

Kapitel XX

Here today ...  
... gone tomorrow

by  
Norman Elrod

A Term Paper for Philosophy

San Jose State College    June, 1948

To  
my poor philosophy teacher,  
who has to read this assignment

## Foreword

Within these pages I have tried to put into writing, as much as possible, what I have been thinking of the past few months. Each section is a subject which has offered a problem for me to solve, and I have tried to meet each as squarely as possible.

I can not say that this paper is an original writing, for it is not. I have tried to find authorities in each field that I have discussed to get their viewpoints. A man of 19 can not be expected to know as much as one 45 or 50, and even then the answers arrived at may be erroneous. As Igor Stravinsky wrote in "Chronicle of My Life" discussing Rimsky-Korsakov's great influence in his early years, "No matter what the subject may be, there is only one course for the beginner; he must at first accept a discipline imposed from without, but only as a means of obtaining freedom for, and strengthening himself in, his own method of expression."

Therefore, I would like to thank the many who have helped me with this paper, and I want you all to know; the greatest right in the world is the right to be wrong.

## Table of Contents

PROLOGUE.	
TO ALL THERE IS A BEGINNING	5
ACT ONE.	
ALL TRUTHS ARE NOT TO BE TOLD	10
Herbert-Jacula Brudentum	
ACT TWO.	
IN THE MOUNTAINS OF TRUTH, YOU NEVER CLIMB IN VAIN	16
Nietzsche -- Thus Spake Zarathustra	
ACT THREE ... SCENE ONE.	
MORALITY WAS MADE FOR MAN, NOT MAN FOR MORALITY	22
Israel Zengwill	
ACT THREE ... SCENE TWO.	
O JEALOUSY! THOU MAGNIFIER OF TRIFLES	25
Schiller -- Fiesco I.1.	
ACT FOUR.	
THEN BEAUTY IS ITS OWN EXCUSE FOR BEING	28
Emerson -- the Rhodora	
ACT FIVE.	
EQUAL RIGHTS FOR ALL, SPECIAL PRIVILEGES FOR NONE	34
Thomas Jefferson	
EPOLOGUE.	
THE END IS IN MY HANDS	41
BIBLIOGRAPHY	42

## Prologue ...

### To All There is a Beginning

As I look back in my life, the question comes to mind as to when I first started formulating a philosophy. Many memories of thought I once owned come to view but soon fade because they are not clear. I was born a Methodist but soon after my second year, the family took up Christian Science and it is this religion that I have been associated with through the years. But as I look back again into the annals of my life, my mind stops at my senior year in high school and it must be there that I first started formulating a philosophy of life.

During my early years of school I became interested in football, and in my last three years of high school had made quite a name for myself as a football player. In my senior year I had transferred to a much larger school and in the first three practice games of football had played fairly well. Like many athletes I became quite satisfied with my game on the field. "Why not?" I asked myself. "I never had to worry at X high so why should I here?" However, the next Friday night in the dressing room before our first league game, I was greatly astonished to hear a complete newcomer's name called instead of mine for the starting line-up. Nothing need be said as to how he played that night because for the next four games he was on the field when the opening whistle blew. This set back on the playing field was of lesser importance, because I was experiencing

another great joy of life, a "romance". My thoughts, my time, my every cent was for Lois. But the time spent with her interfered with my football.

It was after the big game with our cross-town rival that I decided that there were two things in my life; football and women, and that the former was more important. It was two games before I broke back into the starting lineup. Luckily we had won our league so were going into the play-offs for the C.I.F. championship. From then to the end of the season, I played the kind of ball that I was capable of showing. This experience was a bitter one for me, because for the first time I saw how unconcerned people could be. When I was playing, my status was respected and I was wanted as a member of the group. But when I was on the bench, I was a forgotten individual. During that game with our cross-town rival, it was late in the third quarter and we were ahead 24-0. I had only played about a minute and was sitting on the bench, when from the bleachers I heard one of my old "buddies" shout, "Send Elrod in! The game is won." I have seen this same experience in many, many instances. In sports it happens quite regularly, and I have come to the conclusion that the sports public is one of the most ruthless there is. The story goes about the coach who after winning all of his games was given a new car as a token of gratitude from the alumni. The next year, as the story goes, he lost a few games and the alumni paid for his gas and oil to get the car out of town, with him in it.

My last semester in high school was an unusual one, I studied my books instead of the girls. I had never been known as a student, because I got extremely poor grades (sounds logical) in my earlier years. My last

semester, I realized how important school was if I was to achieve my objective in life. My objective was to be a football coach and in order to become a coach a college diploma is essential. My grades up to that time certainly would not have qualified me for a university, therefore all I could do was study hard my last term and hope for the best. I was quite astounded to see what I could do when I applied myself. My grades that semester were the best I had ever received. My physiology teacher was as amazed as I when after giving me a D- the first semester, she had to give me an A the second. I think the note she wrote in my yearbook is one of the nicest compliments I have ever received. It went as follows: "Dear Norman, I'm mighty proud of you! Have never enjoyed giving an "A" anymore than I enjoyed giving you yours. You did a grand job: Now that you know what you can do I hope you never again will be satisfied with just mediocre accomplishment. Good Luck Always!"

During the summer my hopes of being admitted to the State College of Washington came true. I had been accepted and was going there to play football and become a coach. Upon arrival in the Pullman country, we immediately started practicing for our first game with U.S.C., and I along with all the other recently graduated high school boys were sent to the Junior Varsity squad. The head coach was a man by the name of Phil Sorbee, and if ever a worse coach comes along, he will certainly have to take lessons from him. My stay in Pullman was an unhappy and unfortunate affair, and the day I left was a happy one. I had no idea of where I was going or of what I was going to do. But in my heart, there was still that burning desire to play football and later become a coach.

There were two schools in my mind, the University of Arizona and San Jose State. I thought it over and finally decided on coming to San Jose to talk with the football coach. After my talk to the coach about the college, I was quite sure that San Jose was the place for me.

