operate with that purpose ?

THE THIRD MORALITY

This discouragement with thought, this refusal to discuss ultimates has often been rated. It is the basis of what M. Jules Benda denounces as "the reason of the clerks," the betrayal of intelligence by the intelligentsia.

It is, however, no use for men who call themselves men of understanding and believe themselves to be of goodwill to fail even to understand their own companions' bewilderment and disheartenment. If reason is now at a discount, surely it is peculiarly the task of Rationalists to demonstrate reasonably, without anger or despair, why that is so.

The Crisis Nevertheless has Reason

When we face the issue, we see there is another and far more hopeful reason why Reason should return to the attack and not sit down under its reverse. Reason maintains that men's actions are a result of their thought. There is no reason for Reason to despair as yet. True, men's actions do not seem at all largely directed by what a less-informed knowledge of the mind called reason. That, however, is no cause for believing that human action is blind, chaotic, anarchic. There is much method in all our present social madnesses, and it is the task of the Rationalist not to lose his nerve but to detect that method, elucidate its purpose and explain to men so acting why they so behave, and what it is they are actually discovering and achieving.

The first fact, then, that we have to realize is that the acute state of civilization to-day need not be merely an anxiety which everyone is deciding to repress because nothing can be done about it; the crisis in civilization to-day can be an interest. It is a state of affairs so unprecedented and so unexpected that, in spite of our

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

physical fears, we who read and discuss can be expected and should be expected to feel in the presence of this upheaval something beside panic or despair. It may be an eruption, but surely, then, there are enough of us remaining and we have enough remaining shreds of detachment to feel a certain wonder and curiosity at this cataclysm.

When we recover our wonder, then we may discover civilization is still salvable. Plato may not have been merely a poet when he said: "By wonder are we saved." Detached, self-forgetful interest is the first step to mastery. Once we determine to recover our intense interest in the whole process of civilization, we can take the next step.

That next step is to realize that civilization's crisis is a consequence of a crisis in thought. Men are not behaving irrationally, they are behaving violently; but this violence is due to their acting on certain arguments. It was Reason which told them they could not behave otherwise than violently, and so they are following Reason.

Diagnosis

Let us then state our present condition briefly. We have a civilization which was never more powerful and rich. Further, our civilization has not only more control over its environment than any other, it can do and has done more for the physical comfort of its constituents than any other ever was able to do. All previous Governments could only offer defence against the foreigner or against your neighbour—military strength and judicature. If they did this they had fulfilled all their duties to their citizens. To-day Governments assume hygiene, diet, housing, pensions, and sociological enquiries, such as the Census. They make themselves

THE THIRD MORALITY

responsible for education. The community is become more than a number of farmers, craftsmen and traders whose surplus resources keep a leader and his armed followers, the leader, in return for the right to tax them, protecting their frontiers from invasion and putting his arms behind their justice "to keep the peace and enforce contracts." That was the definition and limitation of a government's duties given by Lord Melbourne only a century ago. Even then it was a false abstraction. The nation-state has always been more of an organism than that survival of XVIIIth-century individualism could perceive. The leader, the Crown, has always combined, or confused, two functions—that of the war leader and that other and utterly different vocation of being the epitome of all the people and its ranks, a vestige, but far from being a wholly atrophied vestige, of the priest-kingly estate. The legislature is far from being only a combination of traditional prejudices of the propertied with the irresistible violence of the janissary. The army itself is not by any means a class apart and the rise of citizen armies has shown how blended, if confounded, have become the whole relationships of the individuals and the classes in the community.

This fact—that the modern state is only in part a tangle of class and personal relationships; it is also an organism, a vast unlimited liability concern in which the shareholders feel themselves altogether involved—is still insufficiently realized. If we would allow due weight to it we should be able both to understand some of the present national enthusiasms and also—what appears on the surface to be denied by these hysterias—the amount of goodwill, limited but intense, which a modern community expresses between its constituents.

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

Nor are the governments able to remain as insurance-agents, only taking their subjects' risks if they are "good." To-day they are beginning to accept the task of finding work or maintenance. Everyone in the community (regardless of whether they pay) is a liability which must in some degree be accepted. But this is simply the better to tyrannize, say many. That is not the whole truth. Beside the will and power to dominate, there is the demand on the part of those who have that their neighbour who does not have shall come within the circle of resources.

We have heard much about the growth of sense and power during the last 300 years. We have heard far too little of the other growth, just as remarkable, the growth of sensibility and compassion. The community is becoming community-conscious. That is the credit side and must be fully allowed, if we are to face our baffling reality steady and whole.

The debit side is all too familiar. We have nations (these communities growing in self-consciousness) who refuse to acknowledge any laws between themselves. This is the international anarchy. Each state maintains it is complete judge of its right. This was bad enough. It becomes almost a desperate condition when these conflicting judges maintain that they may use any means to enforce their verdicts, and when science puts in their hands methods which allow each judge to destroy his fellow. Nor does the madness stop here. What nations do, classes also claim. Nation-war must sanction class-war. All war in civilization is civil war, and class war is its logical next step. Not its conclusion, though. That end is every group, every man, against his fellow and a collapse through brigandage into desolation and complete depopulation.

THE THIRD MORALITY

That is the present crisis of civilization. It is, in the mildest language, a pretty mess. Advanced sensibility confronts calculating savagery and this grotesque conflict is not that of a too highly civilized state confronted by brutal invaders, but of a house, a single being divided against itself. Civilized man is in the throes of a seizure. It is not, however, a bolt from the blue. It may be a tangle, a jam, a collision, a "stroke," but it is the end of a series of logical methodical steps. Europe wakes up to find itself at tether's end, to find itself, like a sleep-walker finding himself on the parapet, screaming: "Save me, save me!" and all the time swaying to his fall.

Reason, Long Disregarded, Now Come to Roost

Still, it is only a pretence to maintain that Europe has really been sleep-walking. Rather for the last eighty years Europe has been so well aware where it was going that it refused to look. Each step could not, it seemed to those on the spot and in control, be helped; it was inevitable, logical, rational; you could only hope the edge was still sufficiently far away that you yourself would not reach it. It would be reached in your children's time, and then—well, that was their look-out; the old ways would have lasted your time. Of course, in that statement, "Europe has known where it was going the last eighty years," there are two assumptions which need enlarging. First, "Europe"—who is Europe? And second: "eighty years ago"—why eighty? By Europe is meant, of course, the leaders of European civilization. By leaders is intended the men of thought—not "quite as much" but "even more than" the men of action. The men of action, it is clear, behaved as they did, and let others behave so,

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

because they thought the men of thought had pointed out the way. That statements brings us to the second question : Why eighty years ago ?

How Thought has Dictated Action

It is eighty years ago since Liberalism died as a force in thought. It carried on as a force in action, through momentum ; but there was no longer any intellectual conviction in it. It knew it had no more philosophy, but was only a practice based upon emotional goodwill. Ever since then, down to the collapse of the outer structure of Liberalism in this decade, it has been doomed ; and any sociologist worthy the name should have been able to forecast that collapse, if not indicate its date. Nothing could save it, except its growing a new philosophy, and that it stubbornly refused to do. Hence it was like an oak tree with its tap-root cut—for a time it seemed to have suffered no damage and still to be the King of the Forest ; then mysteriously it began to fail, and briar and thorn, which it thought would never dare come near its shadow, flourish above “ the rotten body of Liberty.”

The sixth decade of the XIXth century is the period in which we must look for intellectual collapse, theoretical defeat, not for political and practical failure. What was the intellectual event of that period ? It was the victory of the opinion that whereas all life was a continuous evolution culminating in man, the method and means of that evolution was by the unlimited and blind struggle to survive. Natural Selection was the force which accounted for all survival ; man, who had supremely survived, was therefore the creature who best illustrated the working of Natural Selection. Natural Selection was expressed through each species competing with all

THE THIRD MORALITY

the others, and the fittest, which survived, was that which managed in competition with its fellows to force them to the wall and itself to the front.

Man, therefore, was the animal which had been most deadly to its rivals. Nor was that all : no species might rest on its laurels. Having won to the top, it must keep its station or it would soon be dethroned. Natural Selection might not be able further to threaten man through any other species. It would, could and must then threaten and keep him "biologically moral" through his own species. He must not think "The past may have had to be bloody, bold and resolute, ruthless and cunning ; thank God, however, that was before my time—*pecunia non olet* ! The steps of the throne have mercifully been cleared for me ; I can reign, a king of peace and mercy who succeeds the crude founder of the line."

No ; as soon as he begins to exercise clemency, rivals will grow up and his dynasty go down. This was the practical teaching of Darwin. It is clear that, if such a doctrine should be accepted, it must prove very dangerous to morality.

When it was propounded most moralists saw that plainly enough. The biologists maintained, however, that it was the unbiassed truth, that new unmistakable facts established this conclusion. Their good faith was never seriously challenged. It was obvious that many of them—at least in their conscious minds—were as concerned at the conclusions they had reached as any official moralist. They saw how serious these facts must prove. T. H. Huxley summed up the position in his famous Romanes Lecture, when he concluded by telling men to "defy the cosmic process." This assured the onlooker of their good faith. Biologists, the men whose

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

science and study was Life and who, alone, at last saw it steadily and whole, would not have so reported if they could have said otherwise. It was pure truth that drove them. That these facts must, then, be accepted was the conclusion come to by all responsible persons.

And when that was done, thank goodness, "no one seemed a penny the worse." Liberalism seemed to go on just the same to ever fresh triumphs, superstition declined, and freedom broadened down from precedent to precedent. Yet a deadly change had taken place.

Thought, However, Takes Time to Act

When an ignorant suicide swallows a fatal dose of a soporific he expects immediately to swoon. He finds that nothing has happened and for a few minutes believes, either with a new despair or a strange hope, that the dose has failed. It may be many minutes before he feels the first symptoms of the poison working.

The minutes of an individual's life are years in the life of nations. The practical conceptions of Darwinianism took fully a generation before they began to affect the policy of statesmen; before the men of action began to realize there was something in these new-fangled "Sciences of Life," that they had cut the root of Liberalism, destroyed the nonsense of the Rights of Man, and instead of the philosopher now putting the real politician, the man of blood and iron, out of countenance by pointing away from his mean practice to sublime principle and the Truth of Life, it was the real politician who could bundle the old phrasemonger out of the room and tell him to pack himself off to science, learn what is the real truth about life and not dare teach men who knew their business.

THE THIRD MORALITY

But even before the statesmen began to wake up to the fact that truth and principle, which they had always feared, had come over to their side, and that the shifts and crimes for which they had felt they had to apologize were really "biologically moral," the Liberals themselves had by their actions shown that they realized, consciously or unconsciously, that the game was up; Darwinianism was the death of philosophic humanitarianism.

That statement again needs enlargement, for the question which may and should be raised at this point is: What did Darwin introduce into the picture of reality that Newton had not introduced 250 years before? Granted that as men believe the universe to be, so they will and must behave, it was Newton and not Darwin who was the mind which destroyed mind's place in the universe—as indeed Blake often maintained.

Traditional Morality Began to be Undermined 300 Years Ago

Why did not Newtonianism, the complete establishment of the mechanic universe, destroy morality? There is no doubt that in those advanced countries in which it was accepted it did destroy the old cosmology and with it fell the Anthropomorphism, the belief that the universe was directed by personal intelligence, which till then had been the sanction of morality.

As the writers and thinkers of the early XVIIIth century put it, it was a struggle between Revelation and Nature. We can, however, analyse the situation a little more deeply. The Revelation was a revelation of an anthropomorphic deity. The Nature, now thought to be fully seen, was a machine.

There was, then, no reason why morality should not collapse; for a machine could be no sanction for

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

righteousness. What actually happened, however, was that the retreating forces stabilized on an inner position. That position is what the XVIIIth century called Natural Theology.

Newton had shown that the cosmos was a blind machine. Of course he himself postulated behind the machine a machine-minder. That postulate, however, was of no philosophic importance. What was vital was that now men were to make a distinction between man and the world, between themselves and the universe. Natural Theology established itself on the fact that Nature is regular, neutral.

Berkeley brushes away the problem of evil on the ground that it is so important for man to learn the regular, majestic laws of Nature that God lets him pinch his fingers in the machine as the best way of teaching him Natural Law. Any amount of pain is worth the lesson. The machine in itself is a moral. Whence morality then? "Man is naturally good," said the Deists, "as Nature is naturally mechanic. It is reasonable for him to behave well: God can be discovered in the human heart." "God is the service of man to man and that is the pathway to glory for ever," the ancient Stoic text responded. "The universe works by simple laws so that within that framework man may be free to act reasonably and well."

It was on this basis of Natural Theology—that God in man's heart and mind, and the machine in all the rest—that Liberalism arose. Here was a universe which never interfered with man, so man could find out what God willed and fulfil that will. Here you had a reforming, as well as an accepting, faith. Old religions which had been otiose in statement and cruel in practice could be swept away. Men should be free from each

THE THIRD MORALITY

other's oppressions, for God was in all men revealed by reason. They would also be free from tabus—the oppressions and inhibitions of older moralities—for man was free to remake his environment. He understood how to tackle it, because he knew its natural laws ; he knew it needed tackling, because it was a blind machine. He must make it give him room and sustenance to live the full life : reasonable, kindly, free and equal, as Natural Theology had shown him was God's will. He was God's hands, who alone acted through him. He knew God's will in his mind. He alone was free and rational in a world so simply and blindly regular that it was obviously his material to shape.

Hence all the reforms of the XVIIIth century and of half the XIXth. You are setting men free to live as God meant them to live. Political Reform, Prison Reform, Penal Reform, Abolition of Slavery, Education—the hundred hands of Philanthropy move among those generations because they are guided and inspired by the belief that man is the mind of God set free in an orderly mechanic universe to build up a free and orderly society.

Right down to J. S. Mill that sanction exists clearly behind all reforms. Man is completely different from the universe. It is his house—not, as the past had thought, his mother. Man acts well and wisely because God is revealed to him in his heart and mind.

But the past had not been so wrong ; though it was true that, unless you did hold the past to have been quite wrong, unless you separated completely between man and outer Nature, then the consequences must be very grave. If man was, after all, part of outer Nature and outer Nature was only a machine, well, then, good-night to Natural Theology and the Liberalism

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

of which Natural Theology was the essential foundation.

It is so remarkable that men made with such apparent ease this distinction between themselves and their world, Human Nature and Nature, that it is worth enquiry how this division was effected. They did not, it became clear, learn to take the separation for granted without an effort. Man and Nature were not easily sundered and many must have felt the banishment, though till Wordsworth's time the cry, "I'd rather be a pagan suckled in a creed outworn" if once more Nature would come alive, had to be muffled. For enquiry shows that theologians and scientists had come to an unspoken treaty, a division of fields—the first of those uneasy con-mentats (if one may coin a word for a cold estimate of what each realized it must yield in order to hold the other at bay) which anthropomorphic religion and mechanistic science have repeatedly tried to arrange.

To trace the first appearance of the fissure between morality and reality, we must go behind Newton to his predecessor Galileo. In his magnificent attempt to plan the campaign of the New Knowledge, Galileo had divided, for strategic convenience, all data into primary and secondary characteristics. He took apart this colourful, moving, sounding and solid world into two portions. Colour and sound he put aside—for the moment—to consider later. Then, with the problem immensely simplified, he set himself to study just mass and movement. Sheer necessity of intellectual convenience drove him to make this division. He could not handle things in their full richness. He must make them simpler. Unconsciously also he may have been influenced by social convenience and safety. Would

THE THIRD MORALITY

he not be secure from moral interference if he studied only an abstraction and not full reality itself ?

Unfortunately he judged without sufficient knowledge of contemporary human nature, his own among the rest. The moral climate was worsening. As intelligence sharpened it seemed to reveal men to each other as having in reality none of the traditional humane virtues and only being cunning animals. Machiavelli (as will be noted further, on page 53) had convinced almost all rulers that almost all their subjects and fellow rulers were evil. Tempers were on edge. Instead of answering Machiavelli convincingly, Religion was torn by civil war. The Church, now driven from the North by Protestantism, was on the aggressive defensive of the Counter-Reformation. Galileo himself was far from being a conciliatory character (indeed his actual condemnation and suffering was due to his publishing acrid reflections on the Pope's intelligence—comment which to-day would have permitted the libelled to get heavy damages in an English law-court). The crash came. All investigation was to be tabu.

The moment of intervention could not have been more unfortunate. Coming, as it did, after Galileo's work was already known, and after other researchers had begun successfully to follow similar lines, condemnation could only forbid that work being completed. The part which was partial, lopsided, inadequate, provisional, that part was already in the hands of all natural philosophers. The half truth could not be suppressed. All that Authority could do was to prevent the second half—the complementary part—of the whole truth being brought into equal prominence and so making a complete balance of knowledge, a full cosmology. What Galileo might well have come to see could only be a temporary

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

division became absolute. The abstraction of the "primary characteristics" from the "secondary" became not a convenience of research but an absolute separation, an objective fact, not a device for thinking and for experiment. Religion and Morality forced Science to make absolute and objective what had been intended to be merely a subjective distinction.

What we may call the second cosmology (the world-picture which the new learning was beginning to put in the place of the ancient world-picture, the anthropomorphic cosmology) was a modern outlook not intended by the founder to be mechanomorphic. He did not intend to banish mind from the universe. He was surprised and arrested in his work when he had made a provisional construction, and only begun to fill in the half of it. Hence, as in so many fairy-stories, the magician, startled and interrupted when creating a higher being, leaves only a lopsided monster. The Church played all too well the part of the frightened Queen-mother who, finding the disguised Demeter making her son immortal by bathing him in the fire, snatched the child away, so fatally arresting his divine development. Science, therefore, was first cowed and after vindictive.

The stage of fear is represented by Cartesianism. Determined to avoid collisions with Authority, it made the Galilean abstraction not a convenient classificatory division of material but an objective fact. So it gave surety that it would never cross the frontier now drawn between soul and body. To show how "sound" they were, what good scientists as well as good Catholics, Cartesians used to torture animals to demonstrate that the animal was only a machine. Man alone had a soul and his soul sat distinct in his body, like a flame in a lamp,

THE THIRD MORALITY

couched in the pineal gland. The soul could never be studied. All the rest, the entire material universe, including all animals and the human body, could be studied and was mechanic.

This was the division made between the old Church and the young Science. Secretly the young Science feared the Church and hated it. The wish therefore prompted the thought that perhaps after all there was nothing to study but bodies, and that souls were merely convenient figments invented by Churches and Religions the better to dupe and control mankind. This was a conclusion to which the behaviour of theologians drove scientists, a conclusion which theologians did not fear when they were strong but were bitterly to rue when their days of weakness came upon them. Consciousness could not so be explained away. Descartes himself had established it as fundamental with his axiom, *Cogito ergo sum*: my awareness, the fact that I find thinking going on in the very centre of my consciousness, is the fact that establishes beyond a doubt my existence. Still, if you might not study consciousness more fully than that (and one step further along the experimental track and you would hear the minatory growl of the Inquisition), how know that consciousness was *sui generis* and not after all only a by-product of the body, only found when the body was working, vanishing when the body collapsed, a steam from a spent steam-engine—in short, as T. H. Huxley was to maintain, nothing in itself, merely an epiphenomenon?

The conspiracy of silence on this essential issue lasted until the XIXth century among all eminent researchers. In short what happened among Protestants, as much as among Catholics, was a gradual, half-conscious assumption that this division between a dead outer world (which

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

probably included all animal life and even the human body) and the soul, the fact of consciousness, was a real objective division, not a convenience for research. The soul could look on, but belonged to another order of things into which research was impossible and blasphemous. Later the Protestant scientists, becoming used to the division, brought up in the assumption, willingly supported what the earlier scientists, who had been born as Catholics and experienced the threats of Authority, had conceded with varying degrees of conscious disingenuousness and resentment. Newton, with childlike and complete loyalty, assented to this division, studying the whole of physics as though it had no connection with the world of consciousness, as though physics and its analysis gave a complete picture of reality, assuming that consciousness perceived with perfect objectivity, and without any deflection, selection or adulteration, a huge alien universe. Naturally in this picture man became insignificant, not because he really was so, but because he had ruled himself out, never asking how much of a hand he had in making what he saw.

In short the Church had grudgingly at length allowed a post-anthropomorphic physics. But neither Protestant nor Catholic would let the second cosmology be completed and add to the post-anthropomorphic physics, a post-anthropomorphic psychology. Hence a hopeless disbalance which nothing but the development of the post-anthropomorphic psychology could correct. This correction neither theologians nor scientists were going to undertake, because the theologians thought they had saved Anthropomorphism, at least in the province of the soul, and perhaps in the province of the body, while the scientists thought that the Mechanism which they came

THE THIRD MORALITY

to feel was a full and objective description of the whole domain of physics, could be assumed to be about to be proved valid for all phenomena (phenomena of life and consciousness as well as of matter) and could certainly be a successful alternative hypothesis for a cosmology, so long as the Church was foolish enough to continue clinging to Anthropomorphism.

Hence science, debarred in its formative years by theology from psychology and epistemology, compelled to make a subjective, provisional division into an absolute distinction, could only produce from an incomplete cosmology an unformed ethic. The penalty which the anthropomorphic theologians brought on themselves and on society was an imperilment of the morality which they thought they could only preserve by compelling cosmology to develop one-sidedly and incompletely and by forbidding the corresponding exploration of those bases from which a true sanction of a true morality could have been derived.

Nevertheless this gap between man and nature could not be held open, despite the goodwill of most physicists, who were simple religious men (*i.e.* anthropomorphs in their spiritual outlook). The outer universe under study had proved to be completely mechanic. Men could not be blamed for thinking that everything else—the small objects such as animals and men—would also prove no exception to the vast rules that ran all round them, and this assumption was strengthened by the suspicious fact that Authority, evidently realizing this, forbade enquiry which would decide. Logically and emotionally it seemed the case was forgone. Man and Nature must be one and the law of outer Nature (mechanism) must be the law of life and man.

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

Natural Theology destroyed by Natural Selection

It was just that ancient connection of man and nature that Darwin reasserted. Natural Theology collapsed with the establishment of Natural Selection as the explanation of life. The Bridgewater Treatises, treatises endowed to demonstrate Natural Theology, by their decline, as Natural Selection arose, show that even theologians recognized the dilemma. Man was an animal. The universe went blindly, and so did all life; because life was part of the universe. Liberalism had no answer to this. There was no noble end to which man, through following the voice of God in his heart and mind, might build while depending from the steady hub of the vast machine. Not only would all life end in futility and be as though it had never been; far worse. The interlude of pointless philanthropy was over. Man must go back where he belonged and once more go down into the battle, if he and his stock were not immediately to become obsolescent. Quite apart from the ultimate futility of it all (that all life must in the end be frozen out), here and now, if he would enjoy even the little time that remained, he must cut his way to a place in the sun. His success must mean others' disaster or *vice versa*: that was the only choice.

Hence Liberalism had to change radically and, we can see by its actions, change it did. It had no longer a philosophy; it could no more point men to some one far off divine event, a great goal. Darwin had proved life meant, and had as little purpose, as the universe. You might disregard the universe or refuse, like Huxley—and unlike the coarser Carlyle—to accept it, and yet hope to build up a noble monument of life under the vacant vault which would stand, if not infinitely, at least indefinitely. You could not disregard life, the

THE THIRD MORALITY

life of which you were part, the blood of which flowed in your veins flooding you to-day with courage, to-morrow with passion.

Life not only had no aim or purpose—the means whereby it carried on were despicable. All talk, then, of “living according to nature,” of co-operating with nature must be dropped. There was no purpose in life, and it only managed to continue by violence and cunning until forces even more violent and blind should snuff it out.

All that the Liberal then could do was to increase men's means till everyone was a man of means ; increase their comforts until all were so comfortable that they ceased to think ; give such full expression to their physical appetites that they dropped into such a satiety that ideas such as meaning and purpose and all general understanding became for them senseless.

This has, in fact, been the path of the Liberal retreat. First ethics must be advocated as purely utilitarian, that balance of conduct required by mutual convenience, by enlightened self-interest. Such a modest ethic is, of course, all that can be sustained by a rationalist, if ethics have no sanction save such personal satisfaction as an individual can and does obtain from such judiciously moral behaviour.

But the retreat cannot be stabilized there. What the community requires and what the individual needs are not necessarily reconcilable. For a short time Liberal ethicists attempted to show that evolution required of the individual, for the sake of society, acts and restraints which looked like sacrifices but which really brought out of him his best nature. He liked being heroic because members of the pack like fighting for their pack. Quite apart from the fact that this social

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

picture presented us with the international anarchy in full blast, this attempt to hush up, to burke, the individual's claims was bound to fail.

Darwin and the struggle to survive was enough proof for practical man, for statesmen and politicians, for the men in office. Biology gave them all the evidence they required to justify reaction at home and war abroad. The philanthropists, those who had ceased to prove the need of reform by philosophy, but, with greater courage than sense, still pressed reform on the officials and administrators, such defiants still refused to face the adverse verdict served on them by biology. It is psychology which has given them the *coup de grâce*.

Liberalism's Cremation

Newton banished God from nature, Darwin banished him from life, Freud drove him from the last fastness, the soul. It was all latent in Newton, in Descartes, in Galileo: mechanism would conquer all, once it had conquered nature, for man's body was sprung from nature and his mind from his body.

Newton's discovery showed the practical man that, outside man, no power existed which would intervene to save his values or sanction his ethics. The only practical advice to be drawn from the Principia was that of an earlier mathematician :

“That inverted bowl men call the sky,
Under whose arch we creatures crawl and die,
Lift not your hands in prayer to it, for it
Rolls impotently on as you or I.”

Darwin's discovery showed that in life and in man's nature was written no law of Natural Theology : on the

THE THIRD MORALITY

contrary, the law of life was the negation of morality. What Kant had talked of as an absolute reality, "The moral law within" had to be banished from any action in the outer world.

But even that last retreat, the conscience which might drive the tender to leave a world only to be controlled by crime, and might give the tough a sense of guilt in their success, even the conscience, psychology has attacked.

In the next chapter, when considering the resistance which illogical rationalists put up to accepting the practical consequences of their theory, we shall see how the teaching of Freud was needed to bring home the lessons logically present in the theories of Newton and Darwin. Here for the present it must suffice to say that the Freudian explanation has revealed to many that conscience is not only harmful but unnecessary, and as unnecessary as harmful. It is nothing but the superstitious efforts of the pack to coerce the individual. If he is to be healthy he must throw off this sorcerer's spell only fit for savages and not to be endured for a moment by men of intelligence who have discovered the truth that they are nothing but, and should be nothing but healthy animals.

So, as every reviewer of science has realized, religion has been made to retreat first from the universe, then from life and now from the very spirit of man.

What however such complacent rationalistic onlookers have not realized is that not only is religion destroyed—if these accepted theories are true—but ethics and all morality as well.

The materialist scientist is generally a rationalist who supports pure ethics and the pure ethicist is generally a supporter of materialistic science. They are agreed

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

that rationalism yields pure ethics, unadulterated by superstition. They may agree; but neither has any objective foundation for this belief. On the contrary, it is obvious that such a belief is so baseless it could only be accepted by those so willing it should be true as to be very unwilling to examine even superficially whether it is. For it is quite clear that the sequence of development, which the materialist rationalist has assumed led to free and pure ethics, leads on the contrary to the abolition of ethics.

The ethicist has thought that first there was magic. Then dawning reason introduced ethics and there was religion, a mixture of magic and morality. And finally—Reason's triumph—magic was cast away and there was left morality.

But this, of course, is not at all the way that things have actually happened. In the first place religion was the sanction of morality—right or wrong, early or late, it was the alternative to martial law—mutual self-interest was not enough to make men serve the community and respect the rights of their neighbour. With religion gone, where was the sanction to be found? In social convenience, reply the rationalistic ethicists.

Against this easy assumption, this wish-fulfilment argument, stands the unanswerable judgment of the greatest of rationalists, David Hume: "There is no reason why I should prefer the pricking of my finger to the death of 1000 fellow beings." That brings us to the second criticism of the materialist ethicist's assumption that morality stands untouched, while it is only religion, superstitions, otiose and immoral, which materialistic natural science destroys.

The ethicist maintains he has his sanction for morality in life, but where has his science discovered that sanction?

THE THIRD MORALITY

In biology? Man is sprung from a gregarious animal and therefore it is natural for him to be altruistic; he has an instinct to serve the pack. Has biology found such an instinct? The verdict is very doubtful. Man may have had instincts, he seems to have none now. All he has is certain tendencies and the very height of his evolution seems to depend on his mental flexibility, his freedom from instinct. But what biology (on which the materialist ethicist depended) did teach is this: Whether or no it is evidence of natural morality that the individual is subordinated naturally to the pack (and so man ought and will subordinate himself to his community), these packs themselves have in their behaviour toward each other or to their constituents no moral nonsense about them. In Natural Selection and the Survival by Struggle we have the complete denial of morality, the complete sanction of the international anarchy which now threatens civilization with complete destruction.

Nor can the ethicist retreat back into the conscience, maintaining that, though biology denies that moral conduct is possible in the world, yet such conduct does yield a sense of comfort to the individual, even when it fails and brings him to defeat. Here now the ethicist finds the Freudian psychologist awaiting him. This sense of triumph in disaster—of defying with glad exultation the blind universe—for one who has felt it, a million know nothing of it. But the one may be right? No, he is only suffering from baulked sexual emotion which brings on illusions of illumination, compensatory hallucinations, megalomania and *folie de grandeur*.

We must repeat, this attack the materialist ethicist cannot refute; it was all latent in Newtonianism. Materialistic Naturalism destroys not merely religion;

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

it also leaves ethics without sanction. It goes further, it shows ethics to be as illusory, and further, as unhealthy, as morbid, as religion.

The Rationalist Materialist to-day must be immoral

This conclusion is not merely a deduction arrived at from the study of theory, from following the history of our thought. It is more than an argument as to what actions should and must result from certain theories. The collapse of Liberalism is the proof that these forces here described have so worked and so wrecked. Liberalism and ethicism are dead. The rationalistic materialistic ethicist to-day has no place save as a survival, for the actual rationalistic materialist of to-day is what Huxley and all the XIXth-century ethicists would have called, rightly, immoral, and yet he is, as he can justly and easily maintain, acting on a rational deduction from materialist principles and the accepted conclusions of materialistic science.

The first freedom of which he avails himself is sexual freedom. Sex-control is a tabu. Maybe. But sex is a very awkward force in society, and, as Malinowski has pointed out, the tabus and restrictions seem to have been imposed because, even in a society which can resist and resolve all other strains—such as economic and social inequality—with little effort and slight modification, sexual strains, such as envy, jealousy and defiance, prove unbearable. To channel this, the primal disruptive force, society therefore uses its strongest inhibitions and they are not in any wise too powerful for that particular explosive energy which must be kept from wrecking social life.

Sociologists who have doubted the advisability of promiscuity have generally questioned that advisability

THE THIRD MORALITY

on the ground that unrestrained sexual indulgence makes men addicts, caring only for lust and incapable of all other interest or of that postponement of pleasure, that self-control, which is the first virtue necessary for civilization. The appetite grows with eating, they have maintained; and there is some evidence now which suggests that those who declared sex was only troublesome when repressed were mistaken. It is not an appetite which ceases to assert itself, without the individual having to employ any conscious control, simply because it attains a natural satiety. As Köhler points out in his study of chimpanzees, constant sexual stimulus does not bring sex to an end but turns it into a constant habit, the aimless repetition of a trivialized, and trivializing, emotion.

That his sex may trouble the individual and make him an addict is not, however, the chief danger with which unrestrained sex confronts society. That is the danger of incessant quarrelling, feuds, injustice and outrage. Sex is a cruel force. We have seen people delighted at having let the tiger out of its cage because they were bored at the irritation it caused them by its constant scrabbling at the bars. Perhaps for a moment that relief seems pure gain. For a moment the animal may have seemed a little dazed at finding itself free. Already, however, it is beginning to show a certain roughness which may end in a homicidal accident. We need to remind ourselves that the majority of murders are always—to-day as ever—sexual murders. We need to repeat, sex is cruel. It springs from the self-assertive, dominating, pretentious side of life. It is not satisfied merely by slaking a physical need. It needs to show-off and dominate. It requires, in order to assuage its passion, not merely to have but to take, not merely to enjoy

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

but to spoil. For it has, if it is to be sated, not merely to be met, but to conquer, to triumph.

This requires that it be not only capitulated to by its prey but that it humiliate all its rivals. It is therefore compelled not merely to seduce any who attract it but to take any, even if they do not attract it, if they are prized by another possible rival. That such another male treasures his spouse is to make that spouse temporarily attractive in the sexualist's eyes. He has to snatch her to keep on proving to himself his maleness. This is always witnessed where sex is not controlled. It is the cruellest form of bullying. It rouses even the weakest and most peaceable to fight. It makes social anarchy. At present we have not seen the later stages of that degenerative process, only the first; the others will succeed. Shaw is still alive who taught: "If you preach breaking the rules, you must not avail yourself of the licence you advocate."

The generation which has succeeded has only had a few years of licence. In the main they are content for the time with numberless affairs. That, however, will not last. Already they are bored. Man does not want concessions—concessional repetitions of the same wearisome, truncated function—for materialism has made people imagine that the lyric element, the restrained and reverential attitude of the lover, was only the consequence of a morbid repression, and that the bare act of copulation was all that was "real" in sex. Man wants, and must have, conquests. It is Stendhal who says "love" is composed of 90 per cent. *amour propre*, and only 10 per cent. physical craving. The woman, too, wants to be passionately, desperately desired, not casually availed. She fans the need of conquest in the man, rouses rivalry and both male and female feel again

THE THIRD MORALITY

the passionate excitement—the only feeling they value and which, without conflict, they cannot have. The complaisant husband, too—he suddenly finds that here is for him a revival of passion, a rejuvenation, when the woman he has viewed as an almost subconscious function of his life is suddenly seen as desired by another male. If he can snatch her back, he will not only have rewon his “valuable,” the valuable will be re-enriched, re-kindled. She will prize him as she never did before.

The hunt is up ; the game becomes fast and furious ; lovers, husbands, wives—catch-as-catch-can goes ever faster. Blood, too, is up ; life’s hot interest is back. Sex wins a new lease of life—but of course society has gone back to the vendetta. There is no equality here, a gentle ease in changing partners and discarding “duds.” No, the powerful get all, and those who have not the physique to fight get out. Free sex ends not in all enjoying themselves, but as on Monkey Hill : the powerful with all the females, the rest with none.

This picture may seem too hectic. Sex surely cannot be of such significance. Yet Conrad Heiden in his important study of Hitler maintains how large a part this sexual competition has played in the making of the present violent German politics. We have to face the fact that men whose life is disbalanced, and on whose passion for dominance women can play, can once more fling the world into war and may wish to do so to prove their superior virility. As always, the private passions of autocrats, who won their power by passion, are charges which explode pent resources and bring on public calamities.

This, then, is what sex freedom must and will do and is beginning to do : first, trivialism and boredom, with aimlessly repeated, featureless intrigues ; then snatching,

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

fighting and homicide to keep the edge on passion. Nor will the decay of morality extend only down the sexual line. If it is important for my health and my only real satisfaction that I have as much sexual experiences as I desire (and there is no biological reason, rather the reverse, why I should respect the rights of others or keep my sworn word), what objection can ethics based on materialistic science put in the way of my taking any other satisfactions I find myself to need? I take my pleasures where I find them and I take goods on the same

“ Good old way, the ancient plan
That he shall take who has the power
And he shall keep who can.”

In short there is no limit put by any rule of conduct deduced from materialist science on any extravagance of individualism. The individual is the only fully real thing. He must, to satisfy himself, take everything he desires; otherwise he is repressed, unhealthy, morbid; a creature who will give way to other-world fantasies and superstitions unworthy of a free man.

Of course this leads to an inter-social anarchy as violent as the international anarchy, and in the end the conflicting individuals—after many have destroyed each other—fall under one tyrant who by superior strength and cunning has managed to crush them. They then have all their liberty taken away and become his slaves, his means. But, adds Natural Selection, that is all right. The fittest has survived; the strong has been selected and the weak have been weeded down and out.

Yet we must add that this is hardly the goal which Liberalism, when it shifted its basis from Natural

THE THIRD MORALITY

Theology to pure ethics, expected to reach. Unfortunately it was inevitable. Ethics have to have a sanction; they must be the consequent, deduced behaviour from a certain view of life and reality. If Materialistic Science, Newtonian Mechanics, Darwinian Natural Selective Evolution, Freudian sex-dominated consciousness is true and this is the whole description of man and the universe, then society must end in unlimited war without, unlimited tyranny within, till civilisation collapses and humanity is liquidated.

The Degenerative Process Illustrated from France

Those people who do not wish to see the logical consequences of their beliefs or lack of beliefs, will declare the above to be too gloomy a picture. Democracy and Liberalism have lost much, it is true. But we are still here, they brightly remark. For how long? A person ignorant of tides seated on the rocky end of a reef may think it alarmist when told, though still feet above water level, that he must go back at once or he will drown because his retreat will be cut off. The tide of reaction is running with ever growing speed to-day. It is, however, fully eighty years ago that this tide began to turn. France, the logical country, showed the first signs. France led the world in social-reforming consciousness based on the Natural Theology of the more active XVIIIth-century reformers. Voltaire is the perfect example of such minds and none had greater influence than he. It is significant that he popularized Newton with religious fervour: he was anxious to show how perfect, fully sanctioned, and humane a morality could be, based on a cosmology which got rid of the traditional, anthropological cosmology of the cruel Church, and put in its stead the rights of man, the

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

goodwill in man's heart, the law naturally written there in man's unfallen nature.

Rousseau's position is the emotional counterpart of Voltaire's rationalism. Even the militarist miscarriage of the Revolution cannot destroy this zeal. Indeed, no accident in the world of action could affect its powerful conviction. Its thought and argument could only be overthrown by other proofs and arguments. It was not the Revolution's excesses or Napoleon's reaction which killed Liberalism in France, but the steady progress of the mechanistic philosophy. La Place, more clear-minded than Newton, tells Napoleon there is no need for the hypothesis of a God behind phenomena—a minder somewhere about the machine. Suspicion has awoken whether Deism is more than a hang-over, a last ineffective shadow from the disproved Anthropomorphism.

So the XVIIIth century's mechanistic interpretation of the outer universe is followed by the XIXth century's mechanistic interpretation of life.

The advance of social reform is checked, administrators cease to improve the prisons; the constant spur of philanthropy begins to be lacking; the social conscience gradually sinks lower. Corruption is no more than a symptom; the grave and deadly cause of that symptom is that men, detached thinkers as much as harassed administrators, no longer believe in man.

A democratic, fully individualized state must hold itself together on personal convenience, a very weak tie, and, when that must be strengthened, on fear and greed. The citizen is no longer proud of his state as the most civilized, rational and humane—he cannot be, for it has fallen behind in that, the true race of ascent. The peasant personality denominates the state. That character cares supremely for its savings, it is deeply

THE THIRD MORALITY

individualist and avaricious, for money is its only reality. The only thing which combines all citizens is to protest against any tax for social services. Better the country squalid, mean, dilapidated ; prisons and hospitals, water and sewage a generation and more out of date—so long as the individual can keep to the full his private savings.

There are no voluntary social services in most of the cities in France. The devout give money to their priest to distribute. The prisons are a scandal, the municipal services on an equal level. France's second city, Marseilles, is of an oriental squalor, and the Chief of Police has reported with the complacency of a zoo-keeper : " We have criminals in France of a type seldom matched in Europe and quite unknown in such countries as England and Scandinavia."

Historians of XIXth-century France have pointed out that it was as she lost her sense of herself as the leader of humane civilization that she took to developing with a certain ruthless thoroughness her colonial empire.

All this of course is not evidence that, as the English used to maintain before they thought her alliance necessary, the " French are decadent." On the contrary, it is proof of their clear-mindedness and power of logic. The sensible, highly thoughtful and shrewd Frenchmen realized, earlier than the more emotional peoples, that Liberalism was done, because it had had its rational basis cut from under it. It was now only an emotional habit ; it was not true. His shrewd and indeed kindly sense was shown by the steps he took to prevent sudden panic and collapse into dictatorship.

He could not prevent the squall and capsize when the kindly, sentimental reign of " the Citizen King," Louis-Philippe, was suddenly ended by emotional revolt, and the clever adventurer, Louis Napoléon, took advantage

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

of the reaction to swing himself on to the shoulders of the people. When, however, the Dictator made his slip, they saw to it that he went for good. But something had to be put in his place, an internal balance of power, an attraction for people who no longer believed either in reform or romance, in the civilized community or the conquering state.

That the founders of the Third Republic found in the appeal to the peasant personality—a nation of individual savers tied together by the Government's sacred guarantee of their "rente." This tie, however, is not sufficient. Internally the standard of social service and the mutual obligation it permits is, we have seen, low, dangerously low; for Communism grows among the city dwellers, who see how much other communities provide as a matter of social obligation for all their members. Yet the immediate danger is not internal but external. France with a heavily farmed empire is envied by her neighbour Germany. France, therefore, holds together not merely because every rentier wishes the Government to pay interest punctually, but also because every citizen fears that the Boche is after his back-garden empire. Greed, therefore—in itself not sufficient social binding—has added to it Fear. So there still hangs together a society but not a civilization. For the constituents are no longer united through a common goodwill to one another and a common aspiration towards creating a human culture supreme over all that came before.

It is worth considering the collapse of Liberalism in France at this length, for, when properly understood, we see here the retreat from Liberalism as it is conducted by an intelligent and humane community. We are used to reflecting, with generally little solution, on the dramatic—melodramatic—collapse in Italy and Germany.

THE THIRD MORALITY

We may learn more from studying how a people, as attached as we to democracy, but clearer minded, has slowly adapted and withdrawn; attempting to find some social theory and practice, which, while facing the supposed and accepted facts of Natural Science, would permit the preservation of some freedom of thought and speech, some liberty of action, some respect for the rights of others.

France cannot stabilize her position, but she is fighting a series of rearguard actions for Liberty. In the end she must abandon Liberty. She will not do so until, fighting for the other possessions which hold her state together—empire and *rente*—her foes drive her to that extremity. This undoubtedly they will; and if France, clear-sighted, resourceful and caring for Liberty, cannot hold on to it, why should other nations imagine they can?

As We Think, In the End We Must Act

We have seen, then, that in our private and in our public lives, individually and socially, we have reached an impasse. We have seen also that this impasse is an inevitable consequence of our thought, our theory. As we have thought we have had to act; our general theory results in individual and social behaviour. The international anarchy is the result of the doctrine that might is right, and that doctrine is accepted with "a smile or a sigh" by all men of action and men of thought, because it, in its turn, rests on what people believe to be the full scientific view of reality: materialism in the inorganic, the organic, and the mental worlds; in the universe, in life, and in man's spirit. Cosmology—the theory of what the whole means—results inevitably in ethics, the behaviour natural and reasonable in such circumstances.

The same is true of our private as of our public lives,

ARE ETHICS ENOUGH?

of the individual as of the community. Those who accept scientific materialism as a full, unbiased account of reality will become private anarchists, as their Governments are public anarchists. The Governments do not want war—we may believe their protests—but they do want, and will have, their way. So we privately do not want a life of mean and violent actions compelled by uncontrollable passions, but we can see no other satisfaction in life, and rationalism has to confess there is none. We have to satisfy ourselves; and the result of everyone seeking to do that is the same as everyone suddenly trying to escape from fire or shipwreck: soon there is a jam, a panic and nearly all crush each other to death.

Ethics by themselves, held up as sufficient sanction of themselves, are quite helpless. No one ever thought of advocating a consequence, a resultant (for that is what ethics are and can only be) as a sufficient cause, so long as a true cause could be found. Examination of this, our last eighty years of history, shows, however, that ethics are left standing without cause, without sanction, because scientific materialism destroyed the sanction on which they originally rested. Nor is that all; not only has that destruction of the basis and sanction of ethics left them in the air; the arguments from materialist science which destroyed anthropomorphic religion have also destroyed ethics.

CHAPTER II

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION ?

WE have now seen that ethics by themselves are not enough. Ethics must be sanctioned, or, to put it more exactly, ethics must be based upon, must be the logical system of action built up from, such general truths as can be discovered from an unbiased observation of reality. Indeed we have seen that the materialist rationalist's whole idea about pure ethics, about a morality which is right and workable just because it is reasonable, is completely mistaken. That altruistic, high-minded ethic which the rationalist used to imagine to be self-evidently right we all now see neither works nor could be expected to work. It is contrary to his knowledge of the laws of the universe, of life, and of his own consciousness.

The destruction of the anthropomorphic cosmology did not leave ethics free. A cosmology of some sort had to be put in the place of that destroyed. As we have seen, it was the mechanomorphic determinist cosmology which succeeded, and this had to encroach on the anthropomorphic ethic until man realized he was not free to choose any ethic which seemed pleasant, but only that one which the new cosmology dictated. Ethics, if they are to be honest or indeed real, must be a consistent action induced from objective observation of

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

reality. If reality is only a machine, expressing a blindly working, amoral law, then ethics cannot be moral. Psychological morality—behaving so that I may remain sane and detached in a universe which is purposeless and in a life which is irrational—must mean no more than being healthy at anyone else's cost; biological morality can only mean seeing that one's own stock survives at any cost; physical morality—that can only be a contradiction in terms, for if the universe is completely without any freedom and man is wholly formed and contained by such a universe, he can have no free will and so talk of morality is nonsense. So, in the end, we see it is, according to the materialist rationalist's own argument, not merely by force of reason that the rationalist must adopt an immoral ethic; he is not free to choose any other. He is merely an automaton.

No materialist-rationalist ethicist has ever been consistent enough to accept this position. He can hardly be blamed for inconsistency when his argument leads him, a rationalist, to have to disown the authenticity of reason and drives him, a man of free thought and pure will, to surrender his belief in his power of action. Nevertheless we cannot avoid facing the fact that ethicists have increasingly, if unconsciously, recognized the untenability of their position. We have had to trace, in the first chapter, the decline of secularist Liberalism both in public and private life. Both states and individuals are showing by their actions that altruistic efforts are not going to be practised—however much men may wish it—in a world where everyone is sure that such ethics not only have no sanction but are in flat contradiction to the proved facts of nature, life, and human character.

THE THIRD MORALITY

Why, till Freud, the Collapse Postponed

This collapse, this facing the facts, this triumph of rationalism has taken time. For a generation after Darwin it was still possible to say: "A man can believe the universe is blind and life aimless and yet behave as nobly and as cheerfully as any saint." Moralists who believed this clung to two things: the suggestions of childhood and the conviction that the "moral light within," their conscience, was (however biologically immoral and contrary to nature) still a sublime defiance. That suggestion, and that comforting belief about the suggestion, have now both of them been undermined. As a popular rationalist has said, a man can take his morality at second hand, but not at third: he can accept his mother's word but not his grandmother's. If, in his most impressionable years, the person he has loved best and who has loved him best taught him an ethic which—as she passionately believed and taught—was deduced from certain fundamental beliefs about the universe (a loving God who answered prayer, and required and, if obeyed, made possible, a good life), then he could so act when he no longer believed his teacher's basic faith. He would find a will so to act so powerfully implanted that he would be able to believe with Kant* that it was an independent authority within the soul, independent even of the universe and of life.

But, when mothers who no longer believed brought up their children, they could not implant such a faith,

* Kant, however, taught that, faced with the Newtonian cosmology of his day, it was impossible to effect "that harmony of duty with happiness which is indispensable to rational moral life" without *postulating* the continued existence of the soul. A postulate *ad hoc*, a demand for an ethical belief in order to construct an argument which shall establish ethics, is a good example of wish-fulfilment thinking. Faced with this problem, Professor Henry Sidgwick felt the supreme importance of psychical research, for, as a teacher of ethics, he was sure that ethics must have proof and rest on fact.

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

and even for these few children who still had had believing mothers, Freud made the Kantian defence and sanction impossible. Freud had maintained (and scientific opinion had increasingly accepted his explanation because it was the logical application to psychology of Newtonian physics and Darwinian biology) that the ethicoreligious impulse, the sense of "inexplicable obligation," was perfectly explicable. It was first and foremost simply a suggestion imposed on the child's helpless and highly impressionable mind. But why those particular suggestions of right and wrong—why impose suggestions at all? Whence this need? In *Totem and Tabu* (1919) Freud explained, and again his explanation was accepted. Morality was imposed on the young for the convenience of their elders, to keep them from those sexual pleasures which the elder wished to enjoy without youthful rivalry.

But why did the good not merely obey the restrictions but devote themselves with a high sense of worth and even with moments of what seemed an illuminated insight, to what was a life of unhealthy thwarting of natural instincts? Once again came the answer, which, in a world that already knew there could be no spiritual realities and ethics could only be based on personal convenience, had to gain assent. At the back of their minds—because they had accepted a mechanistic physics and biology—nearly all men of thought and action really wanted conscience, the categorical imperative, the inexplicable moral obligation explained away. It was the last anomaly in a world which, with this one exception reduced to material terms, would be wholly explicable as a machine and nothing but a machine. As we have seen, Freud's answer to conscience, moral insight, intuition and illumination was simple, if a little

THE THIRD MORALITY

crude: "Granted that a few did have an experience of worth and reality in obeying an inner monition and in leading a devoted life, these people were only suffering from repressed sex. The physical thrill denied its natural outlet, dammed back long enough, in characters strong enough to stand the strain, resulted in a sense of illusory delight and worth—a compensating delusion to assuage the strained nature for loss of its normal satisfaction."

Now that argument certainly destroys the last vestige of pure ethics, of the morality which would maintain that noble and restrained conduct is yet natural to man, though he live in a universe where outer nature is mechanical, and where the real law of life is that advance can only be through ruthless competition, by unlimited force and cunning. The evidence of psychology has been brought into line with that of physics and biology. A process begun in the XVIIth century is completed in our generation. The mechanic picture of the universe is consistently imposed on all that universe's contents, not merely on the motions of the heavens and of the earth but on the motions and motives of life and, finally, of consciousness.

