Document Information

Analyzed document	English IV All UG.pdf (D166196585)
Submitted	5/8/2023 6:49:00 AM
Submitted by	Mumtaz B
Submitter email	mumtaz@code.dbuniversity.ac.in
Similarity	22%
Analysis address	mumtaz.dbuni@analysis.urkund.com

Sources included in the report

W URL: http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf
Fetched: 5/8/2023 6:50:00 AM 26

Entire Document

English IV For All Undergraduate Course
English IV
Table of Contents Introduction Module I: Poetry Unit 1: Poem: Character of A Happy Life—Sir Henry Wotton (1568-1639) 1.0 Introduction 1.1 Unit Objective 1.2 Sir Henry Wotton (1568-1639) 1.3 Poem: The Character of a Happy Life 1.4 Interpretation 1.4.1 Stanza 1 1.4.2 Stanza 2 1.4.4 Stanza 3 1.4.5 Stanza 4 1.4.7 Stanza 5 1.4.8 Stanza 6 1.5 Key Words 1.6 Check Your Progress Unit 2: Poem: The Dead Fox Hunter by Robert Graves 2.0 Introduction 2.1 Unit Objective 2.1 Unit Objective 2.2 Robert Graves 2.2 Poem: 'The Dead Fox Hunter' 2.3 Poem Analysis 2.4 Glossary 2.4 Check Your Progress Unit 3: Poem: "Refugee Blues" – W. H. Auden (1907 - 1973) 3.0 Introduction 3.1 Unit Objective 3.2 Wystan Hugh Auden (1907-1973) 3.3 Poem 3.3.1 Analysis 3.3.2 Summary/ Interpretation 3.4 Glossary 3.5 Check Your Progress Unit 4: "Bazaars of Hyderabad" – Sarojini Naidu 4.0 Introduction 4.1 Unit Objective 4.2 Sarojini Naidu (1879-1949) 4.3 The Poem - Bazars of Hyderabad 4.3.1 Poem Analysis 4.4 Short Summary 4.5 Check Your Progress Unit 5: "Money Madness" – D. H. Lawrence 5.0 Introduction 5.1 Unit Objective 5.2 D.H. Lawrence (1885-1930) 5.3 Poem: Money Madness 5.3.1 Thematic and Structural Analysis 5.3.2 Poem Analysis 5.4 Money-Madness: Short Summary 5.5 Check Your Progress
Module II: Short Stories Unit 6: "The Fly" – Katherine Mansfield 6.0 Introduction 6.1 Unit Objective 6.2 Katherine Mansfield: "The Fly" Writer 6.3 "The Fly": Reading 6.4 "The Fly": Summary 6.5 "The Fly": Analysis 6.6 Check Your Progress Unit 7: "Moonlight" (Clair de Lune) – Guy de Maupassant 7.0 Introduction 7.1 Unit Objective 7.2 Guy de Maupassant (Henri Ren Albert Guy de Maupassant): "Clair de Lune" Writer 7.3 Clair De Lune "Moonlight": Reading 7.4 Clair De Lune "Moonlight": Interpretation 7.5 Clair de Lune (Moonlight): Analysis 7.5 Check Your Progress Module III: Essays Unit 8: "Science and Tradition" – Bertrand Russell 8.0 Introduction 8.1 Unit Objective 8.2 Bertrand Russell 8.3 Essay "Science and Tradition": Reading 8.4 Glossary 8.5 Comprehensions 8.5.1 Comprehension 1:
8.5.2 Comprehension 2: Unit 9: "Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish" – Steve Jobs 9.0 Introduction 9.1 Unit Objective 9.2 Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish: Reading 9.3 Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish: Summary 9.4 Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish: Questions/Answers
Module I: Poetry
Unit 1: Poem: Character of A Happy Life — Sir Henry Wotton (1568-1639) 1.0 Introduction 1.1 Unit Objective 1.2 Sir Henry Wotton (1568-1639) 1.3 Poem: The Character of a Happy Life 1.4 Interpretation 1.4.1 Stanza 1 1.4.2 Stanza 2 1.4.4 Stanza 3 1.4.5 Stanza 4 1.4.7 Stanza 5 1.4.8 Stanza 6 1.5 Key Words 1.6 Check Your Progress 1.0 Introduction Sir Henry Wotton was born in 1568. He addition to being a literary craftsman, he was also a diplomat. Some of his famous works are O his Mistris, the Queen of Bohemia, The Character of a Happy Life, and The Elements of Architecture. "Character of A Happy Life" is a poem that has moral instruction as a motive. Wotton explains the life of a happy man. 1.1 Unit Objective This Unit is informative on the Poem - Character of A Happy Life—by Sir Henry Wotton

1.2 Sir Henry Wotton (1568-1639) Sir Henry Wotton was born in 1568. He addition to being a literary craftsman, he was also a diplomat. Sir Henry Wotton (1568-1639) Resource: Open Source ● He received his formal education at Winchester and Queen's College, Oxford. ● He entered the Middle Temple to qualify for practicing at the bar and got appointed as an agent and secretary to the Earl of Essex in 1595. ● He worked as an ambassador at the Court of Venice. ● From 1604 to 1624, he worked as a diplomat on various other missions. A poet by heart, he once poetically commented on himself, "An ambassador is an honest man sent to lie abroad for the good of his country". ● John Donne and Izac Walton were his friends. Some of his famous works are O his Mistris, the Queen of Bohemia, The Character of a Happy Life, and The Elements of Architecture.
1.3 Poem: The Character of a Happy Life "Character of A Happy Life" is a poem that has moral instruction as a motive. Wotton explains the life of a happy man. According to him, the marks of a happy man are: ● A happy man is one who is independent, honest, and truthful. ● He enjoys the company of true friends, books, a carefree life, true freedom of thought, righteousness, honesty, and truth. ● He is a self-content man who is free from jealousy, ill will, and worldly troubles. He may be poor but lives rich morally. ● He believes in the supremacy of God. ● He is not flattery and listens to the voice of his conscience. ● He does not worry about the rise and fall in life. ● He has self-respect and contentment. The poem is didactic and full of practical teachings. The poet intends to inspire the readers to be honest, righteous, simple, faithful, religious, and carefree by talking about the qualities of a truly happy man. The idea of the poem flows smoothly in the poem from the beginning to the end. There are six stanzas having the rhyme scheme - ab - ab, cd - cd, ef - ef, and gh - gh. Oxymoron is the figure of speech beautifully used throughout the poem. The Character of a Happy Life How happy is he born and taught That serveth not another's will; Whose armour is his honest thought, And simple truth his utmost skill! Whose passions not his masters are; Whose soul is still prepared for death,
Untied unto the world by care Of public fame or private breath; Who envies none that chance doth raise, Nor vice; who never understood How deepest wounds are given by praise; Nor rules of state, but rules of good; Who hath his life from rumours freed; Whose conscience is his strong retreat; Whose state can neither flatterers feed, Nor ruin make oppressors great; Who God doth late and early pray More of His grace than gifts to lend; And entertains the harmless day With a religious book or friend; —This man is freed from servile bands Of hope to rise or fear to fall: Lord of himself, though not of lands, And having nothing, yet hath all. Sir Henry Wotton 1.4 Interpretation 1.4.1 Stanza 1
The poem begins by referring to 'he', a man. The poet opines that a man can be called a happy man if he does not believe in obeying others and acting according to their wish. 'He', a man, does not need armour as his honest thoughts are enough to protect him. He can speak the truth, and that's his biggest skill. Essentially, in the first stanza, the writer intends to say that freedom, honesty, and the truth are qualities whose presence can make a person a 'happy man'. 1.4.2 Stanza 2 The poet continues to assert that the happy man is a person who lives for his passion(s) and not for his master(s). A man governed by others' passions does not lead a happy life. His real happiness lies in following his passions, not others', and his emotions do not reside in his master. The poet further defines a happy man and says that "he" is not afraid of death but is prepared for it as he is not tied to the world by being over-ambitious of public fame and personal gains.
1.4.4 Stanza 3 Continuing to speak the signs of a happy man, the poet says: ● A "happy man" is never envious of those who have raised their status by luck (or by schemes), and he never indulges himself in wicked behavior. ● He knows that praise can cause the deepest incurable wounds. The greed for fame can make a man indulge in such negative activities, which cause problems later. ● A "happy man" follows the rules of good - morality, right-mindedness, or ethics. He does not believe in blindly following the rules of those in power but in his conscience. Here, the poet has the religion (good) versus state angle also in mind. 1.4.5 Stanza 4 In the fourth stanza too, the poet continues to define the qualities of a happy man: According to Wotton:
A happy man stays free (away from) of gossip, as he has independence of thought and an individuality. He relies on himself, his own inner voice. His state of tranquility so attained cannot be disturbed by the flattery feeds nor it can be ruined by any great oppressor. 1.4.7 Stanza 5 Wotton says a happy man prays to God every morning and evening to get His blessings which would lead him to rise and save from fearing falling down. He does not remember or pray to God for wealth and expensive gifts but for simplicity and happiness. He believes in the prays and God. Further, the poet expresses the significance of religious books or friends. He says that a happy man has the habit of entertaining or passing his day in the company of religious books or friends, this way he manages to spend a day safely. Such a company does not cause any harm. 1.4.8 Stanza 6 In the closing paragraph, Wotton describes another eminent characteristic of a happy man. He says that a happy man is free of "servile bands" (a metaphor)

means any imprisonment of hopes (to rise) and fears (to fall). He does not stay to the thoughts of how to rise and fears of losing wealth and status. He is the lord of his will, master of himself, and not of the '"lands" meaning materialistic worth. He might have no materialistic wealth or worldly possessions, yet he is wealthy of "all" which means the things which in the true sense give the happiness of life. He is not controlled by others or any ill will, he is the lord of his life. 1.5 Key Words 1. Serveth: Serves, duties. 2. Will: desire 3. Not another's will: one who is not dependent on another man's will. 4. Armour: defensive covering, usually metal for the body 5. Utmost skill: best ability, quality 6. Simple truth: pure truth 7. Thought: idea 8. Whose armour is his: honesty is the only weapon with which the hones thought protects himself. 9. Passions: strong feelings or desires 10. Still: always 11. United: unattached, detached 12. Whose soul is still: the person who is not afraid of death. 13. Princely love: favor of the king 14. United unto-vulgar: a truly happy man does not aspire for the favour of love of a prince, nor does he care the criticism of mean or low person 15. Rumours: baseless news, gossip 16. Conscience: soul 17. Retreat: refuge 18. Flattered: a person who praises too much
19. Feed: satisfy 20. Ruin: Destroy 21. Oppressors: cruel persons who try to keep down others 22. Envies: jealous of 23. Vice: feels ill-will 24. Wounds: Injuries 25. Chance: opportunity 26. Doth raise: make great 27. Late and early: at every time 28. Grace: divine influence 29. To lend: to grant 30. Gifts: blessings 31. Entertains: welcomes 32. Harmless: Beneficial 33. Servile: of a slave 34. Bands: that which binds 35. Rise: Progress 36. Fall: failure 37. Hath: had 1.6 Check Your Progress 1) Discuss the central idea of the poem 'Character of A Happy Life". 2) Summarize the poem Character of - A Happy Life. 3) Discuss the poetic structure of the poem Character of - A Happy Life. 4) What do you know about the poet Wotton?
Unit 2: Poem: The Dead Fox Hunter by Robert Graves 2.0 Introduction 2.1 Unit Objective 2.1 Unit Objective 2.2 Robert Graves 2.2 Poem: 'The Dead Fox Hunter' 2.3 Poem Analysis 2.4 Glossary 2.4 Check Your Progress 2.0 Introduction Robert Graves is one of the names that stand out among Georgian poets. He became famous for being a poet of World War I. He is one of the few poets who could depict the horrors of wars. This poem was published as part of ''La Basse´e,'' the second section of Over the Brazier. By then the young man of twenty knew the terms of life in the trenches. 2.1 Unit Objective This Unit is informative on the poem - The Dead Fox Hunter by Robert Graves. 2.2 Robert Graves Robert Graves is one of the names that stand out among Georgian poets. He became famous for being a poet of World War I. He is one of the few poets who could depict the horrors of wars.
Robert Graves Resource: Open Source Some of his famous works include: "Goodbye To All That", Siegfried Sassoon, Wilfred Owen, and Rupert Brookes. Robert Graves was born on July 28th, 1895. His father "A P" was Irish, a witty and friendly man, while his mother "Amy" (Amalia) was German, a serious- natured person who lacked a sense of humour. Graves went to Charterhouse for studies, where he met a teacher George Mallory who greatly influenced and motivated him for writing and other interests like climbing and mountaineering. In 1914, when World War I was declared, Graves gained a commission in the Royal Welch Fusiliers and got war experience. Serving the 2nd Welsh Regiment, Graves commanded a unit of 40 men. In July 1915, Graves joined the Royal Welch Fusiliers at Laventie and recorded a book, which reveals how serious the officers in RWF were, who were more towards keeping up regimental traditions which Graves called "childish". On July 19th, Graves got seriously wounded at High Wood by the fragments of a German bomb hitting him in his chest. He was declared dead, and even his
parents were informed of that, but when burying him he was seen breathing. He recalled this experience in his poem "Escape". The wounds received at High Wood made him pronounced unfit for duty. Graves was sent to Oxford University and started working as an instructor in the University Officer Training Battalion. Graves is best known for "Goodbye To All That". He is known for his poetry which shows his association with the men he led and the martyrs. Graves is well-represented, with eight poems: 'Escape', 'Two Fusiliers', 'The Dead Fox Hunter', 'Not Dead', 'Recalling War', '1915', 'Over the Brazier', and 'The Leveller'. Post-war, he received fame for his autobiography and for - 'I Claudius' and 'Claudius the God'. Robert Graves left the world in 1985. ''The Dead Fox-Hunter'' is his 1915 poem, published in Over the Brazier. It was written in memory of Captain A. L. Samson and reserves for him in heaven the fox and hounds but does not turn aside from the harshness, and bravery, of his death: We saw that dying and in hopeless case, For others' sake that day He'd smothered all rebellious groans: in death His fingers were tight clenched between his teeth. (28) This poem waszpublished as part of ''La Basse´e,'' the second section of Over the Brazier. By then the young man of twenty knew the terms of life in the trenches. (The Early Poetry of Robert Graves, Literary Modernism Series Thomas F. Staley, Editor, FRANK L. KERSNOWSKI) 2.2 Poem: 'The Dead Fox Hunter' We found the little captain at the head; His men lay well-aligned.