The fall was the first time in five years that I was not playing football and I felt entirely lost without the game. I tried to attend as many games as possible, but still this was a poor substitute. I found myself a good job at one of the San Jose hardware stores and sat down to an ordinary school curriculum of studies, work, and a few social functions. The regular student who is not a football, basketball, or baseball player has no idea how much liberty he has compared to the athletes. It is true being a sports figure has glamour, lots of it, but it seems to me that people do not envy the athlete himself, but instead his position in the social system of college life. During my absence from the gridiron, I began to become interested in my studies, but this time the interest was lasting.

Three weeks before spring practice started at San Jose State, I began to get ready for football. I found that I was out of shape and knew that hard training was in order if I were to make the team. The next twenty-one days I trained as if I were fighting for the heavyweight championship of the world. I broke off all social affairs, was in bed every night by ten o'clock and was in fine shape when the first day of practice began.

I found myself for the first time after practicing with the team for several days looking subjectively at football, and new ideas of the future were formulating in my mind. I actually began to wonder whether I wanted to play football after all. Reassuring myself that I did I continued. But



still my lifelong desire was falling from under me. I knew something must be done so I looked back over my life as I am doing now and tried to find an answer to this, the biggest decision of my life.

First I thought of the affirmative arguments for leaving football. My interest had been in studies up until now, but this new conflict was completely strangling me. I found that I could not think of anything, much less photosynthesis and the like. I remembered the note my physiology teacher had written and the great enjoyment I had encountered from this new type of exercise. But soon the dark shadows of the negative came into view. People would think that I was a quitter, that I couldn't make the team and that here was the easy way out. What would the coach think after what he had done, and most of all what would my mother and the rest of my friends say where I lived? They had all counted on me to bring glory to myself and the community as a football hero. This was the hardest decision I could have ever made and so, right or wrong, I turned to my class of philosophy for help in giving me a clearer outlook to the problem.

1948/1998  
Here Today ...  
... Gone Tomorrow?

Act 1

All Truths Are Not to be Told  
Herbert-Jacula Prudentum

I have only taken one course of philosophy and am now in my second quarter. The name of the class is "History of Philosophy" and it studies all the great thinkers from Plotinus to Wilman Sheldon. I am ardently interested in philosophy and look forward to attending these classes. It has turned out that I am in agreement with many of the philosophers on single issues but a full acceptance of any one entire philosophical system is beyond me.

I agree, for instance, very strongly with Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel and Johannes Duns Scotus who thought that human beings have freedom of action to a great degree. It is not the "freedom of power to choose undetermined by any motive" mentioned by Duns Scotus in B. A. G. Fuller's interpretation,<sup>a</sup> but freedom as far as mental limitations and

---

<sup>a</sup> Fuller (1938, p. 414).

environment allow.<sup>a</sup> Freedom, as I am using the term, particularly as it applies to self-determination of moral action, was described by Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling in the words of Fuller in connection with the following:

The opposition ... between the *freedom* we experience within ourselves and the *necessity* that we run up against outside ourselves is overcome in the activity of *self-determination*. Here, we are, indeed, necessitated to act as we do by our own natures, but such determination, since it is inner, not outer, and is attended by no sense of external compulsion, means for us liberty of action. Furthermore, as we have just seen, we are forced to think of things as we do, not by any pressure exerted by the outer world, but by the constitution of the mind itself. Knowledge, also, is a free activity and is an expression of the general power of the self to determine its own behavior.<sup>b</sup>

Johann Gottlieb Fichte, along whose lines I follow, wrote about what is possible regardless of all the interferences we might encounter. In Fuller's interpretation of Fichte's thoughts we read:

We can discipline ourselves to regard suffering and failure and misfortune and defeat, not as a thwarting of liberty by necessity, but as incidents in a *struggle* that we *welcome* and *freely* accept.

This self-discipline is a *moral* process ... It is ... an affair of the *practical* activities of the ego. It is, moreover, a discipline *freely* undertaken. It has to be if it is to be a *moral* process, for only that which we freely chose has ethical significance.<sup>c</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> Regarding Hegel (pp. 322, 329).

<sup>b</sup> (S. 297).

<sup>c</sup> (p. 283).

The individual's freedom should be protected by himself and the society to which he belongs.

I do not believe with Zoraster and Mithra that there are two gods, one good and the other bad, who are constantly fighting. I believe that there is an ultimate, omnipresent, omnipotent, eternal, and loving God who experiences no error. I can agree partly with George Berkeley in "The Dialogues" where Philonous answers Hylas on the "infinite mind of God" and experience. Philonous says according to Fuller: "... pain and uneasiness are *understood* by God, but are not *felt* by him. He knows what they are, but, being without those complexes of ideas which represent the bodies, passions, and parts, which the sensations of pleasure and pain are connected, he cannot himself *experience* either suffering or enjoyment."<sup>a</sup>

On morals, I strongly agree with David Hume that what "ought to be is founded upon what is". We do not have within us "any innate sense of right and wrong".<sup>b</sup> We are not born, as Immanuel Kant thought, with "a sense of right and wrong, which we apply to events, as it were, from above, when they occur".<sup>c</sup> I agree with John Locke in as much as man's mind does not contain innate ideas.<sup>d</sup> Locke realized that there is not one inborn universal idea found in all people about God or anything else.<sup>e</sup> If,

---

<sup>a</sup> (pp. 148-149).

<sup>b</sup> (p. 175).

<sup>c</sup> (p. 247).

<sup>d</sup> (pp. 123-124).

<sup>e</sup> (p. 124).

then, we feel we have sinned, we have not sinned against God, but merely against the standards that our society has set up.