It is an immense achievement of co-ordinated argument and carefully selected illustration—not of proof. Indeed it might be called the most protracted of all pieces of special pleading. For the thinker's feeling that he must establish the necessity of realistic immoral political action appears long before Newton (who, as far as he thought of politics, wished far otherwise) and before Galileo (who was, at least, indifferent). The belief that man is essentially immoral and therefore must be coerced (for his good) by violence and cunning—that as we have seen, is the essence of Machiavelli's teaching and the

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

core of its success. Practical politicians read in *The Prince* why ruthless policy paid ; though theories wider than politics—such as theology—could not approve. Hence, until theology (the anthropomorphic cosmology) could be replaced by another, there was still lacking that deadly reconciliation and consistency of pure thought and practical action which could destroy mankind. What was needed was the proof that it not merely pays for the moment to treat men with treacherous violence, but that such behaviour is the human reasonable reaction to and practical interpretation of the nature of the universe. However, after the practical politician (himself, in his blinding individualism, an end-process of anthropomorphism) had acted for sufficient time on Machiavelli, then men, by being so treated, became so rapidly “conditioned” in their individualism that, first, they could apprehend nothing but a mechanic universe (they were content to accept this half picture as a full truth), next, they could only see the life process as equally blind and futile, and finally—the deadly sequence completed—they could even consider their own consciousness to have no springs or inspirations but blind appetite. Worse than acting badly in hot blood or driven by practical necessity, in cold blood they came to be able to see that there was no good.

As has been said, not only has it taken time—some 250 years—for that consistent and embracing picture to be worked out : it has also taken all that time before man could wholly unshackle himself from the morality which was based on the anthropomorphism that was destroyed with the rise of science in the XVIIth century. It has often been noted that when animals are set free and democracies newly enfranchised, a considerable period

THE THIRD MORALITY

elapses before they realize their power and that they are no longer caged. Pike put to swim where they are cut off from sprat by a glass partition spend much time and energy lunging at their prey as it passes the window. When, however, their snouts are bruised by these collisions against the pane, the window can be raised, the sprat swim into the pike's premises but the pike leave them unmolested. After each of the extensions of the franchise in England it was always a generation before the newly enfranchised classes began to return members of their class. Many generations of futile revolt had conditioned the under-classes to feel that they were helpless against their "betters" so that, with their betters in their power, they could not for a moment realize the fact.

For 250 years religion had therefore still an opportunity to rebuild the basis which had proved incapable any longer of sustaining morality. It clung, however, with blind conservatism to its anthropomorphic cosmology, a "sanction" which had shown that it was no longer a sanction, for religion had had to resort increasingly to violence to compel belief.

Action does depend on thought, conduct on theory, morality on cosmology, but there is a lag, a hang-over between finding out that you were mistaken and should act otherwise and actually doing so. Hence the inconsistency between belief and behaviour. On this, moralists who abandoned the anthropomorphic cosmology and accepted the mechanistic cosmology built, we have seen, what they hoped would be pure ethics, a rule of life, independent of what was accepted as being an unbiased view of life. To build on a lag is even more dangerous than to build on sand. To depend on a hang-over is to depend on something as transitory and as

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

unreal as the repentance of a dypsomaniac when he is recovering from a bout of intoxication.

To-day then we see the mechanistic cosmology completed, brought home to roost in the soul, with Freud's dissipation of the inner light. To-day also we see pure ethics—unsupported, unsanctioned morality—also caving in. Theory and practice are now advancing together. As Freudianism is accepted, so sexual morality must disappear and is disappearing. But that is not all: sexual morality was, we now see, however confused, a consequence of the acceptance of social morality. The particular rules were often fantastic and repressive. The psychological factor in them was that the community came first, because the individual could only live completely and fully as a community member. Hence he must submit to restraints. The particular restraints were often far from being the best way of obtaining the desired end: an integrated community. When man was yet pre-individualized his world outlook was a vague Animism, an intuition that the universe was somehow alive. This (whether it could have been avoided we cannot say) condensed into Anthropomorphism as man himself became individualized. Hence all exercises at self-training became efforts to preserve, not to transcend, the self. The mortifying ascetic is an intense individualist. The cure for that was not, however, to do away with restraints, but to find more effective ones, restraints which would canalize, not thwart, this great force, making it a social current, not a social breaker. What, however, has happened, and had to happen, with the abandonment of the anthropomorphic cosmology and the consequent setting up of the physical individual as the only possible ultimate, is the abandonment of all social purpose, the recognition by the individual that

THE THIRD MORALITY

life has and can have for him no purpose or meaning other than his personal physical satisfaction. His soul and the community were equally incapable of being aims—the one was a limiting illusion, the other only a means to his fulfilment. So the right, the absolute necessity, that the individual should have sexual freedom at whatever cost to other members of his community, that sexual right is only part of a larger right, every other part of which the individual (because he alone is the only possible end for himself) must assert, must seize, or he has failed. He must be allowed to take his neighbour's wife—that we think is inevitable, because she is no chattel (still honour asks: Had he the right to tempt her—or she him?)—and leave his—that, too, must be conceded.

But to draw the line at sex-satisfaction with adults is arbitrary. If what is always happening in human society when men do not repress themselves is natural, then on what grounds interfere with the seduction of young girls and pederasty? Anthropology has shown that peoples who are not under any puritan repressions enjoy both these practices. And beyond sex lie the other passions: Rage—is it safe or right for me to repress anger? May not it damage me? Avarice—why should I not have my neighbour's property if I have a strong desire for it and can get it? What rights has he against the right I have to satisfy myself? What do I owe him beside what I owe myself? Greed, malice, fear—these are no longer vices, unworthy feelings; they are the true inner light which lights every man to his only true satisfaction and destiny.

Liberalism can only set free people to indulge their passions. It asks feebly that all should be allowed to

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

enjoy themselves to the utmost as individuals and none encroach on each one's full physical satisfaction. "My full satisfaction," replies one realist, "means that I have to have more room than my sorry neighbours will give me. I deserve more. I am finer. Biology, the law of life, says I ought to have more." Still another cries: "My full satisfaction requires that I prove my virility by taking from the weak what they cannot properly use or hold. The law of life also says I must so act." Liberalism, based on material science, is answered, silenced, dismissed.

Granted it is a blue look-out, what other prospect is honestly open? Granted it must end in a smash—anarchy locked in a death grapple with tyranny—is not that the only rule of life, the only natural law we have been able to find? So things actually are, says the scientific materialist, and it is no use shirking truth. Pure Science has been interrogated, and "'The stars,' she whispers, 'blindly run.'"

Life has been viewed steadily and whole, and it is seen to have evolved by an equal blindness, which, when it becomes conscious, inevitably expresses itself as the triumph of unlimited violence and cunning. Consciousness has been analysed and all man's ideals and his last sublime defiances are reduced to no more than appetites twisted from their natural purpose and satisfaction and made into illusions as fatal to the individual who indulges them as to whatever society should believe him and act on them. As a sociologist who has been already quoted, and who bases his social teaching on materialist science, has said: "There is no objective ethic and there cannot be. If a society says a pogrom is moral, then it is moral." To which can be added the rider: The power and will to persecute the weaker is the manifestation at the moral

THE THIRD MORALITY

level of the struggle to survive, of the dominance rightfully practised by the stronger.

Here then one issue has become clear. Not only is pure ethics—*i.e.*, fine conduct based on itself—theoretically impossible and is now proved to be so, but—what is even more serious—the mechanistic cosmology which was put in the place of the anthropomorphic cosmology (which precipitated the old morality) is now precipitating *its* appropriate morality. Hence, whereas anarchy and violence before were due to the *inefficiency* of the old cosmology, to its trying to preserve social order and civilization through ineffective and often mistaken ways and methods (to an outlook which, the clearer it was defined the more it tended to create individualism rather than to check individualism's natural action), anarchy and violence to-day are due to a logical deduction from the new cosmology. It is clear therefore that not only are ethics not enough—by themselves they are shadows.

That, however, is still wholly to understate the gravity of the problem and crisis which confronts us now. For instead of the ethical shadow cast ever more faintly by the old inefficient faded anthropomorphic cosmology, we are to-day confronted with a new "morality," a new rule of conduct which is being precipitated by the mechanistic cosmology. "This do and thou shalt live"—it is the same rule, but what a different doing is dictated! The pale shadow of altruism fades and in its place forms the nightmare cloud of that unrestrained competition and exercise of cunning and violence, required in order that the individual may assuage his physical appetites, which alone are real, which he must satisfy or be "morbid" and so that his stock may survive—the only "immortality."

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

Now Ethics must find Sanction in Nature, or disappear

We cannot then escape the conclusion: either we must find evidence of other sanction for morality, the mechanistic cosmology must be found to be partial and so untrue as a basis from which to deduce action; or what we have called ethics will disappear and what we have called civilization will disappear with them: society will go down in chaos. From such a collapse, the present anthropological evidence seems to suggest, civilization may never recover, for civilizations are, we begin to realize, far more like living organisms than they are machines. Once shattered they may die, resisting every effort to revive them. Nor would the spreading necrosis be checked there. The present biological evidence seems increasingly to indicate that man, as a species, may never recover if the civilization which is now the brain of humanity cannot prevent its suicide. So may founder with civilization, not only the hope of man, but the whole hope of life.

To most ethicists this dilemma seems deadly. They have accepted the mechanistic cosmology. They hoped it would not interfere with ethics—hoped, even, that ethics would be freer to develop. They strove that this should be so. They attempted to prove it must. They have seen Liberalism beaten in the large field of international politics; they are seeing it brought to a halt, and in many societies already defeated in the next field, the field of social relationships—in social reform, in class contacts, in the treatment of delinquency, in belief in the freedom of thought, the exercise of tolerance, charity and recreative faith in human nature. They are seeing it failing and fading in individual personal relationships. They see the individual becoming soft, hysterical, or paralysed if he is tender, tough if he is strong; tough

THE THIRD MORALITY

since he realizes that it is his natural duty to get all he can for himself because he is the final reality, the only thing wholly real to himself; there is nothing ahead for him when he is no longer able physically to enjoy himself and there is nothing above him in the whole universe—he is the only creature which understands and he understands the whole means nothing.

Why Ethicists Despair

Unfortunately, ethicists, like all other specialists, cannot keep up to date. They are not informed of changes in the premises from which they argue. This fault of all specialists is, however, particularly natural for them. They thought they had got rid of an anthropological cosmology and, with it, of all degrading superstition. They thought ethics had never had anything but an accidental relationship with religion and that religion was only imagination. Being pre-anthropological they did not realize that religion and ethics are in a cause and effect relationship, that ethics—*i.e.* rules of conduct and behaviour—are a deduction from religion, from beliefs as to the nature of reality, of the character of the objective world. Being pre-psychological they also failed to realize that religion—however mistaken, however temporarily misrepresented, however permitted to harden into a false, over-precise interpretation of the living universe in terms of individualized man—is a picture of reality as far as man at each of the stages of his consciousness can respond to that reality. It is not a free play of fancy, a series of silly and irresponsible misapprehensions of reality, of sheer wish-fulfilment myths in the face of a wholly alien and indifferent universe, still less a deliberate device to deceive, dupe and exploit the ignorant. In its long

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

periods of decadence it can be these things. In its growth it is real. Religion is such a construction of experience, such a cosmology as yields a conduct, an ethic, a way of life, which makes possible the building up of an enduring social pattern, the maintenance of a balanced social rhythm and the co-ordination of man's entire nature in creative activity not only with his fellows but with the nature around him.

Unaware of these extensions of our knowledge of the nature of man, the pure, or baseless, ethicist was in consequence unwilling to keep watch for any changes in cosmology. Were any such reported? Was Mechanism in physics found to be less securely based than had been imagined? Were force and cunning found to be less able to account for evolution? Was psychology found to be faced with the data of psychical research? The ethicist thought such enquiries not only did not concern him, were of no moral value, he felt they were dangerous. Cosmology, the detection of any pattern and meaning in things, apart from the meaning man could impose on them, was to ethicists highly suspect. To them the finding of any design or direction outside man must be to bring back the anthropomorphic cosmology and so to restore its ethic, at best a dependence on an external Master Interferer, at worst full of tabus and fears, cruel restrictions, crueller intolerances, cruellest threats.

One must sympathize with such feelings. Those who think that they have attained a full understanding of reality, that they at last and alone have seen things as they really are, cannot believe in any further advance. Any change must be reaction, a return to superstition. Any discovery that things are more complex, more purposive than they, with a very preliminary examination

THE THIRD MORALITY

and with a strong wish to find no pattern, have assumed, awakes their suspicion. They are sure that the old anthropomorphic cosmology—the dethroned God or Gods—is going to be restored. This is their ground-of-public-policy for refusing to watch, for indeed belittling, discouraging and even suppressing, any of the late discoveries which have modified so strikingly the mechanistic cosmology. Cosmology, according to the ethicist, is not necessary for fine conduct, rather it has always been used to persecute fine conduct. Truth, for instance: how persistently have the holders of the anthropomorphic cosmology persecuted those who would have criticised that cosmology in the name of truth! That is true. Truth is an essential virtue and the supporters of the First Cosmology undoubtedly sinned against truth, for the sake of social security. Because of their individualistically distorted idea of spirit they opposed and persecuted those—such as Galileo and Bruno—who were introducing the Second Cosmology. Truth, however, grows and changes, and human nature—whether ecclesiastical or secular—tires of change. Anthropomorphism once appeared not socially convenient but true, and was therefore adopted as the basis and principle from which conduct must be deduced. Anthropomorphism was disproved, but man could not stop there. He had to put some equally comprehensive picture of reality-as-a-whole in Anthropomorphism's place.

As we have seen (page 26), ecclesiasticism, terrified of morality being overthrown and yet finding itself unable to suppress the proofs which had been produced against its anthropomorphic cosmology, threw over to the new scientists the world of astronomy and physics on condition that the world of life and consciousness, biology and

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

psychology should not be investigated. So the worst was made of both worlds by both parties to this impossible pact. For the theologian and the scientist were both agreed in the mistaken assumption (which the former dreaded and the latter welcomed) that, if man was investigated, his nature and the nature of life could bring no new factors into the new cosmology now constructed solely from the observation of the movements of "dead bodies"—the stars and (later) the atoms. No one on either side imagined that, whereas the study of the motion of stars and atoms could throw light on man, the study of man could throw light on stars and atoms, and that a complete cosmology would and must contain as objective a study of the behaviour of life and consciousness as of stars and atoms. Everyone assumed and agreed that analysis gave final knowledge of nature and that as analysis could be carried furthest with dead matter what remained (or, because they did not foresee the surprising outcome of modern physics' analysis, what could only remain) would be the final nature of everything made of matter—star and man alike.

No one asked whether some natures might be essentially wholes and so only to be understood by taking them in and studying them as wholes. It is strange, because anyone looking at a tapestry must have realized that to study it with stronger and stronger magnifying glasses would give you a deeper insight into the thread, but less and less notion of its picture, of what all the threadings were meant to convey and were put together to illustrate. All that the theologian moralists had done was to sell the foundations from under the feet of morality while forbidding new grounds to be explored. The scientists, forbidden to study man, could only assume that man's nature contained nothing which analysis of

THE THIRD MORALITY

matter would not disclose, and as this conclusion, those who foresaw realized, would bode ill for the theologian, they were not inclined to martyr themselves further to save him from the consequences of his cruel cowardice. They themselves expected no more than that superstition would wake up to find a flea in its ear, not that we should all be roused by civilization tumbling about ours.

So Mechanomorphism was constructed. This is the belief that the universe, all reality, can best be understood, not as being in its nature a "magnified non-natural man," but a magnified non-rational* machine—a concept really as strange as, and in some important practical particulars, such as man's actual behaviour, even less accurate than the concept it superseded.

To-day the physicist wishes to enlarge cosmology. And once more he advances with as little regard as Galileo for social convenience or for the disturbing use which those who want to upset the present settlement and understanding, may make of his advances. Mechanomorphism is to follow Anthropomorphism, as being, in its turn, too crude and childish a picture or rendering of reality. The physicist has now a new, exacter, more truthful method of expressing what the nature of the universe may be, in terms of human thought. He uses mathematical symbols preferably. When, however, asked what the essential nature of this post-mechanistic cosmology may be, he owns that it appears as something conceivable neither as human nor mechanic, but rather as the expression of a mental pattern, as a process of thought.

* Non-rational, for, though understood by man, it has itself no meaning, goal or *raison d'être*.

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

The New Advance Not a Return to Anthropomorphism

Truth, then, the most highly prized of the pure ethicist's virtues and values, compels him to attend to the new evidence. But it is necessary to realize that it is almost as hard for the secularist ethicist to face up to the supersession of Mechanomorphism as it was for the ecclesiastical moralist to admit the deposition of Anthropomorphism. For, the fact remains, all men care for truth not so much because it is an abstract, but because it is a practical thing, because they believe it, and it alone allows man to live nobly. Facts with which nothing can be done, however true, are not facts about which ethicists can really bring themselves to believe principle is involved. Even for such truths as the multiplication table an ethicist does not feel he should lay down his life. Those who challenge 2 by 2 making 4 either are insane or mean something which the common sense of the proposition does not involve. In either case martyrdom or suppression is not called for. The real reason why the ethicist finds it hard to attend to the changes in physics, to realize that the mechanomorphic cosmology is being dismantled, is because he fears the disappearance of that meaningless cosmology will mean the return of meaning and that that meaning will be the old narrow meaning deduced from Anthropomorphism.

So much for the motives of policy which prompt the ethicist when he discourages any value being given to the new facts in physics. He cannot avoid such prejudices—they are human—but he would be wise to recognize that he is no exception to the race and envisage them frankly. Then we might be saved the sad, atavistic spectacle of men who honestly believe themselves to love truth wholly, resorting to the obscurantist, but all too

THE THIRD MORALITY

human, methods with which ecclesiastical controversy has made historians painfully familiar. We should be spared the sight of ethicists and rationalists, when faced with the criticisms of the current cosmology made by those perfectly qualified to make them—by the men on whose thought the construction and extension of cosmology depends, by physicists of international reputation—attributing to such men unworthy motives. When we realize that ethicists and rationalists have charged physicists, who tried to explain their thought and its implications, with betraying truth for the sake of superstition, yes, and even for the sake of a knighthood, the hope of progress through a pure love of truth begins to pale. Here is the very spirit which made the conduct of the Christian Councils a sorrow to all humanitarians, a jest to all who wished rather to disparage than understand. Time and again the argument of the religious pioneer was never met; the easier, baser course of misrepresenting what he said was resorted to and even the most unworthy argument of all—indeed an attack not deserving the name argument was employed—the attribution of unworthy motives, the charge of immoral desires as the “explanation” of the pioneers’ desire to discover facts unacceptable to the established view.

Faced with signs of the return of such a spirit, and now among rationalists, the onlooker can at least help forward final understanding by estimating how deeply their feelings must be involved for them so to behave. Perceiving how much they must fear this advance and gauging the intensity of such a fear we have two important indications. The first is that pure ethics are insufficient to make a man accept truth and restrain himself from attributing base motives. The second is that we ourselves are pointed forward to see whether the

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

new facts about reality—now so strenuously resisted—may not provide that sanction without which the love of truth and the generous understanding of those who discover facts which upset presuppositions can neither be attained.

Is It Nobler To Wish Good Action to Mean Nothing?

There is, however, one more reason why the ethicist has been unwilling to accept facts tending to a new cosmology. He feared they would re-establish superstition—he feared so much that he himself fell below his own fine standard of love of truth. He “sinned for the sake of the people”; these facts were so dangerous, so capable of misuse that their discoverers must be discredited. All this was natural enough and sad enough. The ethicist, however, also had a private reason as well as a public reason for resistance. He is certain his pure, unbiased ethic has been nobler. Even if some religions, say Buddhism and Christianity, have in some of their sects taught a noble ethic, they have taught it tainted with the unworthy bait of reward. The ethicist will fulfil the loftiest ethic without reward. He will take no “opium”; no, he will take no stimulant or nourishment even to make him work at the highest and finest pitch. He will do all that the loftiest saint has ever done and do it with complete intellectual integrity, with a clear conviction that he gets no grace to help him, no reward to draw him, no, not even the reward that the humanity he serves will survive.

This, however, is proving too much by reason; reason so used undermines itself. For if I work for humanity with absolute disregard of myself and with the assurance that I so love truth that I face the conclusion that my race is as doomed and irrelevant as myself, then, true

THE THIRD MORALITY

enough, I am not working for reward ; but am I facing truth ? Am I working for any rational result ? The issue indeed is not one of reward but of result, of ultimate meaning. If life has no meaning and must end with its extinction on this globe, if the only goal is to make a number of generations become healthy animals before the cosmic frost kills them all off, then it is not reasonable or purposive to work for such a goal. It is not reasonable to ask an individual to sacrifice himself for cosmic futility ; it is not reasonable to ask an individual to live the loftiest, most self-forgetful life in order that succeeding generations may live a lower, more animal existence—that is sacrificing the finer to the baser ; it is not reasonable to work without result (not “ without reward ”—that word confuses the issue), for result can only be an aim, an achievement worthy of the means employed. The saint lives as a saint, not that other men may become comfortable but that they too may become saints. He sacrifices himself for the low, not because the higher should perish for the lower, not because the lower are his equal now, but because it is their destiny (and it is his to help that destiny) that they grow to be his equal.

On rational deduction and argument it is clear that the baseless ethicist when he prides himself that his actions will never be rewarded, never recognized by reality, is really being irrational, for he is maintaining that he, the realist, is going to behave, and will be most true and noble in behaving, supremely well, with a complete abandonment of any personal satisfaction, for the sake of no ultimate result.

We need not, however, depend on rational argument to disprove this strange misuse of reason. We have only to point to what actually happens and has happened. The pure rationalistic ethicist has not been able to live

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

up to his quixotic irrational programme. We have seen that since ethics became baseless, since Liberalism lost its philosophy and Natural Theology went the way of Revealed Theology, there have been two generations. The best of that first generation lived on the suggestion which it had received from parents who were still ethicists-with-a-sanction, in the widest sense of the word people of faith, believers. This implanted suggestion that first generation revered and acted on. They prevented their reason from dissolving it by maintaining the Kantian explanation and defence of it—that it was an irreducible fact not to be decategorized, explained away in terms of something lower. The universe was blind and dead; nature was blind and cruel; conscience, however, was absolute. Newton and Darwin therefore were fended off. The citadel of the inner soul was beleaguered, it is true, but was impregnable. It could never be made surrender, for within it there was always springing up from an unknown depth a staunchless spring of living water. Drinking of this, man knew he should and could defy the cosmos. Freud, we have seen, made the fortress capitulate. He showed that the stream rose from sources into which the drains of the castle seeped. It was no water of life, only a stream impregnated with the gases of decomposition. Whoso drank of it was not noble—only intoxicated, and to depend on it meant that the addict would become morbid and unhinged. This wild notion of defying the cosmic process, this resolve to refuse to submit to the laws of nature, was proof that this drink made men mad.

And so in the second generation of pure ethicists we have seen a change. They have neither received in their formative years a suggestion given with the absolute conviction of the believer, nor can they persuade

THE THIRD MORALITY

themselves—in the few cases who may so have received, and the many who have received a much more hesitant suggestion—that such a suggestion, such a voice of conscience, is an inexplicable and final fact. On the contrary, they know it is only baulked sex and that they must be unhealthy if they find themselves considering such promptings as irresistible.

The first generation produced few, if any, figures which could compare with the heroic, if narrow, devotion of the acknowledged saint. The utter self-forgetfulness of the mystic, his unlimited charity, courage, and patience the rationalist could hardly be expected to equal. Many ethicists of the first generation were men of a fine goodwill, actuated by a lively social conscience. They worked for reform, for justice and mercy. They had, however, like all men of sense who know this life is all, a balanced régime. They did not attempt the impossible either with society or with themselves. They took such pleasures as they might and put up with such anachronisms as they must. They knew they were human and only had a little time to work with inferior instruments. They did not expect to see a world wholly transformed. Therefore they gave themselves relaxations which the saint, the mystic, and the psychologically trained abstain from, because they say they have other recreations—other recreations which those relaxations would nullify—and they tolerated war and unrestrained competition. They were rational reformers, not inspired visionaries, and so the highest flights of the human spirit (whether those flights “find out heaven” or die in the interstellar cold) were denied them. Their limit was set by the advice of the Book of Wisdom: “Be not righteous overmuch.”

And the second generation's achievement has had to

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

be proportionately more modest. There has had to be proportionate lowering of the moral standard to meet the proportionate lowering of moral conviction and the proportionate reduction of reasonable belief that extreme standards are necessary, possible, or even healthy to attempt.

We see then that the moral achievement of the pure ethicist is not due to pure ethics but to a hang-over, a lag from a period where ethics had a sanction. That lag is now over and pure ethics no longer has behind it any sufficient motive power. Far from the pure ethicist actually living a nobler life, the rationalist, as is reasonable, lives a life of continually increased material satisfactions and continually lowered achievements. It is the saint and mystic, who take their opium (that life means something and that behind it are powers which will feed the strength of those who seek power in order to be made wholly means for the Kingdom), it is the superstitious types whose achievement the rationalist finds it increasingly difficult to emulate. And this again is reasonable; our knowledge of psychology makes it clear that whether such types are sane or no, whether it is wise for their own comfort and health for them so to behave, whether their dreams are morbid hallucinations, people who can so suggest to themselves that their ideals are real and objective, that there is an absolute goal to be reached, that when it is reached humanity will be for ever happy and that mysterious strength is given them to persevere against all outward discouragement and apparent failure, such types, psychology recognizes, have a power of "auto-suggestion" which makes them impervious to defeat as no rationalist can be.

The progress of the rationalist moralist, the pure ethicist, has been from the assured cheerfulness of the

THE THIRD MORALITY

mid-nineteenth-century Liberalism ; when men were convinced that by reason and with no great self-sacrifice or inordinate devotion, by argument and not by heroic example, a perfect order would gradually emerge ; through the short Huxleian phase of defiance, the Promethean attitude to the universe ; to the doubt and despair of to-day—doubt among the young as to whether there is any natural law save : Take what you want and can ; despair among the elder who see the young taking more and more and achieving less and less—and countering these elder rationalists' protests with the rational arguments with which elder rationalism met the churchmen of their day—the end of tabus, etc. Meanwhile, outside the dying Liberalism, the fanaticisms of black and red draw off the strong and make them tough, teaching that reason and argument are a muff's methods and that dogmatism in theory, and violence in action alone achieve success.

We have, then, discovered two things. First, we have seen why the ethicist has not attended to the new facts which are disintegrating the mechanomorphic cosmology and which will give rise to another, man's third, cosmology. Secondly we have seen why ethics, if they are to continue, cannot continue baseless but must be brought into correspondence with a cosmology. If the mechanomorphic cosmology is a complete description of reality, now that it has been extended from dead nature to life and, in our day, to consciousness, we see that what will and must be such a cosmology's rational deduction and practical consequence is not Victorian humanitarianism and respectability, but what the Victorians called the law of the jungle. If the mechanomorphic cosmology is true then the humanitarian and the moralist must retire and the realist must

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

throw off all pretence of humanitarianism and morality. We have reached such an impasse—reason proves it, the European anarchy demonstrates it—that the only happy and right action is that of those who break life's deadly entail: "blessed are the wombs which never bear, the breasts that never gave suck."

Liberalism's Collapse owing to lack of "Social Vitamins"

But it is not true. It is obvious that this will take some proving. Still, we may hope that the proof will be established in time to make men of good sense, let alone of good will, act on it. Surely the pure ethicists must be getting a little uneasy. They cannot feel now with their former certainty either that the nobler life can be lived without any sanction or that any change in cosmology must be disregarded and discredited because it must lead to a return of Anthropomorphism. The facts of human behaviour, what has happened to Liberalism as a public international creed and what has happened to the Liberal's private life—these facts cannot be burked.

Fifty years ago it was, at least theoretically, superstitious (in the literal sense of the word) to say that people must have as a diet to keep them in health fresh vegetables and dairy produce. The essential nourishing elements in foodstuffs, chemists were certain, had been found: fats, carbohydrates, protein and some salts, the calory diet. Fortunately, save in prisons and some other places, the ordinary man was on the whole given many opportunities to follow his superstitious cravings and the practical dietician also could not be convinced that the experimental animals which would die with such unwearying regularity on a vitaminless diet were laying down their lives out of prejudice against science and in order to discredit it. So when we find human beings

THE THIRD MORALITY

unable to be nobler than the saints who fed on a traditional diet—indeed often falling below the saints' level—the scientific attitude is not to deny the fact, still less to crow over such failure, but to set about enquiring whether the diet these human beings believed to be all that was necessary, and on which they strove so hard to act heroically, was adequate, was at all possible to sustain noble living.

When it has been frankly allowed that the traditional saint's diet was far from a balanced one, far from the best conceivable, then it is that it becomes all the more important to enquire whether the rationalist must not have been suffering from grave under-nourishment. Granted that the traditional religion's diet was full of much that was "roughage and bulk," yes, and even of harmful substances, granted that it was degenerating and ever fewer numbers tried to assimilate it, ever larger numbers of conformists only pretended to partake, still it must have contained some vitamins; while it is obvious that the synthetic diet of the rationalist, because he was so anxious to sterilize the traditional food and pick out all unnecessary superstitious stuff has "emptied out the baby with the bath."

Unfortunately "deprivative disease," failure of strength and liability to break down, owing to diet which leaves out vital foods, becomes much more quickly obvious in the individual physique than in the social community, in the body than in the character. As we have seen, the degenerative process has been going on since Newton; it only became acute eighty years ago with Darwin, and it has not become critical till to-day. But to-day we are faced by collapse. Our reserves are used up. The ethicist can no longer refuse to recognize that rationalist society—civilization based on the

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

mechanomorphic cosmology as the unbiased and final truth about reality—is desperately sick; and the individual who accepts in his own life that outlook as true is helpless—in despair if he faces the facts, only happy if he refuses to think and for a moment gains (an ever shorter respite) relief in some emotional excitement, some private affair.

The time has gone past when men of goodwill could say: "These new facts are too good to be true. I refuse to examine them lest I dope myself. I can carry on without." No one can carry on any more, if indeed the signals of outer nature are as redly against him as the elder cosmologists made them out to be. We have to face facts even if they turn out to be the saving of us. "Too good to be true"—the very phrase, as Proust detected, shows a curious modern masochistic wish. We never say a fact is too bad to be true. Our minds are one-way valves—open to the evidence of despair but closed instantaneously to hope. "Realism" to-day is always the discovery that the apparently good are base, never that the apparently evil can become good. Ever since the rise of the modern world with its mechanistic cosmology we have been able to believe in pure evil, but not in pure good. Shakespeare can invent an Iago, but not a supreme and selfless saint. We can believe in the collapse of the best but never in the conversion, the salvation, of the worst. Browning's "There may be heaven, there must be hell" has had the "may" negated and the "must" underlined.

Realizing that, we see we have often turned from facts and refused to consider them, because we feared so much being thought a credulous fool, "kidding ourselves." The wise, we imagined, are the disillusioned. The knowing are those who know there is nothing to be found

THE THIRD MORALITY

and that the universe to the really informed grows at each discovery plainer, balder, duller, more senseless.

Now this is clean contrary to the facts—it is simply that common sense which is the stale science of yesterday, that knowingness which believes everyone who knows more than itself must be a dupe.

It is true that the Newtonian Cosmology with its Mechanomorphism did, as poets such as Blake and Wordsworth knew, make the cosmos an empty thing. Wordsworth, not realizing how necessary it was that the inadequate Anthropomorphic cosmology (which gave rise to a morality in which much was base however alive) should be cleared away, declares he “would rather be a pagan suckled in a creed outworn.” It is true that the Darwinian Biology, with its blind Natural Selection to explain all the richness of life, and its Survival of the Fittest to interpret all its devotions and heroisms, did, as thinkers such as Butler maintained, “empty mind out of the world,” out of life. It is true that Freudianism has made every ideal and aspiration feel itself ridiculous and morbid, a purposeless extravagance made out of what should be a mere bodily routine.

But now we see the time has come—not a moment too soon—when the mechanomorphic cosmology, having completed its interpretation of reality, is shown not merely to have given such a sorry picture that, acting on it, civilization staggers over the edge but, also, to have left out so many facts that a new cosmology now is called for, the old picture must be scrapped, not merely on the grounds that as a chart it runs civilization on the rocks, but because it has constantly and deliberately left out and suppressed important facts all along the course.

We have seen that this Second Cosmology was, as a matter of fact, never completed, but remains an

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

arrested and partial development which to-day must be enlarged into the Third Cosmology. For the Second Cosmology was never constructed—as a complete cosmology can only be constructed—from actual findings, from all the data, all the *sensa* (colours and sounds and sensations, just as much as mass and movement) presented to human consciousness. On the contrary, through the interference of Authority concerned only to preserve the Anthropomorphic Cosmology, scientists were first confined to, next found themselves contented to observe, and finally were zealous to extend and impose, only a partial abstraction from the whole of actual experience. Hence such a picture of the universe, being so gravely incomplete, could not give rise to an adequate ethic or indeed any ethic. When the power to persecute slipped from the hands of the anthropomorphic Churches, the mischief had been done.

That mischief began when the second generation of scientists—Newton's generation—had, by becoming contented with the limitations which Authority imposed on research, accepted a "dislocation" of thought and action. This dislocation had to arise from their having constructed a cosmology which stopped short at Mechanism, having been forbidden to include life and mind. Hence their ethic (such, for example, as Newton's and other theistic scientists of the XVIIIth century), as it had to depend on a complete cosmology, had still to be dependent on the anthropomorphic, though Anthropomorphism had been already disproved in "the outer universe" and (because Authority forbade investigation) was increasingly suspect in the world of life and mind.

The next step was inevitable. So rooted a suspicion compelled scientists, as soon as they were free to advance into "the reserved subjects" of life and mind, to

THE THIRD MORALITY

strive to show (and honestly to believe) that there was and could be nothing in these beyond elaborations of the data which physics had studied and explained mechanically. Hence Darwinian biology and Freudian psychology both "deategorized" their data, because convinced that that data, though composed precisely of those characteristics which Galileo had reserved from physics and put aside for the future studies of the biologist and the psychologist, must be forced into and under physics—physics, which its founder considered as an abstraction from the wealth of reality.

This attempt, to make facts fit into a theory which was specifically devised to leave those facts for a more embracing theory, was bound to fail. By the nature of the case it was compelled increasingly to disregard significant facts. Equally serious was the practical consequence: that so long as this attempt to maintain that physics gave a complete cosmology was persisted in, so long the world of action would have to choose between an ethic which, depending on an anthropomorphic cosmology, was untrue, or a conduct which, deduced from mechanic physics, was unethical and must lead to anarchy. For the sake of action as well as thought, for practical morality as much as logical consistency, we are then compelled to bring these significant facts under observation.

The chart of knowledge must have these neglected observations brought on to it. When they are all in place we shall see humanity can steer quite a different course than that which it imagined, on the word of the mechanists, was the only one open to it—though it led straight to the rocks. We may also see perhaps the first outline of the next vast extension of man's frontiers—the third cosmology. What is clear is that we are living

IS THERE EVIDENCE OF ANY SANCTION?

in the dismantling of the second, the mechanomorphic, cosmology.

The chapter following traces briefly the new fundamental facts in physics, then in biology and finally in psychology. With these in place, it will be possible to judge whether Mechanomorphism is any longer tenable, and whether a new world outlook, a new basis for a new morality, has begun to emerge.

CHAPTER III

THE EVIDENCE TO DATE

I. POST-MECHANIST PHYSICS

Light points to Post-Material Physics

Most well-read people are aware that mechanomorphic physics is being eliminated. This was no sudden breakdown. The classical Newtonian physics had for many years shown signs of being increasingly inadequate as a full rendering and a complete picture of inorganic nature and its laws. Indeed, as Professor Shrödinger has pointed out (*Science and Human Temperament*), even before Newton attempted his vast generalization and produced that picture of the universe as a fabulous machine (a picture which won its way to the XVIIIth-century heart because it banished the Anthropomorphism that age had outgrown and produced something which looked so simply reasonable), even in the generation before Newton, in the middle of the XVIIth century, Grimaldi had made experiments with light which, if followed up, would have shown the Newtonian corpuscular theory of light to be too crude. Grimaldi's simple tests—possible for anyone to make for themselves—showed that light, when experimented with, behaved in an unsuspected way and that this behaviour could only mean that it was some strange form of wave-motion. The XVIIIth century, however, wanted the world to be clear, material, and so fundamentally corpuscular. Newton gave a theory which maintained this.

POST-MECHANIST PHYSICS

Later, however, it became evident that the nature of light was more easily described as a wave than a corpuscle. Newton's corpuscular theory was put aside. Mechanism, however, had to be preserved. If light was a wave, it must be a wave in something. Waves in water were the original, the eponymous waves. Study of sound had shown that sound was wave-motion in air. Light, passing through space, where there was neither water nor air to carry waves, must be carried by an invisible, intangible substance, ether. What was known about the ether, other than this *ad hoc* characteristic? As Lord Salisbury said in the depths of the XIXth century, it was, and it stubbornly remained, "simply the nominative of the verb to undulate."

This unsatisfactory state of knowledge about what was after all a primal fact of the outer universe, light itself, made perhaps the most original physicist of the XIXth century, Clerk-Maxwell, turn his attention to it. After he had made his famous equations, it was clear that light would really not fit into the Newtonian Mechano-morphism. The Newtonian principles were too simple to fit the facts. In consequence the attention of physicists became concentrated on light, electricity, and magnetism, to see whether they could be brought under some vast generalization which would also include all the other material movements already accounted for under the law of gravitation. The results of this search are well known. Light was discovered both to behave as a wave and as a corpuscle, or part of one. To describe it, it had to be given a new hybrid name a "wavicle," a name and a description which of course had no more reference to the shape or behaviour of any sense-size object than has a hippogriff or a chimera to any animal in the zoo. Further it was discovered that

THE THIRD MORALITY

light did not go in a stream, but in droplets or packages of energy, the photons.

Before this stage, however, the advance of physics had led to even more unsettling discoveries about the nature of matter. Not only had light established its autonomy and successfully resisted the attempt to bring it into the mechanomorphic picture. Matter itself, which had seemed safely contained and conquered, began to revolt and break bounds. Analysis of the atom had led to the discovery of the electron and the proton. Analysis of these had shown them to be not matter but charges of electricity. This was the end of materialism. Mechanism, however, remained a little longer. Exactitude, however, compels one to note that a picture of the universe which shows that universe as a machine which has made itself, and every part of which is merely force and not structure or substance, such a picture is, of course, not only not that of any machine that has ever been made or can ever be, but strictly unimaginable. This surely is a grave disadvantage when what we were supposed to have given us by Mechanism was just that thing: a clear material picture accounting for all reality.

Nevertheless, Mechanism was still retained as the official picture of reality by most scientists. The next step made the retention of that picture still more difficult. The ultimate make-up of matter was only force—essentially invisible; we could see its effects, but the ultimate, all-sustaining electric charges would, of course, under any magnification (even if light did not give out) remain invisible, insensible.

But these ultimate charges, the proton and its electrons (forming the atom), it was presumed, though they were not matter, behaved as though they were matter. They

POST-MECHANIST PHYSICS

would arrange themselves and (as they were and had to be in incessant movement) would move themselves, as did all rapidly moving matter. Hence the Rutherford-Bohr model of the atom, the "solar system" model. The nucleus of the atom was to act as sun and the electrons were to act as orbit-describing satellites. That model, as all who read know, has now been abandoned. The path and pattern of the primal, all-sustaining energy cannot be described in any picture or model. Not only is the energy itself immaterial but its behaviour is indescribable in any material imagery or by any mechanical simile.

Mechanomorphism Remains as a Habit of Thought

Still men clung to the conviction—so fixed were their minds in the assumption and habit that Mechanomorphism was the final and only possible cosmology—that, in spite of the facts, Mechanism must be true. Mechanism had only lately been established by deduction from facts, but in that short time of less than ten generations it had become independent of the facts, it even defied them. Like Hobbes's Holy Roman Empire, it sat like a ghost robed and crowned on the grave of the iron (but now completely corroded) structure of fact from which it had arisen. The orthodox faithful went on believing that, though invisible to them, because of the poverty of their powers of observation, nevertheless the sacred principle and pattern of Mechanomorphism was being carried on. This is religious faith, not scientific behaviour. Nor did scientific procedure in its rapid progress allow even that sentimental devotion to remain possible as an act of faith, as something which comforted the heart and which, at least, the mind could not prove untrue. In 1927 came Heisenberg's Principle of

THE THIRD MORALITY

Indeterminacy. It was then established that you could never know an electron's speed and also its mass—though both factors are essential characteristics of the electron's nature and, without knowing both these, the electron must remain unimaginable. No one knows what an electron is when it is still. It can only be known when it moves and so sends out a wave of radiation. Movement is, therefore, as essential a part of its nature as is mass. Yet Heisenberg has shown that, if one is known, the other must of necessity escape us. To try and get hold of both—and both are needed if we are to have a material picture or rendering of reality or any assurance that "matter" is mechanomorphic—is as vain as *Æsop's* dog trying to snatch the reflected bone in the river without dropping the real bone in his mouth.

This Principle of Indeterminacy caused naturally increasing distress. The mechanistic faith was highly nervous. For it had now to retreat to that very dangerous ground onto which all failing faiths are driven. It had to maintain that its principles could still be held, for, though the facts which had given rise to those principles could no longer be demonstrated, at least the other side were no better off; they, on their side, could not prove free will.

A faith that no longer has proof, but is holding out in the hope that the series of reverses which it has suffered may suddenly be themselves reversed, is apt, the earlier and analogous history of theology amply illustrates, to be irritable and unjust. Hence when some competent observers gave it as their opinion that Heisenberg's Principle involved a great deal and might indeed necessitate an examination as to whether causality itself might not be an unnecessary assumption, in the strict sense of the word a superstition—then the faithful

POST-MECHANIST PHYSICS

showed that, like all conservative faithful, their warm emotions were more involved in this matter than their clear minds. Those who suggested that causality might be an otiose hypothesis and might be abandoned for a more advanced and practical conception, were attacked as themselves lovers of superstition and reactionaries desiring to wrest the truth to re-establish Anthropomorphism. In such a situation *qui accuse s'accuse*.

Of course, if strict causality, Necessitarianism, had failed to be established, then the mechanomorphic cosmology, as far as its foundation in physics was concerned, was baseless. This was worth debating closely, if not hotly, because, if the conservatives were right, much hung in the balance. The most exacting deduction, which had been drawn, and properly drawn, from the mechanomorphic cosmology, was that, if the universe was a machine, working through a few simple, inevitable, unexceptional laws, and from the working of this machine all life and consciousness itself had arisen, then free will was pretty certainly a delusion ; and man's belief that he had values, and by striving could attain them, was equally illusory.

The search made by physics throughout the modern age was to find the basic nature and behaviour of matter. That search has in our generation been completed. Matter has been divided until it has disappeared. So much for its ultimate nature : its ultimate nature is an immaterial element we call force. And what about its ultimate behaviour ? Do we find this force behaves, as matter was supposed to behave, with strict causality, with complete necessitarianism ? We cannot honestly say we have so found and indeed there can be no doubt that Heisenberg seems to have shown that to establish this will always be impossible. " Nevertheless," say the

THE THIRD MORALITY

conservatives, clinging to their elder Middle Age cosmology, "Causality has always been demonstrated before and, if you declare it is not proved to be the fundamental explanation of matter and movement and so cannot be depended on as a final law of the behaviour of all reality, what are you going to put in its place?" The answer is simple. What is going to be put in the place is the practical method which, in fact, has always been used. The fact of strict and absolute causality has always been an unattained ideal—an ideal which earlier generations of physicists rightly believed would, and would only, be realizable when the ultimate particles of matter could be watched in their action and interaction, each particle's movement completely determined by the movement of itself (or its neighbourhood) a moment before, and determining the next movement a moment after. The hope of making such observation, of actually witnessing demonstrable fundamental causality at work, that was always only an ideal and to-day it has become an unattainable one, a dream.

Science always Worked by Probability

But if physicists were not working with strict causality, with what law were they working? The answer is clear, if we are not disinclined to face it: ever since Boyle's classic discoveries and principles in the XVIIth century, physics has actually worked with the law of averages, with statistical law. No one could ever watch even the separate molecules of a gas bombarding the walls of a container and so calculate the pressure of that gas. The laws of expansion are laws established by average, by probabilities, by degrees of likelihood, not by absolute demonstrable certainties.

To-day, then, this Principle of Indeterminacy has

POST-MECHANIST PHYSICS

taken away nothing from science's efficiency in explaining the present and forecasting the future. Science is just as powerful as it has ever been. Indeed, it is more so, because it has cleared one more shadow out of the illuminated field it studies. It has found that the shadow was cast by human prejudice, by an unrecognized assumption that man knew how the outer universe ran and what was its form. Man imposed causality on nature as a fundamental objective law of nature's being. He learned how nature worked and accounted for her motions through using quite another principle—that of probability—of averages. Then unconsciously—the wish begetting the thought upon the sly—he declared he had established a complete explanation of the world through the principle of causality and determinism, and the facts of nature had confirmed that principle. Now he sees he has always been using in physics the law of probability. Further, as science is empiric and cannot concern itself with things which might be but are not, a principle, which the scientist has never used and which nature refuses to establish, must be discarded as otiose—a superstition. As has been said, "The fundamental principle of physics to-day is the rejection of unobservables." What cannot be observed, that physics cannot attend to, and what cannot be established by observation, that cannot have any standing as a principle.

We see, then, physics becoming increasingly empirical—dealing with what is actually there and declining with ever more certainty to be drawn into suppositions as to what might be there or will be. The danger of the older physics—which was the basis of the mechanomorphic cosmology—was that it would prophesy and build largely on prophecy. It was so sure of its principles, its "laws," that it was certain that with them it

THE THIRD MORALITY

could not only describe fully but forecast accurately. This is the dangerous method of extrapolation. Because a series of points has already been found to give a straight line, a line is not only drawn through these points but far beyond, and, further, it is maintained that on that line will be found a series of conforming points going on indefinitely. Time and again this method has been shown to be unreliable. As has been said, "As soon as nature is out of sight, she doubles." Physics, therefore, is advancing so fast because it has resolved not to tell nature where she should next be found. To the question: "What is there when no one is looking?" physics now determines to give no answer. The question is wholly irregular and the only answer is: "No one knows or, by any method of physics, can know."

The elder physicists, however, are drawn out into these larger, real possibilities from their narrow certainties unwillingly. It seems to many of them that a great structure of the mind, the huge mechanomorphic cosmology, is being abandoned. They look back and remember that on the site of these vast classic halls, cold but majestic, once stood the narrow, crowded vaults of that previous structure, the Gothic tangle of the anthropomorphic cosmology. They watch the broad and splendid architraves being dislocated and dismantled. The stately building which they thought was about to enclose man completely, to shut out all vague vistas and to stand fast for ever, they realize now will never be completed on that static plan. They view the changes as a breakdown. With horror they suspect that from these dislocated fragments of physics men will once again construct the crooked and mean temple which they thought they had made for ever impossible.

It is natural for the elder to be timid. Reconstruction,

POST-MECHANIST PHYSICS

so as to achieve a vaster plan and elevation, a new outlook which says "these superb pieces were too great even for the mechanomorphic design to employ them fitly, they will build something as much beyond its span as it was beyond the anthropomorphic design"—such vigour of imagination and constructive power belongs to youth, not age. We must sympathize with the aged when their temple has to be unbuilt. It has been their home and work so long that they fear any change will only leave them worse off. We can sympathize with the anthropomorph and the mechanomorph. But the anthropomorphist did not understand the full compass of man's spirit and that its kinship with outer reality was not through man and that reality both being personal, but through each being more than personal. The mechanomorphist with equal mistakenness restricted himself to a partial aspect of Nature. The anthropomorphist realized that mind was of the nature of the universe but thought there could be no consciousness except that individualized aspect of consciousness which was the only consciousness he could recognize in himself. The mechanomorphist thought that the regularity he found in inorganic nature was a complete determinism, an invariable law of strict causality, and that as this existed in inorganic nature it must also inform and control life and consciousness. The anthropomorphist, for the sake of making a clear sanction for moral action, applied to his experience that interpretation which he felt covered all the significant facts, the facts of life. The mechanomorphist, for the equally valid reason of understanding and comprehensibility, applied the conclusion which he drew from that section of nature—the inorganic—which he had been permitted longest to study and the principles of

THE THIRD MORALITY

which he sincerely thought must apply to all nature, man included.

Both built for the human spirit. But both must yield in faith when that spirit knows that it is now cabined and confined in the houses they made for it. As it stretches itself, it will not, like a Samson, collapse into ruin all this finely quarried knowledge, nor cowardly and clumsily heap together out of the fragments some meaner den ; on the contrary, it will achieve with its new elements a dwelling place which will incorporate all that was real in the earlier constructions and frame these elements with the new so as to make a building not only to express its grown nature but to lead to still further growth.

CHAPTER IV

THE EVIDENCE TO DATE

II. POST-MECHANIST BIOLOGY

PHYSICS has finished with the classic mechanics. Mechanism no longer is a description of the ultimate nature of reality. That is a very great revolution. It is clear from this alone that we are entering a new age. We are at a crisis in human thought and experience not less remarkable, perhaps even more profound than the crisis when thinking man abandoned Anthropomorphism. Physics used to be the tortoise on which all the other sciences stood. As it crawled forward they also could advance. They were not autonomous. They could not themselves put foot on the ground of reality and go ahead on their own. They must be carried. Psychology was carried on physiology, physiology by chemistry, chemistry by physics. Science was a feudal system wherein each of the special sciences had to own allegiance to an overlord and it again to a greater lord until the lord-paramount was reached.

The effect of the revolution in physics should then have been instantaneous and profound. As its fundamental postulates were overturned, all the sciences it sustained should have also been revolutionized. Why they were not was because this feudal allegiance—like most feudal allegiances—was more an ideal than a

THE THIRD MORALITY

reality. Nineteenth-century scientists have gone on saying: "Quite soon the mechanistic explanation will be demonstrated in detail in physics; the causal and determined action of every ultimate unit of matter will be demonstrated. Then we shall be able to trace the same causal and determined action in every protein molecule, in every living cell. Then we shall be able to trace the same action in every conscious move. Every brick of the great tower from foundation to pinnacle will have been accounted for, fully known, and described."

That victory had never taken place. The separate sciences had gone on working at their own stages and stories, waiting the moment when the news would come up from the vaults: "The rock is reached! From rock to first floor mechanism is demonstrated. Now carry the great unifying principle through." The news delayed, and meanwhile each of the upper, more surface sciences were not very impatient. Each found its own tale more complicated than it had imagined. It would be long before it would itself be ready to link up with the unifying principle which was to spread up from below.

In consequence when the news began to percolate up that physics had first to announce an indefinite postponement of the demonstration of materialism and then of mechanism, such news, which would have been profoundly shocking twenty years before, did not wholly surprise either chemists, biologists, physiologists, or psychologists. Indeed the chemist who was in closest touch with the physicist understood the situation and was not unprepared for even more extraordinary bulletins.