We touched his hand - stone cold - and he was dead, And they, all dead behind, Had never reached their goal, but they died well; They charged in line, and in the same line fell. They well-known rosy colours of his face Were almost lost in grey. We saw that, dying and in hopeless case, For others' sake that day He'd smothered all rebellious groans: in death His fingers were tight clenched between his teeth. For those who live uprightly and die true Heaven has no bars or locks, And serves all taste...or what's for him to do Up there, but hunt the fox? Angelic choirs? No, Justice must provide For one who rose straight and in hunting died. So if Heaven had no Hunt before he came, Why, it must find one now: If any shirk and doubt they know the game, There's one to teach them how: And the whole host of Seraphim complete Must jog in scarlet to his opening Meet. Robert Graves 2.3 Poem Analysis Graves, unlike his contemporaries, tried maintaining a more detached view of the war, he adopted an attitude which was a mixture of admiration of and amusement at the heroic ideals and behaviour of his comrades. And this attitude is evident in his poem “The Dead Fox Hunter”, which is about a captain who was killed in an attack on the German line at La Bass~e in September 1915. In “The Dead Foxhunter” Graves recalls the painful death of Captain Samson at the Battle of Loos in September 1915. In this poem, Graves is seen moving away from accepting reality. This poem does show the joy, empathy and satirical outlook that marked his earlier war poetry. The poem shows that Graves at that time was not cherishing any romantic notions of war but presenting the heroic actions of his comrades. The poem opens with the finding of Samson’s body lying in front of his men “laid well-aligned”. The captain and his men are discovered dead. The poet says that they (the Captain and his men) did not reach their objective “but they died well”; “They charged (pacing) in line, and in the same line fell”. In horrid fashion, Samson did not die cleanly when he was hit, but rather than scream out in pain and risk other men's lives to save him, "His fingers were tightly clenched between his teeth." The first two stanzas deliver a kind of sadness, reveal the uselessness of war, and cry for the suffering of the "little captain," but Graves moves from it and turns to dull fantasy and sentimental clichés: For those who live uprightly and die true Heaven has no bars or locks, And serves all taste...or what's for him to do Up there, but hunt the fox? Angelic choirs? No, Justice must provide For one who rose straight and in hunting died. So if Heaven had no Hunt before he came,
Why, it must find one now: If any shirk and doubt they know the game, There's one to teach them how: And the whole host of Seraphim complete Must jog in scarlet to his opening Meet. Graves wrote a letter to Eddie Marsh on 8 July 1917 in which he asks Marsh to use any poem but not "The Dead Foxhunter" for entry into Georgian Poetry 1916-17 as "some people in the regiment were very sick about it when it first came out, and only condoned it because Brazier was such an obscure production" (Seymour-Smith 9). 2.4 Glossary ● Smothered: suffocated ● Seraph: an angelic being ● Jog: run at a pace ● Shirk: avoid or neglect ● Scarlet: of brilliant red colour 2.4 Check Your Progress 1) How does Robert Grave want the angels to honour the brave Captain? 2) Write an appreciation of the poem “The Dead Fox-hunter”. Resources: ● Citation: C N Trueman "Robert Graves" historylearningsite.co.uk. The History Learning Site, 17 Apr 2015. 7 Jan 2023. ● The Collapse Of The Heroic Tradition In Twentieth Century English War Poetry By Kathleen Maureen Mcarthur
● (ROBERT GRAVES AND SIEGFRIED SASSOON: FROM EARLY POETRY TO AUTOBIOGRAPHY PATRICK J.M. QUINN, B.A. (Hons), M.A. DISSERTATION submitted for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY)
Unit 3: Poem: “Refugee Blues” – W. H. Auden (1907 - 1973) 3.0 Introduction 3.1 Unit Objective 3.2 Wystan Hugh Auden (1907-1973) 3.3 Poem 3.3.1 Analysis 3.3.2 Summary/ Interpretation 3.4 Glossary 3.5 Check Your Progress 3.0 Introduction W.H. Auden wrote the poem “Refugee Blues” in mid-to-late 1939. The poem is a dramatization of the state of Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany, before World War II. It reveals the disparity and hostility that the refugees faced while seeking asylum. It shows the sad and horrific situation of Jews being in the wrong place and at the wrong time. 3.1 Unit Objective This Unit is informative on the poem - Refugee Blues” – W. H. Auden (1907 - 1973) 3.2 Wystan Hugh Auden (1907-1973) Wystan Hugh Auden (1907 - 1973) was born in York, his father George Augustus Auden was a doctor, and his mother Constance Rosalie Auden was a missionary nurse. While studying English at graduation from Oxford, Auden got influenced by the poetry of T.S. Eliot.
W.H. Auden Resource: Open Source With the publication of his first collection of poetry named “Poems”, a new movement started - “The Auden’s Generation”. In 1937 he married Erika Mann, daughter of the famous German novelist Thomas Mann. Auden was an accomplished writer and poet. ● He won the Pulitzer Prize for “The Age of Anxiety” in 1947. ● In 1955, he won the National Book Award for “The Shield of Achilles”. During the last years of his life, he shifted to Austria and settled in a village near Vienna, where he died of a heart attack in 1973. He is buried in the poet’s corner of Westminster Abbey. 3.3 Poem Read the poem: Refugee Blues 1) Say this city has ten million souls, Some are living in mansions, some are living in holes:

Yet there's no place for us, my dear, yet there's no place for us. 2) Once we had a country and we thought it fair, Look in the atlas and you'll find it there: We cannot go there now, my dear, we cannot go there now. 3) In the village churchyard there grows an old yew, Every spring it blossoms anew: Old passports can't do that, my dear, old passports can't do that. 4) The consul banged the table and said, "If you've got no passport you're officially dead": But we are still alive, my dear, but we are still alive. 5) Went to a committee; they offered me a chair; Asked me politely to return next year: But where shall we go today, my dear, but where shall we go today? 6) Came to a public meeting; the speaker got up and said; "If we let them in, they will steal our daily bread": He was talking of you and me, my dear, he was talking of you and me. 7) Thought I heard the thunder rumbling in the sky; It was Hitler over Europe, saying, "They must die": O we were in his mind, my dear, O we were in his mind. 8) Saw a poodle in a jacket fastened with a pin, Saw a door opened and a cat let in: But they weren't German Jews, my dear, but they weren't German Jews. 9) Went down the harbour and stood upon the quay, Saw the fish swimming as if they were free: Only ten feet away, my dear, only ten feet away.
10) Walked through a wood, saw the birds in the trees; They had no politicians and sang at their ease: They weren't the human race, my dear, they weren't the human race. 11) Dreamed I saw a building with a thousand floors, A thousand windows and a thousand doors: Not one of them was ours, my dear, not one of them was ours. 12) Stood on a great plain in the falling snow; Ten thousand soldiers marched to and fro: Looking for you and me, my dear, looking for you and me. 3.3.1 Analysis W.H. Auden wrote the poem “Refugee Blues” in mid-to-late 1939. ● The poem is a dramatization of the state of Jewish refugees from Nazi Germany, before World War II. ● It reveals the disparity and hostility that the refugees faced while seeking asylum. ● It shows the sad and horrific situation of Jews being in the wrong place and at the wrong time. ● The poem kindles melancholy emotions in the reader. Its tone is sad. ● The poem's speaker is a Jewish refugee. ● The poem is set in Germany in the 1930s when the Jewish people were being persecuted by the Nazi government. Literary Techniques: ● “Refugee Blues” is a twelve-stanza poem, and each stanza has a set of three lines called tercets. The lines are in the rhyming of AAB, considered a perfect rhyme. This pattern helps a reader to understand a poem as the first two lines are paired and the third stands out alone
without rhyming. The meter is in loose form. They vary in length from nine to fourteen syllables. ● Imagery and symbolism: The images of a building with many rooms, doors, and windows hint at a place of shelter that does not have space for the refugees, symbolically talking about Europe at that time and its way of treating the Jews suffering the Nazi control. It is also for the other countries of the world that did not give refuge to the Jews and denied helping them. Auden uses the term ‘thunder rumbling’ to metaphorically depict the voice of Hitler. It also symbolises the Luftwaffe - Nazi Germany’s air force warplanes used for bombing. ● Each stanza hints at the sufferings and desperation of the refugees through a sad tone. 3.3.2 Summary/ Interpretation 1) Say this city has ten million souls, Some are living in mansions, some are living in holes: Yet there's no place for us, my dear, yet there's no place for us. The poem begins by introducing a city that has 10 million people in it. Some live in mansions luxuriously while some others are living in awful conditions, ‘holes’. And this couple is so poor that they do not even have a ‘hole’ to live. Repetition of the words - “Yet there’s no place for us, my dear” invokes empathetic sentiments in the reader. 2) Once we had a country and we thought it fair, Look in the atlas and you'll find it there: We cannot go there now, my dear, we cannot go there now.
The couple is in exile, not in their own country. They can see their nation on a map but cannot go back to it. 3) In the village churchyard there grows an old yew, Every spring it blossoms anew: Old passports can't do that, my dear, old passports can't do that. Trees go through a cycle of nature at certain times of the year. They seem dead but can grow again. Nature gives them a new chance every year to bloom again. The speaker feels it does not happen with a man-made document like a passport, which once lost is not recovered again. 4) The consul banged the table and said, "If you've got no passport you're officially dead": But we are still alive, my dear, but we are still alive. The speaker recalls the incident when the consul, presumably at an Embassy, violently banged the table and made a ridiculous statement that if someone has no passport, he will be considered dead. He sighs over the condition saying, “But we are still alive, my dear, but we are still alive”. 5) Went to a committee; they offered me a chair; Asked me politely to return next year: But where shall we go today, my dear, but where shall we go today? The speaker and his mate have no place to live today. He recalls the day when he went to a committee for help, which offered him a chair but did not help him. Instead of the committee helping him, it politely told him to go back right in a year.

The speaker, now in a state of uncertainty, questions himself where shall we go today, but where shall we go today? 6) Came to a public meeting; the speaker got up and said; "If we let them in, they will steal our daily bread": He was talking of you and me, my dear, he was talking of you and me. The speaker recalls the day when he heard a speaker who had come to attend a public meeting and referring to the refugees, he said that if they are helped and allowed to live here they will (steal) only prove their rights on our food. The speaker heavy-heartedly says to his beloved that he was referring to us (you and me). 7) Thought I heard the thunder rumbling in the sky; It was Hitler over Europe, saying, "They must die": O we were in his mind, my dear, O we were in his mind. The speaker says I thought I heard thunder in the sky. Thunder in the sky signifies the loud and violent voice of Hitler or of his warplanes meant for bomb shelling on the Jews and those who are against him. The speaker refers to Hitler, who says they (the Jews or the ones who are against him) should die and says that at least he thinks of them should in the thought of killing them. Further, the speaker speaks out, mocking his condition, “O we were in his mind, my dear, O we were in his mind”. 8) Saw a poodle in a jacket fastened with a pin, Saw a door opened and a cat let in: But they weren't German Jews, my dear, but they weren't German Jews.
The speaker compares his condition (or of refugees) with that of animals - cats and dogs. He says that the animals are safer and happier; he saw a poodle (a dog) dressed up in a jacket, and he saw a cat allowed to enter a house; the cats and dogs are welcomed, cared for, and allowed to live in a place, but not the refugee because they are German Jews. 9) Went down the harbour and stood upon the quay, Saw the fish swimming as if they were free: Only ten feet away, my dear, only ten feet away. The speaker recalls the day when he went to the harbour and was standing on the pier (a platform), and he saw the fish swimming freely in the water, which is in contrast to their situation. They are refugees who have no place and no freedom of movement. The speaker sighs, they (the fish) were only ten feet away from him. 10) Walked through a wood, saw the birds in the trees; They had no politicians and sang at their ease: They weren't the human race, my dear, they weren't the human race. In these lines, the speaker recalls when he went to a wood (forest) where he saw birds in the trees living freely and singing pleasantly. They could do so because they were not humans. If they were also humans, they could not enjoy their freedom of living, singing, and movement as the politician had never let them. 11) Dreamed I saw a building with a thousand floors, A thousand windows and a thousand doors: Not one of them was ours, my dear, not one of them was ours. Now, the speaker talks of his dream in which he saw a large building with thousands of floors, windows, and doors. But he sighs by telling his mate that
none of them is for them. The large building and its floors, windows, and rooms symbolically refer to the large countries which did not allow the Jew Refugees to enter and give them a safe refuge. 12) Stood on a great plain in the falling snow; Ten thousand soldiers marched to and fro: Looking for you and me, my dear, looking for you and me. The poem ends by telling a dream in which he is standing on a great plain in the falling snow, and then thousands of soldiers march to and fro looking for them. He dreams that in such a condition of being helpless and suffering the thumps of being a refugee or homeless, a force would come, looking for them and would take them to a safer or their own land. 3.4 Glossary ● Soul: the spiritual or immaterial part of a human being or animal. ● Atlas: a book of maps or charts. ● Churchyard: a cemetery attached to a church ● Consul: an official appointed by a government to live in a foreign city and protect and promote the government's citizens and interests there. ● Yew: a coniferous tree which has red berrylike fruits. ● Quay: a concrete, stone, or metal platform lying alongside or projecting into the water for loading and unloading ships. Reference: Google dictionary 3.5 Check Your Progress 1. What is the context of the poem “Refugee Blues”? 2. What is described as ‘the thunder rumbling in the sky’? 3. What makes the poet say: ‘O we were in his mind, my dear, O we were in his mind’?
4. Comment on the poetic style of Auden. 5. Write a summary of the poem “Refugee Blues”.
Unit 4: “Bazaars of Hyderabad” – Sarojini Naidu 4.0 Introduction 4.1 Unit Objective 4.2 Sarojini Naidu (1879-1949) 4.3 The Poem - Bazars of Hyderabad 4.3.1 Poem Analysis 4.4 Short Summary 4.5 Check Your Progress 4.0 Introduction Bazars of Hydrabad is written by Sarojini Naidu. It depicts a bustling marketplace of Hyderabad city, which is full of merchandising goods. Sellers are engaged in selling things like utensils, clothes, mirrors, knives, pulses, grains, spices, chess boards, and jewellery articles. Some jewellers are busy making different kinds of jewellery, musicians are playing music on sitar, sarangi and drum, magicians are bewildering the people with their magic tricks and spells, and floral artists are making flower wears. By depicting an image of an Indian market, the poet Sarojini Naidu hints at the rich Indian heritage. Through the poem, she protested European products and appreciated Indian goods. 4.1 Unit Objective This Unit is informative on the poem - Bazars of Hyderabad, written by Sarojini Naidu.

4.2 Sarojini Naidu (1879-1949) Sarojini Chattopadhyay (later after marriage Naidu) was born on 13 February 1879 in Hyderabad. Her father Aghorenath Chattopadhyay was a Bangali Brahmin and a principal of the Nizam's College of Hyderabad. Sarojini Naidu's poetry entails themes of patriotism, romance, and tragedy; her poetry is also for children. She went to Madras and then London (Cambridge) for higher education. She was working in London as a suffragist before she joined the Indian National Congress movement for India's Independence. Sarojini Naidu Resource: Open Source She was a political figure and actively participated in the Indian freedom movement. She was a follower of Mahatama Gandhi and believed in his ideology of swaraj. She had to go to jail for participating in different movements. She was the President of the Indian National Congress and the first woman Governor. Seeing her poetic dexterity in using colour, imagery, and lyrical qualities Mahatama Gandhi called her 'the Nightingale of India', or 'Bharat Kokila'. Bazaars of Hyderabad was published in 1912 and is among her popular poems. She died of a cardiac arrest on 2 March 1949, at the Government House in Lucknow.

4.3 The Poem - Bazars of Hyderabad 1) What do you sell O ye merchants? Richly your wares are displayed. Turbans of crimson and silver, Tunics of Purple brocade, Mirrors with panels of Amber, Daggers with handles of jade. 2) What do you weigh, O ye vendors? Saffron and lentil and rice. What do you grind, O ye maidens? Sandalwood, henna, and spice. What do you call, O ye pedlars? Chessmen and ivory dice 3) What do you make, O ye goldsmiths? Wristlet and anklet and ring, Bells for the feet of blue pigeons, Frail as a dragon-fly's wing, Girdles of gold for dancers, Scabbards of gold for the king. What do you cry, O ye, fruitmen? Citron, pomegranate, and plum. What do you play, O musicians? Sitar, sarangi and drum.

What do you chant, O magicians? Spells for aeons to come. What do you weave, O ye flower-girls? With tassels of azure and red? Crowns for the brow of a bridegroom, Chaplets to garland his bed. Sheets of white blossoms, new-garnered To perfume the sleep of the dead. 4.3.1 Poem Analysis The poem "Bazaars of Hyderabad" is an excellent example of Sarojini Naidu's poetic skills. She was born and brought up in Hyderabad and knew the city well. The city had bustling markets crowded with buyers and sellers. The frantic yellings of bargaining and customer callings could be heard throughout the day. It was an amusing market, and Sarojini was a discerning watcher of the marketplace. It has been created as an amusing and intriguing poem and cast in a question-answer style. Sarojini Naidu was in politics, an active member of the National Congress. She participated in the freedom movements and wrote this poem as a part of the Swadeshi Movement. This movement was to boycott non-native merchandise, whether clothes, food, or other things. Through this poem, Sarojini wanted to convey a message that Indian markets are rich in tradition, and they don't need foreign products. Through this poem, she presents a picture of a bazaar where traditional Indian products are being sold. The poem is in question-and-answer form, a person or the poet is asking the questions and merchants are answering them. This technique has helped to present a vivid picture of the bazaar.

There are five stanzas, each has six lines. Among the six lines, the second, fourth, and sixth lines are rhyming with each other, while the third and fifth rhyme with each other, it is a unique rhyming scheme ABCBCB. The last stanza is exceptional, it does not follow that scheme. 4.3.2 Poem Summary 1) What do you sell O ye merchants? Richly your wares are displayed. Turbans of crimson and silver, Tunics of Purple brocade, Mirrors with panels of Amber, Daggers with handles of jade. The poet marvels at the wide variety of things being sold in the market. In amusement to know what the merchants are selling the poet asks "What do you sell, O Merchants? She sees there are wares displayed. The merchants reply they are selling - turbans of crimson (rich deep colour) and silver, tunics (loose garments) of purple brocade (a fine rich fabric that is woven with gold or silver threads), mirrors in yellow or golden panels, and daggers (knives) with the jade (a stone and also used for green colour) handles. 2) What do you weigh, O ye vendors?

Saffron and lentil and rice. What do you grind, O ye maidens? Sandalwood, henna, and spice. What do you call, O ye pedlars? Chessmen and ivory dice The poet now visits the vendors, maidens (young girls), and pedlars (hawkers). She asks the vendors, "What do you weigh? To which a reply comes that - they are weighing saffron, lentil, and rice. The poet asks the maidens what they are grinding, and they tell her they are grinding sandalwood, henna, and spices. Now, the poet asks the paddlers what it is called which they are selling, and they tell her that they are selling chessmen and dice made from ivory for the game of chess. 3) What do you make, O ye goldsmiths? Wristlet and anklet and ring, Bells for the feet of blue pigeons, Frail as a dragon-fly's wing, Girdles of gold for dancers, Scabbards of gold for the king. Now, the poet moves up to goldsmiths and asks them what they are making, and they tell her that they are making- ● Wristlets (bangles), anklets (worn on ankles), and rings for girls and ladies, ● Bells that are so light as the wings of a dragonfly for the feet of blue pigeons, ● Golden girdles, which dancers wear, and ● Golden sheaths, the covers of the blades/knives/swords of kings.