I do agree, however, with Kant who thought one should not concern oneself as much with the consequences of an action as with the intention to follow a moral law.<sup>a</sup> This statement means, I think, that if I were to give a child a bicycle and he or she then immediately rides into a car killing himself, I should not feel that it was my fault. I also coincide with Kant in saying that reason cannot prove immortality.<sup>b</sup> I agree with him also in saying that neither pure rationalism or empiricism is practical alone, but only when the two are combined can there be accurate knowledge. Present-day psychology has, to quite an extent, modified this general statement of Kant's. Most psychologists believe that learning is the repatterning of responses, not something new. Gaining knowledge is not a procedure that can be turned on and off, but is a continued process. I also agree with Kant that the mind is not to be considered a *tabula rasa*, as Locke took it to be at birth,<sup>c</sup> but that the mind is active! Human beings partake in synthetic activities.<sup>d</sup> Knowledge is produced by unifying our sense-perceptions with what we think: "Therefore it is equally necessary to make our concepts sensuous ... [and] to bring our ... [perceptions] under concepts."<sup>e</sup> In fact, all life is an active process, changing to a vast degree.

---

<sup>a</sup> (pp. 253-254, 267-268).

<sup>b</sup> (p. 254).

<sup>c</sup> (p. 123).

<sup>d</sup> (pp. 220-221).

<sup>e</sup> (p. 221).

I favor Saint Augustine's view that history has a great meaning, although I do not see history as a "warfare between the City of God and the City of the Devil".<sup>a</sup> We must look into the history of life and profit from the mistakes other people have made. Without putting historical knowledge into practice, our civilization will suddenly terminate. I cannot agree with Francis Bacon in Fullter's interpretation who believed that we can discover "the whole truth about the universe by the use of reason".<sup>b</sup> Still, the United States has proven in the last one-hundred and sixty years that free people in their use of reason can build a society that is truly wondrous. I firmly believe that skeptics such as René Descartes, Baruch Spinoza and Hume were more than just skeptics. They were creative skeptics.

I cannot agree with Hobbes or Berkeley that the ultimate reality is either matter or mind. On this abstract question of ultimate reality I am, at the present time, in favor of Sheldon's concepts of the test of presentation, coherence and action. I also doubt Hobbes's thesis that "the natural condition of mankind is one in which all men are at war with one another".<sup>c</sup> But I also do not agree with Jean Jacques Rousseau that there was once a "noble savage", a being in Fuller's description,

naturally social by nature, full of pity for and sympathy with his fellows. Happily exempt from family associations and from romantic love, and casually reproducing his species here and

---

<sup>a</sup> (p. 357).

<sup>b</sup> (p. 42).

<sup>c</sup> (p. 51).

there as the passing desire of the moment dictates, he is free from all the selfishness, the possessiveness, and above all the jealousy which are love's bitter fruits.<sup>a</sup>

I think that in a natural state, if there is such a thing, you will find indecorous and righteous people. I do, however, feel that man is basically good.

---

<sup>a</sup> (p. 201).

## Act 2

In the mountains of truth, you never climb in vain.  
Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, *Thus Spake Zarathustra*

For many centuries man has been striving to know what the ultimate reality of the universe is. Today we have a better understanding of life than Aristotle did, but we still cannot solve this problem. Thales's theory was that water was the creative real. Plotinus thought it was in the One. Hobbes believed that the real process of life was substance, matter. Berkeley thought it was all spirit. Yes, many great and intelligent men have taxed their brain to find and understand fuller the one ultimately real. From this struggle for knowledge have grown three dominate concepts: idealism, materialism and the lesser scholasticism.<sup>a</sup> They are all three outposts of thought and as different as light from dark. They are as strong today as in the past.

Idealism, which is, I suppose, the oldest of the three,<sup>b</sup> has had many great exponents who believed that it was "the ultimate reality of mind or spirit".<sup>c</sup> It is at heart a religious attitude, "a search for the highest value".<sup>d</sup> No one can disagree that the idealist's motive is wonderful, because idealism is the search for "some stable good".<sup>e</sup> As we look closer into

---

<sup>a</sup> Sheldon (1942, p. 3).

<sup>b</sup> (p. 11).

<sup>c</sup> (p. 10).

<sup>d</sup> (p. 19).

<sup>e</sup> (p. 11).



idealism we find that it falls into two separate little groups. There is the monist, who believes that there is an "organic unity of all things",<sup>a</sup> and there is the pluralist who thinks the ultimate to be many.<sup>b</sup> In short, idealism comes to the conclusion that by using logical reasoning we can come to the one absolute spirit which is present in us all and which is to be found throughout nature.

Materialism, which is the polar opposite of idealism,<sup>c</sup> is the belief that the physical world is the ultimate reality.<sup>d</sup> It is essentially a protest-view, a protest against idealism.<sup>e</sup>

Scholasticism can answer questions neither idealism or materialism can come to grips with. But then we find in it, as Sheldon writes: "hierarchical order, the structural emphasis of the system, the fixed levels of being, containing much change and variety within each level, yet never overlapping, never exceeding the limits assigned to each within the general order."<sup>f</sup> It is actually a synthesis of the other two systems of thought.<sup>g</sup> Therefore we will not go into it further and occupy ourselves only with idealism and materialism.

Looking back again at idealism and materialism we find that although they are polar opposites, they necessarily go together, "are

---

<sup>a</sup> (p. 16).

<sup>b</sup> (p. 23).

<sup>c</sup> (pp. 25-26).

<sup>d</sup> (pp. 29-30).

<sup>e</sup> (p. 27).

<sup>f</sup> (pp. 40-41).

<sup>g</sup> (pp. 33-34).

*natural* pairs".<sup>a</sup> Surely if there were not some ray of truth in these concepts they would not have lasted as they have throughout the ages.<sup>b</sup> If we had no idealists, we would have no conception of the highest good. But if there were no materialists we would not know about mitosis, blood pressure, or nylon stockings. Both point to certain real truths in the world. The trouble comes when we try to determine what ultimate reality is.

