

Lecture notes

Second time thru

J. B. White

LECTURE 1

The routine here is straightforward. Professor Joe Joe Brennan is with me today. He's an Emeritus Professor from Columbia. I will talk for about an hour and then we'll go have a cup of coffee and then we'll sit down and he'll give what he calls a postscript. That will last, at his pleasure, maybe a half hour or longer. That's all we'll do on the Wednesdays and then Thursday we'll (those of you who are not auditing - we do have some auditors here who I'm glad to see) be splitting into two groups and each of you will alternate - once with Joe and once with me. I'll take Group A tomorrow at 1:30 in a little room - I hope not too small a room - but a very classy room here. The one with Admiral Ingersoll's picture on the wall, right at the top of the stairs.

My biggest problem with this course has been to explain to people why I'm giving it. I've tried several ways, but I think it sells itself. Everybody's so conditioned to this immediate payoff that George Wilson of the Washington Post, of course a very unmilitary sort of guy - in fact, sometimes the biggest adversary we've^{got} going in Washington - said in my office one day, "I'd like to be able to say why you're giving it, but I can't understand what it's going to do." He wasn't arguing about it, we were trying to think of something he could

put in the Washington Post that would make sense. I think he'll get it in there eventually.

I could say, first of all, that in my experience, and many of you have been with me in some of my experiences, I've often had the feeling that I was working for a hierarchy that had no idea what was really happening in my mind and heart. Where things were, I thought, much more important and crucial than where my supervisors were. I remember the old ballad, "Down at the hangar they sing and they shout. All about things they know nothing about. But we're the boys that fly high in the sky. Boozing buddies go boozing." I've had that kind of a high altitude gunnery pattern psychosis from time to time where I had the feeling that I was being led by the blind. In those circumstances I think that what I have to say and what we'll read here will have a lot more meaning to somebody who is usually up there than down in the command center. But it's not only for that reason. I think that it's possible to say with some validity that the establishment has lost its authority. That was certainly the impression I got after having been gone eight years to come back. Some of this I can't make it up each time new; some of you went to church Sunday and will probably be hearing some of the things that were said before, because I'm going to go very quickly over that Maccoby rationale. The last

part came from a book that I read written by a man who appeared with me at Taft School last summer - a school in Connecticut - at a one week session in which the subject before the house, and the house consisted of all headmasters from all over the country - headmasters of secondary schools - is it proper that a secondary school (and of course in this case a private school) should teach ethics, leadership or what have you? If so, how do you do it? There were four of us on the program. Two of them were theologians, one was the Dean of the Divinity School at Yale, one was the professor of religion at Harvard - both of them were more concerned with the secular aspects of religion than what I thought we were there to talk about. The third guy was a psychoanalyst whose work I didn't appreciate until I got away and thought about it a little while. His name is Michael Maccoby. He had also been out of the States for a good period of years. He had been doing some research with Eric Fromm down in Mexico and then came back in 1969. He's interested in what kind of leaders are prominent in societies. What kind of people become leaders. He interviewed, psychoanalyzed if you will - made the ink blot tests and everything else, of course, with their concurrence - of about 250 business executives in 12 or 15 major companies in the country. After that he wrote a book and it's called The Gamesman. I'll go through this very quickly but I think it makes some sense and it kind of puts you on the map.

He is familiar enough with history to say there are four kinds of leaders around the world. There always have been more or less four kinds, we'll say since 1776. We're just limiting it to the modern industrialized society of America more or less. From time to time different strains of these people have been prominent. I will describe these very quickly. It's not a progression. It's not one of these things where we used to have them. You know, we learned and now we've got it made. That's not the way it comes out. You won't like any of them altogether probably, because they're not altogether loveable.

From the time, according to Maccoby, of the Revolutionary War until shortly after the Civil War, the people that ran America, the people that were the prominent citizens, the achievers, were known by his term of "craftsmen". The prototype of the craftsman is Benjamin Franklin. We all know craftsmen now - Solzhenitsyn is a craftsman. There are many other examples he shows. But a craftsman is a guy who's primarily inner directed. He does not have to compete with somebody to get self-satisfaction. If he competes, he competes with himself. He is the salt of the earth type guy that's interested in his family, he is interested in his self-discipline, he is interested in his self-achievement, he is also a very selfish person. He is kind of cranky and he is suspicious of other people. He likes to control that part of the universe

that he commands. He's not very outgoing, he's protective. He is the sort of person that is very bright, very independent, who concentrates on things that he's interested in and does not buy slogans. He's really not very interactive (if that's the word). He's the kind of guy with a very high IQ probably or good neurotic capability (IQ may not be the word), who is a very good, bright young man that has trouble with the sash cords because he does not jump at buzzwords. He does not have all the right things to say to get programmed. He doesn't program well. But he is the guy that is the salt of the earth. Self-sufficient, self-contained, self-disciplined, the sort of person that takes care of himself and expects others to do the same. And suspicious of those that don't. This is kind of the story of the early American pioneer. The sort that used religion, almost always with his family, he's concerned about his work, he's a perfectionist. They were leaders until after the Civil War. Some of them are always around, some of them are around now and some of them in prominent positions. But basically their leadership passed in the business and in the political world, but particularly in the business world, to a new breed of cat that really built America.

These were known by his term as the "jungle fighters". Jungle fighters are people who are the Carnegies. People who saw after the Civil War the opportunity to make a great industrial power of America. They built railroads, they

MCCOBY

built steel plants, they populated Chicago and they started the great slaughter houses of the world. These were the guys that really became powerful, became rich, and many of them benevolent. Many of them fine men, but they did require when they got in the office a zero sum game. There's only room for so many meatpackers in this United States and I'm going to expand and I'm going to be one of them and there's no room for softness. Some lose and some win. There are many of those around now and, again, they are the people that get a lot of things done. Some of my best friends are jungle fighters.

He had talked to a lot of people who had all this data on record about the guy we're coming to, the "gamesman". But before the gamesman, the dominant figure in America that started about the time the big companies got so complex that they became what we call bureaucracies, was the "company man". The man in the gray flannel suit, the organization man, remember him? He was riding high in the '20's and '30's and then became a man of sort of ridicule after World War II. When I start naming names now I'll have to give you some of the names he mentions because it stands to reason it will offend somebody. He said Eisenhower was a typical organization man. This isn't a derogatory term either. They are people that control big groups of people with suaveness, persuasion, and fairness. If the jungle fighter is a zero sum man, then these people, by and large, try real hard. They do everything

right and they are trapped by their fears. They wake up at night sometime and think they've been left out, they've been fired, that people have left them, and so forth. They really are eager beavers

In the early '60's there was this young crowd of new thinkers that came along, a more detached type person. Their prototype was Jack Kennedy, but there was a whole crowd of them. These people were resentful of the meanness of the jungle fighters and the paternalism of the organization man. They had very little contact and in common with the old and said that stuff is not practical. These guys figured out that this life is really _____.

That is not to say they didn't have very good qualities. They were cool, they were cooperative, they were bright, they were flexible, they were open minded, and they were not really hung up on competitiveness. They thought they had a zero sum game everybody could win. They created what he calls a _____ to have open competition. There was a kind of buzzword that went with it - a word that he just coined - that meant that there was no class. Black, white, poor, rich, Mexican all get in their and mix it up and let the chips fall where they may. They were, again, on the negative side. They didn't like emotional baggage. They didn't like to get down there and find out what was going on. In fact, he says they are incapable of knowing

truth because they just didn't take that that seriously and particularly where they had to pick up the checks. They didn't like to look in people's eyes. They didn't like to punish people. They didn't want to discipline people. They didn't really like to know any of the gory details about what really happened to people when it became useful, intelligent and rational to sever a certain segment of the company of the people and so forth. It was just simple to learn to get along with this new efficient way. What I think comes down is the man that is, in his words, people of the mind and not of the heart. So every one of these different moods that we have gone through there's a drama, a play, and in this case, a movie, that really epitomizes the spirit of the age. This time it was The Sting. Remember the movie where there you had these effective, exciting, romantic guys through clean play and technology putting down a paternalistic godfather. Now this was just symbolic of what was going on. It was the same cool, cooperative, flexible, open minded graduates of Harvard Business School who were pulling the rug out from under the old guy that built the company at the same time. This new world that they introduced had, of course like all, a lot of defects. I think the main defect was a lack of feelings of the heart. They were capable of what you might call softheartedness, or even bleeding heartedness, but the heart he is talking about is the old theological

heart, hardheartedness. It's only a hardhearted person who looks in people's eyes and who realizes what is going on, who can decide and gets involved and knows first of all, guilt when he sees it, particularly when it's his, and who can repent. A person who is so good and so honest, or so insistent upon not contaminating his hands with discipline or firing people and then talking to them, you find a person who is not all trusting. In fact, in many of these companies he talked to he said, "Boy, these boys can really run a company." You're right, he psyched them out when he talked to them. He said you've got audits, you've got lawsuits coming and going, that's part of the beast. Don't argue about it, don't stay home and worry about it if something goes wrong, let them see. The old jungle fighter, he probably went to sleep every night biting his nails and saying he was going to get even with that guy and the organization man, he was worried to death he was going to do something wrong. These guys sleep like babies.

In America there is another little linguistic problem here. Because even as far back as Thomas Jefferson we've had a little different angle on it. The heart is supposed to be a softhearted person, an emotional type. He takes it back to the old Greek word where the heart is a symbol of courage, it's a symbol of integrity, it's a symbol of conscience, it's a symbol of emotional baggage, if you see

it that way, and so forth. He refers us to the unabridged dictionary, which I looked at. Courage is from the word "cuer", French for heart and "cor", Latin for heart, meaning the seat of knowledge, the basis of integrity and so forth.

So this is not meant to show you that we get from here to there because we're all around. What I'm trying to think to say is that there's no solution to this problem. If you have an idol just hang around awhile and you will find that he has clay feet - quite logically somebody will. Certainly this was the case, I think, of the inevitable happening, and I think you cannot maintain, those people tend to lose authority. Because authority is not power and position. Authority is trust, confidence and respect. It makes people nervous to deal with people who don't seem to have any feeling for what is really happening to the people who work for them.

One of the problems with a course in moral philosophy, and we noticed it in the papers in the last group, everybody seems somehow compelled to find a sweetness and light aspect. You know, everybody ought to be fair and everybody ought to be equal and all these things. That's moralizing, that's soupy. I don't think you have to be artificially brutal either, but what we're trying to do is to gain the things so we can make some sort of incisive observations or read people who do. People who will breed sort of a doubt, not people who are trying to make everybody feel good. We'll see later. Will and Ariel Durant, not philosophers necessarily, have a little book that I think next time we'll ask the class to

read and that's the stoic history which is kind of a distillation of their philosophy books and they come down hard. They come down hard. They studied 4000 years of history

Everybody wants freedom and equality and freedom and equality are sworn and everlasting enemies. When one prevails the other dies.

25 to 30 percent of the people have 95 percent of the intelligence. They are the ones who want freedom. Freedom to make money, freedom to express themselves, freedom to run things, freedom to run countries. When all is said, they don't want equality.

That doesn't mean that I am opposed or for. This is the kind of incisiveness that we're talking about. We're not trying to figure out somehow that everybody can have both. That's not philosophy, that mysticism. So hard hearts are people who, according to the old theologians, are most able to analyze their own defects and to repent.

The course outline, which I think Joe just gave you, I'll go through it very quickly. Today we're going to talk about the world of some prisoners. This is not a course about prisoners of war. It happens that the first lesson we talk about the world of Epictetus, the world of Mike

Walzer, who I will talk about in a minute, the world of Commissar Rubashov. I think the message as you will see, as I see it, is that "You cannot go it alone."

The second week we talk about the problems of Ivan Denisovitch, another prisoner by coincidence, of Dr. ^{RIEUX} Raul of Oran, Africa, a fictional character of Camus' The Plague and the Book of Job. The message being, "Life is not fair." It has to be dealt with. You can't keep you head under a bushel and invent solutions.

Socrates. The third week. Euthyprhro, Apology, Crito, and Phaedo. For instance, we create interest I hope in comparing him to Henry Thoreau. Henry Thoreau was a Massachusetts free thinker of the 19th centruy who was one of those who believed in civil disobedience. His idea was that he made the decision whether the course of the country or whatever was wrong. If he agreed, he accepted. Socrates was the other way. He just _____ even if it was wrong. One thing that seemed to hang him up ^{Thoreau} was the Mexican War of 1845.

Aristotle, a man of common sense: It's hard to really make a caricature of him. One of the things he preached, he was a hardnosed guy, was that free will and compulsion can

coexist. That you can't say that I was compelled to do this and therefore I had to forego my free will. He would say, "No, you can do some of both." This is very familiar to me. You can divulge secrets and take torture at the same time. You can do them both. Never totally successful either way, but you don't break giving up.

Immanuel Kant, the categorical imperative from the moral standpoint. His epistemology to me is even more interesting. He was a guy that put the recorded universe not in the heavens, but in man's mind which I think has some practicality. At least Heisenberg thought so. When he tried to develop his mathematical quantum theory he relied on this idea of a 19th century timid little guy who never got more than 30 miles from his home, named Immanuel Kant, in which the concept of the mind as it pertains to him only if God, freedom and immortality were presumed.

Sixth week. John Stuart Mill who has a little different idea of ethics and different ideas of other things. Kant and Mill were often seen to contrast. He also somehow later figured he had to make everything come out within three _____ securely fasted to his philosophy. That preoccupies people. They don't like to face that dilemma. It's _____, moral men that try to think that way.

The seventh week is what I would call the age of rebellion. The 19th century existentialists, the Ralph Waldo Emersons and I think that's the most interesting week; portrayed by Fiodor Dostoyevsky in his Notes from the Underground. Maybe you will recall they foretold the dilemmas of the 20th century because in those years the people were becoming uprooted into an industrialization organization, leaving the guild, the family and the church and going to the barracks, the school and the factory. They rebelled in not many things, including greed. Writers at least and philosophers presumed that if a man lived like _____ to exist. Here we have, particularly in Dostoyevsky, people rebelling for a primary reason, I will not be programmed. I will not act the way you program me to act. They are very pleased in not acting the way some of the large, so-called thinkers have programmed them to act. Or as we acted as they tried to program us.

The 8th week is a collective Marx-Lenin. It'll be only original stuff here except for some fiction, some novels. Conrad's Typhoon, "Open Boat". We don't read criticisms of Marx or criticisms of Lenin, we read Lenin and Marx. Also a little more of Dostoyevsky who proposes in his meaning of the Grand Inquisitor what Marx, I think, was trying to propose and that is that we all really want to live in one harmonious antheap of universal unity. Which in Dostoyevsky,

Christ did not agree with and maybe you won't either. Freedom is the price of having a tormented soul.

Ninth week, the scientists. Monod, a molecular biologist Sagan. These are all modern people. Monod recently died. Sagan is living and we're corresponding. I'm trying to get him here to talk. Where the week before we talked about Marxist _____, but with purpose, some of these scientists see a world without God and without purpose - chance and necessity.

If all this is true and it is, as I hope, sufficiently hardhearted not to be moralistic and going through the week you are your brother's keeper, there is no road behind, the world is not fair and defiance to the insitution is usually short lived, maybe even shortsighted, pain is no excuse for complicity and God, freedom and immortality seem to fit. If freedom and equality are sworn and everlasting enemies. If men don't like to be programmed, as I don't believe they do, or to live in harmonious antheps, as I don't believe they do, and if moral responsibility cannot be escaped even in the scientific laboratory, then it's not a bad idea to read stoicism, which is our last week - the world of Epictetus.

Again, it's a circle, we're not there. Nothing is perfect, but at least he offers a universe with purpose and with God. We are not reading the transient or immediately applicable in this course. We are

aiming at the solid and permanent aspect of man's concerns, taking a long view of man's life and vision, perhaps, of the greatness to which he may aspire.

I was trying to figure out rationales for talking about these things which meant a lot to me under duress. I was sitting with a guy named Ray Pelehac, whom some of you might know as the designer of the F-18, at a table having lunch and watching the Farnborough Air Show this fall. We were sitting with the Grumman crowd and they were telling me about the wonders of their science and how they had new ways of making strong materials. How these planes were able to pull many, many more G's and were much more light. I sat there and thought that that would be really great if we had pilots that really ate up that envelope, but we rarely do, maybe some. All the money that's spent trying to make those airplanes lighter and stronger is for the most part money down the tube. Because most people, and this is a venn diagram for you guys who are not aviators, this is the sort of thing you'd see in the back of a handbook that would show you the strike limitations of the airplane. There would be a different diagram for each gross weight. This is mach numbers 1 and 2 and these are load factors that you can pull. 7 G's would smash you down in the seat, negative G's.

I just said that for all the blood, sweat and tears that Mike Pelehac puts in that F-18 at least 50% of the pilots that fly it are not going to get outside of this area.

Maybe up to 2 G's and when they get up to mach 2 1/2 they're going to be sitting there with their hands on the stick, their eyeballs sticking out to here, and hoping something doesn't go wrong. But we've got all this maneuvering room in there and I'm hoping maybe if I can put a few of you out there where it's nice and safe, maybe that's another way to justify the course. If you're talking about, as we do in management, cost effectiveness and material acquisition and so forth, and efficiency and hardware and all, you've got a lot of room to go. It's a lot cheaper to talk you into getting out there than to have Mike Pelehac charging us 20 or 30 million dollars a copy for airplanes that nobody uses.

That's about all I want to do before I launch into a very short description of the reading material today. I think it's better if you do read at least the hard core stuff before - but I'm going to say this once and I'll probably have to say it a dozen time and it still doesn't get through - there's more reading here than you might think we should. I'm saying that you don't have to read it like you would mathematics or even like history. You can read it for enjoyment and don't labor over this thing. Joe's going to pass out a sheet that will show that we found in the first trial that we should put more emphasis on the paper and the paper is short. This is not a test of manhood. I really am not very highly motivated toward competitiveness in War Colleges. I'm working that

problem but I want you to know I want you to enjoy it and I want you to get the idea. Now the papers came in and they were very practical. Some of them, again, I thought were a little bit preoccupied to do two things. You might start thinking now about what you're going to do. One was to wrap in all the authors that we'd discussed in the course into the narrative, whether they fit or not, to make sure that, "Yeah, I've been through Mill and Kant and Socrates and Aristotle." You don't have to do that. The second thing you don't have to do is to moralize. It can be practical. You can be abstract, you don't have to be specific. To give you an idea, one of the officers had a big problem with the government's policy on duty free goods. I won't tell you the whole story but he was a company or battalion commander in Korea. He told of all the trouble the soldiers got into over this problem of duty free goods and all the government regulations and all the frustrations and all the shortcuts they were taking and was that the right way to do it? They talked about the bottom line, as we do. That is to say, our pre-occupation and many of the military officers that he felt were trapped facing the ends over means. Get it done, out of the way. Careerism is an end in itself. I was reading that paper again last night and I was thinking about all the things we do and careerism is starting to get a bad name. I support some of the things he talked about as a bad thing. But I was

thinking last night as I read the paper again, that we must have hundreds of organizations in the Navy named something like career counselors, career this, career that. You see that puts everybody (there's some good to that, some bad) as an entrepreneur, everybody's got to cash in his chips, everybody's got to walk his way through, everybody's a real businessman, trying to develop his career so he can get promoted. It's a hell of an organization. How about a refugee who was having a _____ problem like in Guam. There's a very interesting story about how a good man came to a bad end through no real fault of his own trying to help poor refugees. Ethics in government act in 1978. I put !?

When I came out of prison they said here's a new instruction. I sat down and, you know, I had a very high opinion of where life should be and everything. I said, "What is it?" They said we've got a new idea. We're going to have a new ethics code for military officers. I said, "Oh boy, now we're getting something." It was about not taking cigarette lighters, or taking free lunch, or something like that. I resisted slightly more than that. If a CV skipper demanded that the maintenance officer change his statistical processes so it would look like he had more full systems capable airplanes than he did, it's a discussion of the be on my honor code and PUEBLO and so forth. These are the types of things you ought to be thinking about or more abstractions, more refined. You ought to read for philosophic content, not history. Don't try to remember dates, don't try to remember who came ahead of who

*Don't use
it
Now*

except as it becomes easy. Tomorrow in our little discussion, this is a very good book, I'm going to talk about it in just a minute, somebody out to pipe up and talk about, "What does he mean by first person singular." Page 90 or thereabouts, it comes up. This is a man in prison. He keeps talking about the first person singular. What does he mean by grammatical fiction? Those are terms that you'll see in the book. What does he have to say about conscience, how does that come into play? These are the sorts of things we will talk about. Not about what were the circumstances of his capture and things like that. See what I mean? It's in those fields I want you to think. We're not studying history, we're not studying science, we're not trying to come out with everybody looking good or figure out a way where everything will be hunky-dory. We're trying to get some background that will help us in times of pressure to realize that things look bad but there've been a lot of people there before and somehow they persisted. They used various methods to make order out of chaos. Everybody thinks that there's some sort of _____.

The idea I'm carrying is that somehow in this universe there's a moral conscience that prevails in which we are somehow blessed with the assurance that virtue will be rewarded and evil will be punished.

WALZER

I think that that's the sort of thing that I'm hoping that you are thinking about. There are three readings today. The first that I'll discuss is this Walzer pamphlet. That was written about 1970. Walzer is a professor at Harvard. He was born in New York City in 1935. He got his Harvard PhD at the age of 26. He's been up there most of the time since. I've never met the fellow. During the Vietnam War he wrote a lot of essays on civil disobedience and things like that. He happened to write one chapter 7 about POW's. That's what we read. He takes exception to the Code of Conduct. The Code of Conduct you will remember came after the Korean War and it really makes known what it says. Philosophically what it does, it says after you're captured you've still got a military command structure, you've still got certain obligations. They specify a few: support escapes, you don't say anything considered discreditable to yourself or your country and so forth. Remember, seniority still prevails, responsibility still prevails, and you're still carried on the rolls and you're expected to act like it. He doesn't mention it in so many words except to say that the gist of that paper, and this is all you need to know about it, is that he thinks that this is contrary to the traditional 19th century international law, which he undoubtedly is right. In that in those days, before this 20th century, the international law held that once you became captured you were sort of a citizen of the world. You were not at war anymore, you lived in an atmosphere of benevolent quarantine, that the battle

was over. Not now, by our rules. I think for good reason. He believes that now the poor POW has to look over his shoulder not only to abrasive captors but at a vengeful government who will also prosecute him and he is in an untenable position. The Code of Conduct is an unwarranted infringement upon his privacy and that he should be the judge of whether he participates in harrassment, escape, sabotage and so forth. That things are tough enough without having to answer to two masters. He doubts that you could recruit people to be members of an organization where someone can say you are a member whether you like it or not. That had a kind of interesting backlash when we came home. I wanted to put some of them on report, not too many but a few. That incidentally was done as a result of the need to back up the constituency. That was only fair after I had spent eight years telling them to let them beat the hell out of you, and don't come out until you've got a bloody nose. They did that willingly except a couple of them said, "Uh uh, I'm on Walzer's side (they didn't know Walzer's name) and I'll decide what I do." I had a moral obligation to those bloody nosed guys to bring the others to mark. I think that everybody would agree that I had an obligation. Whether I did the right thing in the first place or not, that would be something that Walzer probably would have something to say about.

But the recruiting, how do you become a member of the organization. It turns out that the Secretary of the Army Calloway got into this and he had a lawyer who said that there is no reason to believe (this was not anything of which I was a party, this was an Air Force colonel named Ted Guy accusing Army and Marine Corps enlisted men and putting them on report - there's a long story there that is very interesting but I won't go into it - it's favorable to Guy) but Calloway's lawyer, and for awhile all the newspapers, said that an Air Force colonel had no jurisdiction over an Army enlisted man in a prisoner of war camp. I've heard it relayed that Calloway found out, changed his mind and tried to get it into the newspaper and they wouldn't print it, which is probably right. This whole business of whether or not you're in or out is a lawyer's paradise and confuses the issue but I think we will work around that some way. The dilemma that remains is, can you opt out? Walzer says yes. I will try to show in the other two books that you can't. That to opt out is to betray. And that is not only true of prisoner of war camps, but I think it is true of many military situations in which you can't afford the luxury of not caring about the man next door. Or not caring about what's going on in the bowels of the ship. Or back to The Gamesman, not wanting to look those people in the eye, not really wanting to participate, to play it or not play it depending on how you can best maximize your intentions,

Part 1 of 100-

desires, etc. I think that if there is a message to these books, it is that you are your brother's keeper and if you are responsible and a leader, you cannot lift yourself out of the quagmire and claim some sort of privacy right. He says heroism should not be demanded. I think there are times when heroism is demanded. One of the books that points that out, I think best, is one that the chaplain at Taft School gave me, the story of Robert Falcon Scott, his life, his biography. It talks about the time they were moving back from the Pole after they had been disappointed to find Edmundson. He tells of these five people and some of the heroism they displayed one to another. Oats was one who was getting weak and the food was getting short and he drifted out into the snow and just walked away and froze to death. Because he figured that his strength was not as great as Scott's and the other two. It was, I think, the right thing to do. I think it was almost required under the circumstances. He was on his last legs. So I think that statement needs to be examined, that heroism should never be demanded.

Darkness at Noon was written by a man named Arthur Koestler. I suppose some of you have read this book. Hungarian, born in 1905. It is a fictional book. Koestler was a communist in the '30's, fell out with the party. Know the story. His hero is the fictional Commissar N. S. Rubashov and to me the book hits all of the significant parts of the true terror of being in a prison, particularly in a communist prison. Now

this is not an anti-communist course, there are other types of systems that I'm sure could be described, but it's modern. It's a modern extortion racket and so we'll talk about it. But there are many others. The things that I got out of the book, it's 40 years old, yet of all the books that I've read it more exactly depicts the feelings that I had in Hanoi than anything that I've read since, including many of the books that people have written out of prison who were friends of mine. They're nice books but they're B books, they're not really books. His being picked up in the early morning, I know this feeling so well. Usually blindfolded, usually hands wired, this is when they're moved from one place to another. Going into a cell block, the prison wise man thinks immediately of communication. He's probably going to be in solitary confinement, he knows that. He can pick out where he's going in the solitary cell block. He's looking at the mortar. If he has a blindfold on, he's doing all he can to get it worked up, but if he can see he wants to see what he has for sound transmission. He knows that he's going to live by tap code and he can tell by the wetness of the bricks and the way it's put together, he can make a good estimate of how far he can be heard surreptitiously. Probably he'll use a cup and the guard wouldn't hear out here. He can probably say, "If I'm here and he's there and the guard's there, I can probably conduct two way communication without being detected. He notices that the doors have

certain nametags on them and he's trying to see them. I don't know if they were in Russian. In Vietnam they were manufactured names, but they were names that they gave and after awhile I knew who "Nam" was and who "Bien" was, because I knew their names. We didn't know Vietnamese but we knew the codes and we all seemed to get in the same places. He starts memorizing the gait of the guard, identifying which is which, what his footsteps sounded like, and match it with something else, a face, maybe an eye in the peephole. He talked about developing that sixth sense in a quiet room. Silence somehow feels - this sound like mysticism - but he knows when an eye is looking at him; somehow he knows. The sounds of screams in the distance sometimes is heard. I think a very good distinction is that they all sound different going in but they all sound the same coming out. The rhythm is different, you can get an idea of whether a guy is being flailed or his arms are being twisted or what. Two guys never sound the same going in but they all wind up kind of whimpering in the same way, like little dogs. The morning sounds, the clanging gongs, even that was the same, because we had this gong that rang. I think that it portrays the truth, that soon, intuitively he knows that the first thing he's got to do is get in touch with the guy next door. There's his contact with the outside world and he better be prepared to love that guy because he's going to have to take care of him and vice versa because if they lose contact

they lose trust between them. The world is gone. If you're really in solitary it's a terribly lonely place. Sometimes it has to be accommodated for months at a time but sooner or later you get back to where you can have a zero point. Somebody who can tell you about what's been going on.

I'm going to digress a little and say that I knew a man once, and I won't give his name, he's not in the service anymore, who really was the maverick. He was a very fearful man. He was a prisoner and he was alone. He was a very strange guy. He saw the communication, the leadership and the network as a threat to his security and a threat to his safety. I just couldn't see it that way and not many people do, but I don't think there is any reason to debate the point here. He had never had any body contact sports. I got to know all about him. He was very afraid. He was very, very conservative politically. In other words, he was not trying to make a deal, but he was very afraid of physical abuse. He had gotten caught a couple of times in the network. They wanted to know who was communicating with who. They don't have to take official cognizance of that

but the way we all saw it is you can get around it. You can live with that but you've got to have communications.

You've got to stick together, You've got to have some way of feeling for one another in order to do that. That was a penalty you paid, because

it was an easy way for them to claim that you had violated

beat you up and get you to sign statements and so forth. Particularly if the guy you are in league with is telling other people what to do and organizing resistance. That's the name of the game. This fellow's roommate from next door was a fellow who was a big leaguer and he had really made a lot of trouble. When that happens then they go right down the chain and beat everybody.

and try to get all the details so they can break up the organization. That's part of the game. But this is back to Walzer. He would say that he had a right not to participate. He didn't want to do that, he was going to behave himself, he was going to be better off without that

It just doesn't work that way. 99% of the people feel that that's not the way to go. You cannot have pockets of isolation where people claim to have immunity from the necessity of getting involved in what the leaders are doing. But anyway there are people like that and I thought of that guy when Rubashov got into it. Rubashov was a well known name and he would have been a big man in the communist party and they're the ones

There's nothing worse than if you had been a prisoner and you had been complying and then you decide to become a reactionary. Once you make a step up, you're starting from another plateau and even positive ways. Rubashov knew this for he was a member of the party

Because he knew too much, he knew that there was no way they were going to let him out and no way they're going to be kind to him, lenient and whatnot. So when he got into this cell block and he was eyeing the people and everthing and he started to tap

and finally he said Nicolás Salmanovitch Rubashov. Right then that guy agreed that he was a big time operator. There was no way either of them could lie. If they had charged him, the nature of torture is such that you probably can't lie about something that really happened. Sooner or later they'll know that and they'll know not to stop. That's not the climax of the book by any means but from that moment on they were all in together. It didn't matter. This guy was kind of a younger fellow, he was a right wing. He was some sort of duke or something, kind of a crazy guy. You'll read about him. He had been there a couple of years and he was just a nobleman, kind of a kooky one at that, kind of like a polo player sort of guy. That causes all kinds of a big pain in the neck and joke. But I mean he was as far right as Rubashov had been left at one time, but they got along fine. He does here learn to play the game. I don't mean by that the gamesman. He acts the part is what I should have said.