Here, the mastery of Indian goldsmiths in making different kinds of jewellery is expressed. 4) What do you cry, O ye, fruitmen? Citron, pomegranate, and plum. What do you play, O musicians? Sitar, sarangi and drum. What do you chant, O magicians? Spells for aeons to come. Passing by fruit hawkers catch the attention of the poet, and she asks them which fruits they are selling. The fruit vendors reply to her that they are selling citron (a large lemon-like fruit), pomegranate, and plums. The poet sees some musicians and asks them what instruments they are playing to which they reply that they are playing music on sitar, sarangi, and drum. She gets amused by seeing the baffling magic tricks of magicians and asks them what spell they chant. The magicians tell her that they chant the spells which invoke aeons (divine powers), and they come to help in doing magical tricks. 5) What do you weave, O ye flower-girls? With tassels of azure and red? Crowns for the brow of a bridegroom, Chaplets to garland his bed. Sheets of white blossoms, new-garnered To perfume the sleep of the dead. In the last stanza, the poet asks some flower girls what they are weaving with the strands of azure (deep blue) and red flowers. They say that they are making flower crowns worn by a bride or groom on a marriage occasion and the garlands that will decorate the bed. The flower girls further reveal that they are also making the white-flowers sheets meant to spread on a dead or grave to fragrant it. Hence, the poem depicts a bustling marketplace of Hyderabad city, which is full of merchandising goods. Sellers are engaged in selling things like utensils, clothes, mirrors, knives, pulses, grains, spices, chess boards, and jewellery articles. Some jewellers are busy making different kinds of jewellery, musicians are playing music on sitar, sarangi and drum, magicians are bewildering the people with their magic tricks and spells, and floral artists are making flower wears. Thus, by depicting an image of an Indian market the poet Sarojini Naidu hints at the rich Indian heritage. Through the poem, she protested European products and appreciated Indian goods. 4.4 Short Summary The poem depicts a bustling marketplace of Hyderabad city, which is full of merchandising goods. Sellers are engaged in selling things like utensils, clothes, mirrors, knives, pulses, grains, spices, chess boards, and jewellery articles. Some jewellers are busy making different kinds of jewellery, musicians are playing music on sitar, sarangi and drum, magicians are bewildering the people with their magic tricks and spells, and floral artists are making flower wears. By depicting an image of an Indian market, the poet Sarojini Naidu hints at the rich Indian heritage. Through the poem, she protested European products and appreciated Indian goods. 4.5 Check Your Progress 1) Answer the following given questions:

● What the merchants are selling? ● What are the vendors, maiden, and paddlers are selling? ● What goldsmiths are making? ● What the fruit vendors are selling? ● What the flower-girls are doing? 2) What do you know about the poet Sarojini Naidu? 3) Give a structural analysis of the poem “Bazaars of Hyderabad”. 4) Give an explanatory summary of the poem “Bazaars of Hyderabad”.

Unit 5: “Money Madness” – D. H. Lawrence 5.0 Introduction 5.1 Unit Objective 5.2 D.H. Lawrence (1885-1930) 5.3 Poem: Money Madness 5.3.1 Thematic and Structural Analysis 5.3.2 Poem Analysis 5.4 Money-Madness: Short Summary 5.5 Check Your Progress 5.0 Introduction The poem “Money Madness”, as the name suggests, is about the insanity related to money. The poet is concerned about the mindset and desire of humans for wealth, luxuries, and status. He thinks money madness makes us inhuman and unsympathetic towards others who do not have much money. Humans are misers and small-hearted and cannot bear losing money from their pockets. It is the money insufficiency which can make one taste dirt - to bear insult and harsh treatment. A man with no money and food can get a loaf of bread from others in mercy but at a cost of losing respect. The poet believes that a man is afraid of losing his respect or eating dirt, and that’s why he should save money. A man must have free access to bread, shelter, and fire so he does not turn inhuman towards others. 5.1 Unit Objective This Unit is informative on the poem - “Money Madness” written by D.H. Lawrence.

5.2 D.H. Lawrence (1885-1930) D.H. Lawrence was twentieth- century’s one of the noted English writers. He wrote several novels, short stories, poems, plays, essays, travel books, and translations that give a mental thought especially - Sons and Lovers, Women in Love, and Lady Chatterley’s Lover which deal with the complexities of human relationships. D.H. Lawrence Resource: Open Source “Money Madness” written by Lawrence was published in 1929 and is about the mad love of humans and societies for money. It deals with the materialistic perspective of mankind. It also talks about the need for money. It accuses society of being immersed in the madness of materialism. Lawrence suggests that money can make people lose a virtual mindset, isolate themselves from each other, and make hard-hearted towards the poor. Money is a need but rather than considering it that way people relate it to social status and pompousness; they commit acts of injustice and oppression for it. 5.3 Poem: Money Madness 1.

Money is our madness, our vast collective madness. 2. And of course, if the multitude is mad 3. the individual carries his own grain of insanity around with him.

4.

I doubt if any man living hands out a pound note with-out a pang; 5. and a real tremor, if he hands out a ten-pound note. 6. We quail, money makes us quail. 7. It has got us down, we grovel before it in strange terror. 8. And no wonder, for money has a fearful cruel power among men. 9. But it is not money we are so terrified of, 10. it is the collective money-madness of mankind. 11. For mankind say with one voice: How much is he worth? 12. Has he no money? Then let him eat dirt, and go cold.– 13. And if I have no money, they will give me a little bread 14. so I do not die, 15. but they will make me eat dirt with it. 16. I shall have to eat dirt, I shall have to eat dirt 17. if I have no money. 18.
It is that that I am frightened of. 19. And that fear can become a delirium. 20. It is fear of my money-mad fellow-men. 21. We must have some money 22. to save us from eating dirt. 23.
And this is all wrong. 24. Bread should be free, 25. shelter should be free, 26. fire should be free 27. to all and anybody, all and anybody, all over the world. 28. We must regain our sanity about money 29. before we start killing one another about it.
30. It's one thing or the other. ~D.H. Lawrence 5.3.1 Thematic and Structural Analysis In the poem "Money Madness", the poet: ● Criticizes human obsession with wealth and possessions at the expense of human values. ● Talks about the mindset of mankind that how humans hold no sympathy and kindness towards the poor and needy. ● regards money as a requirement and suggests not considering it all- important as it will only cast a dehumanizing effect and lead to destruction. Structural Analysis: ● The poem is in thirty lines arranged in different stanzas. ● Some stanzas are only one line. ● The lines are not in a specific rhyme scheme, it is a free-verse poem. To create some rhyming, the poet used the technique of repetition of words within a line. ● The poet is speaking from the first-person point of view, it is a lyric poem. ● The lines are in a structure of prose. Poetic devices used in the poem: ● "Enjambment" is a continuation of a sentence without a pause beyond the end of a line. Lawrence has used enjambment throughout the poem, for example, in the second and third lines. ● The poet has used "repetition". Words such as "money" and "madness" have been used a number of times for creating an artistic effect. ● The very first line of the poem has been created using the device 'irony'. ● In the second and third lines, "sarcasm" has been used to humorously describe the people's attachment to money. ● Lawrence has used the technique of "personification" in the line - "for money has a fearful cruel power among men". Here he is personifying the word money with a master. ● "Then let him eat dirt, and go cold", in this line, the word "dirt" is used as a "metaphor". ● "Multitude is mad", "money-madness", and "my money-mad fellowmen", are all examples of "alliteration: used in the poem. 5.3.2 Poem Analysis 1) Money is our madness, our vast collective madness. The poem begins with commenting on "money", it says that it is our (mankind's) madness, not an individual's but of all. Societies and mankind are insane about money. Money madness is not at a small or individual level but at a vast. 2)
And of course, if the multitude is mad 3) the individual carries his own grain of insanity around with him.
The poet says since the multitude is mad, every individual may have some money madness, whether less. 4) I doubt if any man living hands out a pound note with-out a pang; 5) and a real tremor, if he hands out a ten-pound note. The poet does not doubt that if a man spends a pound note and does not feel a pang (a pain) in his heart. This pang turns into a tremor when he would have to spend a ten-pound. 6) We quail, money makes us quail.
7) It has got us down, we grovel before it in strange terror. 8) And no wonder, for money has a fearful cruel power among men. Money makes us quail, stress gripped. The poet blames money for lowering us down. We kneel to it, not out of will but in strange terror or fear, it is like a master, and we are bound to it. It is no surprise that money has an exaggerated power to influence our life. The poet personifies money as a master and mankind as its slave. The poet says money makes humans terrifying and merciless to others. They become highly unkind towards others when it comes to accumulating or obtaining money. 9) But it is not money we are so terrified of, 10) it is the collective money-madness of mankind. 11) For mankind say with one voice: How much is he worth? 12) Has he no money? Then let him eat dirt, and go cold.– The poet says it is not money which is scary but the collective madness for money, which is frightening. People insane and obsessed with money value a person who is rich. They judge the worth of a person on the scale of money. A person who has no money, people do not care about him and do not keep a relationship with him, and they just let him in suffering. Here, Lawrence compares the cruel treatment of people towards a poor man with letting a person eat dirt and die in the cold. 13) And if I have no money, they will give me a little bread 14) so I do not die, 15) but they will make me eat dirt with it. 16) I shall have to eat dirt, I shall have to eat dirt 17) if I have no money. 18)
It is that that I am frightened of. 19) And that fear can become a delirium.
20) It is fear of my money-mad fellow-
men. Lawrence calls readers to suppose a situation about himself. He says if one day he has no money. People will not let him die of hunger as they will give him some bread to eat but humiliate him. It would be like making the poet eat dirt. The poet fears such conditions and reiterates that he would have to eat dirt, he would have to eat dirt, if he becomes penniless. The poet knows that the fear of being needy can advance and turn out to be a disease called delirium in which one becomes a frenzy and unaware. So, the fear of the "money-mad fellow men" can cause a long-lasting mental disorder in others.
He fears that such madness for money might result in the world going completely insane. 21)

We must have some money 22) to save us from eating dirt. 23)
And this is all wrong. 24) Bread should be free, 25) shelter should be free, 26) fire should be free 27) to all and anybody, all and anybody, all over the world. 28) We must regain our sanity about money 29) before we start killing one another about it. 30) It's one thing or the other. The poet suggests that if we want to save ourselves from humiliation, criticism, guilt, and blame, we must have some money. It may save us from eating dirt.
The poet strongly criticizes the degraded notion of money-mad people, which makes them mean to poor and needy people. He advises that bread, shelter, and fire should be provided free to all, all over the world. He sees it as a solution if food, house, and fire are given for free, people might not be severely money mad. In the last three lines, the poet suggests that we must regain our sanity, an ability to think and behave rationally and normally, regarding money. Else we will start killing each other for the sake of money. It is either one way or the other. 5.4 Money-Madness: Short Summary
Money Madness was written by D.H. Lawrence. In this poem, the poet exposes the madness of money-mad people. The poet condemns madness for money, claiming it
led to the loss of life's values. The poem denounces man's
insatiable desire for wealth and worldly luxury at the expense of human values.
This madness turns a person into an insensitive and inhuman being.
He loses his spirituality, his faith, his compassion, and his morality. Left alone, this madness could destroy humanity.
Money madness is more dangerous than money. It has conditioned humans to humiliate those
who have no money. Those who cannot afford it fear social decline. Human worth can be quantified in monetary terms. This fear leads to emotional outbursts. A man
is more concerned with his self-esteem. As a result, he wants money. The poet objects to this attitude. He claims this is all wrong. He
argues that all people in the world should be given
free bread and shelter. According to the poet, we should trade wisdom for money. If we don't do this, men will continue to kill others for money. He criticizes money madness as a loss of life values.
5.5
Check Your Progress 1. How is money a cruel power, in the words of Lawrence? 2. Discuss the theme of the poem "Money Madness". 3. What solution does the poet suggest overcoming the money madness?
Module II: Short Stories
Unit 6: "The Fly" – Katherine Mansfield 6.0 Introduction 6.1 Unit Objective 6.2 Katherine Mansfield: "The Fly" Writer 6.3 "The Fly": Reading 6.4 "The Fly": Summary 6.5 "The Fly": Analysis 6.6 Check Your Progress 6.0 Introduction "The Fly" was published in The Nation and Athenaeum in 1922. This time Mansfield was grieving over the loss of her brother, who died in a military training accident. She was also gravely ill with tuberculosis which later became the reason for her death. These circumstantial factors have strong significance in understanding the story. 6.1 Unit Objective This Unit shall help the learners to read and understand the story "The Fly". 6.2 Katherine Mansfield: "The Fly" Writer Katherine Mansfield (1888-1923) was born in Wellington, New Zealand. She is regarded as one of the most prolific short story writers of the 20th century. James Joyce, Virginia Wolf, and D. H. Lawrence had been her contemporaries.
Katherine Mansfield Source: Public domain Katherine's father was Harold Beauchamp, a businessman and banker, and her mother was Anne Burnell. Katherine had a comfortable childhood as she was born into a wealthy home. However, in the later years of her life, she had to experience poverty, and both experiences provided her with rich material for her stories. Katherine used to experiment with style and subject matter in her work. She is acknowledged to have played an influential role in shaping writing in modernism. Along with the short stories, she also wrote letters, reviews, and journals, in her short life as she died just at 34. Katherine went to London in 1903 and studied at "Queen's College". She returned to New Zealand for a brief period but returned to England in 1908 to never return to her homeland. She had a chaotic life of marriage, love affairs, and breakups. One of her lovers named Floryan Sobienowski introduced her to Chekhov's work whose profound influence is seen in her work. Mansfield met A R Orage, editor of the weekly "New Age" who published some of her stories in the magazine. It led to the publication of her first collection of short stories, "In a German Pension", a book. Katherine met John Middleton
Murry, editor of the avant-garde magazine, Rhythm, they both became lovers, and later Katherine worked with him in editing Rhythm. Living in Paris, she began writing a story that became 'Prelude', a study of family life in post-colonial New Zealand. It was published in 1918 by the Woolfs' Hogarth Press. In 1920, her second collection of short stories, "Bliss and Other Stories", was published. In 1922, her third collection, "The Garden Party and Other Stories" came, and also received high praise. She had become weak and susceptible to disease due to long-timed running disease gonorrhoea and other related problems. She died very young due to a haemorrhage in the lungs, in front of Murry, in January 1923. After her death, Murry edited and published most of her remaining stories and other works. "The Fly" is a fine example
of its author Katherine Mansfield's style and approach - cool, nuanced, sharp, and perceptive of human fragility. 6.3 "
The

Fly": Reading
Y'are
very snug in here,' piped old Mr Woodifield,
and
peered out of the great,
green- leather armchair by his friend the boss's desk
as a baby peers out of its pram.
His talk was over;
it was time for him to be off. But he did not want to go.
Since he had retired, since his...stroke, the
wife
and the girls kept him boxed up in the house every day of the week except Tuesday.
On Tuesday he was dressed and brushed and
allowed to cut back to the City
for
the day.
Though what he did there the wife and girls couldn't imagine.
Made a nuisance of himself to his friends, they supposed...
Well, perhaps so.
All
the same,
we cling to our last pleasures as the tree clings to its last leaves.
So there sat old Woodifield, smoking a cigar and staring almost greedily at the boss, who rolled in his office chair,
stout, rosy, five years older than he, and still going strong, still at the
helm.
It did one good to see him.
Wistfully, admiringly, the old voice added, 'It's snug in here, upon my word!' 'Yes, it's comfortable enough,' agreed the boss, and he flipped the Financial Times with a paper knife.
As a matter of fact, he was proud of his room; he liked to have it
admired, especially by old
Woodfield. It gave him a feeling of deep, solid satisfaction
to be planted there in the midst of it in full view of that frail old figure in the muffler. '
I'
ve had it done up lately,' he explained, as he had explained for the past how many weeks. '
New carpet,' and he pointed to
the bright red carpet with a pattern of large white rings. '
New furniture,' and he nodded
towards the massive bookcase and the table with legs like twisted treacle. 'Electric heating!' He waved almost exultantly towards the five transparent, pearly sausages glowing so softly in the tilted copper pan.
But he
did not draw old Woodifield's attention to the photograph over
the table of a grave-looking boy in uniform
standing in
one of those spectral photographers' parks with photographers' storm clouds behind him.
It was not new. It had been there for over six years. '
There was something I wanted to tell you,' said old Woodfield, and his eyes grew dim remembering. 'Now what was it? I had it in my mind when I started out this morning.'
His hands began to tremble, and patches of red showed above his beard.
Poor old chap, he's on his last pins, thought the boss. And,
feeling kindly, he winked at the old man, and said jokingly, 'I tell you what. I've got a little drop of something here that'll do you good before you go out into the cold again. It's beautiful stuff. It wouldn't hurt a child.'
He took a key off his watch chain, unlocked a cupboard below his desk, and drew forth a dark, squat bottle. '
That's the medicine,' said he. 'And the man from whom I got it told me on the strict Q.T. it came from the cellars at Windsor Castle.'
Old Woodifield's mouth fell open at the sight. He couldn't have looked more surprised if the boss had produced a rabbit. '