Various means to study reality have been suggested throughout the years. Perception has been mentioned time and again; it has been frequently considered reality's sense organ.<sup>c</sup> It was believed that what is seen is real. Seeing is believing. Therefore we see reality, it is reality by itself. But is it? Many times on a hot summer day when I am driving down the road I see water on it. This does not influence my driving. Why? Because I know what is seen is not actually water, it is an illusion. Here at San Jose State College I know girls who look so much alike that when they are separated I can not tell which is which. No, perception does not give complete knowledge of reality.<sup>d</sup>

You ask: What about intuition or mystical knowledge? With intuition on-sidedness is avoided, "it does *not* cut up the presented flowing continuum into discrete parts ... Intuition gives the fact direct".<sup>e</sup> This definition of intuition is not the same as the definition used in Gestalt psychology. This type is other than conceptual knowledge, and it is probably

---

<sup>a</sup> (p. 52).

<sup>b</sup> (p. 46).

<sup>c</sup> (p. 54).

<sup>d</sup> (pp. 55-57).

<sup>e</sup> (p. 60).

other than sensation. Mysticism claims that we all have this intuitive ability for revelation, but it does not show us how we can reach what it professes.

Right here let us not forget that all of these methods of knowing hang together. They have coherence. Many times through life man has thought the world was coherent. Kant and Hegel must have thought so, for they deduced that reason could know all the answers concerning our universe. But they were wrong, for today we can see that man has just scratched the surface of the process of life and much remains unknown. Carl Sandberg once wrote about an Indian and a white man discussing each others knowledge of the world. At first the white man drew a small circle in the dirt and said: "This is what the Indian knows." Then he drew a big circle around the small one and said: "This is what the white man knows." At that, the Indian took the stick and swept an immense ring about both circles saying "This is where the white man and the red man know nothing".

Sheldon suggests in his book *America's Progressive Philosophy* that we look at reality not only through the glasses of the cultivated thinker but also through the eyes of the common man.<sup>a</sup> The normal man believes the objects he sees are "real in themselves".<sup>b</sup> He sees a flower, its real existence is in itself and does not need his mind to make it become real. How about distance? If he is ten yards form the flower, he must walk a certain number of steps to touch it. So distance must be real. Also the

---

<sup>a</sup> (p. 73).

<sup>b</sup> (p. 74).

normal man believes in a world that is more than just neutrons, protons and electrons. Sheldon writes: "He believes in other minds than his own",<sup>a</sup> and he must accept forces greater than his own. A concept of an external world does not come quickly, its growth is gradual and a belief in non-human powers is something unconcieved of by a one-year old. We postulate that action is the chief criterion that something is.<sup>b</sup> Sheldon then writes: "presentation offers the material and action reveals its existence."<sup>c</sup> Sheldon further states: "Vision is the staff of the scientific life, but resisted action is the solid ground on which the staff rests."<sup>d</sup>

These assumptions presuppose that the object perceived by the acting subject exists independent of the perception.<sup>e</sup> Through action man adapts himself to superior powers.<sup>f</sup> The object's identity is lost when object and mind become one.<sup>g</sup> Action takes a man out of himself.<sup>h</sup> As Josiah Royce once said: "A man gains himself, by losing himself." Therefore things which are to be real must use the test of presentation and coherence, and this test must be verified by the test of action.<sup>i</sup> Reality presents an external resistance.<sup>j</sup> We know reality because of relationships.

---

<sup>a</sup> (p. 76).

<sup>b</sup> (pp. 77-78).

<sup>c</sup> (p. 78).

<sup>d</sup> (p. 85).

<sup>e</sup> (p. 86).

<sup>f</sup> (p. 94).

<sup>g</sup> (pp. 90, 95).

<sup>h</sup> (pp. 92, 95).

<sup>i</sup> (p. 96).

<sup>j</sup> (p. 98).

We must conclude then that while order and system are real, to a large extent, there is no satisfactory evidence that they cover the whole of reality.<sup>a</sup> Ultimate truths, since none of them are absolute, must belong to idealism, materialism, pluralism and scholasticism equally.<sup>b</sup> Sheldon writes: "... nature herself contains a principle of *growth by inclusion*, of combining more and more opposites that once seemed uncombinable."<sup>c</sup>

---

<sup>a</sup> (p. 107).

<sup>b</sup> (p. 108).

<sup>c</sup> (p. 109; cf. pp. 231-232).

## Act 3, Scene 1

Morality was made for man, not man for morality.

Israel Zengwill

"Morality, said Jesus, is kindness to the weak; morality, said Nietzsche, is the bravery of the strong; morality, said Plato, is the effective harmony of the whole. Probably all these doctrines must be combined to find a perfect ethic; but can we doubt which of the elements is fundamental?", wrote Will Durant in his book *The Story of Philosophy*. Certainly morals are something that we face everyday and either accept or contend with. Especially in a culture as complex as ours, the morals undeniably follow in step.

The first thing I think we should do to better our ethical life is to look to athletics, for in competitive sports there is probably the clearest and most popular expression of morals. I am sure that on the fields of friendly strife are sown the seeds that later lead to higher morals and more integrated personalities. In football morals are the rules of the game and they must be followed and obeyed. But here is my point: How can people live by morals that were established 100 to 200 years ago? The rules must meet the needs of the present society. Each year football rules are changed for a better and more desirable game and so should our morals. I agree that many of our basic morals are constant throughout the years, but many of our old superstitious ones have been proven false. These out-dated views are at work in many homes today and are causing

many young adolescents to suffer from unnecessary problems. In order for our children to build a stable and unbiased outlook so that they can become future leaders, we must convey to them a feeling of security. In helping the individual to attain maturity the parents and the community must be understanding. They, the outsiders, must see the individual problems as the individual sees them and try to give the right help and advice. Although the church at times has failed in the promotion of brotherhood, it can and should be a wonderful institution for promoting this fellowship toward man.