In our last session you will read, and this is not a bad philosophy for a prisoner in many tough circumstances where you really can't kid yourself, you can't try to make a deal and buy your way out - Epictetus in our last week. One of his quotes from the Enchiridion: "Remember you are an actor in a drama of such sort as the author chooses. If short, then a short one. If long, then a long one. If

it be his pleasure (that is the author) that you should enact a poor man, or a cripple or a ruler or a private citizen, see that you act it well. For this is your business to act well a given part. But to choose it belongs to another." So there you are. In prison, and he acted the part well. He was not naive. He thought some of his prisonmates were. He muses one time about the fellow that's still in the simple belief that his subjective guilt or innocence makes a difference. That he would still argue the case. There's no idea of the higher interests which are really at stake. Even in Hanoi we knew that many of the people there had much greater interests. That you were not really going to be able - if you could somehow objectively prove with a slide show that you were innocent of whatever they were charging you with, it is a naive way to think that would make any difference in the proceedings. It would probably bring down the house in laughter. If you missed the point, that's fine.

I'll just pick and describe a couple of points. Talks about the comparison of drink and pity. He's being interrogated by an old friend of his, Ivanov. Ivanov says, "Drinking is not as bad as the vice of pity, which up till now I have managed to avoid. The smallest does of it, and you are lost. Weeping over humanity and bewailing oneself - you know our race's pathological leaning to it. Our greatest poets destroyed themselves by this poison (the poison is pity). Up to forty

fifty, they were revolutionaries - then they became consumed by pity and the world pronounced them holy. Beware of these ecstasies. Every bottle of spirits contains a measurable amount of ecstasy."

"My point is this," he said; "one may not regard the world as a sort of metaphysical brothel for emotions. That is the first commandment for us. Sympathy, conscience, disgust, despair, repentance, and atonement are for us repellent debauchery. To sit down and let oneself be hypnotized by one's own navel, to turn up one's eyes and humbly offer the back of one's neck to Gletkin's revolver - that is an easy solution. The greatest temptation for the like of us is: to renounce violence, to repent, to make peace with oneself. Most great revolutionaries fell before this temptation, from Spartacus to Danton and Dostoevsky; they are the classical form of betrayal of the cause. The temptations of God were always more dangerous for mankind than those of Satan." Hardnosed, revolutionary.

They also had brains. Talking about this pain of the old party revolutionaries and I've seen them like in the Soviet Union where some of the faces are painted on a mosaic of all the old revolutionaries.

"Each one of the men with the numbered heads on the old photograph which had once decorated Ivanov's walls, knew more about the philosophy of law, political economy and statesmanship than all the highlights in the professional chairs of

the universities of Europe." More or less true, I guess. Now the old guard was used up and their philosophizing was over. It's interesting to read this 40 years ago, that's what they talk about in Europe now. About how the new Soviet hierarchy will suddenly be filled with people who've had no contact with the revolutionary development.

Rubashov, even though he knows that he is going to be killed, even though he knows that he is going to be humiliated, finds it necessary to go through the motions. Driven by a sense of duty. "The idea of death had a long time ago lost any metaphysical character; it had a warm, tempting, bodily meaning - that of sleep. And yet a peculiar, twisted sense of duty forced him (Rubashov) to remain awake and continue the lost battle to the end (and answer the questions) - even though it were only a battle with windmills."

And then one of his old contemporaries, a man named Wassilij, is hearing about this through the newspaper, about the trial of his old friend. Wassilij was sitting there and his daughter was going on about the badness of Rubashov and she said "Apparently his behaviour provoked the audience to repeated spontaneous demonstrations of anger and contempt, which were, however, quickly suppressed by the Citizen President of the Court. On one occasion these expressions of the revolutionary sense of justice gave place to a wave of merriment" and so forth.

"So now you see," said Vera Wassiljovna, pumping petrol into the hissing apparatus. "He says himself that he is a traitor. If it weren't true, he would say so himself. In the meeting at our factory we have already carried a resolution which all have to sign."

"A lot you understand about it," sighed Wassilij.

You see the point is that in these terrible dilemmas of prison of the sort Rubashov was involved in, death is not an option. Even Walzer had trouble with that distinction because he thought it was odd that the Code of Conduct should say, I will never surrender of my own free will. He was going on the assumption that death was an option and therefore it was a harsh requirement. The fact is usually you don't have that privilege of killing yourself.

Well, the third reading that we were to have gotten through today is mine, "The World of Epictetus". The message there is that you cannot stand alone, unity over self. That you must hang together, that all must make every effort to be magnanimous and compassionate to those that fall by the wayside for it is neither Christian nor American to nag a repentant sinner to his grave. Given that atmosphere, I think you will find that men behave a lot better than they are supposed to behave according to the systems analysts' _____ grams.

*Stomach
10/2/71
4/11/71*

I'd like to close by reading such a social science anecdote. One of the famous cases that is apparently used in predicting the behavior of others from a book called Ethics, Inventing Right and Wrong by J. L. Mackie. It's called the prisoner's dilemma and the natural starting point is known as that, the prisoner's dilemma. But its significance and its connections are brought out better by one of the other variants of the story.

"Two soldiers, Tom and Dan, are manning two nearby strongposts in an attempt to hold up an enemy advance. If both remain at their posts, they have a fairly good chance of holding off the enemy until relief arrives, and so of both surviving. If they both run away, the enemy will break through immediately and the chance of either of them surviving is markedly less. But if one stays at his post while the other runs away, the one who runs will have an even better chance of survival than each will have if both remain, while the one who stays will have an even worse chance than each will have if they both run. Suppose that these facts are known to both men, and each calculates in a thoroughly rational way with a view simply to his own survival. Tom reasons: if Dan remains at his post, I shall have a better chance of surviving if I run than if I stay; but also if Dan runs away I shall have a better chance if I run than if I stay; so whatever Dan is going to do, I would be well advised to run. Since the situation is symmetrical, Dan's reasoning is exactly similar. So both will run."

So says the social scientist. I think that those of you who have been in tight circumstances with good shipmates will agree with me that men don't behave in such a self-interested way when they're in an organization that they know depends on them, in an organization in which there's mutual trust and confidence.

The Gamesman

LECTURE 2

We will open the course this time with reference to Michael Maccoby's book, The Gamesman. You will remember I took as a takeoff point the essential weaknesses of that fourth category of leader we have known in this country. In Maccoby's mind they lack above all else, heart. He uses the old scriptural meaning of heart as the seat of intelligence, the seat of feeling. The word for courage from our dictionary is shown to derive from the Latin and French words for heart, and the heart thus is the epitomy^e of conviction and integrity and these people who have it are usually burdened with a fair amount of emotional baggage. But they know the truth, because they look in people's eyes and care and are able to repent.

A wag in this class once gave me a good explanation of the difference between commitment and involvement, both of which are attributes that I encourage. He said one is more serious than the other. Remember that when you look at a plate of ham and eggs, the chicken was involved, but the pig was committed. By being involved, I think it's important that we all have a total understanding of the philosophical implications of our orders. I think it's true that whenever you try to motivate a group for some sort of high stress, dangerous work, that you aim your pitch, which necessarily must urge them on to bravery and high tolerance of pain, to that great center. Because you can rest assured that since you're using

Job

emotive words, a certain low percentage will drop out and just ignore your pleas and a certain high percentage will be over conscientious and die in the effort. About the only way I know to do it right is to try to arrange it so that you have about the same number of casualties at each end of the spectrum. We're really talking about disillusionment. Because it's often true that if you make your demands so gory that they're frightening to the most timid, they become disillusioned and quit. On the other end of the scale, you have the most fearless being disillusioned with the relative complacency of the others and they usually press themselves, often to death, often to starvation, and sometimes to insanity. But of all forms of disillusionment, I think the one way you can destroy and disillusion the great center, is to not play out your plans with the same fervor that you implied in their announcement. Sybil has said that she can deal with hawks or doves, but now with chicken hawks. Those are hawks that turn chicken. I think that of all the circumstances in Hanoi that brought the greatest widespread disillusion, was the cessation of the bombing. Because it was a change of pace, a change of goals, a change of posture and this brought hostility out of the most loyal.

To deal with disillusion, we're going to talk first of the concepts and the literature that tends to say that life

is not fair. Of course the textbook on that is the Book of Job. I have here a book, The Bible and the Common Reader, one that I received from a minister in Coronado years ago. It's by Mary Ellen Chase who taught for years at Smith College. This particular edition came out in 1952. She, teaching the literary side of the bible, was a great fan of the King James Version. From the year 1611, when the King James Version came into print, until the year 1985, that version was literally the only protestant bible on the street. Many, many famous authors wrote with it as a reference - reference for plots, reference for language. Milton, Swift, McCauley, Dickens, Emerson, Melville, and Abraham Lincoln just to name a few. She is particularly fond of the book we're going to read together today and lists one of its verses as that which King James does better than any of the other editions. Whereas the Cloverdale or the Geneva or the Bishops bible will say things like, "When the stars of the morning praised me together, and all the children of God rejoiced" the King James Version says, "When the morning stars sang together and all the sons of God shouted for joy." With regard to the Book of Job she says that the Old Testament poem known as the Book of Job is the incomparable literary masterpiece of our bible and describes its authorship and the many ways in which its literary content can be viewed. It starts with the statement that Job is perfect and upright, as perfect and upright as a mortal man

can be. Job was placed on the testing pad in an argument between God and Satan. To test the case a series of unjustified reverses befall Job. He is given advice from various quadrants as he is puzzling over this loss, first of family and then of possessions and ultimately of friends. His wife is not much help. Curse God and die, is her best advice. Three of his friends approach him and in long and studied dialogue try to convince him that he must have done something wrong, else he would not be punished. He threw off one argument after another and said, "It's not true. I have done nothing wrong and he has stripped me of my glory. All my friends abhor me now." He had lost his friends which we know is probably the most embittering experience of all.

I'm going over it fast, but just to set the stage, we have "life is not fair" portrayed with a demand ultimately on the part of Job to see God and hear from him why he is being punished without cause. The audience is granted. It takes place in a whirlwind and God appears and says, more or less, "I'm boss here and you've got to understand that this is the way life is. This is my world. Where wast thou when I laid the foundations of this earth, Job? Canst thou bid the sweet influence of the Pleiades or loose the bonds of Orion? Who are you to challenge me? Gird up thy loins like a man." Job submits.

I'm not going to try to give any official interpretation of all this. I do want to look at one interpretation. It is a very highly regarded dramatic, tragic poem. I wrote this up there because of Aristotle's definition, he was as we will learn in a couple of weeks the founder of many disciplines, and one of his minor achievements was being the first literary critic we know. In one of his essays he has discussed literature and this comes out in my diagram to be his definition of tragedy: A good man coming to good ends is not news, boredom. That's not very good theater, not even very interesting reading. Not to be cynically opposed to it but it's just not much in the way of good literature. Bad ends to a bad man. Again, that's not very interesting. Most people's sensibilities would register that as justice. For a bad man to come to good ends, that's affrontery. That's just offensive. The real story is the good man who comes to bad ends. Not quite that, he said the good man with a flaw who comes to unjustified bad ends is his definition of a tragedy.

This thing I'm talking about turns out to be in some people's minds one of the main points of an educated person - one of the main qualifications. Somehow education, if it does nothing else, should prepare people for acceptance of the fact that there is not really a moral economy in the universe that somehow rewards virtue and punishes evil. This is not a cynical statement. It is a very serious statement that I've heard some very bright men emphasize. It's serious

because human beings, again with regard to disillusionment, until they can adjust to that, there's an almost innate need among us, all of us, to figure that if we do good that things will work out. If we fail to do good we should at least not be surprised at reverses. When that doesn't work out then sometimes people react in unfortunate ways.

My friend Rhineland says, "Man needs order in the universe. Somehow this life has got to make sense. He needs it for aesthetic reasons, he likes to have some symmetry, chaos is repugnant." You do good work, then you get typhoid fever, then you help a sick child and your wife is shot. Someway you've got to cope with that, you can't change it. You've got to somehow be accustomed, and as I hope we'll show in these other stories, people make their own order. But they make it with the material that is laid on them. They don't invent forces. We need order in the universe for intellectual reasons, chaos is unintelligible. We need it for practical reasons, you can't make any plans unless somehow you've got a handle on the general scheme of things.

The course where I got my interest in this subject was one that was taught by a man who is going to be here next year. The course was two terms at Stanford and it was called, this was his own invention, "The Problems of Good and Evil." That got quite a lot of wear and tear over the years, in fact, wound up even in the catalog known as PG&E, which is not a

had set of initials in Southern California, for those of you who have lived out there. It was his contention, and the Book of Job was ^{the} starting point, he went through literature, and there's a lot of things to be learned in literature. We often read good books as well as hardcore texts. It was a recitation of what has happened to various people in literature and in history when they had to come face to face with the problem of the inequitability of the balance of reward and punishment. One of those I remember was King Lear whose solution to the problem of children who turned against him for no reason, he was mystified and went insane. This can even branch out into political hypotheses. For instance, you might see the rise of Hitler in Germany as a national artificial remedy for an incomprehensible economic dilemma after the Treaty of Versailles. They had somehow to make life make sense. Because no matter how hard they worked, they were still poverty stricken and no hope in sight. So to preclude such, almost always damaging and certainly always escapist, solutions to the thing, it is better to look into the problem in literature and in introspection and figure out how you're going to cope with undeserved disaster.

One treatment - that's why I was so cursory about going over the Book of Job - is in a book that is probably in many of your bedside reading shelves, War and Remembrance, by Herman Wouk. On page 800 and subsequently he deals with the Book

Wouk

of Job in that modern and very popular novel. For those of you who have not read it, it is a prison camp scene in Germany in which the inmates are Jewish refugees. Living in a compound situation they were doing what comes naturally to most prisoners, I think, who have the freedom of a common room. They invent ways to improve their minds or entertain themselves at night, usually with a show, a play or a lecture. This happens, happened to us. Matter of fact, I had never been in a compound until the last week or two I was there. I said what do we do after we have our evening meal. They said we're going to have movies tonight. So I sat down and the movie officer took his place and he gave the name of the film and the actors. This was all just recitation. He explained in detail all the things. Then at intermission we took a break and then came back and had the second half. It took about an hour and a half. I said that that's amazing that you can remember all that. He said, well that's kind of my specialty. I have 150 of them I give. In this case it was a teacher who gave a lecture on literature and the teacher's name was Professor Zastro. He is talking about Homer's Iliad and Shakespeare's parody of that book and the Book of Job. He's trying to explain in his description of Iliad what point Homer was trying to make. It's about a war. What gives the heroes of Iliad their grandeur? Is it their indomitable will to fight despite the shifting and capricious meddling of the gods? There is a lot of that in it. To venture their lives

for honor in an unfair and unfathomable situation where bad and stupid men triumph, good and skilled men fall, and strange incidents divert and decide battles? In purposeless, unfair, absurd battle to fight on, to fight to the death, fight like men? Is it the oldest of human problems, the problems of senseless evil dramatized on the field of battle? Is the tragedy that Homer perceived and Shakespeare passed over? He answers his own question. The university Iliad, in short, is a childish and despicable trash. The glory of Hector in the Iliad is that in such a trap he behaved so nobly that an almighty God, if he did exist, would weep with pride and pity. Pride that he had created out of a handful of dirt, a being so grand. Pity that in a botched universe, a Hector must unjustly die and his poor corpse dragged in the dust. Zastro turns his page and starts a different tack. All right, he says to these Jews in prison. Let us talk about this in our mother language and he shifts to Hebrew. Let us talk about an epic of our own. Satan says to God, you will remember, "Naturally Job is upright. Seven sons, three daughters and the wealthiest man in the land of Uz. And why not be upright? Look how it pays. A sensible universe, a fine arrangement. Job is not upright, he is just a smart Jew. The sinners are damn fools. But just take away his rewards and see how upright he will remain." Of course this was Satan's argument to God. "Alright, take them away," God says.

In one day marauders carry off Job's wealth and a hurricane kills all his 10 children. And what does Job do? He goes into mourning. He says with due deference to God, "Naked I came from the womb, and naked I will return." He says, "God has given and God has taken away. Blessed be God's name." So God challenges Satan. "See, he remained upright, a good man." "Skin for skin," Satan answers. "All a man really cares about is his life. Reduce him to a skeleton. A sick, plundered, bereaved skeleton. Nothing left of this proud Jew but his own rotting skin and bones." Zastro loses his voice then. He shakes his head, in this prison in Germany, clears his throat, passes his hand over his eyes and then he goes on hoarsely. God says, "All right. Do anything to him but kill him." A horrible sickness strikes Job. Too loathesome to stay under his own roof he crawls out and sits on an ash heap, scratching his sores with a shard. He says nothing. Stripped of his wealth, his children senselessly killed, his body a horrible stinking skeleton covered with boils, he is silent. Three of his pious friends come to comfort him and a debate follows.

In Job, as he criticizes the drama, as in most great works of art, the main design is very simple. His comforts maintained that since one almighty God rules the universe, it must make sense, therefore, Job must have sinned. Let him search his deeds, confess and repent. The missing piece

is only what offense he has committed. In round after round of soaring arguments with his friends, Job fights back. The missing piece must be with God, not with him. He is as religious as they are. He knows that the almighty exists and that the universe must make sense, but he, poor public skeleton, knows now that it does not in fact always make sense. There is no guarantee of good fortune for good behavior. That crazy injustice is just part of the visible world and the blight. His religion demands that he assert innocence. Otherwise he will be profaning God's name. He will be conceding that the Almighty can botch one man's life and if God can do that, the whole universe is a botch, and he is not an almighty God. That Job will never concede; he wants an answer. Impatient man that he is, he cries to God. He gets an answer and, oh, what an answer. An answer that answers nothing. God said, "Who are you to call me to account? Can you hope to understand why I or how I do everything? Where were you at the creation? Can you comprehend the marvels of stars and the animals and the infinite wonders of existence? You, a worm, that lives a few moments and then dies." My friends, says the old professor in prison, Job has won. Do you understand? God with all his glory has conceded Job's main point. That the missing piece is with Him. God claims only that his reason is beyond Job and Job is perfectly willing to admit that. With the

main point settled, Job humbles himself and is more satisfied and falls on his face.

Well, it's interesting reading and there's even more interesting stuff, but I think you'll get the idea. That man made to that audience, his idea of sense out of this scheme. Enough that he could proceed with dignity, not in self-serving contempt but with a measure of self-containable nobility which I think most of ^{us} feel obliged or almost impelled to read into this very challenging and historically renowned poem that Mary Ellen Chase identifies as the high dramatic point of the Old Testament. She finally comes down on the idea that Job is the bible's only hero. There are fighting men, patriarch's, lawgivers, prophets in other books, but this is the one man who rises to the measure of the universe, to the stature of God of Israel, while sitting on an ashheap. Job a poor skeletal, loathesome beggar.

The second book that has men in seemingly untenable situations is Solzhenitsyn's early novel, A Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovitch. This is a scene that is very familiar to me and others here. Namely, how to cope in a communist prison where the main force is often, it isn't quite so dramatically brought out here as it was in the previous prison story we read, is a mental strain. Where typically the idea of the game is to follow the routine of confession,

apology and atonement for crimes, political or otherwise, that caused you to be incarcerated by that society. You're usually, and it's done to Americans, it's done to Vietnamese, it's done to Russians, it's done to Solzhenitsyn, put into the position of where it is incumbent upon you presumably to have guilt feelings and where it is usually arranged that you have fearful feelings. This is usually brought about by solitary confinement, where both guilt feelings and fear tend to accelerate as you live alone, particularly if there is no contact with a person that speaks your language for long periods of time. You start looking for friends. Another thing is your captor can justify reprisal in a kind of odd use of conscience. Namely that you transgressed. They're very particular about finding this transgression. Sometimes in the seminar I'll give you some examples of how laboriously they seek proof. Then physical torture. Usually in some kind of physical abuse that puts you in a position to submit that you alone have the power to stop the torture and the price is the demand that they are making for your atonement, supposedly. Usually writing a statement or telling on a shipmate or maybe divulging an escape plan or whatever. This is usually done with a sense of urgency and it is not inconvenience. It is not irons or handcuffs. It's pain usually brought about by wrapping your arms in straps and shutting off the blood circulation, and forcing your head down and swatting you over the head at the same time. About a half an hour will usually do it. Even the toughest guy has

to cope with the fact that he's going to lose it all if he doesn't make some sort of accommodation and that's where the skill comes in. To somehow realize that you don't have a free ticket. That you still have to cope with your conscience and freedom and compulsion can coexist. It's in this very learned and experienced and delicate world of how to be convincing and yet not give away the family jewels that those people learn to live. It's a life of extortion. As I've said many times, it is a life in which you learn to have a great deal of respect for integrity because that's the only safe haven. You catch a lot of guff, you catch a lot of quick and one-time doses of trouble. But if you really want to get into trouble, if you have done something of which you are ashamed, that's power and your trouble comes in long stretches and never lets up. In fact, gets worse as each compromise is made because you cannot back off. You've got to live up to your reputation or whatever you want to call it.

This book is kind of cleverly written. It's not very difficult to read. It talks about a man who has made order out of that chaotic universe, Ivan Denisovitch. He is a conniving, tough, enigmatic guy who has the loyalty of his shipmates, he's contemptuous of his jailors and without posturing it is clear to everybody whose side he is on. He has pleased himself, not to get complicated, not to see things in too many levels. It's straight out. Unity over self.

Hang in with your crowd. Make each day as meaningful as possible within the code of ethics that you have. It need not be a pompous code of ethics. A direct, non-complicated, straightforward one.

A little bit of comic relief there. The new guy, Captain Buynovsky, shows up. New. A little bit more naive. Suddenly he takes himself very seriously. Having been stripped in the snow he shouts to the guards, "You have no right to strip us in the cold, you do not understand Article 11 of the penal code." To which the more knowledgeable Ivan contemptuously advises him, "They know the code and they've got the right and you've got a lot to learn brother." I think this is instructive for the reason that you can see how each day can be involved and complicated as the one we're living here. Once your system is attuned you can experience a full spectrum of emotions. The Captain, much to Ivan's satisfaction, later changes from a "bossy loudmouthed naval officer to a slow-moving cagey prisoner" of the sort Ivan is. I think I can say, that Ivan has found in that unfair environment of possible disillusionment, a sense of dignity, of self-composure, of nobility. One of the things that caught my attention was a scene that you may have noticed. The time that they were going to bed, Ivan is talking to a man across in the next bunk and they were talking about prayers. He offers the advice that ^{it} is undignified, unbecoming a man of self-respect, to beg in prayer. That had occurred to me in my experience.

I think, as many people that have lived alone will tell you, the longer you're there, the more high principled your life becomes. As Ivan says, "God asks you only to pray for one thing, and that's your daily bread and by that he does not mean bread in those terms." I thought that was kind of interesting. We'll see it later in Ralph Waldo Emerson who on a different scale says the same thing. They all advocate prayers, as do I. But I hope to be clear about it. It occurs to people when they are put at their own resources for a great length of time that there are plenty of things to say to God without giving him a shopping list.

The third book is one of, again, dismal circumstances and almost no hope. Probably less hope than even Ivan had. It is written by Albert Camus, a Frenchman, born in Algeria in 1913. He was killed in an accident in 1960 after having previously received the Nobel prize for literature. This book, The Plague, was written in 1948. It depicts a plague in Oran, Northern Africa. It is a city that he describes as having the main characteristic of banality. A commonplace, worn out, African-European town. The narrator is a doctor who is kind of ~~hero~~ of the hero of The Plague, Dr. Rieux. His wife is off on a trip. She is also tubercular and is in the mountains. The city had walls. The rats all start coming out and getting sick. Every place that I'd heard of this book before, I was always told that it was supposed to be a parody or symbolic story of the Nazis and the rats were the Nazis and so forth. I read it and didn't get that feeling

at all. It's a dramatic enough story to me to just think of rats as rats. The history of plague it turns is rather serious. 10,000 people a day (this is real history) were said to have died in the Constantinople plague. It certainly dramatizes the terribleness of an epidemic which is taking ever increasing segments of the population. Of course it makes a very apt place to study character. These people are trapped in a situation which has every indication of leaving everybody somewhat maimed, and many dead. They don't believe it at first that it could really be happening. One line I like, "Like wars people don't think that they're really starting and if they do they'll be short. Otherwise it would be too stupid to have one." There are different characters. There's always the guy that wants to make a deal. Rambert in this case. The prefect has decreed that they cannot leave the town or nobody can enter, for the usual reasons of quarantine. He spends most of his time trying to get ahold of the underworld, and one develops, that'll somehow let him buy his way out so he can join his wife in Paris. Never gets there. He and others, Dr. Rieux, most everybody I name, finally are overcome with some sort of sense of purpose that I think could be attributed to a kind of comradeship. That under these dire circumstances, this goes on for nine months, there is a certain type of person, and generally speaking an admirable person, who in these situations is able to somehow make sense out of his predicament, maintain his dignity and

rely on the great power of the fellows and to drink of that energy that comes of comradeship. Not all were able to deal with that. In fact, only a minority as, again, is usually the case. For the most part, the men of Oran were men of well defined and sound ideas on everything concerning exports, banking, the fruit or wine trade. Men of proved ability in handling problems relating to insurance, interpretation of ill-drawn contracts and the like. Of high qualifications and evident good intentions. That, in fact, was what struck one most. The excellence of their intentions. But as regards plague, their competence was practically nil, as it is for most of us. And yet, some are able to adapt to situations like that well and rather quickly.

Rieux, an atheist, a fatalist, who suddenly takes it upon himself to set up a medical team, to try to ease the pain, to provide for the care of the sick. He arranges an almost continuous service of ambulances to cemeteries. It is a very depressing life in which this disease not only makes people feverish but is accompanied by big body sores that spew forth pus and so forth. Rieux has all this time and is somehow able to cope without being self-righteous. To quote him, "For having known friendship and remembering it, for knowing affection and remembering it, all a man can win in a conflict is knowledge and memories." He draws others toward him. Gene Tarrou, a newcomer, who in a low key style

Camus describes as an addict of normal pleasures without being a slave to them. He likens Tarrou, for reasons I can't explain, to an historian who kept looking through the wrong end of a telescope. He had an ill-defined religion.

So Rieux, Tarrou and Rambert became the key members and the key characters of this group of purposeful guys who without joy or without despair formed meaning to the lives in a situation in which many were running amok. Some interesting things happened though, because all bets were off. The fugitives, the people that were really in trouble, over debts, over crimes, particularly when the threats came from outside the city, were very comfortable. They kind of heaved a sigh of relief. The guilt ridden were happy. Another oddity was a priest who gave a sermon early in the days of the plague that sort of said we deserve this, that the plague is the flail of God, the world is a thrashing floor. It was kind of his version of the Book of Job. God is punishing Job as it is read in the first instance, and seemed to think that it was right out of the book that there had been some evil committed and that therefore, that is what should be expected. He later dies without symptoms, which is supposed to be very symbolic and, I guess, is. He died of a kind of broken heart, muttering something about each man is responsible for his brother and a child who lost his eye should be joined another who would put his own eye out.

A horrible physical situation. People were numbed, they developed a vacant stare that sometimes is unmistakably the sign of insipient or actual insanity. I've had a couple of experiences with that type of development.

Tarrou's death scene after his long and faithful service to this medical rescue corps. He appreciates Dr. Rieux's candidness. His fever was down (he was bedridden at this time) and he said, "I feel better." Rieux said, "You know as well as I that everybody experiences remission at dawn." This kind of hardhearted fellow that emerges in these situations is both heavily loved by his comrades and brutally frank with them at the same time. Tarrou expires about noon, hoping that though he had to lose the match he had put up a good fight and that his comrades will admire him for it.

The plague is over, starting to run out of gas at the end. Fireworks are fired by the city on the eve of opening the gates. He learns that his wife in the meantime had died in the sanitarium. There's hardly a laugh in the book but I think it's, if nothing else, a textbook case of how certain people were able to make order out of chaos in the total absence of hope, in the total knowledge of the fact that there was no rosy lining. Dignity, self-respect, love of comradeship.

I think we've all known people who would have done a credit to any of those circumstances, certainly the last two. I will tell one story about an Air Force fellow I knew in Vietnam. A very colorful, flamboyant guy. I think it's just a matter of self-respect I'm talking about. His name

is George McKnight and he is still on active duty. He'd be very embarrassed if he knew I was mentioning his name. He's really a big, tough playboy type guy with a lot of character. He escaped one time with a little fellow named George Coker and they were about a day and a half swimming down the river. They were running down the streets of Hanoi at night, they were kind of lucky to get out of where they were, but they tied ropes to one another and they were going to swim down to the delta and then they were going to catch a boat and go out and join the Seventh Fleet. The current was about seven knots and it was pretty warm. The water was terrible unsanitary but they decided that they would go ahead and drink water. They didn't worry about food. I thought that that was pretty smart. They had about six days and they thought they would be down there before they got sick and they wouldn't need any food. They'd just swim or float all night and then they'd bury themselves in sand alongside the bank during the day in a desolate place. The first darn morning an old fisherman looked down in a hole, the only way they were visible, and he blew the whistle and everybody came up and they joined us later.

George was a perennial escape enthusiast. He was good. He later got sick. He had been a boxer in college. I'd never see him enough to really describe him well although he is one of my best friends. I haven't seen him since we got out

of prison. He was a big, tall fellow and he had a big funny laugh. I remember I was there the day they brought him in. He always had a sense of humor. Unmarried. The idea of escaping, there's a couple of things I want to touch on. One, escape was quite controversial at times because it involved reprisal and the reprisal was often devastating. So there were those who thought of people who were going to escape as grandstanders that were just going to bring a lot of grief on other people. I didn't hold that feeling. George didn't get in the argument much. He was already ready to go and it took a lot of preparation. I was the guy that was trying to get him out. That's one concept you've got to get straight. Another one is for all practical purposes if you could have known ahead of time to construct the right personality or came by it naturally, that is one of compliance and reliability as they would see a person who could be released and sent home and not blow the whistle on them, you could come home most anytime you could arrange it, provided you convinced them you were willing to totally submit. There was always from the start a lot of talk about the double agent. That's the first thing that comes to a guy's mind. Let me go, I'll go and you tell me to go. There were several reasons why that wasn't too good an idea and the main one was that it would have destroyed the reputation of the guy that had done it. He just would have had to keep it secret and you never would have gotten everybody straightened out on the fact

that he was to have done it that way. Unless you had a tremendous reputation among the prisoners you couldn't have risked it if you had any self-respect. Right at the time the last escape had been canceled by our people and George was frustrated, for all odd things to happen, this bachelor was called out for interrogation and they said to McKnight, who had escaped, who had been on every kind of bad guy list that they ever had, they said, your mother (who was an alcoholic he told us and had been separated from his father and was somebody he "did not like") had taken up with Cora Weiss (so the interrogator said), and apparently she was quite influential because they were even willing to let George go. They said you will be permitted to go home. Of course he would not do that but he came back and told us. Since he alone had so much information and had such a reputation, we said, hell it'll be a good deal letting McKnight go home if they want to and he can tell everybody about it. But that offended his dignity. I'm just trying to draw one last example of how comradeship and sense of purpose and self-respect often do emerge, probably more often in hopeless situations than they do in everyday life. The offer was made and George immediately came back with the message, in a jovial way - you could almost hear his laugh as you read it to yourself - "I will go over the wall with you or I will walk out the gate with you, but that's the only way I'll leave this outfit." Maybe that's typical of what I've been trying to encourage you to do in this hour.