The biologists and physiologists, however, though the growth in the complexity of their subjects made them realize they would not be able to apply the results of demonstrated mechanism for an indefinite period, yet

POST-MECHANIST BIOLOGY

continued to have such a hope before them as their aim. When the news from physics became not merely disappointing but revolutionary, biologists and physiologists were inclined to discredit it. After all, what difference would it make? These physicists were anyhow dealing with quantities which were insignificant. For all practical purposes mechanism still stood, and if physicists had become so fanciful, so superstitious, so metaphysical as to be uncertain what matter was and how objective reality could be defined, well, the practical working scientists who produced results, the physiologists and the biologists who dealt with life, and life-size things and issues, must and would take up the challenge. They would themselves, for all practical purposes, establish mechanism.

As a matter of theory it remained a little difficult to see how you could really clinch the mechanist argument, for to do so you had to reduce all structure to undifferentiated matter; that brought it back into the realm of the physicist, and he it was who had failed to establish the finality of matter.

Why the Life Sciences still thought Mechanism Demonstrable

Nevertheless biologists and physiologists had good reason to suppose they could push Mechanism in their own provinces until they could show that everything that took place on a life-size and sensible scale was ruled exactly by mechanistic-materialistic law. The body was only a machine which worked with chemicals instead of steam. Their reason and their hope were based on many spectacular advances during the XIXth century, spectacular not merely because of the practical powers which they gave the victors, but because of the repulse

THE THIRD MORALITY

they inflicted on the theories of opponents. Whereas in the XIXth century, with Maxwell and his equations, the insufficiency of Mechanism in physics ^{already} able to be perceived, Newtonianism was ^{by} an ancient potentate still honoured but in science already disregarded, in physiology and biology, of the yet earlier Anthropomorphism were still battle and still suffering spectacular defeats. fashioned vitalists were fighting series of rear actions. every time they joined issue, sustaining heavy reverses. Wöhler, early in the century, wins the great victory for chemistry when he manufactures urea, which the vitalists had said only the living body could make, and thenceforward one after another of the body's secretions had no sooner to be called a peculiar achievement of life, a unique product of the body, than the biochemist produced the stuff artificially.

The very name biochemist, the opening of such a branch of science, was a victory for Mechanism in the realm of life itself. The body was made up, it was now established, of quite simple chemicals. The ingredients of that amazing brew or pudding were now all written out and known to be as commonplace as any cook's recipes. All you had to do, evidently, was to take these simples, in the amounts the body showed it required, mix them, and leave them to ferment. It looked as though making living tissue was now in sight. The harder half seemed solved—the finding out what the stuffs actually were. These stuffs had turned out to be surprisingly simple. The second half must be much simpler—how to make them combine.

But often in life, after apparent difficulties have proved simple, a simple-seeming step turns out to be a complete obstacle. Any student could break up a cell into its

POST-MECHANIST BIOLOGY

apparent constituents. No professor could recombine these constituents and have the recreated cell. Yet that is the only sure proof that you have really understood its nature and fully accounted for its constitution. A watch-maker proves he knows the mechanism of a watch not merely by dismantling its action but by being able so to reassemble it that he has again a going time-keeper. Pasteur had also shown that spontaneous generation, germination arising directly from decomposing matter, was a materialistic illusion. Only life gave rise to life. The perfectly sterile remained lifeless. Making a living cell presented a problem which no one could solve or has yet shown how to solve.

The Success of Darwinianism

Meanwhile, also, while physiology and biochemistry continued to make uninterrupted advances and to discover everything about life except how to make it, biology proper made immense mechanistic advances. This, of course, was the triumph of Darwinianism, of the doctrine of Natural Selection and the Survival of the Fittest. We have seen how spectacular was that victory, and how, what nearly two hundred years of physical Mechanism (of a belief that the universe was automatic and purposeless) had failed to do was done in a few years by biological Mechanism (the belief that all evolution had been due to the chance working of unconscious forces). Natural Theology had its root cut. Everyone, the clergy who dared study the evidence as much as the biologists who prepared it, was convinced this was true.*

* For an interesting example of this, see the correspondence between the elder Gosse and such progressive clergy as Charles Kingsley, etc. ; Gosse, who was a biologist, thought he could make a theory which would save special creationism and rebut evolution. The clergy who studied his work decided regretfully against him and in favour of Darwin.

THE THIRD MORALITY

The reason why Darwin himself was convinced that his selection of facts pointed to a blind Natural Selection, and why most intelligent contemporaries agreed with him, we have already considered. Natural science had (by the blunder of the Anthropomorphic Church) been confined during its formative years to physics and denied the study of life and mind. So everyone now assumed that the mechanic principles, supposed to be demonstrated in physics, must underlie and control all natural phenomena. In consequence the minds of Darwin's contemporaries and his own could only assume that the facts of life which they studied were only to be interpreted in one of two possible ways. These facts provided evidence of Anthropomorphic control—special creations by a personal detached deity—or they established that all life and mind were resultants of a blind mechanic force. Faced with this alternative Darwin, his fellow workers and informed opinion, naturally chose the latter interpretation and as naturally neglected the facts which told against such a conclusion. For these facts, whatever they might mean, could not mean, could not be proofs of a personal deity's constant intervention, the constant arranging, contriving and interfering of that Personality which men had made in their own image.

Kropotkin and other naturalists could show how large a part "mutual aid", co-operation and goodwill played in wild life. Their mediation was rejected. The fissure again yawned between conservatives and revolutionaries. Either all nature showed a persistent design of an imposing creator or "nature red in tooth and claw with ravin shrieked" against all "creed." Once again the conservative anthropomorphic theologians were as much to blame as the mechanists. As at the beginning of science, it was they who again gave research only two

POST-MECHANIST BIOLOGY

conclusions to arrive at, superstition or anarchy; and as the facts denied superstition the scientists chose anarchy.

Where these clerical conservatives met their defeat and deserved to be defeated was in their resistance to evolution. Some sort of evolution had taken place, though, as our knowledge grows we have to recognize increasingly a principle which acknowledges evolution but makes it far harder to prove. That is "Convergence" and Polyphyly—the fact that unlike forms of utterly different origin have, during time, come so closely to resemble each other as to look as though they had a common ancestor. This principle of Convergence, it is clear, is the opposite to that particular and popular view of evolution which Darwin urged: that all the variety of forms have arisen from one simple form. How far this other principle, of many forms converging into likeness, has acted in the long history of life no one (from the nature of the case) can be sure. That Darwin was ignorant of it is a factor seriously to be reckoned with and that, had he known its present, recognized extent, he could not have built his theory of evolution—these two facts are recognized and have been stressed by modern authorities in evolution.*

"Convergence" also has another and positive contribution to make to the new Biology. For it not only shows evolution to have been far more elaborate

* See Dr. W. T. Calman's (F.R.S.) presidential address to the Linnean Society, May, 1935. "Darwin wrote 'Community of Descent, the one known cause of close similarity in organic beings.' Causal morphology has proved the possibility of convergent evolution on a scale unsuspected in Darwin's time." Dr. Calman also quotes the late Dr. Bather's presidential address to the Geological Society. Dr. Bather, Dr. Calman owns, was a greater palæontologist than he (and this question must be decided by palæontology, the study of past species, genera, etc., in fossils), and went much further saying: "The whole of our system (of evolutionary description) is riddled through with Polyphyly (many origins) and Convergence".

THE THIRD MORALITY

than Darwin imagined it to be. It also suggests, as H. F. Osborn and other authorities have pointed out, that there is a teleological symptom in life, there is evidence in evolution of an aim. If a number of species all can converge to become a higher type, each finding in itself the power to become that type though starting different, the problem of the directive force or forces revealed in life must not be explained away as nothing but blind competition and immediate advantage in struggle.

It grows, then, increasingly certain that Darwin and Huxley, still more Haeckel, unduly simplified the line. In life's story we are not presented with a single air, but with a gigantic and confusing orchestrated composition wherein themes appear and disappear, blend, separate out, dominate and underrun. The tree of life seems to have no clear bole, but to be made of thousands of intertwined branches. Yet a main sequence still seems to show and, though the roots may come in from all sides, a common crest and crown has resulted. As Wells has said: "Find a fossil human skull in the Coal Measures (fossilized when the Carboniferous deposits were laid down some 180 million years ago), and evolution then becomes not even a good hypothesis." That, however, has not been done and, though our stock is certainly a much earlier stem than any of the evolutionists associated with Darwin would have allowed, there is as yet no vestige of a sign of its presence even in the latest of the great Chalk deposits some sixty million years back.

The conservatives were therefore on far weaker ground. Nearly all of them were trying to defend a Babylonian speculation as to the earth's origin, on the ground that this creation mythos, which shows a number of gods (*Elohim*, a plural word, is used in the earlier

POST-MECHANIST BIOLOGY

document for the creative beings) creating separately but in one week groups of animals and then man, was a divinely inspired account and must therefore be true in every particular. The conservatives were defeated on the evidence of evolution and, so rigid was their position, that once defeated there, they could not reform, after losing the wholly indefensible ground on which they would give battle.

The Darwinians having won on the issue: "Has evolution taken place?" poured through the gap and the conservatives put up no further resistance to these other particular Darwinian assumptions which were as temerarious as evidence as they were morally dangerous. The doctrine of evolution had, of course, been held by many constructive thinkers—Linnæus, Buffon and Goethe. Even Augustine commits himself to some such view. It is a view of life which is rational and evidential. Though the story is evidently far more elaborate than we thought, with far more blind alleys, sudden stops, resumptions, twists and turns; though the tree of life is evidently far more like a banyan (whose branches root themselves and become trunks) than like our single-boled trees, yet an elaborate ascent has taken place. Indeed it is hard to see how any informed and intelligent man could fail to arrive at it, were he not, as were thinkers in Europe, trammelled by an unfortunate arbitrary adhesion which Christianity had contracted between its particular teaching and Babylonian cosmological speculation.

Further, goodness as well as truth advocated the longer view. Evolution is an outlook which is essentially moral, for, in its picture, there is life at the bottom beginning as a feeble movement in the slime, and here is man at the top. Life has given rise to understanding

THE THIRD MORALITY

and devotion. Here, on the vastest scale, is progress ; here, because for so long man had no possible part in it, is a natural theology demonstrated. How this force worked—whether by small changes or revolutionary extensions—we still cannot say. The gaps between species and genera may yet be filled in by fossil finds or they may be objective, real gaps. Of Mr. Dewar's statement in his paper before the Philosophic Society of Great Britain on March 25th, 1935, *Nature* says : "Mr. Dewar correctly sums up the position when he states that "Science can truthfully say that it knows not when, where or how man originated." All that science can say to-day is that there has been a progressive advance ; at what pace, with what leaps, with what drastic discards and sudden irruptions no one can yet say.

Where Darwin should have been withstood and was resisted by such independents as Samuel Butler, was, then, not in the fact of evolution, but in the method and way whereby it had worked and come about. The real and only moral issue lay there. Darwin maintained all advance had been through the working of blind forces—the same random forces which had evolved the inorganic universe. Man was a product of chance and so all his ideals were, of course, also the product of chance and had no objective reality. They could have no greater validity than their source. Their "meaning" was that they helped man to survive as an animal. As powers used to understand the universe and to co-operate with it by realizing its purpose, they were simply ridiculous. Such mistaken and extravagant development beyond and against its real and original purpose often took place in life and is best illustrated by those absurd overgrowths—hypertrophies—which often appear on animals

POST-MECHANIST BIOLOGY

when they are decadent, and which lead to their extinction, such as extravagant horns, armour, feathers, etc. The mind of man, like the snout of a pig, is a food-getting instrument, and the one is as little able to understand the universe and discover reality as the other. But more : the actual forces which, working by chance, had thrown up man, were what man must call immoral forces. Survival was through unlimited struggle. It was strength and cunning which alone counted and gave the prize.

Such a picture, to quote again Butler, banished mind from the universe. Indeed it went much further. It put all morality on its head. "This do and thou shalt live" was no longer a call to keep the moral law. On the contrary, it was to command man to reverse ethics, to call good evil and evil good, to realize that he was most "biologically moral" when he used all his means and betrayed every other's interest in order that he might survive ; he was biologically immoral when he spared his enemy and sacrificed himself.

Darwinianism therefore destroyed Natural Theology through a feint and not through a fought-out victory. The theologians who should have challenged it on the ground where it made his particular advance against morality, had permitted themselves, through a blind and equally immoral devotion to their own tradition, to fight on quite another preliminary issue. On being defeated, they would neither own their mistake nor resume on wholly moral grounds their resistance. They clung to their Anthropomorphic tradition, and so were dismissed as dishonest. Hence nearly all practical men (and by that is here meant all men of action and applied thought, rulers and moralists)—in fact, all save the biological specialists, who could review the actual

THE THIRD MORALITY

evidence Darwin adduced, and philosophic specialists* who could test the validity of his dialectic—were convinced that morality was undermined.

As we have seen, there was a pause before the cave-in took place. There intervened that time-lag which the inertia of all physical and mental structures causes. When their foundations are undercut, for a moment they still stand upon the order of their going before yielding to the inevitable settlement. There was a natural unwillingness to be the first to act on this rather crude new outlook. When, however, someone did take the first step all the others would have to follow suit. A few people clung to a belief in the Kantian categorical imperative, and so hoped that what applied to life might not apply to mind. But even if that were true (as Freud was to challenge), it would only mean that

* This was very important and yet almost wholly overlooked. Darwin had, of course, as a matter of logic cut off the branch on which he sat. If reason was not in its own right, *sui generis*, and able therefore to give an objective valid picture of the universe, then the Darwinian theory, with all other thoughts, fell to the ground. If "man's mind is only a food-getting instrument like the snout of a pig"—an illustration quoted above because often used by Darwinians—and so can tell him nothing valid about the universe, then, of course, all the theories of that mind are invalid. Darwinianism is one such theory. Darwinianism is invalid.

It might be possible to establish (leaving aside all theories as to method) that sheer chance evolvment had given rise to a mind which could validly understand that the process which gave rise to it was blind and senseless, though the more that proposition is considered the more difficult it seems to establish convincingly. When, however, there is put forward a theory of the method whereby evolution has come about, and that theory maintains all living action (including, of course, man's) is to be accounted for simply by creatures producing those faculties which make them able to survive, then to say that creatures (confined as they must be by such faculties) can give a valid opinion on the meaning of this process, seems to involve the arguer in a vicious circle. You are attempting to extract from the material evidence something which you postulated was not present, which could only be thought to be present by a misconception and yet which (unless it comes from outside) can only arise from the material evidence. That something which you must have in order to obtain a valid judgment is an independent mind and it is exactly that which you are maintaining to be an impossibility.

POST-MECHANIST BIOLOGY

a few would have private ideals which, they knew as much as any realist, did not and could not work in the actual world.

Post-Darwin Biology

To-day, however, the time has come to examine Darwinianism closely. Physics has removed its support ; how now does this biological theory stand ? Natural Selection has been much damaged and so restated as to be little more than a tautology. The survival of the fittest is no longer the survival of the strongest and most cunning. It is simply the survival of what was most fit to survive or even, more exactly, if less informingly, whatever exists. Natural Selection itself is a negative force, that is, outer conditions at present only permit certain forms to live, but what that certainty of form is no one can yet rule. Two-headed babies, though frequently born, have the poorest chances of growing up—so far. But no one can be certain that this model may not have a future.

What then is the force behind evolution ? Is it blind ? Is it simply the aimless pressure of outer conditions ? Here Mendelianism upset Darwinianism. The force of evolution, Mutationism—to give it the name coined by De Vries—is something in the germ-cell itself. It is a force which works with sudden decision. How has it worked ? We must answer that question if we are to discover the character of this autonomous energy. We have seen that it presumably started with colloidal mud and undoubtedly has ended with intelligence and devotion—certainly a queer career of chance.

The Darwinians pointed to the enormous elimination that has attended the process, to the fact that most species have died out, and that unmistakable evidence

THE THIRD MORALITY

discouraged those who still clung to the fact that a progress has taken place. If I find a series of long "galley-proofs" and piecing them together discover that they yield a complete epic—the *Iliad* or *Paradise Lost*—I maintain that somehow in the printer's shop there must have been a poet. But later research bringing to light reams upon reams of other "galleys" only covered with "printers' pie," with ill-struck proofs, with random lettering, with crumpled impressions—yes, and with whole strips simply smeared with printers' ink—that is daunting. Someone beside the poet has been here, someone blind, clumsy, stupid—indeed some of the scraps have on them stuff which reads as though a lunatic had sometimes got at the type and presses—and, even worse, here and there, a fiend. Nevertheless, all this does not disprove the existence of the epic itself. Whoever else has been here, here also, truth compels me to recognize, has there been a poet indeed.

Nor can the case be left there. As has been already noted the work of such evolutionists as Henry Fairfield Osborn has gone far to establish a discoverable trend in every part of the evolutionary record—not blind growth but inherently right, directive growth, therefore called by him Orthogenesis. Dr. Robert Broom's important essay, *The Coming of Man*, is also of value here. He shows that there have been three great crises in evolution: first, when sea life gave rise to amphibians; secondly, when the amphibians gave rise to the reptiles (for the elucidation of this transition Dr. Broom was elected to the Royal Society; he therefore speaks with authority); and, thirdly, when the reptiles gave rise to the mammals. This picture shows us that the ascent of life was no sudden fluke but an agelong persistence attaining at each stage to a fuller consciousness.

POST-MECHANIST BIOLOGY

Finally the work of such biologists as Grafton Elliot Smith and Le Gros Clark has established that the human stock is derived from a creature not characterized by fierceness and cunning, but by sensitiveness, awareness, sympathy and affection. The meek have inherited the earth. For the details of this momentous truth and its bearing on human history and its present political problems I must refer to my *Source of Civilization*. Here it is enough to say that already there is gathered together—though no master hand has yet assembled it—the mass of proof which will give rise to, out of which will be built, the post-mechanist biology.

Nor does it seem that the new science of evolution will stop there. The germ-cell, and its mysterious power to mutate, is the source of evolution. This is the reason why in the same environment, reacting to the same surroundings, we get bird, beast, and insect—three different answers given by three different natures to one question and challenge. But what makes the germ mutate and calls it out to give rise to a new being? The only force which can do that is, apparently, radiation. Cosmic radiation may have started up evolution—a sudden “*Fiat Vita!*” uttered to the earth from the depths of space.*

Perhaps the most original contribution to this issue, Accident or Design, is that made by Henderson in his remarkable book, *The Fitness of the Environment*.† In this influential book the author has gone outside the unsuspected capacities of the cell and brought forward a mass of evidence to show an even less suspected suitability and delicate inter-relatedness and balance between

* See Dr. C. C. Hurst's *Heredity and the Ascent of Man*. (Cambridge University Press, 1935.)

† *The Fitness of the Environment. An Enquiry into the Biological Significance of the Properties of Matter*. 1927.

THE THIRD MORALITY

the environment and the life which has resulted and is being involved. As he remarks (p. 280): "Biological science has not been able to escape the recognition of a formative tendency and now it appears necessary to postulate a like tendency in the evolution of inorganic nature." And (pp. 278-9): "Our new form of the old riddle appears two-fold, and on that account for the present more unanswerable. There is but one immediate compensation for this complexity: a proof that somehow, beneath adaptations, peculiar and unsuspected relationships exist between the properties of matter and the phenomena of life: that the process of cosmic evolution is indissolubly linked with the fundamental characteristics of the organism: that logically in some obscure manner, cosmic and biological evolution are one . . . and constitute a single, orderly development that yields results resembling those which in human action we recognize as purposeful." And (p. 312): "The whole evolutionary process, both cosmic and organic, is one, and the biologists may now rightly regard the universe in its very essence as biocentric."

This study shows that, whatever life may be and aim at being, it is not, as was assumed, a waif and an anomaly in the alien universe. Down here, its world is as ready for it as a guest-chamber for a guest. Further, as we study the upper atmosphere, we find that the highest layers are so arranged as to screen life from radiations which, pouring through outer space, would derange them—except on very rare occasions. When a Super Nova, a super example of an exploding star, discharges its energy, it not only sends out light but also super-radiations. These, it seems, may be powerful enough to pierce the vault of the sky, the ionized uppermost layers of the atmosphere (which otherwise, like a torpedo-net, turn

POST-MECHANIST BIOLOGY

back all other, full-force cosmic radiation). This radiation-burst coming through may be that impulse which will give rise to a new species, or rather give species the chance of giving rise to such a succession, a chance which many, perhaps most, as Dr. Broom has suggested, may not have the vitality to respond to—but may, on the contrary, be sterilized by this very same charge. If that should prove to be so—and nowhere else does it seem possible to find the charge of sufficient force to work this creative act—then we may yet say not: “The Heavens themselves blaze forth the death of Princes,” but the birth of species, and a new race may have its heralding star.

Before, however, we leave biology, we must glance at other advances. We have seen the history of life now shows a purpose and a method of attaining that purpose not unworthy of the acceptance and devotion of free and noble men. The actual working of the living body is, however, still supposed to sustain the mechanistic interpretation and theory.

Is Man more than his Glands?

We saw (p. 94) how through the XIXth century, while physics added nothing to mechanism but some fundamental doubts, chemistry, by opening a branch of bio-chemistry, drove the traditional vitalism from pillar to post until there seemed there was not a secretion in the body which the chemist could not make in the laboratory. Finer analysis, however, began to show that the body did contain minute secretions essential to life which had till then escaped examination. These were the secretions of the ductless glands. But the check to chemical knowledge was, nevertheless, only temporary. Rapidly they were analysed and many made synthetically.

THE THIRD MORALITY

That was wonderful enough; but the victory of mechanism appeared far greater than that. "A man is what he eats" was a hoary dietician's maxim, making for mechanism. It was, however, too crude to be of real use. "Is" means more than feeling well or happy or bright or dull. "Is" is character. Was a man's character made by his food, his intake? Mood and temper, perhaps, but not fundamental character, will, and intelligence. Then, however, came the study of the body's own self-manufactured drugs—the secretions of the endocrine system. Gross modifications of structure were found to be correlated with as striking changes of personality, and both of these were shown to be due to changes in the ductless glands and the essences they passed directly into the blood. These drugs were extracted and administered and gradually the majority have been made synthetically and found to work. "Man is his glands," "The glands that make our personality"—such were statements made by many researchers in endocrinology.

Yet this was an over-statement and now we are seeing the reaction. It is clear that, though a deranged gland may make the character go with a bias, a formed character can hold the glandular balance. On the other hand, there is now ample proof to show that a character which desires excitement and has too little sense of purpose to aim at anything but amusement—repeated and irrelevant sensations and experiences—will excite its glands until they get out of hand. Then physical breakdown will take place. For example, adrenalin continually released by excitement, causes high blood-pressure and hardened arteries, and, as has been mentioned, anxiety causes acid secretions which, coming into the stomach, cause duodenal ulcer. These are two very

POST-MECHANIST BIOLOGY

frequent causes of bodily breakdown through wrong mental and emotional habit and addiction. Advance in endocrinology is continually bringing to light more profound associations between disease and temper. In all these cases the initiative lay, however, with the psyche and not with the physique. Before it is too late you can cure the glands by changing conduct.

Indeed, an increasing number of fundamental diagnoses have shown that a massive physical breakdown—diabetes, gastric ulcer which may become malignant, heart disease—can be caused by derangement of the suprarenal glands—the glands most easily and instantaneously responsive to the emotions. Further, this suprarenal derangement and other glandular derangements have increasingly been traced to the pituitary—the ductless gland which (the pineal lies deeper but its use remains unrecognized) is the gland closest the brain. It appears, then, that as the pituitary is in some sense the master gland, it, in its turn, receives its orders from some profound, unconscious centre and urge of the brain.

But does that not leave us still tied within the circle of the body? Granted that in the end all bodily changes are due to brain changes, the brain is matter, and we shall surely track down to each element in it the power and function which controls each organ and activity of the body.

Such, for nearly the whole of the mechanistic period, has been the hope of physiologists. Perhaps no greater effort has been made in the whole of anatomical study than this sustained exploration so as to demonstrate that the brain was a machine and to indicate its varied parts and show how they worked. And no work has so stubbornly refused to give the results required. At first all seemed plain sailing. Injury of specific centres led

THE THIRD MORALITY

to loss of particular bodily and mental controls and powers. Then, however, it was found the brain could, when injured, adapt another centre and make that perform the function. Finally, as Sir Charles Sherrington, our greatest authority on such a subject, has pointed out, in the last few years the attempt to divide up the brain has been abandoned. If it is a machine, it is one which functions as a whole and as though it were the focus of a field of energy, rather than as a series of vessels through which secretions run, and action, feeling and thought result. That "the brain secretes thought as the liver bile" is seen to be a remark which is so false an analogy as to reveal a complete misapprehension of the phenomena under study.

The notion that the brain, "the largest mass of undifferentiated tissue in the body," functioning as a single unit, may be the pole of some field of force—*that* analogy, however, has been as fertile as the other was unhelpful. Study of the brain, not with scalpel and microscope, by X-ray and chemical analysis, but by the new superfine method of electrical detection which the thermionic valve has now given us, has shown that the brain has a field about it and that that field perturbs with thought; for example, the wave of current passing over the brain can be made to fluctuate by asking the experimentee to make a calculation "in his head."

So it would seem that physiology is once again linking up with physics—the new physics in which electricity is the final fundamental element, the finest thing we can sense before the gossamer roots of things refine away into that immateriality where all latent power resides and to which neither our senses nor our instruments can reach. Nor has electric study ceased there. The living single cell had been, as we have seen, almost as resistant against

POST-MECHANIST BIOLOGY

mechanistic analysis as had the brain. We could take it to pieces and account for all its chemicals, but we could not account for the fact that they kept together and grew; we could not account for the cell's essential nature, its aliveness. Now electrical methods have shown the cell is the centre of a "field." It is surrounded by a negative field without—very powerful, considering the size—and a positive field within. (For further information, see work on the sea urchin's egg and parthenogenesis produced artificially on it.)

The living body, then, is on its life-size scale (as a whole) and also in each of its constructive units (its cells) as dependent on immaterial forces as is the atom.

Mind Can Affect Body

Though, however, materialism has failed in physiology, as it has failed in physics, is not mechanism still true at least in physiology? Have we found any evidence that mind can affect body? Mood, we have seen, can upset function and that in turn lead to modification of organ; a state of mind can derange digestion, and indigestion lead to ulceration. But which came first, the mood or the bodily upset? Has mind any demonstrable power to change physical feeling? Elliotson's operations left no doubt of that.* A century ago he showed it was possible to perform regularly major operations under nothing but hypnosis, and, what is more, the patient not only felt no pain but the post-operative death-rate was far lower than after other operations. It seemed that the patient, by co-operation with the doctor (no hypnosis was otherwise possible), heightened his own resistance to infection as well as totally inhibited his feeling of pain. But can mind change tissue? This is

* See *Dictionary of National Biography*.

THE THIRD MORALITY

one of the simplest hypnotic experiments : a cold penny is placed on a subject's hand and not only does he, being told it is red-hot, feel scorched but, appropriately, a blister rises on the spot. On strict materialistic physiology this is quite impossible.

These experiments have been but preliminary efforts (far more extensive changes can be brought about by protracted training), but these effects, which have been repeatedly established, can leave no doubt the mind has power over the body.*

Why, then, does not the mind use this power ? The answer : " Because it believes it cannot " brings us to the third, final division of our scientific study—to post-mechanistic psychology.

* See Baudouin's obstetric work at Lausanne.

CHAPTER V

THE EVIDENCE TO DATE

III. POST-MECHANIST PSYCHOLOGY

It was very natural that physiology should go through a mechanistic phase. The elder Anthropomorphism had to be thoroughly dissolved out of the system. Ecclesiastical Authority gave research no alternative to "Anthropomorphism or Mechanism". The attempt to make life obey nothing but the simple rules which almost exactly (though not quite) accounted for most of the large movements of the material universe was temerarious. Life was obviously very complex and no one has ever approached, in the animal kingdom, that certainty of forecast of movement which was soon attained, and did so much to support the mechanistic hypothesis, in astronomy or physics. To apply Mechanomorphism to the heavens was to give a generalization of the observations (of the data which seemed presented) tallying extraordinarily closely with almost every one of those observations. The proof of that was the accuracy of forecast. To apply Mechanomorphism to living creatures was to use an analogy, an analogy which refused to yield this proof of forecast. Loeb showed it might apply to (that is, account for) the movements of certain insects in certain conditions: an insect blinded in one eye might approach a light one-sidedly. This seems, and quite probably is, a "tropism," a creature "acting in a

THE THIRD MORALITY

field of stimulation," in the light, as iron filings act in the field of a magnet. But, as Miss Cheesman and many other field entomologists have pointed out, un-mutilated insects, when baffled, may actually show invention, *i.e.*, act in a way which it is impossible to forecast.

Pavlov's *Conditioned Reflex*—for example, the fact that, when a dog has been trained by long association to expect its dinner with the ringing of a bell, the ringing of the bell without the dinner will be enough to make the dog slobber—was also advanced to show that all animal action (and so, if man was an animal, all human action), which appears to result from conscious purpose and behaviour, may only be an unreflecting action-sequence into which consciousness—let alone free will—enters not at all. The Behaviourist welcomed these experiments, for with them he hoped to be able to say of consciousness in regard to the body, as La Place had said of deity in regard to the universe : "I have no need of such an hypothesis." Nevertheless, it was found that, if a stranger entered the room where the "conditioned" dogs were being made to show their conditioning, the associations often broke down. That showed that the animals were not such automata that a stranger could not draw away their attention. No machine works with less precision because it has been made self-conscious or distracted by an onlooker. Summing up Pavlov's work and the conclusions his School drew from it, the review in *Nature*, November, 1934, says : "It may be preferable in our present state of knowledge to interpret Pavlov's findings in psychological terms rather than to neglect consciousness altogether and fit everything into a hypothetical reflex framework." In short, although when animals of instinct (such as insects) are

POST-MECHANIST PSYCHOLOGY

left untroubled they may work almost entirely with a lack of consciousness, and when animals of enterprise (such as the higher mammals) are hypnotized into an almost instinctual routine of habit they, too, may fall below consciousness, even the insect can under stimulant on rare occasions act with real enterprise, as if becoming conscious, and, *a fortiori*, there are far more occasions when the mammal so acts and is so illuminated.

Still, Mechanomorphism—the animal considered as a machine—can be a helpful analogy, if we remember it is analogy, not homology. When, however, we come to the mind and would apply Mechanomorphism to intelligence, would attempt to show that consciousness is *au fond* material, that is to attempt to attain a wholly false consistency. It could only be forced on by those who were determined to let theory rule fact, those who, in the formative years, had decided that at any cost any other theory must be rejected, because the only other theory was their deadly enemy's, the theologian's Anthropomorphism.

The Tendentiousness of Freudianism

The success of the Freudian hypothesis is not the success of a proof but of a prejudice. We have heard much of the emotional hostility with which conservatism has met this attempt to enclose the whole front of knowledge within the mechanomorphic model. This is part, an able and effective part, of this attempt's propaganda. He who dares challenge the theory condemns himself. His hostility is the symptom that he is "rationalizing" his repressed conviction that Freudianism is right and he wrong. But this is a double-edged tool. We need to ask: "Was not this doctrine as welcome to some as unwelcome to others?" Emotionalism

THE THIRD MORALITY

is not—by this theory, indeed, cannot be—all on one side, with cold, clear, complete apprehension of the truth on the other. Conservatives, surviving anthropomorphists, undoubtedly resent the Freudian dogma, and their prejudice is not merely the hatred of all change, but of a particular change which would scout what they have held sacred and elevate what they have degraded.

But there are other conservatives in this quickly moving age. To these mechanomorphists (whose position is now as much in danger as is the anthropomorphists') Freud comes not as a revolutionary, but as a kindly reactionary, a restorer of threatened order. He is, they believe, their Life-sent saviour. Just as the great enveloping movement of mechanism seemed brought to a halt and, indeed, a retreat began to appear inevitable, from Vienna has arrived a force which will take counter-attack in the rear. Mechanomorphism's encircling movement of the superstitious will be able to be resumed and completed, and victory will crown the campaign of 300 years. Indeed, as soon as we study Freudianism we see that only such a wish, only such a desperate hope, could have made it possible of acceptance by men who usually demand of new theories that they submit full proof of the facts on which they claim to be built.

Freud's daring is shown in this : that he attempted to save Mechanism by abandoning Materialism. He would prove and establish the insignificance of mind through mental, not physical, evidence. It is true (he allowed) that deeps exist in the mind. The religious were right and the rationalists wrong. The will and the character, and all the values and worth of being lie below the rational and conscious will and are not accessible to it

POST-MECHANIST PSYCHOLOGY

or even to consciousness. "The heart has reasons of which the mind knows nothing." Pascal appears approved. But what is the heart? The conscience? No, the heart is the sexual energy of man—that and nothing else.

The Three Practical Proofs of Freudianism

"Nothing but" is never true—that is a safe rule. But if the mechanomorphic front was to be saved, if the superstitious spiritual were to be crushed, cautiously sticking to fact was not the line. A bold cast must be ventured. Freudianism rests on two things to establish its theory that man is only an animal and all his ideals and aspirations are only perversions of sexual energy: in the first place it claims that it and it alone can cure neuroses—it works empirically; and in the second place it claims that it has, by dredging the mind, by a sort of psychic embryology, found a description of man's history which supports natural selection and the survival of the fittest through the victory of strength and cunning.

Let us examine first the practical claim. Does it cure all its patients and can it alone cure? What is clear is that in certain cases any dominant, self-assured character can make a person of weak will feel better—for a time. Every religion has been able to do this and nearly every quack remedy. Freudianism must have something better than that to advance. It certainly has. Though, of course, the power of suggestion wielded by a strong convinced character on a weak one must account for many cures—temporary or otherwise—and so deduct from the number specifically to be attributed to the Freudian doctrine and technique, Freudianism has done more. But here a second subtraction must be made.

THE THIRD MORALITY

A vital part of the technique is permitting the patient in perfect relaxation "to cleanse the stuffed bosom of that perilous stuff that weighs upon the mind." This, auricular confession has shown, is often a direct way to the recovery of mental balance. Indeed, Catholics have claimed that they have no neuroses due to repressions among the faithful who obey the orders to resort to this mental hygiene.

Nor does the Freudian achievement end with this method. It has one more contribution to make to actual therapy before it ceases to be an empirical technique and becomes an imposed dogma, involved in the defending of Mechanomorphism. All psychologists allow that much material tends to be retained in the subconscious. There it festers and the patient can neither void it nor discover what it is that is poisoning him. The conscious mind however can hint at its trouble by symbols, by odd associations, and in dreams. Yet all this, again, is not specifically Freudian, nor was it discovered by Freud. It is part of empiric knowledge of the mind used by all therapists who had studied dreams, only neglected when mechanist doctors concluded dreams could only be nonsense. It is, therefore, a technique revived, not originated, by Freud. (*E.g.* use made of dream-analysis by the *Æsculapian* doctors at Epidaurus from the Vth century B.C.) And, based on this, on this method of analysis, much that is doing harm can be extracted from the mind, the patient is immensely relieved, and can often recover.

These are heavy deductions which have to be made from the Freudian claim that its particular theory of the mind is true because its application cures the otherwise incurable. Freudianism cannot use as proof methods which are common to quite other theories. Having

POST-MECHANIST PSYCHOLOGY

made those deductions, we can now come to the specific Freudian contributions. This is the theory why "repression" takes place, and how therefore it is best—and indeed only finally—to be cured. That theory is, of course, that sex is the main desire of all individuals, but society has forbidden it, except under inadequately satisfying conditions. Society is so powerful that it not merely punishes lawbreakers, it "puts the fear of God into them"; it can make the individual so anxious to gain its approval, so terrified of owning what he really wants, that he will deny his needs even to himself. He drives his desires below and beyond where he can consciously know them. This is repression. They seep out, however, through the stoppage; but have to come through distorted by a fantastic symbolism, or otherwise the conscious, conscience-stricken mind would forbid them.

The psycho-analyst, however, knowing that every desire is and can only be sex or distorted sex, knows how to construe every disability, every image, every dream, every imagination and fantasy, yes, every mistake, misapprehension and hesitation in waking life. For he has the master clue to them all. And, holding this, he can interpret to the patient his fantasies and his disabilities. When the patient accepts this truth, and sees what his disease is and his delusions meant, he is cured mentally and physically. He becomes a free psyche and, taking his sexual life as the main current of his life, its expression and its meaning, he lives wholly and serenely and dies finally and contentedly.

Has this Theory actually healed?

That is, in outline, the picture of the procedure. How in actual practice has it worked? First, has it

THE THIRD MORALITY

cured all its patients or a vast majority? It does not seem so. What the world has now learned is that an analysis must be very lengthy and may go on indefinitely. It is also clear that an increasing number of the successful analysts are varying their procedure and building up more complicated and less mechanistic theories than Freud's. Jung and Adler started as Freudians and broke away. Gröddeck continued up to his death to give an allegiance, but it was more embarrassing than open revolt—his theories were so extremely psychological and even metaphysical.

As long ago as the War English psychologists, who had been profoundly impressed by Freud's earlier advances, began to perceive that the material supplied from war's breakage (the "shell-shocked," soon to be called the "war neurotics") did not fit into the Freudian category. As Rivers pointed out, sex might be the major repression in a peacetime pleasure city such as Vienna, where life is secured for the comfortable neurotic and everything, save a good conscience about his love affairs, is supplied him. War reversed that. In war sex is free but safety is correspondingly scarce. Hence war-neuroses exhibited animal fear, not animal lust, as the driving power; and the sub-conscious desire, which could paralyse a man's body or dement his mind, was the passion for safety, not sex.

Later work has established a further grave fact about psycho-analysis. Jung made the provisional distinction of human types in the extrovert and the introvert—a more precise definition of William James's division of the Tough and the Tender. The accumulating records of successful Freudian analyses (when the patient's whole being has come to accept the Freudian interpretation as fact) increasingly seems to show that extrovert

POST-MECHANIST PSYCHOLOGY

patients may be stabilized. They have been profoundly bothered by a bad conscience. They have now, to quote Dr. Sheldon (himself for some years a successful Freudian analyst*), undergone "animectomy," *i.e.*, the excision of the soul-complex. Henceforward they will be untroubled by any mental growing pains. "Everyday and in all respects" they will get tougher and tougher—whether a world so manned will get "better and better" is another question. And what about the introverts? They, too, may be brought to accept the Freudian theory as fact but they cannot adapt to it. Their only end is despair. To see life as a thing made for the tough, an utterly blind business, having no place for those who must ask a greater meaning than individual animal satisfaction, is to see that (whether it be true or false) such an outlook is, for beings who must live for a larger purpose than themselves, impossible. They collapse and often kill themselves. As has been said, not until the Freudians publish the suicide-rate among their patients of long standing and completed analysis, among their after-cases and their elderly, comparing that rate with the normal figures and those of neurotics under other treatment, will the world be able to judge the cost of the experiment.

The Proof from History

Hence Freudianism has not succeeded in proving to an impatient public, either from the evidence of cures or from the unanimous clinical opinion of psychotheraputists, that its theory is true, and/or that all psychological factors are and can be reducible to a mechanistic explanation. Freud himself has recognized that the therapeutic record is not what it might be and

* See his *Psychology and the Promethean Will* (Harpers), a very valuable examination of the whole of this issue.

THE THIRD MORALITY

cannot by itself win from unbiased opinion a verdict in favour of the theory. He himself has said that the chief value of psycho-analysis may prove to be as a diagnostic, and not as a therapeutic, agent. This fact is one reason why (since clinical evidence, the cure worked to-day by his method and his alone, will not establish the theory) he turned to an attempt to establish it by evidence from the past, by anthropological deduction, for in his earlier writings no man was more scornful of theorists and of the mythologists. The other reason why an Anthropology, a pre-civilized history of man, had to be composed was in order to explain how it was that such a tremendous power, indeed the only elemental force in man, could have been repressed by such an artificial thing as civilization.

As we have seen in *Totem and Tabu* Freud essayed this explanation. Human nature must be shown to be in origin dominantly sexual. Freud maintained that by what has been called his psycho-embryology he could trace the psychological evolution of man just as anatomists, by physiological embryology, maintained they could trace man's physical evolution. The picture which he wished to construct was, of course, the Darwinian picture—that man in his pre-human condition was a peculiarly fierce ape. He went, indeed, further. The great apes can be exceedingly fierce, if frightened, but no observer has yet reported fierce fighting among the apes themselves in order to establish who shall be father-king of the pack. This picture is taken not from study of the primates but from the *Bovidae*, and to introduce it into the general pattern of primate evolution was therefore hardly legitimate, even for a theorist who was unaware of contemporary evolutionary evidence. Yet this is the romantic description which Freud has made

POST-MECHANIST PSYCHOLOGY

of primitive, pre-human man—a pack of lust-inflamed creatures held back by fear of one dominating sire who keeps all the women to himself, until, when he ages, they conspire, kill him, eat him, and take his wives, so committing incest, as well as murder, for these wives are their mothers.

NOTE:—Much of *Totem and Tabu*, because it has to go so far beyond what Darwin deduced from his study of apes and the physical descent of man and is really concerned with speculation about primitive human society, derives its information not directly from Darwin but from the great attempt to apply Darwinianism to anthropology—*The Golden Bough*. Fraser, who had never lived among any but industrialized peoples, composed from accounts of XIXth-century natives sent him mainly by missionaries, a picture of primitive man which could not but be a misrepresentation. Quite apart from the fact that these reports came from different cultures, the one common factor of which was that they were all immensely removed from animal-man's frame of mind—for each had evolved certainly through scores of thousands of years since that time—you do not go to housebreakers for an account of frescoes. The scraps these demolishers sent to Fraser were inevitably picked to show him how much such architecture had required demolition. In Fraser's hands they were pieced together to show how "savages," and therefore primitive men, were people, of course, like ourselves and their strangely different behaviour was wholly accountable by the fact that they were so stupid that they could not realize that their absurd methods would never provide them with what they had always

THE THIRD MORALITY

been trying to achieve : XIXth-century industrialized civilization. Such pathetic arrogant provincialism naturally gave a picture of man which was so inaccurate as to be useless. Yet it was on this accumulation, gathered by those who despised what they transmitted and arranged to show reason for such contempt, that Freud attempted to build a history of man's essential nature.

The evolutionary evidence for this, as we have seen in the section in biology, is non-existent. Even Darwin's much more cautious picture of man sprung from some large, fierce ape has gone, and instead we see our stock arising from some small, sensitive, inquisitive, co-operative, affectionate creature—the line of ascent running from tree-shrew, tarsoid, gibbonoid types to ourselves. Man is not a degenerate gorilla—every evolutionist now recognizes that.*

Neither, then, by evidence from the past nor by cures in the present can Freud establish his theory. This is not to say that his recognition of the primal energy of the libido was not a contribution to frank speaking in an age almost suffocated by that respectability which is the wish, by wearing black and never speaking of what you do, to appear chaste without being so. He did not, however, establish and discover the importance of sex. That any student of the *Vedanta* would know to be untrue. His attempt to confirm Mechanomorphism in the mind itself, to show all its motivation and activity is merely reproductive striving, expressed or repressed into fantasy, has broken down.

Nor has he himself hesitated to call attention to a fact which damages his thesis more seriously than any

* See *Early Forerunners of Man*, by Professor Le Gros Clark, F.R.S.

POST-MECHANIST PSYCHOLOGY

counter theory. Is there evidence that the mind can function apart from the physical senses? This has long been maintained by many qualified researchers, but as soon as they gave their verdict on that side their *bona fides* was impugned. They were charged with the offence that, though they may not have cheated consciously, they must have been unconsciously lax in admitting as fact what could not be true.

Freud allows Telepathy

Where the weight of evidence is completely convincing to any unbiased mind which will trouble to consult it is in the question of telepathy—the evidence of one mind transmitting definite thoughts to another over distance which precludes any possibility of sensory communication. Now, however, Freud has declared that in psycho-analysis evidence has come to his notice, which he thinks may be telepathic. That it is courageous for the last great champion of Mechanism to make such a concession is shown by the attacks already made on him for allowing the possibility. Even his prestige and authority have not saved him from the charge of ill-faith. “The old man is ‘ratting’.” “Fear of death is making him superstitious.” Such attacks by disciples show how history repeats itself. Some of the very prelates who advanced the Inquisition fell into its dungeons. Perhaps even more ironic is the fact that the man who taught his disciples to look on social order as a survival of a state in which the old man of the herd dominated the pack till his power failed and he was destroyed by his children should himself, in old age, find his spiritual children preparing to dethrone him and rising in revolt.

That he knows fully what he has done may, however,

THE THIRD MORALITY

be doubted, for he, making the announcement, asks his audience not to be alarmed, Mechanism is still quite safe; remember the telephone and, of course, radio. That analogy makes it quite clear that he has no conception of telepathy's method of functioning. "Only telepathy" is a common remark which shows the common man has understood it as little as Freud. Here the question cannot be pursued exhaustively. It is enough to say that telepathy does not obey the law of the square of the distance and is no radiation. On the contrary, it is an activity of the mind not functioning through the space-time continuum. Radio is no analogy. For radio has first to take a sound, or an image (television), render that sound or image in electric frequencies, amplify those vibrations until a Hertzian wave can be sent out and round the world, which wave has to be caught by an aerial, immensely intensified by a valve and then this current made to disturb a diaphragm to yield sound, or made to effect light so as to give a picture. The analogy of radio to telepathy is less helpful than was to brain research the analogy of the mind as a machine. Both misrepresent, not illustrate, the actual behaviour we are trying to study.

We have, then, come to the final point where Freudianism, and indeed all mechanistic psychology, breaks down: the evidence for the mind functioning on its own. That evidence, of telepathy, clairvoyance and prevision, has been resisted not because it was not considerable and deserving careful attention* but because to allow it meant the end of Mechanism. Psychical research is a subject which requires a volume to itself, for the material, when tested and sifted, is inaccessible

* William Archer, always a staunch Rationalist, said: "I cannot understand the mind which can reject such mountains of evidence."

POST-MECHANIST PSYCHOLOGY

to the public, the most authoritative records being those of a private society, the Society for Psychical Research. We need for the present purpose, however, only review the evidence which shows mind acting independently of the receptor senses. That is provided in Dr. Rhine's careful book.* Here at length is something which can be called laboratory evidence, when before we had little beyond "field naturalist observation" of spontaneous sporadic phenomena. Suffice it to say that this evidence, which has been largely confirmed by researchers in Bonn and Gröningen Universities and in London, shows the fact of telepathy and also evidence of prevision: the mind acting outside the space-time continuum. The very fact that physical scientists have so often refused to investigate shows they are right in maintaining how much is at stake, how radically these investigations must modify the world-picture with which till now (whatever might happen to society) the researcher was content. From T. H. Huxley, who said he would not even investigate, down to to-day, when a young psychologist, should he be known to be investigating, can be said gravely to prejudice his chances of future preferment, scientists, in the vast majority, have shown that they are more loyal to theory than fact (the very charge they brought against the anthropomorphists), and by refusing to investigate they have reduced themselves to the level of Galileo's inquisitorial judges who refused to look down his telescope for fear they should see the mountains on the moon.

There, however, the evidence remains and grows, and with it the failure of Mechanomorphism is complete. The world waits until that structure of the mind, once

* *Extra-Sensory Perception.* Dr. I. B. Rhine. (Faber & Faber.)

THE THIRD MORALITY

broad and serene, but now too crabbed for growing knowledge, is condemned by the building authority and a new structure, as superior in span and compass as was Mechanomorphism to Anthropomorphism, be reared, overarching its site.

CHAPTER VI

THE EVIDENCE TO DATE

IV. THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

WE must now sum up briefly the evidence for Mechanism transcended :

In physics we see the universe is to-day realized to be fundamentally immaterial. All that matters takes place outside matter. As Sir J. J. Thomson has said : We know the electron moves, but we know nothing of the wave impulse which makes it move.

In physiology we see the body is an affair of mind—but a mind far vaster than our little surface minds. Yet our little surface minds are linked up and can work through these other layers of mind. Surgery bursts the lock ; chemistry picks it ; but when we have a complete psychophysiology we will have the key which will turn the lock.*

In biology we see that the forces in evolution have not been blind and brute forces, base energies, only more complex renderings of the dead mechanic forces postulated as the whole power in the outer universe.

* The work of Driesch on the organismic power of the living cell, so that the two parts of a divided cell make not each half a body but each two complete bodies ; and the work of McBride on the inheritance of acquired faculties—in insects—are also important details of evidence in completing the case of idealism versus materialism. Driesch has involved himself in vitalistic theory, with his conception of the director of growth, the *Entelechy*. McBride's experiments other researchers have not yet repeated. The factual evidence remains in both cases.

THE THIRD MORALITY

On the contrary, the very powers which to-day have developed in us and which we cannot deny we value most highly—intelligence and devotion—it is these, primarily expressed in awareness, and sensitiveness, affection and sympathy, curiosity and gentleness, which have been the directive currents in our evolution.

In psychology we see the mind is in its own right and cannot, without leaving out its essential character, be defined in terms of any lower or simpler activity. This was always evident to the thinker. The man, however, who despises reason, logic and argument (until he finds, like M. Jourdan with prose, that he has used and has had to use them all his life) says he must have facts. Here then are the facts of telepathy, clairvoyance (or scrying) and even prevision. Here is the mind working on its own.

The Mind's part in making the World seen

If, however, mind is proved on some occasions to be the *causa causans*, why should it not be found to be underlying all phenomena? That question brings this summary to its final point. Physics, physiology and psychology have together arrived at a conclusion which shows that our every apprehension of the outer world is a psychological act of construction, so radical, making with such instantaneous act a solid, sounding, coloured world out of invisibility and intangibility, that it is almost an act of creation. For physics shows us that the universe is really a vast series of force-waves. Our instruments now indicate to us over a hundred octaves of radiation. We have to presume that beyond our instruments' detection there extend, up and down the scale, indefinitely further octaves. Physiology shows us we take up one octave of these waves with our dominant

THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

sense-making sense of sight. We see and we believe ; we don't see and we deny. Yet up and down, each side, octaves, just as efficient, pour out their strength, but we in our blinkers cannot take them in and so deny them the name reality. Real, however, they undeniably are. Radium and X-rays and Hertzian waves have proved that. There would be no broadcasting and television without the Hertzian waves. The other two, minutely small waves are even more directly "real," for, as we know, not only can X-rays demonstrate to our eyes that matter is tenuous and transparent, our bodies only varying shadows, but these radiations can kill and cure.

