

(3)

Only one Monad at Each Level: The New Solipsism

I am a p. to world, enormous, unbounded.
They are little things - nothing whatever like me.
Why should I assume they are selves - the idea is ridiculous.
They are in every way my opposite. I can move the sun at will; I can obliterate the world at will; I can make the whole world revolve around me.
They can do none of these things. They are little solid things; I am nothing at the centre, but vast & open.
They have heads: I am headless. Each of them is one "man": I am all men! If they have selves, I am

them self! I contain all men in myself, but I am one. And if I am a man they are not men, for we belong to species as dissimilar as it is possible to imagine!

⑥ But this is not the whole story. I the Self (the only Self as I have shown) have a History which I have reason to believe is as follows. (This History I arrive at by assuming the existence of other selves, but I'm not guilty of a *petitio principii* because I recognise that these selves merge into me.)

(5)

The New Solipsism (11) If there is anything that observation can tell you it is this: there are countless little creatures with heads, trunks, arms, & legs, which have very little effect upon the world. But if these are men, then you are not, emphatically not, a man. If, on the other hand, you are a man, they are not men. Adopting the latter definition, you are the only man.

(12) And, if your history is what you believe it to be, the same thing applies all along. You as Earth will be nothing like the externally seen Earth: if you

as that stage of yourself are definable as Planet,
then you will be the only planet. So also with
you as Sun: you will be, you are, the only
Sun.

(13) But remember that as Sun you include
richnesses that were not yours as Earth-
richnesses derived from your other-than-Earth
planetary experiences. This is not to say that what
you see as Jupiter is "nally" a self. It is the
opposite of a self. You can say if you like
that it is the label of your other-than-Earth
planetary self.

(8)

The New Solipsism In other words the various levels & parts of levels in your p-h show orderly relationships. You yourself as observer are not in the picture. You don't "behave". You merely observe.

Therefore what you call behaviour in "men" is the exact opposite of what you find in yourself. The fact that they behave should indicate that they are not, like you, a p-h!

(b) These men say that you look to them to be a hunk, with head, arms, & legs. And that, on the other hand, each of them is to himself a picture head.

Reply: Suppose you grant that this is true. Then you must recognize that the objects such as "men" in your p.t. are really everything but what they seem to be. The "man" is really, that is to himself, the world with the exception of that ^{one} bit you identify him as being - the trunk, head, legs & arms.

In other words he is (more or less) you p.t. minus one bit (himself) + plus one bit (you externally). This comes very near to saying he is a branch of yourself.

(9)

The new Solipsism Of the fact that there are many of the leader men there can be no doubt at all. This is not true of the leaders. For how can we know whether what is quite indefinable - the featureless Observer - can be one or many. As featureless there are no criteria by which it can be divided.

(c) C.S: But each "man" is a p. h & each p. h is different. By this criterion - the difference, not of the centre, but of what the centre subtends, - we can distinguish between selves.

Reply: Then does each project or subkind a separate,
unique, world? Then the world is chaotic indeed.
No. There is one sun, one moon, one St. Paul's
Cathedral, one Shakespeare in your p. h. & mine.
There is in fact one world. And one Self of
that world. And since you are a Self you must
be the self.

But admittedly your p. h. is not complete. This
doesn't mean your self is incomplete - that is
impossible. It means that that the Self has yet
to realize its full aura. It follows that in so far
as 'other' p. h.'s are ^{seemingly} not you they are not the present
you: they are the you ~~from~~ which time appears to have cut off.

XII XXIII
25 26

(1)

Can we be honest? Can we express what we all feel but none can say? Let us out with it.

Morality not only is, but should be, a question of your age. There is no one moral law for persons of all ages.

Do we not all feel that the very good child is an abomination?

That the 'very pure' young man is unsatisfactory
That the adult with no fight in him is lacking somehow.

That only the ripe in years ~~and~~ ought to be ripe

in all virtues.