It's whisky, ain't it?' he piped feebly. The boss turned the bottle and lovingly showed him the label. Whisky it was. 'D'you know,' said he, peering up at the boss wonderingly, '
they won't let me touch it at home.' And he looked as though he was going to cry. '
Ah, that's where we know a bit more than the ladies,'
cried the boss,
swooping across for two tumblers that stood on the table with the water bottle, and pouring a generous finger into each.
'
Drink it down. It'll do you good. And don't put any water with it. It's sacrilege to tamper with stuff like this. Ah!' He tossed off his, pulled out his handkerchief, hastily wiped his moustaches, and cocked an eye at old Woodfield, who was rolling his in his chaps. The old man swallowed, was silent a moment, and then said faintly, 'It's nutty!' But it warmed him; as it crept into his chill old brain he remembered. 'That was it,' he said, heaving himself out of his chair. 'I thought you'd like to know.
The girls were in Belgium last week having a look at poor Reggie's grave, and they happened to come across your boy's. They're quite near each other, it seems.'
Old Woodifield paused, but the boss made no reply. Only a quiver in his eyelids showed that he heard. '
The girls were delighted with the way the place is kept,' piped the old voice. 'Beautifully looked after. Couldn't be better if they were at home.
You've not been across, have yer?' 'No, no!' For various reasons, the boss had not been across.
There's miles of it,' quavered old Woodfield, 'and it's all as neat as a garden. Flowers growing on all the graves. Nice broad paths.'
It was plain from his voice how much he liked a nice broad path.
The pause came again. Then the old man brightened wonderfully. '
D'you know what the hotel made the girls pay for a pot of jam?' he piped. 'Ten francs! Robbery, I call it. It was a little pot, so Gertrude says, no bigger than a half-crown.
And she hadn't taken more than a spoonful when they charged her ten francs.
Gertrude brought the pot away with her to teach 'em a lesson.
Quite right, too; it's trading on our feelings.
They think because we're over there having a look around we're ready to pay anything. That's what it is.' And he turned towards the door. 'Quite right, quite right!' cried the boss, though what was quite right he hadn't the least idea. He came round by his desk, followed the shuffling footsteps to the door, and saw the old fellow out. Woodifield was gone. For a long moment, the boss stayed, staring at nothing, while the grey-haired office messenger, watching him, dodged in and out of his cubby hole like a dog that expects to be taken for a run.
Then: 'I'll see nobody for half an hour, Macey,' said the boss. 'Understand! Nobody at all.' 'Very good, sir.'
The door shut, the firm heavy steps recrossed the bright carpet, the fat body plumped down in the spring chair and leaning forward,
the boss covered his face with
his hands. He wanted, he intended, he had arranged to weep...
It
had been a
terrible shock to him when old Woodifield sprang
that remark
upon him about the boy's grave.
It was exactly as though the earth had opened and he had seen the boy lying there with Woodifield's girls staring down at him.
For
it was strange.
Although over six years had passed away, the boss never
thought of the boy except as lying unchanged, unblemished in his uniform, asleep
forever. 'My son!' groaned the
boss.
But
no tears came yet. In the past,
in the first months and even years after the
boy's death,
he had only to say those words to be overcome by such grief that nothing short of a violent fit of weeping could relieve him.

Time, he had declared then, he had told everybody, could make no difference.
Other men perhaps might recover, might live their loss down, but not he.
How was it possible?
His boy was an only son.
Ever since his birth, the boss
had worked at building up this business for him; it
had no other meaning if it was not for the boy.
Life itself had come to have no other meaning.
How on earth could he have slaved, denied himself,
and
kept going all those years without the promise forever before him of the boy's stepping
into his shoes and carrying on where he left off?
And that promise had been so near being fulfilled.
The boy had been in the office learning the ropes for a year before the
war.
Every morning they had started off together; they had come back by the same train.
And what congratulations he had received as the boy's father!
No wonder; he had taken to it marvellously. As to his popularity with the staff, every man jack of them down to old Macey couldn't make enough of the boy. And he wasn't
in
the least spoilt. No, he was just his bright natural self, with the right word for everybody, with that boyish look and his habit of saying, 'Simply splendid!'
But all that was over and done with as though it never had been. The day had come when Macey handed him the telegram that brought the whole place crashing about his head. 'Deeply regret to inform you ...' And he had left the office a broken
man, with his life in ruins.
Six years ago,
six years... How quickly time passed! It might have happened yesterday.
The
boss took his hands from his face;
he was puzzled.
Something seemed to be wrong with him.
He wasn't feeling as he wanted to feel.
He decided to get up and have a look at the boy's photograph. But it wasn't a favourite photograph of his; the expression was unnatural. It was cold, even stern-looking. The boy had never looked like that.
At that moment the boss
noticed that a fly had fallen into his broad inkpot,
and was trying feebly but desperately to clamber out again.
Help! Help! said those struggling
legs.
But the sides of the inkpot were wet and slippery; it
fell
back again and began to swim.
The boss
took up a pen, picked the fly out of the ink, and shook it onto a piece of blotting paper. For a fraction of a second, it lay still on the dark patch that oozed around it.
Then the
front legs waved, took hold, and, pulling its small, sodden body up,
it began the immense task of cleaning the ink from its wings. Over and under, over and under, went a leg along a wing as the stone goes over and under the scythe.
Then there was a pause, while the fly, seeming to stand on the tips of its toes, tried to expand first one wing and then the other. It succeeded at last, and, sitting down, it began, like a minute cat, to clean its face.
Now one could imagine that the little front legs rubbed against each other lightly, joyfully.
The horrible danger was over; it had escaped;
it
was

ready for life again.
But just then the boss had an idea.
He plunged his pen back into the ink, leaned his thick wrist on the blotting paper, and
as the fly tried its wings down came a great heavy blot.
What would it make of that? What indeed!
The
little beggar seemed
absolutely cowed, stunned, and afraid to move because of what would happen next.
But then, as if painfully, it dragged itself forward. The front legs waved, caught hold, and, more slowly this time, the task began from the beginning.
He's a plucky little devil, thought the boss, and
he felt a real admiration for the fly's courage.
That was the way to tackle things; that was the right spirit.
Never say die;
it was only a question of...
But
the
fly had again finished its laborious task, and the boss had just time to refill his pen, to shake fair and square on the new-cleaned body yet another dark drop. What about it this time? A
painful moment of suspense followed. But behold, the front legs were again waving; the boss felt a rush of relief. He leaned over the fly and said to it tenderly, 'You artful little b...'
And he actually had the brilliant notion of breathing on it to help the drying process. All the
same, there was something timid and weak about its efforts now,
and the boss decided that this time should be the last,
as he dipped the pen deep into the inkpot.
It was.
The last blot fell on the soaked blotting paper, and
the draggled fly lay in it and did not stir.
The back legs were stuck to the body; the front legs were not to be seen.
'
Come on,' said the boss. 'Look sharp!' And he stirred it with his pen in vain. Nothing happened or was likely to happen.
The fly was dead.
The boss lifted the corpse on the end of the paper knife and flung it into the waste-paper basket.
But
such a grinding feeling of wretchedness seized him that he felt positively frightened.
He
started forward and pressed the bell for
Macey. '
Bring me some fresh blotting paper,' he said sternly, 'and look sharp about it.'
And while the old dog padded away
he
fell to wondering what it was he had been thinking about before. What was it?
It was... He took out his handkerchief and passed it inside his collar. For the life of him, he could not remember.
Word-meaning: ● Snug: comfortable, warm, and cosy ● Peers: look keenly or with difficulty at someone or something. ● Nuisance: a person, thing, or circumstance causing inconvenience or annoyance ● Exultantly: triumphantly happy ● Groaned: make a deep inarticulate sound in response to pain or despair ● Wretched: (of a person) in a very unhappy or unfortunate state ● Scythe: Knife The Fly, Text Source: https://www.english.ox.ac.uk/ten-minute-book-club/mansfield-the-fly#tab-2240911 6.4 "The Fly": Summary Mr Woodifield is retired and a heart patient who has come to see his ex-boss at his office. He praises the office for its furniture and furnishings. Boss offers him a fine-quality whisky, and they both are enjoying their drinks when suddenly Woodifield recalls and tells him that his daughters visited Belgium and went to the graves and are happy to see that both the grave are very well taken care of. The graves are of their two young boys who died in the war. Woodfield has gone, and the boss remembers his dead son. He becomes so grieved but cannot weep even trying hard. Five to six years have gone by since
his son died.
He decides to go to the photograph of his dead son, but a fly
catches his attention which has fallen into the inkpot.

He
takes the fly out of the ink pot and keeps it on blotting paper. As the fly tries to fly, he drops a
few drops of the ink on it and
sees the fly is struggling hard to fly but succumbs to the load and dies at last. The boss throws the blotting paper and the dead fly into the dustbin. He calls his office man and asks him
to give him
a new blotting paper. He tries to remember what he was doing before
it. 6.5 “The Fly”:
Analysis The Fly by Katherine Mansfield has different themes and used the technique of symbolism. It is narrated in the third person by an unnamed narrator. The theme of control: Reading the story, the reader learns that the author has used an office as the setting. Woodifield tells the boss that the office is ‘very snug.’ We realise that the office has been newly decorated. It lets the reader assume the boss is in control of his environment. At different times he appears to be in control. The boss drops ink on the fly before eventually dropping more, letting the readers sense that the boss exerts a level of control. He orders Macey not to disturb him, which suggests that the boss exercises control. Time is a healer. It wins over grief. “
The Fly” is about the conquest of time over grief. This is a significant theme of the story. The author shows two characters - Mr Wooifield and his ex-boss, both lost their only sons six years ago
in a war. Over this time, Mr Woodifield seems to have won over his grief of losing his son, he does not cry or feel a pang in his heart when he talks about the grave of his son. It shows that time has helped him to overcome his
grief. The Boss once thought that time would not make any difference to his grief.
On hearing about the grave of his son from Woodifield he becomes uneasy. He wants to remain alone for some time. He intends and wishes
to feel the same pang of grief he used to feel. “
He wanted, he intended, he arranged to weep.... But no tears came yet.”
Time has conquered his grief.
As he wants to cry, he decides to get up and have a look at
his son’s picture. But
just then, a fly sunken in an inkpot catches his attention, and he forgets about
the photo of his son and the grief. After the fly dies, he tries to recall what he was thinking before it but cannot. What does
the fly stand for?
As flies to wanton boys are we to the gods they kill us for their sport. The
fly symbolises the helplessness of a man before fate.
Men have no power to defy fate. To convey this idea, the author has used a brief incident of a fly. Like the fly laden with ink drops, a man tries harder to get out of the grip of death. No matter how hard we try, eventually, fate captures us. The fly had fallen into an inkpot, and the boss took it out and kept it on blotting paper. He tests the fly's strength when he sees the fly is using all its might, he again drops down a few drops of the ink on it through a pen, and this time the fly succumbs. The fly dies from those drops of ink. The author herself had got affected by an infection at a young age, she became susceptible to diseases and was forced to live an unhealthy life. Eventually, she died of Tuber Culosis, the last drop of the disease, which took her life. The author died young in her 30s. Other symbolic relevances in the story ● The fly can be seen symbolising the young men who died in the war. ● The pen the boss used to drop the ink also has symbolic significance. It signifies the continued signing of orders by generals that led many young men to lose their lives. ● Woodifield remarks ‘there is miles of it’. Including this remark in the story, the author may possibly be intending to highlight the large volume of deaths that occurred during World War I. ● Woodiefied and the boss have been described as old the author may be suggesting that after World War I had remained more old men as many young had died in the war. ● Woodifield behaves like a child when he says that ‘it is very snug here’, similarly, the boss is also seen behaving not less than a child in his repetitive experiment on the fly. Probably the author is trying to make a point here. She may be suggesting that the old generals who sent the young men to fight in World War I had no wisdom or maturity. ● The boss does not learn anything from his experiment with the fly. The author may be suggesting that just as the boss has learnt nothing from the fly experimentation, neither have the generals, they seem unaffected by the death of the young soldiers. Just as the boss throws the fly into the waste-paper basket, the generals probably do not remember the loss of lives. 6.6 Check Your Progress 1. Summarize the story “The Fly” in your own words. 2. Discuss the theme/s the story “The Fly” carries. 3. Give an analysis of the story “The Fly”, as you understood. 4. How was Katherine Mansfield's life, and also discuss her writing career.

Unit 7: “Moonlight” (Clair de Lune) – Guy de Maupassant 7.0 Introduction 7.1 Unit Objective 7.2 Guy de Maupassant (Henri Ren Albert Guy de Maupassant): “Clair de Lune” Writer 7.3 Clair De Lune “Moonlight”: Reading 7.4 Clair De Lune “Moonlight”: Interpretation 7.5 Clair de Lune (Moonlight): Analysis 7.5 Check Your Progress 7.0 Introduction Gay De Maupassant’s Clair de Lune (Moonlight) is a beautiful story that involves human psychology. It carries a theme that the human mind is not static but is dynamic and flexible and responds to changes in ideas. We might have any ideas, but as we grow or gain experience, the old ones get replaced with new and fresh ideas, and this story reflects that human nature. 7.1 Unit Objective This unit shall help the learners to read and understand the story in different aspects. 7.2 Guy de Maupassant (Henri Ren Albert Guy de Maupassant): “Clair de Lune” Writer Henri Ren Albert Guy de Maupassant was a prolific French writer, he used to write under the pen name Guy de Maupassant.

Henri Ren Albert Guy de Maupassant (Aug 5, 1850 - Jul 6, 1893) Open Source Guy de Maupassant was born in 1850. He died young, at the age of 42, in 1893. He was an admirer of Gustave Flaubert, who set him out to be a writer. Guy de Maupassant is considered the father of the modern short story and is acknowledged as one of the finest and most prolific writers and an inspiration to other writers. William Somerset Maugham, O. Henry, Anton Chekhov, Kate Chopin, and Henry James are some of the many admirers who had been greatly influenced by Maupassant’s writing style. Throughout his career, Maupassant had been a famous writer and in demand by publishers. He had been fortunate to see that his stories were widely read. Maupassant had been an army soldier also. He fought in the Franco-Prussian War. The war experience enriched him with story materials, he has written many stories that depict the tragedy and suffering of innocent civilians caught during a war. He targeted the bourgeoisie for their unadmirable behaviour. Guy de Maupassant had got suffered from a mental illness in his later years and he tried to take his life by suicide on January 2nd, 1892. He was admitted to a private asylum in Paris and died in the subsequent year.