We are then surrounded by an infinite universe of potentiality, an unlimited range of powers, and out of this immense gamut of objective reality our sense-apparatus picks out one octave and we have assumed that and that alone is reality—seeing is believing.

Yet even that overstates the case of common sense, its naive conviction that it knows all there is and sees things steadily and whole as they are, without leaving out anything or adding anything, without ignorance or superstition. Psychophysiology (the study of the senses and how they apprehend) has demonstrated that we are further off from objective reality than we thought possible. When we found we were blind to an indefinite horizon of reality, only seeing one small span—that octave of radiation which our sight responds to—we still thought that there at least, we had an anchorage. We did touch directly on reality at that one spot, in that one octave.

That conviction, now, in turn, the study of the senses compels us to abandon. It is true that this octave produces effects on our senses but it is also equally clear that those effects are not the force-waves themselves

THE THIRD MORALITY

but our very romantic and very free translation of what those "wild waves are saying." We interfere much more, we "tamper" far more thoroughly, with what the outer reality sends us, than common sense in the mechanistic age fancied possible. We do it unconsciously but none the less effectively. Study of our senses now proves that we do more, much more, than pick up what is thrown at us or (if you prefer) stand passively pelted by outer reality.

The ignorant and dogmatic conviction of the mechanomorphist that he at last and alone saw the universe as it actually is, is as groundless as the anthromorphist's conviction that all the world was alive with dæmons and fairies, individual consciousnesses like his own individual consciousness. This conclusion the common-sense man depending on science must accept. Science says: In reality there is all around you nothing but electric energy. There is only force. All notions that there are solids and liquids and gases—earth, water, air: bodies, planets, stars—all that is construction, not actuality. Actuality, reality, what and what alone can be proved by physics to be there is sightless, soundless, shapeless force. When we look at the chart of the waves of radiation—basic reality as physics has now sounded it—and when we see the one octave our sense of sight translates as sight, we must keep on reminding ourselves it *is* translation. Otherwise we shall slip back into the crude childishness of common sense, mistaking what is really in us as something outside us. That one octave, which we take in, is no more objective "Light" and "Reality" than are any of the other octaves of utterly imperceptible radiations. It is just and only that one which our present forms and range of senses construe in a particular way so as to give us a practical "working"

THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

impression we agree to call reality. It is obvious that all the other octaves could give equally valid impressions of reality to beings using senses of a wider range or different selectivity.

But that is not all. With a different sense "pick-up," it is clear, another being could use, could focus on, the same wave-length, that "octave" which gives us the impression of reality and it would see a complete other world—a world which to it would be just as obviously *the* one possible world of common sense, of undoubted objective actualness.

This is perfectly sound speculation, when we are still only studying physics, that is, what we know of the ultimate and pure nature of the outer world. That speculation becomes fact when we turn to psychophysiology, the study of our physical senses and how they transmit the outer reality to us. For it is now recognized that "each sense organ transmits and can only transmit in terms of its function." What that means can be vividly illustrated by an example from the two major senses of sight and hearing. The sight organ is much more than the eye itself. It takes in the vibration to which it can respond and which it will build up as sight, through an elaborate transmission system. Indeed it is exact to say that the eye is as blind as a telescope tube is empty. The eye is chemically disturbed by the particular electrical wave-lengths to which it can respond. This, its disturbance, is transmitted by an electrical current to the seeing-centre at the other end of the brain, at its back. Then there is *fiat lux*: an outer world of apparent reality is apprehended.

The ear also picks up the air vibrations and in the same way finally translates them as sound. But here, too, it is not the ear which hears but a hearing centre which

THE THIRD MORALITY

turns an electrical current into hearing. *Fiat vox*. Out of lightness, soundless force has been made, composed, not received—light and sound. But now should the ears—the aural receiving set—be linked up with the visual centre at the brain's back ; and should the eye's cables be transferred from that visual centre—their normal terminus—to the other, the ear's terminus, the hearing centre, then what would happen ? Facing a sunset, we should see nothing, only something would be heard—a tremendous sound, perhaps like a Bach chorale : In the presence of an orchestra playing Beethoven nothing would be heard, only something would be seen—a marvellous auroral splendour, probably like a stupendous display of Northern Lights. Such a transference is yet to be done, but already we know it cannot be otherwise—all senses must and can only transmit in terms of their function. An electric shock can be apprehended by the visual nerve as a flash of light ; the same shock by the aural nerve is apprehended, rendered, as a sound ; by a taste nerve as a tang, by a sensory or feeling nerve as a prick. Yet all the time there was only “ given ” an electric vibration.

There is then no light in the universe except for those creatures who choose to pick up a particular, but not peculiar, wave-length of the universal energy and to make it into light. To think of light as something there in itself, as we see it, is to be as ignorant as the simpleton who imagines that the radio wave carries actual voices round the world and that, as he sits listening, he hears the very speech of the broadcaster. As we know that the ear-phones or the loudspeaker make a synthetic, a mimic voice out of electric impulses, so we must also realize that our eye and all our senses make what we call the real world also out of electric impulses.

THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

It has been a slow and stubborn struggle to free the human mind so that it may realize this, its creative power. First came the discovery that colour was not "real," it was a lovely construction on our part (under the moon what colour was there in the garden ?); and next that sound also was not there always and in its own right—there was no sound in a vacuum. So far the early scientists up to Galileo went, and had no doubt about our senses making up much of what we experienced. And then, in the very natural wish to make a world which would not melt away into pure subjectivity but to keep a foundation of common objective reality, researchers stopped exploring the senses. We have seen why neither conservative anthropomorphists nor advancing mechanists wanted analysis to go further. So it was agreed: colour and sound were "secondary characteristics" of reality—things we imposed on reality. The "primary characteristics"—what the world had in its own right, whether we were there or no—were size and weight, mass and extension: it was solid and it spread.

Now we know that, if we depend on our senses to tell us what is there, we have no right to say what is there when our senses are not attending. To say the universe is there when we are not apprehending it and that it would (blazing stars, vast space, spinning earth, surging tides, solid rocks, teeming creatures) all exist if no one was looking on—this is common sense. But it is common sense not based on observation, the only ground of physical science. On the contrary, such common sense is only based on extrapolation—the belief that because I find this here I shall find it going on there—a guess-work method which physical science is finding more and more misleading.

But surely the solid world, *that* is real, peculiarly,

THE THIRD MORALITY

unshakably real—as Dr. Johnson believed when he rebounded himself from the wayside stone. And *that* solid matter tallies with and sustains sight and sound : I see a rock, touch it and find it, as it looked, hard. I shout and from the cliff face my voice re-echoes. This brings us to the final unravelling of the confused grapple in which we and it are involved.

We have seen that we select only a minute part of the wave-energy which is, at present, science's conception of objective reality, and we choose that *that* shall be reality. Light is only an octave of the many hundreds certainly pouring around us and through us. But, further, we choose only certain wave-lengths to be the solid world—as well as the light by which we see that world. The cosmic radiation—already recorded as penetrating more than thirty-two feet of lead*—and of course piercing that thickness of steel much more easily—is, we see, much *harder* than any matter we know. Against the needle jet of this force, matter is like a loosely woven web of worsted. Yet that force, that ultimate probe, that superfine point, simply because it is so tremendously hard, goes right through our bodies, as though they were not there, as wind goes through a wide lattice without disturbing it.

Again our common-sense prejudice revolts, our conservative adhesion to our assumptions resists. It is not true, we say ; such force is only calculated fancy. Remember, then, X-rays and radium and what they can do to flesh and blood. And, if flesh and blood seem soft and we fall back into the Johnsonian arrogant ignorance, striking the rock and saying in rock (yes, and more in

* Every further investigation seems to show that radiations coming from outer space penetrate ever more deeply through "matter." Radiation has now been recorded 800 metres deep in water.

THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

metal, above all in iron and steel) *there* is hard and stubborn fact on which your fancy can break its point, then this illustration comes to help our stunted imagination to rise to and accept its new knowledge as fact. Tempering steel, making it gain in hardness, formerly needed tremendous heat followed by violent chilling and often heavy hammering—only with such effort and energy could the hardest of all stuffs be made to change, be “stepped-up” to even greater hardness. Yet to-day, with our knowledge that all matter is only electrical energy, we use instead electric energy. We pass a piece of steel quickly through a magnetic field—a field which yields us no sensation, no heat, no light nor sound. Yet the steel in a moment is changed, tempered to greater hardness as though it had been into a furnace and then flashed into a quenching tank.

We Select and Translate to make the Solid World

The solid world is thus no more real than the coloured, the sounding, the smelling world. The whole thing is a construction made out of wave energy by a peculiar creature, the living body; a particular organism, the psychophysical being. That selection, which this creature makes from all the available energy around him, is very narrow. But more: he is not content with leaving out the vast majority of all the raw stuff there is. He does not cease playing fast and loose with reality when he has discarded almost all of it. Even that small piece which he accepts he proceeds to twist, translate, model, and colour until it gives him the picture he has wanted.

Here again it is actual experiment which shows us how elaborate and how artificial is this construction which man has assumed to be reality—if not all reality

THE THIRD MORALITY

at least an authentic cross-section. For example sight and sound do not, even after æons of effort, co-ordinate at all well. The infant learns slowly and with difficulty to make this collation of two very different messages from very different sources. Those who recover in adulthood sight lost in infancy discover how arbitrary is the current construction we all use and take for granted, and these newly sighted people for sometime actually find that construction to be a dangerous confuser when they have to judge spatial relationships and distances, as, for example, when crossing a road. Then they shut out this confusing, irrelevant sense and trust to the co-ordination they have perfected, *viz.*, sound and touch.

Every study of our senses confirms with what strain we pull together into a continuous construction—an objective, common-sense world—those data which our various senses pick up from different and widely separate vibrations—how the vibrations of light can be made link up only approximately with those of sound or with those other vibrations which come through the sense of touch and which lead us to make the assumption of solidity. Seeing is believing—that is common sense. Light is the paramount sense. “I would as soon think of disbelieving my own eyes,” we say as the final surety. But research shows we never, as a matter of fact, do believe our eyes. For our eyes—as does the lens of a camera—show us the world “upside down.” Our sense of touch and balance decides which of the two impressions (what we see or what we feel) is right way up. We therefore decide against our eyes, and, what is more, such is our creative faith that we are able instantaneously to transpose and translate all that our eyes show us, and make it appear as though it were seen the

THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

way we intend to have it. After that who can talk about seeing the world as it actually is ?*

So psychophysiology confirms and enlarges the proof which physics has given us—that what we took to be a solid world around us, in which we were open-eyed, uninvolved onlookers, is really a mixture of ourselves and some unimaginable energy. We cannot tell where the outer thing begins and the inner self ends. We and it are unbelievably involved and enmeshed. We have gradually and carefully, more painfully and slowly than a fly off a fly paper, to extricate ourselves, push ourselves back from the jam, get ourselves able to focus clearly on what we have been stuck and draw back our senses, mixed up, tangled, and embedded like antennæ in mucilage, till we can clearly distinguish that vital frontier, where we actually end and the outer reality begins.

It is here that psychology comes in—the supreme science. We have seen how we have involved and confused ourselves in what we mistakenly took to be objective reality. Only a clearer study of ourselves will show us how to get free of that involvement.

Physics has shown what “the outer universe” is not. Psychophysiology has shown how much we read into that outer universe to make it look like what we assume reality must be. But does not this end in complete disillusionment ? All reality has vanished. We are left with *Berkeleyan Solipsism*. Each consciousness—perhaps there is only one—makes the whole phantasmagoria which he mistakes for reality. It is at this point that psychology can help us to reality. Starting where psychophysiology ends, psychology begins with

* The latest work done on this subject shows that it is not till the child has actually handled objects and crawled about that it can so “translate” or “invert” its vision and see things not as they appear to its eyes but as its touch sense shows that it is convenient to see them.

THE THIRD MORALITY

the study and analysis of our normal or average apprehension. We discover that concepts come before percepts. In other words we know the meaning of a thing, or to be exact what we intend it to mean, what we mean to do with it, before we know its actual appearance, before we know anything more about it than the use it serves. As Dr. Aveling has shown, an infant in its early weeks will recognize whether the face that is looking down on it is cheerful or depressing by reacting accordingly, although at that time the full co-ordination of focus has yet to be attained by the eyes, and the object perceived—the human face—changes but little in shape and even less in colour when it expresses alteration of mood. Next psychology notices how, as we are ruled by this necessity to make sense and to fit our experience, our sensations, into a pattern of meaning and a plan for action, we are compelled to arrange and even alter what we observe. Further, and graver, such things as we may happen to notice, but which we cannot use in our pattern of meaning, “cannot see the use of,” these odd facts we either suppress or mislay—either fail to notice or completely forget.

The Feelings' part in Limiting the Mind

We must next enquire whether we can discover what are these inherited concepts which allow and limit our percepts; for so may be revealed how we can release ourselves from these limitations and see the world with greater objectivity. There are, it seems, two main patterns and plans for which we have been driven unconsciously to collect facts and gain confirmatory perceptions as proof. The first is the pattern of animal need and the second is the pattern of social need. First we had to notice and attend to those facts, those experiences which

THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

allowed us to live and to reproduce. Hence the limited perceptions of animals—where smell predominates (smell to lead them to food and to each other) and where, for example, colour-vision, and even, in many mammals, co-ordinated binocular, long-range vision are restricted, because such sight leads to little if any physical advantage. That animal prejudice, that bias toward noticing and attending only to a very restricted range of sensations and stimuli, still remains. We have, however, largely modified it. It distracts us occasionally, as a violent glare in the foreground makes it difficult to study a less crudely lit distance. The reduction of the olfactory centre and our predominant dependence on sight have already freed us very largely from that limited and limiting animal meaning, that confined apprehension of things viewed only for bodily use. We can attend to facts of no biological or economic importance.

It is, then, the pattern of social meaning which, we find, proves in the end much more restricting to our growth in apprehension than the restriction imposed by simple animal meanings. The categories of worth, of what should be attended to, of what is sense and makes sense—these categories are imposed not by physical heredity, *i.e.*, by appetite, but by social heredity, by tradition, and they are more limiting to-day than any contraction caused by instinct.

Psychology employed by anthropologists has already made this important, interesting, but till now unapplied fact strikingly clear. We see races which do not belong to our civilization incapable of realizing facts which seem to us axiomatic. For example, the peoples who have not accepted our mechanistic causality deny that congress with a male is the only and whole cause of child-bearing and they point to the fact that, although before

THE THIRD MORALITY

marriage their young women copulate freely with young and healthy males, no offspring appear; while, when marriage has been performed, and the spiritual blessing has therefore been given, children do appear. This fact appears to be true for such races. They have therefore as much right to say their theory is true as we have to maintain ours.

This discovery—that we can only attend to those facts which suit our system, to those facts which seem to make meaning—was a discovery made by psychologists when they were confronted with a fact as strange but more obvious: that backward anthropomorphic peoples, suddenly presented with a mechanomorphic way of life and outlook, tend to become extinct.

The discovery, however, does far more than help explain a mysterious tragedy affecting a few of civilization's less valuable wards. Here, it seems highly probable, lies a clue to the solution of our civilization's own discontents, neuroses, hysterias, and danger of disintegration. We ourselves have advanced too quickly, our powers are beyond our controls, because we failed, in building up the system which was to take the place of the anthropomorphic cosmology, to lay out a complete foundation. The scientific pioneers of the modern world, for reasons we have seen, failed to lay that complete foundation of fact on which right action can alone be built—a foundation of fact based on the three areas of knowledge, the knowledge of physics (of the inorganic), the knowledge of biotics (of the organic) and the knowledge of consciousness (psychology). They did not realize that, because as a man thinks in the end he must act, cosmology is always underlying and sustaining ethics. When the new researches in physics abolished Anthropomorphism, the new learning should have realized that this state of

THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

things could not last. Instead it was irresponsibly content either to mask the fact behind Natural Theology or to enjoy the embarrassment of the anthropomorphic theology.

These practical effects—the fact that Mechanomorphism never really made a cosmology to take the place of the anthropomorphic one which it destroyed, and that to-day we have to make such, the new complete cosmology made of the whole of reality (physics, biotics, psychics), and this will result in the new complete ethic—these practical conclusions we must follow up in Part II which follows immediately upon this chapter.

What must be considered here is the light which our discovery, that our modern cosmology has been strangely, arbitrarily limited, throws on the nature of that limitation. Our society when it broke out of Anthropomorphism (a world view which had itself become too restricted, too limited, in attempting definition) became even more restricted, and the urge compelling men to that restriction was the will for power and their subconscious wish to be free of meaning. The animal is restricted by senses which are built up from, and only respond to, the stimuli to which greed and fear, appetite and preservation, can respond.

Man makes attempts to release himself from this restriction. Failing, however, clearly to understand what is wrong with him, his efforts end by sinking him deeper. His intuition, that the world is somehow alive and the universe at base is mental, he cannot hold to, but falsely condenses this faint apprehension into the dogma of an individual Deity—a Deity who ends by existing only to satisfy man's individual desires : personal pleasure, personal preservation. This Anthropomorphism therefore leads inevitably to Mechanomorphism, for,

THE THIRD MORALITY

in this later system, man transposes for a God who may be persuaded to satisfy his personal needs a machine which can be made to do so.

Hence we see our existence in a supra-animal society, and our discovery of how to make our surroundings yield power, has not extricated us from those limitations by which the animal is bound in its rudimentary attempt to understand the universe. On the contrary, we have only gained in power without adding anything to meaning. Civilized man to-day considers himself as being no more than an animal: that is the only meaning his power—applied science—has, he believes, given, or been able to give, to his life. Hence, having no more vision, no more sense of the meaning of it all than an animal, but, having enormously increased powers and also a sense of conscious discontent (a sense that meaning must be found and answers be provided—even if that answer is only that there is no meaning), man imperils his society, his individual life and the hope of his species.

Man's senses and apprehensions may have enlarged a little. It is possible that other past cultures and even a few to-day (see Rivers's work on colour-sense among natives) had not, and have not, quite our acuity of colour sense. As far, however, as psychophysical tests and anatomical dissection can guide us, it seems that most of the great apes have an eye which is equipped to notice all that we notice of tint, tone, and shape, if they choose to attend.

We can then say that man's powers—powers based on seeing the world as nothing but a machine to be shunned or used as a reply to greed and fear—have completely outrun any advance he has made in vision, in real insight, in meaning. Hence man in his society is more cut off

THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

from the universe than is an animal and more in danger, therefore, of perishing from off the earth's face.

Is, then, the greatly extended vision given to man by physical science not a real addition to the animal outlook? He sees the stars which they never notice, and with telescope and microscope looks out into inhuman supra-animal areas and down into equally inhuman infra-animal confinitudes. That is true. It is equally true that the passion which here seems first to have stirred his enquiry is that purest of the passions, pure curiosity. The odd, the thing appearing beyond the familiar limit and fence, caught his attention. He attended simply because oddness arrested his notice. This first stirring of pure interest may be compared with that first stirring of the sense of wonder, of the "numinous" which was a recognition of the strangeness but the kin-ness of the universe, that dawn of religion.

It was undoubtedly the dawn of detachment, but it was a dawn rapidly overclouded. Such natural enquiry did not lead to an enlargement of man's awareness. Rather it canalized his attention down certain narrowing channels. Fear and greed, defence and offence took over the new defenceless, self-forgetful wonder, pure curiosity, and taught it what to notice. Hence man, almost at once, stains the night sky with his passions and, with astrology, not only spreads a mythology across space but makes every movement only a pointer reading of a destiny confined by greed and fear—his success, his doom.

Nor did the revival of learning set him free; on the contrary, it confined him more close in these animal bonds. For astrology could be dismissed as fanciful projection. Astronomy, on the other hand, confirmed his belief that his animal nature and its crudest, most

THE THIRD MORALITY

mechanical passions were the natural and only possible outcome of a universal nature, which, considered with perfect objectivity, was blind, pointless, and doomed to extinction. Further, we must repeat, the more we study the rise of the physical sciences, the more it becomes clear that the picture they arrive at and yield is a picture prompted, however unconsciously, by a wish for irresponsible power—the wish to find that man is free to get what power he can in a universe blind enough never to mind, simple enough to be circumvented and even to be controlled to a considerable degree, considering man's smallness (a smallness which it is morally convenient, for one who wished to be amoral, to stress). Physics is prompted by an unconscious wish for power without purpose, therefore a power which I may use for my own purposes, greed and fear, offence and defence.

Physics, the word shows, is simply the wish to know how things move and to leave aside why they move and whither, to what end and purpose. As an increasing number of historians of the growth of ideas (Mumford's *Civilization and Technics* ; Hocart's *Progress of Man*) have pointed out, the rise of modern science is not the rise of a pure speculation, an abstract curiosity, an extension of simple awareness. It is the driving need for more power, power to fulfil more completely the demands of appetite and misgiving, satiety and security.

The dream-wish of astrology—the science of Anthropomorphism—has failed. The beams of a more intractable universe thrust into man's cobweb nest. Man's response was not to open his eyes to this enlarging splendour but to "ichor o'er the place," the breach made in his defences against the invasion and disruption of the animal self. Faced with the fact that his traditional system had broken down, he refused to see that that breakdown did

THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

not mean that the universe and life had really no meaning but that it had a larger meaning, and that the breakdown itself was caused by the growth of his own nature which required that larger meaning. He failed to realize that all that modern science with its mechanistic cosmology (based on a study of natural phenomena which omitted life and mind) could do was to add more power and greater means to animal passion. The mechanistic cosmology was erected to justify the machine, not to enlarge the mind, to increase means for carrying out more completely, more fully, the old ends dictated by the animal passions, greed and fear.

A science based on physical mechanism assumes that it can devote itself wholly to means because it is sure that the ends of mankind are known, obvious and needing no investigation, *viz.*, physical appetites and physical shrinkings. Modern mechanistic man is then to-day something much more tragic than "the strongest animal." Because in his search for power he has discovered what he wished to discover, that there is no power in the universe which will interfere with him if he knows how to get out of its way (fear) and how to satisfy his real nature (greed), he has in some respects sunk below animal level. For the animal is held on the rails of instinct. It hates and fights but only within limits which instinct imposes. Very few fights are to a finish, and instinct, which makes a creature start a quarrel with great energy, generally switches off before that quarrel has been brought to what an individualized, self-conscious being would call a conclusion. As Eliot Howard, the authority who discovered the important fact of bird "landed property sense," has described, in his *Nature of a Bird's World*, a bird when nesting will

THE THIRD MORALITY

drive out an intruder from its territory with great *élan*, but not only does the trespasser put up little more than a conscience-coward rear action but the defender also, as soon as the territory is cleared, does not press his advantage. Here in nature is "*aidos*"—the sense of not pushing things to extremes—actually working; here is that counter-balance of Nature in the large and general coming into play against particular excess and local flush of protest, which, unless so checked, leads to "*hubris*"—the self-centred sense of oneself as above all and not of any kin or kindness—that arrogance which automatically calls in the inescapable, counter-balance of Nemesis.

This intuition in the individual, that he may only act in so far as he adjust the general balance of life—he may protest, he must never persecute or even, beyond the most modest claim, prosecute—is present as a tradition of inherent justice in all traditional morals right up to the close of Anthropomorphism. By then and by that it is, however, turned into an arbitrary tabu—the Gods or the God will not endure the implacable man—forgiveness is the peremptory preliminary of obtaining blessing. When the Gods go, man therefore thinks their rules can be dispensed with, because these rules are obviously unreal, unsanctioned. Feeling himself to be only an individual uncoerced by any super-Individual, feeling that he knows the urges and aims of his own personal nature and that all the rest of nature has neither meaning nor aim, mechanomorphic man sets himself with his mechanic power to satisfy that partial abstraction, what he takes to be his real nature, what he believes to be animal nature, but which lacks just those checks and balances of actual instinct which Mechanism inevitably overlooked.

THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

This is the reason why mechanomorphic man to-day threatens to destroy himself as no other animal, balanced by instinct, has been able to destroy itself. His curiosity about phenomena (a curiosity which should have led to an enlargement of his outlook, an enlargement which would have balanced, against his animal greed and fear, a self-forgetful interest) acted completely otherwise. This curiosity was limited to an investigation confined to those parts of the universe which would yield a mechanistic picture and process, insight into power-procedure and not into aim or meaning. When that was secured the rest of phenomena, life and consciousness, were only considered in that light. They were forced into the mechanistic picture, assumed to illustrate the machine and the pointless-power-process, and all observations which stood outside or told against such a "decategorization" were either neglected or even suppressed.

* * * * *

To sum up then, Mechanomorphism is not a cosmology and cannot be one because it is not composed from a consideration of all phenomena, of all objective reality, but only of that section of it which can be described by physics—the behaviour of the inorganic, the way matter moves when it is in large enough units to be seen. Biology and psychology and even advanced physics cannot be brought under the simple categories of Mechanism. Hence Mechanomorphism—not being a cosmology, a complete picture and rendering of all experienced phenomena—cannot give rise to an ethic. That is what has actually happened. Modern man remains unbalanced.

Physics has destroyed Anthropomorphism but it has not put in its stead any complete system of the universe

THE THIRD MORALITY

to which man can react with a complete pattern of behaviour. Modern man has therefore had (1) either to go back to authority, to a complete system of conducts, but one based on inadequate interpretation of all the facts, (2) or on to anarchy, to no system of conduct ; to conduct based on conduct, ethics on ethics ; or to conduct which is based on the " proof " of biology working under the suggestion of physics—that reality respects nothing but force, nothing but violence.

That is the present dilemma and this analysis has traced it to the failure of a partial study of phenomena to give rise to a complete system of conduct. This failure does more, however, than ruin society through making men either to depend on a cosmology which is out of date for their ethics or to have no ethic at all. It brings thought to a stalemate also. For mechanism stultifies pure thought just as much as it makes applied thought destructive, not constructive. For, as we have seen, all our picture of the outer objective world—made of octaves of force-radiation—is made according to our power of apprehending that force-radiation and of constructing it into a world of human action. Unless we can attend to the process and apparatus whereby consciousness achieves this, we cannot advance knowledge further. Knowledge will remain limited by the restrictive meaning-making demands of fear and greed, with such " extrapolative " extension of the impulses of fear and greed as is given by a curiosity mainly prompted by the desire to find power processes—to find the universe to be a power machine which can be turned to fulfil our purposes (never *vice versa*) because it is infinitely powerful and utterly purposeless.

Hence mechanism cannot go further. As a practical philosophy it leads to anarchy—to those amoral struggles

THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

between men who feel themselves driven by it to use any means against each other and whose means are now, through mechanistic advance, of annihilating violence. As a pure philosophy it leads, as directly, to collapse. The mind cannot advance when the main hypothesis of scientific philosophy is still assumed to be that reality is mechanical and mind epiphenomenal, when all the while science has proved that any picture of the outer universe depends on the mind which not merely apprehends it but constructs it. Mechanism practically, theoretically, and actually comes to an end now, in this decade. It has to yield before that further research which shall produce a complete, consistent picture of reality—a complete cosmology—which is the basis of a complete consistent pattern of conduct, a complete ethic.

As, however, the world we see is the world our animal nature and our social tradition permits us to see, and the system we have built (mechanism) is simply the induction from such observations, such data, it is not enough for us simply to say, “we will get rid of Mechanism because it is inadequate.” True, there are enough odd facts and sporadic phenomena and experiences to show that the old system of Mechanism does not work, and we can also now see how tendentious a construction that system has been—but how put another in its place? Are there, at present, the facts to do that? Quite apart from the ordering of them, what about apprehending them? Have we enough new data not to disprove the old, but to construct the new? We have seen that the animal outlook is due to the selectivity of greed and fear which provides only those experiences which serve their needs. We have seen that the mechanistic outlook—resulting in the amoral power States which lead to civilization’s and humanity’s destruction—is due to greed and fear

THE THIRD MORALITY

capturing and exploiting curiosity. We must, then, not merely order our new facts and so begin to make the third cosmology from which we may deduce the new ethics ; we must also discover how to find further facts, that full complement of data out of which a complete ethic may be constructed. We see that, as our apprehension is limited by greed and fear, our first practical step must be to cut off these inhibitors of understanding. This will set pure interest, curiosity, free again, and new facts will become apprehensible. This is no easy task, but one of lengthy discipline and training. The eye takes twenty minutes, we must remind ourselves, to react from day sight (full normal illumination) to night sight (the power which permits us to see in starlight). We can only apprehend that to which we give protracted attention.

We have, then, in preparing the new ethic, a double task. We have to order those facts which are already to hand and which transcend mechanism, and, having ordered them into a system of facts, we have to act up to them. Further, we have also to train ourselves not merely so to act but, beside that, to apprehend more widely, to find new experiences which, combining with the new system of facts, will yield the new cosmology. It is an immense task. It is one from which most may shrink—to work on this double front. It would certainly be impossible, were it not profoundly natural, the next step in our evolution.

To say that, however, is not to say it will be taken, but only that it can and ought to be taken. Here is real natural selection working—the whole species brought up against an impossible position—an impossible position arising from too long contentment with too easy assumptions, too greedy or fearful apprehensions, too self-

THE POST-MECHANIST OUTLOOK

centred an outlook. Now a new psycho-social mutation is demanded of us. We can produce it best only if we draw on all our immanent, evolutionary energy. The gravity of our crisis will, undoubtedly, compel some to achieve this tremendous creative effort.

The second part of this volume, therefore, sets out very tentatively not only the mental ordering of the new facts and the new conduct to which those facts point, but also such mental, psychological and psycho-physical methods whereby it seems we may most quickly and adequately rid ourselves of greed and fear, revive that pure interest-affection which leads to fresh apprehension, and so may come to that vision in which we ourselves see the entire purpose for which our lives are lived, our community is recreated and our nature in its being and action is fulfilled.

PART II

THE ACTUAL ETHIC

CHAPTER VII

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

Practical Deductions

ETHICS cannot stand by themselves. The picture you have formed (as you believe, without bias) of the universe—on that you will and must in the end act. Cosmology must end in ethics. The anthropomorphic cosmology has gone, never to return. So, however, has gone the mechanomorphic attempt which never succeeded in making a cosmology to succeed to Anthropomorphism's. The third cosmology is not yet found. It will, however, rise to the surface of consciousness, as a consistent intellectual system embracing all the facts and pointing to an appropriate and complete way of action, a complete way of life. It is already forming under the threshold of consciousness. It already indicates sufficiently the direction we should go if we would keep in touch with that emerging, co-ordinative pattern and hasten its release and emergence. Already we can see that, if we desire this new order to be proved and manifest, what we have to do is to act in accord with it as far as it at present can be apprehended. So it is that our apprehension grows and we perceive and bring to light the new facts which will make completely clear the unbroken

THE THIRD MORALITY

circle of the new thought and the new facts, the new picture of reality, and the new conduct.

The provisional picture or plan with which we are left and on which we must act is, then, neither a scheme of things controlled by "a magnified non-natural man" who created it and will judge the achievements of his creatures, and yet whose own behaviour seems arbitrary and vague, nor yet a scheme which has no control, but is simply a blind system, an aimless machine, which certainly behaves comprehensibly, regularly, definitely enough, but which means nothing and is going nowhere.

The first fact we have to face is that mind is the best notion we can have of the cosmos. But this notion, if it is not to be more limiting than suggestive must be cleared of all notion of human desire. Man's pure thought—when he reflects in an effort to understand for the love of it—that conception and that alone helps us to a growing apprehension of the basic nature of the universe, and acts as an analogy (it may be even an homology) of that nature.

If, then, mind is the source and sustenance of things, our consciousness, instead of being an irrelevant by-product of the body's action, is *sui generis*, an irreducible, ultimate reality. But if that quality of mind, which is the basis of the universe, only approximates to our minds when they are at their highest, then though our consciousness is ultimate and irreducible it certainly is not so in its present condition and aspect. At its best it is now no more than a very rudimentary form. Further, if it is ever to rise to any higher conception of the true nature of its mentality and the true mentality of nature, it must concentrate on its highest activity of pure interest and universal affection. Only so can it escape from those

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

relapses into personal appetite and power which manifested and expressed themselves in magical religion and mechanical science.

This is the deduction which we now make from our experience of the outer universe. Fundamentally and comprehensively its nature is not to be thought of as personal or mechanical but as mental. This deduction from the outer universe (that we now have to think of a new conception of reality, orderly, but not mechanical, conscious, but not personal, following laws, but laws of thought, not of matter) is confirmed by our exploration of the inner universe : the depths of consciousness reached through the back of our own mind. The unexpected way in which our mathematical calculations tally with astronomic observations—so that each reciprocally indicates the next step for the other, how what is arrived at by pure deductive thought is confirmed by the furthest range of sight—shows that our minds and the universe-mind think in the same manner.* It may think beyond our thoughts, as a higher mathematician thinks beyond the thought of a child, and thinks until his conclusions seem different even in quality from those of the child. But the higher mathematician's thought is, though much above, based on the same foundation as the child's thoughts ; and so the universe-mind's thought and ours are one at base, though

* We are free to say that every confirmation we find in observation is only our finding—what we can't help finding—the reflection of ourselves. This argument, however, leads to Solipsism. If the universe is only a reflection of myself, then I cannot say that it and all it contains, suns, men and mathematics, are not the invention of my solitary consciousness. The truth seems to be half way between "Solipsism" and "common sense," *i.e.*, each construction man has made of the universe, each cosmology was true to his degree of consciousness. It allowed him to interact with the outer reality to the level of his capacity. As his consciousness went on to another stage of its evolution he had to apprehend more, and therefore make a further and "truer" cosmology.

THE THIRD MORALITY

its upper reaches seem to us now completely incomprehensible.

How the Individual Mind Contacts Universal Mind

That discovery leaves us, however, only knowing that the universe's nature is fundamentally a thought which in its more rudimentary forms we can follow. It is when we go deeper into our own minds, beyond calculation and such profound mental concentration and abstraction, to even profounder depths, that we begin to have some real and practical experience of what this universal mind may be. Exploration of the subconscious has shown us that our personality is indeed only a "persona," a mask, a crust, a skin. Behind, below this there lies a series of depths.

The first explorers thought of the human mind as a little room in which we lived, looking out of its windows at the world outside. On the wall behind us we could hear vibrations and even blows ; sometimes fumes came through the floor and stains seeped through the wall. That picture of a solid partition separating the conscious mind from the subconscious is now yielding, through further research, to a more accurate if less definite picture. We see now a surface-lit layer and then a sequence of gradually more diffused, less defined depths. We use the simile that the field of consciousness shades away from crude, sharp-focused light—"spotlight"—to a vague dusk. This simile will not mislead, if we remember that physics has shown us that each looker may have his own sort of light and therefore, when we say "from crude light to dim dusk," all we mean is from the range of stimuli we are used to, and so take as full light, to those further ranges which we seldom experience, and therefore only dimly apprehend.

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

What is exactly true is that, as we explore these profounder levels, we find that the sharp limitations and frontiers of awareness which are ours here at this superficial level there begin to expand and merge. It is not merely that we cannot see our barriers in that dimness, it is that in that profundity we have access to knowledge denied us in our personal superficiality. Research in hypnosis has established that the deeper the hypnosis, the more the subject is "under," and unconscious of this normal surface level of consciousness, the less is he aware of himself as a personality, of his name, position and character, and the more is he possessed of memories : first those which he had forgotten, then, deeper, those which he never remembered receiving, and finally those which do not belong to his personal experience and life.

In the deeper layers of consciousness, telepathy, clairvoyance and prevision seem to be proceeding. In other words, in these layers we seem to emerge into a comprehensive impersonal consciousness out of which all our individual personalities are thrust, as islands out of an underlying land mass are thrust above sea-level. Our personalities, it also appears, can serve that common and personal consciousness so long as they keep contact with it through their depths and through the realization that they are not ends but means, not separate wholes but parts of a single state of being.

Here then we have not merely confirmation that the deduction of advanced physics is true, and that the fundamental nature of the universe is an impersonal comprehensive mind, but also that it is possible for us to have direct experience of, and access to, the fringes of that mind. That experience and access are necessary, for without them we shall never be able to prevent

THE THIRD MORALITY

ourselves falling back into Mechanomorphism (when we think of its regularity and pervasiveness) and Anthropomorphism (when we think of its consciousness and volition). It is an extremely difficult task to proceed on this "parallelogram of thought" and it is not suggested that by hypnotizing themselves people should attempt it. What does, however, seem indicated is the necessity of that "contemplation," that steady and deliberate development and extension of impersonal consciousness, by practised concentration on the infinite life and undivided being, without which the assent of our intellect can never make our action accord with our opinion or even our conviction.

Power over Surface World has meant Loss of Contact with the Deeper

That, in simplest outline, is the action-picture, the plan, the cosmology from which we now have to draw our ethic. As we gain in intensity of analytic and personal consciousness, in "power over the outer universe" (which phrase should really be written: "in making our special and partial selection of stimuli yield us a more complete and unthwarted activity"), we are in danger of losing contact with our deeper, but less clearly and concretely defined, apprehension of our common life. This is the real reason, the *causa causans*, of the present European anarchy. We assumed that "power over the outer universe," power, obtained by analysis of physical phenomena on the assumption that all phenomena were at base mechanical, meant a complete apprehension of all reality. Therefore success in physics meant that he who so succeeded (Western man) must by that fact be equally informed in psychology, in the understanding of his own nature and all human

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

nature. The Pragmatists, led by William James, in America, defined truth as that which gave man power over his environment. Mechanical man had more power over his environment than anyone else in the present or in the past. Therefore he knew more about truth. Therefore when he differed from the psychologies of the past and those of contemporary, non-mechanized traditions, he must be right and they must be wrong.

Unfortunately for our peace and progress the reverse was far nearer the truth. Predominant attention to the outer world meant in reality neglect to explore the inner. For the outer world—that picture presented by the unanalysed senses as common-sense reality—could, we now see, only begin to be grasped with any degree of objectivity, provided that its selective and distorted character was first understood. So, for pure and true physics, a psychology and an epistemology were essential preliminary requirements—as indeed physics, now that it approaches purity, is realizing. Without first understanding how the mind and senses transmitted and distorted the picture which they gave (and on which the physical mechanists fell with greedy impatience to exploit its satisfactions), all that the mechanist could obtain were such impressions as his appetite-confused senses permitted—permitted in order that their peremptory demands should be satisfied.

Hence we see that, instead of the mechanic-power civilization of Western Europe being as wise as it was powerful, it became chaotic and so had to fall. It assumed that it had only obtained power through seeing truth more clearly than any seekers after truth had ever beheld it before. It had in fact come close to doing the reverse. Unconsciously, but none the less fatally,

THE THIRD MORALITY

it had indeed been prompted by a desire for power apart from meaning, and, as that wish had been so strong, it had found what it was looking for : a power universe in which individualized, self-conscious man was the only being with any plan or purpose and perhaps even—happy thought—with any consciousness.*

We are now realizing that Western man is ignorant of psychology just because of his immense practical success in obtaining power by assuming that the whole of reality is mechanical and by confining himself exclusively to those aspects which would, at least for the moment, submit to that menial interpretation, and yield him powers and means, not insight and meaning. On the other hand those thinkers and cultures which have hesitated to exploit the outer world as a power machine, before they had explored and understood that inner world through which all apprehension and conception of the outer world had to reach them, we now discover it is not unnatural to suppose, have thereby certain insights into the inner world which we are denied. In brief, our civilization, just because it is so powerful, is ignorant ; because it knows so much about means, is proportionately ignorant as to ends ; because it is physically so competent, is psychologically inept.

To-day Psychology and Meaning can Balance Physics and Means

Further reflection on this problem shows that, though grave, it is far from hopeless. This partial, intemperate, greedy and premature attempt to control the universe for the satisfaction of a self not understood was bound to

* From the Cartesians to Pavlovians there has been a strong wish to prove animals to be automata, and, with a sublime passion to wind up the whole matter, the Behaviourists have sworn to include man as well.

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

happen. Consciousness evolves, its evolution is spiral, all history and all the works produced by man are shadows and symptoms of that evolution. Man began in a generalized consciousness. Next he had to attain self-consciousness. This self-consciousness had two phases, the anthropomorphic and the mechanomorphic. In the first phase man thought the world to be a projection of his self-conscious, individualized person. In the second he saw that was not so, but then assumed that it was a mechanic means and blind process of which he was the end ; individualized self-consciousness was the end of all ; all would end with him ; he was the crown and all the rest was material for his fulfilment. That phase is now rapidly passing. It could not last. It was self-destructive. The very wish to get more power and prevent power destroying the power-holder led to knowledge that he had made a misapprehension about reality, about himself—and the reciprocal reality around him.

Our task, then, throughout life, the basis of our morality, the principle of all ethics, must be to render as clear our apprehension of this profound uniting common life as is our apprehension of our material, individual life. Throughout our life we have to keep this balance of intensities advancing together. It is true that "Heaven lies about us in our infancy" ; we have at that preliminary stage easy and effortless access to a wide range of apprehension, for we are yet to become incessantly aware of our separating individualism. We have yet to become so aware of self-limitation that we immediately challenge every experience, asking whether or not it can serve the preservation of our individuality and denying it the name of reality if it cannot pass that test. As we become defined, we gain in power and lose

THE THIRD MORALITY

proportionately in insight, intuition, intuitive sense of value. Then it is that, as we have become fully conscious and narrowly focused, we must learn a fully conscious, a deliberate method and practice for keeping open our access to the profound, unifying, common nature and for preventing our lives from becoming so confused that they become incapable of apprehending or even of conceiving any reality save that which we have made a habit of noticing. The child has width of apprehension in proportion as it is helpless and does not know the "use" and "meaning" of the things it experiences. That is why it is easily interested in anything. The grown person has deliberately to recover this power of regarding things without thought of exploiting them. They have to re-supple and re-expand their natures, which have become prematurely assured, "knowing the use of everything and the value of nothing." They have to achieve that outlook which Roger Fry said was essential to all true insight : "alert passivity."

What use if all are Mortal

There are two immediate objections to this practical rendering of our present knowledge, this way of acting on our new insight. The first is that, though it not only proposes a way of living whereby the individual keeps open his access to a larger life but is also able to maintain that in such access the individual's life can alone have meaning and worth, the individual who so lives is mortal. He may have this access during life and at such moments when bodily appetite, weariness, distress, and disease do not make the effort too difficult, but in the end he must disappear with the disappearance of his *persona*. Is not the materialist, the complete individualist (though he may live a life whose indulgences

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

make him a nuisance and, maybe, a peril), ultimately just as wise as the being who would keep open a way to the larger life? For in the end, real though that may have been, death will, like an icy avalanche, rush down and sweep away that slender path, just as completely as it wipes out the muddled strayings of those who wandered blindly after every impulse.

That would be true if death ended life. But if consciousness is, as we have seen, *sui generis*, then it cannot be destroyed by the destruction of the organism which it spun for its temporary manifestation, in this space-time continuum. What is clear is, however, that as the consciousness which created the organism, the body, is for most people separated from their individual consciousness, so that they are unaware of it, death must be for them a temporary eclipse, a sense of blackness (not necessarily a loss of consciousness) until they are provided with other apparatus and have become used to apprehending different stimuli. While for those who have completely identified themselves throughout their life with their personality and body, who have lost all other apprehension and whose whole interests are now completely confined in appetites, possessions and ambitions, there may be even greater difficulty. For, as the senses are persistently used to yield only one series of apprehensions, these apprehensions become steadily narrower. Lust, as Freud has pointed out, shrinks from a general sensitiveness, widely diffused, until it is focused wholly on the nates and the sensations becomes as narrow in time as in area. It is no more than momentary release, a "detensioning," no less trivial than a yawn. Possession, once for display and even for generosity, becomes mere hoarding miserliness. Ambition becomes envy. Hence in such a case, when the body collapses, the soul must be

THE THIRD MORALITY

self-hypnotized and remain tied in its own room (though its physical bond is actually broken), as the potbound roots of a plant remain netted although the pot is shattered. The psyche is now having its possibility of apprehension immensely widened but it seems to itself only to be in complete dark, as a mole which has let its eyes atrophy and guided itself wholly by smell, suddenly put in a brilliantly lit but aseptically clean and empty room, could only cower and tremble knowing itself utterly lost, utterly without a glimmer of indication as to where it may be. It is clear that when we leave the body, even for those who have never neglected exercise so as not to sink, and become fixed, plugged, and buried in the channels of the senses, the reorientation will be difficult and confusing. We shall have to stare long at the apparent dark before we realize we are looking at the light and it is the light's intensity which blinds us.

What Death can do

Our present knowledge of the nature of reality shows us there is a consciousness around us, similar to, but not the same as, our personalized consciousness. There will be required on our part, then, a change of mental focus or aperture before we can apprehend that other quality of consciousness. Hardly anyone can hope to escape a temporary confusion. Some may experience prolonged and distressing distraction and bewilderment. But none, as far as we can see, can be extinguished. Only the persistently self-isolated can prevent a re-awakening apprehension and even then, as they may be less defenceless without their body, they may be more exposed to the sympathy of others who see their distress and must succour them. It is possible that those who are

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

used to apprehending their larger consciousness by regular access to the common life may discard the body, may glide from one focus to another without any sense of vertigo and confusion, as, by realizing that he and all his immediate setting is rapidly moving towards a larger frame which does not move, a passenger on board a liner can resist the illusion that the pier is coming towards him and realize that he is being carried towards the pier.

Life after death is then to be counted on and the trajectory of intentional living, which makes everyone aim at a range which is outside the limit of his personal life, is not illusion, but natural and right, for we are being made to "act as though we are immortal," because we are immortal.

How the Problem of Evil may be faced

The other practical objection to this modern cosmology, this provisional post-mechanism, is the problem of evil. This problem—that, even if I act well and see that I am acting with a power of understanding and good, there is so much that is not well in the universe, and indeed actively evil, that I cannot know whether good will ever win—this, which is the companion problem of the problem of survival, did not arise under Mechanomorphism. Under that cosmology evil was whatsoever refused to yield to human convenience. The universe was neutral and man's good was to get around its bars and avoid its pistons and so, in such interstices, to express himself. This, however, was cold comfort and poorer sense. Sooner or later the machine would catch and crush the sorry insect that crept among its wheels. Nor, if the physical satisfaction of irrelevant animal appetite was the only conscious purpose in the

THE THIRD MORALITY

universe, could man have been said to have discovered what the universe really meant. To say that the whole means nothing is only a bombastic and unreflective way of saying : " I cannot make any meaning of it."

Under the early cosmologies, which are all classifiable as anthropomorphic, and which culminate in Monotheism, the problem of evil became increasingly acute. For Deity first fights against evil, then countenances, and finally must approve it. To increase the power of an anthropomorphic deity until it is absolute is to increase his responsibility until he is amoral. Whatever is (and can only be) by his constant and conscious will. Hence Anthropomorphism broke down quite as much because it was faced with an ethical dilemma as because it had reached a cosmological contradiction.

The problem of evil—the ethical inadequacy of the two earlier cosmologies—is then another reason why a third cosmology is required. Can we, in this provisional outline of a plan of action (a pragmatic " interim ethic " until the new cosmology is clearly constructed) give an explanation of evil which will neither underrate its objective importance nor paralyse our will to surmount and dissipate it ? Our present evidence does not leave a contradiction which arrests all action, although it cannot, of course, solve every abstract problem. Why mind, as we know it, should be evolving, why incarnate, why subject to ignorance and accident—why, on the contrary, it should not be free, independent, instantaneously informed and creative—we cannot say. It is possible that such questions are, in these forms, so crude as to be unanswerable.

What we can say is that the concept of objective reality as being a state of mind and of ourselves as minds attaining knowledge of and union with that state,

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

through acting in accord with that mind and its purpose—this dual concept, which is cosmologically least open to objection of all cosmologies, is also ethically most workable. Our comprehensive but practical aim is to transcend our personalities and to unite our lives with this comprehensive life of which we all, all separate lives, are more or less isolated sparks. The universe is (*sub specie aeternitatis*, and even in the light of our present most advanced physics) such a mind. Psychology shows how we are attached to this all-embracing frame of mind through the subconscious. Further, psychical research shows how there is evidence that not only such a mind exists but we can become part of its super-personal consciousness—that when our minds function in that sphere and frame they are not personal but have transcended personality, and that the evidence of communication with minds or aspects of minds which have possibly been incarnate (*i.e.*, personal) is evidence which points to such minds belonging, out of the body, to a state of consciousness where personality is discarded—as men may leave their cells to join in a common freedom and meeting. These minds are still—if we take the evidence without straining it to fit our prejudices—not united with the fullest expansion of mind. They are not as yet consciously one with the universal mind, or they could not communicate along the lines of special memories and peculiar expressions and characters. They are, however, already uncelled and united in what had best be called layers of mind, united with all those who were and are on the same level of apprehension as themselves.

It is a thousand pities that owing to lack of a new hypothesis, a new category, a new cosmology to which to refer, and in which to order, these observations, which

THE THIRD MORALITY

are now so ample, the mechanomorphists can only deny them—because they destroy Mechanomorphism—and those who have been driven by experience to accept them can only refer them back and distort them to make them fit into and confirm the anthropomorphic cosmology.

If, however, we will realize, firstly, that neither is Anthropomorphism going to be revived nor can Mechanomorphism continue, but that a third cosmology is forming around us from the assemblage of the new observations in all the sciences; and, secondly, if we will recognize that the facts brought to light by psychical research—telepathy, clairvoyance, prevision, and the communications of reliable mediums—are facts, but do not fit into Anthropomorphism any more than they can be reconciled with Mechanomorphism—that they point to a super-personal cosmology and will only fit in such a frame of mind: then we are ready for the next great advance. We can act so as to make that advance possible and behave so that our individual lives are each lived as part of a consistent, interactive, comprehensive evolution.

Evil, in this scheme, is neither denied nor given absolute importance. It is part of the condition of a transitional state. We are individuals for the time being. We easily come to regard our individuality as final and absolute. When we do *that* we betray life, prey upon it, become centres of morbidity and decay, dying and in distress ourselves and spreading distress and death. Evil springs from the individual believing that he is an end in himself, and not a phase in a life which embraces all, for, so believing, he must act against that life.