First of all, as you read these things, get accustomed to the idea of having to cope with a moral economy that does not provide for justice. Secondly, read through it and see the commonality of hardhearted guys in all these stories making their lives make sense in full knowlege of this moral dilemma.

LECTURE 3

SOCRATES

Although this is a philosophy course and not a history course I think it pays at times to keep track of the time frame in which you're talking. Probably the first famous literary Greek was Homer. His heyday was about 725 B.C. He wrote as most Greeks thought in those days of the wonders of things, and they did have a wonderful civilization - full of palaces, ramparts, harbors, causeways; they had armor, they had door keys, hardware, sailing ships, bathtubs, chariots; a marvelous material civilization. It was on this type of thought that their intellectuals dwelt. Three hundred years later, 425 B.C., an entirely different intellectual frame of mind dominated the intelligentsia. Of course, by that time Socrates was teaching, Pericles was dead, the Peloponnesian wars had started, incidently Socrates was a hoplite in those wars, Plato was born at about that time. Then 15 years later, by 411, the great city-state of Athens, a town no bigger than Newport, Rhode Island that was able at the same time to be the intellectual capital of the world and the military of the world; be the site of the most renowned school and the site of the headquarters of a world war simultaneously. In that year, 411 B.C., Thucydides, the great general and historian died. Politics were disintegrating, the two competing groups

were the oligarchs, the rich few, and the democrats, the mob. The mob was displaced by 404 B.C., the year of anarchy by the 30 oligarchs, one of whom was Socrates' uncle, another was Alcibiades, a man whom during the Peloponnesian wars Socrates, a hoplite, awarded the medal that he himself had been given. Five years later, by 399, Socrates had under the renewed democratic rule, been convicted of three charges and put to death. That gives you kind of the historic frame of Periclean and Homeric Greece. Fourteen years after Socrates died, Plato started his academy and 42 years after Socrates died, Plato's student, Aristotle, had gone on to Macedonia as a tutor for the king's son, Alexander, who later ruled the world as Alexander the Great.

The big thing about Socrates and, of course, his biographer Plato, was that through their use of the forms, Western science was born and through their ideas of the immortality of the soul we had many strings to follow on christianity. To them virtues were objective. All was not relative. There was something called justice, there was something called goodness. It was not just a psychological matter of how you felt about those words.

I had occasion in Vietnam to make use of my previous study of this period in Greece when in one night I was marshalled into a conversation in a very formal atmosphere with a so-called Vietnamese intellectual. A man I later learned was a Dr. Vien.

Although he didn't harrass me he was asking questions that gave me a clear indication that he had been educated in the West. Questions like the connection of conscience and protestantism and authority and catholicism. Of course he was zeroing in on my concept of justice. It was at that time that I recognized his background well enough to suggest that if he remembered the old opening dialogue in Plato's Republic, a dialogue that took place ⁱⁿ Piraeus at the home of Cephalus when Socrates as usual turned the conversation into a series of dialectic exercises, making his adversaries alternate definitions of justice from such terms as helping friends and harming enemies or the interest of the stronger, until they finally gave up as he advanced new contradictions. While they had probably learned something about justice they were able to say that they could not well define it.

Plato's works and they are, of course, mostly famous for their descriptions of Socrates' discussions, can be studied and viewed and worked with on at least four different levels. For instance, Republic can be thought of as a political treatise and studied as a political science text. It can secondly be thought of as a treatise on human nature in the political metaphor, and often is. Thirdly, his distinctions, his categorizations, his conclusions that this is a part of that and that is a part of this, it is a kind of an epistemological text. And fourth, it is a skeptical

work of art in which each of his arguments is built up to. Usually starting with the most general and then each step becoming more specific as he comes to the top of the pyramid with sort of the clinching argument and then backing down to lesser levels of specificity to the general conclusion. Those who spend years studying these things realize that each step up is matched by one step down, perfect symmetry, a piece of art. What I'm saying is, that if you are asked to write an article for the Atlantic Monthly that was at one sweep a work of perfection on four different levels, it would take you certainly the most of the winter to get it done.

Socrates, or Plato depending on how you read it, is one of three major philosophic contributors to a description of human conscience. Socrates describes this voice that speaks to him always in the negative except for one instance in which it was mentioned that he should study music. Always in the negative. That's often thought of as the first literary description of what we know as conscience. Of course, St. Paul followed up with more about it. I would say Immanuel Kant was a third major contributor, although Kant was too cagey to call it conscience. It might seem odd that this word soul comes up so often in Socratic dialogues. Sounds kind of spooky doesn't it. Arthur Rubenstein played piano one night in San Diego and I heard him say that he had studied 30 foreign

languages and every one of them had a word for soul. So it's a rather basic human concept. Jesus and Socrates had much in common. Both were moralists and both had many disciples. Both came from poor backgrounds; Jesus from a carpenter and Socrates from a stonecutter. Both were executed by their societies for immorality, and yet, both were the epitome of morality. Socrates the founder of political theory and science; Jesus the founder of christianity. Plato had a lot of common sense and a lot of insight into the political process. At the time of the year of the anarchy, before Socrates' death, he described the situation in Athens as follows: "The teacher fears and flatters his scholars and the scholars despise their masters and tutors. The old do not like to be thought of as morose and authoritative and therefore they imitate the young. The citizens chafe impatiently at the least touch of authority and at length they cease to care for even laws written or unwritten. And this is the fair and glorious beginning out which springs dictatorship. The excessive increase of anything causes reaction in the opposite direction. Dictatorship naturally arises out of democracy and the most aggravated form of tyranny and slavery out of the most extreme form of liberty."

The great philosophy professor at Harvard has said that all Western philosophy is but footnotes to Plato. The four dialogues we have read give you some insight into the dramatic ability of Plato to frame Socrates' arguments. Euthyphro,

a man who brought impiety charges against his father for causing the death of a servant, confronts Socrates who is on the verge of being charged with impiety by his government. An interesting conversation ensues and the punch line is, "What is piety?" You get such dichotomies popping out as Socrates asks, "Do gods love piety because it is pious or is piety pious because the gods love it?" Reverence is defined as a special kind of fear and so on and so on. These Greeks, the classical Greeks, were not fundamentalists in the current sense. Religiously they were not friends of the anthropomorphic idea of God. God would not stoop to being a quarrelsome, prideful man grown large.

The second dialogue, Apology which means defense. The man who brought charges against Socrates, Meletus, is shown before court as was Socrates, as the case was tried. The charges were three: one, corrupting the young; two, making wild speculations about the heavens and the earth and the areas under the earth; and three, making a better argument seem worse. This case was heard before a jury of 500. Socrates at first is rather cocky. He cites the example of a democrat (not dead) who went before the Oracle of Delphi and asked who was the wisest man of Athens and the Delphi said Socrates. Of course he used that against him. Socrates believes in the divine order and semi-sarcastically says, "Far be it from me to disturb the children of the divine (fundamentalists)."

He had an implied charge of imprudence against him and he

used a military metaphor from his old days as a hoplite and said he must stay at his post. The court does not want to convict him. He is a popular man, it's going to be a political problem to deal with him. They've offered him amnesty if he will stop his philosophical inquiry and teaching. Of course he refuses. He considers that a personal right, a divine right. Other Greek issues of a similar nature: Sophocles' Antigone who thought she had the right to bury her dead brother. Socrates refuses to parade his wife and three sons. He thought that that would be cheap. He is convicted 280 to 220. They ask him to suggest a sentence and he reminds them that he was a senator and that he might be committed to the hall of the senators. They said death. He said in so many words, no sweat, that will give me a chance to converse with the wise men and poets who have gone before me.

In Crito, the third dialogue, he is in conversation with his friend Crito who offers him a chance to escape, as was common in those days. He was willing to bribe the guard and let him go into exile, but this was where Socrates drew the line. He said, in so many words, if I set myself above the state it would set a bad example. Although he refused to accept the state's offer because he thought it was infringing upon his personal or divine rights, in legal matters he was a child of the laws. Obey the orders or persuade the state it is unjust, but never say that laws should not be obeyed, he

would say. Even though he got a bum rap he would not demoralize his countrymen by disobeying the law. It's interesting that Henry Thoreau was on the opposite fence. In his civil disobedience article which we read the state is evil and whenever he gets an order from it, he decides and the exception is when he goes along with it. Socrates on the other hand obeys the law and it's only in the exception that he goes his own way.

The most moving of the four dialogues we read is Phaedo. Phaedo, like Crito and Euthyphro is a man's name. He was an ex-POW. He was one of those that was with Socrates at the time of his death. It was in this dialogue, written by Plato some 12 years after Socrates' death, that we get Plato's idea of metaphysics, the forms, equality, beauty, goodness, justice, the holy. They are eternal, not mutable. To Plato, the body is sluggishness, inertia, in error; to Christ, body is the temple of the holy spirit, neither good nor evil. To Plato the soul is immortal by nature; to Christ the soul is immortal by the grace of God. To Plato the soul is permanent and seeks to behold the forms. It's an exaggerated dualism. Soul strives to leave body. At that point he gives various proofs of immortality. The argument from opposites: life and death are opposites he says, one generates from the other. A second proof, he asks the question, "What would a soul do after death, how could it break down? The soul like the forms

is uncompounded, it has no parts to break down into." This is called the argument from simplicity. A third argument, among many, was the argument from recollection and he talks about conversations with a slave boy in which he showed to his satisfaction that learning is really recollection, that the soul of this slave boy had a previous existence. He was able to talk to this unschooled youth and have him deduce that if a diagonal is drawn across a square and a square is constructed with sides the length of the diagonal, that the second square has twice the area of the first. To him this could not be possible unless the boy (or his soul) had had some previous experience with the ^{Pythagorean theorem} pathagarian. This boy's soul knew equality itself, beauty itself, justice itself. Of course, the allegory of the cave: the four levels of consciousness. First of all the reflections on the cave, the things, the visible, the image, the likeness, the least permanent. Then the men walking in front of the fire. They corresponded to the general categories. The beliefs sufficient guides to action, what you might call common sense homilies. In the third, the outside, his even higher level of abstraction which he would relate to mathematics. The fourth, the sun, is reality itself. The forms, God.

In kind of a way, William Wordsworth's poem "The Ode to Immortality" is similar. Socrates had this boy recall from the past and his recollection of his previous life was generated more and more as he got into his teens. The Wordsworth theory

is also that a soul returns from a previous existence, but the immortality or the memory fades with time. Remember the old stanza, "The soul that rises with us, our life star, have had elsewhere its setting, and come again from afar. Not in entire forgetfulness and not in utter nakedness, but trailing clouds of glory do we come. From God who was our home, heaven lies about us in our infancy. Shades of the prison house begin to close upon the growing boy, but he beholds the light and whence it flows. He has seen it in his joy. The youth who daily farther from the east must travel still is nature's priest and by the visions granted is on his way attended. But at length a man perceives it die away and fade into the light of common day."

We'll never tear ourselves away from the basic idea, that Plato first wrote of. I am not a body, I am something else, but I have a body. Plato in the final analysis was a mathematician, a poet, a metaphysician, a man from whom all Western philosophy grew.

LECTURE 4

I don't presume to override the good class notes, although there will be some repetitiveness. This is my view of the high points of the week of Aristotle and Joseph Conrad. We finished Plato last week. He was, as you will remember, an intellectualist, a mathematician, a poet, a rationalist. Not to escape reality but to deal with it most effectively, as he saw it. The practical attempt to understand the chaos of ^{the} universe, and particularly chaos in his case as we know from the history of Greece was significant. As I and everybody have said, his influence is not reduced by this by any means. In fact, Whitehead said that all modern philosophy is but a footnote to Plato.

Another standout today, who, like Plato, places great emphasis on moral and political action. That, of course, is Aristotle. Aristotle is more empirical, because rather than being a poet and mathematician he is first and last a natural scientist. If you were to give him a profession you would call him a marine biologist. He had the largest fish collection in the Mediterranean. He was a great classifier and a great textbook writer. He started out by classifying knowledge into two categories: the theoretical, the knowing part (you did it to know); and the practical, the stuff that you should study in order that you could do things. Some of the theoretical stuff we would now think of as

practical. Like physics and astronomy. But in those days it was really and intellectual curiosity. Metaphysics we still think of as somewhat theoretical. He called it first philosophy and wrote its first textbook, as he did in the case of psychology and astronomy and physics and marine biology. He was the first man to write on any of these subjects. He wrote the first textbook on embryology. I think it's in your notes that the question is often raised, "What about these guys? What practical significance can we give them in this scientific age?" Not too much. I don't want to overkill that. But once in awhile the concepts that they came up with have practical aftermaths. Professor Delbrook of Cal Tech less than a year ago wrote in the New York Times after receiving the Nobel Prize for biochemistry that the kernel of his ideas that resulted in that prize was the notion of the genetic blueprint of invariance in the male sperm and that this was really an idea that Aristotle had had. He thought he ought to get a posthumous Nobel Prize. Other disciplines - and I'm not naming them all - but the practical disciplines: ethics, politics, drama criticism (so you would know how to write and criticize a play. I think I've already discussed one of his definitions of a tragedy. A story of a good man with a flaw who comes to an unjustified bad end.) Categorizing, always categorizing. Rhetoric. How to write speeches.

His political ideas we'll talk a little about this afternoon. He was the guy that said that man is a political animal and that those who live outside society are either beasts or worse. There's at least two schools of thought of that. Aristotle thought that man since his beginning had always lived in social units. Others, Hobbs for instance, believes as you may remember in the social contract theory - that we got together for protection and to calm one another's brutal, nasty habits. In fact, he said that life outside society was brutal, nasty and short.

The Logic was a textbook that he wrote that had continuity through Boethius, the old fellow that was imprisoned in about the 4th century that Joe talked about. But most of these others were lost, at least in the Greek translations. Aristotle was popularized after they had been translated into Latin and the man who popularized him was Thomas Aquinas, a scholar of the 13th century and a clergyman of worldwide note. Thomas Aquinas was tired of trying to handle only faith and he thought that perhaps these writings of Aristotle gave theology a scientific basis. He'd come out for one God, that he could account for his existence by pure reason. But that pure reason of which he spoke, if Aristotle is closely read, was not to be an exact demonstration of his existence of the way we would ask for a demonstration in trigonometry or geometry, but by good reason. This was one of the first

things that I think I want to note about Aristotle. Because he is known for his position that different disciplines require different orders of proof. This is not always accepted, even now. Perhaps that is why our social scientists are always trying to quantify. Sometimes it's better expressed in numbers and sometimes it is labor to go to numbers. But our culture seems to have a lot more respect for numbers and graphs than they do for intuition. You can't use intuition in the Pentagon. They'd throw you out if when asked, "Why do you think we ought to have so many guns on this ship?" you said, "I just know it, by intuition I came across this." It's just as valid. If you read these scholars there are many people who place just as much validity on it - it depends on what you're talking about. But you've got to have lines and numbers. Aristotle would have scoffed at that. People say, in the same light, since you cannot give exact demonstrations of ethical truth, that everything is relative. Again, that's the easy way out. He had gradations of proof. Joe will talk a little bit more about that. For instance, he thought that theological proof could be a good deal more rigorous than say, social scientific proof. Social scientific proof, now, usually consists of asking questions of people in the form of questionnaires. Then you come back with what is dispensed as knowledge. Aristotle would have scoffed at that.

He said that's opinion. What has that got to do with knowledge that 85% of the people prefer to do this rather than that?

He's had his detractors. This swing of theologians to reason as a result of the encouragement St. Thomas got from his writings had an overshoot. One of those that thought it was overshoot was Martin Luther who wanted to go back to faith and referred to Aristotle as a "stinking goat". All in all he is the founder, in many ways, and I've also said that Plato was for instance, in the discipline of making decisions. In a real sense I think you can also say Aristotle was the founder of modern science. He was born 15 years after Socrates had died, that being 399. He overlapped Plato by about 37 years. He was one of Plato's students at the academy. At the age of 42 he went to Macedonia at the call of the king and tutored his son, Alexander, who became Alexander the Great. Then he came back to Athens, founded his school called the Lyceum, died there at the age of 62 at a time when Athens was trembling at the threat of the Macedonian empire that was soon to overcome them. As I said, like Plato, he said that the general preceded the particular. This applied in politics that the good of the state preceded the good of the individual. Perhaps in the same way that Socrates chose death after being convicted unjustly in deference to the state and the bad influence he would have on the populace not to obey its laws. A little bit aristocratic in political

preference, like Socrates. He was admired by Thomas Jefferson and Madison, particularly.

He lined up six forms of government in order of preference; three he called good, three he called bad. The best of the good was the monarchy with a benevolent single man running the country. The next best good was an aristocracy. That would be a group of the best - the best minds, the best education (as I jokingly say, the good guys on Bellevue Avenue). The third best would be the polity - the upper middleclass in basic charge with a constitution and with some sort of legislative process for laws, kind of like the USA. That was the worst of the good. The best of the bad was democracy, which was the lower middleclass in charge without a constitution. Kind of a mob, kind of a town meeting. The sort of a group that put Socrates to death. The middle bad was the oligarchy - a few rich (the bad rich), the merchants who happened to have citizenship and not all did. Those would be the bad guys on some of the better known streets in Newport, perhaps. As I said, don't forget that Athens was about the size of Newport when it had all of this going on, including the theatrical contests. It also happened to be the headquarters of the dominant power in the world running a world war. The worst of the bad is tyranny. That's again, one man as monarchy was at the top, except this is a bad man instead of a good man. I'll lead into good and bad men because that was very fundamental with the Greeks. So much for politics.

We'll dwell mostly on ethics. The book Nichomachean Ethics named after his son, who he had by his mistress. The name means victory in battle. It's really a work that you could spend many, many more hours than you have digging through because of the classifications. It is a model of analytic technique and of the logical approach. Some of the buzzwords which I see in certain people's writing and hear about is that they will say, "Well, history's OK" or "Philosophy's OK, but if you really want a hard discipline you've got to do something that uses an analytic technique and a logical approach" - which has become a synonym for mathematics or marine engineering. Those words shouldn't frighten you because you can say, as I would, that this discipline is renowned for its hardnosed analysis and analytic approach and technique and for its logic.

I've got about seven quick items that I would think of when I thought of Aristotle. This business of goodness. Again, as with Plato, the Greeks used the disposition of character as an expression of goodness rather than the conformance with particular rules. Some people call this a morality of virtue versus morality of acts. It's two sides and throughout history there have been proponents on both sides and I don't presume to say which is better. I can say that the morality of virtue in some people's eyes is typical of the Christian New Testament. Some don't even agree with that. The morality of acts of the Old Testament. There is a cultural heritage. Some say that a morality of virtue is more Greek and the morality of

acts is more Hebrew. It's not as simple as that, I'm sure, in any sense. The Greeks we can say were certainly not people who would find a man good because he did nothing wrong. A good citizen, they would say, could be a bad man by that categorization. Again, the disposition of character. It's a man you can rely on to take the fact situation and make a sensible judgement to avoid evil. It usually probably involves obedience of the law, but sometimes it's taking exception to a law. Of course, in the military I think we see the usefulness of this approach time and again. Certainly I do. It's kind of a matter of temperament. You would not gain admittance to the best private clubs in Athens because, to put it in modern day, you had no traffic tickets. That would never be. Nor would you be appointed to the highest government positions because you had a file of good fitness reports. It was much more subjective than that. And yet, not all that far out either.

Two. The idea of making your own character. Other people used this. We're not born good, we're disposed to the good, he would say. But here on earth you manufacture your own character, you build it. You build it by study and by experience. Plato's dialogue Meno inferred that there was no evidence to indicate that you could become more virtuous by studying ethics. On the contrary, he devoted his life to it but he couldn't find the proof. Aristotle didn't profess

a proof, but he professed a belief that the study of ethics was generally a plus for moral behavior. In making your character he would say that a good thing to do was to read ethical literature, study by print or by example ethical people, and to practice and to learn to be courteous, courageous, and just train yourself.

Number three. The dynamic ideas that he imparts in his highest goals. He says the highest good, which he defines as happiness which we'll talk about, is activity of the soul in accordance with virtue. That needs a lot of explanation and I'll try to give some brief explanations. He said the highest good was happiness because it was an end and never a means. Wealth would not be the highest good because that was a means to something else. But happiness was an end in itself. His idea of happiness was not titillation, it was not self-indulgence. Very practical sort of thing that we'll see coming up later in Mill. That would be a man with family, a man with health, a man with enough wealth, a man with friends, reputation, he would probably be a citizen - now that's what he means by happiness and that's the highest good. Achieved by activity of the soul in accordance with virtue. This was not available, there was no way that little children could achieve happiness because they didn't have enough experience. They couldn't acquire families, friends, reputation and citizenship. It was not available to people who were too humble to win honor. In other words, you could get so

far back on the social economic curve that even Aristotle said that there's just no way that that guy no matter how much activity of his soul is in accordance with virtue, he's never going to get there. He didn't say that out of spite. He said it trying to clarify. People who had misfortune so severe that their nobility could not shine through were not ever going to achieve the highest good, happiness. It may be a crippled man, it would have to be a man in pretty sad straits. In my case, as Joe pointed out, certainly that would not apply. A prisoner, certainly that would not be a misfortune so severe that nobility could not shine through because I saw it shine through in many cases. In illness, we know lots of times nobility shines through. So these are limits but they don't exclude as many people as you might think. Activity of the soul. The soul to him, after our talk of the immortality of the soul with Plato, it was more general with Aristotle. You could just translate it as life. Even vegetables had souls, but the highest form was in humans. The highest form of human soul reflection concerned intelligence or mind. I pause to note that he was one of the first to not equate mind and brain. Today even some of the hard materialists say that it's all chance and necessity and little bits that go together to make up the universe and men and there's no difference. But he was one of those who said, no, your brain is one thing, that's the kind of mechanical part, and your

mind is more comprehensive. The mind, as some later wag said, is the coat and the brain is the coathook. "In accordance with virtue," and now we're getting down to brass tacks because it is the virtues that he outlines in many of these chapters. We have two kinds. The intellectual virtues which have to do with rationality, specifically with rationality. With reason, perhaps is better. A virtue of wisdom would be an intellectual virtue. A statesman, moreover, could not get too much wisdom. The intellectual virtues were not only specifically rational, but specifically of the sort that a man could not get too much of it. There was just no way you could exceed some sort of decent maximum. But of course the moral virtues come down in terms of a mean. We had an interesting discussion in one of my seminars last week about one of the flaws in the arguments in Plato is that by arguing from opposites he sometimes used liberty in choosing what was the opposite of what. You people that were offended by that, you might take a little more kindly to this Aristotilean mean. Of course I'm talking about hitting the target, in the case of courage, somewhere between cowardice and rashness. We'll talk more about that later. That's one virtue and that's the way he defines it. The balance is achieved by practical wisdom but I warn you, and I'll say it again, he does not mean watered down rashness is courage or souped up cowardice is courage - they're a different thing - it's a more demanding requirement. The moral virtue is not

specifically rational. It has some components other than reason. If it were all reason it would be an intellectual virtue. The Greeks have a word for it. They call it irrational. This is a difficult point I have trouble making all along because somehow when you say irrational to an American they think you mean crazy. Arational or unrational, let's try it that way. It's not specifically rational as are, I believe, most military virtues are made up of reason and others. Now, what other? This is expressed in one way that we'll read about later in the week when we talk about the existentialists. The first known writing that was later called existentialism didn't even know what the word meant, but one of the things we'll read is Dostoyevsky's Notes From the Underground. One of the lines from that, this man is a very interesting character, this Underground Man, and he says, "Reason is an excellent thing, worthy of all respect. But reason is nothing but reason and satisfies only the rational side of man's nature, whereas will is a manifestation of the whole life." That is the whole of human life, including reason and all the impulses. So these moral virtues have arational, unrational, irrational components, as certainly the prototype we're talking about, courage, does. But not craziness. Professor Fuller of Harvard says, "For moderns, the middle way (and that's the mean) is the easy way, involving a minimum of commitment. For Aristotle the mean was the hard way, the way from which the slothful and unskilled were likely to fall."

We'll hit that again, but as Joe has said, the mean is not halfway. It's not a fulcrum, where you try to get in the middle where you're not too much this way or too much that way. He likes to think of it as a bull's eye of a target where rashness, timidity and so forth are off the center, but courage is a thing in itself, right in the middle.

The fourth point. Free will. He has a little thing that makes sense to me. In every place he's so sensible that it's hard to caricature. Free will and compulsion can coexist. He insists on being reasonable and if you rushed in and said so and so just ran his ship aground, and somebody said convene a courts-martial, he'd say, "Wait a minute, the guy was obviously under the compulsion of certain things and he had some free will. We'll have to measure. We're going to have to check the tide and the wind and the navigation charts and what he did and so forth. We'll look at that." Also we would say that if a man came in from a prison cell and said, "Well, I spilled my guts. I got tortured." He'd say, "We won't pardon you. We'll look into it." There are certain things free will and compulsion can coexist. You had to give up certain things, but not everything. There were ways a reasonable man could have arranged to give them false information to save stuff you knew they didn't know, to have misled them and so forth. So, he's an old schoolmaster all

the way. He doesn't jump to conclusions. On the basis of the old philosophical dilemma about intellect versus will. To say what I mean is to start with Socrates who said, "To know good is to do it." He said that will wasn't necessary to do the right thing. Any thinking man, once he understood what the problem was, he did the right thing. Aristotle came off it a little bit. We have a progression. He said that's true except for maybe the weak willed man, maybe the self-indulgent man. He needs willpower to do the right thing, even when he knows it. St. Paul says all people need willpower, because our nature is weakened by original sin. Immanuel Kant, as we will find out next week, says the moral side of man is based on will, not just reason.

A sixth point about Aristotle. Justice. He advocates a common sense reciprocity which you might remember for an argument. He would say that the rights and privileges are proportional, not equal, between children and adults, between seniors and juniors.

The last point. His scientific model was deductive. Sounds like an obscure technical point maybe but there's been for ages arguments about the correct scientific model. Does science proceed from general principles like mathematics to particular events? Aristotle said yes, even though it's kind of a chasing the tail game because he had all these fish and he was a marine biologist and he proclaimed probably that there

were certain principles that applied to fish in general. But really he acquired that by an inductive process of studying all these fish. I don't want to labor the point, but it was such a big point that Roger Bacon was all upset about it. He wrote a book Nova Morgranum, [?] The Inductive Logic, he was going to turn Aristotle inside out. I've had experience in test flying as some of you have, and if any of you have been at Patuxent, remember how we used to do our fuel consumption, and our speed curves to try to generalize them for gross weight and atmospheric conditions to get standard day figures, anavaroot data and dimensionist parameters, [?] W over Δ ? Somebody here may remember it. But anyway, by dimensional analysis this is sheer induction. You've got a physical problem and you collect a lot of data and there's a mathematical process by which you can come out with parameters that set up a minimum number of variables which you can test and standardize. That is the epitome of induction versus first principles of the mathematical sort. Science in that sense is exactly the opposite of mathematics. Sometimes people carelessly lump them together. After all, maybe like so many birds that come home to roost, I'm told that in nuclear physics that we're back to really a deductive base, a first principle base. That nuclear physicists spend more time scribbling on tablets, deductive, than working in the laboratory, inductive. So maybe Aristotle was right after all.

Organum

I think the way to handle that is to say the more sophisticated the science, the more deductive. He at least was able to contemplate these things 2500 years ago which I find rather amazing.

This business about the moral virtues and the mean, the irrational content. He said the first virtue of manliness was courage. The first virtue of the military man is courage. We expect the disposition of character of a military man to be primarily courageous, to be committed to duty, to have endurance, and they didn't go into whether he squared corners or this or that. I mean they kind of just left that up to the guy. He would be guided by principles. It was reasonable to have rules and he would handle them in a sensible way. Cowardice was a lack of courage. Rashness, foolhardiness, bravado were false courage on the other side. The Greeks had models of men, they were paradigms of this or that. They would make this model military man, Aristotle called him the Magnanimous Man. I always thought magnanimous was some kind of forgiving sort of guy. That's the third definition in Webster. The great soul man is the magnanimous man and one of the ways he differs from the Christian ideal is he has pride - a decent amount of pride. He thinks it would be poor form to be a braggard but equally poor form to try to hide the fact that man had a certain amount of nobility - noble spirit I mean. So we find this magnanimous man being very proud, very self-confident. If vaingloriousness is to the

right of the bull's-eye, self-deprecation is to the left. He is never surprised at anything. You get the picture of this guy. He evidences not warmth, no concern for his fellow man. He's a cold, noble, bright guy. That's the epitome of military virtue in Aristotle's mind. The image to me is more of a MacArthur than a Bradley. That's his view.

Going on with this courage, this idea, and we'll talk more about it in the seminar I hope, but think of the mile-posts that have been set by various writers and thinkers. Courage, says Aristotle, is how a man handles fear. He would say that if man is not afraid and he did something good, audacious, that's good, but it's not courage. He would have had to have fear to have it called courage. On the other hand, Conrad whose book The Typhoon we read this time, in another book called Lord Jim makes the point that he may have made in this one but I can't put my finger on it, that the mother of fear, and fear is the debilitating thing to some extent although not always, is imagination. I had that pointed out to me one time. I was at Stanford as a graduate student and old Doc Thomas Bailey, who I saw in December. He's in his 80's and he's ailing but he's still bright. He wrote a lot of good books and he's the dean of American diplomatic historians. His method of history writing is to go to the library and read the papers of the time. If he's going to write about the War of 1812 he finds the New York and Philadelphia papers and tries to write it with the view of what the man

is doing on the street. So I was curious because when I was his graduate student, John Glenn was orbiting the earth. So I said, "Dr. Bailey, how does this compare to Lindberg?" "No comparison," he said. "Lindberg's impact was so much greater because he had done it all himself." Now everybody was really wild about John and I was one of them and John's one of my best friends. He said people in this country really came unglued because here was a poor farm boy from Minnesota who had got his own idea, helped design his own airplane and gotten himself over there. I said, "Well, John's a good friend of mine" and he started asking questions. He said, "Is he very manful?" I said it's hard to say, I was in class with him. "Well, that's where they get the cowards," he said. That's what the writers say, I read that in Time magazine once. I don't know where John fits into this, but they said what that astronaut test was, which was primarily a psychological test, they wanted to make sure that a guy was calm and cool under pressure and didn't sit there and look at all those dials and wait for the red lights to come on. He didn't worry about it until they came on. Maybe there's something to it. But on the other hand, this fellow that was here to talk to us, Colonel Wegener, we were talking about imagination and courage. He works with those groups of his and he has to be very astute about what kind of personalities he takes to be on that hit squad. He said we can't have those unimaginative clods on the border patrol squad. He said we've got to have

imagination, we know that. Incidentally, the thing he said was the hardest test was when they blew those doors off was to get people to jump through the explosion. That was kind of interesting.