7.3 Clair De Lune “Moonlight”: Reading CLAIR DE LUNE Abbe Marignan's martial name suited him well. He was a tall, thin priest, fanatic, excitable, yet upright. All his beliefs were fixed, never varying. He believed sincerely that he knew his God, understood His plans, desires and intentions. When he walked with long strides along the garden walk of his little country parsonage, he would sometimes ask himself the question: “Why has God done this?” And he would dwell on this continually, putting himself in the place of God, and he almost invariably found an answer. He would never have cried out in an outburst of pious humility: “Thy ways, O Lord, are past finding out.” He said to himself: “I am the servant of God; it is right for me to know the reason of His deeds, or to guess it if I do not know it.” Everything in nature seemed to him to have been created in accordance with an admirable and absolute logic. The “whys” and “becauses” always balanced. Dawn was given to make our awakening pleasant, the days to ripen the harvest, the rains to moisten it, the evenings for preparation for slumber, and the dark nights for sleep. The four seasons corresponded perfectly to the needs of agriculture, and no suspicion had ever come to the priest of the fact that nature has no intentions; that, on the contrary, everything which exists must conform to the hard demands of seasons, climates and matter. But he hated woman—hated her unconsciously, and despised her by instinct. He often repeated the words of Christ: “Woman, what have I to do with thee?” and he would add: “It seems as though God, Himself, were dissatisfied with this work of His.” She was the tempter who led the first man astray, and who since then had ever been busy with her work of damnation, the feeble creature, dangerous and mysteriously affecting one. And even more than their sinful bodies, he hated their loving hearts. He had often felt their tenderness directed toward himself, and though he knew that he was invulnerable, he grew angry at this need of love that is always vibrating in them. According to his belief, God had created woman for the sole purpose of tempting and testing man. One must not approach her without defensive precautions and fear of possible snares. She was, indeed, just like a snare, with her lips open and her arms stretched out to man. He had no indulgence except for nuns, whom their vows had rendered inoffensive; but

he was stern with them, nevertheless, because he felt that at the bottom of their fettered and humble hearts the everlasting tenderness was burning brightly—that tenderness which was shown even to him, a priest. He felt this cursed tenderness, even in their docility, in the low tones of their voices when speaking to him, in their lowered eyes, and in their resigned tears when he reproved them roughly. And he would shake his cassock on leaving the convent doors, and walk off, lengthening his stride as though flying from danger. He had a niece who lived with her mother in a little house near him. He was bent upon making a sister of charity of her. She was a pretty, brainless madcap. When the abbe preached she laughed, and when he was angry with her she would give him a hug, drawing him to her heart, while he sought unconsciously to release himself from this embrace which nevertheless filled him with a sweet pleasure, awakening in his depths the sensation of paternity which slumbers in every man. Often, when walking by her side, along the country road, he would speak to her of God, of his God. She never listened to him, but looked about her at the sky, the grass and flowers, and one could see the joy of life sparkling in her eyes. Sometimes she would dart forward to catch some flying creature, crying out as she brought it back: “Look, uncle, how pretty it is! I want to hug it!” And this desire to “hug” flies or lilac blossoms disquieted, angered, and roused the priest, who saw, even in this, the ineradicable tenderness that is always budding in women's hearts. Then there came a day when the sexton's wife, who kept house for Abbe Marignan, told him, with caution, that his niece had a lover. Almost suffocated by the fearful emotion this news roused in him, he stood there, his face covered with soap, for he was in the act of shaving. When he had sufficiently recovered to think and speak he cried: “It is not true; you lie, Melanie!” But the peasant woman put her hand on her heart, saying: “May our Lord judge me if I lie, Monsieur le Cure! I tell you, she goes there every night when your sister has gone to bed. They meet by the river side; you have only to go there and see, between ten o'clock and midnight.” He ceased scraping his chin, and began to walk up and down impetuously, as he always did when he was in deep thought. When he began shaving again he cut himself

three times from his nose to his ear. All day long he was silent, full of anger and indignation. To his priestly hatred of this invincible love was added the exasperation of her spiritual father, of her guardian and pastor, deceived and tricked by a child, and the selfish emotion shown by parents when their daughter announces that she has chosen a husband without them, and in spite of them. After dinner he tried to read a little, but could not, growing more and, more angry. When ten o'clock struck he seized his cane, a formidable oak stick, which he was accustomed to carry in his nocturnal walks when visiting the sick. And he smiled at the enormous club which he twirled in a threatening manner in his strong, country fist. Then he raised it suddenly and, gritting his teeth, brought it down on a chair, the broken back of which fell over on the floor. He opened the door to go out, but stopped on the sill, surprised by the splendid moonlight, of such brilliance as is seldom seen. And, as he was gifted with an emotional nature, one such as had all those poetic dreamers, the Fathers of the Church, he felt suddenly distracted and moved by all the grand and serene beauty of this pale night. In his little garden, all bathed in soft light, his fruit trees in a row cast on the ground the shadow of their slender branches, scarcely in full leaf, while the giant honeysuckle, clinging to the wall of his house, exhaled a delicious sweetness, filling the warm moonlit atmosphere with a kind of perfumed soul. He began to take long breaths, drinking in the air as drunkards drink wine, and he walked along slowly, delighted, marveling, almost forgetting his niece. As soon as he was outside of the garden, he stopped to gaze upon the plain all flooded with the caressing light, bathed in that tender, languishing charm of serene nights. At each moment was heard the short, metallic note of the cricket, and distant nightingales shook out their scattered notes—their light, vibrant music that sets one dreaming, without thinking, a music made for kisses, for the seduction of moonlight. The abbe walked on again, his heart failing, though he knew not why. He seemed weakened, suddenly exhausted; he wanted to sit down, to rest there, to think, to admire God in His works. Down yonder, following the undulations of the little river, a great line of poplars wound in and out. A fine mist, a white haze through which the moonbeams passed,

silvering it and making it gleam, hung around and above the mountains, covering all the tortuous course of the water with a kind of light and transparent cotton. The priest stopped once again, his soul filled with a growing and irresistible tenderness. And a doubt, a vague feeling of disquiet came over him; he was asking one of those questions that he sometimes put to himself. “Why did God make this? Since the night is destined for sleep, unconsciousness, repose, forgetfulness of everything, why make it more charming than day, softer than dawn or evening? And why does this seductive planet, more poetic than the sun, that seems destined, so discreet is it, to illuminate things too delicate and mysterious for the light of day, make the darkness so transparent? “Why does not the greatest of feathered songsters sleep like the others? Why does it pour forth its voice in the mysterious night? “Why this half-veil cast over the world? Why these tremblings of the heart, this emotion of the spirit, this enervation of the body? Why this display of enchantments that human beings do not see, since they are lying in their beds? For whom is destined this sublime spectacle, this abundance of poetry cast from heaven to earth?” And the abbe could not understand. But see, out there, on the edge of the meadow, under the arch of trees bathed in a shining mist, two figures are walking side by side. The man was the taller, and held his arm about his sweetheart's neck and kissed her brow every little while. They imparted life, all at once, to the placid landscape in which they were framed as by a heavenly hand. The two seemed but a single being, the being for whom was destined this calm and silent night, and they came toward the priest as a living answer, the response his Master sent to his questionings. He stood still, his heart beating, all upset; and it seemed to him that he saw before him some biblical scene, like the loves of Ruth and Boaz, the accomplishment of the will of the Lord, in some of those glorious stories of which the sacred books tell. The verses of the Song of Songs began to ring in his ears, the appeal of passion, all the poetry of this poem replete with tenderness. And he said unto himself: “Perhaps God has made such nights as these to idealize the love of men.” He shrank back from this couple that still advanced with arms intertwined. Yet it was
his niece. But he asked himself now if he would not be disobeying God. And does not God permit love, since He surrounds it with such visible splendor? And he went back musing, almost ashamed, as if he had intruded into a temple where he had, no right to enter. Source: The Entire Original Maupassant Short Stories By Guy De Maupassant Translated By Albert M. C. Mcmaster, B.A. A. E. Henderson, B.A. Mme. Quesada And Others 7.4 Clair De Lune “Moonlight”: Interpretation Abbe Marignan was a priest of thin and tall build who was a rational, emotional, and honest. He had strong and firm beliefs that did not go less or more to any degree. He believed of being well aware of God and understanding His plans, desires, and intentions. Sometimes when walking in the garden, a question arose in his mind: “Why did God create that?” He would stay in this contemplation for a long, and then mentally, taking the place of God, found the answer, which was always correct. It was never like murmuring to himself - “O Lord, thy designs are impenetrable (incomprehensible)!”, instead it was firmly saying to himself - “I am the servant of God; I must know the reasons for what He does, or, if I do not know, I should guess them". Nature, in all aspects, appeared to him to have been created in accordance with admiration and logic. He realised that the 'whys' and 'because' are balanced or corresponded. Dawns or the early sunrise wake and gladden us, the daytime ripens our crops, rains moisten them, evenings prepare for sleep, and nights are for sleep. All four seasons are according to the needs of agriculture. Abbe had no doubt the intent of nature. However, he believed that everything that exists must fulfil the demands of seasons, climates, and matter.
Abbe did not like women and hated them. He often repeated the words of God, “Woman, what have I to do with thee?”, and then would say - “it seems even God himself was not happy with this deed of creating women”. The priest believed the first man was tempted by a woman and accused women of still doing this damnation. He deemed them feeble, dangerous, and mysteriously troublesome. He admitted to not liking their body and even their heart. He did not like women behaving tenderly to him. He believed they always had love or physical desires in mind, and their talking tenderly to him always irritated him. According to him, God had created women only to temp and test men. And, one must talk to women carefully, or they will trap him by showing their lips and opening their arms. He had only nuns with whom he used to talk but sternly. He felt that the tenderness, which he refers to as everlasting and cursing, must be burying in their controlled minds and humble hearts. He believed that women could never be free of love and desires, which is so cursing. Even in the docile behaviour, low-toned voices, lowered eyes, and tears of nuns, which often rolled out their eyes whenever he reprimanded them, he felt the cursed tenderness in them. And on such occasions, he often chose to leave the place to evade the danger of falling into their trap. Abbe Marignan had a niece who lived with her mother in a little house near him. He wanted to make her a sister of charity. His niece was a beautiful girl, giddy and unconventional. When Abbe used to teach her, she would laugh, which angered him, but to cheer him up, she would lovingly embrace and kiss him. Though it used to awaken a fatherly love in Abbe towards her, he would disengage himself from her embrace.. Abbe and his niece often went on walks together, when he would talk of God to her, but she did not prefer to listen to him and instead loved looking at nature

- sky, grass, flowers, which gave her immense joy. Going behind the flying creatures and appreciating their beauty used to give her joy. She would kiss the insects and flowers out of love, and it disturbed Abbe as he used to see her nature love from his own perspective. He believed it is the same unremovable tenderness that blooms in the heart of women. One day the sacristan's wife who is a housekeeper reveals that his niece has a lover, and this news shocks him dreadfully. He refuses the news to be true. Melanie, swearing by her heart, asks him to confirm it himself. Every night his niece goes to meet her lover by the riverside between ten o'clock and midnight, Melanie asks him to go and see the truth himself. Abbe reacts to the information of the love affair of his niece angrily with indignation. A priest's anger boiled already at the power of love has risen by feeling deceived and robbed by a child to whom he was a spiritual father, a teacher, and a guardian. He felt the way parents would experience when a daughter tells them that she has chosen a husband withou their advice. Throughout the day, he remains restless, and as it strikes ten at night, he heavy-heartedly and hurriedly moves out of his home. As he opens the door, he stops on the sill for a while, astonished by the beauty of the moonlight. Rarely he has seen such a sight of the moon. He becomes immersed in the beauty of moonlight falling on his garden and the plants and trees there. So delighted and wonderstuck he becomes that for a moment he forgets about his niece. When Abbe reaches the open countryside he stops for a moment and enjoys a view of moonlight nature looking reverential around him. He listens to the sounds of keats and insects, and sweet voice of nightangle coming from a distant. The moonlight and the vibrant music which can make one dreaming and kissing gives him a different experience. Abbe resumes walking and feels
his heart is failing, it is unfathomable to him. He feels tired and wants to sit down to rest and admire God in His works. He thinks, why God made all this? As nights are for sleep, rest, and forgetfulness of everything then why has he made it lovelier than the day, sweeter than dawn and sunset? Why has He made stars more poetic than the sun and talented birds to sing in the night? Why this semi-veil has been cast over the world? Why my heart is sighing, the soul is in tumult, and I am feeling pleasantness. Why are men sleeping and not seeing this charming nighttime and natural poetic beauty? Abbe finds it difficult to understand all that. Just then he spots his niece with her beau who was walking side by side. He notices that the lover of her niece is taller, and his arm is around her neck, he is kissing her forehead from time to time. He perceives the couple has animated the lifeless landscape; their scene seems embedded in the frame of beautiful nature. They both seem to him like a single being for whom this tranquil silent night has been created. Abbe feels His Master has given him the answer to his questions, and he became overwhelmed with a kind of joy. He has understood that perhaps God has made nights such beautiful to cast a veil of the ideal over the lives of men. He moves aside from the path of his niece and her lover. He asks himself would it not be like disobeying God to object to accepting the love of them? He has discovered that even God is not against love, had He been he had not have made nature this way. He goes away from there ashamed as if he had entered a temple where he was not permitted to. 7.5 Clair de Lune (Moonlight): Analysis Gay De Maupassant's Clair de Lune (Moonlight) is a beautiful story that involves human psychology. It carries a theme that the human mind is not static but is dynamic and flexible and responds to changes in ideas. We might have many ideas, but as we grow or gain experience, the old ones get replaced with new and fresh ideas, and this story reflects human nature. The priest Abbemarigan did not like women, he believed that he knew them very well. This ideology of his proves false later and gets changed. He realizes that man and woman are incomplete in the absence of one another. He used to think that women only tempt and test men. They trap them by showing their lips and opening their arms. He concludes by the end of the story that a man or a woman become one when their souls or hearts unify. The story Clair de Lune attempts to replace the negative ideology with the positive one. It eliminates ignorance and enlightens the human mind. The priest believed that he knew all, but by the end of the story, he realized that he did not know all, and he considers both genders equally important. Guy De Maupassant was a 19th-century French realistic writer. He has used realism in this story. The character of the priest has been sketched in the realistic picture of a priest in general, who is an all-knowing man, with his faith in God, and an ideology about women. The portrayal of his niece is of a naughty girl who irritates him when he tries to preach her religion. She admires nature and runs after the insects to capture them. She embraces him to calm his anger down, which children usually do. The story has the traditional type of plot as action develops in an order without any break. It is related to middle-class people with typical characteristics of common thinking. The setting of the story is also realistic, it has descriptions of village roads, beautiful moonlight night, and riverside. The story narration is by a 3rd person narrator who gives us omniscient point of view. Maupassant has used extraordinarily beautiful language using images,

symbols, metaphors, illusions, humours, and descriptions, “The beautiful night with silvery moon”. 7.5 Check Your Progress 1. Read the story and interpret it in your own words. 2. Give a characteristic sketch of the Priest Abbe Marignan. 3. Write a note on the ideologies of the Priest Abbe. Did they remain static? Resources: ➢ Studying the Short-Story SIXTEEN SHORT-STORY CLASSICS WITH INTRODUCTIONS, NOTES AND A NEW LABORATORY STUDY METHOD FOR INDIVIDUAL READING AND ➢ USE IN COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS BY J. BERG ESENWEIN, A.M., Lit.D. EDITOR OF THE WRITER’S MONTHLY REVISED EDITION THE WRITER’S LIBRARY EDITED BY J. BERG ESENWEIN HINDS, HAYDEN & ELDREDGE, Inc. NEW YORK PHILADELPHIA CHICAGO ➢ Copyright 1912 By J. Berg Esenwein Copyright 1918 By J. Berg Esenwein
Unit 8: “Science and Tradition” – Bertrand Russell 8.0 Introduction 8.1 Unit Objective 8.2 Bertrand Russell 8.3 Essay “Science and Tradition”: Reading 8.4 Glossary 8.5 Comprehensions 8.5.1 Comprehension 1: 8.5.2 Comprehension 2: 8.0 Introduction “Science and Tradition” written by Bertrand Russell is an informative and thought-building literary chapter published in the book “The Impact of Science”. It highlights the traditional concepts that existed in the pre-scientific stage, the relevant scientific developments, and the outlook of people towards them. It was

100% **MATCHING BLOCK 1/26** W

subsequently repeated at Columbia University, New York, and published by the Columbia University Press.

Bertrand Arthur William Russell, 3rd Earl Russell, OM FRS (18 May 1872 - 2nd February 1970) was a Welsh philosopher, logician, mathematician, essayist, historian, social reform advocate, pacifist, and Nobel laureate. 8.1 Unit Objective Read and comprehend the essay - “Science and Tradition” – Bertrand Russell
8.2 Bertrand Russell Bertrand Arthur William Russell, 3rd Earl Russell, OM FRS (18 May 1872 - 2nd February 1970) was a Welsh philosopher, logician, mathematician, essayist, historian, social reform advocate, pacifist, and Nobel laureate. Bertrand Russell Source: Google Open Source ● Bertrand Russell was born in Welsh and also died there, though he spent most of the time of his life in England. ● He is considered one of the founders of analytic philosophy. ● He co-authored with Whitehead for - Principia Mathematical. ● His essay “On Denoting” is considered a paragon of philosophy. ● His works have had a major impact on logic, mathematics, set theory, linguistics, and analytic philosophy. ● He was an anti-war activist, a supporter of free trade between nations, and anti-imperialism. ● A pacifist activist, Russell had been imprisoned during World War I. He campaigned against Adolf Hitler, criticized Soviet totalitarianism, and American involvement in the Vietnam War. ● He was awarded the Nobel Prize in Literature in 1950, in recognition of his writings which are on humanitarian ideals and freedom of thought.
● He wrote over ninety books, technical and popular, on various topics. His most famous writings include “On Denoting” (1905), “Knowledge by Acquaintance and Knowledge by Description” (1910), “The Philosophy of Logical Atomism”(1918, 1919), “Logical Atomism”(1924), The Analysis of Mind (1921), and The Analysis of Matter (1927). Two of his best-selling works are The Problems of Philosophy (1912) and A History of Western Philosophy (1945). ● Russell died of influenza on February 2, 1970, at his home in Wales. According to his wish after his death, his body was cremated, and his ashes were scattered over the Welsh mountains. 8.3 Essay “Science and Tradition”: Reading Man