Today with the growing wave of thought towards stereotypes and discontentment against minority groups, we must more than ever judge people separately. Our primary emphasis should be placed on people as individuals rather than as members of a particular class or race. We must remember that Jew 1 is not Jew 2, that politician 1 is not politician 2, and that Negro 1 is not Negro 2. I firmly believe that all persons have a special, individual value and this is something that no one can take away from them. Whether a man be street-cleaner, salesman or bank president, each has his own rights of freedom, and each is of value to the society in which he lives. As Douglas Malloch so vividly wrote.

If you can't be a highway then  
just be a trail.  
If you can't be the sun be a star;  
It isn't by the size that you win or you  
fail.  
Be the best of whatever you are!

I believe that a man should be judged not only by his success, but how he acquired it, and how he uses it. Brutus, in William Shakespeare's "Julius Caesar", reasoned this same problem out on deciding whether Caesar should die. The logic may or may not be correct, but it is an interesting thought. Brutus said: "That lowliness is young ambition's ladder, whereto the climber-upward turns his face; but when he once attains the utmost round, he then unto the ladder turns his back, looks in the clouds, scorning the base degrees by which he did ascend. So Caesar may."<sup>a</sup> I also feel like Duns Scotus that man can either will to do good or bad, that his life is not determined and so has freedom of will. A moral life, as Kant believed, is strictly an end in itself and in no way a means to an end.

---

<sup>a</sup> Shakespeare, "Julius Caesar" (Act 2, Scene 1,22-27).



Act 3, Scene 2

O jealousy! Thou magnifier of trifles  
Friedrich von Schiller - Fiesco I. 1

"Jealousy is a frequent way in which a child under six responds to anger", wrote A. B. Hill in *Parents Magazine*. I agree with Hill that jealousy starts in childhood, but the trait is much more universal than he seems to think. I like the definition given in the book *Everyday Problems of the Everyday Child* where the author states that, "Jealousy is an unpleasant feeling induced by any interference or attempt to thwart us in our efforts to gain a loved object, either a person, power, possession, or position". But now let us investigate and see just what causes jealousy.

There are two common types of childhood jealousy. First, there is the holding up of one child's behavior over the brother, sister or playmate. Second, the arrival of a baby. Now the first child up until the time of the new infant has been the center of the stage and has received all of the attention of the parents, but after its arrival he finds himself suddenly forgotten if the parents are not watchful. The older child sees much of the attention that he had been used to receiving showered on the new arrival and for the first time experiences the feelings of jealousy. He begins to doubt his parents' love and his own place in the home. This causes feelings of insecurity. He is unable to share with the new baby and so regresses to such behavior as bed wetting, refusal to eat, and thumb sucking to gain his parents's attention.

The parents' job in this case is to be fair with the older child and tell him the truth about the new arrival. They should teach him to be generous, thoughtful, unselfish and understanding. Also the child should be taught independence, and he must be able to share with others, in the home and with his playmates. "But", you ask, "What if these things are not done?" Well, for example we could do as the Balinese. Before the baby is weaned the child learns he has a vigorous rival for the milk supply. The mother borrows a neighbour's baby and begins nursing it. The baby seeing this sudden obstacle for its food supply tries desperately to get to the mother, but is pushed away by her. This is a very funny game for the adults and their point is supposedly proven when the baby shows no emotions of jealousy upon the child's arrival. It should be noted that Balinese adult life is plagued by schizoid personalities, which may be caused by this all-around conditioning of repressed emotions. Also if this tendency towards jealousy is not stopped at an early age it will go on smoldering and may seriously harm the child. He may become generally hostile, not only to the one he is jealous of, but all. In fact, his entire emotional development may come to a standstill. Suppressed jealousy is a violent emotion. It can, however, be a spur to great efforts. It has also been said that nervous breakdowns are most frequent among adults who were older children.

We have all seen jealous husbands and wives who get very upset when their partner looks at or talks to a person of the opposite sex. And what about the mother who poisons her child's mind against outside relationships with others. I. N. Krigelmass writes in *Growing Superior*

*Children* that the "claim to love is not love, but a chronic condition of resentment, a perverse form of self-love and selfishness". These jealous people (and the tendency is for all of us to watch) are not to be looked down upon, but pitied. The whole complex, we think now, stems from early childhood and a feeling of insecurity.

## Act 4

Then beauty is its own excuse for being.

Ralph Waldo Emerson<sup>a</sup>

Being able to appreciate beauty, art and nature, is something that all of us should strive towards. As T. B. Aldrich shows in his poem "A Shadow of The Night", beauty is always present for us to find, if we only look for it:

What is lovely never dies  
But passes into other loveliness,  
Star-dust or sea-foam, flower or winged air.

Many people assume that aesthetic experiences are limited to the queer or intellectual sort and that you must be of that type to enjoy life's underlying beauties. But this is not true, we all can enjoy beauty. One friend of mine enjoys hiking in the woods, another paints, and still another collects Life magazines, while I enjoy football games. Yes, the aesthetic values are as varied as the individuals differ who enjoy them. But here again we must be tolerant. We must not ridicule the man who collects birds' eggs, or the male ballet dancer or opera singer. Each is in his own way helping to make life more enjoyable and worth living. The writer Eugene Field expressed this thought beautifully in his poem "Red":

---

<sup>a</sup> Emerson (1836).

Any color so long as it's red,  
Is the color that suits me best.  
Though I will allow there is much to be said  
For yellow and green and the rest.

No writer, no musician, no painter can feel deep emotion before a work of art without expressing it in some way, although the expression may be a thousand leagues removed from the inspiration. How few of us reading about the art that Vaslav Nijinsky possessed can not feel emotion? To the painter he gives a new sense of proportion, the musician a new sense of rhythm, while to the writer he must present new meanings for old words. We look enraptured at art and go away with certain remembrances, perhaps even unconsciously a new quality creeps into our own work. Great music can pull the cork out of the bottle of emotion, and its potency is as varied as are the joys of life. Surely Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart's "Don Giovanni" can do this, and what about Igor Stravinsky's "Petrouchka", or Ludwig van Beethoven's "Fifth Symphony"?