Well, if imagination is the mother of fear and courage depends on fear, how do you rate Captain McWhirr? Certainly I wouldn't call him imaginative. I've had skippers just like him. Yet, the guy does it some way, some how. You know, right in the midst of that storm he didn't seem to get the message that they were in trouble, and yet he seemed to come up with the right answers. Kind of unconsciously. They were down there trying to get the Chinese straightened out and find their money and everything. Somebody told me, and I don't think this is greatness I think it's just an interesting personality trait, that old Admiral Black Jack Reese during World War II, who was a strict disciplinarian anyway, they would be bombing carriers and fires and all hell breaking loose, and he'd be up there saying, "Get that man's name, he's got no hat on down there." Kind of the same psychosis. Maybe that's the way he kept himself calm.

Endurance. Certainly McWhirr had that. None of the Greeks, and I'll refer you to my deathless prose in the Naval War College Review this time, they were not stupid. They knew that sometimes audacious acts had to be done and they properly praised them. But when they thought of a courageous soldier

they thought of a guy who hung in there, lots of endurance, under pressure and under pain and more than a shot in the dark.

Kind of an odd piece here that I've got which tells about a man I know you've heard of. We're talking about courage and this little thing is entitled "Courage". It's written by one James Corbett. Corbett was the prize fighter, born in 1866. Bachelor of arts Sacred Heart College in San Francisco. He was a bank clerk and in his spare time he boxed at the Olympic Club in San Francisco back at the turn of the century. This was bare fisted boxing. He was there when they started putting on padded gloves and incorporated the Marquis of Queensbury rules. There's a whole lot of bio here but to give you an idea of what kind of endurance he had, he was known as the dancing master. When I was a kid there was a film that talked about Gentleman Jim Corbett. He beat John L. Sullivan, knock out in round 21, in 1892. They'd have to go out sometimes and hide and have these boxing matches, almost like cock fights now. There's a picture of them down in the Reading Room in round 21. There didn't seem to be any limit to them. He beat Peter Jackson, a Jamaican who outweighed him by 20 pounds, in the 61st round. Four hours they'd been fighting. He fought 33 bouts, won 26. James J. Corbett, maybe he wrote it, they give him credit. He was an educated man.

"Fight one more round.

When your feet are so tired that you have to

shuffle back to the center of the ring
fight one more round.

When your arms are so tired you can hardly lift
your hands to come on guard
fight one more round.

When your nose is bleeding and your eyes are
black and you are so tired that you wish your
opponent would crack you one on the jaw and put you asleep
fight one more round.

Remembering that the man who always fights one
more round is never whipped."

Presumably Aristotle would have approved of that.

LECTURE 5

IMMANUEL KANT

As I've told you since this course began, we like to draw on opposites. We're not looking for middle of the roaders as we study these men. We're looking for people who had positions out on the point. The idea being that it is more sensible to identify the mainstream of philosophical thought by knowing where the boundaries are, than where the centerline of the road is. Certainly today with Immanuel Kant we go all the way toward ethics of motive and as you've been told time and again, this is followed by the other wing of the discipline, John Stuart Mill who goes all the way toward ethics of consequences. Now that doesn't do you much good just to remember those two things. It sounds like a vacuous statement - sure we've got a guy who thinks one way and another who thinks another. But today's lecture I hope will point out, if nothing else, that Kant was a very smart man. I hope a week from today I can make equally forceful the point that Mill was also a very smart man and here you have two very smart men being widely separated. To understand that is education. Going right down to the bottom line with Kant's ideas of the categorical imperative in which when a moral act is to be considered, a man should act in a way that he would have all other men act, comes down to his position on life. This is the most bizarre way in which one can spot-

light his position, and even he was willing to discuss how he would handle lying. The way he would handle it would be to insist that it was beneath the dignity of a human being to stoop to such depths. Even to the extent, as he would admit, that were he in the doorway and watched a man come in with a bleeding head and go in the second door on the right down the hall and followed by a man with a knife who asked him, "Where did he go?", he would tell him second door on the right down the hall.

With that confidence-building introduction I would like to say that I want to talk today about lying, about deception, about intentionally misleading your listeners. What Professor Raiffa of Harvard Business School teaches under the title of "Strategic Misrepresentation". (Wall Street Journal, 15 January 1979). Strategic misrepresentation or lying can take forms all the way from well intentioned innocent white lies all the way to foul treachery. One form of innocent well-intentioned white lies was that practiced in prison by the professional optimist. People who thought it was a matter of Christian goodwill to repeatedly predict the end of the war and release what was seemingly reasonable dates in the months ahead. I want to say that for many people this was accepted in the spirit in which it was given, as a method of cheerful conversation - of course the conversation being tapped or signaled. But there were those who were disturbed by the creams and their bursting

like bubbles as the dates passed. In one case that I'm very familiar with, one man started to look very peculiar and sort of lost his appetite and then his ability to eat and finally died. I think optimism was one of the causes. In general, and I've read it in other books, if you must put up with people who stretch the truth, pessimists are better bedfellows than optimists. At least as far as mental health goes.

Our second form of deception that was practiced in prison and every place else where there is a military service, is the idea of a leader taking charge supposedly to salvage a bad situation and he issues an order which on examination really doesn't mean much of anything or in some cases cannot be followed. Such an order that doesn't mean anything really to the recipient of the order, as in the prison camp to put out a blanket CYA coverall, "Obey the Code of Conduct". This needs further explanation and to let it go at that strikes those who hear it as your insurance against a bad reputation after return. It leaves the poor guys who are working for you in a quandary or worse. Much like I once attempted to give such an order by telling a camp to follow the general policy of oblique envelopment. This at a time when we were trying to curtail the adventurous doves who were about to cut loose on a permissive prison thing. I modeled this oblique envelopment after such nice management buzzwords as "protective

reaction" that I had heard on the Voice of Vietnam. This was met in the first instance after being transmitted to the next cell block with the immediate reply, "Dear CAG, are you shitting me? Orson can't even spell it." So much for the way CYA orders are answered when inhibitions are off as in a prison camp or other place under pressure.

With regard to deception vis-a-vis the enemy, it would be my last piece of advice to ever level with a gook. ^{the enemy} So how do we handle the subject of the ethics of lying to an enemy. Several well known people have supported the idea of lying. Martin Luther for one in the sense of its being a part of the order of necessity, as were evil men, as were the mechanics of the state, as opposed to the order of Grace which pertained to us as children of God. To Martin Luther, in this order of necessity, practicality ruled. He said, for instance, "What harm would it do if a man told a good strong lie for the sake of the good and for the Christian church, a lie out of necessity, a useful lie, a helpful lie? Such lies would not be against God, He would accept them." Thus spake Martin Luther around 1520. A rather odd piece of advice. Probably equally odd, but a little more practical was that of the Protestant Dutch jurist, ^{Grotius} Groges, around 1600. His position was that you should not be perturbed about lying to people who did not deserve the truth. He would say that to thieves, falsehood was not lying. All of this from a book by the wife of the president of Harvard University, Lying: Moral Choice in Public and Private Life by Sissella Bok.

Sissella says in law, journalism, government and social sciences, deception is taken for granted. Usually under the guise of doing what is necessary for the public good, I might add. I notice now that in the world of journalism, people are blaming Cambodia's rack and ruin on Nixon. Undoubtedly for "the public good". Even Sissella who has what I would call the typical Cambridge, Massachusetts code of ethics in which Nixon should be hated, Vietnam abhorred, liberalism hailed, and I might add she uses some of her from this framework of ethic in such a manner as to make it difficult for me to sort out her lies from her truthfulness. She often cites the near-thing as an example. For instance, is it not alright for people to exaggerate evidence given to congressmen when anti-poverty laws, the passage thereof, are at stake. To make a long story short, Sissella does come up on the side of truth as the first cut.

There are many cases for truth. Sam Johnson says in the interest of sensible discourse, truth is necessary even in hell. In the Book of Revelations we have a reference in Chapter 22, Verses 14 and 15. "Blessed are they that do His commandments that they may have right to the tree of life and may enter through the gates into the city. For without are dogs and sorcerers and whoremongers and murderers and adulterers and those who maketh the lie." That is to say those who lie are not admitted to the city of heaven and St.

Augustine was a supporter of that view. He thought that lies had an adverse affect on the quality of life and society. The polar position of course, as we say, was Immanuel Kant, when he says that it destroys a man's self-esteem, it throws away his dignity as a man.

Now Sissella starts out by giving a negative score to lies. Quotes Aristotle as a good reference, as always. To him a lie is, as a starting point, "mean and culpable". Her examples are lying to old people, medical situations, white lies, fake pills, inflated recommendations (in fitness reports), lawyers who want a "truer picture", and honor codes who would start out simple and get so tangled with legalistic provisos that we all wish we were back to the Greeks working with a disposition of character instead of this interminable mess of rules of conduct. Rules of conduct are the way of modern philosophy - since Descartes in about 1600.

Who was Kant? He was a man who lived in the same age as George Washington. George was born in 1732 and died in 1799. Immanuel Kant was born 8 years before Washington was born and died 5 years after. He was born in Königsberg, East Prussia of poor parents. His father was a saddler who had emigrated from Scotland. His parents were religious. They were a Lutheran sect who had committed themselves more to faith than the mother church. They wanted more heart in the religion and they were somewhat like typical plains people, protestant, somewhat fundamentalists. Their sect

was called pietist. Immanuel never married. He was small, frail, very smart. Went to the university and he was so good at playing cards that he couldn't find an opponent; he never forgot a card. Got his PhD at the University of Konigsberg and for his whole life never got more than 40 miles from his birthplace. For 60 years he taught at the University of Konigsberg after graduation and people in that little town could set their clocks by the lamp in his room. If it came on then people knew it was 4:45 a.m. and if it went out everybody knew it was 10 p.m. If his door opened on a weekday morning everybody knew it was 7 a.m. and he was off to lecture at the university on metaphysics (reality), epistemology (knowledge), ontology (being), ethics, anthropology, math, and physics. He was attuned to the philosophical side of life as well as the physical side. A total man. A sort that even Admiral Rickover might admire.

The rage of the time was Newton's laws of motion. As he taught them in physics he was disturbed. He was disturbed because he knew there were many philosophers at large who would take exception to Newton's idea that this was a true law invariant in a clockwork universe. Kant was up to speed on the state of play of ontology. To explain that I should say that there was a tug of war in those days between the philosophic viewpoint of rationalism and the philosophic viewpoint of empiricism. The rationalists were the outgrowth

of Plato's cave and they had ruled the philosophic scene for a thousand years. But empiricists who thought that the senses rather than the contemplation of the mind was more the source of truth. The interpretation of the senses, that is. We'll take an aside and say that empiricism is a theory about the relationship of knowledge and experience. It holds that ideas are derived directly or indirectly from sense data. This is not to be confused with a method called the empirical method. Science is empirical when we insist on checking theories with observable data. That is to say, the empirical viewpoint is that theory should conform to facts, not that facts should conform to theory. If you buy empiricism as a theory, on theoretical grounds your method is not empirical. That is to say, the theory you may support empiricism on rational grounds, thereby bypassing the empirical method. These kinds of philosophic distinctions sound very stratifying and mysterious, but in them, Kant found truth. First of all, he was aware of the fact that the theory of empiricism may not be altogether correct. Since the renaissance, the interest of man had shifted to nature, the mind and to the senses. Rene Descartes, a total rationalist, had bifurcated mind and body. David Hume, a total empiricist, had questioned it. Hume was not altogether wrong. The old man from Missouri who did not give an inch when challenged on his idea that billiard balls hit in identically the same way might not always follow the same tracks. And Kant said, "What kind of statement is this $F=MA$ statement?" Hume said

it was really a prediction. A prediction based on data and that there was no justification to believe that it was invariant. Kant analyzed it as an a priori statement, before experience, as a synthetic statement, a statement of fact not an analytical statement, usually more like a definition. Bear in mind Hume wasn't nuts, he would have followed the $F=MA$ idea but he would say just don't give it to me as data. It's a statement like, "You can't trust an Irishman." Practical, but that's different than fact. Kant said, "I solemnly suspend all metaphysicians from their task until they answer the following question: How are a priori synthetic judgements possible?" He answered his own question and the answer was, a priori synthetic judgements are possible up to a point. Kant in other words was a referee in the rationalist/empirical battle. He came out with a modified empiricist position. Kant said in effect, Hume thinks my work's like a computer, that the outputs are limited to the inputs. That is to say a mind would be a "bit machine" like we now have in "artificial intelligence". Kant said mind is not a bit processor, it supplies creative ideas and creative interpretation to the data that comes in. Mind works with packages of bits, patterns, rules, unities, wholes. The output of the mind is greater than the input of bits. He would say it's OK to say a computer is a mechanical mind but not that mind is a sophisticated computer. (Much of this is confirmed in Sagan's description

of the mind in his book, Dragons of Eden.) In other words, Kant took Hume's empiricism, added "creative judgement" and came out with a modified rationalist position. Hume had a firm idea of how the mind worked and he had it conceptualized first into the intuitive section into which the mental concepts of space and time took the sense data and located it. Then it passed on into the understanding section of the mind where he had 12 universal concept forms: causality, unity, etc. As the mind, which acted like the lens of a camera, screened this sense data through these two sections (intuition and understanding sections) you came out with what we know as the world of common sense and science. This world was an apparent world and Hume called it the phenomenal world. He said we would never know the world in itself, the real world out there. That if there was order in the universe it was in our mind and it was up here that it all happened and this was called a copernicum revolution of the mind. He said that since we cannot know the world in itself, we make logical constructs. Much as we would diagram a molecule or maybe even say $F=MA$. It handles the problem in a certain regime of observation. He said you can have a relative truth over a range of applicability. Newton and Hume would disagree for opposite reasons. It came about that when the particles got small (quantum mechanics) and fast (relativity) Kant had predicted the problem. Heisenberg who fought this battle as a quantum mechanic has written a book called Physics and

Philosophy in which Hume dots almost every page. Heisenberg found himself with mathematical expressions without physical meaning as he worked with these tiny particles and their behavior and realized that Hume had it figured out all along. He was a nuclear physicist before his time. But $F=MA$ did not always apply and that what we call molecules on paper are just logical constructs and not necessarily what really happens in nature at all.

Kant had another section of the mind called pure reason. This was out of the evidential loop. Whereas the world of common sense and science that came out of the meat grinder of intuition and understanding dealt with what a man knows, the pure reason side of his mind dealt with what shall I do, the acting side, the ethical side. He said since there is no evidence here we must like mathematics, start with unprovable axioms. He said moral life makes no sense without God, freedom and immortality and thus they must be posited, much as you would posit the diagram of a molecule. The world of pure reason, he said, is what determines our ethics and categorical imperative. That with good will and right reason a man is noble. It is a legislator of ethics with a categorical imperative acting in such a way as he would have all others act. Man is a law unto himself, in no need of compulsion of external law. Moreover, ethics is an autonomous science. It's not sociology, you don't do certain things to get along better with people. Or psychology, to make yourself feel

better inside. Or for practicality or even for religion. This is all very close to conscience, but he never called it that, because he wanted to avoid the criticism that he was making subjective judgements that were "just a matter of opinion."

It all comes down to "we ought" says Hume. And we must do what we ought to do categorically, not hypothetically. Virtue has nothing to do with happiness says Kant. Virtue can be painful. Falling out of this is some other important concepts. It was Kant who said, "Persons are because of their nobility and their legislative powers, ends, inviolable ends, never means. Ethics is autonomous." And thus he challenged the idea prevalent since the stoics of the indwelling reason in the universe. The reason he says is up in our heads. But you can't account for man, if he is limited to the phenomenal apparent world says Kant. Therefore, you must have the realm of pure reason, so that with good will and right reason man will do the ethical thing.

We're back to deception and Sissella Bok. She says, "But can we agree with Kant? His position has seemed too sweeping to nearly all his readers and even obsessive to some. (Of course she's talking about his ethical position.) Kant holds that a conflict of duty and obligation is inconceivable." But then she also says, "That as soon as the more complex questions of truthfulness and deception are raised, the

utilitarian view turns out unsatisfactory as well." That's the one we'll talk about next week - the practical side where lies are not all that important. At least not to utilitarian's founder, Jerry Benton. He said, "Falsehood, taken by itself, considered as not being accompanied by any other material circumstances nor therefor productive of any material affects, can never upon the principle of utility constitute any offense at all. Combined with other circumstances there is scarce any sort of pernicious effect which it may not be instrumental in producing." Sissella can't live with this either. "The simple seeming utilitarian calculation," she says, "is that it often appears to imply that lies apart from their resultant harm and benefit are in themselves neutral."

Brilliant Kant may have painted himself into a corner. But his position is a necessary thing for an educated man to understand the ethics of right and wrong. In many ways his "ought" is the epitome of military duty. You've got to do it because you ought.

LECTURE 6

MILL

We're past the midpoint I guess, this is the sixth week. Today I won't talk very long, it's midterm, which I think is going to be to your liking.

It has been said that all Western philosophy is but footnotes to Plato. Another truism that Joe's given me is that the history of Anglo-American ethics has been the story of the correction of John Stuart Mill's mistakes. I don't mean to be cynical about him because he is, in fact, so practical and so commonplace to us in what he says that it's hardly news. That's probably because he is sort of the symbol of 19th century English liberalism from which this country has drawn a great deal. He starts out at the other end of the spectrum when he starts to make an ethical analysis rather than with the act itself. The aim, what is the end result? The result, as you know, is what his focus is all along and the aim is to achieve the highest good. That's what should be in the back of people's heads as they go about their moral decisions. Same conclusion to which Aristotle came. He frequently hangs in there with Aristotle. The good that is identified is Aristotle's happiness and for the same reason, that that is the good to which all other goods contribute. It's one good which you want for no purpose other than for itself. There are some differences. He defines pleasure as

synonymous with happiness. Aristotle happened to have that sorted out as another good. Both Aristotle's and Mill's goods are enduring satisfactions, or high-purpose pleasure, or happiness. Not just titillation. You remember with Aristotle we talked about a good family, good health, good job, citizenship and Mill is in that same frame of mind. He says in the defining sentence, "Actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness and wrong as they tend to produce the reverse, pain." There's another word, that I've forgotten, that he uses there as well as pain.

If you want to nitpick it, there's plenty of room to nitpick. Pain is introduced as the opposite of pleasure. Pleasure he defines as the same as happiness. There are articles written, I've read some, that say that is one of the problems with his viewpoint. This came up in one of my seminars in a similar way about Plato, that sometimes when the philosopher starts out with a pair of opposites they're, in some people's eyes, not really opposites. Pleasure and pain have been challenged as opposites. For one thing, pleasure is a more general feeling. You can't put times on it as well as you can pain. You can say, I had a toothache when I woke up this morning and I took aspirin and the pain ended at midmorning. Pleasure doesn't lend itself to that kind of analysis. Also the locality of pleasure. I'm just introducing some of the many approaches people use to criticize what he

has attempted to do, which is really to codify common sense. It's awfully difficult to not run into roadblocks and he does. If people say, "What about health? Why not health?" He would answer, "It's a part of happiness." If you say that pleasure's a transient as a criticism, Mill would say not high-pleasure. The pleasure I'm talking about is not a transitory feeling, it's a more enduring satisfaction. If you accuse him of being selfish in that when I'm really looking for happiness that sounds like a selfish viewpoint, then he would say, "Oh, I don't mean just you, I mean the whole community. When you do an act you want to maximize happiness throughout, I suppose if you pressed him he would say, the world. But also yourself." So he hedges each bet as he must.

In this calculus of how you're going to try to arrange it so that you behave in a way that will contribute to the happiness of the biggest, the most gross happiness in the world, the most people, and so forth, then you raise the issue, "That calculus might well work out to 90% happy, fulfilled people and 10% slaves. Is that right?" "Oh no," he would probably say, and he spliced on a chapter five. "That's justice, that would be injustice. Don't forget justice is another factor." So he kind of chases his tail and very laboriously seems defensive about what he has to say because he is really trying to put it down once and for all. Fairness was the subject that was really his chapter five, trying to

account for the beleaguered minority. That has been a continuing problem of some moralists. Rawls. We have an article by him. As late as '57 he wrote an article "Justice As Fairness". The punch line of that is, there is a relationship between justice and utility and there should be an unwritten social contract in which both equality and liberty are advocated. He has another expression you might have come across, the "^pvail of ignorance", that Rawls uses, which is a way that he would make sure that he who designs this society somehow was forced to not know what part he was going to play as he designed it.

There is a whole literature of corrections to Mill, if you want to call it, but somehow to handle this problem of the difficulty of coexistence, of equality and freedom. Equality and liberty, equality and freedom. I'm reviewing a book for the Naval Institute Proceedings written by a political scientist. I think that every time you get one of these utopians, they want their cake and eat it too. They usually deal in abstractions and in so doing really kind of have trouble with that equality and liberty idea. I'm a fan of the Durants. I've probably mentioned this before, but this is a book that I think we're going to probably suggest some readings in next year. It's in the library I'm sure, Lessons of History. They have written, as I'm sure you know, about 12 volumes of history, spent their whole lives doing it. He

is about 90, she is a little younger. He married her when she was a teenager and he was a college professor. She's become a historian and she is probably about 70 now, sweet old lady. Together they've written most of these volumes and this was kind of the cream off the top of a lifetime of work. They wrote this book I like to quote. It's very simply written and the chapter titles are: "History and the Earth", "Biology and History", "Race and History", "Character and History", "Morals and History", "Religion and History", "Economics and History", "Socialism and History", "Government and History", "History and War", "Growth and Decay", "Is Progress Real?". These are the distillations of a lifetime of study.

The one that I'm going to refer to here is "Biology and History". They're kind of hardnosed old people. They don't look it but they don't mince words. "The first biological lesson of history is that life is competition. Competition is not only the life of trade, it is the trade of life." "War is a nation's way of eating." As I say, they've gone over nearly 4,000 years pretty carefully. "We are all born unfree and unequal, subject to our physical and psychological heredity and to the customs and traditions of our group. Diversely endowed in health and strength and mental capacity and qualities of character." Skipping some more: "If we knew our fellow men thoroughly we could select 30% of them whose

combined ability would equal that of all the rest. Life and history do precisely that with a sublime injustice reminiscent to Calvin's God. Nature smiles at the union of freedom and equality in our utopias. For freedom and equality are sworn and everlasting enemies and when one prevails the other dies. Leave men free and their natural inequalities will multiply geometrically as in England and America in the 19th century under laissez-faire. To check the growth of inequality liberty must be sacrificed as in Russia after 1917. Even when repressed inequality grows. Only the man who is below average in economic abilities desires equality. Those who are conscious of their abilities desire freedom." And so on and so forth. This is not very happy a thought maybe.

To Mill, to Rawls and everybody in between, that's a hard nut to swallow. So we have these lengthy explanations in which somehow it all comes out even. Another fault of Mill if you consider it a fault. I don't mean to ridicule him. Because he did, as you will see and as you have probably read, particularly in the book On Liberty, in the political realm, in the personal realm, he really set some watermarks that are really those ideas that we sponsor today. While we were freeing slaves, shortly after in 1867 he was in parliament supporting the Union. That was kind of a minority view in England at the time. They had the big cotton trade. He was

a supporter of the Northern cause and he was at that time trying to get a bill through parliament for women's suffrage. That was some time ago. It was tabled, but he was a man of ideas and was surrounded by men of ideas. Some were brilliant; some were kind of nutty.

I will talk a little bit now about the nutty Englishmen with whom he is associated, and in some ways himself. He even liked nuttiness to the extent that he advocated, "People should be eccentric." He thought that that was a better world. Everybody acted differently. When you try to hammer that into the categorical imperative you kind of come to a stultifying situation.

He was born in 1806. His father, James, was a university graduate, University of Edinburgh, a Scot. His father was Chief Examiner of India House, that is the president of the East India Company. I've heard it being compared in our day to being president of Standard Oil of New Jersey, in terms of the social position that the job held, or president of IT&T. When the baby John Stuart was two, his father was developing a very close friendship with a 60 year old Oxford scholar and writer, Jeremy Bentham. Bentham was kind of a child prodigy and had a very interesting, a very prolific life of writing. He wrote on law; he was an inventor; and this is where we start getting a little bit different, he designed prisons. He would name things and he had a panopticon prison, which was designed for minimum escape risks. Air, sunshine, it

looked like the spoke of a wheel. Tried to sell it. He wrote on ethics and he, of course, stressed utility: the greatness happiness for the greatest number. That's all borrowed from him. That's all borrowed from him, there's some mutations as they go through John Stuart. Old Bentham had everything down to a fine science. He had a way of measuring happiness, ^{FELICIFIC} philosphic calculus as he called it. He had variables. Happiness is a function of variables; the intensity of happiness, the immediacy of happiness, he had all of these different categories he put it in and worked over. He had more good than crazy ideas. He was the first man known in our Western society, in recent years at least, to give his body to medical research before he died. He gave it to the medical school of the University of London with the provisions (he got to thinking about it - this was 20 years after John Stuart was a baby) he said that the human body had certain decorative capabilities, that he would like to have his body be a decoration in the library of the London University. They could have his body and his organs but as soon as the organs were removed he wanted the body cleaned out and the skeleton stuffed, a wax head put on it that resembled him, his real head embalmed and laid at his feet, he called this use of the body, autoicons. He made suggestions that this might be a fitting way for people to honor their ancestors. When people died they would have their bodies made into autoicons

and then they could be displayed in and around the house. You know, you could have your grandfather and his father sitting around. Anyway, his body sits there still, I've got a picture of it here. This is a modern shot of the 150 year old carcass of Jeremy Bentham in the library. Apparently they can move it around because the head is not there. Another picture we're getting he is holding his cane up with his right hand, so apparently it is moveable and you can get different poses. And this one has the head between the feet. I've talked to an old professor out at Trinity Church who's seen this skeleton.

Of course he had another bunch of ideas about education. He wanted to take this boy, John Stuart, his friend's son, and make a real scholar out of him. And that's the man we're talking about. So he had learned some Aesop's Fables as a little tiny kid, learned them in Latin. He started working with both men. Both were well educated and they made their project this boy. They had him reading Latin by three, by seven he had mastered Greek, he had read all the Platonic dialogues in Greek and understood all but one he claimed. By 14 he had no friends, he was kind of an odd kid as you might imagine. He was an economist by 14, he was like a college professor. He studied law, left that as a teenager a little later and was appointed as a member of the board of directors of the East India Company; he was a teenage executive. He did all of these things easily and well. Had a nervous

breakdown as you might imagine when he was about 20. But don't be misled because he went right on. He succeeded his father as Chief Examiner, president of the company. He could cope with a nervous breakdown and still handle the company business. He got into philosophy and later some other things which we will talk about too. He could hold a job on the E Ring and make admiral and be in the process of a nervous breakdown. His IQ was supposedly astronomical, they've never been able to calculate it. A bright, very serious, kind of an odd person. His love life was odd. He fell in love at the age of 24 with a married woman who had two sons and later had another daughter - her name was Harriet Taylor, kind of a famous person in her own right. She was really the inspiration of the women's lib thing. Mr. Taylor is described as kindly, complacent and tolerant. He didn't mind it when John Stuart moved in with them, where he lived most of the time he was going up in the company. They would take trips to Europe and they were in part of the international set, that is, John Stuart Mill and Harriet Taylor with the concurrence of Mr. Taylor. And she with her kids. In London they became friends of the poet Carlyle. The idea was that it was a platonic relationship. Carlyle called Harriet Taylor, "Platonica" in honor of that method of operating. There's some funny stuff that Joe dug up about Taylor being kind of eccentric herself. Mrs. Carlyle talked about Mrs. Taylor

insisting that the Carlyles come over to her house because the rats were so nice there, and so forth. You really think you're off your rocker after you read about these people for awhile. They worked together on this book On Liberty, that is John Stuart and Harriet. Ultimately Mr. Taylor died and they were married later. He about that time became the president of the East India Company and held it until the company went out of business which was soon thereafter. Then they went to France. He had tuberculosis; he gave it to her, so it's said. She died; he could handle it, she couldn't. She was buried in France and he was despondent for the rest of his life although he came back, did some more writing. He wrote Utilitarianism after that time. He was a member of parliament in his later years, was ultimately the godfather of Bertrand Russell (a dubious honor). It's not all that far back because Russell went to school to Whitehead and so did Joe Brennan so we're almost home with this guy.

That's the background on John Stuart Mill. Kind of, I think, generally known as the father of 19th century British liberal tradition. His ethics of On Liberty we'll look at in just a little bit. Philosophically he was an English empiricist of the Hobbs-Hume school, the kind of hard practical guys, non-metaphysical people. People that possibly agree with the fellow who says that metaphysics is the name that gives bad reasons for what we instinctively know to be true. Some references will talk about him being a rationalist. There are two meanings to that word. The rationalist in the "philosophic

sense" is the opposite of the empiricist. He thinks you can think up the ideas and not have to do it from sensory observation. But there are other meanings of rationalist, including one which sometimes applies to Mill, which means kind of sensible. A man who thinks that reason is a better test of the truth than intuition and a great sponsor of education. So much for that. He is an empiricist of the typical English school.

The book On Liberty which is recommended and I think a little more exciting than Utilitarianism in many ways, starts out by complaining about the tyranny of the majority and evil of society. That the group is usually wrong, and anyway it's an infringement on personal rights. That's the whole thing: freedom. "The sole purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised by a society, by a government, over any member of a civilized community, is to prevent harm to others." Under his rules these laws that require you to wear a hard hat when riding a motorcycle would be completely out of the question. My head, none of your business. Suicide; if you were going to jump off the other side of the building into the water, he would think it was a great invasion of privacy to send the fire department up to get you off. That's your life, none of their damn business. Now I suppose if you were going to plunge into the street, then you've got the harm to others aspect. But I've thought about that, and I think you have too.

I remember in my squadron I always said, my flight gear is nobody's damn business but mine. And that's the way it was for all the pilots. If they wanted to wear oxfords, then they could wear oxfords; they're grown men. It wasn't abused to that extent, but that's an example of that type of thinking. If it was a matter that involved somebody else, then you've got another thing. I remember there was a little guy in an A-3 outfit and we were flying/up ^{in Laos} in the Plains of Jars in '64 on some photo missions, I wish I could remember this guy's name. He was very sure of himself; he was a mustang and an older man, but pilot of an A-3, a LCDR. He always wore tennis shoes and the admiral would call him up and say, "Why don't you wear the damn flight gear?" He said, "No sir, I know what I'm doing. I've lived in the swamps of Florida and I'll be walking out of there in these tennis shoes." Never had to test them out thank goodness. ^{TP} He excludes kids, people who have not reached their majority. They're subject to restrictions for discipline and training. Not speaking about savages, backward societies he calls them. You can marshal them into line, they don't know any better. Despotism is a legitimate means, he says, of dealing with barbarians. The ultimate appeal for all ethical questions was utility. He does not subscribe to the idea of there being an abstraction, a right thing, the Kantian thing, the ought. No objective morality in that sense. Cut and dry. Practical. Will it work, that's the test. He keeps writing about all these

subjects. Talking. Gets into these dilemmas and winds up with very intricate, improvised explanations for what really is just plain old British or Yankee practicality. But when you try to codify it there's a great tendency to start out with a nice concise chapter 2 and then gush all the rest of the book with just backing and filling. Which is kind of the way I think Utilitarianism comes out.