98% **MATCHING BLOCK 2/26** W

has existed for about a million years. He has possessed writing for about 6,000 years, agriculture somewhat longer, but perhaps not much longer. Science, as a dominant factor in determining the beliefs of educated men, has existed for about 300 years; as a source of economic technique, for about 150 years. In this brief period, it has proved itself an incredibly powerful revolutionary force. When we consider how recently it has risen to power, we find ourselves forced to believe that we are at the very beginning of its work in transforming human life. What its future effects will be is a matter of conjecture, but possibly a study of its effects hitherto may make the conjecture a little less hazardous. The effects of science are of various very different kinds. There are direct intellectual effects: the dispelling of many traditional beliefs, and the adoption of others suggested by the success of

the

100% **MATCHING BLOCK 6/26** W

scientific method. Then there are effects on technique in industry and war. Then, chiefly as a consequence of new techniques, there are profound changes in

the social organization which are gradually bringing about corresponding

94% MATCHING BLOCK 10/26 W

political changes. Finally, as a result of the new control over the environment that scientific knowledge has conferred, a new philosophy is growing up, involving a changed conception of man's place in the universe. I shall deal successively with these aspects of the effects of science on human life. First I shall recount its purely intellectual effect as a solvent of unfounded traditional beliefs, such as witchcraft. Next, I shall consider scientific techniques, especially since the industrial revolution. Last, I shall set forth the philosophy which is being suggested by the triumphs of science and shall contend that this philosophy, if unchecked, may inspire a form of unwisdom from which disastrous consequences may result. The study of anthropology has made us vividly aware of the mass of unfounded beliefs that influence the lives of uncivilized human beings. Illness is attributed to sorcery, failure of crops to angry gods or malignant demons. Human sacrifice is thought to promote victory in war and the fertility of the soil; eclipses and comets are held to presage disaster. The life of the savage is hemmed in by taboos, and the consequences of infringing on a taboo are thought to be frightful. Some parts of this primitive outlook died out early in the regions in which civilization began. There are traces of human sacrifice in the Old Testament, for instance in the stories of Jephthah's daughter and of Abraham and Isaac, but by the time the Jews became fully historical they had abandoned the practice. The Greeks abandoned it in about the seventh century b.c. But the Carthaginians still practised it during the Punic Wars. The decay of human sacrifice in Mediterranean countries is not attributable to science, but presumably to humanitarian feelings. In other respects, however, science has been the chief agent in dispelling primitive superstitions. Eclipses were the earliest natural phenomena to escape from superstition into science. The Babylonians could predict them, though as regards solar eclipses, their predictions were not always right. But the priests kept this knowledge to themselves and used it as a means of increasing their hold over the populace. When the Greeks learned what the Babylonians had to teach, they very quickly arrived at astonishing astronomical discoveries. Thucydides mentions an eclipse of the sun and says that it occurred at the new moon, which, he goes on to observe, is apparently the only time at which such a phenomenon can occur. The Pythagoreans, very shortly after this time, discovered the correct theory of both solar and lunar eclipses and inferred that the earth is a sphere from the shape of its shadow on the moon. Although for the best minds, eclipses were thus brought within the domain of science, it was a long time before this knowledge was generally accepted. Milton could still speak of times when the sun In dim eclipse, disastrous twilight sheds On half the nations, and with fear of change Perplexes monarchs. But in Milton, this had become only poetic license. It was very much longer before comets were brought within the compass of science; indeed the process was completed only by the work of Newton and his friend Halley. Caesar's death was foretold by a comet; as Shakespeare makes Calpurnia say: When beggars die, there are no comets seen; The heavens themselves blaze forth the death of princes. The Venerable Bede asserted: "comets portend revolutions of kingdoms, pestilence, war, winds, or heat." John Knox regarded comets as evidence of divine anger, and his followers thought them "a warning to the King to extirpate the Papists." Probably Shakespeare still held beliefs of

the

superstitious kind about comets. It was only when they were found to obey the law of gravitation, and when some at least were found to have calculable orbits, that educated men, in general, ceased to regard them as portents. It was in the time of Charles II that scientific rejection of traditional superstitions became common among educated men. Charles II perceived that science could be an ally against the "fanatics," as those who regretted Cromwell were called. He founded the Royal Society and made science fashionable. Enlightenment spread gradually downwards from the Court. The House of Commons was as yet by no means as modern in outlook as the King. After the plague and the Great Fire, a House of Commons Committee inquired into the causes of those misfortunes, which were generally attributed to divine displeasure, though it was not clear to what the displeasure was due. The Committee decided that what most displeased the Lord was the works of Mr Thomas Hobbes. It was decreed that no work of his should be published in England. This measure proved effective: there has never since been a plague or a Great Fire in London. But Charles, who liked Hobbes because Hobbes had taught him mathematics, was annoyed. He, however, was not thought by Parliament to be on intimate terms with Providence. It was at this time that belief in witchcraft began to be viewed as a superstition. James, I was a fanatical persecutor of witches. Shakespeare's Macbeth was a piece of government propaganda, and no doubt the witches in that play made it more acceptable as a piece of flattery of the monarch. Even Bacon pretended to believe in witchcraft and made no protest when a Parliament of which he was a member passed a law increasing the severity of the punishment of witches. The climax was reached under the Commonwealth, for it was especially Puritans who believed in the power of Satan. It was partly for this reason that Charles IPs government, while not yet venturing to deny the possibility of witchcraft, was much less zealous in searching it out than its predecessors had been. The last witchcraft trial in England was in 1664 when Sir Thomas Browne was a witness against the witch. The laws against it gradually fell into abeyance and were repealed in 1736—though, as late as 1768, John Wesley continued to support the old superstition. In Scotland, the superstition lingered longer: the last conviction was in 1722. The victory of humanity and common sense in this matter was almost entirely due to the spread of the scientific outlook—not to any definite argument, but to the impossibility of the whole way of thinking that had been natural before the age of rationalism that began in the time of Charles II, partly, it must be confessed, as a revolt against a too rigid moral code. Scientific medicine had, at first, to combat superstitions similar to those that inspired belief in witchcraft. When Vesalius first practised dissection of corpses, the Church was horrified. He was saved from persecution, for a time, by Emperor Charles V, who was a valetudinarian, and believed that no other physician could keep him in health. But after the Emperor died, Vesalius was accused of cutting people up before they were dead. He was ordered, as a penance, to go on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land; he was shipwrecked and died of exposure. In spite of his work and that of Hervey and other great men, medicine continued to be largely superstitious. Insanity, in particular, was thought to be due to possession by evil spirits and was therefore treated by subjecting the insane to cruelties which it was hoped the demons would dislike. George III, when mad, was still treated on this principle. The ignorance of the general public continued even longer. An aunt of mine, when her husband quarrelled with the War Office, was afraid that the worry would cause him to develop typhus. It is hardly till the time of Lister and Pasteur that medicine can be said to have become scientific. The diminution of human suffering owing to the advances in medicine is beyond all calculation. Out of the work of the great men of the seventeenth century, a new outlook on the world was developed, and it was this outlook, not specific arguments, which brought about the decay of the belief in portents, witchcraft, demoniacal possession, and so forth. I think there were three ingredients in the scientific outlook of the eighteenth century that were especially important: (1) Statements of fact should be based on observation, not on unsupported authority. (2) The inanimate world is a self-acting, self-perpetuating system, in which all changes conform to natural laws. (3) The earth is not the centre of the universe, and probably Man is not its purpose (if any); moreover, “purpose" is a concept which is scientifically useless. These items make up what is called the "mechanistic outlook," which clergymen denounce. It led to the cessation of persecution and to a generally humane attitude. It is now less accepted than it was, and persecution has revived. To those who regard its effects as morally pernicious, I commend attention to these facts. Something must be said about each of the above ingredients of the mechanistic outlook. (1) Observation versus Authority: To modern educated people, it seems obvious that matters of fact are to be ascertained by observation, not by consulting ancient authorities. But this is an entirely modern conception, which hardly existed before the seventeenth century. Aristotle maintained that women have fewer teeth than men; although he was twice married, it never occurred to him to verify this statement by examining his wives' mouths. He said also that children will be healthier if conceived when the wind is in the north. One gathers that the two Mrs Aristotles both had to run out and look at the weathercock every evening before going to bed. He states that a man bitten by a mad dog will not go mad, but any other animal will (Hist. An. 704*2); that the bite of the shrewmouse is dangerous to horses, especially if the mouse is pregnant (ibid., 604Z?); that elephants suffering from insomnia can be cured by rubbing their shoulders with salt, olive oil, and warm water (ibid., 6050); and so on and so on. Nevertheless,

classical dons, who have never observed any animal except the cat and the dog, continue to praise Aristotle for his fidelity to observation. The conquest of the East by Alexander caused an immense influx of superstition into the Hellenistic world. This was particularly notable as regards astrology, which almost all later pagans believed in. The Church condemned it, not on scientific grounds, but because it implied subjection to Fate. There is, however, in St. Augustine, a scientific argument against astrology quoted from one of the rare pagan skeptics. The argument is that twins often have very different careers, which they ought not to have if astrology were true. At the time of the Renaissance, belief in astrology became a mark of the free thinker: it must be true, he thought, because the Church condemned it. Free thinkers were not yet any more scientific than their opponents in the matter of appeal to observable facts. Most of us still believe many things that in fact have no basis except in the assertions of the ancients. I was always told that ostriches eat nails, and, though I wondered how they found them in the Bush, it did not occur to me to doubt the story. At last, I discovered that it comes from Pliny, and has no truth whatever. Some things are believed because people feel as if they must be true, and in such cases, an immense weight of evidence is necessary to dispel the belief. Maternal impressions are a case in point. It is supposed that any notable impression on the mother during gestation will affect the offspring. This notion has scriptural warrant: you will remember how Jacob secured speckled kine. If you ask any woman who is not a scientist or an associate of scientists, she will overwhelm you with incidents in proof of the superstition. Why, there was Mrs So-and-So, who saw a fox caught in a trap, and sure enough her child was born with a fox's foot. Did you know Mrs So-and-So? No, but my friend Mrs Such-and-Such did. So, if you are persistent, you ask Mrs Such-and-Such, who says: "Oh no, I didn't know Mrs So-and-So, but Mrs What's-Her-Name did." You may spend a lifetime in the pursuit of Mrs So-and-So, but you will never catch up with her. She is a myth. The same situation occurs in regard to the inheritance of acquired characters. There is such a strong impulse to believe in this that biologists have the greatest difficulty in persuading people of the contrary. In Russia, they have failed to convince Stalin, and have been compelled to give up being scientific in this matter. When Galileo's telescope revealed Jupiter's moons, the orthodox refused to look through it, because they knew there could not be such bodies, and therefore the telescope must be deceptive. Respect for observation, as opposed to tradition, is difficult and (one might almost say) contrary to human nature. Science insists upon it, and this insistence was the source of the most desperate battles between science and authority. There are still a great many respects in which the lesson has not been learned. Few people can be convinced that an obnoxious habit—e.g. exhibitionism—cannot be cured by punishment. It is pleasant to punish those who shock us, and we do not like to admit that indulgence in this pleasure is not always socially desirable. (2) The autonomy of the physical world: Perhaps the most powerful solvent of the pre-scientific outlook has been the first law of motion, which the world owes to Galileo, though to some extent he was anticipated by Leonardo da Vinci. The first law of motion says that a body which is moving will go on moving in the same direction with the same velocity until something stops it. Before Galileo, it had been thought that a lifeless body will not move of itself, and if it is in motion it will gradually come to rest. Only living beings, it was thought, could move without

the

100% **MATCHING BLOCK 4/26** W

help of some external agency. Aristotle thought that the heavenly bodies were pushed by gods. Here on earth, animals can set themselves in motion and (can cause motion in dead matter. There are, it was conceded, certain kinds

of motion which are "natural"

100% **MATCHING BLOCK 5/26** W

to dead matter: earth and water naturally move downwards, air and fire upwards; but beyond these simple "natural" motions everything depends upon impulsion from the souls of living beings. So long as this view prevailed, physics as an independent science was impossible, since the physical world was thought to be not causally self- contained. But Galileo and Newton between them proved that all the movements of the planets, and of dead matter on the earth, proceed according to the laws of physics, and once started, will continue indefinitely. There is no need

for the

97% MATCHING BLOCK 7/26 W

mind in this process. Newton still thought that a Creator was necessary to get the process going, but that after that He left it to work according to its own laws. Descartes held that not only dead matter but the bodies of animals also, are wholly governed by the laws of physics. Probably only theology restrained him from saying the same of human bodies. In the eighteenth-century French freethinkers took this further step. In their view, the relation of mind and matter was the antithesis of what Aristotle and the scholastics had supposed. For Aristotle, first causes were always mental, as when an engine driver starts a freight train moving and the impulsion communicates itself from truck to truck. Eighteenth-century materialists, on the contrary, considered all causes material and thought of mental occurrences as inoperative by-products. (3) The dethronement of "purpose"': Aristotle maintained that causes are of four kinds; modern science admits only one of the four. Two of Aristotle's four need not concern us; the two that do concern us are the "efficient" and the "final" cause. The "efficient" cause is what we should call simply "the cause"; the "final" cause is the purpose. In human affairs this distinction has validity. Suppose you find a restaurant at the top of a mountain. The "efficient" cause is the carrying up of the materials and the arranging of them in the pattern of a house. The "final" cause is to satisfy the hunger and thirst of tourists. In human affairs, the question "why?" is more naturally answered, as a rule, by assigning the final cause than by setting out the efficient cause. If you ask "why is there a restaurant here?" The natural answer is "because many hungry and thirsty people come this way." But the answer by final cause is only appropriate where human volitions are involved. If you ask "why do many people die of cancer?" you will get no clear answer, but the answer you want is one assigning the efficient cause. This ambiguity in the word "why" led Aristotle to his distinction of efficient and final causes. He thought—and many people still think—that both kinds are to be found everywhere: whatever exists may be explained, on the one hand, by the antecedent events that have produced it, and, on the other hand, by the purpose that it serves. But although it is still open to the philosopher or theologian to hold that everything has a "purpose," it has been found that "purpose" is not a useful concept when we are in search of scientific laws. We are told in the Bible that the moon was made to give light by night. But men of science, however pious, do not regard this as a scientific explanation of the origin of the moon. Or, to revert to the question about cancer, a man of science may believe, in his private capacity, that cancer is sent as a punishment for our sins, but qua man of science he must ignore this point of view. We know of "purpose" in human affairs, and we may suppose that there are cosmic purposes, but in science it is the past that determines the future, not the future the past. "Final" causes, therefore, do not occur in the scientific account of the world. In this connection Darwin's work was decisive. What Galileo and Newton had done for astronomy, Darwin did for biology. The adaptations of animals and plants to their environments were a favorite theme of pious naturalists in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. These adaptations were explained by the Divine Purpose. It is true that the explanation was sometimes a little odd. If rabbits were theologians, they might think the exquisite adaptation of weasels to the killing of rabbits hardly matters for thankfulness. And there was a conspiracy of silence about the tapeworm. Nevertheless, it was difficult, before Darwin, to explain the adaptation of living things to their environment otherwise than by means of the Creator's purposes. It was not the fact of evolution, but the Darwinian Mechanism of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, that made it possible to explain adaptation without bringing in "purpose." Random variation and natural selection use only efficient causes. This is why many men who accept the general fact of evolution do not accept Darwin's view as to how it comes about. Samuel Butler, Bergson, Shaw, and Lysenko will not accept the dethronement of purpose though in the case of Lysenko it is not God's purpose, but Stalin's, that governs heredity in winter wheat. (4)