But evil extends outside man. Throughout life we find the beast of prey, the parasite, the pathogenic germ, the cancer cell. Yet here again our picture of a process,

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

whereby the rising sparks ascend towards unity with each other in the transcendent flame, is still perfectly self-consistent. We must not overrate the evil in the world. Most apologists have felt they must either maintain that the universe is without a fleck of failure or that it is wholly fallen, it has hopelessly miscarried. Careful acceptance of the actual facts shows, however, that, besides the innumerable forms of life which function without conflict and fulfil their nature harmoniously without the ruin of others, those which tear down and destroy lives above them or beside them are rare. The beast and bird of prey is less common than the harmless beast on whom it has become parasitic; the insect parasite is rare beside the insects which are not parasitic, and many thought to be parasites are found to be useful and even essential partners, living in those corporate relationships which have been evolved unconsciously, sharing a common table to which each contributes essential supplies (commensalism) or going even further and being actually physically integrated (symbiosis). The pathogenic germs are a small minority beside those which are harmless and beneficent—co-operative, not destructive; the vast majority of bacteria are either harmless or beneficent. The cancer cell is an exceptional, mysterious aberration amid the million cells which interact and balance against each other in lifelong harmony. In the main, all life seems subject to one vast purpose—to become more alive, and its means is by growth, not at others' expense but often through direct mutual benefit.

Through and across that vast process and advance, two adverse elements are evident. The first, we have seen, is the departure into piracy, the resolve to be individual and to live at others' expense. The second

THE THIRD MORALITY

is not so morbid, but far more widespread. It is the failure to go on, the failure of vitality in the creature itself. It is this latter element which seems (now that we can study life more free of anthropomorphic assumptions) to account for the greater part of the extinction of all the fossil forms of life. This may not be an example of what we could possibly call, by any stretch of the word, real evil. It may be simply the withdrawal of the primal vital energy because (for instance, like the Dinosaurs) that energy has got itself into a blind alley, and there was nothing to be done but to withdraw the hand from the glove which had become too rigid any longer to allow the fingers to feel, reach and grasp.

Life is a continual choice : either feel more, suffer more, be more aware, more open and more sensitive, see the self increasingly as a means ; or shrink from feeling, from understanding, and sympathy into defensiveness, exclusiveness, condemnation, and make the self the end, resolve to reject the whole. From this standpoint, evil is a mark of failure. Such evil must exist as long as evolution exists, for it is the continual wastage-failure streaming down from the advancing front, the lapse of those who find the pace of progress too hot.

But why active evil ? Why, once the great refusal is made, should not extinction come down at once ? Why suffer such powerful forms of revolt as we see against the general advance into the united life ? Because of evil's other aspect, repentance, death's real enemy, recovery and restoration. The higher must suffer for the lower, the nobler for the more craven (who so often believe that they are the brave because they have chosen to shelter themselves with the hide of "toughness"), because the lower may turn again, and in the end, the

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

deepest insight believes no seed of life can be lost. There is therefore no private salvation, no public safety at the cost of destroyed public enemies, no, not even the salvation of the highest until the utmost low have been raised equally. The higher must, then, endure the damage the lower commit until the higher come to such power that they can buy up all the damage which the lower can do and set fair the balance once again. So, as much for the sake of the higher, that they may grow in creative power, as for the sake of the low, that they may go on until they can avail themselves of the gift of the high, and from their desperate helplessness of self-love and violence be released into the freedom of the surrender of the self, evil must be in this transitional life, "offences must needs come."

No view which looks less deeply into the problem of evil dare face evil as it really is. We dare not with facile talk of accident, Natural Selection, the general happiness outbalancing the particular disaster, face the child dying of meningitis, and its mother, or the creature born to blasting hereditary disease. Without a fundamental philosophy to embrace these (and not dismiss them as must any materialistic humanism) our explanations of evil are only fair-weather fancies with which we cannot face anyone caught "in the fell clutch of circumstance," far less confront with clear realization the fate which may at any moment close on those we love and on ourselves. Such a point of view, however, as will be seen later, is not one of helpless resignation, of "Providentialism," the belief that whatever happens must be endured. We can accept that this is the meaning of the transitional life and of this life's shadow, evil. We are all the more free, understanding its nature and our true power, to fight it and overcome it.

THE THIRD MORALITY

All life, then, like ourselves, is attempting to achieve awareness and, with that awareness, co-operation with all other life. Evil, when it is really present—not as a negative force: simple failure of vitality and the wish to cease—evil, when it is positive, is that vitality become, in its energy, somehow cut off, strangled, only able to realize its life as something alien and hostile to all other lives, to the whole life. That is the only evil—the same evil which appears in us—the evil which our exploratory knowledge of our spirits shows to be due to a fissure in our consciousness whereby we have become cut off from our awareness of ourselves as parts of a whole, embracing life and can only think of ourselves as lonely, final, absolute individuals who must and can only exist by taking all we can for the assuagement of these selves. So the individualist in his materialism is the same evil (*i.e.*, strangled, morbid death-in-life) which is manifest at still earlier stages of aberration in the beast of prey, the parasite, the pathogenic germ, the cancer cell.

The picture, the plan of action with which, then, we are now given to work—the blueprint of life—is that we and all life are involved in an immense process and transition involving this life (with, it seems we must assume, some particular development of consciousness alone to be achieved in this life-incarnate) but itself, the life process and our career in it, extending far beyond this life, far beyond this individual physical experience.

Whether we have had other experiences before this, whether reincarnation is true, we cannot say. And for a sane, embracing, empirical way of life, a full morality and a purposive co-ordinating existence, it does not seem necessary to know. The theory is certainly attractive and probably solves more difficulties than it raises. To

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

those discouraged by their disabilities and disendowments it may teach patience and persistence. They earned this particular life and indeed chose it. They can capitalize all their handicaps in this life, if they will only realize what all life is for, what it means. Karma seems cruel ; it is, to those who will not resist it but accept it, merciful. It says : " Thus you are, because thus you did." It adds (which is all that matters to those that are alive and so look forward) : " This you can do, and then, as you do, you will be. At any moment you can begin to remake your life as you will have it."

The doctrine of Karma is also always associated with the two supplementary conceptions : (a) that the world as we see it is *Maya*, an illusion—a partial construction made from insufficient data and therefore unreal, though we mistake it for reality ; (b) that this partial construction is made under the stress of, and is wholly limited by, craving, desire. This second notion, as we have already noticed in passing, is highly interesting from a purely speculative point of view. For the Neo-Lamarckianism which appears to be gaining support among many biologists (as a more satisfactory conception of the cause of evolution than aimless Natural Selection) indicates that all organs (and so all senses and therefore all *sensa* or data) have been evolved by and out of the continual striving of the organism to express certain fundamental urges, cravings, desires. The living organism, like a specially " tuned " television set, only picks up those vibrations which will result in a picture of a world it can lust after. Whether this theory of evolution is proved in the future or no, we have seen that modern psychology has established not only how narrow but also how distortive are the senses which take in for us the outer world. This investigation also suggested that this selective and

THE THIRD MORALITY

constructive process, through which alone we knew the outer world before we had instruments (and since we discarded intuition), is a selection and construction, the method of which can be discovered when we realize that what is perceived and shaped into meaning is what may best satisfy appetite. In short, we have only seen a world as fear and greed would see it, adding thereto in these modern years such limited insight as a curiosity restricted by the wish for power would permit.

The world as we see it is, then, a world created by desire and, as it must appear quite different to another being without our cravings, it is true to say that what the ordinary man calls reality is illusion. From a practical point of view this hypothesis is also not unhelpful. Most people regret their lot hardly at all because they are poorly equipped with virtues, but almost wholly because they are denied position, wealth, and health. The Karmic hypothesis proposes that not merely is lack of virtue the individual's fault but that lack of rank, possessions, and even the sedative comfort of health can be his opportunity. Those who have physical gifts may too easily be overweighted by them. These gifts can themselves be opportunities, but only to supreme natures. The wise spirit may have chosen insignificance, poverty, and even disease because, so freed from the dangers of addictiveness, possessiveness, and pretentiousness, it might healthily outgrow its present, limiting personality and self-love. Too frequently has it been proved that an artist endowed with super-technique has produced nothing but facile, uninspired work; his very gifts made it too easy for him to avoid the agony of real creativeness; and even of Lord Macaulay it was remarked: "He had so great a memory that he seldom troubled to think."

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

Yet Karma is mainly concerned to explain to the individual how he has involved himself in his present difficulties and so for many—myself among them—it seems to stress individuality too much. “Did this man sin or his parents?” In the light of our new psychology, individualism is a phase. I cannot say to the deformed beggar: “So you earned and so you are.” Neither he nor I have ever been, are now, or will ever be, absolute individuals. We earn for each other both evil and good, and are earned for. My thought and feeling is not mine but came from others, and I can give to others. Or to take again what seems to many a harder case, not because the suffering is in sum greater, but because the victim appeals more to our sympathy. The child dying of meningitis appears to be so clear a case of a high being pointlessly destroyed by a lethal germ that this is taken as a denial of all purpose in life. But here again the child pays with its several days of suffering for the ages of blind craving and baffled striving of all the community, for our utter ignorance of how to live. It was begotten not for its own sake but to satisfy the parents’ need. In how many children was there implanted in their procreation, how many were begotten in, the clear conviction that life for them was to be part of a vast unfolding of purpose, and that they were being brought wisely and intentionally into a nobly consistent pattern of living—a united, humane, purposive humanity? When the act was not simply blind satisfaction of youthful or maternal lust it was an act of defeat: “Here in some way I escape death; this, my child, will somehow redeem my failure and fulfil my promise.” The more we learn about general resistance, the more we see that infective disease is dangerous only so far as that resistance is lowered. Further, we are beginning to associate the

THE THIRD MORALITY

higher forms of resistance with psychological factors which command the physiological defence. As we study diet, we wonder not that people are ill but that they still resist so well. As we study frames of mind we are astonished that in an anarchic society such as ours the will to live has not collapsed already. No wonder that our children and ourselves pine and suddenly succumb. Polynesians in such an environment would have refused to procreate and for themselves have willed on death. We may marvel that in our general ill-will there is so little physical suffering, not so much. We have no more reason (at least till we live better) to attribute each suffering child to a malign deity than to our mortal ignorance, which freedom from craving can alone cure. Vicarious suffering is often laughed at by Karmists as a violation of the law of cause and effect only urged by sentimentality. This, however, can only be true if individuality is here and now absolute. That, we see, there is ample psychological knowledge to show, individuality is not. The higher, then, can raise the lower; the richer pay the poorer's debt.

Whether he who is helped will not have, in the end, to pay back—that is another matter. In the deepest reality perhaps absolute gifts are not made—only loans. The final step into complete union may perhaps be possible only for the soul which has “paid the uttermost farthing” of every debt, every loan it contracted through its entire process. As long as it is in any way a separate entity, so long it must repay whatever it has had to borrow. Conversely, as we are all tied together, perhaps none of us may attain absolute enlightenment until all the rest have arrived. The last may be first and the first last, because in the end we shall all be equal, attaining our common fulfilment simultaneously.

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

It is not, then, of much practical importance whether we, as the same particular individuals, have existed before and simply have forgotten our past lives, or whether past life involved all of us inextricably in the past acts of all. Ours is a common responsibility only to be discharged in common, by a common united effort and understanding. To find comfort in allotting blame for past mistakes is neither wise nor just. It is ahead we all have to look. This life, then, in the light of our present knowledge, we can look upon as (crude but definite simile) an aerodrome. We find ourselves and all our fellows "taxi-ing" across the area. Behind it is dark. We cannot see whether we have just emerged from hangars or whether we came in from another long flight and are only running along the earth now for a moment preparatory to taking to the air again. What is clear is that the area, the clear space we have during which we can so run along open ground, is limited. At the border of the aerodrome we must have done one or other of two things: either by then we must be independent of the earth, we must be flying, or we shall have crashed into the fence. We cannot go on "taxi-ing."

Psychological Development the Meaning of Life

Our whole and comprehensive activity and purpose in life is thus a continuous psychological development. Every stage must and can be a co-ordinated extension of awareness until the individual apprehends himself clearly as one with all the life around him and as a continuing stream of growth which expands until it loses the limits of individuality. This process and this alone can give a complete meaning to every stage of life and a harmonizing unity to every interest and occupation. All life

THE THIRD MORALITY

is seen in the only aspect which can give sense to the whole, as a series of stages of release.

Without such an extension—without the realization that our individuality is only a channel through which we pass to experience our truer, larger life, which we share with all our fellow lives, and that the span of our bodily life is only a duct through which we go to become conscious of a life in which physique would be a limitation, no longer an expression—without this enlargement of vision, life has to be made worth while by the constant repetition of irrelevant amusements and distractions.

Even the noblest, without this assurance, must pay themselves the “wages for upkeep” which life itself is not going to pay. They may act supremely well, but they act without hope that either they or the cause they serve will ultimately prevail. They have then—if they are not to serve with stoical despair—to keep themselves from dwelling on the ultimate futility and miscarriage of all purpose by deliberate use of relaxations, recreations, amusements. Life is not mocked. Unless you can prove to it a purpose equal to its range, it will have to be distracted, doped by immediate pleasures from the pain and despair of ultimate defeat. “Life is a fretful child which must be played with till it falls to sleep.” It is not the religious only who, with dreams of Paradise, are giving themselves opium. Everyone who has not discovered a worth and goal commensurate with the whole unremitting effort of the dedicate and devoted life, a meaning adequate for a life’s consistent endeavour, must and will take some analgesic of the mind or body.

That drug need not be the hope of personal comfort, compensation, reward, or honour in a life to come.

THE OUTLOOK FOR ACTION

Alas, it may often (among those who despise and feel themselves superior to the crudely religious) be a compensation more harmful to the individual and his fellows. A few noble workers have actually taken to physical drugs ; a few have found a small harbour of comfort in possessions—their wife, their children, their collections. Most who know they are noble, however, find their real comfort in contemplating their nobility, “ the last infirmity of noble minds ” : “ Mine honour will I not share with another,” or Job’s despairing cry : “ I will not let my integrity go from me.” Their opium is ambition, pride, the love of fame. They will tie their fleeting name to some great cause and so the attention of mankind shall turn to them and recall them every time it shall recall the cause. This arrogance is probably more harmful to them, to those they would dominate, and the causes they would serve, than even those dreams with which others, who may serve humanity far less obtrusively, assuage, far more gently, the craving that the human spirit cannot deny itself—that need for the “ meaning of it all,” or for distraction of oneself : the need for a comprehensive result or private reward. The official good have been disliked, and their example has been considered daunting and discouraging, not without cause. The sense of superiority with which they must sustain themselves does not show to onlookers (as it should) as pathetic. These poor defiants are taken at their face-value, and not as their shrinking hearts show them to be. They have therefore done incalculable harm to the life of purpose and process, while those who imagined that process and goal in too crude terms (envisaging their anthropomorphic heaven), since their mistake was less contrary to the facts (as there is survival), have done less harm. Better a life lived in childish joy

THE THIRD MORALITY

over a half-truth than a life only sustained by that least attractive, if most pathetic, of austerities, that adolescent superiority that imagines it alone has the secret of all knowledge in the trite formula of premature disillusionment: "Too good to be true."

CHAPTER VIII

THE COURSE INDICATED

A.—THE ATTITUDE

WE have now seen that ethics are not enough: they must be based on, because they are the resultant of, a cosmology. The rationalistic ethic was only the foundationless superstructure left standing for a moment after the Deistic cosmology had been cut away from under it. We have also seen that the mechanomorphic cosmology must result in its appropriate ethic causing individual indulgence or despair and international tyranny or anarchy. Thirdly, we have found that the mechanomorphic cosmology, at the moment when it seemed about to complete its proof, has failed and collapsed, for it was not founded on a complete study of reality but only on a study (and that partial) of one third of reality—to which one-third the other two-thirds were assumed to conform. Fourthly, we perceive that another cosmology is forming to take the place of the previous two, which have proved inadequate to contain and express all the known facts, and we have seen that this new cosmology will be neither a return to the anthropomorphic nor a continuation of the mechanomorphic: it will be a cosmology in terms of mind.

THE THIRD MORALITY

Fifthly, we have seen that, though this cosmology, which will be the third great cosmology man has made, cannot as yet be stated in terms of a single embracing definition or set of principles, we can already deduce from such principles as are already provisionally established a provisional ethic and way of life.

In broadest outline we see the universe evolving life, and life evolving to continually extended awareness. We see our individuality as a phase—perhaps a “hairpin bend” in the zig-zag spiral of ascent—and we see that our task in co-operating with the purpose of life and the universe is so to act and to think that we become increasingly aware of our extra-individuality—that is, the common life which unites us with our fellow creatures, with all life and the universe.

That co-ordinating outlook being ours, and that purposive way of living its resultant, how, in the circumstances in which we find ourselves, are we to act, to conduct ourselves, behave? This must be the true new morality, the consistent acting according to the truth. It will certainly be unlike the confused conduct, that mixture of “conscience cowardice” and intermittent “realism” which is the behaviour of most men to-day, whether in their public or private lives. Yet, it is not less important to make clear, it is no reaction. It will depart therefore no less from the morality of the traditional Anthropomorphism, for that contains and would impose much which is no more than a reflection of crude individual fears and prejudices (actions and inhibitions aimed to preserve the ego by pleasing a being supposed to resemble the character of the ego) and leaves out much which a more enlightened view of the nature of the universe would advise.

THE COURSE INDICATED

The Aims of the Third Morality

Let us begin with the aims of such a morality—the world's third great ethic—reserving for a further chapter discussion of the means whereby those aims may be attained.

The general aim is the individual's realization of his unity with all life and being: his realization that the universe is alive and that every creature, himself included, is part of that life. Such a realization must have, as applied action, practical aims: the abolition of war, of all cruelty, and of the employment by communities of violence to keep down their inmates. It must aim at the spreading of arbitration and mutual concern in all social relationships. It must also cease to kill animals for pleasure, and such as it decides it may kill it must despatch without inflicting pain or fear. Later must be discussed whether the third ethic would adopt the Buddhist attitude or that of the Jains—that all life must be immune and none, insect or germ, may be killed by man. There does not seem reason to suppose that it would.

In social relationships (in which it includes animals as well as men) it aims at an establishment of kinship. To achieve this it aims at making possible not justice but generosity, for justice is the balance between conflicting claims, those conflicting claims which irreducible individuals must always carry. Generosity is the natural relationship of two beings who realize that each is only fulfilled if it can understand the full nature, and forward the development, of its fellow.

The two Reasons for the Rationed Life

As all individuals are part of this general life, but can only become so by themselves recognizing it, the third

THE THIRD MORALITY

morality is both communistic and yet inequalitarian and non-compulsory. Each individual must be won over by practical experience to seeing that the life of extra-individuality is his natural, normal evolution and the only way he can escape death—the death which is inescapable if he remains confined in his individuality. To this he can only be won, in the first stages, by seeing this larger life successfully lived by others. Their example in his guarantee. When he realizes that the whole meaning of their existence is in the larger consciousness and that so living they have no need of—they are embarrassed by—whatever protects and fosters the individuality, then he can begin to discard his shackles also.

Those then who adopt and spread the third morality live naturally rationed lives for this double, reciprocating purpose: the freeing of themselves by their own efforts and the freeing of their fellows by the encouragement of their example. On the one hand, they adopt a rationed way of life because it is necessary for themselves: any form of self-love in its three aspects of addiction (of appetite), possessiveness (of property or person), or pretensions (love of fame) can become insidiously an end of existence and so fatally embarrass the spirit in its main purpose, to advance into a life which transcends these blind-alley limitations. On the other hand, pioneers also adopt this rationing because a life which is not clearly drawing its purpose, meaning, and happiness from an all-engrossing purpose and aim of existence cannot hope to persuade its companions, who are yet at a more rudimentary stage, that such a life actually exists. You may be able to swim, yet, if a man who has never known of swimming and has only seen men drown if they fell into deep water perceives that, while your arms

THE COURSE INDICATED

wave about in the water, your toe is all the time on the bottom, he cannot but believe you are deceiving him, and not only you, but all who tell him that swimming is a reality.

This is not to say that there may not be those who know as a matter of fact that the world of common-sense is only a temporary construction, a token coinage, who are really living the larger life and finding all their purpose in it, although surrounded by other apparent supports. When I. C. Brunell, the engineer, built Saltash bridge, the railway directors were ignorantly certain he had made the spans dangerously wide. They insisted on a series of additional piers being built, and overruled Brunell's protests. He, compelled to conform, raised the extra piers, but stopped them within a few inches of the bridge's beams. So may be the lives of men and women who live with such ample comforts that the onlooker can say: "Even if all they believe is false their life has been good enough." The queerly honest Hoadly, then Bishop of Bangor (an XVIIIth-century bishop who, like many, was frankly determined not to reside in his see), rent the Church of England with his outspokenness, and compelled George the Second to close Convocation for the remainder of the Age of Reason by preaching on the text, "If in this life only we have hope in Christ we are of all men the most miserable." He maintained this was no longer true for comfortable clergy and thought the truth should be recognized. He did not seem to recognize, however, that lives lived so that—whether there is or is not another world—this life is allowed to yield to these few the best it has to give (and everything which the poor think they need to make them happy), such lives in their obvious materialism eclipse any latent illumination. They are probably

THE THIRD MORALITY

the poorest advertisements the noble life can have and the cynic's best example.

The rationed life is lived, then, for the double purpose of preventing the self from becoming adherent to this temporary, transitional experience and also to help others to realize that the deeper experience of long-scale, purposive living, of being consciously part of the whole eternal life, is not only the one way to social justice but the only way in which the individual may escape frustration, futility, fear, and despair, and attain an ever-growing enlightenment and freedom.

In other times a less definite way may be advisable. But to-day, when we see that our civilization is in so great a degree nothing more than a construction of fear and greed, it is essential for those who would stand up against that mass suggestion and make others see through the deadly illusion, themselves not merely to see through it but to reach through it, as a man wrapped in a slimy death fog, reaches out his arms and flings up the window.

Efficiency and Innocency the two Characteristics

Can the rationed life be defined more exactly? It aims at two things: efficiency and innocency. The first aim is to keep the individual from losing his flexibility, sensitiveness, adaptability, power of growth. Against the constant tendency to settle down, stiffen, "to be subdued by what it works in," to accept as absolute the current assumptions and partial prejudices, the human spirit has to practise a compensatory expansion, a constant keeping in training, an athleticism, an "asceticism." Asceticism, in the ordinary sense of mortification, is shunned by the third morality, as indeed it has been barred by most of those who have really understood

THE COURSE INDICATED

the human spirit and its laws of growth. It is not denial, but a wider acceptance that is aimed at, an expansion which casts off, as atrophied, confining husks, its old practices and passions. Atrophy, not amputation, is the process of a creature which is growing, not mortifying, and which focuses all its energy on fuller life, looking upon the lesser life (as indeed it must prove, if persisted in) as a slow suffocation.

So the rationed life is partly pursued in order that the individual may attain the maximum of growth with the minimum of effort—for few of us can grow as we would unless we give ourselves every available help. Reciprocally it also aims at innocency. The individual who concentrates on his extra-individual life encroaches less and less on the lives of others. He has more to give, and needs less and less to get a *quid pro quo*. He is essentially innocent, harming none, exacting from none, and able to give because he draws on an extra-individual generosity.

How then are efficiency and innocency attained? How can the individual find his path to this double freedom? As we have seen, nearly everyone finds himself involved in a threefold entanglement of body, personality, and society. As an animal, as a propertied individual, and as a social constituent, each one has a treble involvement from which to extricate himself. The mortificator would cut the knot. Chastity and fasting shall make the body a starved and broken slave. Poverty shall abolish property. Obedience shall relieve the citizen of the problems of responsibility, of co-ordinating his power of service with the other social powers. The extreme ascetic has often also gone further and broken all social connection, becoming an anchorite, so that the problems of social relationships should be as completely extirpated as the problem of sex and property.

THE THIRD MORALITY

The knot cannot be cut, but must be untied, because, in the third morality, as individualism is a phase to be surmounted, there can, clearly, be no private salvation. The individual cannot foresake society or call life evil. He grows by developing each power until it transcends its limits and what, contracted, would have been a private vice becomes, expanded, a public virtue.

We must then examine in turn the three levels on which individuality is present, threatens to make itself permanent, but must and can be made transitional, leading to a larger, correlating consciousness.

The Three Involvements to be solved by Growth :

(a) Physical Addiction

The first level is the physical. Appetite may become an addiction, an end in itself. Then, as the original creative energy, which informed it, volatilizes out of it (for creative energy can never be held, must always be allowed to pass through : "He that kisses a joy as it flies lives in eternity's sunrise"), the pointless repetition becomes a habit, no longer with any gusto or keen delight in it, but a process dictated by what is becoming an autonomous reflex. The pleasure grows less but the compulsion is irresistible, because the habit is so strongly confirmed by constant practice and the energy, thus drawn away, is lacking to resist the reflex. The vice is no longer interesting, but power of interest in any other compensatory activity is gone and the individual becomes a slave of an ever-narrowing function. There is no more any rapture in the convulsion than in a hiccup. This can be avoided if appetite is kept as a means and so prevented from becoming a fixation. To do this successfully, three things are necessary : mentally,

THE COURSE INDICATED

a point of view ; psychophysically, a breadth of alternatives ; and, psychically, exercise in strengthening the will and in the employment of full power of control.

One of the chief troubles about physical appetite to-day is that it is for all Mechanomorphists the ultimate reality, and as such Freud has recognized it. Honour and position, property and wealth, room and leisure, what are these but means to healthy animalism ? It is the ultimate reality, the one specie in which all the other currencies must be able to be quoted, and into which they must be able to be exchanged and converted.

In the state of civilization where a larger cosmology was recognized, where consciousness was assumed to be more than the body, appetite could not be so dangerous. The nearer a psychic activity is to the subconscious, the more it tends to be able to look after itself, provided the individual will live just healthily and follow on (or rather let himself be carried forward by) the natural flow of interest. Appetite then is not a severe problem in simpler communities. Life takes away the dish before we try to break our teeth on the bones. We cease to desire when we no longer lust.

It is one of the unsuspected tragedies of a falsely intellectualized society (such as the mechanomorphic) that lust becomes the only aim and purpose in the whole universe. Further, lust becomes the gauge that the individual is still not declining into the ultimate futility which awaits all and every creature and all life. Lust is life, the only real life. So the individual must repeat it and keep it going, not merely because it is the only real, raw pleasure, and all else shadow beside its reality, but also because its presence is the one sure guarantee of life—of death being still far away. Hence the passion for rejuvenation, not merely to recover

THE THIRD MORALITY

pleasure, to know one will go on being able to lust, but to be sure one is not, for an indefinite time, going to die.

There is also a deeper need appearing in an even more tragically degenerated form. Beside the need to know one is cheating death a little longer, there is also the sexual experience, the orgasm, in which, at least when he is young, the creature of appetite has had the only experience of ecstasy, of that loss of self, which, in an age which denies any reality to the higher experiences of consciousness, is otherwise unknown. The ecstasy of union through psychological means, through the fact that in its higher stages the individual consciousness blends with others, with all life, this ecstasy can, in a mechanomorphic age, only be obtained at the lower (at the pre-individual instead of at the post-individual) end.

Appetite, especially sexual appetite, needs then, direction. The hope that by leaving the reins on the horse's neck, by getting rid of all tabus and yielding freely to impulse, impulse would become eliminated is not true in a mechanomorphic society and may—as man has no specific instincts—be untrue of any human society. We may need always to use some conscious control of the body's routines, when they are no longer physiologically needed, if they are not to become habits, engrams, addictions. An intentional life must have a dietary throughout. The fact that our emotions are very flexible means that they easily become suited to any habit or lack of habit. We know that our sex begins by being diffused, or—to put it otherwise—sex is at the beginning part of a general psychophysical pleasure. It may well be that, as we now realize our individuality is the “hairpin bend” in our zigzag spiral ascent, so we shall see that, as sex begins in a state of diffusion and reaches a focus, so in fully healthy living, where the

THE COURSE INDICATED

individual realizes his evolution and his present phasal condition, sex will expand again, after having passed through its specific focus. Such seems to happen in successful parenthood where general tenderness takes the place of intense passion and cherishing is substituted for possessing. The Third Cosmology would show this third, re-diffused stage of sex not merely as an inevitable stage of completion but as an upper stage of growth. Instead of lust, develop tenderness: that is the general ruling of the third morality on the problem of sexual appetite.*

So much for purely physical desire. Yet sex can never be wholly equated with food. It has one aspect in which it is a normal animal appetite—but here, even, it is more a refreshment by release, like exercise or elimination, rather than nourishment. Nor, further, can its intense emotional tone be left out of any description of it. Left to itself, sex is highly selective: individuals seek a type satisfying to their idiosyncrasy. Here fresh possibilities and difficulties arise. Sex must be kept, far more carefully than hunger, from encroaching on the rights of others. Possessiveness appears here

* That tenderness is probably polar to lust and that lust can be most naturally balanced by tenderness has become increasingly evident. As Dr. Ian Suttie pointed out in his book, *The Origins of Love and Hatred*, there has been in the modern mechanistic world a "Tabu of Tenderness." Tenderness is considered soft, un-male, effeminate. Hence a natural needed emotional expression is denied, and the baulked emotion seeks that "detensioning" in lust which can only momentarily ease it and itself causes fresh irritation and tension. Further confirmation as to the place of tenderness in the proper balance of life, and the danger of exacerbating lust by excluding it, is given by the discoveries, (a) that masturbation is largely due to tenderness-starvation in childhood and the cure is immensely helped by giving the person's baulked tenderness opportunity for expression, (b) that epileptics, to whom the orgasm is highly dangerous, as it may precipitate a seizure, it has been found, when a seizure is becoming liable, can be "detensioned" by some strong appeal to the tender emotions, when, if tears are released, the danger of the oncoming seizure is avoided.

THE THIRD MORALITY

most acutely. The rationed mind will never permit itself any jealousy or envy, and, if it finds such emotions arising, it will remove the cause. Better no passion than passion's disgraceful by-product, jealousy. On the other hand, free love is only possible among truly free people, people who have won in themselves complete control over irrational and peremptory impulse, and so in their emotional relationships with others are always able to act intentionally, fully to observe on their side such contracts as may be agreed and to allow that the other party should never fail to be given benefit of doubt. Such requirements are exacting, but essential, and those who feel themselves not strong enough to observe them will not, in common sense, put themselves in positions where their weakness may prove disastrous. The small insurance-cost which an ordered and rationed life entails is, after all, a slight exaction beside the bankrupting charges made by uncontrolled desire.

Yet, again it must be repeated, this is not to advocate the life of mortification or denial. The conventional ascetic is a very dangerous person. The ordinary man fears that the person who is always declining is a timid creature who wants to be thought superior. In turn the decliner may come to refuse just for the sake of exercising his negative power and feeling superior, or for escape into the ease which is untroubled by desire—even the desire for others' happiness. If appetite is not looked on as a natural means and sequence in development, as part of the early stage whereby the psyche grows up through individuality to an even more enjoyable stage beyond, the individual who gives up for the sake of giving up may become really soured. Then he will take his revenge by spiritual pride and by the determination (conscious or unconscious) to deny to others rightly or

THE COURSE INDICATED

wrongly what he himself did not relinquish for something better. He will make himself a tragic failure and his cause detested: the last state of the man will be worse than the first. Better an addict who hates his failure, as nearly all do, than an arrogant who, as nearly all do, prides himself on his achievement.

If, however, the aim of ordering appetite is not for ordering's sake—not for a sense of power or display—but as a means to a fuller life, and with a humble, courteous, yes, and a humorous, admission that the more the asceticism, the more the recognition by the ascetic of his inherent and really rather ridiculous weakness, then the rationed life of the body is attained and the man is free to turn his attention to the control, wielding, and aiming of the next human expression: property and possessions.

(b) Social: Possessiveness

Possessiveness, we have seen, already appears in sexual relationships. It extends, however, much more widely. Man has a necessary capacity for saving, but this passion, if he conceives of himself as nothing but an individual, and happens to be of a timid and cautious nature, will become morbid and dominant. Animal appetite will be starved that provision may be made out of the present for the future. This state is, however, easily cured, once the individual realizes the phasic nature of his individuality. Possessiveness itself is the characteristic symptom of individualism, and so the passion for security and over-saving have naturally marked the culmination and crisis of the mechanomorphic age, in which individuality was taken to be the final and absolute term.

There are, however, forms of possessiveness which are are loftier and therefore more subtle and dangerous.

THE THIRD MORALITY

Even if the individual fails to realize that his individuality is a phase in a development in which he and his fellows will become united in a larger consciousness, he may not of necessity be driven to snatch material possessions and blindly accumulate. Economics alone may argue successfully, in these days, against an instinct which, ungeared, has become socially dangerous and which also fails to serve and protect the individual who feels it.

But economics has no proof with which to refute more dangerous forms of possessiveness. The individual argued out of his love of money-avarice, and forbidden it, may yet be uncured of the root passion. He will still suffer from a possessive wish to influence those particularly loved. Because he cannot realize that this individual experience is part of a vast development and that there are ahead of him stages of power and influence far above any help he can give to-day (yes, and far above the present capacity of those he would help, for they, too, have this vast growth-time in front of them) he acts precipitately, impatiently. He would coerce those over whom his love gives him power. It is the gentlest of violences and yet may do the authentic damage violence must always inflict. He is preventing the object of devotion from growing. He is compelling it to take from him and depend on him. Often this imposition is due to the individual's realization of his own imperfection. "I shall always be so imperfect, I am and I remain so wretchedly less than I would be (and must be, if I am to influence indirectly) that I dare not depend on my example telling—indeed I must correct the hopelessly inadequate impression which I give. Hence I must give precepts to supplement a sorry practice, and indeed, if anyone is in my power, I must use authority to save them from my mistakes." If, however, the

THE COURSE INDICATED

individual realizes that he and his charge both have a vast time of development before them, he will no longer be tempted to take the short-cut. He will realize that everyone must freely accept for himself, and not to please another, the way of advance.

This, however, may seem an almost inhuman patience. But, understanding how temporary and, indeed, how superficial individuality is, the new moralist may take heart. For he who lives for the larger individual life has already begun to transcend his individuality. He thinks too often that he is making no progress and that his superficial, still unresolved egotism spoils and betrays his every effort to serve and show forth the larger life. He can comfort himself by realizing that the last thing which will be melted will be that defensive crust of personality, for personality is most intransigent and rigid on the surface. Underneath, the change, the gradual softening and melting, is going on, and it will only be when the process is complete that the final and last layer of the rigid mask will fuse and his assimilation be complete.

Meanwhile the deeper levels are being made more fluid and, as it is in the deeper levels of the mind (we see through telepathy) that individuals have their profound and decisive contact, he who cares, if he cares only for the other's growth and not for the expansion of his own power, is all the while transmitting influence. Indeed the unconscious influence is probably the only direct influence. For to attempt to influence consciously is either to arouse opposition—opposition all the more efficacious, the more it is unconscious—or to reduce the patient to a stage of psychological parasitism. Until all individualism is transcended and fused, unconscious influence alone is safe and pure. The transmitter can

THE THIRD MORALITY

feel no pride or possessiveness in the exercise and success of this influence which goes out of (or rather through) him, because he does not know that virtue is being transmitted through him. And those who receive the transmission, they, too, can feel no resistance, as they would, and must, against conscious precept and against the dominance of another individuality. They can never feel the resentment of the patronized, the imposed upon, and so can receive without any loss or delay.

Indeed, the more we examine this problem of influence the more we discover the immense pervasive danger to which it is liable owing to possessiveness. From military influence and coercion, which "makes a desolation and calls it peace," to that possessive maternalism which will not let its child be "weaned" but would always decide for, shape, and inhibit on every occasion where creative choice can arise, it is clear that the better the end and motive, the more the mistaken means does such damage as to prevent the end being attained. Yet it is equally clear that as long as individualism is the only end which human consciousness can envisage for itself and others, so long no other behaviour is really possible. Here, in short, is one more vivid example that as we think ultimate realities to be, so we must behave, however noble we wish to be. Our cosmology dictates our ethic and causes our conduct. Only those who realize that individuality is a phase in the growth of consciousness can act so that others can grow. All others will always be taking the short cut of arresting, repressing, moulding life—whereupon life either dies (social stagnation) or revolts and breaks the mould (anarchy). Only those who have discovered the process of life can do other than damage it.

The man who is rationed has therefore few possessions,

THE COURSE INDICATED

and these he would at any moment hand to any other who might use them better ; they are simply the tools of his craft. Even in personal relationships he would guard against all possessiveness. In short, he aims so to live that anyone can take his place, and would so work that, becoming integrated in the general design, no one would notice when his particular personality drops out. This is, need it be said, no scorn of life or coldness of heart, but the vivid and continual awareness that, until individuality is transcended, love and life have not in reality begun. Until each can recognize in each their common transcendent life, affection and sympathy are still no more than rudiments.

(c) *Psychical : Pretension*

Addiction is the danger of appetite. It is a danger which nature itself often removes and which in most cases only causes grave trouble because the individual has, in a materialistic age, been taught that his body alone was real, this life his sole experience. So he tried to keep alive appetite, because it was the only reality and also because so long as it could be made to last he was not at an end, death was still far off.

Possessiveness is the danger of property, of equipment. Here, again, if the individual believes this individual life to be all, then possessions, instead of being treated as means whereby the individual makes himself serve the general good, become, and must become, ends. Yet common sense shows most men how little they can really hold. It is a passion for safety and security that makes us hoard. Even when a man believes there is no other reality save materiality, he will often be sufficiently vigorous and "sporting" to realize that possessions are little satisfaction : getting is quite another, and more

THE THIRD MORALITY

exciting, game than holding. The very foresight which makes accumulation possible also shows it to be ultimately vain. Materialism approves as emphatically as the extremist asceticism: "We brought nothing into this world and it is certain we can carry nothing out."

When passion is expressed, the mind may be cool. When a man has possessed himself of ample goods, reflection comes upon him. The third great danger is so great because it inflames the judgment itself and has no natural limit or satiety. That danger is Pretension: pride, the claim to be honoured, respected, recognized, praised, deferred to, valued not for beauty or wealth but for character. It is all the more dangerous because it comes last and cannot indeed really envelop the man and net him in his individuality unless first he has rid himself, or been rid, of the two lower involvements. The man who is caught by ambition, pride, and the will to power must nearly always surmount bodily addictions and ordinary possessiveness. He will not be able to dominate unless he is strong, and the man who is liable to be dominated by lust or love of goods is always liable to be beaten by the man who is superior to these lures. Most dictators are abstemious. Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin live lives of almost ascetic concentration. Ambition, like morphia, takes away the more innocently animal lusts. The will for power is insatiable, for it can have no limit. Appetite can be slaked; goods may glut; but ambition is always megalomania in the seed and, success watering that seed, it sprouts and spreads like a jungle. Ambition, as the mythos says, is the individual determined to become god, the means madly believing it can be the end. Therefore it is deadly and all profound morality diagnoses it as the supreme sin.

THE COURSE INDICATED

So against this the new ethics would guard more carefully than against craving or covetousness. "Power always corrupts; absolute power absolutely corrupts. All great men are bad." That is the verdict of an encyclopædic historian, Lord Acton. To prevent the first cell of the soul from becoming morbid the new ethicist would take care to have no personal arbitrary power, no individual authority. Courts of appeal have found that several judges, not one, must sit. Great wealth can be like a huge sledgehammer in one's hand—you try to touch gently with it, you cannot, it smashes at every touch. Great charm can be like the face of Moses—something which should be shrouded, for others will yield to its splendour, dazzled, and he who wields will soon wrest. It is true wisdom, confirmed by our present psychological knowledge, when Patanjali rules as a preliminary step to advance: "You must yield up power over anyone."

How, then, shall society advance? The answer is not difficult: In the way that it has always been trying to advance, by taking power out of individuals' hands and vesting it in law, in principle. The just judge is one who simply points out as an umpire and arbitrator, to two persons representing two sides of a case, how the general principle lies between them and how their respective rights may best be reconciled with it. That conception of principle, in which all individual rights are included, does away with the conception of power, of arbitrary authority. The subsidiary conception that no man may be judge in his own case shows how in all issues in which the modern moralist finds himself involved he will seek at once an impartial arbiter, so that he may himself have no power and so that the ruling of principle may come from an unbiased channel.

THE THIRD MORALITY

So much for the negative rules ; such are the things which the third morality will avoid because the third cosmology indicates that the individual is a phase. The fundamental principle whereby the growing spirit knows all those things which should be avoided is this : Whatsoever will keep the individual arrested in his individuality and incapable of growing into the enlarged life that lies ahead, that is deadly to life. Greed, fear, malice, ambition, defensive-offensiveness, and resentment, these are the self-regarding emotions, the natural and fatal way in which any being at the individual stage, if it cannot see beyond, is tempted to behave, to feel it must behave, and assume there is no other way of behaving. Recognizing these as cramping limitations which, if not unloosed, will tighten round the soul till it is strangled, the individual who has come to see what he is, and what he is to become, releases himself from these ties, as by massage and exercise a convalescent eases adhesions and finally frees the muscles until they have full play and he can stand upright, supple and lithe, able to go at what speed he wishes in whatever direction he chooses.

The first stage is over. Right insight has been followed by right attitude and this in due time cannot but be followed by right action.

CHAPTER IX

THE COURSE INDICATED

B.—THE ACTION

Now that the individual sees his path of life and growth, once he has trained himself to become creative, generous, undefending, understanding, self-forgetful and compassionate, with that principle of living before him, how will he apply it? He knows what to avoid, but that only leaves him free to be active and positive. His outlook, based as it is on a cosmology which has made its interpretation of experience—which established for him that life has meaning—this interpretation accepts life and the universe and therefore cannot be content with negations. It is dynamic, creative. It is not mortificatory or, as the ordinary man would say, ascetic. It is not in retreat but about to advance. It is not flight from the world, but an approach so positive, so initiative, so intimate, that beside this realism, this activism, the behaviour of materialists and men of action is a mere romantic play of fancy and daydream.

This is where the third morality branches away from and goes beyond the highest morality produced by the highest development of the anthropomorphic cosmology—for example, the idealism deduced by Jesus from paternal monotheism. The Sermon on the Mount is the greatest of all Songs before Sunrise. Men who so

THE THIRD MORALITY

sang were getting ready for a day in which what they sang about should be practised. Meanwhile, until the sun was actually up to show them how to start work, they were to hold themselves clear of the groping and clutching which is the natural activity of creatures without sight, children of darkness. So, as scholars have pointed out, the Sermon on the Mount is an Ethic of the *Meanwhile*, of the transition, a rule of conduct for the twilight. Until the sun shall be risen the children of light put away their blind activities and stand with their faces towards where the sun they are to serve will rise. They will drop the old habits and their eyes will become accustomed to the growing illumination. Finally, as they grow with the growing light, they will look, undazzled, at the full daylight. But, like the wise virgins, though they are all prepared to meet the bridegroom, they can do no more than prepare for action, be rid of entanglements. They "slumber" till the new order appears, as seeds sleep through the winter till the soil is warmed by the sun. A process is going on, but it is an internal, invisible process. The outbreak comes with the sunrise. They cannot act until he has come.

This view the third morality cannot hold. The intrusion of another order, the intervention by a paternal deity to put the universe right so that the gentle and the good may act according to their nature in this universe and now henceforward its nature will answer theirs—that cosmological picture, the highest point anthropomorphism can reach, the new cosmology must consider mistaken, false. "God" is not going to "intervene." That has, we know, failed to happen and that is why the Sermon on the Mount was abandoned by the Christian Church. God did not do as was

THE COURSE INDICATED

counted on.* That is why Bishops to-day still support military sanctions. Their dilemma is this: either God must intervene or man must do evil to save the good. The idea that the spirit works in man by its spiritual power, if he will let it, is an idea almost inapprehensible by anthropomorphists.

But with the new cosmology we can go further. We are able not merely to recognize frankly that an external God does not intervene; we can see why that could not happen. This picture of a material universe (more careful study showed it to be a mechanical universe) shaped, controlled and interfered with by spiritual powers (more sensitive feeling united these in one supreme Father God), that picture is a mistake. Morally it is as inadequate as it is intellectually awkward. For, we must again recall what anthropomorphic monotheism has always burked, this one God must now accept responsibility for all evil.

The Third Cosmology sees Man as Vice-Creator

The third cosmology shows us that this picture of a God separate from the universe was due to a "projection" of a splintered part of our consciousness. Our consciousness had become fissured into two insulated areas. Hence that part of which we had become exclusively aware we assumed to be the only sort of consciousness—a self-consciousness completely separate from the universe, from the body, from matter. Man then assumed that, if the universe had a God, He must

* If, however, as is suggested in *The Source of Civilization*, Christianity, as we know it, is only one side, the outward side, the aim, not the means of a psycho-social discovery and it had its activating complement in Gnosis, in a psychophysical method whereby the spirit becomes capable of living up to the Sermon on the Mount, then Christianity need not have failed but could have initiated the new order and the new life which lies before us to-day.

THE THIRD MORALITY

be as separate and as interfering as our self-conscious intelligence is in relation to our bodies and to the world outside them. It is this false division which our knowledge of the subconscious mind has broken down, first in the understanding of our bodies and now also in the understanding of our universe. We have seen (Chapter VI) how study of the body-mind has shown not only how much more involved are we in the universe than common sense or early science, Anthropomorphism or Mechanomorphism, thought possible, but how that universe of apparently hard, inescapable fact has been constructed, by the creature who imagines he is its victim and plaything, out of a something—radiant energy—to which, in its raw, unworked-up state (its condition of “complete objectivity”) probably none of his senses would respond. Aeons of striving wish have succeeded in denaturing a grain of the pure nature until from that fragment has been made a “construct,” with which the desire, which so worked on it and worked it up, can get satisfaction for a moment for that desire. For the reason for this narrow selection, which has been made out of the gigantic width of radiation, is to be found, we must repeat, in the desires which have acted as the selectors—greed and fear.

These desires when carried on into the life of an utterly individualized, self-conscious human being (an impossible state for an animal) must lead to disaster. Such a passion-limited apprehension, unbalanced by the appropriate animal instinctive limitations to pugnacity and vindictiveness, destroys itself. It can, however, be corrected (but only so) by man becoming aware of what has befallen him: that by becoming self-conscious he has been swung out too far from the balanced mean of life; and, if he will have self-conscious knowledge of

THE COURSE INDICATED

the outer world, untrammelled by instinct, he must also have equal self-conscious knowledge of himself. Then he begins to realize that the picture of a nightmare world, which seems to leave him no choice but to destroy his fellows or be destroyed, is no more than a projection of his own unbalanced nature, his individualism. That world of brutal fact will modify itself, *pari passu*, as he modifies his nature, his unconscious selection of the facts.

It is not easy for man so to change himself. As we have seen, it is one of the most tragic facts about ourselves that we have always imagined that it was easy, but of no great profit, to change one's own nature, and hard, but immensely valuable, to change outer nature. Detailed examination of the problem is now showing us the reverse to be the truth. Our construction of fact (what we call the outer universe) and ourselves we see are tied together in an intense interlock. We can change the world we see, but only in proportion as we have the self-control and courage to let go of the present current construction. For it is not possible, without mental disaster, for anyone to see with equal clearness two mutually exclusive worlds at once. There can never be for a living creature more than one full reality at one time.

We must remember how much even the best of us cling to the present picture of things. This world made by greed and fear suits most people so well that to suggest that it is brutal and in the end will prove disastrous is to awake even more fear and resentment. They will endure agonies rather than leave it. However much they complain, in all who are still ruled by fear and greed there is no real wish for any other sort of world. They complain partly because they want more, partly because they feel that it is a kind of insurance against

THE THIRD MORALITY

being too happy. Dr. Johnson's harsh remark is true of nearly all of us: "Sir, clear your mind of cant, the state of the country never put a man off his victuals" (far less, he would have added with equal truth, the state of the universe). The third cosmology, however, realizes that man is beginning to be able to become faintly aware of a larger universe than up to this time he conceived possible, and that this enlargement is due to the fact that the constrictive grip of fear and greed is ceasing to throttle down exclusively his power of apprehension.

The third ethic can therefore have one aim and one only: to set men free of fear and greed. And, because of the reciprocity of ethics and cosmology, vision and action, the consequence of living up to this ethic can be nothing less than the emergence into our sight of an objective world in which greed and fear are steadily diminishing elements.

This is the fundamental discovery of the third cosmology and its fundamental difference from the only other two cosmologies which have preceded it. Here is a cosmological-ethical revolution: man makes the universe; he has made its nightmare, arbitrary quality (of polytheism), its inaccessible righteousness (of monotheism), its blind, inhuman necessitarianism (of mechanism). Each of these cosmologies have been a part picture of an aspect of his nature. He has only been able to see in outer nature what confirms and answers to his inner nature. The invisible replies and materializes in the form in which it is summoned and imagined. But man can only remake the present crumbling picture of the universe into one which will not be a pure chaos but an answer to his higher emergent, super-individual nature, if he will behave continually in such a super-

THE COURSE INDICATED

individual way. The growth of the cosmology waits on the growth in the ethic ; enlarging insight depends on the expansion due to exercise ; vision on action, on acting up to the limit of what has been glimpsed.

Therefore man does not and cannot wait on an external God so that that God may remake the universe in order that, when this has been safely accomplished, man may get on with his noble behaviour, his idealistic activity, his saintly conduct. Man is more than God's viceroy. He is the creative power's vice-creator, for he may make any universe up to the standard of which he is prepared to live. Absolute freedom from the individual self approaches absolute creative power. For as man dares act (this is the fact of creative faith), his apprehension-construction grows and he sees not subjectively but objectively a new reality. For he brings into being that which he has so dared to desire. His desire (equal to the creative desire of animal need which created out of energy-radiation another world of common sense and appetite) creates out of that same energy-radiation another world, a nobler world, but a world as firm as the world of common sense, because constructed and cemented by a desire as strong. The one fundamental objective fact is that the energy-radiation will sustain and substantiate any construction creative desire calls upon it to support and fulfil.

The Kingdom of God is not imminent but immanent ; it is not "among you," about suddenly to break like a thunderstorm, but "within you," ready to be expressed the moment you understand your latent, common nature and how you must and can transcend your individuality, your egotism which makes the world the obstacle it proves to-day to be to you.

THE THIRD MORALITY

The morality derived from the highest anthropomorphism—paternal monotheism—became, we see, “an interim ethic”—a “strike” morality, if you will—and then, when no intervention on the strikers’ behalf came from “the Supreme Government of the Universe,” only two ways were open. Either you must retreat or you must take arms yourself. Retreat leads first to Providentialism and then to Eremitism—first to the refusal to accept any responsibility, any initiative, and next to the refusal to accept life at all, and the individual flees the world and would seek suicide, if that were not too positive an action.