On the positive side he believes, stresses, that man is corrigible, correctable, man is perfectable. He likens a man not to a machine, but to a tree. He wants him to have the freedom to grow. The idea of the individual worth, the individual choice, honoring the sanctity of the individual. Kant had that same idea too, for different reasons. The categorical imperative would say that all together we don't need a government to tell us what to do, we can apply the categorical imperative. Although they came out on opposite sides of the argument they were both highly respectful of human capacity. In the case of Mill, he was for everything you would imagine that had freedom attached to it. Freedom of religion, free trade (no tariffs), freedom of the press. He wrote a chapter in On Liberty that I could have read at the military media conference. He said a lot of these things that are now repeated. To silence somebody, the press infers an infallibility that he didn't believe was justified. "Who's to know?" He raised that issue. When you say national security's at stake, he

would say, "Maybe. First of all it's the obligation of the government to show it, to prove it. The burden of proof is on the government, not on the individual. If he writes a slanderous article, it's going to stand unless they can show reason why it shouldn't be printed." And even when they do come out with statements like national security, he would say, "That's a statement of a government which probably represents a majority and the majority of eminent men have always shown to have been wrong on hindsight." He was very skeptical of the ability of the majority to come up with anything. It really is conclusively bad. Some of the smartest men in the world have been wrong. As far as a group, he talks about Christ being crucified for blasphemy, which is the dumbest charge they could have come up with. He is the last man that should have had that happen to him. I think Mill was an agnostic, but very respectful of christianity and other religions. He talked about the individual, Marcus Aurelius, the Greek stoic whose concepts and ethical codes and ideas were almost exactly those of Christ, and yet, for some reason, this very bright man chose to be an enemy of Christ. So these are all arguments for freedom of the press, freedom in general.

He is not as sophisticated, at least in the scientific sense, as Kant was. Because he says, without public scrutiny we would not know the truth even of the Newton philosophy, as we do now. Of course, Kant had been awakened from his dogmatic slumber by the empiricism of Hume and challenged that. In other words, I think of Kant as a little bit deeper,

certainly in that sense, the philosophic sense. He was a professor whereas this fellow was in and out of business and parliament and the Taylors' house and everything else. How about the sanctions. There are two. If you don't like government how are you going to get a man to apply this utilitarianism? You have external sanctions, the opinion of fellow men, and the internal sanctions is conscience. And he calls it conscience. He defines it as the disinterested connection with the idea of duty. Again sounds almost like Kant. Free discussion. I think it's an interesting idea he has that, "Ideas of people should be pressed out to their full extremity." That it is a cop out to say you can't. If you've got an argument that can't be demonstrated to be valid at the most extreme example you could draw, then it's not valid. He wouldn't say that utilitarianism is good in its ultimacy. Kant says the same thing. Even though they look stupid out there, with Kant and his idea about lying.- If it doesn't wash all the way out at the end of the extremity he is suspicious of it. I don't think that that idea is generally acknowledged. Most of us say, "Well, don't take it to ridiculous extremes." He would say, "The hell you say. If it doesn't test to extremes, it's no good."

Well, that's one of the reasons we're in this course, as I've said. To get used to taking these positions and running them all the way out and see what they look like.

You don't have to say that's the only way you'll buy it, but to take these views that are all over the what you might call the epistemological map, the map of knowledge, to see where is this crazy guy when his ideas are stretched all the way across the board. I would say another reason we're in this is to put a name to what have been innate notions we've held. As we read these people you really can't afford to try to emulate any of these people. Because that never works out. But they are people who if you can remember two or three ideas that each one of them had and whether it is ridiculous at its extreme or not, and what the name of the idea is. What is empiricism? What is this guy that show me, that doesn't believe anything without evidence? We've got a name for it and its empiricist. What is the man that poetic, mathematical dreamer that thinks he can sit there and contemplate his navel and really come up with an answer? Called a rationalist. And as I've said to give us an opportunity to gain the confidence in the vocabulary to defend our prejudices.

LECTURE 7

I know that you'll all be happy to know that Sybil and I just got back from a nice weekend in the Napa Valley in California, where the buds are out. But this looks pretty hopeful today here in the Narragansett Bay. It was a trip in which I talked to the PG School, had a good turnout there, and to this University of San Francisco group. Had my first confrontation with a heckler I guess you could call her, although the crowd was very anti-heckle, they booed. It wasn't too abusive, but she was there to cause trouble and it was kind of amusing. It's so hard for a '60's rebel to make sense out of current history that it seems like taking candy from a baby. As a matter of fact, I was asked, and I asked them not to quote me, in the big crowd at Monterey, what my feelings about the Chinese invasion of Vietnam were. How do you view that? I said if you won't quote me, I view it with amusement. Which may sound a little callous, but that's about as deeply as I go into it.

I also thought a good takeoff point would be a happening that occurred just before I left. I was talking to the chapel service at St. George's and searching for some little message to give those boys and girls in about 10 minutes squirt, when the phone rang that afternoon and a New York television station called and wanted to know if they could bring their

portable rig up and point it at me when they asked me what I thought about brainwashing. John Morse said, "How do you like the sound of that?" I said it would be an easy answer, I don't think there is such a thing as brainwashing. He said, "I'd like that, why not?" And I gave what I really came to believe, and I came to it for not only I think matters of experience, but for matters of practicality. Because brainwashing, if you once get in a position in prison camp where you are even willing to entertain the idea that somehow you can receive a mental whammy, you've lost the whole battle. I know what persuasion is, and I know what loneliness is, and I know what pain is, and so does I think everybody else here, but I don't know what it is to have some sort of mystical effect on a person's brain. I didn't take that interview for the reason, and it was well thought out, I talked to people here and I talked to Admiral Cooney and he said, "All they want you to do is to say that and then you're in the middle of this big controversy about cults and deprogrammers." Because I, in my view, would be lined up with the cults against the deprogrammers, because I don't think there is such a thing as brainwashing. But that is one thing for a 40 year old man, or a 25 year old man, to combat, and another thing for a 18 or 16 or 15 year old kid to combat. The essence of what I'm saying is you have to believe in a tough mindedness, a kind of hard headed pride to combat it when you're looking

for it. I believe, and I told the boys and girls out at St. George's, and I tried to make it applicable to them not quite as harsh as I'm making it to you, that there is one thing, and it's only human and goodness knows it's possible, to get compliance from a person to a degree (going back to Aristotle and his coexistence and coercion and freedom), when the application of pain is at the time you want compliance. But it's a much more difficult thing to apply pain and get future compliance. If you fall into the trap of giving future compliance for past pain, I would have to brand that weakness. I saw it tested, in a test tube sample. I didn't see it but I know the story of those so-called Cubans in Hanoi who spent a year trying to take 10 Americans, trying to randomly pick pilots, and see if by a carrot and stick method they could so beat them in one day and, not be gracious the next, but let them even plant flowers the next, then back. If they could somehow work up a primitive scheme of mind control that would allow them, we think, to let those people come home with a promise that they would not bad mouth the Vietnamese and keep that promise. That, we presume, was the purpose of this experiment. It failed miserably. And it was serious. One man named Cobeal went insane and later died as a victim of this. Nevertheless, his resilience as he went into insanity, his resistance, his resoluteness increased to the point that his cell mates would have to take him and force

him to bow so the Vietnamese wouldn't beat him up. He was out of it. Finally wound up burping him like a baby, he became emaciated and so forth. But all the way, the farther he went down the track, the more resolute he became, even within insanity. That's probably not a typical sample, but I'm saying this tough mindedness, although I'm sure he never would have dreamed it, the kind of spokesman for that is Ralph Waldo Emerson. "Nothing," says he, "is at the last sacred, but the integrity of your own mind." You are the captain of your soul and the master of your fate.

Victor Frankl, the man who wrote the book about his experiences in a German prison camp, he is a psychiatrist, you've probably read some of his stuff, said no matter what the conditions, you never want to forget you always have total control of one thing, and that is your attitude towards what is going on. There is no way that that can be taken from you, provided you retain this individuality. Of course, Emerson is the American champion of that trait. Where he got it, and where it came from and the nature of this lecture today is to kind of give you threads of continuity through the 19th century. So for what it's worth, I will say what the notes say, what the books say, that Yankee spirit of the 19th century was a fascination to de Tocqueville and our obsession with equality. He thought that there would be, as his book indicates, an idea of self over institutions among Americans.

I think that's been true in the past, I'm not sure it is anymore. But the man is the thing and the institution is just a convenience or maybe a hindrance. There's a lot of Immanuel Kant in Emerson. Kant, remember, preached on the moral side, the individual's moral autonomy. That is, a man who with good will and right reason needs no institutions, save his own reason, as he called it. I would call it conscience, but he chose not to for fear it would get mushy in some people's minds. The utopian society that Kant envisioned, the kingdom of ends, was one of the cumulative effects of unfettered individuals, and they as such were the institutions. They, by applying the categorical imperative, made their own order.

Ralph Waldo Emerson was born in Boston in 1803, three years before the birth of John Stuart Mill. I want to kind of keep you on the time track. He was the son of a seventh generation Puritan clergyman. His father died when he was eight. His mother was poor, had several children. Rumor has it, myth has it, history has it, take your choice, that she had pastured her cow for her kids on the Boston Common. Certainly he lived in the center of Boston. His aunt, Mary Moody Emerson, had some money, sent him to school, Boston Latin and to Harvard, which he entered at the age of 14. Ultimately, by the age of 23 he was like his seven predecessors in the lineal family chain, he was the eighth ordained minister in a row. His church was the Unitarian. But he lasted as

an ordained minister only seven years. Ultimately he got hung up over the ceremony, in particular the ceremony of the Eucharist, the reenaction of the crucifixion, this is my body, this is my blood. It was a little bit too formal for this individualist. He wasn't hostile, but he said I'm going on the road as a philosopher, not as a theologian. I just don't believe I'm equipped to handle that sort of thing. So he became famous as a lecturer. In those days there wasn't much formal entertainment and there was apparently a great national interest in these people who were, like himself, rather dry lecturers I suppose we would think of them now. He would come and would give a very serious talk and he would get paid a modest sum. His wife had some money. He had two wives as time went on ^{the first} ~~one~~ died of tuberculosis. The second wife had some money and helped support him. But he was the intellectual giant of America as strange as it may seem with some of his idiosyncracies, but he was a bright fellow. One of the little blurbs I read and I don't remember where it was, people of all stripes would show up at these lectures. There was a scrub woman that was seen frequently sitting there in the front row mesmerized at his words and when somebody said later, "Do you understand what he's talking about?", she said I don't understand a word, but I just like to sit here and see him up there talking as though I was just as important as he is. Which was an understandable thing. In other words, he was out in public displaying or exposing his intellect

for all and sundry. He was not a very effective platform man to read the accounts of it. Lots of humorous anecdotes. Apparently he came laden, like I do, with notes. Although his were various colors, various vintages, he pieced them together. He was dependent upon them. He would pull them out of his pocket sometime. He was famous, I'm told, for a quick ending and an exit. People wouldn't realize, they'd look up and the speech was over and he was gone. Sometimes he left before the speech was over. On one occasion he stopped dead, he couldn't find his place, and he left the auditorium. That was the end, he had to have those notes. He gave a famous oration in 1837 at Harvard University. It was so-called "Phi Beta Kappa" speech in honor of the society, called the "American Scholar". It had such lasting impact that the Phi Beta Kappa magazine today is named after that speech. The next year he gave one at Harvard, it was an annual event, the subject was theology, but it was too liberal for the clientele. He belittled the idea of creeds and was not invited back for 23 years. But when he did come back, and of course he was on the road all over the country in the meantime giving these speeches that later became essays, he was given an honorary degree in 1866. Today, Dr. Brennan reminds, the philosophy building at Harvard University is Emerson Hall. He was not a rich man, he was a frail, little fellow, on again off again cigar smoker, and of course you know one cigar maker took advantage of that and named a cigar after him. He had humble

jobs. In Concord, his hometown, he was the village reaver. I found out that a reaver is the guy who runs in the stray pigs. He was a member of the West Point examining board during the Civil War and was an abolitionist [and so forth.]

His religion became one very similar to the stoics. Nature is the outward manifestation of God. It was a rejection of the rationalism of Calvin and of Unitarianism and says each of us is a part of the universal spirit. God is eminent in man and nature. It was an almost mystical idea that was held much in common with some of the English poets. Man transcends institutions, like the stoics he would say and they called it, of course, transcendentalism. It became a big intellectual force in the country, certainly throughout the 19th century.

Of course, we read the essay "Self Reliance". I think we all, at least I as a boy, were urged to read Emerson's essays. "The Social Value of the College Bred" was one of his essays that my mother insisted I read and I think it was probably as good an argument for education as any as I remember. "Trust thyself. Accept the place that Providence has provided for you," says Emerson. "Conformity makes one false in all particulars." You know the famous quote about consistency, it's the hobgoblin of little minds. This is one I like. He said one time in a lecture, "With consistency, a great soul simply has nothing to do." He described prayer as a contemplation of the facts of life from the highest

point of view. He said something that I came to think about in prison. I've said it before, so I'll repeat it, "Prayer as a means to affect a private ends is meanness and theft." He was a very high minded person. That is to say, praying for things did not become a man. "The essence of genius," says Ralph Waldo Emerson, "is spontaneity and instinct and intuition is the highest form of contemplation." I'm going to go back to Europe now and drop it there for the American side. But you can see that he bore a little resemblance at the end to the ideas of the rational social schemes of John Stuart Mill and most of Mill's predecessors. Mill and all, from Socrates on, had more or less conformed to the idea of first of all deciding what is good, and then providing a means to teach men what is good and then assuming that they will follow it which is always thought of as a good assumption. Some of them, particularly, Mill and others, designed social systems or models to maximize something or other, usually happiness for all men, in a rational scheme that they could understand and would naturally follow.

If I were to ask the hypothetical question, it applies more to some of the later people than Emerson, "Is it in the nature of man to allow himself to be marshalled and programmed as Mill would, even by reason?" Emerson would say no. Spontaneity, intuition. Conformity stinks. To hell with Mill. To hell with systems. Many European intellectuals of the 19th century were to be more strong with their hell no.

I think this is a good point in time to appreciate the impact of so-called intellectuals on society, because the 19th century to me was the epitome of life on the outside being one thing, and life in the minds of the brightest people being something entirely different. The gay '90's even at the end of the 19th century was really, I'm told, a happy time, an optimistic time. Certainly in the United States. We had become a world power, the economy was building, education was starting to really gin up, middle class families could send their kids to college, piano music was bright and cheerful in the streets of San Francisco and elsewhere. So there was a genuine gay '90's optimism. But as we will see today, in the minds of the intellectuals, and I only pick out two or three, and these were the sort of cloistered, almost troublesome, grouchy guys you would think about. But their minds were already in the revolutionary era of the 20th century. At least to the Bolsheviks and maybe to the 1960's. Because the country and the world and all had been terribly uprooted, particularly Europe. If you remember when we first started we talked about the guild and the family and the church had all been stabilizing influences. There had been poverty, there had been disease, there had been lots of evils, but at least people knew where they lived. With the industrial revolution, the upheavals, the barracks, the draft was something that was never heard of in America until World War I and it had been preceded in Europe. The public schools, and the factory, and all the alienations.

Where you really didn't know where you lived. You were always a part of some martial mob; in the barracks, in the school, in the factory. So this was a very stabilizing thing that was really taking place in the 19th century.

I just want to trace the thread of reaction to this in Europe. We have in the United States, I'm told, men of the '60's, and so did they in Czarist Russia, men of the '60's. And I will talk about one rather minor player, but one who had great influence when you think about what some of his readers did. Nicholai Chernochevsky was a 20 year old student at the University of Saint Petersburg when the revolutions of western Europe of 1848 took place. He was 18, he was like most everybody in the 19th and 20th century, an intellectual kid in college whose mind was very sensitive to liberal new ideas. Like most of them, he was an advocate of agrarian reform, of emancipation of the serfs, a typical college intellectual. He became a reader of John Stuart Mill. He was only a few years up the road from Mill. Mill who advocated, if you remember, social and personal freedoms, both sides. He sort of concentrated on the personal side and he translated Mill, if we may be a little bit careless with it perhaps, as "We'll all be happy if we perform rational action in our own best self interest." That's a pretty dangerous way to interpret Mill but I can see how you could tie him in with some of your other ideas and his told him, ultimately as he advanced into a political underground, and

ultimately to be arrested as a radical some many years later in 1862. Incidentally, there was a lot of intellectual unrest in Russia in those years for emancipation of the serfs and the Czar did do that in 1860^{1860?}, about 10 years before Abraham Lincoln freed our serfs, if you want to use that parallel. But Chernochevsky was arrested in 1862 and ultimately was sentenced to Siberia for 19 years imprisonment. During the 18 months of his trial he was incarcerated in the Peter and Paul Fortress in Saint Petersburg and there he wrote a book. The book was called, What is to be Done?, a revolutionary document. I should hasten to add that when he was there in 1862 he was probably not far from the hot bunk that another man I'm going talk about, Fyodor Dostoevsky, had occupied in that same prison 12 years before. Dostoevsky left that prison, went to Siberia, had just gotten back about the time this What is to be Done? came out of the underground press. We'll talk more about Dostoevsky later, but it was the same prison, maybe the same cell, 12 years separated these people. They violently disagreed on the conclusions of this book. Now this book What is to be Done?, there are two books. We're going to read What is to be Done? next week but that was by Nicolai Lenin and it was written in 1902. He got his inspiration here. This book was interpreted in various ways. One of the leading characters of this book written in prison in 1862 was Ramatov, the son of a landed family. He ran away, as did its author, to Saint Petersburg at the age of 16 and rationally supported the revolutionary

cause for the same reason, perhaps, that the author did. Now this character was a very spartan man and he described how he devoted himself to the revolution. He gave up drinking, no booze, no sex. At one point, just to build character he is depicted as sleeping on a bed of nails that he constructed so that he can keep himself zeroed in on the end desire. He was one of the select few in this novel who gave "the people" fervor. And one of the quotes that later caught the eye of Lenin was, "He was one of the select corps, the few who 'as a few choice herbs give flavor to tea' he gave the spirit and direction to the revolution." You see already that the logical conclusion, first of all the exemplary revolutionary character that this man displayed, and the idea which we will develop, which really was original, it's the party system that Lenin originated in 1902 and first put in this book of the same title, What is to be Done?

Lenin said, "The book made me over completely. The greatest merit of Chernochevsky lies in his showing that any right minded and truly decent person must be a revolutionary." More about that next week. The other reader, however, our old friend Dostoevsky, had already been to Siberia and back by the time he read this book. He was 50 years old. He read it with jaundiced eye. The plot concerns a woman, a modern woman, she had two husbands. She had strange living arrangements, there were two bedrooms with a neutral room in between where you could meet if you had some urgent matter

to discuss. She, in her kind of utopian way, was obsessed with rationality and she set up a factory (this was late 19th century Russia in novel form) where she paid high wages and workers participated in social events. She had a grand piano and they all played piano. It conformed to the general idea of the age of the 19th century spirit of Mill, if you educated workers and let their rational nature be free, their civilization will prosper. So this kind of idealistic story came out of the book that Lenin was so in love with. They had multiplying factors. As the workers got good pay, they got to play the piano, they got democratic association with their bosses, and they became more productive and more profits. It became to Lenin, perhaps, symbolic of what the worker Soviets, the workers' communes, that was to be his utopian ideal of the revolution nearly 60 years later.

Fyodor Mikhailovich Dostoevsky read that book and he said bunk. I'm sure he said more strong things, but he called it shallow optimism. I want to take a minute here and try and get you on the time scale. I mentioned three 19th century thinkers. This the fourth. They were all born and died in the 1800's. Emerson and Mill, both born, you don't have to remember the dates of course, but early 19th century, about 1810. Emerson and Mill, Emerson on this side and the Englishman of course over there. Two Russians, Chernyshevsky and Dostoevsky. They went to jail 10 years out of phase but they were about the same age and they were both in the

same prison. They were both born about 1825. All four of these 19th century people had an affect on Lenin who straddles the turn of the century, 1870 to 1924, and he borrows from all of them, the best from all. There's lots of overlap among all these five and for a few years all five of them were alive at once. The older four were alive for quite a period at the same time, I don't think any of them knew one another personally, but they read one another. They tracked one another intellectually. Fyodor Dostoevsky is known as a novelist and a precursor of existentialism and a Christian philosopher. He thought not so much that the road to hell is paved with good intentions, but that the road to heaven is often paved with bad intentions which take men against their better judgement to degradation and then hopefully to revelation or illumination as they see the bottom of the barrel and then as they climb back out to atonement and finally to salvation and redemption. Dostoevsky thinks that man is the victim of powerful urgings to sin deliberately against his own interests, if only to free himself from what comes out in his novels as the tyranny of reason. Now this guy was not a nut. It comes across as I talk about some of his writings, you people are going to say he's crazy, or he's just a showoff. But he's passed the test of time and I just apologize for not being able to do more with it. He says that people do not like to obediently

accept (Now this is his characters talking. Remember, he's a novelist and some of the best philosophy comes from novelists. You know you can't say, Dostoevsky said, he didn't say that, one of his characters said it). One of those characters, in the Underground Man perhaps, said why do we have to accept the fact that two and two is four?

He was born in Moscow, the real man, Dostoevsky, in 1821, son of an aristocratic doctor and a bourgeois mother who died when he was 16. His father, the doctor, was described as miserly, greedy and corrupt. He got his son into engineering school and programmed toward a commission in the army when, as a terrible tyrant, alcoholic, fighter, he was killed by his own servants. And the kid was a college boy. It had a great affect on him, his mother died a natural death, his dad was killed by servants. He was an upper class kid, as was Lenin. We'll talk more about that. Revolutions aren't born in the gutter, they're born in the best homes. He, like Chernochevsky and all the rest, was after he got out of engineering school and into the army, a young man about town, an intellectual sort of guy who liked to, as we say in the old tune "putting on the style," living the modern life that so few of the people on the street are aware exists. He, of course, like Chernochevsky, got involved in a study group which met in dark rooms and drank vodka after hours and his had as its chief bad actor a 25 year old what we would call a State Department Foreign Service Officer by the name

of Petrochevsky. Now Petrochevsky wasn't as bad as you might think, although he was a trouble maker. He was an atheist, he was a tinhorn radical who sponsored all the going avant-garde operations, the least of which was freedom of the press, but even that was an alarming stand in Russia and certainly in the conservative society of Saint Petersburg in those years. The Czar would tolerate this sort of thing, but that same revolution of 1848 and that series of revolutions that excited the 18 year old Chernochevsky, really was the downfall of Dostoevsky who was 10 years older, because they raided their group. There was an informer among them, a guy named Antonelli, and he took all their names, 23 of them, and the gang was run into the same prison, Peter and Paul Fortress. There they were given military trials and during that year he was essentially in solitary confinement, Dostoevsky, the elder. A man in those days of 1849 or 1850, right in the middle of the century, this is 1849 when he is in prison. The man I spoke of earlier in 1862. Dostoevsky was ultimately convicted. Antonelli, the best they could come up with, and this sounds rather ludicrous, but the real charge in this case was reading a letter which pooh-pooed formal religion political orthodoxy. This was enough to trigger the Czar's troops when they were in a situation where western Europe was explosive and they couldn't put up with every kind of a back drawer operation up and down the street. 23 in the band, 21 of them were sentenced to death. They were, after this year of solitary confinement, in a very stirring scene,

blindfolded before a firing squad. Some claim this was kind of a theatrical production, depending on what book. But anyway, there he was with his hands trussed behind him, blindfolded, a horse rides into the courtyard with the Czar's moderation of sentence on the eve of execution. The Czar's messenger said the Czar had mitigated the sentences. Petrochevsky, the troublemaker, was sentenced to life in the salt mines, which he may have deserved, and Dostoevsky four years in a Siberian prison and then six years in exile as a private in one of the regiments. He served that sentence without complaining.

This is a book I bought over in England last fall at a cheap bookstore. I won't labor this but it talks a little bit about Christmas Eve, 1850, after the trial. This is biography of Dostoevsky. It was Christmas Eve and they were lining people up and they had put these fetters on their legs. They took them to a blacksmith shop and put these things on which they could hook to leg irons or whatever. "About midnight the fetters were riveted on the prisoners," (I'm skipping) "and they were placed each with a guard on three open sleighs and driven on to Saint Petersburg, past the lighted windows of friends and relatives in the midst of the Christmas celebration. It was over four years before Dostoevsky walked without fetters and ten before he again saw the streets of the capital. A copy of the Bible was the only book which the prisoners were officially allowed to

possess." The magic of this is that he was such a good writer and was able to bring it back later. He talks about his first years up there in one of his early books called, Memoirs From the House of the Dead. "The fashion of the fetters which walking or sleeping, in health or sickness, never left him. The manner in which they performed the complicated operation of dressing and undressing themselves under the fetters." He talks about the moral torments of those about to undergo brutal flogging. Their problem was not solitary up there, but never being alone. All those four years he was always in a big room, even when he bathed. A few words about the bath. In the winter every couple of months they'd throw people into this steam room to get washed. "When we opened the door to the bath room itself, I thought we were entering hell. Imagine a room 12 paces long and the same in breadth in which as many as 100 and certainly as many as 80 were placed at once. Steam blinding one's eyes. We somehow forced our way onto the benches around the walls, stepping over the heads of those who were sitting on the floor and asking them to duck to let us by. Petrov informed me that he had to buy a place on the wall" (they exchanged money in the prison all the time, and they'd take coins in their hands) "He finally bought a place, stuck it in the man's fist having providently brought it with him to the bath room. The convict I had ousted at once ducked under the bench just under my place where it was dark and filthy and the dirty

slime lay two inches thick." "Members of the peasant class don't wash much with soap and water. They only steam themselves terribly and then douche themselves in cold water. That's their idea of a bath." (He was contemptuous of them.) "It was not he who was held. All were shouting and vociferating to the accompaniment of 100 chains clanking on the floor." "It was here in prison along with men coarse and enraged and embittered, who stank like swine, whose constant company was the worst of all torments, that this reserved and hypersensitive nature of Dostoevsky received the first seeds of idealization of the people, which formed so important a part of his later political and religious creed." "The more I hated individuals," says a character in The Brothers Karamazov, "the more I loved humanity." Says Dostoevsky (and he wrote this 20 years later, "Judge the Russian people, not by the degrading sins which it so often commits, but by the great and holy things to which in the midst of its degradation it constantly aspires. Judge the people not by what it is but what it would like to become." In the midst of all this he acquired epilepsy and he learned tolerance. Dostoevsky was in his 33rd year when the fetters were struck off his feet in the prison blacksmith shop and he walked once more in the world of free men. But it was a world transfigured for him forever by the experience through which he had passed. After the years with the army, six as a private, he came back to Saint Petersburg.

INSERT idea of
Criminals being good persons

"Is it in the nature of man to be marshalled and programmed?" I would ask hypothetically. As Mill would say yes, as our analytical authors many would say yes, as our designers of the escalation ideas of Vietnam would say yes, as McNamara would probably say yes, Dostoevsky would have said long ago, not only no, but hell no. In Notes From the Underground, one of the characters says, "You see gentlemen, reason is an excellent thing. But reason is nothing but reason and satisfies only the rational side of man's nature. While will is a manifestation of the whole life. That is the whole human life, including reason and all the impulses." It was these impulses that he writes of and I think they have a ring of truth about them. Man is not a piano key. As I've said, he's not a shellshocked crank. He's written some of the best literature we've known, Crime and Punishment. He is up to speed on the intellectual scene, he in 1870 wrote a book on which the Euclidean nonsense was ridiculed. That of course is post-Euclidean geometry, of the sort we see here in our nuclear physics. It was already making big headway in the Russian scientific circles. I one time shared a desk at Hoover Library with a fellow named Alex Gusnich, who was writing a series of books about the cultural history of science in Russia, not the Soviet Union. Alex has a brother who is a professor at Stanford now, I don't know where Alex is. He was a sociologist and an anthropologist and like his brother a Yugoslav. He spoke all of those southeast European languages. He didn't know

much about math but he learned about it as he wrote, wrote, wrote. You couldn't even see him, he had this pile of books. I was there with him for a year and he talked about all these non-Euclidian geometries that had cropped up in Russia in the 19th century. They do have a very credible scientific background.

Notes From the Underground, the one you read today is part 1, which has all the philosophy. I've got a secret copy with part 2 which has all the fun in it. He just brings it out a little bit more, practical applications of the sort of stuff that part 1 brings out as theory. Notes From the Underground we are told was one of the precursors of existentialism which Joe will talk about after the break. He has asked me to describe it as kind of an exaggerated individualism. I don't understand it very well, but I was once told to look at it this way: that most all books and programs and people's ideas, they look at life as a spectator looks down at a football game from the stadium. At the goals, and the teams, and the clash, and the drama, and the winners and the losers, and you see why. That's most everybody's viewpoint. The existentialist's viewpoint (it's not a philosophy, it's only a viewpoint) that's the football game as seen by the guard in the center line. What to you is rhythm and majesty and order, to him is all knees and elbows. It is from that viewpoint that these books are written. "I am a sick man," it starts out, "I am a spiteful man."