Man's

97% MATCHING BLOCK 8/26 W

place in the universe: The effect of science upon our view of man's place in the universe has been of two opposite kinds; it has at once degraded and exalted him. It has degraded him from the standpoint of contemplation, and exalted him from that of action. The latter effect has gradually come to outweigh the former, but both have been important. I will begin with the contemplative effect. To get this effect with its full impact, you should simultaneously read Dante's Divine Comedy and Hubble on the Realm of the Nebulae—in each case with active imagination and with full receptiveness to the cosmos that they portray. In Dante, the earth is the center of the universe; there are ten concentric spheres, all revolving about the earth; the wicked, after death, are punished at the center of the earth; the comparatively virtuous are purged on the Mount of Purgatory at the antipodes of Jerusalem; the good, when purged, enjoy eternal bliss in one or other of the spheres, according to the degree of their merit. The universe is tidy and small: Dante visits all the spheres in the course of twenty- four hours. Everything is contrived in relation to man: to punish sin and reward virtue. There are no mysteries, no abysses, no secrets; the whole thing is like a child's doll's house, with people as the dolls. But although the people were dolls they were important because they interested the Owner of the doll's house. The modern universe is a very different sort of place. Since the victory of the Copernican system we have known that the earth is not the center of the universe. For a time the sun replaced it, but then it turned out that the sun is by no means a monarch among stars, in fact, is scarcely even middle class. There is an incredible amount of empty space in the universe. The distance from the sun to the nearest star is about 4- 2 light years, or 25 X io12 miles. This is in spite of the fact that we live in an exceptionally crowded part of the universe, namely the Milky Way, which is an assemblage of about 300,000 million stars. This assemblage is one of an immense number of similar assemblages; about 30 million are known, but presumably better telescopes would show more. The average distance from one assemblage to the next is about 2 million light years. But apparently they still feel they haven't elbow room, for they are all hurrying away from each other; some are moving away from us at the rate of 14,000 miles a second or more. The most distant of them so far observed are believed to be at a distance from us of about 500 million light years, so that what we see is what they were 500 million years ago. And as to mass: the sun weighs about 2 X 1027 tons, the Milky Way about 160,000 million times as much as the sun, and is one of a collection of galaxies of which about 30 million are known. It is not easy to maintain a belief in one's own cosmic importance in view of such overwhelming statistics. So much for the contemplative aspect of man's place in

the

94% MATCHING BLOCK 9/26 W

scientific cosmos. I come now to the practical aspect. To the practical man, the nebulae are a matter of indifference. He can understand astronomers' thinking about them, because they are paid to, but there is no reason why he should worry about anything so unimportant. What matters to him about the world is what he can make of it. And scientific man can make vastly more of the world than unscientific man could. In the pre-scientific world, power was God's. There was not much that man could do even in the most favorable circumstances, and the circumstances were liable to become unfavorable if men incurred the divine displeasure. This showed itself in earthquakes, pestilences, famines, and defeats in war. Since such events are frequent, it was obviously very easy to incur divine displeasure. Judging by the analogy of earthly monarchs, men decided that the thing most displeasing to the Deity is a lack of humility. If you wished to slip through life without disaster, you must be meek; you must be aware of your defenselessness, and constantly ready to confess it. But the God before whom you humbled yourself was conceived in the likeness of man, so that the universe seemed human and warm and cozy, like home if you are the youngest of a large family, painful at times, but never alien and incomprehensible. In the scientific world, all this is different. It is not by prayer and humility that you cause things to go as you wish, but by acquiring a knowledge

of natural

laws. The power you acquire in this way is much greater and much more reliable that that formerly supposed to be acquired by prayer, be cause you never could tell whether your prayer would be favorably heard in heaven. The power of prayer, moreover, had recognized limits; it would have been impious to ask too much. But the power of science has no known limits. We were told that faith could remove mountains, but no one believed it; we are now told that the atomic bomb can remove mountains, and everyone believes it. It is true that if we ever did stop to think about the cosmos we might find it uncomfortable. The sun may grow cold or blow up; the earth may lose its atmosphere and become uninhabitable. Life is a brief, small, and transitory phenomenon in an obscure corner, not at all the sort of thing that one would make a fuss about if one were not personally concerned. But it is monkish and futile—so scientific man will say—to dwell on such cold and unpractical thoughts. Let us get on with the job of fertilizing the desert, melting Arctic ice, and killing each other with perpetually improving technique. Some of our activities will do good, some harm, but all alike will show our power. And so, in this godless universe, we shall become gods. Darwinism has had many effects upon man's outlook on life and the world, in addition to the extrusion of purpose of which I have already spoken. The absence of any sharp line between men and apes is very awkward for theology. When did men get souls? Was the Missing Link capable of sin and therefore worthy of hell? Did Pithecanthropus Erectus have moral responsibility? Was Homo Pekiniensis damned? Did Pilt down Man go to heaven? Any answer must be arbitrary. But Darwinism—especially when crudely misinterpreted—threatened not only theological orthodoxy but also the creed of eighteenth-century liberalism. Condorcet was a typical liberal philosopher of the eighteenth century; Malthus developed his theory to refute Condorcet; and Darwin's theory was suggested by Malthus's. Eighteenth-century liberals had a conception of man as absolute, in its way, as that of the theologians. There were the "Rights of Man"; all men were equal; if one showed more ability than another, that was due entirely to a better education, as James Mill told his son to prevent him from becoming conceited. We must ask again: Should Pithecanthropus, if still alive, enjoy "The Rights of Man"? Would Homo Pekiniensis have been the equal of Newton if he could have gone to Cambridge? Was the Piltdown Man just as intelligent as the present inhabitants of that Sussex village? If you answer all these questions in the democratic sense, you can be pushed back to the anthropoid apes, and if you stick to your guns, you can be driven back ultimately on to the amoeba, which is absurd (to quote Euclid). You must therefore admit that men are not all congenitally equal, and that evolution proceeds by selecting favorable variations. You must admit that heredity has a part in producing a good adult, and that education is not the only factor to be considered. If men are to be conventionally equal politically, it must be not because they are really equal biologically, but for some more specifically political reason. Such reflections have endangered political liberalism, though not, to my mind, justly. The admission that men are not all equal in congenital endowment becomes dangerous when some group is singled out as superior or inferior. If you say that the rich are abler than the poor, or men than women, or white men than black men, or Germans than men of any other nation, you proclaim a doctrine which has no support in Darwinism, and which is almost certain to lead to either slavery or war. But such doctrines, however unwarrantable, have been proclaimed in the name of Darwinism. So has the ruthless theory that the weakest should be left to go to the wall, since this is Nature's method of progress. If it is by the struggle for existence that the race is improved—so say the devotees of this creed—let us welcome wars, the more destructive the better. And so we come back to Heraclitus, the first of fascists, who said: "Homer was wrong in saying 'would that strife might perish from among gods and men.' He did not see that he was praying for the destruction of the universe. . . . War is common to all, and strife is justice. . . . War is the father of all and king of all; and some he has made gods and some men, some bond and some free." It would be odd if the last effect of science were to revive a philosophy dating from 500 B.C. This was to some extent true of Nietzsche and of the Nazis, but it is not true of any of the groups now powerful in the world. What is true is that science has immensely increased the sense of human power. But this effect is more closely connected with science as technique than with science as philosophy. In this chapter I have tried to confine myself to science as a philosophy, leaving science as technique for later chapters. After we have considered science as technique I shall return to the philosophy of human power that it has seemed to suggest. I cannot accept this philosophy, which I believe to be very dangerous. But of that I will not speak yet.

The whole transcript has been taken from the book “The Impact of Science” http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf 8.4 Glossary ● Conjecture: an opinion or conclusion formed on the basis of incomplete information ● Sorcery: the use of magic, especially black magic. ● Presage: be a sign or warning that (something, typically something bad) will happen. ● Savage: a brutal or vicious person. ● Infringing: to break a rule, law, agreement, etc. ● Pestilence: a fatal epidemic disease, ● Extirpate: root out and destroy completely ● Portents: a sign or warning that something, especially something momentous or calamitous, is likely to happen; an exceptional or wonderful person or thing ● Abeyance: a state of temporary disuse or suspension. ● Valetudinarian: a person who is unduly anxious about their health. ● Pernicious: having a harmful effect, especially in a gradual or subtle way ● Hellenistic: relating to Greek history, language, and culture from the death of Alexander the Great to the defeat of Cleopatra and Mark Antony by Octavian in 31 BC. During this period Greek culture flourished, spreading through the Mediterranean and into the Near East and Asia and centering on Alexandria in Egypt and Pergamum in Turkey 8.5 Comprehensions Understanding an essay form of literature involves comprehension skills. Some two comprehensions have been given illustratively. Apply comprehension skills to understand the whole essay text.
8.5.1 Comprehension 1: Man

98% **MATCHING BLOCK 12/26** W

has existed for about a million years. He has possessed writing for about 6,000 years, agriculture somewhat longer, but perhaps not much longer. Science, as a dominant factor in determining the beliefs of educated men, has existed for about 300 years; as a source of economic technique, for about 150 years. In this brief period, it has proved itself an incredibly powerful revolutionary force. When we consider how recently it has risen to power, we find ourselves forced to believe that we are at the very beginning of its work in transforming human life. What its future effects will be is a matter of conjecture, but possibly a study of its effects hitherto may make the conjecture a little less hazardous. The effects of science are of various very different kinds. There are direct intellectual effects: the dispelling of many traditional beliefs, and the adoption of others suggested by the success of

the

100% **MATCHING BLOCK 13/26** W

scientific method. Then there are effects on technique in industry and war. Then, chiefly as a consequence of new techniques, there are profound changes in

the social organization which are gradually bringing about corresponding

89% **MATCHING BLOCK 14/26** W

political changes. Finally, as a result of the new control over the environment that scientific knowledge has conferred, a new philosophy is growing up, involving a changed conception of man's place in the universe. I shall deal successively with these aspects of the effects of science on human life. First I shall recount its purely intellectual effect as a solvent of unfounded traditional beliefs, such as witchcraft. Next, I shall consider scientific techniques, especially since the industrial revolution. Last, I shall set forth the philosophy which is being suggested by the triumphs of science and shall contend that this philosophy, if unchecked, may inspire a form of unwisdom from which disastrous consequences may result.

Vocabulary: Dis·pel: (verb) gerund or present participle: dispelling: make (a doubt, feeling, or belief) disappear. Witch·craft: (noun): the practice of magic, especially for evil purposes; the use of spells Check Your Understanding: Q: 1) What direct intellectual effects of science Russell does see? A: 1) Russell claims to see various kinds of effects of sciences which are - direct intellectual effects. He sees:

100% **MATCHING BLOCK 15/26** W

The dispelling of many traditional beliefs, and the adoption of others suggested by the success of

the

100% MATCHING BLOCK 16/26 W

scientific method. Then there are effects on technique in industry and war. Then, chiefly as a consequence of new techniques, there are profound changes in

the social organization which are gradually bringing about corresponding

80% MATCHING BLOCK 17/26 W

political changes. Finally, as a result of the new control over the environment that scientific knowledge has conferred, a new philosophy is growing up, involving a changed conception of man's place in the universe.

Q: 2) The taken excerpt indicates what Bertrand Russell intends to deal with through this essay. What are they? Russell asserts he shall

82% MATCHING BLOCK 18/26 W

deal with different aspects of the effects of science on human life. First, he shall recount its purely intellectual effect as a solvent of unfounded traditional beliefs, such as witchcraft. Next, he shall consider scientific techniques, especially since the industrial revolution. Last, He shall set forth the philosophy which is being suggested by the triumphs of science and shall contend that this philosophy, if unchecked, may inspire a form of unwisdom from which disastrous consequences may result. 8.5.2 Comprehension 2: The

99% MATCHING BLOCK 19/26 W

The autonomy of the physical world: Perhaps the most powerful solvent of the pre-scientific outlook has been the first law of motion, which the world owes to Galileo, though to some extent he was anticipated by Leonardo da Vinci. The first law of motion says that a body which is moving will go on moving in the same direction with the same velocity until something stops it. Before Galileo, it had been thought that a lifeless body will not move, and if it is in motion it will gradually come to rest. Only living beings, it was thought, could move without

the

100% MATCHING BLOCK 20/26 W

help of some external agency. Aristotle thought that the heavenly bodies were pushed by gods. Here on earth, animals can set themselves in motion and (can cause motion in dead matter. There are, it was conceded, certain kinds

of motion which are "natural"

100% MATCHING BLOCK 21/26 W

to dead matter: earth and water naturally move downwards, air and fire upwards; but beyond these simple "natural" motions everything depends upon impulsion from the souls of living beings. So long as this view prevailed, physics as an independent science was impossible, since the physical world was thought to be not causally self- contained. But Galileo and Newton between them proved that all the movements of the planets, and of dead matter on the earth, proceed according to the laws of physics, and once started, will continue indefinitely. There is no need

for the

96% MATCHING BLOCK 22/26 W

mind in this process. Newton still thought that a Creator was necessary to get the process going, but after that He left it to work according to its own laws. Descartes held that not only dead matter but the bodies of animals also, are wholly governed by the laws of physics. Probably only theology restrained him from saying the same of human bodies. In the eighteenth-century French freethinkers took this further step. In their view, the relation of mind and matter was the antithesis of what Aristotle and the scholastics had supposed. For Aristotle, first causes were always mental, as when an engine driver starts a freight train moving and the impulsion communicates itself from truck to truck. Eighteenth-century materialists, on the contrary, considered all causes material and thought of mental occurrences as inoperative by-products.

Vocabulary ● Galileo Galilei was an Italian scientist, he formulated the basic law of falling bodies, which he verified by careful measurements. He constructed a telescope with which he studied lunar craters, and discovered four moons revolving around Jupiter and espoused the Copernican cause. ● Leonardo da Vinci was a painter, engineer, architect, inventor, and student of all things scientific. He liked to dissect corpses. ● Conceded: acknowledged, admitted, accepted ● Aristotle: Aristotle was a Greek philosopher who made important contributions by systemizing deductive logic and wrote on physical subjects. His philosophy had a long-lasting influence on the development of all Western philosophical theories. Source: Google open source Check Your Understanding: 1) What does the first law of motion say?

95% MATCHING BLOCK 23/26 W

The first law of motion says that a body which is moving will go on moving in the same direction with the same velocity until something stops it. 2) Before Galileo, what had been thought

about movement or motion?

97% MATCHING BLOCK 24/26 W

Before Galileo, it had been thought that a lifeless body will not move, and if it is in motion it will gradually come to rest. Only living beings, it was thought, could move without

the help of some external agency. 3) In the pre-scientific phase what natural belief about motion? It was conceded, certain kinds of motion are "natural"

100% MATCHING BLOCK 25/26 W

to dead matter: earth and water naturally move downwards, air and fire upwards; but beyond these simple "natural" motions everything depends upon impulsion from the souls of living beings. 4)

What did the 18th century French thinkers opine about the mind and matter?

93% MATCHING BLOCK 26/26 W

In the eighteenth-century French freethinkers took this further step. In their view, the relation of mind and matter was the antithesis of what Aristotle and the scholastics had supposed.

Resources: ● Vocabulary: Google and Other open sources ● “The Impact of Science” http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

Unit 9: “Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish” – Steve Jobs 9.0 Introduction 9.1 Unit Objective 9.2 Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish: Reading 9.3 Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish: Summary 9.4 Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish: Questions/Answers 9.0 Introduction Steve Jobs was born on February 24, 1955, he had incurable cancer and died young on October 5, 2011, in America. However, in his life, he had been a successful entrepreneur and a legendary technology leader who took his company Apple Inc. to heights in success that no other has still been able to beat. He is remembered as the most passionate technology innovator of the century. On June 12, 2005, Steve Jobs, the CEO of Apple Computer and Pixar Animation Studios, delivered a speech to the students at Stanford University. It appeals to the students in quite a friendly way and inspires them. Steve Jobs Source: Investopedia

During his speech, he used the quote - “stay hungry, stay foolish”, which is described as life-changing and career-transforming. Stay hungry means do not stay contented with what you have achieved but strive for more. Stay foolish means never think you know everything and are very smart, there is always a need to learn more and new. In the speech, he narrated three stories of his life. The first story is about his birth, upbringing, and education. The second, as he describes it, is about his love and life. How he started Apple and got fired from it circumstantially and how this condition led him to start NeXT and Pixar and his return to Apple. He also talks about his other love, his wife. The third story is about a life- threatening experience. Hence, this speech throws light on the early life of Steve Jobs, his educational, professional, and 9.1 Unit Objective Read and comprehend the essay “Stay Hungry. Stay Foolish” 9.2 Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish: Reading I

am honored to be with you today at your commencement from one of the finest universities in the world.

I never graduated from college. Truth be told, this is the closest I've ever gotten to a college graduation. Today I want to tell you three stories from my life. That's it. No big deal. Just three stories. The first story is about connecting the dots. I dropped out of Reed College after the first 6 months, but then stayed around as a drop- in for another 18 months or so before I really quit. So why did I drop out? It started before I was born. My biological mother was a young, unwed college graduate student, and she decided to put me up for adoption. She felt very strongly that I should

be adopted by college graduates, so everything was all set for me to be adopted at birth by a lawyer and his wife. Except that when I popped out they decided at the last minute that they really wanted a girl. So my parents, who were on a waiting list, got a call in the middle of the night asking: "We have an unexpected baby boy; do you want him?" They said: "Of course." My biological mother later found out

that my mother had never graduated from college and that my father had never graduated from high school.

She refused to sign the final adoption papers. She only relented a few months later when my parents promised that I would someday go to college. And 17 years later I did go to college. But I naively chose a college that was almost as expensive as Stanford, and all of my working-class parents' savings were being spent on my college tuition. After six months, I couldn't see the value in it. I had no idea what I wanted to do with my life and no idea how college was going to help me figure it out. And here I was spending all of the money my parents had saved their entire life. So I decided to drop out and trust that it would all work out OK. It was pretty scary at the time, but looking back it was one of the best decisions I ever made. The minute I dropped out I could stop taking the required classes that didn't interest me and begin dropping in on the ones that looked interesting. It wasn't all romantic. I didn't have a dorm room, so I slept on the floor in friends' rooms, I returned coke bottles for the 5¢ deposits to buy food with, and I would walk the 7 miles across town every Sunday night to get one good meal a week at the Hare Krishna temple. I loved it. And much of what I stumbled into by following my curiosity and intuition turned out to be priceless later on. Let me give you one example: Reed College at that time offered perhaps the best calligraphy instruction in the country. Throughout the campus every poster, every label on every drawer, was beautifully hand calligraphed. Because I had dropped out and didn't have to take the normal classes, I decided to take a calligraphy class to learn how to do this. I learned about serif and san serif typefaces, about varying the amount of space between different letter combinations, about what makes great typography great. It was beautiful, historical, artistically subtle in a way that science can't capture, and I found it fascinating. None of this had even a hope of any practical application in my life. But ten years later, when we were designing the first Macintosh computer, it all came back to me. And we

designed it all into the Mac. It was the first computer with beautiful typography. If I had never dropped in on that single course in college, the Mac would have never had multiple typefaces or proportionally spaced fonts. And since Windows just copied the Mac, its likely that no personal computer would have them. If I had never dropped out, I would have never dropped in on this calligraphy class, and personal computers might not have the wonderful typography that they do. Of course it was impossible to connect the dots looking forward when I was in college. But it was very, very clear looking backwards ten years later. Again, you can't connect the dots looking forward; you can only connect them looking backwards. So you have to trust that the dots will somehow connect in your future. You have to trust in something — your gut, destiny, life, karma, whatever. This approach has never let me down, and it has made all the difference in my life. My second story is about love and loss. I was lucky — I found what I loved to do early in life. Woz and I started Apple in my parents garage when I was 20. We worked hard, and in 10 years Apple had grown from just the two of us in a garage into a $2 billion company with over 4000 employees. We had just released our finest creation — the Macintosh — a year earlier, and I had just turned 30. And then I got fired. How can you get fired from a company you started? Well, as Apple grew we hired someone who I thought was very talented to run the company with me, and for the first year or so things went well. But then our visions of the future began to diverge and eventually we had a falling out. When we did, our Board of Directors sided with him. So at 30 I was out. And very publicly out. What had been the focus of my entire adult life was gone, and it was devastating. I really didn't know what to do for a few months. I felt that I had let the previous generation of entrepreneurs down - that I had dropped the baton as it was being passed to me. I met with David Packard and Bob Noyce and tried to apologize for screwing up so badly. I was a very public failure, and I even thought about running away from the valley. But something slowly began to dawn on me - I still loved what I did. The turn of events at Apple had not changed that one bit. I had been rejected, but I was still in love.