Not only in music can we experience the joy of the aesthetic feeling, but in all works of art. Certainly William Shakespeare showed us that all types of drama can be moving. Look at his contrast in modes from the sinister "Othello" to the rollicking "Twelfth Night". Leonardo da Vinci once said: "A good painter has two chief objects to paint: man, and the intention of his soul." Surely his "Mona Lisa" is a fine example of this thought.

There is something immense in all great interpretive art, and that is what remains after the story, after we have left the gallery or the theater.

Whether it is a feeling of love, surprise, happiness, or disappointment, this does not matter, but when we think later of this experience, this association will usually be in our mind. With this beneficent aid the interpreter not only contributes to our pleasure, but he broadens our horizon and adds to our knowledge and capacity for feeling.

Philosophers are quite often not interested in aesthetics for the sake of art, but merely in aesthetics for the sake of their philosophy. They treat it as a department of knowledge and try to cubby-hole it with their concepts of ultimate and absolute reality. George Santayana once wrote: "Philosophers have interpreted aesthetic facts in the light of their metaphysical principles and made art theory an outcast or footnote to their systems." Is this devaluing of art by a philosopher or scientist called for? I do not know. Certainly they cannot apply the scientific method to the artist and come to any final conclusions about him. As the philosopher S. Alexander once wrote: "Great artists know or believe that they are inspired from something outside themselves. Why should we suppose them to be deceived?" William James also carried this thought through by writing: "There is about mystical utterances an external unanimity which ought to make a critic stop and think." Certainly many honest citizens who during all other periods can be precisely logical in their thinking, enjoy art. They find art appreciation beneficial and endowed with power to enrich human life.

The ideas that the production of art is a way of thinking and of understanding life is quite recent. This should be as much a part of a well-trained student's mental equipment as are logic and science. Art is

not just for the artist, as was the old concept, it is a means of reaching beyond the present horizon of understanding, beyond those points reached by logic and science.

R. E. Johnson writing in *Scholastic* magazine states: "Imagery is as much a part of the ordinary thinking process as the manipulation of word ideas. Because imagery uses symbols, the ideas which it presents are not real in themselves but are associated with the real, or alteration, or inversion of the real. If we are to understand imagery, we must understand what it is an association to or substitution for." One can see that imagery is a useful link between art objects and the emotions which transcend verbal logic as far as the individual's understanding is concerned. In fact, without a desire for a finer life here now and tomorrow, there would be no need for planning toward a sustained happy existence. The poet's words cannot put aesthetic feelings into children merely by the reading of poetry. There must be real experience for association. True appreciation is based on knowledge and understanding. I once knew a man of questionable worth to the society who would sit in the park and watch the robins and other birds scratching in the ground. Many, many people passed that very spot and never saw anything -- but themselves. The poet D. B. Hill wrote a touching poem that expresses this thought much better than I can:

But I have walked a street with straining  
crowds,  
With surging men who would not say  
their names;  
They were no more than dust and dreams  
and shrouds

And dress and gold and little passing  
fames.  
And some there were who would not lift  
their eyes  
From the dim bitter highway where we  
trod,  
But I was rich! Against the distant  
skies  
I saw the hill that raised my world  
to God!

It makes me quite upset to hear people say that opera is simple, dull, sluggish and senseless. Six months ago I was not at all interested in opera, but after taking a class in oral reading at San Jose State College I began to understand what the artists have to offer. They lose themselves in their work, and when they are most impressed they are self-possessed. Art is never natural, it only seems so. Even in music there is a great need for feeling the part, and it is not enough just playing or singing the part correctly. Once Arturo Toscanini in a rehearsal for Beethoven's "9th Symphony" stopped the soloist and asked: "Do you know what you are singing about? You are singing of brotherhood, but in your face you look like you hate everyone. That will show in your music." Today when we hear records of the deceased Enrico Caruso, or the present tenor sensation Ferruccio Tagliavini, you can hear in their voice that expression of emotion that the score demands. Nijinsky had this sense of feeling in ballet, and so did Winslow Homer in art. Therefore we should listen, analyze, and judge critically so as to appreciate the full results of these aesthetic works. For if we do not evaluate the artist's efforts the participants may become self-satisfied with their work and we will not see as



much progress in the arts. We must not be hasty, however, in quickly praising or condemning an individual. As Johann Wolfgang von Goethe wrote: "It is much easier to recognize error than to find truth; error is superficial and may be corrected: truth lies hidden in the depths."

Who is to establish the defectiveness of an original interpretation? We no longer make traditional music. As Virgil Thompson said: "Tradition is established by the last good performance." This may be irrelevant to the subject, but as I was listening to Loretta Young being interviewed by Louella Parsons, after Loretta had received the Oscar for her performance in "The Farmer's Daughter", Miss Young remarked that a star must remember that he or she is only as good as his or her last picture. If I hear two masterly performances of Peter Ilyich Tchaikovsky's "4th Symphony" in which both of them move me, which one is right? For me, tradition will build itself around the one I enjoy more. For someone else tradition will build itself around the other one. And both will be right, if they are musically honest and if they violate none of the canons of style.

There is a considerable difference between tradition and style. Tradition has to do with the way a work is performed. Style (which remains constant) has to do with the elements inherent in the work itself, the spirit of the age that produced it, the intention of the composer and the existing state of musical conditions at the time the work was written. Certainly an allegro in Verdi's woodwinds will be different from Georges Bizet's, or an andante of Joseph Haydn will not parallel Claude Debussy or Nikolay Andreyevich Rimsky-Korsakov. Toscanini once remarked: "It is not I who want this fortissimo, it is Beethoven."