Rather than reasonableness he prefers one's own free, unfettered choice, one's own choice. Man is not a piano key. He cannot stand carrot/stick manipulation anymore than prisoners can or anymore than Vietnamese can. The tyranny of reason he cannot accept it. In part 2, if you were ever worried about making an ass of yourself, I recommend you read part 2, you'll feel like a million dollars. It is written in the first person as is the other. Quickly, it is written when the man is 40 years old looking back in hindsight on himself as a 24 year old uniformed office functionary in Saint Petersburg. A man of tormented soul. He was shy. These are such personal things he talks about. He always dropped his eyes, whenever he was going on a path he would always get off the walk and let the other people through. He just hated himself. He didn't like the way he looked, he didn't like the way he stepped aside or dropped his eyes. There was a long passage in there where he changed clothes, bought a new suit, you know pumped himself up and finally got a guy to move off the sidewalk when he came by. But he was always treated like a fly. He even came by a bar one night in a Saint Petersburg neighborhood and there was a violent fight going on in one of the bars with a pool table with the guys breaking windows and hitting one another over the head with pool cues. He got in there and he wanted to participate. He got in the middle and he couldn't even get hit with a pool cue. This is said much more delicately

prostitution, so he said I will go on that too. They all jumped in a cab and slammed the door and he caught the next cab. He went out there and he was fearing this experience because he had been to that same place once before and there was a very beautiful woman out there by the name of Olympia who had ridiculed him in the living room. So he hoped he didn't see her. He got there and he couldn't find anybody. Finally they brought out an animal-like kid named Lisa and they said this is your partner. He somehow was obsessed, it wasn't put on. He kind of became morbid as he talked to her and she was so thin and she was calloused, she was tough, a street kid. He made her cry by talking to her and he seemed to be obsessed with doing that. He said I was walking down the street the other day and you know the girls after they become tubercular, and they all get that way (and she was already tubercular), they finally wind up from the floors and they work down in the basement and then they die in the basement. Then they put them in coffins and they take them out, you've seen them. I saw one and it was raining and there was mud on the street and they were taking one of the coffins out and it was slipping on its side and it fell in the water and water got in the coffin, and on and on, and they went to the cemetery and they dump them upside down in the cemetery, and the grave diggers put them on the paupers side, and that's where you're going to wind up, and so on and so forth. Finally, even this tough street kid it started

to get to her, and she bit her arm. There was no sexual activity at all. She bit her arm and she became sort of sympathetic. She said you sound like an abbot. He said you've got to take yourself out of this corruption. He got involved in pity. He was being mean to her really against his better judgement, although she accepted it as pity. Then he made another mistake and he told her his address and said come by sometime. She was kind of interested, not in him as a partner, but here was a human being that really she thought that somehow maybe she could get some sympathy from. That had never happened before. Then he got worried for fear that she would come. Then one night she came. Again, he knew better, but he said you thought I was serious, I was making fun of you, don't you understand that. But even she could read through him, because he was such a tormented soul. She realized that he was not trying to make fun of her that he was just a poor thing, more poor than she. And she pities him. Then there was the embarrassing incident in which he tries to pay her and she leaves the money. It's just on and on and on like this. This not being any sort of message except to say, a sensitive observer of the passing scene really.

He talked more about, "You gentlemen see reason as an excellent thing, but reason is nothing but reason. It satisfies the rational side but the will is the manifestation of the whole life, the human life, including all the

impulses, good and bad." We'll talk more about Dostoevsky next week and I'll have a little less morbid story to tell, but equally if not more powerful, and that is the Grand Inquisitor scene from The Brothers Karamazov which is applicable to Lenin's writings. So, to cool it for today, we've started with the 19th century philosophers, from Mill, who talked about seeking happiness through rationality, both socially and somewhat personally or selfishly. Chernochevsky who interpreted the selfish side accurately and sort of ignored the other half, who wrote a novel in prison which turned Dostoevsky off as shallow optimism and fired Lenin with ideas as we will see next week to try to force men to be free given this irrationality. Taking that into account, how you're going to make it work. You've got to force them into the mold. Of course he writes some years later, his own version of What is to be Done?

LECTURE 8

I left you with the question that was being asked in 19th century Europe, is it in the nature of man to allow himself to be programmed, that is manipulated, even by reason, even for his own good? Of course Mill said yes, and then we came across one on each side of the Atlantic that said no, and there were many others. There was a kind of growing restlessness in the new industrialized society. Ralph Waldo Emerson would have said no, nothing is sacred but the integrity of my own mind. The author Dostoevsky would have said, hell no, at least his characters say, "I am not a piano key, I do not respond to your ping with the right frequency obediently. Why should I obey the tyranny of reason?" At least the man in the Notes From the Underground displayed such a person. I think that that was a person, as in all these cases, that had always been around, but was coming to the fore a little bit more and a part of the public scene. This whole issue of whether or not you want to be programmed, or whether you want to have it your way, out of frustration or the need for self-satisfaction, is of course a basic human dilemma at center stage. Freedom versus order. One of those four or five dilemmas, freedom and equality, freedom versus order, all a little different but insoluble. Solzhenitsyn: "Order has limits beyond which it degenerates into tyranny, but freedom is moral only if it keeps within certain bounds beyond which it degenerates into

complacency and licentiousness." In other words, the idea of which we are familiar, that you have to go somewhere in the middle to keep your bearings.

Plato, a long quote that I've used before: "The excessive increase of anything causes reaction in the opposite direction. And dictatorship naturally rises out of democracy and the most aggravated form of tyranny and slavery, are the most extreme form of liberty." R and R. Scarcely a philosopher hasn't expressed himself on this dilemma. I'm just going to talk about it as it was written up here, to start with by Dostoevsky, then I'm going to talk about Marx, and then I'm going to talk about Lenin.

Dostoevsky, as a social critic, as a very artful author. I think the average man, once he hears what the man from the Underground has to say and see how preoccupied he is with expressing himself rationally or not, says, "What about social services? What is modern urban life going to be without it if everybody goes his own way? How in the world can you ever provide for these people crowded up in cities, in militarized lives, in factories and barracks and so forth? What about world peace? Men will cast down their temples and drench the earth with blood if everybody is two-blocked on the freedom side and obeys their own whims." Well, actually that last line is a line in the story I'm going to talk about. It was written by Dostoevsky. It's actually a story within a story,

written when he was 58, just 100 years ago. The story, which you've been asked to read, was of course extracted from The Brothers Karamazov and it is known as "The Grand Inquisitor" story. The big book is a story of sons killing their detested father and you get symbolism of Dostoevsky's father being killed, a detestable man being killed by his servants. This little segment is the story of human freedom told by Ivan, the number two son of Karamazov who I would typify as a cynic, to his baby brother, Alyosha who is sort of the most innocent of them all and he is a novice in a monastery. A position that Dostoevsky had himself at one time. The only characters as you know from reading are Jesus Christ and a 90 year old Cardinal who goes by the name of the Grand Inquisitor. It is a very tough story and to get right down to the point, this Cardinal decides upon the appearance of Christ during the Spanish Inquisition that Jesus must be executed to save the church. I'm just going to breeze through this. It's rather jolting to hear that but it's not as heretical as you might think.

First of all, it was Christ. It wasn't a case of mistaken identity. It did take place in Spain. The "GI", The Grand Inquisitor (my abbreviation), was not an empire builder. He does not want to do this just to preserve his image, just to preserve himself. Because, after all, as we say, he's 90. It's two positions that argued toe to toe by the man that is an advocate of order, against a man who is committed to human

freedom, namely Christ. The way this things shapes up, after burning several heretics at the stake, a busy afternoon in Seville or wherever he was, the respected, revered Cardinal sees the crowd part as this person comes through it. He sees him healing children, making blind people see, and recognizes the features - and sure enough, it's Christ. The first thing he says is, "Off to prison with him." The reason being not that he was jealous but that when he got him into quiz (as we would call it) or interrogation, he says to Christ, "Thou didst reject the one infallible banner which was offered thee to make all men bow down." He was, of course, talking about Satan's three temptations described in the Books^{cf} Mathew and Luke. "In those three questions," says the Cardinal, "the whole subsequent history of mankind is as it were brought together in one whole. And in them are all the unsolved contradictions of human nature." By that he meant that Christ made a mistake in every one of these cases of his confrontations with Satan. In other words, Christ damned men to freedom and insisted that they go through the misery of finding their own way through good and evil.

The first case was when the devil dared Christ to turn stone into bread and Christ's reply was, "Man does not live by bread alone." This is interpreted in the book as his refusal to participate in social services, he spawned thereby this competition and the elites and the religious wars and all that grew out (this is the Cardinal's view). Secondly, Christ refused, if you will remember, to demonstrate his

immortality by plunging off a high pinnacle. The Christ says, "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord, thy God." That was his reply to that challenge. The Cardinal says you refused that miracle and mystery and authority that all men have to have. You had the chance to demonstrate that you were the son of God and could have taken over this burden. They could have followed you without question, and yet you left it. You didn't demonstrate your own power. Men need authority and if they don't have it they will invent their own (perhaps he was thinking up into the Hitler era, whatever). He thought God owed mankind a form of proof of the inviolability of his immortality. He had been given the choice and he turned them down, let the men wander around, stumble around here on earth, fighting this dilemma of good and evil. Third, the devil took Christ to the mountaintop, showed him all the kingdoms of the world and said, "All these things I will give thee if thee will fall down and worship me." Of course he refused and the inference there is that he passed up his opportunity to wipe out war, to develop a community of nations. The old Cardinal says, "Don't you realize what you have foresaken. It is to mankind's advantage to live in one unanimous, harmonious antheap of universal unity." Of course that translation of the antheap, I don't know the Russian language, but there the story starts to reveal the author's viewpoint on this. In other words, I think Dostoevsky,

as we know from his background, was contemptuous of such a communal relation and a very strict Christian of the classical, Eastern church and very sympathetic, of course, with the idea of Christ being correct in his avoidance of formal proofs for one reason or another. "Nothing has brought mankind," says the Cardinal, "more suffering than freedom of conscience. Dost thou forget that man prefers even death to freedom of choice and the knowledge of good and evil?" Later he says, "You mock men. You left them to drench the earth with their blood all of this time." Christ is silent. But he knows who he is talking to and the old man is too old to care. The old Cardinal says, "Why dost thou look silently and searchingly at me with thine mild eyes? Be angry." (He tries to get him to be angry.) "I don't want thy love for I love thee not. Do I not know to whom I am speaking?" Well, this, like many of you perhaps, by this time in the story Alyosha was typical, he was disgusted with such a story. He got restless and he asked him brother, who we say is kind of a cynic, "What happened?" And the brother said that Christ leaned forward, kissed the old man on the bloodless lips and said nothing. "Then what?" The Grand Inquisitor relented on his execution sentence he had already given him. He was infuriated. He pointed to the door and said to Christ, "Go and come no more." "And the old man?" asked Alyosha. The kiss glows in his heart but the old man still adheres to his idea. Namely, that Christ had erred.

That is to say, he thought Christ should have given sanction to social services, authoritarianism, and an antheap existence, at least an international community. And if they don't want it perhaps they should be forced to be free from these burdens of conscience. A very serious story but I throw it in because it is of the same era. It was at a time when these questions were just being clearly articulated. Dostoevsky had read Chernochevsky 18 years before he wrote this and, of course, being an educated man I am sure he was familiar with the writings of Karl Marx. I think you might interpret this story as definitely an opposition to the attitude of forcing men to be free, which was of course Karl Marx's idea and Chernochevsky's as a revolutionary was somewhat the same.

Remember that Karl Marx wrote his Manifesto in that year of revolution in Europe, 1848. That was when Dostoevsky was a young man, in fact that was the year in which he himself was a radical in Saint Petersburg and was arrested as a radical, sentenced to prison, and then exiled for the same charge, the same type of activity that these men he now opposes advocate. It was the man Antonelli, if you remember in the Upstairs Room, that informed in 1848 and the young guys, these college boys, as they seemed to do in every generation, got into trouble and some of them marched off to prison. Most of the people I've been talking about this week among them.

Karl Marx has been heralded by an Indian student I knew (now dead I found out from an Indian student here at the

War College), very bright fellow at Stanford. He had studied Marx. I don't think he was a Marxist but he knew he was very classically educated. I was very dumb to get the idea, what was so powerful about Marx? He said, "Don't you realize that this fellow took the three great intellectual strains of the 19th century and wove them into one philosophy." He took the dialectic of Hegel, who was a great German philosopher who thought you were nobody in academia unless you knew about the thesis and antithesis and the synthesis, and of course he has that aspect to his writing. The formalization of the economic theory that had been done by the Englishman rather late, suprisingly, late 18th century, Ricardo and others who had talked about laws of supply and demand. Of course it was an economic text that he was basically working on. In the last of that 18th century he took the theory of the French Revolution which was really a case study of a rolling revolution that changes complexities as time went on. He assumed that if man did not want to be struck like a piano key that you can't use a pull string sort of reasonableness about your philosophy as maybe Mill would have thought, you can't push a string if you will remember, a push rod, force feed way to force man to be free. The writing is not bad. If you read the Manifesto he talks about the history of class struggles. He relates this to history then says that as the feudalists had given way to the bourgeois that the bourgeois who were then in power had destroyed (and it was high minded stuff) men's pride in

their work, the ecstasies of religious fervor, and they had converted poets into wage earners. This competitive degrading way of living under a profit system. He predicted future overproduction and that within this system, as he always said in all the communist literature, within the womb is born the seeds of its own destruction. That it was inevitable that bourgeois morality, bourgeois economics would destroy itself - that it was implanted within it, it was a matter of time. Modern law, modern morality, modern prejudices, all of this religion, everything that went on, were just excuses, bourgeois prejudices. They also would pass on as a higher level of existence would inevitably occur, says Marx. All previous historic movement he said, and this is why it was different than all the other evolutionary things, that the inevitable revolution had taken place but it was ^{propelled} primarily by minorities. But in this industrial revolution, in the city that he had in mind for this revolution where everybody was now working in the factory and the proletarians, the factory workers, they were not only going to revolt, but they were going to be the majority. As such, it would be a new order in revolution and one that would be irrevocable. Ultimately, they would have to establish order through the dictatorship of the proletariat, but that in due course the state would wither away and utopia would prevail.

An aside: I asked one of the students here to give me a little bit about Marx and the dictatorship of the proletariat. That term went out of favor in the Soviet Union

in the recent 1977 constitution. They say that this has been done and now we are in a state of the whole people. It's a complicated explanation, they've quit talking about the dictatorship of the proletariat and ^{imply} infer that it has served its purpose, that the social, political, and ideological unity of the Soviet society has been achieved, and so forth. So that's kind of an aside about how an ideology gives you stability and strength but it is also an albatross around your neck. You just can't discard it. You've got people programmed and in their case you've got to make up very elaborate explanations of why certain terms drop out.

Back to the 19th century, and of course the punchline of this very emotional, well written document, the Communist Manifesto and it tells the proletarians, "You have nothing to lose but your chains and a world to win." The writing tracks. He works a lot with trends. I think that he extrapolates his trends a little too far. Have I told you about General Weyand's ^{talk about} trends when he was talking about computers down at the War College. This is the ex-Chief of Staff of the Army. He said that he thought that extrapolating trends, particularly through computerized methods, could sometimes lead to faulty conclusions. He said, for instance, if you had tried to make a study of the efficiency of the highway system of the United States in the 19th century, you know try to predict what warfare would be like in the middle of the

20th century and how road travel would go, he said with the data you had at hand at the time you would have come to the conclusion that all the wagons would have had to grind to a halt because the horse manure would have been up over the hubs.

Marx, a utopian dreamer. Even Bertrand Russell, certainly no friend of mine and certainly not a man who would normally be considered as a critic of Marx, says that, "He has grave shortcomings as a philosopher and his purview is confined to man. Since Copernicus man's importance has been in doubt and no man who fails to understand that has no right to call his philosophy scientific." That was written some many years ago, I'm sure. His book Das Kapital is more or less beyond the understanding of even Marxist economists, I'm told. It's kind of mystical, because like everything else he wrote, he was not writing textbooks, he was writing a bible. And this bible is vague and it comes out as a matter of interpretation. For fifty years men took this idea of the historic process and from New York to Siberia there were underground revolutionaries making conscious determined efforts to understand this process of history and to locate the levers of social action. He never was specific enough to tell how it really happened. Why was he more influential than Mill and probably one of the more influential men of this era? First of all, Mill was a liberal and liberals kind of tend to rule in the name of doubt. They always leave things open, that's part of the

liberal creed. Remember the second chapter of On Liberty where he talks about freedom of the press and why it is not good to stop people from writing, from publishing. Because you don't know really whether you've got the right message or not. You know, that's kind of the liberal stance - ruling in the name of doubt. And that always tends to peter out. People don't hold to that as well as they do a dogmatic kind of a leader, and that certainly Marx was. More important than that, Mill did not have a Lenin. That's the guy I'm going to talk about now.

Vladmir Ilich Lenin, that really wasn't his last name, Lenin was a cover name that he picked up early in life and more or less kept for most of his life, was born in 1870 (younger than these poeple I've been talking about), in a Russian provincial town. I don't remember the name, but it was a decent place. He was of upper middle class parents. In his biography there's talk of his mother's father being a doctor and a landowner. His father's father, there were six kids in this, I'll call them the Lenin family that wasn't really the name, but he had five brothers and sisters. They spent summers joyously on the summer estate of his father's father, a thousand acres we're told. Not rich. His father was a teacher and school administrator. The home was permeated with an atmosphere of loyalty to the Czar and orthodoxy of religion. A typical upper middle class family

of the sort you would find out in the middle west is the way I would describe them. His father was successful after a fashion, he became a state counsellor, which is sort of like being a minor nobleman. He was a well respected man of the community, played chess with his six kids. Lenin's mother taught all of them how to play the piano. Vladimir was number two child, the first two being boys, the older being his oldest brother Alexander. Lenin did well in school and the brother went off to Saint Petersburg to the university, his older brother, and in due course got into trouble. Just like Dostoevsky did, just like Chernochevsky did, just like everybody seems to over the years. His brother got into trouble and, I'm not trying to psychoanalyze this. I got a lot of this out of James MacGregor Burns' book which I've just reviewed for the Naval Institute and the dustcover says he is an eminent historian, but he is the sort that tries to psyche everybody out on the basis of how their father treated them and so forth, but it's interesting. In the process you get a little insight. When the father died in 1886, the boys kind of came unglued. Lenin is said to have lost religion at that time. His brother was deeply affected, away at college and for some reason did not return to the funeral, but got himself into some sort of a gang that made a bungled effort to kill the Czar. This is the way it is in the universities, some segments I guess. He was arrested and hanged. This young college boy out of this fine family and it left its mark on

many and particularly on his next younger brother. But even after that Vladimir Lenin was admitted to law school. He was dismissed from law school after being involved in a student protest. His mother got him back into law school. He passed the bar with high grades and became kind of a junior attorney, still hopefully, going to join the society. But he did not. In 1893 when he was 23 years old, he dropped out. Went back to Saint Petersburg which is kind of the revolutionary capital of Russia and for the next 31 years practiced revolutionary activity. For 24 of those next 31 years he was either a prisoner or underground. Burns again, talks about his kind of identity crisis after he had dropped out. He took up the vocation of revolutionary leadership. You can't read a book about Lenin without people admiring his virtue and revolutionary zeal and I understand that. However, if you see how he worked I think that there's something interesting about this ID. He took up the vocation of revolutionary leadership. He took up that which came very naturally to him. Sometimes this is kind of a vague idea that we've had, but often, I'm looking for the buzzword, I used to have a friend that often made jokes about this, but somehow, do you really think that Lenin was as communistic, that he was as choked up about communism as his lieutenants? I doubt it. You'll see how flexible and how independent he was. Never sacreligious about the idea but we talk about people being more Catholic than the Pope, more royalist than the king, and I think that's kind of an idea. People who are able to run big organizations

frequently, I'm not saying they're opportunists, but as they are not as zealous. Zealousness tends to kind of close your mind up and I think that Lenin was anything but choked up mentally during the time when things were happening. He studied. Of course he had studied Marx, he read Chernochevsky, that seemed to be a more popular appealing book to both Lenin and Dostoevsky than Marx. Marx was so heavy. Chernochevsky you remember that was the story about the boy that slept on the bed of nails, that was the zealous fellow, and was an admirable revolutionary. Lenin read it at 14 and didn't get much out of it. He picked it up again at 19 and thought that was really good. After the law career and back into the underground, he studied the rise of capitalism, he quizzed the peasants, he was really going after this. He took an interlude in Switzerland with a ^{Alekhanov} Plakinau (I'm not sure I'm pronouncing that right, you see that in all the communist literature), a European communist plakinau by kind of a tutorial session with him. He came back, he had a bunch of literature. He had a false bottom in his suitcase and he was caught and in trouble again. He had in the meantime become an expert in disguise and evasion, but not enough an expert to avoid getting caught in this instance. Fourteen months in prison, Saint Petersburg, then to the familiar tour in Siberia which seems to be par for the course among this crowd. Four years up there, from 1895 until 1900. He didn't live the kind of life that Dostoevsky led when we read his

story about The House of the Dead. When he was in Siberia it was sort of a sabbatical. Not pleasant. He was exiled, exiled is a better word to use. Maybe we were all better off because Dostoevsky was hurt up there, at least he learned his lesson.

There is another idea that I've been playing with. I get manuscripts from funny quarters. There's a fellow up in Burlington, Vermont named Lawrence Suid, he sent me a manuscript that he has been trying to peddle for some time and it's called "A Moratorium". His theory is not really too kooky. His idea is that anybody that has really been able to affect the course of events of the universe has had a period of moratorium. Sometime during their life they've had time to think and get their lives all squared away. He would say that Lenin had his moratorium during those five years in Siberia as did Luther in a monastery, as did Franklin Roosevelt with his polio. That enforced severance from the hubbub of life if given at the right time to a bright person often is the forerunner of great achievement. It would be ideal he would say if you could go to bed rest in a hospital, but that's so impractical that really the prison seems to offer one of the better places to get away from all the requirements. That was so with, as we read the activities, as Suid put it in old brown paper that he wrote some years ago, he's got a lot of data on all of those people. Lenin slept nine hours a day, dreamt of a better

world, he studied, wrote, swam in the river in the summertime. He made some kind of deal with the government, he had a girlfriend, also a revolutionary, ^{SP?} Krishenka. She came up to Siberia to marry him. That was part of the agreement, they would both stay there in exile. During that time, according to Suid, Lenin more or less planned the next 17 years. Not exactly, because he was always surprised, but he had enough guidelines he knew what he was going to devote his life to. He had had these days on end with no clock, no regular meal service, no impediments. He could get up, he could sleep, he could think, he could read, he could swim, and he came out of there a man ready for great things. That's sort of the way I would like to think. I was misinformed on that. Way in hindsight it always looks better. I thought that was the way I was in PG school and I gave a talk to the last class and I said I'm so happy you guys are able to get off the wheel of life and come up here to Newport and have that moratorium, ~~but I should have~~, and you really get your act together and you go back to the Navy, Air Force or the Army and you really tear them apart. Captain Platte came in later and said, "That was a good speech but that's not what we do here." Which is kind of too bad. But I'm working on it. After he was released from prison in 1900 he went to Europe, became a pamphleteer, an orator, really a better writer than speaker. He was not a prominent member of the revolutionary underground, but he got to be well known. His blunt, hammerlike delivery seemed

to make points. The one thing that he had and everybody says that he exhibited an intellectual and emotional self-discipline that was somehow eyecatching and somehow had an effect on the world. At one point he ditched this lovely Krishenka who came up to Siberia and married him. She was always late to the cell meetings and he warned her officially in public that she'd be reprimanded if she was late. That's just a trivial example of the way he went at things. But friends, sentiment, love were all dirt under his feet when they conflicted with revolutionary duty. He was a sensitive man. He was kind of afraid of his sensitivity. He loved music, loved Beethoven, and one of the quotes there and one Joe got out of another book, he is quoted as saying, "I can't listen too often. It affects your nerves, it makes you want to say stupid, nice things to people. You musn't stroke your friend's head, you have to hit him over the head." Duty is hard. Given his options he would have loved to have been a sweet guy, but that was the problem with him. He had to keep himself in the posture that he was prepared if they violated revolutionary laws to hit them over the head whether they were his wife or whoever. Also we see that he was not as confident in this historic process as his philosopher was. You'll see it time and again. He said that history has an inevitability about it and this will happen but it helps to kick history in the shins, to kick it in the behind, to keep it moving.

And keep it moving the way you want it to move. You've got to have a good grasp of the historic process, but if you leave it to its own ends, its going to take a long time and it's irritating. At 31 he wrote his own book, What is to be Done?, the one we have. Revolution needs discipline. He had to put some power into this thing and you cannot have the man on the street and history and the prominent people determining the course of the world. They'll do it eventually, but whose got the time to wait on them. You need a militant vanguard, a disciplined corps, to run this operation. And they've got to have the trust of the people of course. But then above that you've got to have a guy with a mind that can run the militant corps. Of course that was Lenin. We see that that was exactly the way he worked. I mean, he had to maintain positive control over this historic process. He liked it but he wanted to run it and let history work. That's where the spontaneity comes in. You know, if everybody suddenly gets disaffected with the contamination of the bourgeois profit motive and all that terrible thing as they're inevitably going to do, according to theory, then sometimes the crowds will rise spontaneously and then what have you got. Well, he said, if you don't watch out you've got nothing but what he called "trade union consciousness". People preoccupied with weak, pitiful, sniveling ideas like reform and compromise and they will, if you leave them to their own features, like his great enemies the social democrats, also underground people at times

later big in Russia, first thing you know they'll have these underground constitutions and they'll talk about voting rights and all of this for which he had total contempt. This trade union consciousness of the sort we would find in Ford Motor Company is nothing but ideological enslavement to the bourgeoisie. He also, of course, was contemptuous of the left and the hard line. He hated both gradualists and terrorists. You're going to say, how did he come out riding? He never did, but he didn't presume to. He was able by power of his determination to persuade people. He wrote a book, Left Wing Communism. This was some time later but I couldn't believe the title of it, you always think of communism as left wing. V.I. Lenin, Left Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder. He lays it out to the party about how stupid it is. "Although absolute centralization in the strictest discipline of the proletariat constitutes one of the fundamental traditions of victory over the bourgeois, blah, blah, blah...the conclusion is clear, to reject compromises on principle, to reject the admissibility of compromises in general no matter what kind, is childishness." You see, he contradicts himself. "Which it is difficult to take even seriously. A political leader who desires to be useful to the revolutionary proletariat must know how to single out concrete cases when such compromises are inadmissible..." He was able with all of his activism and when he got into Russia after he was taken over there during the Bolshevik Revolution, to be able to sense (I don't want to paint him

as a plaster saint, he was just as mixed up as the next soldier in the field probably), he said slow down, the crowd is getting ahead of you. They were attacking the ramparts. He had a great sense of timing, it wasn't time yet to topple ^{Kerenskiy} Karenski.

The message that I hope I'm leaving with you is, how tough the doctrinaire communist is. And how easy it was, you know these ideas about civil liberties, voting rights, and fair representation and all, it's in this book and in others, that's just the idea. That's bourgeois mentality. If you really know how hard, if they're really doctrinaire communists, and it's well to know that, I'm not trying to paint them red or black or anything. But it was interesting in prison to see the interrogator looking for the reaction. Because they would start out by saying, now what is the.. and they were told I suppose that we had simplistic, bourgeois mentalities, upper middle class boys who would be very impressed if they could be shown that the civil liberties were good in the country, or the voting rights were good, or that fair representation was there. They would throw these words out and they loved to talk about that. Then when you left they just laughed their head off to think that you were that soft, that you were that gullible to think that they were even interested in that sort of thing or even that it was important. Because they ^{WERE} looking about another plateau and when you rid yourself of all this bourgeois encumbrance that has polluted our souls. As Henry Kissinger said, when you're

negotiating with the communists you've got to realize that he is talking to you just like an American psychiatrist is talking to his patient. I mean everything that is offered and said, he is really sympathetic. You have a problem. You have a warped mind that has been made that way as a result of you and all your ancestors having been on this system based on greed instead of love. So somehow, in all their sympathy they're going to bring that out, you see. When you're working, you've got to know that they would be contemptuous of, it's politically so profitable to deal with our liberal fringe that they probably have a whole code of ethics that says, you know, don't make fun of them. I mean, Jane Fonda to them is absolutely hilarious. I'm sure that she would be so gullible to think that by some process by reform or compromise you could help the world.

Lenin, another thing that he had straight, he knew enough not to let the enemy set the frame of reference of the argument. He comes out time and again and he won't let them do that. Now we do that all the time, and if you really think about this, it's all in the rules of the game. All in the rules of the game. One of the problems that I shocked Tyler Dedman out at the PG School the other day, I didn't shock him but I mean his face went kind of slack. We were talking about how you can convince the government or the Navy to give more to education. You see the methodology there, some bureaucrat cranked it in. I said, "Anytime you start defending

your institution on the basis of the number of billets that require its graduates, you've lost. That's got nothing to do with it. Don't argue with them on that basis." Now I don't know how you do this, but these ^{ARE} ingrained. And that's your DoD dilemma, because if you really think about it, what you're doing and many of your problems you're talking about in management, you're walking into a trap where the frame of reference is unbeatable. I had it happen in prison. I can remember one time when I wanted to get John Dramesi and George McKnight and a bunch of these guys out over the wall. It was a two year project, we got all things set up on the other side, and I got rebuffed by a fellow who was senior to me. He was a very good manager and he had, in hindsight I can see, he would very calmly sit down and he'd say, "All right, now let's think what we're going to stand to gain, and stand to lose." Sounds reasonable doesn't it. You could never run an escape from a prison if you tried to decide to go or not on the basis of what you had to gain versus what you had to lose. Because you're going to lose more than you're going to gain. That's part of it, in the short run at least. But you're going to gain spirit, you're going to gain self-confidence.

Again, communists don't make that mistake. They will wait and demand that the references be ones that they can win on. Fairness. You know Americans are gullible on that. Fairness, consensus? Hell no.

More of this book, Left Wing Communism, Vladimir Lenin:
"Speaking of truth is a petty bourgeois prejudice. A lie on the other hand is often justified by the ends. The capitalists of the whole world and their governments will shut their eyes to the subversive activities on our side that I have referred to and will in this manner become not only deaf mutes but blind as well. They will open up credits for us which will serve us for the purpose of supporting communist parties in other countries and they will supply us with materials and technology which we lack and will restore our military industry which we need for future victorious attacks on our suppliers." In other words, they will work hard to prepare their own suicide if you treat them like you should.

As I've said there were three things about Lenin. The contempt of bourgeois, both of those are sort of about the frame of reference. And third, is his artful leadership versus science. The zigzag. He was one of these guys that couldn't diagram the attack plan of how you're going to blow up the oil tanks or bridge, but if you could make sure that he had control and he knew his people, he could take it out there and he was just an artist under pressure. He didn't need a plan. They were encumbering. He needed to know his people, he could feel the dynamics of the situation, which I think is a necessity for super leaders, super soldiers. Like Emerson he would have said that consistency is the hobgoblin

of little minds. Marxist theory? Sometimes. Usually, but he at times preached anarchism, depending on how the situation developed in Russia. Other times he would send them out in the street, terrorism, both an anathema to the "true word" of Marx. He scoffed at bypassing capitalism. You know, they were supposed to go from feudalism to capitalism to socialism. The Vietnamese I remember were always very happy that they had bypassed capitalism, that was a great achievement. That wasn't Marx's idea. In fact, Lenin one time just came up in the Soviet Union and he scoffed at them. You can't violate the laws of history. And yet, a couple of months later he was repudiating it himself. This two-stage revolution is no good, we'll go all the way right now. He held the lead. He never fell into the trap of playing a little game of bargain brokerage he called it. Trying to make accommodations to build coalitions. That was a bummer. He never wanted to cut corners to get more followers. That was a bourgeois trick. You had to have people that were hard, disciplined and reliable and the first thing you knew you got a bunch of left wingers in there and they would think they were running it and I'd rather keep my own little crowd and they can go to hell or take the oath. In the meantime, no coalitions, no compromises. Bargain brokerage. He wanted ^{elan} and not flabby majorities. Now what about Marx's merger? You know, he said there will be a merging of the leadership in the land. Well, that'll happen. He did ^{not} refute him, but that just dropped out. Majority

revolt? We won't talk about that. He did know where he was going. He seemed to know that thing that was in Herman Wouk's book which I've heard quoted many times, he did not like to run the revolution like you would run a big military organization here. What is it they say about the Navy? It's designed by geniuses to be run by idiots, and that's exactly the way he thought a big organization, he did not design his organization to be run by idiots. T. E. Lawrence has a good quote on this. He says that nine-tenths of all tactics can be taught in school but that the irrational tenth, like the kingfisher darting across the pool, that's the measure of the general. That's the measure of victory and loss. It was the irrational tenth that Lenin seemed to have. But all this time, while this whole process was going on, and as he gained strength, he sat back kind of like an authoritarian father. He was never harsh. That was his image among the underground.