On the other hand, the only apparent alternative advance has seemed to necessitate taking full responsibility, not merely for means but for ends. I may use any method; and any gain which seems good to me is good. If I win without outside help, I must make the law, for I have no proof there is any outer law except my victorious will. Mechanomorphism then naturally arises. This leads rapidly to two further degenerative changes: all means are legitimate, for God is not going to help, and, next, all ends must be abandoned save human, material satisfaction. For a personal God, who is not going to intervene (it is impossible in the end to disguise), has left no proof that he exists and certainly no evidence as to what aims or means he approves.

Now, however, with the third cosmology, ethics come back again. There is a discernable nature in the universe. It aims at a universal consciousness, a state of complete awareness and sympathy. This state is attained by individuals becoming aware of their kinship with each other and all life, and through their realizing that their individuality is transitional. They extricate themselves from their individuality by a double reci-

THE COURSE INDICATED

procal process : mentally it works by such exercises as make them aware of their common life which they already share, through the subconscious—the exercises of recollection, contemplation ; on the active, ergetical side it works by actions of goodwill, by constant gentleness and truthfulness, generosity, compassion and understanding in all human and living relationships. So individuals come to realize their kinship with their fellows, and these in their turn realize that, so dealt with, they too behave extra-individualistically. Every event is a creative opportunity ; every contact an insight, a revelation.

This ethical position is therefore one which, while pacific (for violence must always defeat the aim of this ethic, which is to get another to recognize he is one with you and you with him), is not passive or negative, but dynamic and creative.

In short the dedicated life, the life which has discovered what its aim and destiny is, this individual life has a right, has a moral obligation of the highest sort—to act as life's vice-gerent. Below are, as its wards and charges, the less conscious creatures. Above are, presumably, powers as ultimately controlling and overruling as are the powers of the human mind paramount over the animals. But these higher powers will no more crudely, obviously, irruptedly intervene than a naturalist will intervene with his creatures. Indeed we may say that the higher, more intelligent a power, the less is its interference evident to the lower intelligences it oversees. So to say there is no interference or intrusion is, of course, not to say that arrangements cannot be so planned (obviously nothing could be either easier or more effective to high intelligence which can foresee) so that he who would act with the higher power may find his path ready for him and discover that his obstacles are,

THE THIRD MORALITY

in the accurate sense of the word, "trials," tests, exact adjustment of conditions so as to bring out of him the utmost creativeness both of character and intellect. Against such planning and foresight how clumsy and inadequate looks the notion of miracle, of a sudden intrusion of an anthropomorphic power, of a super-human hand to snatch a poor creature from under the machine's wheels. If creative power has so balanced the animal's mind with the animal's powers—the less it is capable of creative response, the more it is guarded from apprehension and terrifying reflection—shall it not also have given increasing creative opportunity and power of creative response wherever it exposes higher intelligence to apprehension and reflection? Yes, we have little faith, little generous trust.

The Third Morality neither Machiavellian nor Providentialist

Once we thus understand the general nature and our own nature and their relationship we make the double discovery that we are deputy creators, and also, because we are such deputies, we can, if we are to fulfil the creative pattern, only use those means which the creative nature employs.

The transitional individual of the Third Morality is, then, incapable of being a Machiavelli, but at the same time he is as far from being a Providentialist. Not only does he "accept the universe," he accepts his responsibility to mould it. The Providentialist, waiting for an external deity to help him, abstains. (The mechanomorphic ethicist, of course, soon ceases to be an ethicist at all. When things go well, he congratulates himself; when so ill that he has to realize he is incapable of shaping the world to his wishes, he rails at its "blind cruelty.")

THE COURSE INDICATED

The Providentialist naturally cannot abstain from everything. He therefore abstains from whatever is new and un-customary.

This should not be treated as ridiculous, though inconsistent. All peoples do it. Only those who realize that the creative power is in themselves, and how it makes them able to act creatively and restoratively, dare accept full responsibility. All others can only see part of the truth—that new powers given to a divided nature can only make that nature of theirs more destructive. Consider War: War is, when it becomes self-conscious and ceases to be only part of a degenerated social ritual, the unlimited use of violence to impress one will on another which resists it. Yet every time a new weapon to make it more efficient—not necessarily more cruel—is invented, soldiers are the first to call such a weapon inhuman and outrageous and to threaten all who use it with still more violence if they do not abstain.* Of course this talk of cruel weapons is a childish escape from reality. No weapon is or can be cruel. Man, the individual self, alone is capable of this horror of perverted consciousness.

But consistent, moralist Providentialism naturally does not stop at forbidding new weapons. It forbids all independent novelties. The Ebionites, the early Christian Jews, would not cut their beards because God had evidently meant them to grow. Their cosmological deduction was simple. God had made the universe, why and how and for what, no one could clearly say, and he was in constant active control of it. Hence you

* Bayard, the model soldier, flower of chivalry, was so horrified at the new weapon, the arquebus, that he forbade its use and threatened the penalty (and inflicted it) of putting out the eyes of anyone who was captured using it. *cf.* also the first reaction against gas in England, 1915, until the authorities announced they were ready to use it.

THE THIRD MORALITY

could deduce no clear principle of action and behaviour, except not to intervene with anything, and you were justified because God would manage for you.

Now that we realize what the process of the universe is—the expansion of individualized consciousness into union—we see both at what we are aiming and also what means we may use to attain the end, and what means are debarred because they would defeat the end. That end is the complete evolution of consciousness through unity. We can also see why the mind of the universe should expect such action from us and not directly intervene. The Third Morality is not afraid of suffering or of others suffering. What it does fear is a profound misapprehension of life's purpose and how to attain it.

The way of action may now be made clearer at this point by giving some actual examples. The providentialist code—the highest morality of the anthropomorphic ethic—forbids war. We see why the Third Morality agrees with that. The individual I attack is made more individualized, and my individuality, by my having to attack him, is inflamed. Here is something more than a vicious circle: it is a deadly spiral of descent. What is it that first makes him revolt and threaten violence, if the order I approve is not altered? Fear arising from craving. He has wants and he fears they will not be satisfied. To cure this condition I therefore threaten him with greater violence than he can summon, for if I threaten him with less, he will beat me. His reply is to increase his counter-threat. So he can always outbid me, because I shall hesitate to use the extremes of violence for the reason that I am less frightened than he; also, because I am more comfortable and have more to lose in destruction, I am by so much less willing to go to extremes. But my

THE COURSE INDICATED

threat to take overwhelming action, if he dare attack the *status quo* must inflame his fear, and so we push each other down into the pit. Our fear, in short, makes us provoke just that condition which we are striving to prevent. The only cure is to cure the disease in the victim. That this is the only way has been proved with the unhinged, and it is not less true of those who are only in a state of temporary paranoia and hysteria or merely suffering from mob-excitement.

I may, then, only use such force as is used on a lunatic to restrain him without physical damage. It has been found with lunatics that it is better to hold the door than to lock it when they are in frenzy, and not to use the strait-jacket, for they can understand when there is human pity and not mere mechanic force in their restraint. The park ranger who has care of animals will get out of their way when they are nervous and suspicious instead of defying them, and so also will the anthropologist with his subjects of study. The task of these guardians is not to defend their prestige but to preserve their charges, and they know how quickly excitement dies down if it is not opposed. Here the higher gives ground to the lower and certainly loses no real dignity by retreat. This is the action of the new morality in all social and international relationships.

Euthanasia Approved

But the new morality does not have a superstitious tabu about shedding blood. There may be reason against this, but it is far from being as evident as is the case against that unlimited violence and cunning called war. (But see p. 231.) It is the mass killing of those who are either only acting under orders or doing what they honestly believe to be right, or even only living

THE THIRD MORALITY

on the other side of a frontier—it is this insane attempt to make a precise good, an exact, just settlement come by doing indiscriminate evil that the Third Morality unequivocally condemns.

Meanwhile there are the problems of disease and population pressure. We must remember that the traditional anthropomorphic morality has always attempted to forbid any interference with suffering, and that when Simpson discovered chloroform the clergy (naturally, because they were conventional providentialists) denounced its use. The incurably diseased should not, out of moral prejudice, be compelled to drag out to the last moment their physical existence. They have other experiences awaiting them. Their power of creative activity in this one has become almost completely restricted. They have to involve the energy of other healthy, active, and trained persons in their irremediable decline. Disease is not part of the plan of life ; as far as we can see at present it is a degenerative process which must be actively opposed. Therefore euthanasia seems indicated. We are all tied together in one common life, and, if it is lawful and wise for me to amputate a mortified finger, it is lawful for our common community life, if the constituent member is able to assent (if he is not able to assent, then on his behalf), to release any who cannot recover.

It is true that a high type may manage to develop, out of the most restricted and distracting conditions of body and nerve, peculiarly beautiful patterns of behaviour. At present, however, our experience of capacity to shift consciousness, dilate the focus of awareness and change the aperture of apprehension, seems to show that this real and essential exercise depends largely on physical health and is a form of psychological activity

THE COURSE INDICATED

so high and exacting that the ordinary person can no more attempt it—at least in its early stages—than he could attempt to concentrate on a problem of higher mathematics during a sharp attack of toothache or with a pavior's drill working at his elbow.

Indeed there is some evidence to show that if anyone really learns to alter the aperture of awareness, though the conditions of body and mind which drove them to this effort may have been "morbid," on attaining this further awareness his body shares in the mind's release and an energy and health never enjoyed before becomes his. (*Vide* lives of the Catherines of Sienna and Genoa and of many other mystics whose later life was one of great organizing activity).

Control of Birth

Euthanasia (being the larger application of the same principle) of course also involves contraception. If life may be released, it may also be restrained. In one case an individual is being extricated from what looks like, and may be, an accident. We must remember that the Third Morality is, until the third cosmology is complete, empirical. Providentialism says there are no accidents. The new morality must allow there may be, though it would add that they are all of them probably not final, but, rather, problems set for us to solve to the best of our knowledge, not to leave unsolved. Every happening that presents a problem is an opportunity for a solution which will express, and is meant to draw out, our full degree of creative capacity.

Next, though it lies between euthanasia and contraception, we must face the problem of abortion. In each of these three cases the provisional principle by which we have to shape our action is that what matters and

THE THIRD MORALITY

what is at issue is an individual, conscious development and that development must be and can only be in regard to and through relations with other individuals. The individual is to develop to a larger state of consciousness through his vivid regard for the common life which is in his fellow individuals. Abortion is therefore advisable on the same grounds, and with the same justifying objective, as is contraception.

Suicide

We are free, then, to act as seems best for the community in abortion and contraception. All life must be intentional and we must only bring in those lives which we want quantitatively and, as far as our eugenic knowledge goes, qualitatively. As to leaving this life—the complementary aspect of the same problem—suicide should never be attempted but on the considered advice of other moralists and probably is never permissible except when physical breakdown has made the adequate reaction of the individual consciousness to its problem no longer possible. To know objectively whether that point has been reached the opinion of others acquainted with the facts must be sought, and so, too, in abortion and conception, as well as contraception. As we grow in power over our minds we may learn how to prevent rather than to have to amputate in order to cure. Accident is generally due to lack of foresight, and foresight can be so much further developed that prevention may come to forestall any necessity for cure. Till then we must act up to present knowledge.

The Slaughter of Animals

Animals again raise a population problem. Most people are agreed that they may be killed when they no longer can live well. Further, their power of breeding

THE COURSE INDICATED

necessitates that we must somehow restrain their increase. Until we can sterilize them, quick killing seems our only way. (See Gandhi, *The Times* report, May 30, 1935.)*

We must, however, realize that this is a harsh, unsatisfactory method. As far as we know they are not individuals as we are, nor with our intensity and continuity of consciousness; but a common life flows in them and can respond to our sympathy. Whithersoever this life is going (whether it is dying away, as many evolutionists say, and all animals save man are already "atavistic," living fossils, or following a devious, divergent line of ascent, as mystics think they have proof), we do know that our own expanding consciousness may be expanded or contracted, may glow or dim, according as we behave either gently or brutally to these second-magnitude stars in the firmament of life. We respond to their "field," as they respond to ours, because no life is cut off from any of its fellows. Better, then, to anæsthetize animals which breed too fast for our present control than to butcher them. In short, the limit of our kinship with and power over animals is not at present known. Külver, in his studies on the intelligence of animals (Chicago University Press), has proved how unsuspectingly sensitive they are to our presence. Gorer (*Africa Dances*) has shown how Totemism may give rise to an interrelation between man and beast for which mechanomorphic society has no parallel.

Though, then, we have in moments of crisis to answer animal suspicion and attack with counter-violence, we

* See also report published by Ministry of Agriculture from N.S.W. study of rabbit control by cyanide gas. It is also highly significant of the present growth in sensibility that in these reports on extermination of vermin by gas, those putting forward the cyanogen method said they would not have done so, had not this gas been not only more merciful than the steel trap but also itself a painless gas. Soldiers planning the next war with gas, of your charity, note.

THE THIRD MORALITY

are right in feeling such a reply a mistake. We have to act hurriedly to remedy mistakes, often our own. Dr. Schweitzer has ruled that the only basis for a philosophy of creative living is "Reverence for all Life," and he has said that he can feel a real regret for the deadly trypanosome germ when he kills it. Our attitude must be: No violence to any life so long as that life can be dealt with in any other way. We have yet to find any approach save sterilization to the deadly germs. Towards the animal we are already aware of other means and bridges; even snakes respond to music, and birds and mammals to those non-violent methods which are possessed to-day as an art by many naturalists but which with our new outlook may soon be reduced to a science.* The large carnivores can be tamed, Humphreys has shown, by those who are free of anger and fear. All life, then, we may aim at handling by the method of that initiative of goodwill which springs from selfless, fearless interest. Only these forms of life with which we cannot by any effort make this contact may be dealt with by destruction.

Animal Pleasure

The whole principle and aim of this new morality is the intentional life, and that is directed to the liberation of all individuals from their individuality, so that they may be united in the common life. This principle also supplies the answer to the small problem left over from

* Discoveries of this kind, as also the approach of interest-affection used by anthropologists successfully with savages, by psychiatrists with the unhinged, with criminals by the new penology, with deficient and violent children by the new child psychology, all throw light on the acute problem of war. This new technique of the Third Morality we are already using on all intractable cases with a completely new success. We must now make it an ethic, a general conduct towards all our fellows.

THE COURSE INDICATED

contraception—sexual intercourse without intention of conception. Sexual activity, as we have seen under the section on addiction, may become a distracting habit, an end and not a means, because life as a whole has not been found by the addict to have any end other than physical satisfaction. With the discovery that life has an end and purpose—*any* end or purpose, organized curiosity, playing a game, acquiring property, achieving fame—sex can often become secondary in the lives of men who are still only individualists. To exchange avarice or ambition for lust, however, is not necessarily the way of deliverance into the extra-individual life. Lust fails and disgraces immediately, and so by a quick smash and fall the spirit may recover more quickly than it may if it must extricate itself from subtler ties and more honoured evils. But the fact that any end can draw off the sexual energy, when nature dictates it should grow less, gives hope that sexual addiction will be mainly cured by reorientation of interest. Man, now able to know he has a full, indefinite life of transformation ahead of him will lose interest in that particular sex obsession, an obsession with the physical, which, as we have seen, is exacerbated by the belief that this physical life is all, and that to remain “potent” is to be assured that death and the end are not yet here.

Nevertheless, sex is an immensely powerful belt of interest, and if, as seems increasingly probable, specific sex is only the most violent and crudely cathartic discharge-form of basic, generalized energy and vitality, then there is the dangerous tendency for all the upper discharge-forms to become starved, as this lower form commandeers quotas of energy which, as the body-mind grows up, should be transferred for these loftier uses. A fountain can only throw rainbow patterns provided

THE THIRD MORALITY

the water is discharged under pressure on to a lofty trajectory. Let the supply-pipe be tapped at a lower level and there is only a swamping seepage.* We must recall that our present knowledge of sex shows this energy growing, as the individual's life grows, to a focus. It contracts from a general, physical diffusion, and, psychologically, we find a lyric state concentrating in an intensity of highly selective passion. From the materialist point of view that crisis seemed the end. Now, however, that we see that all consciousness, all life, is a vast spiral from diffusion to focus and thence again to diffusion, so, too, it must be with physical life's specific manifestation, sex. Both mechanomorphists and anthropomorphists have fallen into the teleological mistake (inevitable with their narrow cosmologies) of imagining that they knew (and were agreed) as to what was the purpose and meaning of sex. It was "nothing but" the physical reproductive urge. "Nothing but" is never true, and life provides for several purposes (as we know from physiology) through one channel, and every organ seems, in evolution, to have had an earlier, other function. Sex is for reproduction and its focus, or second stage, is mainly (though not even then exclusively) concerned with reproduction. In its primary and tertiary stages it is far less concerned with reproduction. In its primary stage it is an emotional enlargement whereby the individual may realize his power of, and need of, and delight in, complete self-forgetfulness and devotion.

It is also diffused, in other meanings of that word. The most savage of our tabus is based on an imperfectly informed rationalism—the belief that sex

* *c.f.* Unwin's work on sex restraint correlated with height of civilization. *Sex and Culture*, Dr. J. D. Unwin (Oxford University Press).

THE COURSE INDICATED

only exists for reproduction and all other sexual or highly emotional and devoted behaviour, *i.e.*, all physical tenderness, save between reproductively related individuals, is wicked. That has made our anthropomorphic and mechanomorphic ethics look upon homosexuality as "unnatural" and grotesquely despicable. Homosexuality is as natural in the primary, diffused stage of sex as heterosexuality. There is in all human beings a profound and profoundly natural need to transcend their individuality. They wish for a mutual pledge and assurance of tenderness and compassion. To tame an animal you must not shrink from it but caress it. The third ethic, though it believe firmly that man is more than his present body, would never imagine that at this stage he can be considered apart from his body or that he could develop, in anything but a deformed way, without developing through his body.

Tenderness Essential

Physical tenderness is essential as a training in, and assurance of, spiritual tenderness, and the shrinking of the stoic and the ascetic (again in the vulgar tongue's use of that term) from physical tenderness—often to lavish on an animal that tenderness which will not be baffled—is a sign of a scarred and mutilated nature.* This condition, from which most of us have suffered in greater or less degree, may and should be pitied and commiserated. That people should pride themselves upon it—as many do—would be laughable, were it not, on deeper insight, seen to be tragic.

As we have seen, the mistake made about tenderness

* It is worth noting that the modern vernacular rendering of the Stoic, "The more I am among men, the more I return less of a man" is "The more I see of men, the more I like dogs."

THE THIRD MORALITY

by mortificators and then by their degenerate successors, the respectable, has led us to discard this emotion, the expression of which, it now seems clear, is precisely that which gives the control and balance to lust. There will probably be no trouble with lust if tenderness is allowed its natural full play. The need for animal happiness will provide its own "governor" if it is seen that its love of fun is balanced by its sense of pathos. So control is provided in the only sane and effective way, not by inhibition when a desire has arisen, but by feeding in the blended feelings which give rise to a creative desire. We are thus brought back in this question to the conclusion arrived at, provisionally, earlier (p. 195)—the practised rule of the Third Morality about sex expression must run: always and only with tenderness.

To call sexual intercourse a sacrament is true, but in our religious tradition the present, temporary, rigid association of sacrament and solemnity has made the idea of happiness and play, two factors in natural sex, seem incongruous in a supreme act of devotion. Hence, though in the deepest sense of the word all sexual experience can be and should be religious—the "rebinding" of the individual into the living body of life—it cannot always have that sense of awe which to-day has become (again owing to individualism)* the dominating and almost exclusive religious attitude. Sex is the possibility of a real communion with life. In that experience each touches something profounder than his lover. The loved is kissed but the lover embraces and is embraced by the underlying life of both and all. This embrace may, however, numb the conscious being unless he carries his awareness of it into his consciousness as direct sense of kindness, of his profound commonness with his fellow,

* *cf.* Karl Barth's theologically popular doctrine of "God the Wholly Other."

THE COURSE INDICATED

a communism which no race, class, or material distinction can sunder.

Sex, then, exists for many purposes : for reproduction, but also for as definite and essential aims—lyric love, tenderness, and the keeping of soul and body together in a co-ordinated development and advance. Such a force, therefore, cannot be confined to one end and we should not think of its having an end in an ever narrower, more specific, less varied discharge. It converges to that focus, but it, too, must follow the spiral of life. When the whole process of life was felt to be an inevitable descent, then it was clear that sex could only be conceived as a force which began by being diffused and afterwards narrowed until it vanished away. Now, however, as we realize that life is a spiral ascent, so we can see sex must have its three stages—first diffused, then focused, and then once more again dilated. The vital energy, which, at a certain and specialized stage, is specifically, if not exclusively, reproductive in aim and sexual in expression, becomes again unspecialized. What for a moment has been emotionally concentrated, so that the experient is “in love” with one person and that love-feeling culminates in physical ecstasy, now once again recovers its physical and its psychical generality. Intense tenderness can again be felt for many—not exclusively for the one—and physical feeling, which had been confined for the short period of the focus (or the acute turn of spiral) to specific sex-feeling and a single object, again resumes its wide commonalty. Here springs that staunchless compassion for all life, which the mystic has always realized was his direct intuition of his eternal unity with all being.

It is not necessary, then, to explain away mystic ecstasy, the delight of the artist, the physical tenderness of child

THE THIRD MORALITY

and parent and of friends as nothing but baffled sex. The ecstasy of love which not yet or no longer discharges its energy in orgasm is as true a part of the emotional life, as authentic in its own right and sphere, as the reproductive act. Neither is to be decategorized, explained away in terms of the other. It is as false a use of reason so to argue as it is a false rationalization to say, of the sex act itself, that the only real part is the orgasm and the preliminary joy of courtship and the epilogue of rest and comfort are mistaken, superstitious and morbid feelings.

The third morality, therefore, sees life as a continuous whole of development, an unbroken sweep of living, like the curve of the swallow's flight, which in one unchecked movement passes down through the air, skims the water, and passes up again.

This, briefly, seems the manner in which the new morality, in the light of its new knowledge of life's process and aim, regards and develops sex. Because it understands that life is a continuous development of consciousness, the new morality goes through the period of specific sex without adhesion. It therefore expects serene ecstasy and a growing unbounded tenderness to follow on and resolve the exclusive intensities of the reproductive phase. It neither despises that phase nor seeks to condemn and dismiss the succeeding phase as merely a sad, distorted and ever fainter reflection of that blazing focus.

As the child has diffused psychophysical feeling and must be ready for this to concentrate into specific sexual feeling directed to one person, or very few persons, of its own age, so, in turn, the individual, after puberty has been experienced and has begun to lose its intensity, must be prepared for, and, if enlightened, will welcome,

THE COURSE INDICATED

the re-extension, rediffusion of the intensity, the recovery of general tenderness and psychophysical sympathy.

There is another reason why tenderness is to be fostered as essential to psychophysical health. If, as seems certain, "Man is the foetalization of the ape" and whereas his embryonic stage recapitulates the race history, his child stage forecasts his future development, and also (as there seems to be proof) the more advanced the society, the later its people attain puberty, then the first, the adolescent homosexual phase of sex will play an increasingly important role in the life of the people of the future. This, again, will present no problem and lead to no danger, provided the expression of tenderness is not suppressed, for, as has been pointed out by Gorer, arrested, baffled and conflict-producing homosexuality (homosexuality made blind by being driven to attempt to be the second phase of the sex-cycle instead of the first) only appears in those societies where tenderness has been called effeminate, in all save woman, contemptible, and she for that reason considered weak.

All Findings are Provisional

Such, then, in briefest outline, seem the aims, the pattern of behaviour which the Third Cosmology indicates. The particulars of the pattern must be provisional and the deductions given above are put more as examples of possible applications than as advices. The Third Cosmology is not yet itself sufficiently defined for us to be able to say that, as we know its principles in every detail, we can draw from each of these specific cosmological observations its appropriate, particular, indicated action. We have, however, enough to go on, enough to give us a definite procedure which will result

THE THIRD MORALITY

in a life which can be in every day and action constantly, co-ordinatedly purposive, directed to an aim large enough to embrace our entire lives. This is sufficient to permit us to know that if we advance to this range of discovered knowledge, on its crest we shall see the further country we shall enter.

Action is for more Knowledge

We must realize that our knowledge is still provisional and incomplete not merely because we have yet to construct from the findings already to hand a complete third cosmology; we must also be prepared to find more data. It is only with a certain stubbornness that we yield to the thought that our apprehensions must be greatly limited by our poor power of observation and that our power of observation expands and will expand as we give ourselves more time and a better will to attend. We have, with constant reiteration, to remind ourselves that the world of hard fact, which we complain about when it pinches, and accept with a smug sense of being realists when it pinches someone else, is after all found out, discovered, and proved to be enormously our own selective construction—a construction which, because it is so largely animal, is both instinctive (and therefore so hard to question) and also often, increasingly often, painfully inadequate for our present stature. We can make another nobler, more widely and truthfully selective construction, if we will. But so to wish means holding greed and fear, the master magnets of the “common sense” world-picture, out of play and bringing in, instead, the full play of that alert passivity, that detachedly intense interest, which up to the present only the mystic and the artist have been able to achieve.

Still, at the best, the fuller reality we apprehend can

THE COURSE INDICATED

only dawn gradually on us. It cannot be utter reality, but only a wider construction, a more exact approximation to truth. Practice and observation are two aspects of a single reciprocal process. At present, and for a long while, we must shuffle along between our two restrictions from those two sides, like a hobbled donkey. We cannot but expect our present deductions to be provisional, and so we shall guard against the tragic mistakes of the first and second cosmologies, of Mechano-morphism as much as Anthropomorphism, their naive conviction that they were final and had described the universe as it actually is and must ever be and that all who differed from them were a peril to right living and right thinking.

We may have to restore inhibitions which to-day it seems wise to raise, and raise others which it now seems wise to observe. For example, the killing of animals for food (see p. 217) ; greater knowledge of the life process may show that it is a mistake to interrupt these lives for no other purpose than to add to our diet a heavy, and perhaps now unneeded, charge of protein. We may learn that they are serving some purpose that only a need far more peremptory than that for flesh-food would excuse our interrupting. With higher sympathy on our part, new capacities and uses may spring in them ; while on our side we may discover that Yogic thought may be psychophysically accurate, and that a flesh diet makes concentration and contemplation, the power of intense detached thought and sensitive insight, on which our mental and physical advance may depend, far more difficult, if not impossible. We may find that becoming aware of and attending to other octaves of radiations beside those out of which we compose the world of average, sensual common-sense is only possible if we modify the intensity with which our animal natures present to

THE THIRD MORALITY

us their narrow and partial picture of reality. The world we see and hear and take for reality, physics shows us is only a distorted scrap of all the untouched, unnoticed "continuum" which pelts and surges about us. Our method (and limit) of selection has been, biology indicates, ruled by two intense but limited emotions, fear and greed. To attend to any forces which these animal master-passions have neglected it may be we must first check their harsh emphasis. Who can recollect a delicate melody in the brazen tempest of a military march or even see through a window into a room so long as the glare of the common day beats on the glass ?*

On the other hand, we may find that some or many of the sex inhibitions may be unnecessary or unwise.† We can only know with greater knowledge ; and greater knowledge, we know, can only be attained by the mind which is free from prejudice and ready to learn (this means a mind which has been released from fear, greed and malice) and also can use any way of knowledge : integral, as well as analytic, thought ; insight as well as deduction. Nothing must be done against reason. But reason is the judge before whom evidence is brought ; it is not the barrister who collects that evidence and lays it before the judge.

The Necessity of Training

We see, then, after discussing the ends to be attained, we have to conclude by reviewing the means whereby

* Dr. Katz, late of Rostock, discovered that children on a meat-diet were creatures of action and impulse (extroverts, to use Jung's phrase), children who were vegetarian were reflective and thoughtful (introverts). See his paper, with photographs illustrating the two types, in *The Human Factor*, Journal of the National Institute of Industrial Psychology.

† We may also find that some psychophysical exercises may give such release or catharsis that sex, which had become of addictive importance, may be sublimated.

THE COURSE INDICATED

such ends may be attained. And this, it is evident, we need to do for a double purpose. First, without some such new means we shall never attain the present indicated ends. Psychology has shown us that. The statement made by reason that there is the path, and that the path is open, does not mean that we shall be able to make ourselves go along that path, however sensible, right, and alluring it may seem. Reason is a map, not a motor, and to be sure that one is going to have the motor-force to proceed along the plan indicated and approved one has to appeal to the will. The way to the will is, we now know, through the subconscious, and therefore only through those methods—completely different from argument and making up one's conscious will and mind—whereby the subconscious may be reached, can we hope to make our lives purposive, intentional, rational, to arrive where we aim and not somewhere disappointingly different. The employment of such method and exercises is no more superstitious than the learning by the fish-spearer that if he strikes through the water at the spot where the fish obviously, quite clearly, appears to be he will miss it, that he must practise so as to allow for the fact that the fish is not where it seems, and therefore he must aim indirectly.

But there is a second reason why we need to understand, far more fully than the ordinary ethicist thinks necessary, how our minds work and what the subconscious side of them feels about our aims and methods. Without its co-operation, it is clear that we shall fail to get even as far as we see. But more, without employing it, we shall fail to realize the world we are in. Through psychological exercises we can not only strengthen and make really effective the will: we can increase, at least to the same degree, our insight. To use again the simile

THE THIRD MORALITY

of the fish-spearer, an intelligent man, when he has learnt how to hit the mark, when he understands why up till then he had always missed his aim (the precise phrase ἀμαρτιω, which the Greek rightly used for moral failure, for sin) is not merely possessed of a small item of practical knowledge (how to get fish when others fail), he knows much more. He begins to realize the strange nature of light, which, passing through one transparency—air—shows things to be in one place, and then, passing through another—water—shows them to be in a different place. He begins to be able to study optics, he begins to discover that water cannot merely “displace” things but magnify them. He is on the path which will lead him—if he wants to understand and not rest content with a simple and limited power—to the microscope and the telescope.

Access to the Subconscious both Empowers and Enlightens

The exploration of the subconscious and the recombining of it with the conscious mind has then two purposes: The immediate, but less important, is that our intentions may be actualized, that what we resolve we may, as a matter of fact, do. The second, and much larger, purpose is that we may not only order the subconscious mind to make good our promises but that it may show us larger purposes, aims, and meanings. The subconscious is not merely a slave-genie to make practically possible our good intentions. It is a guide to lead us to where we can see even further and loftier ends and learn how to act so as to attain those ends. As has been already said, in the present stage of our knowledge, while the third cosmology is forming, we must have no finalities. Perhaps never again shall we have the old dogmatic finalities of the two preliminary cosmologies, perhaps

THE COURSE INDICATED

there will never again be a common creed but instead, as Radhakrishnan has said, a common quest. "Modern science," has said Hermann Weyl, one of the pioneers of the new physics, "makes the world appear as a world not closed but pointing beyond itself. . . . We (the physicists) must not, by including the transcendental sphere (in our physical picture), attempt to establish a new, a closed (though more comprehensive) world."* The moralists must follow suit. Each advance in action may, indeed it seems must, lead to an increase in vision. We see more as we attend more, and function, practised to its limit, produces enlarged organ, which permits still further apprehension and function.

Such an attitude toward life may be dismissed as subjective: we are warned against our immense desire to reject reality and to build up, as defence against it, a self-deceiving world of fantasy. We need, therefore, at the conclusion of this summary to remind ourselves once again that it is science itself to-day which has shown that it is the world of common sense which is just such a construction made by our animal nature to satisfy its intense wish for sensational reply. Only by challenging and analysing that so-called objectivity can we hope to advance understanding. On the other hand, this outlook with which the third cosmology presents us is no day-dream, nor a place for daydreamers. Unless each seer of this thing lives up to the very limit of his insight he will never define, still less enlarge, his vision. It will remain vague, impractical, unco-ordinated, unlived. Action, athletic action, is the essential complement of insight. He who sees that his insight must always remain restricted and fatally inadequate if confined by greed and fear, will still remain so confined unless he acts on

* *The Open World*, H. Weyl.

THE THIRD MORALITY

his knowledge. He must therefore continually behave with that interest-affection, that reciprocatory entering into others and being moved by them which is both the price and the reward of that understanding which is the sympathy of the mind and that sympathy which is the understanding of the heart.

Neo-Lamarckianism has, as we have seen, given us reason to suppose that only by some such theory of striving (of action aiding and being aided by sensation, of vague yearning, through rudimentary sense leading to evolved sense organ, which in turn provides clear apprehension) can we hope to understand the urge behind the evolution of all life. Certainly we need not fear a Lotus Land to lie ahead of us if we accept this creative outlook, nor that we shall all live in the sun and by creative wishes satisfy every fancy. If "stubborn fact" is not the objective thing we fancied as standing outside our grasp, we have exchanged for that picture one which may be more hopeful, but only to those who have more courage than their predecessors, those predecessors who said, often with a sense of relief that they need do no more about it : "I accept the universe."

For the stubborn fact does not stand aloof from us, too alien, smooth, and hard to be shaped, but it has us by the throat and round the loins and only he who, like Hercules with Antæus, can embrace the whole coil of his passionate involvement and implication with things as they are, and can drag that intense, involved nature of his out of its clutch on circumstances, may hope to master circumstances. Otherwise, as the Hercules myth describes, the lower nature in intricate alliance with its mother the earth, will pull down the hero. To conquer it he must snatch it from its hold.

Our knowledge at its best, at its most detached and

THE COURSE INDICATED

ordered, is still too flawed with antinomies and contradictions for us to be able to rest even for a day content with it. The action which such a partial and confused picture of reality gives us must be unsatisfactory. If we do not go on to build a complete cosmology, we shall see the world fall back either into the confused cynicism, which is all Mechanomorphism can give rise to, or into the blind, rigid and persecuting traditionalism which is all that an outworn Anthropomorphism can provide. To-day we have to hold these antinomies because we know that the fact that they both appear equally true and also irreconcilable, is evidence that our consciousness is in process of expansion, but has not yet attained complete and consistent apprehension. We see partly as an animal, partly as a man; we wish partly to create a world of sense-satisfaction and partly a world of pure curiosity, wonder and contemplation. Only by our persistent striving to live free of sense-addiction and distraction and with our whole purpose of life in the meaning of the whole of life, can we come to that widened apprehension which will show to us those facts needed to unite the antinomies in one complete and consistent system. Our completed nature will give rise to a completed cosmology. But our partial cosmology, constructed up to the limit of our freed knowledge, will give, and, indeed, already gives us, an outlook which will lead to that perfect world-picture.

.

CHAPTER X

TRAINING

WE have now seen that we can change ourselves and our circumstances immeasurably. We have also seen that this is the path of evolution—as we strive, so we discover ; as we discover, we can find fresh strength to strive. Thirdly, we have seen this is no daydreamer's escape from reality. On the other hand, it is equally clear, neither is this way that of the rationalist—the idea of improvement and progress through applied science used upon nature, and through reasonable good sense toward oneself, the notion of man as the sole rationalist in a world utterly mindless. This method is then neither religion as we have understood it nor rationalism as we have defined it, but the intentional, purposive conduct appropriate to our present knowledge of the universe's nature, of our own nature, and of our inter-relationship. It is a behaviour to be achieved by two things : by consistent deeds, but also by appropriate psychophysical training. We have already seen something of the actions natural and reasonable for people so informed. Interest and sympathy—this is the mental emotional attitude of those who understand, who know what life means sufficiently to know what they should do. It must, however, be recognized that, in

TRAINING

the world as it is to-day (concentrated in an intensity of anxious individualism), it is far from easy and may become impossible to retain that attitude. Without self-training exercises we are, in the present world, like raw levies going straight into battle. The action we know we ought to show we cannot achieve. Exercises are therefore supremely important. Better start with considerable and prolonged exercise than get into bad, ineffective action, discouraged by failure and practised only in mistakes. A wrong golf-swing has to be unlearned, an ill-set bone rebroken and reset.

It is here that we must face the fact that the methods and exercises of the anthropological cosmology are unhelpful. As the third cosmology does not return to Anthropomorphism but enlarges that idea, so does the third ethic not return to Anthropomorphism's natural exercise, prayer, but develops it.

The anthropomorphist can never wholly escape the notion that he is addressing a super-being external to himself, a being who may be kind but could be arbitrary—he will save but may destroy. Hence anthropomorphic Deism in one of its latest forms becomes actually immoral. In Calvinism there is postulated a being so completely personalized and separated from man that not only could his actions not be forecast but his motives could not be understood. This God, who was supposed to have revealed himself to man, in the end was declared to have left even the morality of his intentions in doubt and complete obscurity. "Man must not judge God" even if God does evil. The answer to this, an answer which brought Calvinism to an end, was: If God does what seems to me evil, how can I know that my good actions will please him? Perhaps he is pleased by evil and

THE THIRD MORALITY

would be pleased with me for doing evil and not good. Hence, as we have seen, morality was attacked by religion.*

The Third Morality does not say that God—the ultimate conceivable reality—is unknowable. It maintains that the human heart, when it seeks the good of others and attempts to apprehend with detachment, is following the pattern and purpose of the universe. Divinity, creative power in space-time, is immanent. When, however, that heart becomes rebellious? Here again the Third Morality departs in its practice from the moral practice of the anthropomorphic religion.

* It is necessary to point out that Calvinism was an inevitable development, as Anthropomorphism began to yield to Mechanomorphism. The Calvinistic God who predestined his creatures to bliss or woe, regardless of what they might do, is the pathetic recognition by the religious intelligence of a law of cause and effect which cannot be reversed by any immediate action of the conscious will or by an exterior intelligence, a law far vaster than the individual life (*cf.* the earlier Greek idea expressed in the phrase: "Even the Gods cannot recall their gifts"). Calvinism is, then, the last effort of the religious mind to be honest in its morality when faced with a mechanomorphic cosmology. What could—and alone could—have saved Calvinism from becoming immoral (and so collapsing) would have been the discovery of the law of cause and effect as psychological as well as physical—in short, the discovery of the law of Karma, that every experience and indeed every event is the fruit of a certain action and that in turn is the fruit of a certain desire. The East says: "Of your particular desire or my particular desire." The West can now add: "Of our joint and confused desires, our unlimited liability." Neither is the causality (as we have seen) rigid. It is that high probability which rules that unless a powerful act of creative choice is made, then what has been done must rule completely what shall be. These are, however, details. What matters and what puts this matter right is the realization that there is no God who can sentimentally intervene, not because, as Calvin thought, God is incapable of our compassion but because ultimate reality only works through us. No one will interfere, that is true, but as soon as you wish ("to-day, if you will hear the voice") you can start undoing the Karmic coil of deeds and cancelling them. It is slow, because they are many—habit has as many coats as good lacquer. But it is sure—they can all be stripped away and we be released, because we are creators. The iron outer world which Calvinism saw as the creation of arbitrary power, and Mechanomorphism saw as the result of blind energy, is to an indefinite degree our construction. Therefore, if we change ourselves, changing our power of apprehension, we change the universe confronting us.

TRAINING

The Mistakenness of Petitionary Prayer

In Calvinism it was little use addressing a diety which had predestined you to wrath or bliss. Nevertheless, like the rest of the anthropomorphic moralities of which it was the last, Calvinism tended, when disappointed at its own or others' performance, to pray. It could not do other. If man was helpless, he must cry, even if God was implacable. Petitionary prayer is one of the greatest stumbling blocks in the way of the praxis of the Third Morality. It is a natural, inevitable development from Anthropomorphism. When Anthropomorphism goes, it must go. It is an address made to a magnified, non-natural man in order that he may do something for the individual which the individual is certain he cannot do for himself. Such a procedure may lead to a fatal development. The individual, holding a private communication with this super-individual, may persuade himself that this super-individual is willing to save his private self and give him special benefits if he will give the super-individual certain things which the super-individual requires. Here, then, is a private bargaining going on behind the back of humanity, and individualism, which should be transcended by religion, is, instead, being inflamed in a way which earthly ambition, let alone avarice or lust, could never inflame it.

Private salvation is the ruin of all morality, for in a true morality it is clear that private salvation is a contradiction in terms. For an individual to save his sole individuality is for a chrysalis to win the boon of being unable to cut its way out of its cocoon, for a chick to be granted strangulation in its egg-membrane.

But even when the anthropomorphist in prayer intuitively realizes he must not ask for private salvation—or for anything except deliverance into the general life

THE THIRD MORALITY

—even then such praying is dangerous. The individual, imagining that he is addressing a completely other individual, tends to ask that individual to change his nature for him and then waits for the change to take place. He does not realize that the creative power is immanent within him, and to speak to it as a person outside, who may or may not help him, is to misconceive his whole situation. When he fails to achieve the deliverance he requires, when he wants to overcome greed, resentment, and fear, he thinks he must renew his petitions and, when they still do not get a full answer, he often gives up, and, as with most people to-day, taught to pray anthropomorphically and finding prayer “unanswered,” not only is prayer abandoned but also all psychological or religious exercises.

That is why petitionary, anthropomorphic prayer is such an obstacle to the next advance in religious praxis, in moral reinforcement and the implementing of good resolve and the enlargement of perceived purpose. It is a misconception of the whole spiritual relationship and hence, even when it works, the nature of the process is so misapprehended that sooner or later bad breakdowns, “dryness,” perfunctoriness, lack of any result, or complete abandonment of all religious exercise ensue. Prayer is not asking for things—not even for the best things: it is going where they are. The word prayer, with its inevitable sense and stain of supplication, is therefore best abandoned. It is meditation and contemplation, it is opening another aperture of the mind, using another focus, that is the real recreative process.

Many still say: “I cannot move unless I first believe that someone puts out a hand to pull me higher. I must know that there is a power not myself, which is making me into an instrument of righteousness. I will

TRAINING

not ask for anything for myself but that myself may be lost in the enlargement of the greater life." The plea is natural and has intense appeal. No one who has explored the spirit and tried to train the self but recognizes his own words in such a protest of self-helplessness. Further, by using this method of projection we, with our anthropomorphic past, may well make rapid preliminary progress, denied to those who use the surer way—for it is surer, that way which rejects all Anthropomorphism. The rapid progress of those who employ Anthropomorphism, so bringing themselves to a belief that the power that helps them is beyond them, depends on a hypothesis which is less true than the utmost we can know to-day. It appeals to a power which is creative but which we now know is manifesting itself and means so to manifest itself in ourselves. To pretend, out of custom, for the sake of traditional ways of thinking, that this power is external is, in the end, to add to the spirit's labour in freeing itself and entering on that creative activity which the creative power intends it to show and to be.

The power is felt to be outside us because of the denseness and obduracy of the threshold which separates the surface, self-conscious mind and individuality from the universal deeps of the mind. To treat, then, power felt to be outside as though it really were so is to treat the threshold as though it were a real division, a wall or gulf between us and the outer world and outer being and not an arbitrary division of our present stage of growth, caused by the very thing—our individualism—which we must overcome and which our whole exercise is undertaken to overcome. He who prays to an external God asserts his belief in his own individuality and the helplessness of the power of creative energy (faith) in

THE THIRD MORALITY

himself. This is to raise a huge obstacle in the path of his growth into enlightenment.

That this objection is no theoretical one but proved by practice, we can see when we realise how prayer becomes inevitably petition for the self. The theme behind prayer which does not outgrow Anthropomorphism becomes : "Grant that I may do good in order that I may be saved, may endure." The good is something external, an arbitrary test set by an alien power whereby we have to qualify for what we really desire, *i.e.*, not the good itself, but the survival of ourselves. The theme of the true contemplative is : Let the good be ; it is my one desire, and if the change in me, needed to make it actual, lead to my elimination, it is well, indeed it is so much the better—for what is base has been permitted to purchase excellence.

The Reality of Immanence

To stress this danger of Anthropomorphism is, however, not to be committed to a doctrine of nothing but auto-suggestion : the soul of man in an alien and indifferent universe remaking itself and only able to remake itself by self-hypnosis, because there is no power other than this self and no method other than this hypnosis. A real creative power is immanent in the soul and it is no self-illusion but contact with supreme reality when that power is felt and when it changes the quality and force of consciousness. What this definition is intended to make clear is not that the creative power is limited within ourselves but that it is not limited in a person outside ourselves. It is an attempt to render in our present vernacular the theory of the Paraclete, of this creative power as present in the central consciousness of man but to be heard not as a thunder voice nor as

TRAINING

a peremptory and detailed "guidance" but as a whisper which only the trained, even in silence and after much skilled practice, can hear with any clearness. It is a polar radiation which, after much care in leaving the needle free and seeing that the compass has been removed from all metal that might deflect it, will show, if it is kept steady, where lies the north. Even then it will not prevent a man falling into a ditch through his own folly, for it is not for his personal comfort and convenience, or to save him the labour of thought and "deducing his reckonings," but to show him that there is a way he can go and a goal he can reach if he care for nothing else.

The East has taught that "One of the Yogis is Bhakti"; that is, that one of the ways towards enlightenment can be through hypostasising a divine entity and guide outside oneself, through projecting all one's concentration into such an hypostasis and so drawing oneself up and out by this hypothetical fulcrum. It is added, however, that whoso climb by this path of personal devotion to a God must learn, as soon as they approach enlightenment, that they have been worshipping a projection of the creative nature which is within themselves. "Every man worships his own Christ, his own Khrishna, his own Amida."

To retain anthropomorphic methods is then only to postpone an essential step in spiritual development. It must be taken sooner or later and the advantages of postponement, the advantages of making this provisional and temporary hypothesis, are, we see, generation by generation becoming less. To-day those who cling to anthropomorphic projection find themselves confronted with far more difficulties than they are presented with solutions: the practical and pressing problem of

THE THIRD MORALITY

“unanswered prayer,” of “permitted evil,” and of the reported historical actions of their particular divinity (in the Christian tradition the cursing of the fig tree, the destruction of the Gadarene swine, the purging of the Temple and the cruel ending of many of the parables ; in the Indian tradition the libidinous behaviour of Khrishna, the cruelty of Siva and Kali).

These inherent difficulties of anthropomorphic religion have driven and still drive away from all religion far greater numbers than those who find their hold on the underlying reality strengthened because they are so permitted to envisage that reality in human terms. The process which man's mind is now undergoing is an example of that “psychological weaning” to which students of the mind to-day rightly attach so much importance. Sooner or later man has to abandon Anthropomorphism. At an earlier stage it was an essential construction, an essential frame of mind. Man could not but feel that he and the vast outer universe were sundered and he must therefore approach creative power as a child pleading with an all-powerful and almost incomprehensible father. Now, however, that he realizes to what a degree he himself makes this outer universe, that it is a construction of his mind, he can and must seek within himself for the source of his sundering from it and the place of his reconciliation with it.

If we do not wean ourselves from these childlike fancies, then the helpful hypothesis becomes a dogma, the simile is made an exact objective description, the medium turns from being a clear lens, a means to insight, and becomes an opaque shutter, an end in itself. It is all too natural to worship the weaknesses of the mediator who has been made fully divine and the idiosyncratic

TRAINING

mistakes of the greatest masters have been the most serious stumbling-block to the advance of truth. The noble teacher who made a few mistakes of impulse, and then was apotheosized, has these mistakes also made divine and so finally it becomes possible to divinize a Dictator-Saviour and find no moral difficulty in his deeds of violence. Better, then, a slow advance, which can guard against reaction because it never denies or outruns concrete knowledge.

Our task is a vast one : First to discriminate where we end and the universe begins, to realize our vast implication in what we took to be (both at the anthropomorphic and at the mechanomorphic stages) the objective universe. When we have so discriminated, then we have to unbind our involvement, changing ourselves until, when we are changed, the change in our apprehension reveals an altered universe. Relating ourselves with that "altered universe," we then have power to remake that world in which humanity thinks itself imprisoned by natural law, when it is indeed only imprisoned by "the law of its own members," a law which self-knowledge and self-training can and does repeal.

The real nature of our task being found to be such, no one need be disappointed at slow progress. We are not faced with the inexplicable mystery of an onlooking, all-powerful person who tells us to behave, and says he will help us if we ask him, and we ask and find ourselves still without the promised gift. We have to learn to open this other aperture. The contemporary individualism jams it shut, as outer pressure of water on the cap of the manhole makes it enormously difficult for men trapped in a submarine to raise the hatch and escape to the surface. To imagine any other state but this present individualism seems to many to be encouraging hallucination.

THE THIRD MORALITY

Yet we have seen there is no reason to think we are deceiving ourselves. On the contrary, it is the individualists who, thinking of themselves as inevitably, irrevocably sundered, cannot see the real relationship. This particular jam or cramp does yield if tackled—but it yields only with time.

The hurry of this age—a characteristic symptom of its individualism—makes us grudge time, and even then, when we have made it, waiting amounts almost to a torture. The change-over cannot be hurried. “Muddied water let stand becomes clear,” says Lao Tzu. As already mentioned, the eye going into the dark takes twenty minutes before it is fully adapted and has reached the complete capacity of its alternative way of seeing—“night-sight.” The mind involved in ways and means, full of the management and negotiation of individual relationships—still resounding and vibrating with the surface contacts of its personality with and against other personalities—such a dazed and deafened mind must be in the silence for some time before the re-echoings of the world’s hubbub die down—such a surface, flurried and cross-hatched, must be left to calm before it can settle to smoothness and translucency.

Psychological Practice Essential

Meditation is then essential. Imports must balance exports. Everyone must first learn by himself what he would practise in public. Through insight acquired in solitude he must study to recognize the underlying pattern and coherencies so that when he comes out into the contemporary confusion he may still detect and discriminate the fundamental design and meaning, though it be blurred by the surface disturbances. Only those who have first taught themselves by listening to

TRAINING

clear, unambiguous enunciation to recognize a language new to their ear, can hope to pick up from the clipped and elided vernacular the meaning of casual speech. To less practised ears it sounds no more than a confusion of indistinguishable noises incapable of any specific meaning. The individuals whom any other individual sees are not in themselves immediately appealing, still less inspiring. They seem pointless, futile, boring. They, as he, are engrossed in their own cares and careers. Even if he tries to treat them as creatures with immense capacities within them, he sees they are not that now. On the contrary, they are blind to what they might be, and unless he can take the initiative with a generous and assured conviction, which is positively creative, it is they who convince him of his individualism and separateness, not he who convinces them of their general eternal life and common union.

He cannot, then, begin by feeling a creative, non-personal generosity, which they deny and he rather desires than possesses. The first step, therefore, is practice—practice in throwing the mind open by meditation to its larger being, practice in throwing off the individuality where there is space—in the silence where the pressing claims and strident assertions of others' individualism are not challenging him and rousing his own reaction to protect himself against such incursions, encroachments, and collisions.