Morality has in the past been looked on as something static; a question of rules of conduct, commandments. There should be separate commandments for the young, the mature, & the old - commandments which correspond to their natural development. There is something unseemly, forced, about a pious infant, a young man without pride who never resents an insult. Saints should not be too young.

Morality is a natural growth, and it has its natural history.

The Natural History of Morality (II)

But the real question is not one of mere calendar age. Developmental age is what counts. Some grow up quickly & are morally mature at 25. With others many years bring the philosophic mind. It doesn't matter how soon you reach maturity so long as you grow through its intermediate stages.

Wordsworth, St. Francis & St. Augustine 'sowed their wild oats'. They achieved understanding, experience, humility, moral depth, by not growing

up too fast!

The Natural History of Morality is a history of growth, from level to level, of loyalty. Just as you may not avoid your upstakehood or your fishhood, or your babyhood, so you may not avoid your narrow-selfish-human-selfhood. This is just as necessary a stage. So is patriotism & internationalism. But an old selfish man, & an old patriot (men patriot) are cases of arrested development.

25 26

The doctrine of moral growth is the answer to the moral dilemmas such as:

We feel that self-effacement is unworthy, yet the highest sort of behavior.

We feel that superabundant life & will, even when it over-rides the claims of others, is healthy & good, yet bad.

The answer is that one must grow to self-effacement & one must grow through the other stages.

Parents & teachers would be wise not to expect

fruit in April and flowers in January: &
when they do find such unseasonable products
to be way of praise.

①

Man & Society ① There is no divergence of interest between the individual's development & society's. For society is simply the other, higher, side of the individual man. Society is not an alien form into which man is grafted, or even a beneficial extension: it is man himself - as much man as his own hand is.

② The more general truth is that every higher whole to which a monad belongs is the development, fulfilment, & higher self of that monad. Thus your molecules find in you a measure of self-development that they can attain at no lower level. In you all your

sub-words are to a large extent 'saved'; redeemed from their primitive limitations. In you they do, in some sense, even attain human level. For in you, at you level, there is neither molecule nor cell nor atom: there is only You.

③ Cf. The members of the body take on Christ, so that in the Body there is neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free.

④ The developmental problem before Society now is this: to achieve a unity that included the full diversity achieved to date.

(2)

Man & Society Fascism & Communism achieve unity at the expense of institutional, intellectual & cultural diversity. Democratic Capitalism achieves rich diversity at the expense of unity. Thus we suffer conflict at the social level of our human selves. This conflict in our super-minds is both from above & from below $\uparrow\downarrow$; it is our conflict, your conflict. In your own mind this conflict is going on.

(3) The solution is simple to define: social unity which allows full scope for internal diversity. The premature attempts to unify result in a low

sort of unity. The unity that will come from an inclusion, instead of from a suppression, of diversity, will be a much higher unity. There is no divergence really between interest of individual & society, because the highest sort of society (considered at its own level) makes for or rather is the expression of the highest sort of individual.

© In Fascism & Communism the individual has unified his super-self. He has overcome the conflict he is experiencing at this level, but at the cost of a rigidity (& probably a hidden conflict) at the individual level.

(4)

Man & Society. Part & Whole. Premature Unity (10) The whole lies on the future side of its part, & the unity of present diversity is no less real when we cannot now see it.

(11) The political & religious 'absolutists' commit the same error in rushing to unity, suppressing forcibly the diversity which, by the logic of its own development, would find its way to the whole. To the whole from which, anyway, it denies that same diversity with which it enriches the whole.

(12) We get our talents from the whole & we take them back to the whole, with some interest. Too early a

unification means that you do not bother to use
your talent here & now. You refuse to play the
game, insisting upon (what is quite true) the fact that
it is a game only. The opposite fault is to take the
game too seriously & fight. Both attitudes are
unsportsmanlike. The British tradition of fair play is
just this: (a) Do your damndest to win, play up;
and, at the same time (b) don't forget that it's only a
game: don't take it too seriously. Here is a knife-
edge; a very difficult feat of balancing is needed.
And the feat is essentially the feat required of the
reader of Mabel: unity neither too early nor too late.