Some of the historic points, I'll zap through them. 1903 after having gone over to Europe. I'm backing off now. Bolsheviks mean majority, the menshoviks mean minority at the second party congress in 1903. I think they started out in Brussels and the cops were coming and they had to go to London and reconvene. He won a minor victory there but he fell back. What he was really trying to do was to keep control of the underground newspaper, ^KIscra, which I think he controlled for most of the ten years of that century. He developed a second girlfriend in 1909, a Parisian, ^{sp?}Anessa Armond. He was on and off with her as well as his wife until she died of cholera

in 1920 we are told. He was in Switzerland and shocked when the war started. He thought, really naively (I'm sure he had many naive thoughts, I'm afraid I've painted him too tall), he thought surely the socialists would revolt and not get involved in this little skirmish that started down there in Sarajavo. But sure enough, they went along with their countries and that kind of rattled his cage. Ultimately, some bright German organizer realized that they had a time bomb there and if they could aim him in the right direction it was a good weapon and they sent him in a sealed train at the crucial moment at the time of the revolt in Russia in 1917. He was not well known. He was sneaked in. But that was the end of the war on the eastern front for Germany, because it took him about six months to take over that country and get them out of the war. Not to help Germany, but they knew what his value system was. They also sent some money, I'm told. His idea, although he wanted to control things, was to never play with uprisings and once it started going, when it occurs, you've got to go on the offensive. He started off with his April thesis. He was already cutting himself out with the menshoviks. The menshoviks as you know were led by Korenski. ^M Korenski is kind of like a socialist, later directed the Hoover Library. Was director while I was there and I heard him talk in history class. Now dead. Bald headed, stoop shouldered, bone handled cane, very aristocratic old Russia. After this, as an aside, Karenski, once Lenin had disposed of him, fled with an American

flag we're told. Got to Paris. Lived there most of the '20's and '30's and finally (of course he was very anti-Bolshevik although he had overthrown the Czar and was actually the power in the country there for about six months) in his old days in Palo Alto, California he would signal in the Hoover Library to this French scholar that I sat next to, Pinot. I one time asked the guy, what does the old man want with you all the time? He said, he likes to speak French, he doesn't like English. I said, what do you talk about? (He was 90 years old, I guess.) He said, women, mostly.

Anyway, it was Lenin who put down ^{Korenki} Korenski because he knew one big thing as I am told Isiah Berlin calls a man who calls a hedgehog. He knew one thing for sure: that the Russian masses wanted what neither reformers nor liberals could supply, nor Korenski. That was bread, peace and land. He got very practical. They were still shouting, "All power to the Soviets" and these dramatic things, but he knew where the winning buttons were and came in at the right time. Of course he died a few ^{years} later. I don't want to go through all of that history. I used to see his visage on a prison window. It was in an upstairs room and it was a place where later in '70 we were exercised. It was a very famous shot of Lenin and it would glower down at this prison court. I was in very bad shape one time, hands cuffed behind me and going through hell over all one fall. I remember it was

October '67, I can remember that loudspeaker at night playing the anthems to the 50th anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution. Of course, he actually took to the field in November. So we know all of those stories I guess. We know how hooked people get on it. I told you the Palo Alto story about the Yugoslav communist who came to talk to a seminar I was in and later went out and had a drink with him. His host for the night, a good friend of mine, Alex Gusinich who was not a communist, an anthropologist professor there. Alex told me, don't bug this guy. He has had all sorts of trouble with the party. His wife's been killed, their son's been killed, but he's still very dogmatic and very much a believer. He was a professor at Oxford, Dedier, looked like a truck driver. Everything he said was always the dialectic. You know, what is the major contradiction. If you asked him what he was going to do tonight he would explain it in terms of a dialectic process and a contradiction. He was really kind of spooky. He looked at me, I was in civilian clothes about your age (some of you), and he said, "What do you teach." I said, "I don't teach. I'm a naval officer and I'm going to school here. I'm a friend of Alex." He said, "Well, let me give you some advice. Stay in the Navy. The happiest days of my life I was a colonel in the army in World War II." And he said there's a hard core of veterans there. Strange advice from a communist.

Well, so much for the push rod system designed by these, one the philosopher and one the practitioner. They describe a world without God and without purpose and next Wednesday we'll talk about a completely different viewpoint. A viewpoint of the scientist, the modern scientist. Not all of them, but some of them, including Monod who is so close to those molecules that he sees not only a world without God but a world without purpose.

LECTURE 9

I just greeted our guest, Woody Hayes, who just arrived I'm told by "noon balloon" from wherever. John met him and we met just now in here. I'll say this for everybody, we have several auditors. The "Foundations of Moral Obligation" course was not one of the sort where you take a bunch of middle of the road admirable characters and try to emulate each one or make up your mind how you make a composite of the best qualities of all of these people. In other words, it's not a, to use kind of a scurrilous quote, a pabulum for the cultured audience that somebody used for a very famous preacher who gives talks of the uplifting type. In other words, our job, if you will recall, is to look at people who work on the periphery of the mind sets. We take far out rationalists, far out empiricists, far out materialists, far out idealists, logicians, metaphysicians, some who will necessarily bridge the gap, Aristotle, Kant, but middle isn't necessarily good here. In fact, it's not up to me to say what your idea of good is. We've just been through the ethics of the individual, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Dostoevsky, and last week the ethics of the collective, Marx and Lenin. We seek no compromise. I'm not trying to make an accommodation for all these things. You define yourself, to make your own character, if I may say so, although the people we talk about today would doubt that you could. That was Aristotle's position, that was Sartre's

position. But what I'm saying is that I hope here we're getting to know the epistemological map, the metaphysical map of the past, the scientific map, if you are to make any reasonable choices and really be conscious of the true flexibility of style and approach to problems that are available to you from the past. You've got to know the territory, as the man in "The Music Man" said.

That is what I'm trying to do is to cover another niche of territory today with this scientific week, which may seem an odd insertion into a course in moral philosophy. All of these one-sided people, most all of them, thought that their system, whatever it was, and there are probably a dozen entirely different viewpoints, but each (each of these people were famous in the historic sense) thought that his system fully explained the universe. I would say also that we should bear in mind that each eliminates at least a part of the truth. It was a crowd and is a crowd of smart people. It's hard to put a handle on the ancient Greeks, except to take note of the fact that they set the pace. Ralph Waldo Emerson entered Harvard at 14, John Stuart Mill's IQ is incalculable with all his special tutoring and linguistic abilities at the pre-housebreaking age.

Descartes is another smart boy we're going to sort of open today's discussion of a form of materialism with. He was a mathematician, a skeptic. He put together algebra and

geometry at the age of 19 and invented analytic geometry, which I'm sure all of you have studied, and the cartesian coordinates that we use are named after him. But that was a sideline, and one as I say that he dabbled in in his teens. He is known as the father of modern materialism. Backing off to place him in time, he's about 1620 when he's doing his writing, about the time the Pilgrims landed here in New England. From him comes the basic idea of materialism. That reality is stuff, material and motion. As opposed to the opposite number, the idealist's mind and motion. Plato comes to mind as an idealist who lasted really without challenge for a thousand years. The ideas of the forms, mental concepts, are reality and that we are seeing mere imperfect reproductions of the true thing. Before Plato, the pre-Socratic Greeks had much in common with the materialistic determinists I will discuss today. In fact, Democritus used the term when asked for a plan of the universe, this is a pre-Socratic Greek, that he said it was simply a matter of chance and necessity. He saw no plan. It was one thing after another. They were preoccupied with building objects, studying things as they were. You recognize the words "chance and necessity". One of our authors today, a modern molecular biologist Jacques Monod named his book after those remarks, and he of course saw nothing in the universe but genetic chance and environmental necessity.

Last week we were on another form of the materialist, the Marxist who as Joe explained at the end, developed a philosophy

of dialectic materialism from the sort of odd combination of Hegel's dialectic method. Hegel being the epitome of the modern idealist, where spirit was reality. But they used his dialectic method and coupled that, this is kind of a hokey philosophy of Engels, with the reality of the physical, lumping even mind and thought into a special kind of energy, to use this dialectical materialism that they have insistently applied to all of their scientific, literary, as well as political, concepts. It's a dynamic, somewhat useful tool, that is as Joe said, falling out of use for practical reasons in the higher sciences of the modern age because it doesn't make sense. I'm talking about Soviet scientists. So, if you would consider Marx-Leninism as an economic determinism, today we talk about two other forms of scientific determinism. Environmental determinists I would call them, which you can also label Marxist, but generally of the disciplines we know, the tunnel visioned anthropologists and the tunnel visioned sociologists. And of course, the biological determinists, the geneticists, who have a very important, powerful story that has crept into the literature since I left college and one that I find very interesting and I think should be covered here.

Both these we talk about today are modern materialist concepts. The roots I said to Descartes, the skeptic. He was one of those who was still trying to start a master philosophy that would explain the universe once and for all. He was very basic, as most of them had to be, as he started. He

based, first of all the necessity to prove his own existence. That sounds kind of dumb, but he said, "I think, therefore I am." Cogito ergo sum, in Latin. Then the next procedure, bland it would appear, but he proved the existence of God as follows: I have an idea of perfection, God is perfection, I cannot have an idea of perfection without its existence. That goes under the title of the ontological proof of the existence of God, which still is the standard proof and one that is very hard to refute. Then having proved the existence of God, the existence of himself, he then had to tackle universe. Again the line is simple, but I'm sure not casually thought out. I exist, God exists, He would not fool me being a just God, thus I am not dreaming (and that was what he was really worried about, could he be possibly dreaming). No, the world exists, so he made kind of the self, the world, and God in three piles, if you will. Or the bifurcated world of mind and matter with God off to the side as kind of an overseer referee. By doing this it became possible to describe this world without reference to God or self. In one of my articles, I think you read, I jokingly referred to this bifurcation of mind and body, that I could remember in prison, and how I one time was coaxed into fasting myself so as to make myself so weak that I would be unattractive to the Vietnamese. Although the guy next door was able to do it to a point that he could pass out almost at will and was at will inviolate, and very effective that way because he could not be had in an extortion, I had the wrong metabolism or

something and I couldn't pass out. I would get in there and do pushups and I hadn't eaten for finally ten days, but I was getting so depressed that I was about ready to look for a Vietnamese and spill my guts just so I would have a friend. I said then, as I do now, that I wish he had been true sometimes, that there is no connection between our minds and bodies. If we could have the self-discipline and I think the lack of physical links between them, it would often be useful. I think that varies a lot with the individual as I just said, but when you tinker with one there is an effect on the other by my experience.

That was hardly the type of thing he was talking about specifically. He was, of course, thinking of a cosmology, a much more grand categorization, but it would be an application of his idea.

Newton was very influential as a man who did apply, I don't know whether he consciously said, "Now Descartes said that I can think of the world alone", but at any rate he generated a whole science of physics and Newtonian laws of motion that were really independent of people. Minds, selfs, had nothing to do with $F=MA$. We've already noticed that although that seems self-evident on the surface, that there were weaknesses in that which Immanuel Kant picked up and realized that David Hume would never buy such a proposition as $F=MA$ as a matter of fact. He would use it as a matter of utility, but it was offensive that you could make such a

prediction of the happenings of the universe and say that it was good for all sizes of particles and for all speeds. Of course it turned out not to be. Again, possibly you can score that as a partial refutation of Descartes if you want. Descartes was quite preoccupied with this world, this mechanical world. He talked of mechanical dolls which he called automata. He warned that if these things were constructed they would be very similar to man except they would have a language inflexibility and the output of the doll would be limited to the input which we of course associate with computers. Some people with brains, not Immanuel Kant. He says a brain does more than that, and I agree with him.

I make a joke here, if it is one. I was told the same thing under a Top Secret clearance at the Naval Research Lab last fall when I went in there and they showed me this thing and said it's called artificial intelligence. Same two things have to be remembered, and that's Top Secret, language inflexibility and limited use.

They called his mind/body dualism the ghost in the machine. Historically this was followed by even more naive French 18th century materialists who were setting about, at one point, composing poetry with machines. These faddish reliances on physical and mechanical materialism of the 18th century had an outgrowth in the 19th, biological materialism. I'm talking about the intellectual thought, you understand that. The man on the street is not going to have any more knowledge of these trends than you might imagine, but these are the

waves that are going between the best minds on the continent. Of course, biological materialism is thought of first of all as a product of Charles Darwin. Darwin was not a philosopher. He didn't claim to philosophize about these things, at least not in his first book; to some extent in his second. He was a naturalist. It was T. H. Huxley who took up Darwin's book and made a philosophy out of it and he carried it on to where everything was preordained in nature as a result of this natural selection. He made one remark that souls were not really anything important, if anything an epiphenomenon, an accessory.

The idea of Darwinism, and I hope nobody is offended as sometimes people are, if you don't believe it's a fact I'm not going to say it is but I think there's a preponderance of literature that assumes that it is. The ideas are of course quite complicated and not simply stated and some of them are more controversial than others, but the idea of Darwin's and we'll all start on the same footing; is that a species survives by adaptation. You remember he went around to these islands and he just collected this stuff and did a lot of thinking. A species, to remind you, is the name we give to an animal or bird or whatever, two of which mate and produce a fertile offspring - that's a species. Not a species would be a horse and a jackass. They would mate and produce a mule that is not fertile. Species survive by adaptation. This is made possible by casualties. Casualties to the genetic process.

I'm going to go ahead now and talk about DNA molecules a little bit. Darwin didn't talk about them, but I've done more reading about this than I should have I think. I've spent too much time on it. I've never found a modern molecular geneticist that challenges Darwin. They go farther than he did, but usually they say people didn't realize the power of what he was saying for years. So everything they're finding seems to generally support him. So I'll just throw it all in one pile and say that in the rope ladder of the nucleotides, these are the building blocks of this little DNA molecule, that is the genetic molecule, there are frequent casualties. I'm told in a book by Sagan that describes this very well that there is a physical process to repair these casualties in this rope ladder, cracks, breaks, however you would describe such a tiny thing. But that they never all get fixed and thank goodness they don't or we could not be flexible as a species. We could not adapt to new conditions. Now each person is born into this world with a hard wired genetic program as part of them. This is a very complete program, according again to Sagan. Sagan is an astronomer, he is also a geneticist, he's at Cornell University, he works with the NASA people, he has been asked to come here and talk. He is very highly regarded. He writes very clearly, even for a person like myself who has no background in this. The building blocks, there are four kinds of nucleotides and they're kind of like making up a coded message with only four letters. You can all understand that

from a cryptology viewpoint, different combinations, binomial and so forth.

This set of instructions that the new child arrives with has five billion pairs of these nucleotides which is a heck of a lot of information. There's all sorts of these analogies but I won't bore you with them. He said that if you typed up a complete list of all the characteristics this child was born with, you know hard wired, eye color, handedness, you name it, and a bunch of other things, if you typed them on normal sheets of paper, single spaced, 500 pages to a book, 4,000 books would be required to describe this child. So a lot of casualties in there are not too surprising. These casualties cause differences between it and its parents. It makes it unique. So we have a bunch of unique, but similar, products of this species that get immersed in the environment and they either survive or fail to survive. What happens follows this individual by generations. Certain types of codes do better than others. To give you an idea of the sophistication, and I don't have any problem with this vis-a-vis religion, the highest science we've got on the street now is the Viking Lander which was built and they put a genetic programmer in that. They probably spent billions of dollars and put everything in it and to give you an idea, that had the genetic program of a bacteria. I mean it was a piddling thing. I say I have no problem with it because it is possible to look at this two ways. I'm not trying to make you believe it, I just think it's on the shelf and it comes in clear to me. We'll take

an example. This is a simple example of the way this idea of Darwin's works.

There was a history of an English moth, a maeledon moth that was white. It used to live on white birch bark. Then it suffered a genetic casualty and they started coming in, the parents would live and if they had children they would come in with gray colors and they were really taking a beating on the trees. The birds were really eating them up. They were of course about to recess when the industrial revolution coated everything gray and these are the only surviving members of the species now. Chance and necessity, the moth didn't try to survive. But this is the way these people would see, you can explain that in many ways. And one of the ways to explain it is that that is a magnificent plan of God. That is just as valid as what Monod would say, he would say, no, it's chance and necessity that the casualty took place.

Man's brain. All right, here's another one, simple one. Man's brain it is pretty well decided underwent, again if you believe most of the literature, a great spurt of growth sometime back, thousands of years back, when he was learning to walk on his feet, learning to grunt, whatever. His brain really started to grow fast and this was accommodated again by one of these genetic accommodations. The fall out there was that only women who had big pelvic cages lived through child birth because these heads were getting big and so the size and shape of women mutated to where the only ones you

saw around were ones that were daughters of people who had these big pelvic cages. Now if the brains had gotten any bigger, they couldn't have walked. This took hundreds of generations. The human is the only animal we know of whose cranium is not closed and that same process probably isn't complete. You know the baby's got the hole in the head and the most birth pain is in the human race. Most animals don't have much. You see again, accommodating a change, a mutation, a growing brain in that case, which had some other utility.

You really get caught up in this after awhile and you can see how the fellow would sit there and his whole life's tied up in it and pretty soon you say, that's the whole story. If you understand that, and really understand it, everything else follows. That's a nice, simplistic idea. One of the best ways to understand this I think was in that book that we talked about today, and maybe you've read, Komongo, a story out of print by a fellow named Homer Smith, a biologist. Most of the guys, Joe tells me, that write about this spark of life, where does life leave off and what is life and what is soul and what is spirit, are usually biologists, because they're just so close to it there that they just can't lay off it. Homer was one. You remember the story, and it's a very nice story. We had to get that book reprinted at a more than it's worth price to give those to you, you know, for the copyright laws. The physiologist and the Anglican priest are coming back from a trip in Africa through the Red Sea. If any of you have

been through there as I have, you can really smell the humid night and follow them from port to port as they inch their way along in these terribly hot nights where people are having heart attacks and everything else. This long conversation goes on. The physiologist reluctantly finally complies with the priest who had been a missionary, he reluctantly complies with his request to tell him what he was doing in Africa. He had been down there getting some specimens of a lung fish. More questions. The lung fish it turns out was the hero of the planet 4,000 years ago. It was supposedly the first, and I think there's some truth in this, I would imagine there is, it was thought to be the first thing that slithered out of the water. I don't know about that 4,000 years, that sounds awfully short. Slithered out of the water as a fish and was kind of a half-fish, half-alligator, and it grew lungs as well as gills. It got creatures out of the sea and it was a prototype land animal. But what legs it had had gone away and now it was a very rare thing, the name of it was komongo. There is a biological name but that is what those natives in that one part of Africa called it and that's how he located it. These things have a very peculiar existence because they are very unwieldy, they're barely hanging on as a species. They bury themselves in the mud and they can lie in that mud for five years without drinking or eating and the only reason that they're there is that they are betting on the come that the tide will rise and wash them out within five years before they die. After which

they gulp whatever they live on and then they go back into the sand. Naturally, they're a rarity. Half alligator, half fish. They somehow by a regressive evolution as this guy continues to tell the priest upon query, have lost their legs and are at an evolutionary dead end. You can go up and you can go down on this system. Then he went on to say that whales have had legs and they had lost them and birds had hands, both of them were better than what they have now as far as utility went. The hippopotami and the gorillas are getting too big, they're getting too specialized, and in his study of this field said that the specialized species die and that life is an accident. He goes on and on and you can imagine the dialogue. Life has no purpose is kind of the bottom line. Humans are accidents, some kind of a carbon deposit was the only reason we showed up. And life does not have a purpose and that we are, as is often said by these people, just an eddy in the second law of thermal dynamics. You see the fact that has caused a lot of people problems because humans seem to get warmer and at least they grow and the earth is running down, that is what the second law of thermal dynamics tells us. So this priest is disillusioned and this makes for a nice book. How do you accommodate all this and is there such a thing as evolutionary dead ends? Specifically the guy evidenced the fear that he thought man was in an evolutionary dead end. That he was regressing. That's sort of where he left it.

Well, what has all this to do with ethics? Because some people say that is the whole story. If you believe what I

just told you, there is no reason to study moral philosophy. It's all programmed. You've got your set of instructions. There are 4,000 volumes and what you're going to do in a crisis situation is in the program. E. O. Wilson, a Harvard prof, wrote many books. I've just finished one of his new ones. He practices what is known as sociobiology. He thinks like Hume, not like Kant. He thinks the mind processes bits and he thinks that mankind works by genetic chance and environmental necessity, just like Monod before him and just like Democritus several thousand years before him. That more or less comes down that the species, the human species, has no particular purpose and if we have a goal it ought to be devoted to some such worthy end as creating a "stable ecosystem with well nourished population". That is almost like Dostoevsky's words that he put in the mouth of the Grand Inquisitor, the old Cardinal of a couple of weeks ago, where it is man's nature, he told Christ, to want to live in one benevolent anthep. I can see a similarity there although there is no connection between Marxists and sociobiologists. They usually are mutually contemptuous of one another. But at any rate, any kind of materialism and any kind of determinism is really a let down if you have any ambition, spark or artistic talent or any of the rest of the good things that life provides. They would say that morality is simply instinct. If you asked an environmentalist determinist why do we have a taboo against incest in the society? They would run off a bunch of answers like it preserves family integrity, the economic value of sisters

and daughters has been preserved in the past, so forth and so on, all of these ideas that have to do with why. The biologist might have a better, they say that's bunk. It's scientifically proven that incest produces a high proportion of defective offspring and it's a regressive evolution and that, I quote, "The biological hypothesis states that individuals with a genetic predisposition for bond exclusion (that is normal associations between brothers and sisters and parents and so forth) and incest avoidance, contribute more genes to the next generation." And thus, it's doomed to its own disaster just because that's the way nature works. There are a lot of imbeciles and dwarfs and everything as a result, enough that it's genetically significant over say a 100 generation span.

I'm not saying take your choice between those because I think there are still other choices, which is more or less the point of this lecture. But I want to go ahead with some of these biologists and talk about Monod, whose book we assigned. He has positive things to say about his position whereas the physiologist in Komongo was gentle with the priest and tried to break this news to him very gently. He knew it was offensive. Monod is adamant. He says that there is no plan, there is no purpose, there are no natural rights, no natural law, no law of the universe, no meaning, and he insists that this be so. That Marx is just as wrong as religiousness, that it's sheer animism. That virtue (and this is back to the old times too) virtue is knowlege, virtue is commitment to scientific objectivity. The objectivity of truth, laboratory sterility.

Dedication to scientific method is ethical commitment in itself, he said. So he said, no, I'm not a worthless guy, I've got a commitment, I've got a strong commitment, I've got a commitment that breaks down, if you cancel out the inner me, a commitment to meaninglessness. Which is kind of a contradiction in terms, amusing sometimes to professional philosophers. A professional philosopher Joe will talk about more, I would certainly introduce I think a safe name, Whitehead, the great Harvardian philosopher, mathematician and scholar, the man who may have a bias toward idealism. At least he said that all of Western philosophy was but footnotes to Plato who was the prototype I think of idealists. Whitehead said, not to this man who didn't live when he did, but he made the remark that scientists animated by the purpose of proving that they are purposeless constitute an interesting subject for study. It's the old logical thing about how can you make a commitment to unintelligibility. It just doesn't have any meaning.

My purpose is not to destroy sociobiologists. They have reached some very interesting conclusions. These are bright fellows who have useful information to give the world. They have of course extensive experiments and show not only they can predict the inheritance of eye color, of handedness, a lot of things you would think of being genetic and a lot of things you wouldn't. Criminal behavior, they claim to have some data that indicates trends there. Propensity for rage, for egomania, there are some racial split outs in this data that are sure

to cause a lot of trouble somewhere along the line. They have a lot of data on mental ability, numberability, word fluency, memory, this language learning rate, of course. There's another one of these guys, who I hope I never have to see, this Noam Chomsky always comes up. He was a guy that was over in North Vietnam about half the time that I was there only he was living in the hotel talking to Ho Chi Minh. He does apparently do some good work, he's up at MIT, on this business of language in children. He claims that there is no way a child, a human baby, can learn language as fast as he does from a memory circuit viewpoint, he just learns it quicker. He has to have been born with a facility for sentence construction and linguistic ability. That's the core of this. That being so, that's genetic information. Even there of course there's variations in the rate at which they learn languages, their own and second, third and fourth languages. All of this is in the book somewhere. I'm not saying this is bum dope. Also there's data on inherited, they can give you probably statistical information on manic-depressive personalities, schizophrenia is apparently inherited. These books are very convincing, so I'm not going to say it's all bunk. Nor is it my purpose to destroy the anthropologists and sociologists. Because certainly we are affected by our environment. But are we totally dominated by either? Of course my answer to that is no. These are things to get off the check off list I think as you walk through kind of a reassessment of what motivates you in terms of your character

and morality and so forth and I would be very disappointed if anybody here fell hook, line and sinker for either of those. Because it's more complicated than that. It's interesting that these two disciplines, the biologist and sociologist, when I say them I'm talking about the prototype, the archetype, the guy who doesn't believe anything else exists but his discipline, they are at each other's throat over certain differences between the two of them. For instance, by studying the aborigines that are still around the world and another big source of information are identical and fraternal twins. Identical twins I found out have identical genetic programs. Of course that's very useful, they can bang them off against other effects. Various categories of mental retards and they have a whole lot of different categories. Some function one way and others another, and they can relate that back. So these are the kind of raw materials that these guys work with. Both disciplines, the sociologists and the biologists, feel that most of our genetic makeup, our inherited makeup, was formed in the hunter-gatherer existence of man, say 20,000 years ago. So what we've done since then has been very, very small in this sense. I mean how your mind works. Whether we're still mutating or not is a source of question. Most think that human nature, and we'll call that what we've mutated to this human nature, mutation could have happened in less than a 100 generations. In other words, nobody thinks that we're any different than Julius Caesar. They're not talking that short a time frame.

But are we still in the process? The social scientists, particularly those of a leftist trait, I mean by that leftist meaning manipulative environmentalists, people that think that all they've got to do to make everybody happy is to give them nice surroundings, they'd like to freeze us back there 20,000 years ago. It eliminates a variable and they can say now here's what's happened over the last 20,000 years, as the bedrooms have gotten warmer, the people have gotten happier or something like that. On the other side, and this is a true story. I got into an argument some of the biologists, some of the hard scientists guys, if I understood him right. I was coming out of a meeting in San Diego one night at a banquet which we both attended and I just heard a partial talk, we all gave little talks, by Jonas Salk who's right down the street there in La Jolla. He was talking about the great things that are happening in the world and how through medicine health is getting better. No dispute. Pretty soon, the more he talked, he had us getting smarter. I said later, I hope I misunderstood you, you don't think that my mind is any better than that of Julius Caesar do you, in terms of anything I can do creatively with it. I had the idea he thought I could, but we were both a little bit drunk so I'm not sure. So it's not either/or between materialistic determination nor either/or between materialism and idealism. You don't have to be a Hegelian to believe that the only reality is spirit to disagree with

deterministic biology or environment. It's really a question of materialism and common sense and there's, I think, a healthy meld.

Now lots of the findings I've talked about, which are so impressive, are really as I talk to some of my profs here, rather trivial. Learning rates, whether you're right or left handed, but they're really not human character. Any way I'd like to make the general statement that it's probably proof of your self-discipline. Determinism breeds a cop out situation. Did I say here the other day I was almost on the air, I'm glad I didn't but I believe it, that I thought that brainwashing could not exist. For one reason, I know pain, I know persuasion, I know loneliness and so forth, but no big whammy can be put on you. I just believe that physically, but I also believe that you can't let that, if you suddenly let yourself believe it, you will probably go to pot. The same with anything else. If you believe your genetic program, what the hell, just move along and wait for the program to be played out. The same with the environment. I think basically, the deterministic viewpoints as appealing and as simple as they are, are habit forming and probably not right. Because I've got a lot of evidence and I want to ^{talk} about some people that would not for a million years go along 100% with either one of them. I don't think we're necessarily closing in on some final explanation of the human predicament. I think we might even be losing ground on that.

What about Aristotle and Sartre? Do we or do we not build our own characters on this world? I don't think either one of those guys is dumb. I certainly don't think Aristotle is a second-rate mind. Joe tells me that materialism is appealing, I'm sure he didn't mean this in anyway but correctly, but the philosophy of materialists is dominated by amateurs today. He'll talk more about that. Brilliant, productive, useful amateurs. Monod. Their scientific determinism is neat and sounds simple and reasonable, but that's not a test of goodness, reasonability or practicality. Remember the Underground Man? And I think, again, we find most of our wisdom in the novels sometimes. "Reason is a marvelous thing but it's only reason and only applies to the rational side of man." What about will, or you might say free choice? Will includes not only reason but it and all the impulses, and the impulses are every bit as much of life as reason. I think you will find lots of genetic and environmental scattered data that talks about how people perform under pressure. I know how they perform in the classroom. How they perform under pressure, how they'll perform while suffering. There it is probably the will, the soul that dominates and I don't think they'll disappear. I don't think they're ruled out by some of these findings. Erik Fromme, Man's Search for Meaning, a psychiatrist, takes violent exception to being forced to take sides either genetically or environmentally. He says man is not a puppet. And he says, there is one thing that no matter how tough the circumstances get, you

always have one option and that is your attitude of what is going on. Of course, he was a prisoner in the German prison camps during World War II. There are tough men who are able to exert themselves under pressure as a matter of willpower, as a matter of finding their souls, all of that.

Two very big in the news right now. I want to read you some quotes from a couple of them. They're sitting on the biggest news story, or it's been worked out, in the world and they're two tough guys. Anwar Sadat was in a British prison '42 to '44 when he escaped, again as a terrorist in a British ^{PRISON} from '46 to '49. He says, "Suffering crystallizes the soul's intrinsic strength. This became quite clear to me through suffering and pain in Cell 54. It is through suffering that a man of mettle can come into his own and fathom his own depths. Through that feeling which came to be an invisible part of my very being and which, though unconsciously, remained with me all my life, I was able to transcend the confines of time and space. Spatially I did not live in a four-walled cell but an entire universe. Inside Cell 54 as my material needs grew increasingly less, the ties which had bound me to the material world began to be severed. One after another my soul having jettisoned its earthly freight was free and so took off like a bird, soaring into space, into the furthest regions of the existence, into infinity. So long as man is enslaved by material needs waiting to be or possess one thing or another, nothing will ever belong to him. He will always belong to

things. A slave to things does not exist as a human being. Only when he has ceased to need things can a man truly be his own master and exist truly." A book he wrote a long time ago, In Search of Identity. Anwar Sadat.