## Act 5

Equal rights for all, special privileges for none  
Thomas Jefferson

Today we are being pulled by two poles of thought. On one side is communism and the other is democratic capitalism. Hate can easily grow out of this conflict, which is based on misunderstanding, fear and uncertainty. And as for hate, Sandberg wrote: "Hate has never grown anything worth growing." So we must now more than ever guard against this poisonous contagion.

During the last war the British people refused to hate the Germans in spite of all the suffering that was inflicted upon them. In fact, the British unwillingness to fall into this infected cavity of thought was one of the factors that proved their mettle and demonstrated that they were worth saving. As Frederick Eastman wrote in *Christian Century*: "Hatred is a consuming fire. It destroys the hater as well as the hated. Man cannot take fire into his bosom and not be burned. Hatred can very easily lead to race riots and physical injury between capital and labor." Between these two ideas hangs the destiny of civilization as we know it. Winston Churchill said once: "We believe that the spirit and temperament bred under institutions of freedom will prove more enduring and resistant than anything that can be gotten out of the most efficiently imposed mechanical discipline."

In Washington congressmen are asking themselves if universal military training is necessary for our defense? On this subject I am in complete accord with H. P. Rainey president of Stevens College in Missouri. Rainey stated in a recent Town Hall discussion of this problem: "Universal military training places our national security almost wholly upon a basis of military force and neglects the moral, political, economic and other factors of our security. Right now three-fourths of all American educators are opposed to peacetime military training. It is based upon an unsound conception of what our foreign policy should be -- that of imposing our will by force. Universal military training is based upon the unreasonable logic that we are fighting armies and not fighting ideas. It is communism that is our enemy, and we could win every military engagement around the world and communism could and probably would continue to spread.

We simply have to fight ideas with better ideas. We must make democracy more attractive than communism or all the military strength in the world will not save us. We find it is imperative for us to make democracy mean something for our time, as Thomas Jefferson made it mean much for his time, or Andrew Jackson, or Abraham Lincoln. A billion and a half people, three-fourths of the world's population, are have-nots and are underprivileged. They want bread, houses and freedom from want."

It seems to me that attacking the problem of world order by way of armaments is to prescribe for symptoms rather than for the disease. Also, to assume that individual men or groups of men can be left in possession

of absolute power and persuaded to use such power in an enlightened manner is optimistic thinking. As Alexander Hamilton once said: "Arma-ment of a nation is to set at defiance the accumulated experience of ages." Universal military training is not the type of education and leadership that are needed in the world today. It is based upon force which is negative and makes us the victims of militarism, which we have fought two world wars to stamp out.

We simply cannot win the people of the world by being merely anti-communist. We have to make the values of democracy more desirable and more exportable than those of communism. The real victory will be on the rice and wheat field and not on the battlefield.

Many people think the message to the churches issued by the Delaware (Ohio) Conference of Protestant Leaders in 1942 is the best single leaflet to date as to what is needed. It is a balanced analysis of the social, spiritual, economic and political elements necessary for world order. It states: "Certain powers now exercised by national governments must be delegated to an international government, organized and acting in accordance with a world system of law. Among the powers so delegated must be the power of final judgment in controversies between nations, the maintenance and use of domestic order, and the regulation of trade and population movement among nations."

As I see it there is only one way for peace. This is an appeal from the United States for universal disarmament under *effective* international control. The president whose only hope seems to be that if America is "strong" enough Joseph Stalin will be scared into meekness, demands

more billions for conscription which by its psychological and other effects makes war more likely without giving any corresponding assurance of victory. There is no hope, in any event, of peace unless sooner or later the peoples, even of the Soviet Union, put a check upon the war-marketers. A willingness to help the world as a condition of our own peace and well-being is by no means equivalent to a willingness to pour out the blood of our men to bolster up Turkish dictators or Greek incompetents against communism.

Surely an American proposal for genuine disarmament could not be entirely kept from the minds of the Russian people or entirely misinterpreted. Disarmament is not the end, but it is the beginning of the road to lasting peace. Without it no association of nations can save us.

The atom bomb is a matter of death, or life abundant. There is no middle ground. It is one thing or the other; either we can control it, or we cannot control it. If we cannot control it, it will be extermination, but if we can control it, it will contribute to a better life. It is one or the other. America's voice may be decisive, and it is our voice, yours and mine, that will decide for America. As Leland Stowe, the famous writer, once remarked: "There is very little time remaining, and slow thinkers make fast burners." The controlled release of atomic energy is the most momentous fact ever to confront the human race. It gives man at one and the same time the power to destroy himself or the entrance into a life of unparalleled abundance.

The splitting of the atom is as fundamental as man's discovery of the principle of the wheel, or his discovery that he could harness fire for his

own use. But the release of atomic energy has this great difference; it places in man's own hands the means of destroying the human race. It is we the people who shall decide.

Today the United States must send aid to the starving countries of the world, but we must not let our aid degenerate into the mistaken belief that our economic power can bribe Europe. If the Marshall Plan is promoted as a means of stopping communism, which is what the administration and most of its proponents are now doing, it is certain to create a situation in which the necessities for Eastern Europe will not be forthcoming, and accordingly the plan will fail in Western Europe no matter how many billions we put into it. If it is another "Cold War" move to crush communism, it is a pre-destined failure. You simply cannot buy peoples' thoughts with food and clothing as a necessitated means for a selfish end.

Just recently the Italians voted for freedom but they will not go on voting for freedom if they are to become a pawn on a wider chessboard where we move the pieces on our side. The defeat in Italy of the communists is an opportunity for strengthening democratic foundations in Europe, but it is not anything more yet. It must be used as an opportunity to the fullest, and it is Italians who must be helped to use it in the Italian way and not the American way. Today talk of war in the United States merely frustrates the Europe in which rational negotiation is possible, and we must remember that want changes men into wild animals.