The slowness of self-change, against which so many rebel and because of which even greater numbers abandon this essential process, becomes more endurable when we realize two things. The first is that, considering the results to be produced, change, if it is to be effective, could not be faster. To change oneself—that seems a small preliminary thing. In fact it is nothing of the

THE THIRD MORALITY

sort. It is the most radical of alterations. To change oneself is not merely to alter one's relations to all fellow-men, to alter the whole of self and social nexus. That is much. We are, even the most independent, unsuspectedly integrated with our society. We cannot move without affecting all those around us: they have made and make us largely what we are. Self-change must always be social change: that is why moral courage is rarer than physical courage; the determination to alter the social will needs more energy than the determination to sacrifice the self to that will.

To change oneself is to have to do that, but it is also to do far more. It is to alter one's outlook literally—to attend to what has been overlooked, to see through what has riveted attention. It is to see another world. Once that other world is seen, once the new faculty has grown, then a new way of action is natural and inevitable. Seeing, realization of the further range of reality, that is the step that really counts. Once that step is taken the further steps follow with comparative ease. It is, however, not possible to see, to realize, unless the aperture of apprehension has been changed. The instrument has to be altered in order to take in the new knowledge from which the new activity will and must result. If it needs moral courage to change one's point of view (because that point of view is so largely our society's and to change one's own is to reflect on the present social outlook and to feel cut off), and if moral courage is difficult to summon, yet something even more serious than social ostracism must be faced if we would see through to the more basic world-view.

What we have to face is nothing less than a shattering of what we have till now taken to be reality itself. Social ostracism may make a man, even a strong man, un-

TRAINING

believably miserable. To see through all the social standards and conventional values of your time may be exhaustingly painful. It is not, however, the supreme test which must be accepted by the spirit that would free itself and make contact with the deepest reality it can know. That test is to see not merely that the social standards are illusory: it is to have to see through something even more closely woven into the individual's being, his appetites, his belief that the impressions of common-sense are reality.

It is easy to quote cynics and stoics that no man worthy the name should attend to social judgments. It is equally easy to quote mystics and scientists to show that the world of bodily appetite is unreal, a construction concealing reality. When, however, we would act against the sheer suggestive force of our society, still more when we would see past the immediate, passionate findings of our physical nature, we come up against an intense resistance. Even if we manage temporarily to disregard these elder habits of thinking and acting and to behave in regard to our deeper knowledge, too often we find we have, maybe, discarded the old convention but have not achieved a working grasp of the new. We feel bewildered, lonely, listless, as men raised too rapidly into too thin an air. We feel nerveless, as limbs numbed by cold. "Dryness," the sense of impulse giving out—the invariable experience of all who abandon the small, gross, false convention for the large, inhuman reality—the experience of mystic saint and power-seeking Faust (of supreme artist and profoundest scientist)—this exhaustion of spirit overwhelms all who—like men in a caisson, changing from one atmosphere pressure to another too rapidly—change themselves precipitately.

THE THIRD MORALITY

This is the second reason why self-change must be slow. Let us again remind ourselves, we need not be impatient, because the results of this change must change, and alone can change, not merely our society but also its surroundings and ours. We should not be impatient because the change to and in ourselves is indeed so profound that if we do not make it gradually, building up, as our insight grows, appropriate reactions and activities to that new insight, we find ourselves suddenly exhausted—what we see we cannot react to, what we have seen through we feel still is the only world in which we can find action. (See also further on page 288.)

The task is an immense one, for, by remaking the self, we remake, and can only remake, the world. Yet every day the cramping individuality can be further unpicked, distended, relaxed. The actual conduct of any individual, however much he realizes his transitional nature and the need to complete that transition, must be to himself, and to those who need him to behave so as to help them most, acutely disappointing. They fail to respond and he is torn between the natural wish to attribute his failure to their invincible irresponsiveness and a deeper discouragement, though a less dangerous one, of recognizing how poorly grown he himself is, how sorry an advertisement. He, then, has sharp spasms of despair when he feels that they are wholly right and not only is it patently clear that he himself has made no progress but that no progress is really to be made at all.

This later deduction is, however, to accept a very dangerous condition. Better recognize one has fallen far from the way than say there is no way from which to fall. So, till a man is strong, he will spend more

TRAINING

time in gaining strength than in spending it—more time in being sure he has begun to live the extra-individual life before he attempts in the open competition of this individualist-obsessed world to show he can keep his balance when all his fellows are reeling in confusion and knocking one another down. It is not selfish dalliance or cowardly diffidence that makes a doctor be sure he has learned an operative technique before he tries it on a patient; a swimmer to be sure he knows rescuing technique before he attempts life-saving; or a sanitary officer to wait the days for his own plague-inoculation to take before going into an infected area.

Actual Exercises

Enough has now been said to emphasize the supreme importance of praxis, of a regular intake and exercise in order that the man, who has chosen the devoted life and kept himself free—"swept and garnished"—by the rationed life, may fill himself to capacity with the individual-transcending life and build up by action the appropriate and confirming reflexes, habits and behaviour. Now we may examine in some detail these exercises themselves.

The preliminary facts we must keep in mind are that these exercises are empirical and do not depend on, though they draw upon, traditions. We also realize that, in this approach to a new powerful relation with reality, we are considering not detached spirits communicating with an even more detached spirit, but a mind-body learning how to relate and unite himself ever more consciously and intimately with a life and a universe, which he has mistakenly assumed must always be outside himself but which is largely his construction. It is necessary to recall these facts with the

THE THIRD MORALITY

utmost definiteness, otherwise we will find that we may consider any physical aids as irrelevant or beneath our spiritual dignity.

Among all the adepts of the Mystery Religions, those teams of disciplined and intelligent men in Greece (Plato and, indeed, every able and responsible thinker of the Græco-Roman world were among these initiates and valued above all things the experience so won), mind-body exercises were used to train their wills and understandings. One of the ablest and most informed authorities on the subject, himself also a religious man, has expressed surprise that such intelligent and devout men could have thought that physical attitude, régime, and exercise could affect and help spirit. Certainly when such exercises are proposed to practical men they seem ludicrous. So little—these unguarded reactions show—have our minds, whatever we may say, really acknowledged the fact of the mind-body inter-relationship, that every change of mind is a change of body and only possible thereby, and *vice versa*.

We have to make access to our subconscious and we know that that is difficult for us individualized, materialized Westerners. We must then approach that threshold when the diurnal tide favours, when the body-mind is passing from its rest on the sleep-facet to its rest on its waking-facet. It is no use attempting to cross a bar when the tide is out. Evening and morning are therefore probably the best times. When the mind is recovering from sleep it has now been established that it takes a full hour to close one aperture and open fully the other. Dreams, most people know, last often for an hour or two in the memory and then like hoar-frost are gone. When the mind is approaching sleep, it again passes across the threshold. Hypnotic and all sub-

TRAINING

conscious suggestion-therapy has shown that there is a belt of accessibility to the deeper mind, or, perhaps a better, more exact simile, a stage of compromise when the two apertures of apprehension (that of the conscious and that of the subconscious mind) partly overlap. Then exchange can take place and the consciousness which has insight can inform the normal consciousness which, because it looks out exclusively on the world of physical action, has possession of material means.

We must also repeat and remind ourselves that deliberate dilation takes time. The natural tide of life as we pass from sleep to waking gives it an hour, night and morning. For an hour after sleep, while dreams can still be recalled and an hour before, when the mind is preparing for sleep, intercommunication is possible. It is wise to reserve a considerable portion of these periods for the exercises.

Time, then, is important in making the essential recreative contact. Those who have fully mastered the process, the enlightened, can make it at any moment. The learner must select so that every circumstance and condition lie in his favour before he can hope to make a successful extension of consciousness. When time has been chosen and sufficient of it reserved to make possible the slow opening of the aperture, then also the meditator may help forward that extension by physical attitude. We, dominated with the prejudice that the only activity is physical activity, are convinced that staying still must be passivity and slackness. This naive mistake hypnotic research has shown to be the reverse of the truth. Hypnosis looks like sleep, but is in actual fact the opposite. In sleep, as Dr. William Brown has shown, there is relaxation of muscle and diffusion of attention: in hypnosis there is tension of muscle and complete

THE THIRD MORALITY

concentration. In contemplation, in integral thought, the mind is concentrated through an effort of the whole will, so that, compared with that intensity, the attention of the conscious will (kept attending by following constant change in the work on which it is bent) is a diffuse and intermittent activity.

The mind, then, which is doing contemplatory exercises raises first its desired transformations before itself and thinks itself into such states. At the first stage it finds itself unable to concentrate because of the reverberations of its normal active life. When it has had the patience to keep quiet till these immediate echoes have died down, it next finds itself disturbed by the deep underlying resonance of its age. This belief that thinking, conceiving in the mind of a higher state of being, can affect action—this, it finds itself feeling, is only self-hallucination. Then, therefore, the mind should still “damp down” that resonance, that prejudice, by logically recalling to itself that thought-feeling affects function and function affects organ. The material therefore can be moulded by the spiritual and the will can be creative. When this line of thought has been pursued, it is next wise to clinch the matter by illustrating to the mind this fact, for example, by directing the blood-stream by thought to the hands and the feet. Steady slow breathing also gives the realization that the mood can be changed, calmed, broadened.

These easy preliminary exercises, similar to those by which the stammerer learns to overcome his stammer, show the practiser how extensive is the area of control and expansion already in his ordinary possession, and how unnecessarily he allows himself to live a far more restricted life of control and purpose than even his present untrained equipment permits.

TRAINING

Some will smile at these rudimentary mnemonics. To begin to alter society with such preliminary mental exercises will seem to them sheer waste of precious time, a recommendation which can be dismissed as wholly impertinent to our present crisis. Either a new world must be revealed rapidly and unmistakably or we must abandon such patient preparations to forge new instruments and start at once to hack at the debris around us with such weapons as we find in our hands. Perhaps they will be more inclined to tolerate fundamental beginnings if they recollect that mistakes made in originating any mental technique often prove the most stubborn of difficulties later, defying all attempts to remedy them, unless and until the whole superimposed structure of habits has been dismantled and the faultily laid ground-course has been reconstructed. Faulty learning is the chief cause of ignorance and mistake, even in memory training.

This general observation is all too plainly applicable to our particular pressing concern—public policy. Our present international problem is in the first place one of character, not of intelligence. The world to-day has an adequate mental equipment. Where it fails is in common morality. It has more than enough power over nature. Where it is fatally deficient is in power over its own. Unless we repair our characters, our powers but make our mistakes more destructive. This would be platitude, did we not wish to escape from a truth which requires first and foremost the remedy of our own wills.

Much of our present social and economic activity is only in order to escape from the difficulty of this problem—the remaking of the self. We seek to find in economic confusion (which is a symptom of our state of mind)

THE THIRD MORALITY

or in the evils of some other class, nation or race, the cause of our own distress and mistake. So might a builder, when his bricks crumbled because they were badly baked, blame the fact that the building had put pressure on them. We have continually to remind ourselves (for it is a fact so unpleasant that if possible we will shirk it) : the world to-day is a picture, a " projection " of ourselves, of our personal characters, our ineffective good intentions, our unmastered passions.

An Outline of Contemplation

When then the trainee has, by these preliminary illustrations, taught himself how his age and its common-sense actually make themselves out to be far more helpless than even without organized effort they yet are, when he has taught himself really to understand his present capacities and the amount of flexibility which even at this stage belongs to him—he can begin to add to these powers and increase this range.

The first contemplation must be of the unifying life to which the individual belongs and into which he may be delivered by pushing through and beyond his individualistic arbitrary frontiers. He should realize by mental concentration the state of being which (in contra-distinction from the natural state of the individual—activated by greed, fear and resentment) is manifested by three phases of enlarged consciousness, which phases neutralize those intense aspects of individuality and so make its resolving possible. The first is creativeness, so that the power to make may cancel and cut off at its source the need to accumulate. The next is understanding—the realization of the life ahead, the realization that individuality is a phase to be transcended : this knowledge cuts the root of fear which is grounded in

TRAINING

anxiety that the individual self, the only reality, may not be preserved. The third phase of the enlarged consciousness is compassion, the insight to see, in the other individuals who attack one's own individuality, the blind struggle which went on in oneself—because the individual is striving to live and yet shrinking from birth: the insight to see that such individuals and oneself can only be delivered when their claims are both met and explained to them: the insight to see that in their struggle the process of one's own salvation is not only recapitulated but is actually being worked out; for without them, as enlightened beings, one's own extra-individuality cannot be completed.

It should be clear that in this exercise the drive and trend is not to thwart and deny the individuality in oneself but to make it realize that the life which it so passionately desires, and fears may be taken from it, will be won if only it can find its path out of its self-defeating entanglement—an entanglement arising from ignorance of its real nature. These positive aims, of creativeness, understanding, and compassion aim at healing individuality by growth into its next stage, by expansion, not by extirpation. Left as it is, it can only press with increasing misery and inflammation against limits which it imagines are imposed from without, but which in reality are due to a blind hypertrophy, a refusal to realize the radical expansion of development which is its true line of vital advance.

When the contemplation has reached this preliminary lucidity, a next stage is to take up into the mind examples, those occasions of other individuals' failure, treating such—as when in this condition one can—as one's own failure. Then, translating all such egotisms and violences as failure to realize the process of the evolution of

THE THIRD MORALITY

consciousness, it is possible to see them as desperate efforts of a drowning man who, though sinking lower and even dragging down those who swim to his rescue, has no wish but to be on land and who would swim with all his might, did he but know the art. We must, then, never say: "I cannot understand such behaviour." Our task of enlightenment is to be able to analyse and translate all human conduct. Nor is Baxter's "There, but for the grace of God, go I" anything but a very rudimentary attitude. It is only the noblest reaction of the anthropomorphic ethic. The new ethic says rather: "There at this moment go I." It sees all life (wronged and wronger) as a nature tragically divided against itself, and it realizes that only the heart which dares to endure the pain of understanding and feeling for both sides is the heart which is already creating the new creature which can embrace and reconcile both.

So, in contemplating, the practician broadens his sympathy until there is no failure or cowardice, no betrayal and no treason that he cannot understand. When he can conceive how natural it is for individuals to fall to such depths, then he realizes how desperate is the case of individuality. He himself is driven with a double urge towards illumination—to escape such degradation but also to make it possible for his fellow, who is caught in that particular trap and so degraded, to be extricated. When failure takes place, then the new ethicist can accept responsibility for it and so redeem it. The saint alone takes full responsibility; all the rest of us, the less we are enlightened the more we say: "It was someone else's fault."

The enlightened do not sentimentally say: "Man cannot behave otherwise—do not blame, do not punish."

TRAINING

Rather they say : " Man will behave otherwise when he realizes not merely how contemptible but, further, how transitional is this individuality of his which he thus struggles and must so struggle to preserve." There must be payment for such mistakes, and remedy. The bankrupt, however, cannot pay. Those who have, they alone can discharge the debt. It is a joint debt run up by an unlimited liability company called mankind. For members to try and disown the actions of their partners, to make a scapegoat of the actual criminal, that is neither justice nor science.

The enlightened then buy up the stocks of those who have failed and so staunch social panic. They are the salt that stops the rot. So contemplating one's own and others failures (as a general confusion due to lack of vision as to what our joint life is and how it does evolve), we attain serenity toward failure. Each individual, we see, is incomparably precious not for what it is, but for what it will be and also because, until it is resolved to its full power, the completion in which alone we all can be fulfilled cannot be attained.

When, then, we have refreshed our understanding of the process, illustrated to ourselves its working by the examples of all around us and illuminated their and our actions in the light of this evolutionary principle (we are all individuals struggling to attain life and that life is only attainable when we understand it is extra-individual), then we can turn and contemplate that transmuting delivering life. As we think of it, striving to express its wholeness through our temporary partiality, some of that partiality falls from us,* we begin to be part of that next larger life, as the child in the womb

* *cf.* Santayana's " When a man realizes his own insignificance, by that act he becomes more than insignificant."

THE THIRD MORALITY

begins to have the heart-beat which will sustain its life in the larger world into which birth will usher it.

The body is quiet and at rest—ready to reflect and not distract the spirit's apprehension. The personality is relaxed and loosened—its hard harness of character-habit is unbuckled and movements of consciousness, which the restricted, professional, customary life does not permit, are possible. The spirit stretches and, day by day, as it does these exercises, finds its touch and even its grasp is gradually extending. This is real evolutionary growth. Many details practical authorities and advanced pioneers have added, add, and will add, to this rudimentary outline and skeleton of praxis. He who knows and goes to the limit of his knowing, will grow and, growing, will know how much further he may see and go.

Here, at least, the Third Morality takes us, and leaves us in hope of indefinite further advance, for it shows that this is not the goal but the threshold. Yet while we are only on the threshold, even then we have crept to a level where society is seen as salvable and, instead of being faced with an impasse, we are become aware of an infinite future of achievement and expansion. Steep is the way—but it is a way leading to ever fuller life. Life does not need comfort, when it can be offered meaning, nor pleasure, when it can be shown purpose. Reveal what is the purpose of existence and how he may attain it—the steps he must take—and man will go forward again hardily, happily, knowing that he has found what he must have—intentional living—and knowing that an effort, which takes all his energy because it is worth his full and constant concentration, is the only life deserving the devotion, satisfying the nature and developing the potentialities of a self-conscious being.

The Objective is Being

One thing remains to be said. As this process is a process of the evolution of consciousness, being is its essence and doing merely its means and symptom. This is undoubtedly a hard saying, an unwelcome thought to the West. We Occidentals have believed that we are, and should make ourselves, solely that we may do. Any attention a man gave to his character was in order that he might act more effectively. Thought, we agreed, without action is non-existent ; and, more, we followed this up with the practical opinion that a bad means, base action, poor character, as long as they seemed—however temporarily—to have achieved a good end, were justified, excused, even to be imitated as “practical.” If, for example, as seems possible in Russia, new masses may be supplied with greater physical plenty—more means—then the methods, however brutal, are excused. On the other side, in Italy because the young Fascist despises comfort and sweeps aside all opposition he is considered justified in brutalities. Success sanctions all. It is surely, even on the surface, a dangerous principle, dangerously akin to the corrupting Mandevillian philosophy that private vices make for public virtues. If we penetrate below the surface, the principle exposes itself as deadly. These short-cuts increase only men’s material wealth and power, and such an increase may blind them, more than would poverty, to the true nature and meaning of their life—especially when, as in Russia, there goes with the economic advance the specific teaching that man is nothing but an animal and has no destiny except to eat and ease himself and die, or, as in the Fascist States, the nation is with increasing frankness taught as the object of divine worship.

Yet the West is deeply involved in this materialistic

THE THIRD MORALITY

delusion, and materialism can never end, but only inflame, individualism. It calls any other method than violence "impracticable" and any other aim than increasing physical means, and goods, visionary. But if, as the third cosmology indicates and the Third Morality must actively believe, man is a spirit, then increase of physical means is only a means, a method whereby man may help himself to be free to develop. It is obvious that such means can only be a partial help. Man's life consists not in the number of things that he has but in how he may use what he possesses so as to release his individuality in order that it may outgrow itself. If foul methods are used to gain him such things, such means, then the end is defeated by such things.

The Third Morality must then distinguish itself from the materialistic humanitarianism into which Liberalism degenerated until this decadent Liberalism found its throne usurped by consistent, persecuting, materialistic State Capitalism. We have seen materialistic humanitarianism was used as a substitute-ethic during the period when the mechanomorphic cosmology was at last fully accepted. For then no spiritual goal could exist for man, or indeed any final purpose. With the discovery of purpose and the discovery that that purpose is not material, we see that a mere increase of means could be no more than an attempt to distract men from the discovery that no purpose could be found—a veritable "opium for the people."

The task before us is to learn to be, because being, becoming a complete and united consciousness, is the purpose of our existence and the only purpose worthy of self-consciousness. And when we are, we can do. Prior to that we can only do what we would not. The poverty and incompleteness of our nature ruins and must ruin

TRAINING

the work we intend to be our justification. We can influence and direct others as we desire their good, but only when they are convinced, with the shrewd sense that all creatures have, that our motives are clean, our statements true, that we do seek their good, and not our advancement and elevation as their essential benefactors.

But this, after all, is only indirect influence. There is a more excellent way, a way whereby we may exert the only direct action. All of us are individual spirits created to evolve into a common union. If we have made ourselves to grow, so that we are advanced some stages beyond the average intensity of individualism, we can directly influence those who wish to grow, and who are feeling the natural need to grow, in that direction. The spirit and character which is already advanced in constant creativeness, in wide compassion and unceasing illumination, knowing what life means and how to attain that meaning—such a spirit not only influences those among whom it is—but its influence spreads radioactively, telepathetically, and the limits of its force cannot be set, because the source on which it is drawing is itself illimitable. Being, therefore, is all, and doing merely the symptom and sign of being, as body is the appearance of spirit.

The Difficulty and Essentialness of Persistence

In spite of the fact that any enquirer may, as we have seen, convince himself of the fact of telepathy and that states of feeling, of goodwill, despair, hatred or resentment are much more easily transmitted than are mental ideas, nevertheless there is this immense resistance to recognizing the fact of this direct action. "Mere quietism" is the dismissal of any such suggestions, and yet those who so dismiss this "imponderable" are often

THE THIRD MORALITY

those who talk with most assurance of the spirit of the age and that we must not judge earlier, more brutal ages, because they had not the atmosphere in which we live. To what, it may be asked, is that atmosphere to be attributed but to the numbers in earlier ages, and to-day who, acting as an invisible leaven, keep the whole lump leavened? They create the field of general suggestion which says of rationally defended horrors: "These must not be and shall not be," and of immense achievements: "They can be done and shall."

This progress cannot be revolutionary and spectacular. Many grow disheartened, seeing themselves making so little advance. They wonder whether, as they themselves as beings are so poor and ineffective, they had not better take to doing, to get something done. Deeds so done, as revolutions show, have to be undone. The leaven works slowly; it leavens the whole lump in the end. There is no other way. The short cuts of violence always have to be retraced.

Moreover, the view of the new cosmology can be long and patient. We have time. No other cosmology had that. The anthropomorphic hastened against a last judgment, the mechanomorphic against a final, oncoming, cosmic night. The Vedantic outlook alone conceived the vast adventure on which mankind is launched, and even that outlook fluctuated between an Anthropomorphism which looked for outer-salvation and a Pantheism which felt no effort was needed or could be effective. We have time, but each moment counts. At any moment an individual may start expanding, evolving his individuality; at any moment he may accelerate this, the one fundamental progress. It will never be easy; never impossible; always worth while; always having to be kept up. Life is balancing on a

TRAINING

rolling ball ; life is taking off in a plane from an aerodrome ; life, with its seventy years, is a gestation and birth of consciousness. If we do nothing, then life will do something to us. If we will not grow, then we shall encyst, fossilize. Every moment of life has its peculiar choice and all these choices are co-ordinated steps leading up or down. If we will not expand, we shrink. If we will not increase in awareness, understanding, sympathy, we will stiffen into prejudice, ignorance that calls itself knowing, and hardness that is sure it knows human nature and, alas, only knows its shrunken self so well that it can recognize only such features in any other.

We are far too dynamic a type, our life is far too vast and varied, the crisis and tempo of our evolution too rapid for us to stay still. That is why the hatching chick, which in a week or two must assimilate its egg food or find itself strangled with egg-membranes unable to hatch out, the insect in its desperate struggle to escape from the cocoon which was its shelter and now, if it cannot emerge, will immediately become its trap and its tomb—indeed every transforming creature at the moment of its crisis—is only a faint picture of the life and crisis of man.

That is why we must keep up with the march and tempo of the rapid development that is ours—our opportunity and peril. The power of life has put us in a stream of event, has set us in bodies timed to carry us in any case swiftly past a series of choices where we may take the opportunity or no. We are like fishes in a rapid current. If we do not swim faster than it, it will force its way into our gills and we shall drown.

Sometimes life seems long ; but, considering what we have to do, the transformation we have to effect, the

THE THIRD MORALITY

series of graded tests we have to pass, there is not a moment to spare. The nine months in the womb were long, but every day and every moment of every day was needed for growth. If against every day's inevitable lapse can be put an intentional striving to grow and expand, then life is full, and he who so lives neither clings to the past (or shrinks from memory of failure) nor winces from the future (or strains to what, without proportionate growth, would be premature delivery). He desires neither to return to childhood nor to have it all over and be dead. He accepts with cheerful content the time and place where he actually is, knowing that these are most suitable and apposite to that stage of consciousness which he himself has reached. He realizes that no stage can be missed out in the growth of full being. He has found the true tempo of life and its aim, its meaning. He has co-ordinated the inevitable process and explication of his body with the expansion and release of his spirit. He has thus found the Way, Truth and Life.

Such a life is indicated by our present cosmological knowledge. Further it does not at present take us. It does not yet appear what we shall be. We cannot—transitional creatures that we are—see more than how our transition may be and is being (if we will) effected. We see that by contemplation of our full nature and by goodwill to our fellows we serve them and ourselves and see them and ourselves as one co-ordinating purpose and unity. Here is a social and personal *raison d'être* and method, a practical philosophy for mankind, for civilization, for human relations and for the individual. More we have no right to ask, till we have achieved that much which is visible, possible, and desirable.

The ultimate fate of it all? We can leave that in

TRAINING

hope. We know we are growing—if we will—to a vast destiny, too vast for our present expression. We know we are learning patience, self-forgetfulness, self-transcendence. Such questions, then, of the final goal must wait, and we know, as we become enlightened, that we can wait, without impatience and without misgivings, their final elucidation. The fate of those who fail to be enlightened here and now? Who go down into the dark, blinded, futile, trapped in themselves, paralysed or enraged? Here again, and it is the gravest challenge, the answer is: "There is time, and have patience." We serve them best if we will be ourselves most enlightened. And, as part of their failure (because we are all parts, even when most sundered by individuality) is due to our failure (that we are not or were not better, fuller, more recreative beings), so we may, it would seem natural, be allowed, as we advance, to take up more of their disability. We may hope, against the intensely hardened prison wall of their fatally completed individuality to pour the even more intense and fusing energy of the enlarged consciousness into which we have emerged. This is the truth behind that principle of vicarious suffering which has often been misrepresented and abused. As we are all inextricably members of one life, and as the higher we develop, the more we become clearly aware of our communism—it is naturally the highest who are able to impart their strength to the lowest and help the most restricted into the deliverance and freedom they themselves enjoy.

These are reasonable hopes. Meanwhile the moment is here. Here is this moment's choice to be made and lived. In the face of our knowledge, we who are given this new vision of what life is and what our lives may and must be, cannot do other than with gratitude accept.

THE THIRD MORALITY

We belong to the larger life, we commend and dedicate ourselves to it. In acceptance we cannot fail. By accepting we know we are accepted. Each day we must, we do, and we will, receive ; and it will give. This is the supreme reciprocation and the supreme hope. As long as that reciprocity is realized, the process will not fail.

CHAPTER XI

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

IN the last chapter there were discussed the methods of contemplation or realization, those methods which are the appropriate exercise and reaction to the third cosmology, as prayer was to the first cosmology and rational resolution to the second. A brief outline of these frames of mind was given and it was also stated that it is only possible to retain a frame of mind at its most vivid and recreative if it is associated with frame of body : attitude, régime and exercise. These frames of body must now be considered. When that is done, we must try to estimate the evidence for results produced by this method. The chapter and the book will conclude with an attempt to answer the question : If this is the appropriate reaction to our present knowledge of the universe—if this method combines in it the forces of the earlier and narrower cosmologies and goes beyond them—then what is its effect to be ? Is this simply a method of final eremitism, whereby the human race will volatilize, or is it the power, the mould, the binding and the urge whereby there may appear on earth a society which will be even more powerful than the mechanomorphic and more purposive and more in communion with the universe than was the anthropomorphic ?

THE THIRD MORALITY

The Physical Aids—Why Necessary

We have seen that we have to hold in our mind's focus an interpretation and rendering of reality different from that current to-day. By an intense effort of abstraction and analysis we have to make ourselves experientially aware that the present common-sense outlook is only a construction. We have to pick to pieces that construction into its elements and to hold them apart with a fully conscious discrimination. That is the task of "alert passivity." Keeping the mind in a state of detached attention, we have to see our environment and ourselves with the intense but impartial interest of the artist and the scientist. Nothing is revolting, nothing is uninteresting. When we have won to that interest in relationships, to that realization as to origins, to that insight into interconnectedness and causality, then we have accomplished the first stage: we have understood that nothing is separate but all is tied together and given shape and purpose by an informing current. We see that the whole of the world, as we and our fellows see it, is a world comprehended through desire. Appetite has arranged that we shall perceive and it orders, through its restriction of our attention, how we shall admit any further apprehensions.

That realization is, however, only a preliminary step. When we have made this analysis and taken to pieces the current, unquestioned synthesis, which we call the world of common sense, we have to undertake the new synthesis. We have provided ourselves with raw material, as a housebreaker provides himself with the bricks he takes from the house he is demolishing. No more than he can we rest content with a pile of bricks. We have now to construct with them a larger, nobler building.

The first step, of dismantling the current structure,

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

is sufficiently hard. The forces of appetite, of greed and fear, which hold the present world-picture together, are strong enough—in spite of the present distress—to make any real taking to pieces no light task. Yet that is the easier part of the double effort. Tens of thousands now see through the present construction. They know the world's opinions, beliefs and prizes, whether of animal sense, of human possession and property or of civil and military fame, to be illusions. They do not become enlightened, but only cynical. Out of those tens of thousands who see through, only one will see on to an underlying pattern worthy of man's devotion.

Artist and Metaphysician Escape, not Remake

It is true that the artist does, more often than anyone else in our society, make out such a recombination, turning into a serene design elements which to the ordinary man only spell appetite. Unfortunately he is content to stop short with vision, to be as a bodyless eye. Hence few artist have been artists in living or indeed of any value apart from their work. They were content to do rather than to be. Nor has there been much more success in this difficult matter on the part of the professional philosophers, men who are supposed to be trained to make with the mind that analysis of sensation and experience which the artist makes with the eye. Amazingly few metaphysicians or even ethicists have been outstanding philosophers in the ordinary and necessary sense of the word. They have been singularly acute at analysis and not a few have designed systems which showed as much force of mental construction as the artist has shown visual construction. However, no more than the artist could be an artist in living could these thinkers actually contrive to live up to and in their

THE THIRD MORALITY

systems. These frames of mind were logical, they failed to be vital. They were intellectual assent but were not actually experience.

In both cases it is apparent that the world's current construction, however ugly and illogical, is too much for the thinker and the visualist to *live* against it. In both cases he has to escape if he is to build up anything apart from it. The philosopher and the artist are men who live much apart from life and the moment they have to make contact with life they lose their vision and detachment and behave like the rest of us. Even if this escape of theirs, as well as leading to the making of constructions, did remake them themselves, something more is required. We have seen that the new insight shows, not merely that we have our world made for us by our past and present intense selectivity of appetite, but that we are all involved with each other in that construction. There is no private escape because we are all one, and only by the analysis which shows us our underlying unity can we gain release.

Hence the second step, the step of combining the analysed elements into a new construction, a construction in which men may live as naturally as they live in the present construction of appetite, this step is extraordinarily difficult, but unavoidable. We have to do more than shut out the surging clamour of the present world. We have to hear so clearly a deeper music that we can sing it against the prevailing discord until others can catch up the theme and the discord be drowned in the new harmony.

This, in brief, is both to shut out the tumult and yet be present in the crowd. It is possible, but on one condition only: that we exchange, for the rest and poise of solitude, the rest and poise of a completely

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

co-ordinated consciousness. We may remind ourselves, and encourage ourselves by the reminder, that we are, in fact, always at some distance from the outer world. It can only reach us indirectly through the transmitting system of our senses. Hence we need not flee our native country and take refuge in the uttermost parts of the ocean. So long as we control the ports no one can enter uninvited. The ports of the mind are the senses of the body. Learn to control these and the problem of keeping poise and yet not losing touch is solved. It is not easy, but it can be done. It may sound an excessive and unnecessary effort : without it one or the other of the essential linkages—with the depths of the mind and with the commonalty of mankind—will be lost.

Real Progress Must be Psychophysical

It should be clear now why mental training without bodily training will fail. If we really desire the one we cannot but undertake the other.

Greed, fear, and anger—these are the volcanic fires in the self and in other selves and they are animal things. They can only be held when training has gone down to animal level. This, though painstaking, is not difficult. Once the fact that we are dealing with a mind-body is frankly realized, progress can be surprisingly fast. Indeed, so much advance in self-control has been disappointingly slow because of our intellectualist vanity which would not recognize that the dictates of the surface will produce only surface results and even when the whole system is made so to obey, it is arrested and not co-ordinated. Hence results so achieved are at great cost in nervous strain and are flawed with disastrous relapses and failures.

The authentic result of co-ordination between mind

THE THIRD MORALITY

and body through the subconscious is illustrated when the practitioner says afterwards : " I felt no fear and was surprised I was taking such an attitude for granted. I felt I had only to keep quiet, not interfere, but back up with my full assent what was going forward. In some way I seemed a spectator in the background." These common remarks explain exactly the completed process. There is no stoical effort, no tense triumph of the constricted will facing its antagonist and determined to win the right to be superior to him. On the contrary, there is the realization that the surface ego is not winning a victory, but that all it is asked to do is to release the amount of vital energy it usually absorbs and to pass this along (as detached and wondering interest) into the combined current of that still larger interest which is embracing and harmonizing the whole experience, the whole circumstance. This dynamic detachment is fully possible, but only possible when and because the body acts not as a conductor but as an insulator, not as a general confused stimulator but as a channelled focus through which the consciousness can see, as in a condensing glass, the confusion of pressing events (otherwise so close up as to be forced out of focus) related, ordered and composed.

The Three Physical Means

As full serenity of mind is therefore impossible without serenity of body, how may the body be brought to this essential co-operation ? There are three ways in which the conscious will can directly affect the body and train it so that it will form those habits which will aid, instead of thwart, the psyche. These three approaches are through diet, through attitude, in its two aspects of carriage and posture, and thirdly through breathing.

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

These three functions are all functions generally sub-conscious, profoundly affecting consciousness, and able to be brought into full consciousness, reordered and "relaid" as a better pattern of basic psychophysical behaviour.

(a) Diet

Diet, as we have seen, has been proved to have a very evident effect on temperament and so on character. For millenia this was taken as established, and only the false dichotomy of that rationalism which separated mind from body (the rationalism of the second cosmology) threw doubt on this ancient experience. Now, we have seen, work such as Dr. Katz's (see page 232) has given detailed documentary evidence not merely that diet and temperament are closely correlated, but that tradition has been right: the reflective, controlled type is vegetarian; the impulsive and impatient is the high-protein eater.

There is no doubt that until to-day our ignorance of diet was so considerable that a vegetarian diet often proved inadequate for health. A further obstacle to finding a diet for improving the quality of consciousness was presented by the fact that the vegetarian ascetic was, in the vast majority of cases, a mortifier and even a record-breaker. His reason for dieting was not to clear the mind but to tease the body and even to see how much less he could live on than his competing fellow-hermit in the next hermitage.* Buddha, it is true, preached against such a body-obsessed attitude, such a losing sight of the end (the serene, liberated mind) in the means, an obedient body. He is said to have remarked: "He that

* See, in *The Desert Fathers*, the histories of the eremites of the Egyptian Thebaid. They often said that an ill and broken body was the soul's health.

THE THIRD MORALITY

is mounted on an animal from which he cannot alight will not unduly vex the beast." Modern education has taught us that breaking the will of the child is a grossly mistaken path to teaching. We are learning the same thing about the body. If we are to educate it to co-operate with us in a unity, we must not aim at breaking it but at releasing it.

Modern dietetic knowledge now permits us to choose a diet which clears the mind and allays the body. We can admire the blind courage and devoted vision of the anchorite (as we admire that other blind courage and devoted vision of the mechanistic nationalist) while we perceive that his method nearly always prevented his attaining his end. The notion that mind is cleared simply because the stomach is empty is a belief which is so negative as to be largely false. The Tantric experts, in experiments with the mind-body, rule that the stomach should never be empty of food but never heavily loaded—hence they recommend a light meal every four hours, an opinion which many modern dieticians are beginning to favour, and which seems to have much to be said for it on the analogy that a fire burns most clearly which is continually and lightly fed with fuel.

Diet, then, should avoid a high-protein intake. Quantity is not nearly as necessary as we thought in pre-vitamin days. Vitamin research, however, favours a varied diet in which fresh vegetables take a large place. A considerable intake of fluid seems just as desirable, water being the best of solvents and therefore the natural cleanser. The question of stimulants in distinction from nourishments also can now have further light thrown on it. The distinction is probably not as objective—not as much a physiological fact—as earlier trainees have supposed. Many "nourishments" such

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

as "beef tea," meat extracts, and sugar itself may either be pure stimulants, making and repairing no tissue but releasing energy, or may, as does sugar, turn purely into energy, if effort is being made, and into reserves for energy (fat), if effort is not being undertaken. Some "stimulants" such as alcohol seem able at times to take the place of food and prevent the further loss of tissue, if not to supply the material for its recreation.

Our growing dietetic knowledge does, however, permit us to make an important distinction between the so-called "stimulants" themselves. It is increasingly doubtful whether alcohol has any right to be described as a stimulant, but that it should be called rather a "depressant" or "releasant." It seems that its effect is always to make precision and accuracy, the power of judgment and the reception and weighing of impressions, more vague. Its action, it is believed, is confined to rousing the lower layers of the cortex of the brain and inhibiting the action of the higher. It therefore produces a wholly unwarranted sense of appositeness, as is known all too well to anyone who has had to listen to a man, however slightly drunk, trying to tell a story and deludedly certain it is funny and he is witty, when both facts are patently otherwise. In the nervously inhibited (a common mental paralysis in our age in which the sensitive are mostly dominated by anxiety and fear), alcohol, by destroying their caution—which may be excessive—can release pent energies, and they become fluent and assured—but never as assured and fluent as they might be, would they face and rid themselves of their anxiety and be able to say in perfect soberness: "One to me is shame and fame."

Tea, on the other hand, especially in the China form, where the theine content is greatly developed

THE THIRD MORALITY

at the cost of reducing the tannin, may be a true stimulant, for theine is a singularly assimilable form of the tri-methyl-xanthine which is the basic chemical underlying both theine and caffeine and which seems to act not on the lower cortices of the brain but on the seventh and highest. Such a stimulant may well have a place in a fully rational diet aimed at the most harmonious interaction of mind and body so that mind and its largest intentions may be the meaning, pursuit and co-ordinating power of the entire psychophysical organism.*

The rule which will control all diet will be—results. Does this diet give me the freedom so to live? That is the question and the enquiry with which every régime will be undertaken. For, remarkable as our progress in dietetics has been and though much of past experience we find we can now endorse and incorporate in a rational régime aiming at the greatest psychophysical suppleness and freedom, yet at least as much is still to be discovered.

We diet in order to know about the mind-body just as much as to know about the universe, to improve our instrument as to improve the image in our instrument. This is the rule, the double, reciprocal aim which runs through all the rules of the third ethic, whether of mind or body, of meditation, of diet, of attitude, of respiration. Already we know that the rules we have found are only averages, ways for the average man.

* It is worth remarking that the Chinese Buddhist system called "The School of Meditation" used tea to clear the mind and to assist concentration, and it seems that the "Zen" Buddhists—Zen being the form in which this high type of meditation was developed—introduced tea into Japan as they required it to assist their exercise in concentrative meditation. Dr. Rhine also, in his *Extra-Sensory Perception*, points out how the balance and concentration necessary to make the extra-sensory faculty or faculties function under the strain of control is assisted by caffeine and made much more difficult, if not impossible, by fatigue.

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

Already we can see the higher type will have (not no rules) but rules of a more complex sort, obeying principles which at present one cannot detect. The highest types, it has long been suspected, can come "eating and drinking" and keeping any hours and any company. It is becoming equally clear that they can also do without diets which are essential to the average. Of what the mind-body can fare upon, when the mind has come to full mastery and agreement with the body, we have only occasional hints. For instance, many saints seem to have lived on diets which were without vitamins and yet these people have shown great physical energy. There is the case of the Jesuit saint, St. Peter Claver, whose diet was a few handfuls of dried maize, who among other activities, used to carry the exhausted slaves on his back up from the slave ships, and who lived to be seventy. The more famous saint of the last century, the Curé d'Ars, lived also to old age on a diet almost as deficient. They could, one must suppose, not only release energy as we average distracted creatures cannot, but also derive, by the same intense energy, nourishment from sustenance which our unco-ordinated psychophysique would reject, partly no doubt because it would not see any reason for being so little tempted to assimilation. The purpose for living, if it is single and strong enough, will find ways of surviving, which to us who need constant fresh enticement and temptation to think life worth living, seem miraculous and contrary to nature.

(b) *Attitude*

So much for the vast and growing subject of diet. The next bodily co-ordination with spirit is physical attitude. Here again the ascetics with their hardly-veiled contempt and even hatred of physique have missed

THE THIRD MORALITY

much and set up conflicts (on which they wasted their spirits in an expense of shame) where they should have achieved co-ordinations. We are gradually discovering how much mood is expressed in carriage and posture, and carriage and posture suggest and create mood. It is possible at a considerable distance to detect the deranged mind of a madman or a psychotic by the peculiar way the body is held. Further, we find every frame of mind has its answering frame of body. The melancholic and dejected walk and sit collapsed, the sullen with a slouch, the confident do, physically, look up. Every régime also has made its appropriate stance. There is the bent spine of that abject humility which extreme anthropomorphic theism dictated. There is the extreme, exhibitionist standing-at-arms of the soldier, the chest thrown out, rigidity in every muscle, the neck constricted and the blood supply to the brain checked.

The Third Morality will have as distinct a carriage and posture as the abject crouch and the bent head of the pleading sinner of Anthropomorphism and the swaggering display or mechanized, ram-rod, goose-step rigidity which is naturally produced by the mechanomorphic conduct.

To believe, however, that such a new suppleness should be natural reaction to the new free outlook is not to attain it. We can change our diet with fair rapidity and have little but the beneficial results we intended from the change; though when an alcoholic is to be taken off his drink he must be "tapered": for fear *delirium tremens* will intervene, his intake of alcohol must only be cut down gradually. In attitude we are all addicts. We have settled into our bodies and, as they are the expression of what we long have felt, changing our feeling too rapidly is only to find the self up against

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

a resistance which defeats our good intention to turn over a new leaf. Yet this is not the worst difficulty we may encounter in this task of releasing the psyche by re-education of the physique.

Why Change has to be slow

As far as we can now outline the mind-body process, it begins with the self-conscious surface will; passes down through ever less conscious, less flexible and more powerful will-attitudes; through customs, habits, engrams, conditioned reflexes; from reflexes on into functions, tensions and rhythms; into secretions, tissues, organs and structures. There is really no break in this enormous front from clearest, most conceptual thought to bone at its hardest and most brittle. As, then, there is no break, any change at one end must affect the whole long sequence—affect but not necessarily change, upset but not necessarily resettle. Here there arises a great difficulty, as has been mentioned. It is possible to disturb and to throw out long before it is possible to transform. The late Dr. Gamble, the eminent zoologist, pointed out that even in normal living—when no change was being attempted but only maintenance was desired—the sheer length of the “lines of communication,” from the self-conscious fore-brain to the deepest secretory and metabolic processes of the body, was so great that breakdown was often bound to occur. Outer circumstances suddenly demanded of the upper centres that they should make modifications of the whole body, modifications which the lower centres could not implement—hence collapse. A sudden call for intense action or thought may have to be answered. It can, however, only be answered by a closing of the stomach and by the blood being rushed away from the digestive tract, either

THE THIRD MORALITY

to the brain or muscles. Immediately the deeper physical processes are brought to a standstill, regardless of whether the body can afford such an arrest in its income or whether such processes—such as digestion—left incomplete, will not be followed not merely by malnutrition but by auto-intoxication.

This well-known cause of psychophysical damage in our world of haste and worry—fruitful cause of duodenal ulcers, etc.—is, it is clear, apt to appear even more strikingly, if, instead of occasional external excitements and disturbances, there is a persistent attempt on the part of the mind to change its relation to the body and that deeper consciousness which administers and reflects the body. As Dr. Carrel has pointed out (*Man the Unknown*), for us to pay any attention to any of the subconscious processes—such as breathing, digesting, heart-beat or even swallowing—is, to some extent, to hinder their free working.

Further it can be dangerous. We are built up to run in a certain way and the going concern is the result of innumerable compromises, treaties, checks and balances between the intelligence, which thinks itself only an independent observer, and the body, which seems only a chemical still. We cannot then lightly alter any of these arrangements without repercussions from one end of the system to the other. As long as we only play about with changing ourselves, are content with a purely emotional change, little trouble, if much self-illusion, will be experienced. The moment we see we must change the whole psychophysique, if the psyche is really to be changed, we are in for trouble. With our present copious evidence of that fact it seems probable that much of the acute ill-health which has attended the achievement by mystics and other geniuses of their enlarged insight into reality

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

may have been due to their dragging after them too hastily the vast remainder of their entire psychophysical organism, before it had had time to arrange a *modus vivendi*. That so many of them (as we have seen) after a considerable period entered into a completed peace seems also to show that there was achieved, following the violent, preliminary derangement, this new re-education of the whole system to the "transvaluation of all values." On the other hand, the equally important fact that a considerable number—more than we can know, for "where are the monuments of those who were drowned?"—of these pioneers never won to completeness, but, having abandoned the small conventional settlement, failed to arrive at any other, and so were deranged, must be held in mind just as clearly as the triumph of those who, though torn, did get through.

Failures as well as hard-won successes do not advise us to abstain, but show the need of a patient, cautious, scientific procedure in undertaking these profound modifications. Up to the present only superwills have got through. Hence the saints are admired and not imitated, for the ordinary man remarks they are of tougher fibre than his weave and if he attempted so to twist himself he would only fray to pieces like the fatuous enthusiasts, whose history he knows quite as well as he knows the saints'. Hence the explanation why the saints' triumph makes so little social difference.

It is necessary to stress this problem when considering modification of physical attitude, for diet can be changed without such disturbances, both because we now know sufficient about dietetics and also because we have naturally a wide range of foodstuffs out of which we can get nourishment. With attitude we begin to approach a dangerous possibility of upsetting such balance and

THE THIRD MORALITY

co-ordination as we have, in the hope of attaining a better, which nevertheless we may miss.

One more example must suffice. It has been found that, when a common spinal complaint of growing children has been remedied by massage and other treatment, the child may fall into a not less crippled condition and one which resists treatment more stubbornly. Indeed such a condition appeared intractable until it was discovered that the trouble arose from the fact that, though the spinal muscles had been reconditioned, the palliative reflexes which the nervous system had set up in the nerves of the back (so as to make the carriage of the distorted body at all possible) remained unresolved. The specific mechanical cure was thwarted because the reflexes which had been conditioned by the distorted muscles failed to recognize that their compensatory behaviour was no longer needed. The reflexes had to be re-educated so that the psychophysique might re-avail itself of its repaired mechanism.

It is clear, then, that psychophysical re-education and co-ordination, because it is the reblending of the mind-body in a single unity, must be advanced simultaneously from the two ends of mind and body and this linking up can only be brought about harmoniously if the area where mind and body interact, the subconscious mind, is actively engaged in the transaction. Hence we have lately begun to perceive the value of rhythmic pattern in advancing the unification. Dancing, music, and even the plastic arts are not merely recreations—dancing of the body, music of the ear, and painting and sculpture of the eye. The studies made in *Empathy*—in the way plastic form affects the onlooker—seem to show that, as we contemplate designs made by a master, it is not merely our eye and our intelligence which are pleased

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

but our whole nervo-muscular system responds, and by tensions and releases we are profoundly and subconsciously moved by, and respond to, the superb salience of the composition before us. Therefore the training of the body in its contribution to full psychophysical release will no doubt have, as part of its technique, the contemplation of such works of art.

It has been mentioned that there seem to be among men three physical aids whereby the mind is released from the harness and cramp of habitual utilitarian behaviours and thrown into a larger frame: the first motion is the Dance, the manifest and active rhythm in which the performer swings himself out of the rut. That method we to-day despise. It is a "Shamanistic," a Dervish, a savage way. It is ridiculous, undignified, childish. Yet dignity may be precisely that self-conscious nervousness and hypertonic rigidity which is the base of much of our neuroses to-day. The Dance may be the safest and sanest way of enlargement. It is unlikely, however, that we shall have the courage to revive it as a psychotherapy until we have obtained considerable relief from our constricting self-consciousness, through the two other, less spectacular but less safe, physical attitudes and carriages.

The second motion is the ritual rhythm, the "mudric," processional method. This has been the common religious carriage in Western Europe. It is that steady persistent, quiet swing and beat, that "ambulation" into which many people find they fall if they are lecturing or dictating closely but freely, "thinking on their legs" or at which it is common to see Catholic priests when reciting their breviary offices. This, however, is a very loose empirical carriage and would undoubtedly yield far better results in aiding concentration, did we

THE THIRD MORALITY

incorporate into it the technique of, or permit it to be recast by, F. Matthias Alexander, with the experience he has had of the remedying of faulty carriage and the discoveries he has made of the benefit to mental condition that results from true ortho-grading.

The third motion is the specifically contemplative attitude, that sedence in which, with spine and neck held straight, arms folded and legs crossed under the body the whole frame is lodged in stillness. This attitude undoubtedly is most dignified, but to the active mind-body of the westerner, though it secures the body, it seems all the more to release the mind, which then swarms the thicker with random thoughts, as the head of a brisk walker through a fly-infested wood, as long as he moves, trails a train of midges and, when he pauses, is encloused among them. Some fly-whisk for fly-thoughts must be kept sweeping the air clear. This, of course, can be and is supplied by rhythmic deep breathing. For the rhythmic motion of the limbs is substituted this internal tide.

(c) *Respiration*

This, however, as is well known now, is the most powerful and therefore the least safe of all the methods of changing focus. Too rapid a change of diet may upset digestion ; too rapid a change of attitude and carriage may tire, distress, and even lame ; too rapid a change in breathing may disorganize the central nervous system. Earlier (p. 284) there has been quoted Dr. Carrel's remark that merely to attend to breathing or heart-beat (or indeed to swallowing or any other semi-conscious process) is to disturb the natural functioning of that centre. Deliberately to alter the breathing is to involve the mind-body in a far graver adventure. Still, as

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

people to-day would rather be endangered than be laughed at (so Dance cannot become part of the psycho-physical release), and as they want quick convincing results and indeed need them (so ambulative contemplation will probably not give them enlargement of focus before they fail in their effort, becoming either merely perfunctory or negligent), we must be prepared to see the main advance made along the short but dangerous path. It is necessary, therefore, to say something about this, the third and far the most instant and powerful of all the physical methods of affecting, altering, and enlarging consciousness.