To give equal time to another old prisoner who's undergoing the same trials, Menachem Begin also wrote a book. Also went to prison. He was in Poland when World War II started and spent two years in Siberia in a Soviet prison camp, '40 to '42. The same thing about transcending his material existence. He was told stare at a wall as kind of punishment, knees against the wall. "That one single point on the wall can take you out of the detention room and carry you beyond its narrow confines. Away from the building of horrors and the lost world of the N.K.V.D. To the world of the living into the world which has and will be again. As you sit and stare a miracle occurs. By means of self-command, that magic creation of the human soul, the one reality departs and another comes in its place. The reality imposed upon you disappears entirely and the reality for which your soul yearns and upon which even the N.K.V.D. cannot impose its will appears in all its splendor. What I have written is not mere theory. I am not dabbling in mysticism. I have told the truth of not only what happened around me but within me during the 60 hours when I sat facing that wall. That is how the time went by." Page 36 of White Nights by Menachem Begin. Quite a coincidence. Those two tough guys who I am sure are neither about to bow to their genes or to their environment, but to depend on their will and that's why they're running their part of the world.

I could tell more personal stories about transcending. In my case some of the things that I had to do exert what would be to me now, impossible self-disciplines of the mind. When I would be in tight circumstances. It was in those situations that I could have lost my cool. I could have really become an idiot, a screaming idiot. You know after awhile that that's not going to get you out of it either. I remember one time being put into a big pile of dust as I was going to have to go back into that torture room, and this was a little tiny short cell. I'd never been in it before and as far as I know I was the first guy in there, we called it Calcutta. Hot, summer, September. The door opened after I was there and I was in regular irons and he came in with these heavy, squeeze irons that were really meant to put pressure on my bones. You can grit your teeth for the first hour but that means your legs are going to be swelled and they're going to be bloody by morning. But just to be able somehow to transcend and get your head out of the box and think about something else, think about your friends over in that other prison, and you just somehow find yourself, you can escape by willpower, escape mentally. Another time I can remember being blindfolded for a month with a bad leg I couldn't get up on and handcuffs behind. Maybe you think I wasn't about to blow my mind then. But I found an out. I had a certain ritual and I could get my mind out of that blindfold. So I'll verify the general idea

of transcending material restraints. That certainly is not either the environmental or genetic book. It reminds me of that oft-quoted passage I have of St. Paul to the Romans: "We rejoice in suffering, knowing that suffering brings endurance, endurance brings character, and character brings hope." That of course sounds almost like the stoics. Another form of materialism that we'll talk about next week. But a materialism with God and with purpose and I think a darn good philosophy for soldiers.

In summary, we study one-sided views here with the idea of getting some of the wisdom they have to give us. For after all it's men who hold these one-sided views, often fiercely and intensely, that makes the world go around. But I don't believe that personal affection and aesthetic enjoyment are just an excitation of the hypothymus, that's what E. O. Wilson now of Harvard would have you believe. Hypothymus is some part of the fore brain. I think it's somewhere else. I don't believe that as T. H. Huxley would have me believe, that the soul is just an epiphenomenon. Arthur Rubenstein, the old pianist, I heard him play one night and he gave a little talk, kind of a philosophic guy. He was talking about art and the soul and his part in it. He said he looked into foreign languages and every one of them had a word for soul, including some of the primitive languages. Today Albert Einstein is a hundred years old and he had time for both materialism and idealism. He

would not have been very popular with the hard scientists in one sense. He had an intuitive mind and that's usually the way with scientists. Imagination is more important than knowledge says Einstein. And so say many of the great scientists. He intuited, I read, the idea of relativity over a long period of time. He knew that that was the only way it could work. He could perceive enough discontinuities in nature, that's a definition of genius I'm told, to realize that there had to be an explanation and he had it figured. But the problem was not figuring it out, it was conducting an experiment that would prove to the rest of the community that he was right. By luck he had some very key experiments that were just ready to blossom at the time he was ready to prove it. Somewhere I've lost in my files those experiments exactly, but Joe and I think one of them was an eclipse of the sun that gave him an opportunity to see light bending and the Nicholson-Morley experiments conducted by our only famous scientific naval officer, I guess, I think, was another. Unlike Monod, Einstein who was not really a theological guy, it was hard to put your finger on him, but he did say God does not play dice with the world, he would not have thought it was all chance and necessity. Joe tells me in Princeton there's a little subtitle in German under his picture quoting him saying, "God is subtle, but not malicious." Frau Borne, one of his associates, once asked him if he thought it was true that you could express everything

scientifically. He said, of course, but it would make no sense. How would you like to hear me describe a Beethoven symphony in terms of variations of wave pressure.

I'm going to leave on the musical note here. Joe is going to pick us up here as soon as we have a cup of coffee. The piano fills in nicely. He's going to talk about a professional philosopher, Wittgenstein. Wittgenstein was a very wealthy man from a very wealthy family whose brother lost his right arm in the first World War. He was a musician. He had enough money and influence that he could still hire composers to compose music for him, using only the left hand. Last summer here in Newport at a music festival in one of the performances out on Bellevue Avenue, an artist with two good hands played this certain number for Wittgenstein with the left hand. It was very interesting and sounded every bit as good as the real thing. Wittgenstein has another connection with Newport. He once told his associate Malcolm that he would like to come to America, in answer to a question. He said that if he did come to America the person he would most like to meet was Betty Hutton. Well, Betty Hutton, I found out when you guys came is the hostess out here at the jai alai fronton. So we're pretty close to him already.

LECTURE 10

pages out
y
order

Second time through on Lecture 10 on the second go on this moral philosophy course which, as we said, and I looked at our Course Summary blue book that Joe wrote and it defined moral philosophy as "inquiry into what ends are good and what actions are right." I thought this morning, having come from the Pentagon yesterday, that one of the things - I'll tell you a little bit more about that. It wasn't a disastrous trip but it's a reminder of how tunnel visioned people get to be back in the format of the systematized decision making process. I think if nothing else here, it helps me and hopefully you to get your head out of the box, as we say as some of you know in the survival school camp. For those of you who are not familiar with it, maybe I've described it for this group before. Those who are not aircrewmembers in the Navy, you may not realize that one of the things we do is (I think the Air Force too) take two weeks, or a week depending on the time, in a simulated prisoner of war environment and an outdoor survival environment. There are phases where you take long hikes, you navigate by the landmarks and then you eventually wind up in a prison compound (simulated). Usually after you've been captured in an evasion course. One of the best drills there, I say from experience and others I think would say, is what they call the "black box". The black box

used to be up in Warner Springs. I don't know if it's still there are not. A couple of guys have died in it. There is always a lot of pressure to quit it. But the reason they died is because they panicked. You bend over and get the feeling of claustrophobia and they beat on the box. You're always put in there on some sort of charge, assumed charge. Those guards, I hope still, are able to box you around at least to the extent that you see stars, you get knocked down and so forth, but being good guards, as good torture guards do in Vietnam, they don't mark you. They know how to hit a person, scare the heck out of him and not leave him permanently damaged, hopefully. The drill is to somehow, and that's the gauge, if you panic in there you just kill yourself if you want to because you press against it, press against the box, you'll gag, you'll run short of breath. There's plenty of air in there, people have said, "There's plenty of air. Just relax, get your head out of the box. Think about something else. Don't think about yourself. See the big picture." The best usually as is practically done there, I'm making some rather rough analogies here, remember your street, where your house is and what's the number and what's it look like and who lived next door. Some thought process that you can force yourself to go through. That will take the steam out of the panic situation, because you've got air, and you're getting a lot of noise and it's black and it seems close. But that's all. This is not as easy as I make it sound. It comes up in many forms. It came up for me in Vietnam.

It came up not in a black box but in a position where I was being forced with my head down between my feet and a guy standing on my back and beating on me and everything. But I remember^{ed} that black box. I said, "Get your head out of the box, get your head out of the box." I remember I went back to the little place Alcatraz and I was going from cell to cell remembering who was there and what their song was and what their birthday was. I really beat the system that one time because I didn't panic and I was programmed to panic. But I'm not over it. I'm a scuba diver now and that's another panic situation. You can get in a heck of a lot of trouble for the same reason if you don't keep out of the box.

I'm talking about keeping your head out of the box and keeping a broad view of what's going on outside this little cloistered cell you're in, whether it be a confinement situation of whether it be a bureaucratic situation. Because I think by not keeping an eye on the epistemological map or whatever you want to call the broad spectrum of thought that we've had happen on this earth, that you are subject, if not panicking, to being stricken with tunnel vision, to being confined to the rules that are set before you. I'll talk a little bit more about that, but the framework of decision making that tends to put you into a position of being led around like a bull with a ring in his nose. Or being as Dostoevsky's man from the underground says, a piano key that as soon as he is struck he vibrates obediently at the frequency

assigned. I don't think this is becoming to a human being to get that, it discredits you I think. I'm talking about the thing you will all probably experience, the stylized decision making processes, buried assumptions in them, clouded with acronyms and buzzwords. Sometimes you feel that you are on a treadmill. That is as Herman Wouk's old book said, like the Navy you are on this treadmill that was designed by geniuses to be operated by idiots, and I think there's a lot of truth in that.

The people that design these decision making processes have varied over time. I think it was this class that I went over MacCoby's idea of the four general leadership types or domineering types that we've had in the country: the craftsmen, the jungle fighters, the organization men and as he said, the gamesmen under which we still have if not direct influence, I think indirect influence. The men of the brain, the head over the heart, men of efficiency over honor, men of manipulation versus commitment. Anything to avoid the unpleasantness of punishing somebody or disciplining somebody or looking somebody in the eye when you know he's got a problem. Yesterday it wasn't too grim a session. We were talking about the education activities of the Navy in a small group, all good friends of mine. But I felt like I was lassoed and strapped to a chair because all we were talking about was really there were certain things you didn't mention and there were certain other things that were OK to mention. This was an unstated rule. You could sit down and you had

a certain obligation to stay within certain confines if you wanted to argue the case as it was presented. If you've ever been involved in the administration of a school, the way that these are argued in Congress how big they are or how small they are and thus everybody else, they start, all this sounds logical enough, but the number of people in this War College class should probably have some connection with the number of people in the Navy you wanted to be graduates of it. Now that's a trap, because pretty soon, every time you wanted to train somebody for something, you've got to show objective - you can't ever catch up with it. It's really a murderous scheme. If you wanted to know how many aeronautical engineers you want in the Navy, then they say how many billets are coded for aeronautical engineers? Or if you wanted to know how many political scientists. You see, that's the frame of reference that kills you because we all know that your degree if it's aeronautical engineering is useful other than in billets that are coded. In my case, PG in political science they called it then, I never had a job in it. But for eight years I made more use of those two years I had in PG school than I made of anything else that's ever happened to me. Again, it misses the coding.

Well, you can lose a school that way, but a more serious thing, you can lose a country that same way. Because of this stereotyped influence of people who would set the framework

that was advantageous to them. I just was referred to a book by a man whose name is Townsend Hoops. I remember the name well because I can remember going into a prison camp and having it announced on the squawk box in this cell I was in that we had a new Under Secretary of the Air Force whose name was Townsend Hoops, another war monger. To which I secretly clapped. I was put in leg irons and two years later I was in the same leg irons and I was being read a book he had written about how he had gotten religion in the system and now how he disavowed all of the things that he had done about the war. So I don't think much of the author, but apparently he had the measure of his boss. I'll quote from this. He talked about McNamara's great skill at manipulation. "He was a master of managed decision making by holding control within the very narrow channels." He talks about when he would make trips from Washington out to the field, out to see Oley Sharp, out to see the others out there. According to his ex-Under Secretary of the Air Force, he wrote his report before he left. In other words, he was such a gamesman that he had this all channeled to where he could control within very narrow channels the context of what was being discussed and by moving fast he finessed serious debate on basic issues and thus, which apparently was his aim, saved the President from the unpleasant task of arbitrating major disputes within his official family. All of which worked very smoothly except that we found ourselves pretty soon with 500,000 troops

in a place we didn't have the guts to operate with them. What I'm saying is, one of the reasons you want to get your head out of the box and study epistemology and these other subjects, if you can imagine a couple of guys supposedly in confrontation or argument, gentlemanly I'm sure. I'm trying to show that this is the frame of reference on which they're arguing. They're not arguing about whether or not we have commitments, whether we want to commit ourselves, in the case of a war, to the misery and it's a serious business. But if it's simply a matter of some minor point, there's this fellow named Ross Milton who I had lunch with out in Colorado Springs the other day. He's a retired four star Air Force officer, he's going to be a newspaper man eventually. He's 63 years old. He talked about those days out there and talked about the limited frame of refernce on which they debated these issues. He said that McNamara always had a black notebook and he thought that was the cat's meow, he could really put everybody down with that thing. . Somebody said, "You know we're programmed to bomb certain targets up here and we're coming back with loaded airplanes that have been maybe defensive fighters or something, and they're going right over truck convoys." He said, "Why don't you let us hit those?" Well that was called armed wreckage. This was '65. Ross was Oley Sharp's deputy. He said, "OK, I'll give you 25." "25 what?" "25 airplanes a month can shoot a truck convoy." You know, numerical close control over these

haywire military men. Then it was really funny, because everything was by the numbers. Six months later he came out and they said, "We want more armed wrecking." He got out that book and said, "You didn't use all I gave you. I've got the figures right here. You only used 23 in April and 24 in..." All that was about was that you couldn't send planes individually and they would have planes go down, I mean, they just couldn't overshoot it, so that was a squadron flight line problem. But here was a Secretary of Defense arguing with two four star generals about how they arranged something on a flight line in some way back station months before. These numbers, I'm saying 25, but he said be sure and don't use those numbers because I can't remember them, but it was something like, "OK I'll give you 35."

But the frame of reference, and I think if we are really conscious of the sort of things that are being preached by the men we've been listening to, each for a different reason, some for good and some for bad, as we see it. But Emerson and Kant and Mill and certainly Lenin, and all the rest, they know better than to stand up here in spite of a guy that's rigged the slightest table against them. That's where they cut the bottoms out of the frame of reference. If you really want to - you're in a no win situation and if you've got your wits about you, you won't be trapped into that.

What I'm trying to open your minds to is the fact that if you keep your eye on the reference points, these frames

of reference, you can not only defend yourself from discrediting yourself and getting the bad habit of obediently falling into line with whatever is the basis of discussion. But more importantly, this sort of exposure to what I would call keynote thought processes and assumptions, gives you something on which to build a civilization, a legal system when it comes time to do it on your own. It came time for me to do it. It's an odd case. But there are plenty of times when you're going to be out there with your ship or airplane and something is going to happen and everything is going to fall out. You've got to have some kind of orientation, some consciousness of not only moral values, of what's available to you in terms of options as to either how to get people to comply with your wishes or how to defend the country or how to not discredit yourself or whatever.

I'm reminded of one of the better Abraham Lincoln quotes I remember. It was of course a bygone day when the communication lines were severed, but they may be again. He told his commanding generals, I've read, at one point and he was giving them this sort of a pep talk as he sent one down south, maybe Sherman to the sea I don't know, but he said, "Remember gentlemen, when you are in the field, you are the Republic." You are the Republic and everything we all stand for is in your hands. I put it in your hands and there is nobody else there and you can't get ahold of me. So bear in mind your responsibilities, moral included.

I'm trying to summarize what we've done and put a purpose on it. I say again to get our heads out of the box, to have a look at the epistemological map and realize that, as I've said, there are polar cases. We've seen polar rationalists and polar empiricists and polar materialists and polar idealists and polar logicians and polar metaphysicians. And they all had something to say and there was no school solution and nobody was to be put up as an idol but it's better to have this in the back of your mind so you can compare your circumstances to some they faced. Of course, the first week was the stories of those in prison. The best I think by Koestler, Darkness At Noon, and others. Not for the reason that anybody here is every going to be in prison, thank God hopefully and I doubt very seriously if they are, but the intense situation illuminates the need for morality in the extortion environment. Because there are usually extortion environments in prison where the jailer if he wants to manipulate you he's got to find, if he wants to scare you, probably wants to hurt you, but most of all he wants you to feel guilt. Because it's there the soul starts to deteriorate. If he can get you on the downhill slope he can put you where he wants you, put you in his pocket. As long as he can hold something over your head he's going to do it. It's not only there that happens. As I've said, we're all in an extortion environment of some subtle sort all the time. Thus a man is well advised not to do anything he is ashamed of. Another thing I think

that brings out in general, and again it's illuminated there, is the dependence of one of us upon the other. You can't go it alone. If you're going to have any form of corporate activity, you can't give yourself the opportunity to opt in and out as you individually judge the merits of the case. If it's serious enterprise, to drop out is to betray.

The Book of Job the second week; the story of undeserved suffering. How people cope with it. Camus, Solzhenitsyn, as well as the Bible. Socrates reminds us that in his view there is a central objective truth, that all is not relative and that that which is just transcends self-interest. Not that egalitarianism of ideas which seems to dominate so many of our social sciences today. Aristotle: virtue is a disposition of character, not necessarily obeying one legalistic law after another. The law is the floor. You can't accept that if you are looking for virtue. Virtue is above the law. You've got to do better than the minimum standards set by the law. Also the old common sense schoolmaster, founder of nine or ten of our current disciplines here in this school probably, talks about the fact that he doesn't buy all or nothing of excuses. Compulsion and free will can coexist. Immanuel Kant of course gave us the workings of the mind which are still very valuable. He says things in response to Hume who awoke him from his slumber about the way the mind works and its ability not just to work with bits of information as a computer would but to typify, categorize, sort, make that which comes

out of it greater than that which went into it. About the particles, smog. Remember his use to the nuclear physicists. It's easier to start to believe that that atom you draw really works like that. If you go back to Washington's time you will find that Kant was warning us about that. That it's just a logical construct and if in the process of working with small particles or fast speed you find yourself with nothing but a bunch of formulas and they don't connect with the data, that's one reason. It's a useful construct. But where we concentrate of course is that part of the mind which is pure reason, which is free of sense inputs, and that's the moral self where he had this tremendous "ought". You ought to do this because you ought. If there's any reason beyond ought, it's not virtue. To have that so, he says the moral sense does not make sense unless we posit God, freedom and immortality.

Mill, the other side of course, not to overkill that, the end result. A great spokesman of human liberty. A man who would never tolerate firemen scrambling up a ladder to prevent a suicide or making a man wear a hard hat when he rides a motorcycle unless it can be proven that he was endangering other people. That was their life, it was their head. The essence of the morality of the individual. Sartre: essence, character precedes existence for everything but man, where existence precedes character, existence precedes essence. Which is another way of saying what Aristotle said after a fashion, that you build your own character here on this earth.

I am the master of my fate, captain of my soul. Of course Dostoevsky's tales fit into that too. Then of course the Marxian side, the harmonious antheap. The tremendous tactical skill of Lenin, particularly that reassembling the assumptions beneath the argument. The scientists of last week, not only the anthropologists and sociologists, we see ^{that} the determinists, in my view, are not just useless. They have lots to say, particularly the biologists. But neither are they adequate for it all in my view. In fact, as you know, Monod makes a dogma out of a lack of dogma, but as we I think discussed Whitehead and others, you can say those are interesting people because preoccupation with a lack of dogma is a dogma in itself.

Well, putting all of that together and closing out the review, if you can't go it alone; if virtue is not always rewarded; if all is not relative and pain is no excuse for complicity; if God, freedom and immortality must be assumed; if as I think came up under Mill, liberty and equality are sworn and everlasting enemies and when one prevails the other dies; if we are in a world where men don't like to be programmed or live in harmonious antheaps, in a world where moral responsibility cannot be escaped even in the laboratory; then stoicism is not a bad thing to read. And that's what we're talking about today. Not as a climax, certainly not as an advocate. I'm not pushing any line of thought, but this was very useful to me in prison.

I know you've looked at the old boy, himself, Epictetus was born, I like this historic anchor to windward, he was born to give you an idea, 20 years after Christ was crucified. He didn't know of Christ I don't believe in his lifetime. He was born in Turkey, son of a slave, he was himself a slave, who was crippled by a brutal master. Carried the limp the rest of his life. Sold into the retinue of a man who became the secretary to the Emperor Nero in Rome, got to Rome that way. He was ultimately freed in Rome. Attended stoic lectures which were popular. Zeno's word had been around for 300 years or so. He liked the idea of stoicism, he liked its indifference to external goods. Of course he was a man of meager goods. He liked the idea of the true good being within one's self, not unlike Sartre and Aristotle. His was a world with purpose. This is not a competitor of Christianity, there are strains of stoicism and Christianity. Although he technically lived after Christ, I consider it a pre-Christian philosophy because of the communication lack. Joe has pointed out that there are roots with the Christian ideas of fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man in stoicism. Stoicism saw the world with a purpose and with God, the earth being God's body. Materialism, yes, but not a godless materialism. He became an advocate, he lectured on stoicism himself in the streets of Rome after being freed. A student army officer by the name of Arrian really wrote this Enchiridion from memory. Epictetus had been picked up on a freedom of speech charge, really, as so many people always seem to do. He was

banished back to Greece where he was in touch with Marcus Aurelius the other great author of stoic writings. He later being a Roman emperor.

These guys are tough on themselves. I'll skip around. It's not long, you've read it. "The condition and characteristic of a philosopher is that he looks to himself for all help or harm. If he is praised, he smiles to himself, at the person who praises him. If he is censured he makes no defense. He keeps watch over himself as over an enemy and one in ambush." In other words, that's the epitome of self-control. He guards himself as though he were his own enemy. But he also advocate discretion, moderation, propriety, self-discipline. Fairness after a fashion, not to gossip. "Does anyone bathe hastily? Do not say he does it ill, but hastily. Does anyone drink too much wine? Do not say that he does ill, but that he drinks a great deal." In other words, choose your words carefully. For unless you perfectly understand his motives, how should you know if he acts ill, if his motives are bad. Self-sufficiency. Total lack of this idea of sharing or interacting that's so popular now. Concern yourself with your attitude and not what other people think of you, that's my summary of the thing. There are certain things which are within our power. They are: opinion, aim, desire, aversion. In other words, whatever affairs are your own. Beyond our power are: body, property, reputation, office. In other words, whatever are not your own affairs.

He has things to say about style. "Where it is practically necessary for you to pursue or avoid anything, do even this with discretion and gentleness and moderation." Conform to nature. "When you set about any action (some of this is kind of funny) remind yourself what nature the action is. If you're going to bathe, represent it to yourself the incidents usual in the bath. Some persons pouring in, others pouring out, others pushing, others scolding, others pilfering." In other words, don't go in there and act the part. The older you are the more self-discipline you need, that's my words. They always have the analogies, allegories. Talks about your position in your organization in your life is like that of a crewman of a ship. If the boss calls you must be ready. If the captains calls, run to the ship. Leave all these things, these diversions and never look behind. But if you are old never go far from the ship lest you should be missing when called for. Pay more attention to your self-discipline as you get older, that's in kind of a different switch.

Stay off the hook. "A man's master is he who is able to confer or remove whatever that man seeks or shuns. Whoever then would be free, let him wish nothing. Let him decline nothing which depends on others. Else he must necessarily be a slave." I think this occurs to us all. Certainly in an extortion environment because there is a great glee in the eye of your executioner when somehow you've asked for something and he has given it. That puts a different psychological situation between you. This moral leverage is the

difference between winning and losing all important arguments, in prison or out.

"Remember you are an actor in the drama such as the author chooses. If short, then a short one. If long, then a long one. If it be his pleasure that you should enact a poor man or a cripple or a ruler or a private citizen, see that you act it well. For this is your business, to act well a given part. But to choose it belongs to another." Tough life.

I've got clipped in here another similar expression by Shakespeare. I had it in here because, was this class here when I went down on that Not For Women Only Program; the soliloquy of "As You Like It"? "All the world's a stage and all the men and women merely players. They have their exits and entrances and one man in his time plays seven parts. At first the infant, mewling and puking in his nurse's arms. And then the whining schoolboy with his satchel and shining morning face, creeping like a snail unwillingly to school. And then the lover, sighing like a furnace with a woeful ballad made to his mistress's eyebrow." This was the part I worked on with Lynn Redgrave: "Then a soldier full of strange oaths and bearded like a pard (that's a leopard I'm told). Jealous in honor and sudden and quick in quarrels, seeking the bubble reputation even in the cannon's mouth." And so forth. So, the thought seems to be not unique to Epictetus that one can view his life as an actor on a stage.

Some people find that offensive. I think you can overdo it, as in all these ideas. Pretty soon that's a copout. If you say I'm destined to this job, I'm a poor boy I haven't got any means of education, so forth. The basic idea of once you're in a predicament and acting the part, and it's particularly important for soldiers.

I've written it but I can't quite quote it, the free speech, the civil rights of soldiers, was debated by the founding fathers. Frank Knox had put out all of those, he was Secretary of War, rules and then the Bill of Rights was passed. Then there was some conflict and they had a debate. At that time it was decided to let Knox's rule stand. The rule entails more than normal citizenship.

"What place then, say you, shall I hold in the state?" The answer is, "Whatever you can hold with the preservation of your fidelity and honor. But if by desiring to be useful to that you lose these, how can you serve your country when you have become faithless and shameless?" He asks us to contemplate death. "Let death and exile and all other things which appear terrible be daily before your eyes. But death chiefly and you will never entertain an abject thought nor too eagerly covet anything." Not bad psychiatry.

Victor Frankl, the fellow who was in the German prison, the Jew, the psychoanalyst, Man's Search for Meaning in which he says no matter what the circumstance you always have the option over your own attitude toward the happenings.

As a psychiatrist and a man who has been through it he said in one of his books, "I consider it a dangerous misconception of mental hygiene to assume that what man needs in the first place is equilibrium. What man actually needs is not a tensionless state, but rather the striving, the struggling for some goal worthy of him." I think I've thought of that in the physical sense as a test pilot. There's something about a situation where you're all trimmed up that's insipient aflutter. Something about economic systems that get totally imbalanced, stand by, it's really going to blow sky high. You've got to be working the problem all the time. You've got to be working against a tension for stability. Not bad poetry. Similar to that of William Henley, an Englishman, died in 1849 at the age of 54. Fell off a train. It jerked as it moved out of the station in London. He had been crippled since he was 12, his leg was amputated because of tuberculosis of the bone. He was a very famous English professor. Near miss at being poet laureate after Tennyson. Invictus is his poem, the closing lines of which are: "It matters not how straight the gait, how charged with punishment the scold. I am the master of my fate, the captain of my soul."

As I told the last class, this is one of the few times I've used the same sheet, I was in bad shape in prison and I was alone in a place where I had to receive information from a message drop and stick it in my pants and hold my legs together until I got back to the cell and hope that

I didn't get frisked. We were all taking all these precautions. I was under pressure. I always sat on the bucket when I read this (I had eyes I could read good then and that was very important), the bucket being my toilet. I'd sit there so if the guard came I could throw it in there and it was written on toilet paper anyway. Even that wasn't always home free. But I got this paper and I got all braced and at great personal risk and what is it, it was the complete text of Invictus, "I am the master of my fate, the captain of my soul." But that was well intentioned, I thought well of those guys. That's what I needed; exactly what I needed.

This idea is even not bad religion. I'll quote again St. Paul's letter to the Romans, "We rejoice in our suffering, knowing that suffering produces endurance, endurance produces character and character produces hope."

Well, that's kind of the windup. I've gotten more confidence in the idea of what we're doing here as we've gone along. In my next comment in the War College Review I've written, wrote it last night and I've got a copy of it here, I think this is the way it'll go in smoothly and it talks more about school. It talks about the curriculum now, what changes are in for next year and this will be out in May. It's really to be read by the next class, but I say, "Philosophy is a logical discipline from which to draw insights and inspirations into military leadership in general and combat

virtues in particular. (Philosophy, very oddly placed in the War College.) In my view, trendy chit-chat case study leadership courses usually wind up in a welter of relativism. (Maybe a cheap shot, but I've got a reason. Because I've got a particular program I'm aiming at.) In fact, current literature (and I've got the literature if you want me to get it out) tells me that the social sciences on the whole are becoming committed to a veritable ideology of relativism, an "egalitarianism of ideas" via the route of a logical positivism that most philosophers have long since rejected. (I took that out, Joe bought it, the guys in the office thought that was kind of an interesting statement. I asked John, my aide, about some people and he said the two guys just came through here and the Chief identified them immediately as logical positivists.) If one leads men into battle while committed to the idea that each empirically unverifiable value judgement is just as good as the next then he is in for trouble (and I believe that). Thus I think offerings of a discipline whose founder (Socrates) was committed to the position that there is such a thing as central, objective truth and that that which is just transcends self-interest provides a sensible contrast to much of today's management and leadership literature."

I'll get off my pedestal here. This is all we have today and I want to close with a poem that I was read in a classroom in Stanford by a Professor Maravchek. He's back there on the faculty now. He was on loan from the

University of Michigan in a summer course. He's a Czechoslovakian I think, a very intense guy, a very perceptive guy. He had a book and said, "I want to read you a poem." We had just finished a philosophy course. He said you know nobody's going to pay much attention to you when you get out of here, don't think you're going to have much influence. He read this poem from Autumn Leaves. I'm telling you this because I went to the Stanford Library which is a pretty big library and they couldn't get^{it} and I finally had to get it from England, so it was out of print. The guy's name was Louis MacNeice. I looked up his biography and he was a very clever man. He had been a BBC script writer during World War II. A man of letters, as Maravchek said, a very sensitive observer of the intellectual scene, if I'm not mistaken. But this is a long poem about a bunch of graduates of Oxford in this case, getting together for a night on the town after they had finished. They were now back to normal and they were out working and they bemoaned the fact that it was:

"Life in the particular always

dozens of men in the street.

And the perennial if unimportant problem

of getting enough to eat.

So blow the bugles over the metaphysicians,

let the pure mind return to the pure mind;

I must be content to remain in the world of appearance

and sit on the mere appearance of a behind.

But in case you should think my education wasted
I hasten to explain
that once having studied the classics
you can never really again
believe anything that anyone says and that of course
is an asset
in a world like ours;
Why bother to water a garden
that is planted with paper flowers?
O the freedom of the press, the late night final
tomorrow's pulp;
One shouldn't gulp one's port but as it isn't
port, I'll gulp it if I want to gulp
But probably I'll just enjoy the colour
and pour it down the sink
For I don't call advertisement a statement
or any quack medicine a drink.
So goodnight now, Plato and Hegel (and I would add Socrates
and Aristotle and Kant and Mill and Dostoevsky
and Epictetus and others),
the shop is closing down;
They don't want any philosopher-kings in Newport,
There ain't no universals in this man's town.