What all of us should keep in mind is that power is not the parent of persuasion. Power is the parent of fear! What history will remember is the nation with the imagination to take the first great step to peace. We

have nothing to fear but fear itself. Let us have the courage to conquer fear. The defeat of fear is the first great stride towards a creative and lasting peace.

We need (which is quite improbable) a revision of our government. It does not matter what name we call it: either social democracy, which is as different from communism as a nightingale from a vulture, or regulated capitalism. Frank Owen in a recent speech said: "Perhaps democracy is hard to define, but it is like the giraffe; you can't mistake it when you see it."

Right now over vast areas, men and women are caught in the struggle for power between a reaction potentially fascist and communist totalitarianism. There is no salvation except by the rise of a third force, and that force can only be democratic socialism. Today democracy is not an alternative to socialism, socialism is a necessary expression of democracy. The totalitarian state was not a socialist invention. It was the product of the breakdown of the capitalist nationalist system, of war for profit and power, and of the subordination of human interest to the national military state.

Democracy, in Lincoln's great phrase, is "government of the people, by the people, for the people". That is not government run by bosses for the profit of absentee owners. If any man is good enough to be president of the United States, a fact which has some support in American history, surely the common man as a worker and consumer is good enough to have a voice in the administration of the basic enterprise which so largely

controls his life. The world's plight is so desperate that the human race will survive only if a countless number of people work to this end.

Radical changes in history have usually come with great suddenness and unexpectedness to most of the people living at the time. They have usually come out of the sheer compulsions of international chaos like that in which we are now living. Yet the perils of crisis produce in us a panicky blindness to its opportunities. I am for making the best of whatever may come.



## Epilog

### The End is in my Hands

Six weeks ago, May 3, 1948, I handed in my football uniform. A desire as strong as Sampson was ended, and in its place a hopeful look to the future. It seems to me now that what may sometimes appear to be all there is in life -- actually is not. Today, I take my place in a new room, no longer on the green grass of the playing field, and time will only tell if my decision was correct.

## Bibliography<sup>a</sup>

- Commager, Henry Steele, Editor (1973), *Documents of American History, Volume I to 1898*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Eastbrook, M. (1942), Hatred is Healthy. *Illustrated Science*, N. I. 15 August, 42:106-108.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo (1836), The Rhodora: On Being Asked, Whence is the Flower? In: Emerson (1994, pp. 1-2).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1994), *Nature and Other Writings*. Boston and London: Shambhala.
- Fuller, B. A. G. (1938), *A History of Philosophy*. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1945.

---

<sup>a</sup> This is the first paper I ever wrote using a number of published texts as sources. In 1948 I was a newcomer in the field of human science, having only gotten started several months before the paper was written to take intellectual matters seriously. I was just learning the canons of quotation and not at all adequately disciplined in my method of writing down everything that should go into a bibliography. It will thus be noted that certain items pertaining to the one or the other text are lacking. I can also not be sure if all the words are spelt correctly and if all the page numbers are correct. It was also difficult to read the original text because the print on the pages has faded during the past 50 years. My secretary, Ursula Etter, and I have done our best to reproduce accurately with the computer what is on the typed pages of the original.

The following persons are quoted in the text and there is no reference to them in the bibliography: T. B. Aldich, Alexander, Winston Churchill, Delaware (Ohio) Conference of Protestant Leaders, Will Durant, Frederick Eastman, Eugene Field, Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Alexander Hamilton, William James, Thomas Jefferson, Leonardo da Vinci, Douglas Malloch, Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, Frank Owen, Herbert-Jacula Prudentum, H. P. Rainey, Josiah Royce, Carl Sandberg, George Santayana, Friedrich von Schiller, Leland Stowe, Virgil Thompson, Arturo Toscanini, Israel Zengwill.

- Hill, A. B. (1937?), Jealousy. *Parents Magazine*, 12:125.
- Johnson, R. E. (1948), Fine Arts as a Means of Personality Integration. *Scholastic*, April, 56:223-228.
- Krigelmass, I. N. (1935), *Growing Superior Children*. New York: I. N.
- Lee, Harry B. (1947), The Cultural Lag in Aesthetics. *Journal of Aesthetics*, Number 26, pp. 120-138.
- Lincoln, Abraham (1863), The Gettysburg Address. In: Commager (1973, pp. 428-429).
- McMaster, M. (1938), How to Handle Jealousy. *Illustrated Parents Magazine*, February, 13: 26-27.
- Menninger, Karl (1939), Men, Women, and Hate. *Atlantic*, February, 163:158-168.
- Nash, Vernon (1947), Utopia or Cataclysm. *Christian Century*, 26 November, pp. 453-455.
- Newcomb, T. M. and Hartley, E. L., Editors (1947), *Readings in Social Psychology*. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Nijinsky, Romola (1934), *Nijinsky*. New York: Simon & Schuster. [Die deutsche Ausgabe erschien beim Insel Verlag, Frankfurt am Main, 1974].
- Palmer, E. L. (1948), Nature. *National Education Association*, January, 37: 36-37.
- Shakespeare, William (1599), Julius Caesar. In: Shakespeare (1905, pp. 820-845).

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1905), *The Complete Works of William Shakespeare*, edited by W. J. Craig. London, New York and Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1947.
- Sheldon, Wilman Henry (1942), *America's Progressive Philosophy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Shultz, S. D. (1945), Beware of Jealousy. *Better Homes and Gardens*, May, 23:
- Stein, L. (1948), Exercises in Criticism. *American Scholar*, April, Number 2, 27:161-169.
- Thomas, Norman (1947), What Shall We do For Peace? *Christian Century*, 24 September, pp. 1137-1140.
- Town Meeting<sub>a</sub> (1948), Is Universal Military Training Necessary For Our Defense? Radio Broadcast, 30 March.
- \_\_\_\_\_<sub>b</sub> (1948), What Next in Europe Now? Radio Broadcast, 20 April.
- Van Vechten, Carl (1917), *Interpreters and Interpretations*. New York, pp. 149-176.