So far as our knowledge extends at present on this interesting, little-known subject, it seems possible to say that the same principle rules in breath control as in muscular control of bodily attitude and carriage, *viz.* the rate of change should not exceed that at which the mind-body can simultaneously carry out all those other co-ordinative changes which the alteration of this specific and central rhythm will necessitate. We are only beginning to discover how extensive or elaborate those changes must be. We realize that heart-beat will be remarkably affected by breathing rhythm and that the reduced heart-beat will in turn be reflected in a shift in the endocrine balance, the secretions from the supra-renal glands, the glands of excitement, becoming reduced, and so the whole function-phase and feeling tone of the body-mind, reciprocatingly, will be brought into another gear.

Probably the safest rule in such exercises is, fundamentally, the simplest : the increase in the extension of breathing (longer inspiration and expiration) should be governed by perceiving how far this extension gives an increased awareness and power of concentration. The

THE THIRD MORALITY

aim is not sensation, of however high a sort, of however lofty a serenity. The aim is the widened focus of consciousness, yielding on the one hand a greater knowledge of and power over the self and on the other a greater insight into and compass of the outer condition. If diet is advanced at the same time and carriage is also simultaneously mastered, then probably progress will be satisfactory.

That is not to say that advance will be either fast or without check or reaction. There is a real and constant danger that experimenters, finding they can produce quick and unmistakable results, if they press the method to the utmost they can endure, and fearing (because of a "hang-over" from materialism) that they may be deceiving themselves unless they can show such obvious consequences, may find their minds concentrated on these side issues, these concomitants, and in the end, becoming absorbed in producing spectacular effects, they will not only fail to gain the enlarged insight, they will damage the body-mind, the instrument through which the greater perception was to have come.

A slow advance is probably that which is most truly economical. The interaction between mind and body, between the conscious and the subconscious life of the organism is to-day both slow and intermittent. The conscious mind and the subconscious mind have to communicate with each other, through the valve which separates them, by a sequence which is analogous to swallowing. Anyone who tries to drink without a pause will choke. This "swallowing rhythm" is a rapid one, but there are probably also other such which are larger and slower. Hence, though, as has been suggested, the extreme distresses of the mystics ("dark night of the soul," etc.) may have been due to their

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

unwisely forcing the pace, any advance must have its tidal fluctuations, its flows and shallows, its fullnesses and drynesses. Even in learning a language everyone realizes the fact of intermittent advance. There is nearly always an initial period of surprising aptitude. This is as invariably followed by a second period, one of equally surprising forgetfulness, when the disappointment leads many to give up all together. Perseverance ends in the third period, when not only what had been temporarily lost is recovered but a further rapid extension and mastery results.

The interrelatedness of diet and carriage with breathing exercises seems also to be important. The low-protein diet being less stimulating is less apt to disturb intense reflective thought (as Dr. Katz's work seems to give some confirmatory experimental evidence) and, further, as the keenness of apprehension which comes from intensified and heightened awareness is experienced, the greater sensitivity of the whole organism responds to all stimulant with greater reaction. So, too, the straitened spine is also thought by some experimenters and in some traditions to be necessary, because, when the main nerve-centres of the spine are being affected (such as the *medulla oblongata* which directly controls the nerves working the lungs), it is vitally important that such complimentary and compensatory changes as may have to take place in the neuro-spinal tract and in the spinal cord itself should be given a free path and at no point be congested or embarrassed.

Of these facts we may soon have experimental evidence. Meanwhile on first principles it seems wise to act on such advice, for we know, beyond doubt, that diet, carriage, and respiration are three outstanding nodes in the single function of the mind-body: each one can only

THE THIRD MORALITY

act fully with the fullest co-operation of the others, each can change only with the concerted change of the others. The advice to make haste slowly comes from those who have great experimental experience and who, as they have been accused of a passion for other-worldliness, cannot be charged with hesitance or tardiness in advancing into the country which lies beyond the world of unreflective action and immediate passion.

With such a triple co-ordinated effort we may hope to swing the mind-body so that it both pursues the larger pattern it perceives and, by that pursuit, comes to ever enlarging perception of vaster pattern. The threshold of consciousness is widened and shifted until it informs the whole organism and, through every channel and apprehension of the organism, becomes integrally aware of an integrative experience. The process is subjectively, or interiorly, the enfranchisement of the whole three estates of being; mind, feeling, and body. Only with this re-sensitized awareness of its total being can the human creature have, and be, the instrument through which it may apprehend the totality of its environment.

Why this Way, though Dangerous, must be Taken

It must be repeated that this is a risk. Because it is a real adventure no one can say what the casualty rate may be. But it is a risk which we have no choice except to take. Some are so impressed with these dangers, at the damage which the passionate and enthusiastic will can inflict on the whole system, to sanity and to health, that they would still discourage all such pioneering. Such an objection can be answered all too easily to-day, whatever reply might have been appropriate when society was stabilized and when health of mind and

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

body was possible by unquestioning conformity with immemorial custom. Then the XVIIIth-century ecclesiastical dread of "enthusiasm" may have had justification, not merely because that enthusiasm was dangerous but because the established "apollonian" religion (enthusiasm's alternative) was still adequate to supply the psycho-social needs of the majority of those generations.

To-day it is clear that those who enquire into the mind's powers and the mind-body relationship are not, through these enquiries, giving rise to the derangement of the psycho-social balance. Our investigations are not a cause or a provocation of disturbance, but a reply to a derangement which has already grown so grave that not only is the number of unhinged steadily increasing (Carrel, *Man the Unknown*, p. 20), but the number of diseases (which account for the death rate) which can be referred to psychological causes increases even faster. When diseases with such obvious physical destruction as duodenal ulcer, skin diseases, diabetes, and even phthisis are in ever greater number of cases traced back to morbid states of mind and when, in turn, these states of mind are found to be attributable to a social way of living, an outlook on life which puts an intolerable strain on the individual, then what accident has already caused intention must strive to remedy.

Our grossly partial outlook on life has built up a mechanic system of society because that partial outlook so believed the whole universe to be. This mechanic system puts strains on our mind-bodies under which they break down. The mechanic social system, however, cannot be changed in a moment or indeed in less than a generation. Nor can it be changed unless and until people know quite clearly that it gives a false

THE THIRD MORALITY

picture, it is a mistaken model of, and reaction to, the universe. People cannot therefore change the system before they can conceive another underlying reality (than that which gave rise to the system) and they cannot clearly conceive of that other underlying reality until they are living in a system which does not flatly deny it. They seem, therefore, involved in a vicious circle, and so no doubt most people are, for, though as they think they act, so also as they act they think.

No more then need be said to answer the charge that these investigations are dangerous and best left alone. They are dangerous. Were X-rays not worth finding out, though they killed or mutilated most of those pioneers who discovered them? No real power is ever other than dangerous. It would be no power, were it less. We are, however, given no choice. Our society is breaking down and breaking down its constituents, in its process of decay, so that they cannot resist its decomposition. Only by an intense, co-ordinated effort of attention and training can those who see this condition turn themselves round, contact larger reality, build up a complete reaction with that reality, and so give rise to a way of life which can break through the vicious circle and take the place of the present way of death. What we are called on to bring forth is a new psycho-social mutation, a new step in evolution. Of course this is dangerous. The majority of all individuals, of any species which has to go through metamorphosis, never get through, but die in the transition from chrysalis to free, living insect. The majority of all species have failed. The whole past path of evolution is one enormous discourse on the text: "Many are called, few (perhaps only one) chosen."

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

The New Athleticism

The third ethic, deduced from the third cosmology, calls, then, for a distinctive practitioner, a type made by training. It will and must give rise to a new athleticism. The first cosmology had its highest type in the ascetic saint, for even those who rejected mortification were of the prophetic category, outside the social order and orientated to another state of being: Gautama seeing behind the world the actionless calm of Nirvana, Jesus looking for the apocalyptic transformation of this fallen world into the Kingdom.

The second cosmology had its specific and finished type in the rational natural philosopher, who, with detachment and with no feeling but cool interest, took to pieces the world around him and even attempted by analysis so to neutralize his own passions. However, this misconception of his own nature, because it was a unity only to be understood and controlled as a whole (*gestalt*), made him far less successful with self-control than with nature control. His rationalism made him first despise and then make covert concession to the rebellious body. So he contributed to the hypocrisy of respectability.

The type produced as the expression of the third cosmology and its ethic must be the mind-body athlete, who has the critical analytic experimental interest which characterized the best of the second ethic and also has the intense devotion, the capacity for self-forgetfulness and the fully mastered, wielded, and aimed body-mind which shines out in the highest types of the first ethic.

This athletic type will resolve the conflict of matter and mind, body and spirit, which neither of the earlier ethics succeeded in solving, though the best succeeded

THE THIRD MORALITY

in eliminating, through intuitive sublimation rather than through scientific understanding. It will create that state of being in which "flesh helps soul no less than soul helps flesh." For it will experience that condition when the psychophysical organism will become a unity, no longer a conflict, body being realized as a form of mind and mind as a form of body.

* * * * *

Is this Dope ?

But granted such a state can be attained and should be attained, is it more than a scientific stoicism, a new way of bearing but not changing old unalterable ills ? Does it, can it, make a real, an objective difference, change things outside itself, or is it, in final analysis, no more than an athletic opium through the use of which a man may become so fit that he cannot care, whatever may happen ? The new psychophysical condition is undoubtedly an athletic state of the mind-body, but it is more. Through that condition man gains a new rapport with his circumstances ; that is the purpose of this reconditioning.

The power of rational analysis and critical experiment which was the finest discipline of the second cosmology not only benefited those who practised it, it gave them an enormous power over their environment, a power which, as we have seen, has been so great as to prove disproportionate for their natures, only so disciplined, to control.

And when we go behind the second cosmology to the first, there again we find its appropriate method, prayer, a discipline of the mind, but certainly not intended to

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

be that only—on the contrary, intended to yield control of environment and rapport with the essential force of the universe. Nor can we dismiss prayer as only a dope. It could only be considered as such by the mechanomorphic age. Since then we have recognized the power of auto-suggestion. If prayer be no more than dope, then it is a queer drug, for, though no doubt it can be and has been used as a soporific, it can also act as a true stimulant. It is a strange sort of self-hallucination by which a man can empower himself to break an addiction which, as long as he considered his condition critically and rationally, he could not cure.

Further investigation has shown that prayer is not limited to auto-suggestion, to cures worked on the individual self. Men can cure others by prayer. As we have seen, the evidence for telepathy makes it easier for this particular prayer evidence not to be dismissed without investigation. Further, there is evidence that men by prayer can get their way and obtain their wishes in more material matters than healing. The truth about this interesting problem has been difficult to get at, because neither of the earlier cosmologies wished to recognize it. The mechanomorphist maintained as an obvious fact that prayer is never answered and, by the nature of Nature, can never be. Being so sure of the latter part of his statement, he does not think it necessary to establish the proof of the first part of it. Yet scientists can never afford to forget that "universal negatives" are notoriously difficult to establish, probably impossible. The anthropomorphist maintains that prayer can be, should be and always is answered if you pray rightly. Both "are right in what they maintain and wrong in what they deny." Prayer, any anthropologist cannot

THE THIRD MORALITY

deny,* is far too often answered not to be investigated. The same impartial observer will add: "It is also far too often not answered not to be investigated"—*i.e.* to be taken and left at the anthropomorphist's estimate and explanation. It is indeed unfortunate that those who prayed would not investigate and those who investigated would not pray. Had this been done (and there surely would have been no "irreverence" in trying to find out the laws of this method of communication, for you do not reflect on the majesty of the Government of the United States if you enquire into the capacities and limits of submarine cables), then surely we might have developed, with greater speed and less heartburning (yes, and body burning), man's spiritual capacity and his psychological knowledge.

Now with the third cosmology, the cosmology which conceives the universe as being a mind which in certain aspects resembles the human mind and so to be contacted by the human mind when it attains a certain detachment from the contraction its individualized urgencies impose upon it, we can realize what prayer can do. Such anthropomorphic petitionary prayer, assuming the universe to be personal and individual and treating it as such (*i.e.* praying to it), can and does produce some result—in fact, just as much result as there is truth in that assumption. Mechanomorphism maintained (wrongly) that there was no truth in that assumption and therefore could not explain why

* See reports on Don Bosco's and Müller's orphanages and Mary Austin's account of her experiments. These are only three extensive and carefully documented examples, one from the life of a contemporary Roman Catholic saint, the other from the life of a contemporary undenominational Protestant philanthropist, and the third from the records of an empiricist who studied and took part in the working of prayer methods used and made to work to-day by a variety of practisers from Roman Catholics to Red Indian "witch-doctors."

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

prayer sometimes was answered. Anthropomorphism maintained (wrongly again) that that assumption was quite true and therefore could not explain why prayer was so frequently unanswered.

The Third Ethic has the Third Technique

But the third ethic, by making this discovery, not only settles a difficult and important problem in psychology, it also sees its own technique and its effects elucidated by the discovery. Contemplation is not merely a subjective exercise. It is an essential way of bringing the united consciousness into rapport with the mental element of the universe and so obtaining powers which are the appropriate powers, the applied results of that world picture, as answers to prayer and healing "miracles" were the appropriate powers and applied results of the first cosmology, and applied science and all its powers were the result of the second. And, as the first cosmology, so acted on and contacted, gave considerable psychological power and benefit (which were lost in the second), and as the second yielded great physical power and some considerable benefit, so this third cosmology, combining these two and transcending their limitations will give us powers which will surpass any which man has so far had, and a balance and security which generally has only been his when his span of knowledge and power was crampingly restricted.

Team Work Essential

Before concluding this outline of method, we must touch on one other factor and means towards making the new ethic actual. Up to this point this training of the mind-body has been considered purely as an individual

THE THIRD MORALITY

concern and achievement. That, of course, it cannot be. The whole cosmology is one which points to the aim of the world process being not merely the transcendence of individuality but also to that transcendence through union with the common, deeper life isolated in all other individuals. We cannot too often repeat to ourselves (after the mistake of the two other earlier cosmologies in this direction): There is no private salvation; each strives to be delivered by and through the deliverance of all.

The new athleticism of mind-body must therefore be a team achievement. It is essential for its aim that this goal be sought for together. But, further, the means also will be lacking, no real progress towards the goal will be made, unless the effort is a joint effort. In the solitary intensity of the highest Anthropomorphism it may have been possible and even expeditious for an individual to cut himself off from the world and, as an anchorite, to make the "flight of the alone"—the absolute individual—"to the Alone" (the Absolute which is inapprehensible by the transitional). The third cosmology neither so conceives its goal nor its means. The highest state of being is, it holds, latent in mankind, in every man, and it must be called out. The third cosmology's conception of the highest is Immanence, because this cosmology sees the universe as constructed (to a degree unsuspected by either of the earlier cosmologies and even now still unknown) unconsciously by ourselves.

This discovery therefore compels, for a double reason, that our further advance be a collective advance. We must bring others with us or our advance would be vain; they are us. But no less we must have others with us, or our advance will fail; we cannot save ourselves

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

single-handed. Indeed we need hardly discuss the morality or immorality, the rightness or wrongness, of what Jerome called, aptly enough, "Holy Selfishness." For this greedy hope of spiritual advance by oneself, of stealing a march on all others, of deserting mankind and only asking (a question all too common in Anthropomorphism): "Where shall I be most safe?" is for the third ethicist simply a hallucination of inflamed individualism. As a matter of fact it is impossible.

Whether, then, it is right or wrong to wish so to act becomes an academic question. Right or wrong is a matter of seeing things as they are or as we mistake them to be. For with the third cosmology and its ethic we arrive back at the point where what is morally right is, and can only be, what is scientifically right. Truth and goodness come again together. This is the goal of that sanity to which Buddhism looked forward when it taught that understanding was the fundamental morality, because he who had insight must in the end discover the two enlightening and emancipating truths, that he and all life are one and that he and all life create sorrow, disappointment and pain by building up a world of craving, a world composed by the selective and transmutative power of greed and fear.

As, then, private salvation is impossible, and yet the sudden mutation of all the human race is not to be expected, it is clear that individuals who would so transmute themselves must do so in teams. Otherwise, it is obvious, the individual will not escape. He need not discuss whether he ought or ought not to fly. In reality, as the conduct of too many anchorites proved through their passionate wish for self-survival, he is in no more danger of flying from the rest than a high-jumper is in danger of flying off the earth. He is still

THE THIRD MORALITY

as heavy as he was, still as firmly attracted by "the field" he is in and he will only come down all the harder, the more violently he springs. Only neutralizing gravitation's pull can really set him free.

For the main Adverse Force is Social Suggestion

In the world to-day, as we have seen, we are involved in something much more intricate than our own personal adhesions. We are held by them, true enough, but they are only an additional layer and weave of some forty years of habit put upon two other much more tightly woven strands. Those two other strands are our animal inheritance and our social heredity. "A three-fold cord is not lightly broken." It must be unpicked. A knot with pressure on it cannot be untied. Loose the pull and it may be undone. When, likewise, the individual, by himself, has loosed his own habits and psycho-physical conditioning, he finds, under this untied knot, the other two. These are kept taut not by his pressure but by the pressure round him. He can then by himself loose the pressure of the knot he himself tied, but he cannot by himself loose the pressures on the knots which he himself as an individual did not tie.

We have seen the care which he must take in loosing his animal ties and yet we must remember his evolution has already largely loosed him of these. He has now no instincts, and we know now that as far down as the higher primates—as soon as the big brain appears and pioneering and experimental action becomes possible—instinct, in any exact sense of a fully-engrained, complete behaviour-pattern, has been cut off. The place of instinct, however, has been taken by social heredity, by tradition. It is therefore this midmost knot which

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

takes most of the strain, and so will resist most stubbornly an individual's effort to unpick it.

Indeed we may say man is as highly suggestible as he is un-instinctive, and he who may find it easy to deliver himself from his personal habits and even his animal urges will find himself helpless against the suggestive power of his society. True, he may think he has escaped it when he goes into passionate revolt against it or deserts it for solitary deliverance. But his revolt is only the ringing echo of his society's greed, fear, and passionate individualism, while his desertion also is due to the same urge, to preserve the supremely precious self constructed by greed and fear and, in turn, expressing these basic passions.

Social suggestion is then the master knot, tying us into our individuality, and so denying us the power to see the world as it appears to the wider focus and nobler constructive power yielded by interest-affection. We need to repeat, social suggestion is more powerful even than animal instinct with us, for we see how far commoner is physical courage—the defiance of the urge to physical safety—than moral courage, the defiance of the urge to social conformity.

Hence it is against social suggestion that we have to unite all our efforts if we are to win freedom for ourselves and others. To untie this knot in ourselves we have to loose the pressure on it. To neutralize the vast pull of this "gravitational field" we have to set up together a society living the life inspired by interest-affection in contradistinction to the present society living the life driven by greed and fear.

Those, then, who would use and develop the exercises mentioned in the first part of this chapter must do so in teams, and those teams must be living a way of life

THE THIRD MORALITY

which is a psychiatry, an economy and a policy, a complete new life because it grows up as the complete social expression of a completely relaid and reintegrated psychophysical being, a being who is entirely energized by interest-affection, by full awareness of his all-embracing life.

It may be said that this is impossible. As the individual cannot stand against the suggestive force of the pervasive social heredity which ties him fast in its knot of craving, so neither could a team. It would never be able to come together and function in the intensely adverse field of the present degenerating social heredity of our lapsing civilization. But it is just here that bad news read twice can become good, and the worst may turn out to be a friend of the better.

Social Heredity's Extremity is the Pioneer's Opportunity

True, our civilization is in acute distress and is showing many signs of atavistic behaviour. But why? Because it knows that it has reached a stage in its rapid evolution when its disintegration, in order to assimilate new outlooks, has become so extensive that it must either go back to far simpler and cruder conditions or make a complete and radical reconstruction. It is, at this moment, trying to go back, because, naturally, the past looks safer and easier to attain than a new social mutation, a completely new pattern of living. Hence the romanticizing of the past. But, though it wishes to go back, it will not really pay the full price needed to repurchase the old, narrow balance. True, it tries to get rid of the new sensibility and deliberately to achieve the toughness only natural and easy to the stupid. But it tries equally desperately to hang on to the new sense, the new immense, intricate technological powers,

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

and these need intelligence to handle them. They are as deadly in the hands of a fool and in the false limits of nationalism as is T.N.T. in a wooden cannon. In fact the present bewildered Leaders Backwards are like the wretched monkeys who are caught by the trapper, because, having put their hands into narrow-necked bottles containing food, they can neither remove the full hand nor will they relinquish the bait. So, self-manacled, they are picked up, captives of their own blind greed.

Civilization to-day is therefore showing signs which are hopeful to the social pioneer. Its violence and degeneracy are symptoms of its bewilderment, of its subconscious realization that it cannot stay still or drift, but must strike out. To-day much of it (but, we must remind ourselves, in our discouragement, far from all of it) is striking back. Even among such, doubts are growing as to whether any harbourage can lie behind. Now all this is hopeful, because a civilization in such bewilderment is a civilization with very low suggestive power. As people say, it is becoming every day more "impossible," more self contradictory. The more a society resorts to force, the more certain it is that its power of appearing obviously right is vanishing. The statements made by civilization's leaders to-day are increasingly divorced from anything which even common sense could maintain. Their "cases" are more and more obviously whatever shifts may postpone a complete explanation. Their dependence on violence they have to justify by mis-statements about strangers.

To those who know the force of social suggestion, that it is the master knot, more powerful than private interest or animal craving, able to sweep the wise individual off his feet, equally able to make the craven show

THE THIRD MORALITY

all the signs of a brute courage, there is, then, nothing but hope in the fact that the old, almost unconscious suggestion, the suave assumption that the Government and Reality were one, and obedience was clearly the only sensible action of rational men, has vanished and that in its stead is naked violence. For this is the frank confession for which we have been waiting, that the game is up, that social suggestion is no longer working, and the loudspeaker and the secret torture-chamber must take its place. They cannot. For a social suggestion to have to labour its point, argue and be explicit, to have to invoke phantasms and revoke even that degree of actuality which men have come to see, is to own itself found out, to confess that the sure, deep, hidden social heredity has come to an end and that further advance is only possible through a further (not a reduced) facing of reality. When manufactured public opinion fails, then to try to carry on by threat of violence is even more fatal to such government. Its days are numbered for, as we have seen, it is social suggestion that man fears far more than physical damage and to threaten him and torture him is only to confirm in his heart (even though his flesh yield) that the social suggestion is bankrupt, the social heredity in that line at an end.

If then the practitioners of the Third Morality will to-day come together in teams to live the life which the new cosmology sanctions, the new ethic indicates, and the new psychophysical training makes actual, they will find that they can, in the present chaos of confused counter-suggestions in our contemporary civilization, build up the new order with sureness and rapidity. Cross winds can wreck a sailing ship, but for a steamer (though the passengers may feel sick) such winds may be more favourable than a steady gale from one

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

quarter. Well built and under its own power, the steamer drives through the cross seas to its port. The present crisis of violence, because it shows that social heredity is at an end, gives to those who have the material, the technique and the will, an unparalleled opportunity to rebuild civilization.

Much has been learned in the past about such team work. Here it need only be said that the nucleating unit should not be larger than a score, perhaps it ought to be only a dozen, and it is a company (as is any association—nation or church—which accepts the whole being of its constituents) of unlimited liability. Experiment will show how in detail such nucleations should be composed. Already much experience has been won from experiments being carried on now. What we have mainly to add to the psycho-social knowledge of the past in this matter, is our new knowledge of the psycho-physical unit and the ways of training it, through present knowledge of its environment (the new cosmology), through present knowledge of the induced conduct such a cosmology sanctions and demands (the new ethic), and through present knowledge of the access to the creative will (the new exercise, training and athleticism).

The Nucleating of the New Civilization

One question remains to be answered, one criticism met. Granted that individuals must achieve this new co-ordinated outlook and action with a devotion to all life and through actual and entire co-operation with others, is this, though not eremitism, still only a monasticism, a cloistered life out of the world? Is this new way only for the few, an esoteric path which, though a way of life and sanity, leading to reality and the only way out of the present nightmare, is nevertheless an escape?

THE THIRD MORALITY

Does it, though it can undoubtedly save the few, and transfer them into a world of fact instead of the present phantasmagoria, still have to leave the vast majority lost in their *delirium tremens*? Will not this new insight (the new cosmology), this new "induced action" (the new ethic), and this new conduct only end as, perhaps a more intelligent, a more balanced but not a more socially effective movement than the eremitism of Egypt, or the asceticism of India?

That doubt and that discouragement is natural. It is strongest among those who know history best. They acknowledge the conviction, the insight, and the enthusiasm of all the great psychical pioneers—the founders of religions and orders. They point out, at the same time, that such movements, though they leave, possibly, the level of the tide of all mankind a little higher than they found it, cannot permanently carry forward humanity or civilization beyond such a very moderate advance. The wave of enthusiasm spends itself and, though for some fifteen to twenty-five years it seemed as though it could lift all the heavy waters in its sweep, in fact it spends itself and they drop back. That, however, is, as it happens, completely to misread history.

The actual story of the present situation is both far more precarious and far more promising than that. This popular notion of a gradual amelioration—that the "spirit of the age" no longer countenances certain violences; that "we must not judge the men of the past by our higher standards"; that consistent enthusiasts are not to be followed, because they are unpractical people, but may be useful as gradually shaming us into devising better compromises between what we will have and what we ought to do—all that accepted notion about history is false.

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

There is a development of sensitivity, there is an evolution of consciousness, but if this change is not clearly apprehended and acted on, but only vaguely imagined as an inevitable easement in human relationships, it will turn into sentimentality (the enjoyment of "just feeling good" and letting things slide) and, because of that, this sentimentality will be succeeded by a return to toughness among the grim and a turn to cynicism or despair among the tender. We hardly need reminding that almost all the Reformist movements to-day are terrorist. What the evolution of consciousness offers us is not a new social order but the promise of making one and—equally—the threat that, if we fail to make it, then even that which we have will be taken from us and we go down into chaos. If we act on our new feeling, make of our new apprehension a science, apply that science and train ourselves to live up to those applications, then progress will be a fact and in our time.

For, though progress is true, it is by steps, by leaps, and not by "the inevitability of gradualness." Our social evolution, like all other evolution, is by a sudden mutation. Further, as seems the fact with all other evolution, there comes a time when a concatenation of circumstances compels every form of life to leave its rut and to strike out. All that circumstances can dictate (it is grimly much) is that the old ways must cease and a new way or extinction must be found and faced. It is a criterion of the inherent vitality of the creature whether it sees that sudden change in its conditions as a desperate crisis or an immense opportunity. If its vitality is high, it will realize that all depends on what it itself does and on the profound originality of its own response. If its vitality, through too long

THE THIRD MORALITY

familiarity with and affection for its surroundings, is low, it will play for safety, expect something to turn up to extricate it, and die.

In the past history of religion and of all psycho-social departures, men stumbled on new methods, mistook what were the essentials in the powers they contacted, called them by wrong names, employed wrong methods and so quickly lost touch with the new sources of power. They had sporadic successes and they "fluked" their victories. Suddenly certain methods became infectious effective. As suddenly the methods "went dead," the words and formulæ no longer worked. Swept as though by a pandemic in one decade, in the next mankind seemed to have generated a "resistance" to the enthusiasm which flushed it a few years before.

To-day that need not happen. History does not repeat itself, not even religious history. To-day that method of awareness, through detached interest and patient experiment, which has given us such powers over our apparent environment, is turning like a search-light beam, on to our own nature. To-day we can begin to produce, as a clearly understood technique, changes and power which till now were only practised intuitively and which therefore acted sporadically. That is our hope.

Our risk and peril lie in the same fact. Psychological forces, we can now see, are as natural as, and far more effective than, dynamite. Considering how ill-equipped most natures are to carry such forces, it was not wholly a disaster that in the past no one could command and discharge these forces except for a short time. Without self-discipline and insight in the deepest centres of the psyche, so making it loyal and linking it up to the whole of being, it is probably fortunate that a complete unity

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

of the psyche has not up to the present been able to be maintained for long. The danger to-day in psychology is similar to, but even greater than, that which confronts us in physics. For millenia man has wanted, in moments of passion, to wreak his unrestrained will on his fellows. The weapons of war, however, were not sufficiently effective to let him do what he wished. He was saved from himself by his ignorance. Now his weapons will do his will, and who shall save him? So, too, he longs for complete freedom from the restraints of caution, the need for social esteem, the failure to concentrate wholly on his principal interest. This power, more transforming than any physical weapon, can be his to-day. Those who to-day succeed to the task of the founders of the religious orders, are able to see, with almost scientific exactitude, how religious energy is released and how it may be used. Such accurate insight can and must give them freedom not merely to keep that power from giving out but to keep it for themselves if they so choose.

Only a complete realization of the purpose of life (and so deliverance from any personal or class ambition) can make this power safe. We are going to see a race for this power, a race between the "power types" and the enlightened. The power types, the dictators, are beginning to realize (with their immense empiric command over masses and their historical knowledge that, without technique, that power will give out) that here in this direct action on the will, is the essential force. The enlightened also are turning to the world with as clear a realization that they must command and direct this force to save it for humanity and save humanity through it.

That, then, is the answer to those who say: "These new insights, methods, and ways are only for the few,

THE THIRD MORALITY

for they are only a repetition of the past psycho-social history of man. There we see waves of leaders suddenly sweeping the surface of humanity's ocean, for a moment drawing it with them—but invariably they pass on and out from ordinary life, which sinks back to its natural level." History is not going to repeat itself, but, if we will not realize the novelty of our age and be contemporaneous, that will not check the radical change. It will only leave us bitterly regretting that history cannot repeat, that we can no longer stumble along between moderate miseries and moderate happiness.

We have then to face a new world. The eremitic escape out of it is, geographically and psychologically, no longer possible. There is nowhere to escape from mankind, if we wished. There is no reason why we should so wish, for here at last is a method dawning on us whereby evolution can escape frustration and resume advance. This new outlook is, unavoidably, for action. There is going to be a completely new world for all of us. The only choice for all of us is whether it will be far higher or far lower than anything mankind has so far known. The civilization which man could now build (and there is no reason save human reasons, reasons of character, why he should not) will be a simple civilization, because all advanced methods are simple ; all transitional methods are needlessly complex, because purpose at that stage is not clearly apprehended. This civilization will live in no dream but in a far clearer reality than we can have to-day. It will be a world in which "matter" will not be banished but under complete control, and power not abandoned but exactly harnessed.

This new order can and must begin now. Every individual can begin that transformation of the self by realization of present knowledge, by deducing the apt

ACTUAL EXERCISES AND EFFECTS

action indicated by such knowledge and by exercising himself so as to be able to perform such action. So he makes the unit, the brick, the living cell, without which the new structure cannot be built, but which immediately begins to assemble itself when such units are individually ready. For civilization to-day is a very close macrocosmic rendering of our microcosmic selves. As Raymond Pearl has pointed out, we make societies and cities of certain patterns and certain confusions, because our social structures can only be a reflection of our nature, as the termitary, the anthill, and the beehive are each of them specific precipitations of the termite nature, the ant's, and the bee's.

Till we remake intentionally that nature, it will give rise to chaos. As it is blindly changing to-day, it increases its own distress, for it develops both power and sensibility, but does not reconcile them. Hence that conflict will continue to be transferred to the outer world and our societies and our circumstances will become acceleratedly more chaotic, the expression of irreconcilable forces, until social living will become no longer possible.

But we can take hold of this opportunity, seize this tide, and ride this breaker. Then, instead of being dashed to pieces on the reef, we shall be carried into a broad water. We can co-operate with, reconcile, and explicate the profound changes at present working in the depths of our being. We can go forward and reunite the sundered parts of the psyche which are making convulsive efforts once again to be united and knit. We can bring once again into complete consciousness a complete being; and that being is the essential factor of a new state, civilization, humanity. This creative act for himself and for the whole is within the powers of

THE THIRD MORALITY

each. Further, we are driven to attempt it now. This is the new Revolution and alone can achieve the new order. To-day all other ways are inadequate, inapposite, and unpractical. Whether we take it depends on ourselves alone. That the old way here comes to an end—that is ruled by an edict we cannot revoke. Our choice is to go on to a new state of being or to end.

INDEX

- ABORTION**, 219-20
Addiction, 188, 192-7, 201, 223
"Aidos," 148
Alcohol, 279
Alexander, F. Matthias, 288
Altruism, abandonment of, 49, 58-9
Ambition, the supreme sin, 202-3
Ambulation, 287-9
Anarchy, 58, 150; international, 17, 36, 46-7, 73, 162; inter-social, 41
"Animectomy," 121
Anthropomorphism, 55, 62, 74, 143, 148, 172, 186; abandonment of, 22, 53-5, 142-3, 246; limits scientific investigation, 25-30, 62-3, 77, 96; limitations of, 89-90, 245-7; and problem of evil, 170; Heaven of, 182-3; highest attainments of, 205-6, 216, 295, 300; and prayer, 239, 241-4, 296-9; enlightenment gained through, 243, 245
Appetite, 192-7, 201, 223, 272-3
Arbitration, 187, 203
Ars, Curé d', 281
Artist, the, 273-4
Asceticism, 190-1, 196-7, 281-2, 295
Astrology and astronomy, 145-6
Athleticism of mind-body, 295-6, 300
Atom, nature of, 82-3
Attitude for contemplation, 281-8
Auricular confession, 118
Auto-suggestion, 297

BEHAVIOURISM, 114, 164 *n*
Being versus doing, 263-5
Berkeley, on problem of evil, 23; Solipsism of, 139
Biochemistry, 94, 107
Biology, Darwinian, 31, 33, 76; post-mechanistic, 91 *et seq.*; seeks to demonstrate Mechanism, 92-4; post-Darwinian, 103
Birth control, 219-20
Brain, study of, 109-11
Breathing, deep, 288-91
Broom, Dr. Robert, *The Coming of Man* of, 104, 107
Brunell, I. C., and Saltash bridge, 189
Buddha, 277, 295
Buddhism, 280 *n*, 301
Butler, Samuel, 100-1

CALMAN, Dr. W. T., on convergence, 97 *n*
Calvinism, immorality of, 239-40
Carrel, Dr. Alexis, *Man the Unknown* of, 284, 288, 293
Carriage and posture, 282, 291

Cartesianism, 27
Causality, 84-7, 89
Cell, the living, 94-5, 110-11, 129 *n*
Character, and endocrine glands, 108-9
Child-bearing, 141-2
Christianity, failure of, 206-7
Civilization, present crisis of, 13-18, 59, 74-5, 162, 304-7; causes of failure of, 142, 257; ignorance of, 164; the new, 307-8, 312-14
Clairvoyance, 126, 130, 161, 172
Class-war, 17
Clerk-Maxwell, Sir George, 81
Colour, unreality of, 135
Colour-sense, 141, 144
Commensalism, 173
Community, man's relation to, 55-6
Community-consciousness, 17
Conception, 179, 220
Concepts, inherited, 140
Conditioned reflex, Pavlov's, 114
Conscience, 34, 36, 50-2, 69
Consciousness, 28-9; Freud's analysis of, 57; Mechanomorphism applied to, 115; an ultimate reality, 158, 167; exploring the depths of, 159-61; the universal, 161-2, 168-9, 171, 212; evolution of, 165, 216, 237, 263, 309; survives death, 167-9; result of division of, 207-8; the purpose of existence, 264
Contemplation, 162, 242, 248-9, 299; methods of, 256, 258-62; physical aids to, 271-2, 276-92
Contraception, 219-20
Convergence, 97-8
Cosmic radiation, 105-7, 136
Creation, Babylonian myth of, 98-9
Crown, functions of, 16
Curiosity, and wish for power, 145, 149, 152, 178

DANCING, 286-7
Darwinianism, 33-4; kills Liberalism, 19-22, 31-3; denies morality, 36, 100-2; "empties mind out of the world," 76, 101; success of, 95-102; illogicalness of, 102 *n*
Death, life after, 166-9, 171
Desire, world created by, 177-8, 208, 272
Dictators, 202, 311
Diet, 73, 277-81, 285, 291
Disease, association between mind and, 108-9, 284, 293; problem of, 218
Dream-analysis, 118
Driesch, work of, 129 *n*

INDEX

- ELECTRICITY**, and matter, 82, 132, 136-7;
in study of brain and cell, 110-11
- Electron**, 82, 84, 129
- Empathy**, 286
- Endocrinology**, 107-9
- Entelechy**, 129 *n*
- Enthusiasm**, 293, 308
- Eremitism**, 212, 271, 277-8, 300
- Ether**, 81
- Ethics**, rationalistic, 34-5, 41, 48-9, 185;
left without sanction, 35-7, 42, 47, 54-5;
impossibility of pure, baseless, 57-8,
67-72, 157; civilization's dependence
on, 59; and religion, 60-1; principle
of all, 165; of the third cosmology,
212-13
- Euthanasia**, 218
- Evil**, problem of, 23, 169-70, 172-6, 179-80,
207
- Evolution**, Darwinian theory of, 33-4,
95, 99; convergence in, 97; evidence
of aim in, 98, 104, 106, 129-30; essen-
tial morality of, 99-100; force behind,
103, 105-7; great crises in, 104;
psychological, 122-3; evil the mark of
failure in, 174, 176; proceeding through
desire, 177-8; new social, 294, 309, 312
- Exercises**, psychophysical, 232 *n*, 233,
253-7, 303
- Extra-individuality**, 186-8
- Extrapolation**, 88, 135
- Extroverts**, 120-1, 232 *n*
- FEAR**, 216-17 (*see also* Greed and fear)
- Fichte, J. G., philosophy of, 7-8
- Fitness of the Environment*, *The* (Henderson),
105
- Force-radiation**, 130, 132, 150
- France**, collapse of Liberalism in, 42-6
- Fraser**, *The Golden Bough* of, 123-4
- Freud**, shows mechanism of the soul, 33-4;
explains away the conscience, 34, 36,
51-2, 69; *Totem and Tabu* of, 51,
122-3; traces man's psychological evo-
lution, 122-4; allows telepathy, 125
- Freudianism**, 76; tendentiousness of,
115-17; healing by means of, 117-22;
remains unproven, 121, 124
- GALILEO**, 25-7, 78
- Gamble**, Dr., 283
- Generosity**, 187, 249
- Germany**, 40, 45
- Gnosis**, 207 *n*
- God**, and intervention, 206-7, 212; a
projection of consciousness, 207; im-
manence of Kingdom of, 211; Cal-
vinistic, 239-41
- Golden Bough*, *The* (Fraser), 123-4
- Greed and fear**, basic stimuli of, 143,
145-7, 150-3, 178; universe created by,
208-9, 232, 273, 301; need to banish,
210, 230
- Government**, duties of, 15-17
- Grimaldi**, experiments of, 80
- HEARING**, sense of, 133-4
- Heisenberg's Principle of Indeterminacy**,
83-6
- Henderson**, *Fitness of the Environment* of,
105
- Hertzian waves**, 131
- History**, misreading of, 308-10, 312
- Hoadley**, Bishop, 189
- Homosexuality**, 225, 229
- "Hubris," 148
- Humanitarianism**, 22, 24, 31-3, 72-3, 264
- Hypnosis**, 111, 161, 254-5
- INDETERMINACY**, Principle of, 83-6
- Individual**, rights of the, 55-6, 58, 60
- Individuality**, 165-6; need for trans-
cending, 171, 188, 211, 222; evil of,
172, 176; Karma and, 178-9; a transi-
tional state, 179-82, 186, 192, 194,
198-200, 204, 212, 252, 261; posses-
siveness of, 197-8; extrication from,
212-13, 247-53, 258-62, 302-4; and
war, 216-17; and prayer, 241, 243
- Influence**, problem of, 198-200; tele-
pathetic, 265
- Innocency**, 190-1
- Insects**, 113-15; parasitic, 173
- Insight**, 233-5, 248, 259, 311
- Instinct**, 147-8, 302-3
- Interest-affection**, 153, 158, 236, 238,
303-4; present employment of, 222 *n*
- Intervention**, divine, 206-7, 212-14
- Introverts**, 120-1, 232 *n*
- Italy**, 45, 263
- JESUS CHRIST**, 205, 295
- Jung**, extrovert and introvert of, 120
- Justice**, and generosity, 187
- KANT**, Emanuel, 34, 50 *n*
- Karma**, doctrine of, 177-80, 240 *n*
- Katz**, Dr., 232 *n*, 277, 291
- LIBERALISM**, destroyed by Natural Selection,
19-22, 31-3, 37; basis of, 23-5; collapse
of, in France, 42-6; and freedom of
individuals, 56-7; general defeat of,
59, 72; humanitarianism of, 264
- Life**, need for a system of, 4-6, 9; purpose-
lessness of mechanistic, 31-2, 52, 57;
attempts to create, 94-5; extinction of
fossil forms of, 174; unity in, 176, 181,
186-7, 300-1; purpose of, 181-2, 216,
262, 264, 281; opiates for a purposeless,
182-3; rationed, 187-92; powers above,
213-14; tempo of, 266-8; final goal of,
268-9
- Light**, nature of, 80-2, 134, 136
- Love**, 196, 227-8
- Lust**, 167, 193, 195, 223, 226

INDEX

- MCBRIDE, experiments of, 129 *n*
- Machiavelli, Prince, 26, 52-3
- Mammals, conscious acts of, 115; limited perceptions of, 141; pugnacity of, limited by instinct, 147-8, 208; killing of, 187, 220-2, 231
- Man, natural goodness of, 23-4, 42-3; relation of, to Nature, 24-5, 31, 63; essential immorality of, 26, 52-3; falls with civilization, 59; unknown origin of, 100; pre-human ancestor of, 105, 122-4; animal and social heredity of, 140-2, 302-4; animal outlook of, 144-7, 151; curiosity of, 145, 149; lacks instinct, 147-9, 302-3; possessiveness of, 197; vice-creator of the universe, 207-11, 213-15, 240 *n*; planned path of, 213-14
- Marxian theory, 6-8
- Materialism, 46-7, 82
- Matter, basis of, 82, 85
- Mechanomorphism, 83, 210, 212, 296; inevitable end of, 42, 57-9, 150-1, 185; and ethics, 48-9, 54-8, 61-2, 214; completed by Freud, 50-5; failure of, 64-5, 72, 79, 88-90, 129-30, 185; incomplete cosmology of, 76-8, 142-3, 149-50, 185; disregarded facts in, 78, 149; physics fail to uphold, 80 *et seq.*, 92-3; and causality, 84-7, 89; applied to life, 113-15; applied to mind, 115, 124-7; and evil, 169; appetite the ultimate reality of, 193; and disease, 293; highest type under, 295; and prayer, 297-8
- Mendelianism, 103
- Mind, and disease, 108-9, 284, 293; its relationship with body, 111-12, 129, 254, 275-6, 281-8, 290; independent action of, 125, 127, 130; creative power of, 130-5, 137-9, 150, 158-61, 170-1; limited by feelings, 140; limited by mechanism, 150-1; individual and universal, 159-62, 298-9
- Mind-body, 275-6; inter-relationship of, 254, 283, 290; and diet, 277-81; and attitude, 281-8; and respiration, 288-291; breakdown of, 293; new athleticism of, 295-6, 300
- Monotheism, 143, 170, 205-6, 210, 212
- Morality, undermining of, 22-5, 53-4; denied by Mechanomorphism, 34, 36, 52, 72-3, 101-2; sanction for, 35-7; psychological, biological and physical, 49; Freud explains, 51; mechanistic, 58; lowered standards of, 71; first steps towards a new, 151-3 (*see also* Third Morality)
- Mortality, 166-9
- Mutation, 103, 105; new psycho-social, 294, 309
- Mystery Religions, Greek, 254
- Mysticism, 71, 219, 227, 284-5, 290
- NATIONALISM, 7 *n*, 17, 263
- Natural Selection, 76, 95-6; destroys Liberalism, 19-22, 31-3; denies morality, 36; present position of, 103; as exemplified to-day, 152-3
- Natural Theology, 23-5; destroyed by Natural Selection, 31-3, 95, 101; in France, 42-3
- Nature, Man's relation to, 24-5, 30-1; imposition of causality on, 87; co-operation and goodwill in, 96; counter-balance of, 148; evil in, 172-3
- Necessitarianism, 85
- Neo-Lamarckianism, 177, 236
- Neuroses, Freudian cure of, 117-22; caused by war, 120; increase in number of, 293
- Newton, Sir Isaac, 29, 80
- Newtonianism, 22-3, 33, 76, 80-1
- ORTHOGENESIS, 104
- Osborn, Henry Fairfield, 98, 104
- PARACLETE, theory of the, 244
- Passions, indulgence or repression of, 56-7
- Passivity, alert, 166, 230, 272
- Pavlov, conditioned reflex of, 114
- Personality, and the subconscious, 160-2; and survival after death, 167; need to transcend, 171; rigid crust of, 199; loosening of, 262
- Peter Claver, St., 281
- Philosopher, the, 273-4, 295
- Photons, 82
- Physics, post-anthropomorphic, 29-30; post-mechanistic, 64-6, 80 *et seq.*; biology and psychology made subservient to, 78, 91; fails to demonstrate materialism, 82-3, 91-4; becomes increasingly empirical, 87-8; prompted by wish for power, 146; and psychology, 162-4
- Physiology, 92-4
- Pineal gland, 28, 109
- Pituitary gland, 109
- Polyphyly, 97
- Polytheism, 210
- Possessiveness, 188, 195, 197-202
- Power, wish for, 146, 150, 164-5; over the outer universe, 162-3, 296; individual, 202-3
- Pragmatists, 163
- Prayer, 239, 241-4, 296-9
- Pretension, 188, 201-3
- Prevision, 126-7, 130, 161, 172
- Protestantism, and scientific research, 28-30
- Proton, 82
- Providentialism, 175, 212, 214-16
- Psychical research, 126-7, 171-2
- Psycho-analysis, 117-22
- Psycho-embryology, 122

INDEX

Psychology, 139-40; Freudian, 51-2; post-mechanistic, 113 *et seq.*; physics need for, 162-3; Western man's ignorance of, 164; danger in, 311

Psychophysical training, 232 *n.*, 238 *et seq.*, 275 *et seq.*

Psychophysiology, findings of, 131, 133, 139

RADIATIONS, cosmic, 105-7, 136; universe a series of, 130-4

Radium, 131, 136

Rationalism, 34-7, 238, 295

Rationalist-ethicist, and religion, 60; opposes the new cosmology, 61-7; irrationalness of, 67-9, 214; changes in two generations, 69-72; "synthetic diet" of, 74

Rationed life, reasons for, 187-90; aims of, 190-2; and sex, 196; and possessions, 200-1; exercises of, 253

Reflexes, conditioned, 114; palliative, 286

Reincarnation, 176-7, 181

Religion, 34-7, 54, 60-1, 145, 310-11

Research, specialization in, 2-4; limitation of field of, 25-30

Respiration, 288-92

Rhine, Dr. I. B., *Extra-Sensory Perception* of, 127, 280 *n*

Roman Catholicism, 8, 26-30, 118

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, 43

Russia, 263

Rutherford-Bohr's model of the atom, 83

SAINTS, 71, 219, 284, 295

Salvation, impossibility of private, 175, 192, 241, 244, 274, 300-1

Schweitzer, Albert, *Indian Thought and its Development* of, 7 *n*

Science, limitation of field of, 25-30, 62-3, 77, 96; works by probability, 86-7; feudal system of, 91; and psychological research, 127; and wish for power, 146-7

Self-change, 249-53

Self-consciousness, 165, 207-8

Self-control, 275

Senses, and reality, 131-41, 163

Sermon on the Mount, 205-6

Sex, Freudian views on, 36, 51-2, 117, 119; unrestrained, 37-41, 55-6; Third Morality's outlook on, 194-6, 223, 226-8, 232; purposes of, 224-7

Sheldon, Dr., 121

Sherrington, Sir Charles, 110

Sidgwick, Professor Henry, 50 *n*

Sight, sense of, 131-3, 138, 139 *n*

Social heredity, strength of, 141, 302-4

Social morality, abandonment of, 55-6

Society, 119; suggestive force of, 250-1

Solipsism, 139, 159 *n*

Sound, 81, 134-5, 138

Specialization, in research, 2-4

State, the, organic entity of, 16-17

Steel, tempering of, 137

Stimulants, 278-80

Subconscious, the, 116-18; and personality, 160-2; communication with universal mind through, 171, 199, 213; way to the will through, 233; results of access to, 234; method of approach to, 254-5; co-ordination of mind and body through, 275-6, 286, 292

Suggestion, power of, 117; social, 302-7

Suicide, 121, 220

Suprarenal glands, 109

Suttee, Dr. Ian, *The Origins of Love and*

Hatred of, 195 *n*

Symbiosis, 173

TABUS, sexual, 37, 194, 224-5; of tenderness, 195 *n*

Tea, 279-80

Telepathy, 125-7, 130, 161, 172, 265, 296

Tenderness, need for, 195, 225-9

Third Morality, coming of, 157, 172, 185-6, 237; aims of, 187, 210, 222; reasons for, 187-90; ethical position of, 212-13; training for, 232-4, 238 *et seq.*; no finalities in, 234-5; dangers in attainment of, 284-5, 288-90, 292-4

Thomist cosmology, 7-8

Thought, universe expressed in terms of, 64; stultified by mechanism, 150; and action, 263

Totem and Tabu (Freud), 51, 122-3

Touch, sense of, 138, 139 *n*

Tradition, 141

Tropism, 113

Truth, 62, 65, 163

Tyranny, 41-2

UNIVERSE, establishment of mechanistic, 22-3, 30, 52, 64; mind the basis of, 64, 158-61, 170-1; immaterialness of, 129-130; of man's creation, 177-8, 208-11, 230, 232, 235, 240 *n.*, 246-7, 272-3, 300

VEDA, 266

Vegetarianism, 231, 232 *n.*, 277-8, 291

Vicarious suffering, 179-80, 269

Violence, modern resort to, 58, 305-7; uselessness of, 187, 213, 216-17, 266

Voltaire, 42

WAR, 17, 187, 215-16

"Wavicle," 81

Weyl, Hermann, *The Open World* of, 235

X-RAYS, 131, 136, 294

YOGIC THOUGHT, 231, 245