And so I decided to start over. I didn't see it then, but it turned out that getting fired from Apple was the best thing that could have ever happened to me. The heaviness of being successful was replaced by the lightness of being a beginner again, less sure about everything. It freed me to enter one of the most creative periods of my life. During the next five years, I started a company named NeXT, another company named Pixar, and fell in love with an amazing woman who would become my wife. Pixar went on to create the world's first computer animated feature film, Toy Story, and is now the most successful animation studio in the world. In a remarkable turn of events, Apple bought NeXT, I returned to Apple, and the technology we developed at NeXT is at the heart of Apple's current renaissance. And Laurene and I have a wonderful family together. I'm pretty sure none of this would have happened if I hadn't been fired from Apple. It was awful tasting medicine, but I guess the patient needed it. Sometimes life hits you in the head with a brick. Don't lose faith. I'm convinced that the only thing that kept me going was that I loved what I did. You've got to find what you love. And that is as true for your work as it is for your lovers. Your work is going to fill a large part of your life, and the only way to be truly satisfied is to do what you believe is great work. And the only way to do great work is to love what you do. If you haven't found it yet, keep looking. Don't settle. As with all matters of the heart, you'll know when you find it. And, like any great relationship, it just gets better and better as the years roll on. So keep looking until you find it. Don't settle. My third story is about death. When I was 17, I read a quote that went something like: "If you live each day as if it was your last, someday you'll most certainly be right." It made an impression on me, and since then, for the past 33 years, I have looked in the mirror every morning and asked myself: "If today were the last day of my life, would I want to do what I am about to do today?" And whenever the answer has been "No" for too many days in a row, I know I need to change something.

Remembering that I'll be dead soon is the most important tool I've ever encountered to help me make the big choices in life. Because almost everything — all external expectations, all pride, all fear of embarrassment or failure - these things just fall away in the face of death, leaving only what is truly important. Remembering that you are going to die is the best way I know to avoid the trap of thinking you have something to lose. You are already naked. There is no reason not to follow your heart. About a year ago I was diagnosed with cancer. I had a scan at 7:30 in the morning, and it clearly showed a tumor on my pancreas. I didn't even know what a pancreas was. The doctors told me this was almost certainly a type of cancer that is incurable, and that I should expect to live no longer than three to six months. My doctor advised me to go home and get my affairs in order, which is the doctor's code for preparing to die. It means to try to tell your kids everything you thought you'd have the next 10 years to tell them in just a few months. It means to make sure everything is buttoned up so that it will be as easy as possible for your family. It means to say your goodbyes. I lived with that diagnosis all day. Later that evening I had a biopsy, where they stuck an endoscope down my throat, through my stomach and into my intestines, put a needle into my pancreas and got a few cells from the tumor. I was sedated, but my wife, who was there, told me that when they viewed the cells under a microscope the doctors started crying because it turned out to be a very rare form of pancreatic cancer that is curable with surgery. I had the surgery and I'm fine now. This was the closest I've been to facing death, and I hope its the closest I get for a few more decades. Having lived through it, I can now say this to you with a bit more certainty than when death was a useful but purely intellectual concept: No one wants to die. Even people who want to go to heaven don't want to die to get there. And yet death is the destination we all share. No one has ever escaped it. And that is as it should be, because Death is very likely the single best invention of Life. It is Life's change agent. It clears out the old to make way for the new. Right now the new is you, but someday not too long from now, you will gradually become the old and be cleared away. Sorry to be so dramatic, but it is quite true. Your time is limited, so
don't waste it living someone else's life. Don't be trapped by dogma — which is living with the results of other people's thinking. Don't let the noise of others' opinions drown out your own inner voice.
And most important, have the courage to follow your heart and intuition. They somehow already know what you truly want to become. Everything else is secondary. When I was young, there was an amazing publication called The Whole Earth Catalog, which was one of the bibles of my generation. It was created by a fellow named Stewart Brand not far from here in Menlo Park, and he brought it to life with his poetic touch. This was in the late 1960's, before personal computers and desktop publishing, so it was all made with typewriters, scissors, and polaroid cameras. It was sort of like Google in paperback form, 35 years before Google came along: it was idealistic, and overflowing with neat tools and great notions. Stewart and his team put out several issues of The Whole Earth Catalog, and then when it had run its course, they put out a final issue. It was the mid-1970s, and I was your age. On the back cover of their final issue was a photograph of an early morning country road, the kind you might find yourself hitchhiking on if you were so adventurous. Beneath it were the words: "Stay Hungry. Stay Foolish." It was their farewell message as they signed off. Stay Hungry. Stay Foolish. And I have always wished that for myself. And now, as you graduate to begin anew, I wish that for you. Stay Hungry. Stay Foolish. Thank you all very much. Source:
https://archive.lib.msu.edu/tic/holen/article/2011oct28.pdf 9.3 Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish: Summary Steve's mother was unwed and in college when she got pregnant with him. She decided to put the child up for adoption. The first willing couple refused to
adopt him at the last moment as they wanted a girl. A couple who had never gone to college got the consent of Steve's biological mother on the grounds that they would send the child to college for higher education. First Story: Steve's adoptive parents sent him to Reed, an expensive and good college, but in just six months, he decided to drop out. Later, when Steve developed a deep interest in learning calligraphy, he went to Reed again, which was offering a good calligraphy course at that time. He learnt serif and sans serif typefaces, about varying the amount of space between different letter combinations, and about what makes great typography. Ten years later, when he was designing the first Macintosh computer, it had typography as a unique feature. Steve says that if he had not dropped out of college and learnt Calligraphy, he might not have been able to offer this typography. Steve suggests that one cannot connect the dots of life looking forward as they can only be connected by looking backwards. He admits that trusting in destiny, life, karma, and guts has never let him down and made all the difference in his life. Second Story: When Steve was 20, in his garage with Woz, he started Apple, which in 10 years became a company of two billion dollars and had 4000 employees. Apple brought Macintosh the finest creation in the market. Steve fell into some misunderstanding with a person he appointed and left the company. For some years, he remained jobless, but then he started a company NeXT and another Pixar. He fell in love with a woman whom he married later. Pixar created the world's first computer-animated feature film, Toy Story. And when Apple bought NeXT, Steve returned to Apple. Steve says that if he had not been

fired from Apple NeXT and Pixer had not come. He suggests that it sometimes seems life has hit you in the head, but don't lose faith, keep doing what you like, do great work, look for a big job, and don't settle. Third Story: Steve suggests that fearing death does not mean it will spare us. Rather, welcome it, it will not frighten you. Once he had read that - live each day as if it is your last day, it inspired him so much. If one accepts that he will die soon, a man will not think about anything else but the work he wants to do before death. He recalls the time when he was diagnosed with cancer in his pancreas. He was told that he would live for six months and not more. Later when he underwent biopsy and endoscopy tests, a ray of hope appeared, he got operated on and cured of it that time. He recollects that he saw death from a very close point and learnt a good lesson from it. He calls life temporary and unavoidable and suggests not wasting time until the candle of life is not extinguished. Keep following your heart and intuition with courage. He talks of the book "The Whole Earth Catalog" published by Stewart Brand; on whose final issue's back cover he noticed a picture of an early morning country road that had a title "Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish". He says that he has always wished that for himself and suggests students wish the same for themselves. He concludes his speech by saying the line: "Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish".
9.4 Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish: Questions/Answers 1. What does Jobs say about his mother in question.1? According to Steve Jobs, his mother was a recent college graduate who was single. Her intention was to place her child for adoption. However,
the willing pair must hold degrees. A couple of attorneys expressed interest in adopting her child. They were reluctant to welcome Steve into the world since they desired a female child rather than a boy. She then permitted another couple to adopt her kid. 2. What does he say about his time spent studying at Reed College? Steve Jobs' foster parents sent him to Reeds College when he was 17 years old. They paid for his education with all their savings. It was a pricey university. However, they adhered to their word and sent him to college. But he could not study there as in the six months he decided to quit. 3. How did his foster parents adopt him? Steve Jobs' mother let his child be adopted by his foster parents on the condition that they would let her son go to college for graduation. The couple who came forward to adopt him were not graduates. So, Steve's mother was not signing the adoption papers. But when they agreed to her condition that they would send the son to college and make his career bright then she signed the paper. 4. Why did he drop out of college? Steve Jobs accepted his mission at Reed University. It costs money to study here. His foster parents spent a lot of money. Six months later, Steve realized that this training would not help him in the future. So, he was absent from class. Regular attempts like this paved the way for him to get out. 5. What difficulties did he have after the abortion? Steve Jobs dropped out of Reed College. Then his life became miserable. He didn't have his own room. He was sleeping on the floor in his friend's room. He returned a bottle of coke for 5 deposits to buy food. He used to walk seven miles across town once a week for a delicious meal at the Hare Krishna temple every Sunday night. 6. Why did he decide to learn calligraphy?
Steve Jobs dropped out of Reed College. He fought hard for his survival. At the time, Reed College offered some of the best calligraphy classes in the country. Across campus, every poster, every label on every drawer is beautifully hand-painted. He dropped out of college and wasn't attending regular classes, so he decided to take a calligraphy class to learn. 7. How useful was his knowledge of calligraphy? Jobs learned about serif and sans-serif fonts, how to vary the spacing between letter combinations, and the finer points of good typography. Ten years later, it all came back to him when he was designing his first Macintosh computer. He built everything into his Mac. It was the first computer with beautiful typography. Mac has multiple fonts. Personal computers did it. Windows copied Mac. 8. What does it mean to connect the dots? When Steve was studying in college, he couldn't connect the dots and see ahead. But looking back 10 years later, it was very clear. Looking ahead, the dots do not connect. You can only connect backwards. So you have to trust that somehow the dots will lead to your future. Be it your own intuition, your own life, your own destiny, your own karma, whatever this approach will bring you success in life. What do you have to trust? 9. How did Jobs establish Apple? When Steve Jobs was 20 years old, he teamed up with his schoolmate Steve Woznaik and founded his Apple in his parents' garage. They worked hard, and in a decade Apple grew from just the two of him in a garage to his $2 billion company with more than 4,000 employees. They released their best work, the Macintosh, and they were hugely popular. 10. How did he lose his position at Apple Inc.? As Apple grew, the company hired a talented individual named Steve Jobs to run it. Years later, however, the two boys' visions did not

match. The Board took the side of the fellow. That's how Steve Jobs got fired from Apple. 11. How did he feel about his dismissal? Steve Jobs was a founding member of Apple. He was dismissed for being an outsider. It shook him a lot. He was openly slandered. He tried to apologize but in vain. As a public failure, he wanted to flee the valley, but his love for Apple wouldn't let him. He decided to start his life anew. 12. How did he get back to Apple? After Steve Jobs was fired from his Apple, he founded his own company, Next, and then another company, PIXAR. Fortunately, these companies did well. Apple has acquired Next. Then Steve Jobs returned to his Apple, and the technology they developed in his Next became central to Apple's current renaissance. 13. How did the quote about death affect Jobs? When Jobs was 17, he read these words: The death consciousness made him active. He forgot his pride, his fears, his failures and the harassments of his life and continued to work hard before his final hour came. 14. How did the death consciousness affect him? Death consciousness helped Steve Jobs make a big decision in his life. He forgot all external expectations, all pride, all embarrassment and fear of failure. These things collapsed in the face of death. Leave only what really matters. Remembering that he was going to die was the best way he knew how to avoid the trap of believing he had something to lose. 15. What did his doctor say when he was diagnosed with cancer? Steve Jobs was diagnosed with cancer. He had a tumor in his pancreas. Doctors said it was an incurable form of cancer. Patients will live no more than 6 months. Doctors advised him to go home and prepare for death. Still, dying at home would be better than dying in a hospital bed. 16. How do Jobs view death? Steve Jobs faced death. He was of the opinion that no one wants to die. Even people who want to go to heaven don't want to die to get there. Yet death is a goal we all share. No one has escaped him. Death is life's greatest invention. It is an agent of life change. Clear out the old to make room for the new. 17. What is the most important thing in the face of death? Death is certain. No one can avoid it. Time is running out. So don't waste your time. Don't get caught up in dogma. That
is, living with the results of other people's thoughts. Don't let the noise of
other people's opinions drown out your inner voice. And most importantly, have the courage to follow your heart and intuition. They already know what you really want to be. Everything else is secondary. 18. What was the farewell message? Jobs' farewell message was "Stay Hungry, Stay Foolish". He quoted this from the Stewart Brand Edition of The Whole Earth Catalog. Don't settle for what you have already achieved. If you still think you're stupid, you fool yourself and try to learn more. References / Suggested Reading: ● Watch and listen to the speech: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UF8uR6Z6KLc ●
https://ivypanda.com/essays/steve-jobs-speech-stay-hungry-stay- foolish-analysis/

Hit and source - focused comparison, Side by Side

Submitted text As student entered the text in the submitted document.

Matching text As the text appears in the source.

1/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	16 WORDS	100%	MATCHING TEXT	16 WORDS
subsequently repeated at Columbia University, New York, and published by the Columbia University Press.			subsequently repeated at Columbia University, New York, and published by the Columbia University Press.		

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

2/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	154 WORDS	98%	MATCHING TEXT	154 WORDS

has existed for about a million years. He has possessed writing for about 6,000 years, agriculture somewhat longer, but perhaps not much longer. Science, as a dominant factor in determining the beliefs of educated men, has existed for about 300 years; as a source of economic technique, for about 150 years. In this brief period, it has proved itself an incredibly powerful revolutionary force. When we consider how recently it has risen to power, we find ourselves forced to believe that we are at the very beginning of its work in transforming human life. What its future effects will be is a matter of conjecture, but possibly a study of its effects hitherto may make the conjecture a little less hazardous. The effects of science are of various very different kinds. There are direct intellectual effects: the dispelling of many traditional beliefs, and the adoption of others suggested by the success of

has existed for about a million years. He has possessed writing for about 6,000 years, agricul- ture somewhat longer, but perhaps not much longer. Science, as a dominant factor in determining the beliefs of educated men, has existed for about 300 years; as a source of economic technique, for about 150 years. In this brief period it has proved itself an incredibly powerful revolutionary force. When we consider how recently it has risen to power, we find ourselves forced to believe that we are at the very beginning of its work in transforming human life. What its future effects will be is a matter of conjecture, but possibly a study of its effects hitherto may make the conjecture a little less hazardous. The effects of science are of various very different kinds. There are direct intellectual effects: the dispelling of many traditional beliefs, and the adoption of others suggested by the success of

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

superstitious kind about comets. It was only when they were found to obey the law of gravitation, and when some at least were found to have calculable orbits, that educated men, in general, ceased to regard them as portents. It was in the time of Charles II that scientific rejection of traditional superstitions became common among educated men. Charles II perceived that science could be an ally against the "fanatics," as those who regretted Cromwell were called. He founded the Royal Society and made science fashionable. Enlightenment spread gradually downwards from the Court. The House of Commons was as yet by no means as modern in outlook as the King. After the plague and the Great Fire, a House of Commons Committee inquired into the causes of those misfortunes, which were generally attributed to divine displeasure, though it was not clear to what the displeasure was due. The Committee decided that what most displeased the Lord was the works of Mr Thomas Hobbes. It was decreed that no work of his should be published in England. This measure proved effective: there has never since been a plague or a Great Fire in London. But Charles, who liked Hobbes because Hobbes had taught him mathematics, was annoyed. He, however, was not thought by Parliament to be on intimate terms with Providence. It was at this time that belief in witchcraft began to be viewed as a superstition. James, I was a fanatical persecutor of witches. Shakespeare's Macbeth was a piece of government propaganda, and no doubt the witches in that play made it more acceptable as a piece of flattery of the monarch. Even Bacon pretended to believe in witchcraft and made no protest when a Parliament of which he was a member passed a law increasing the severity of the punishment of witches. The climax was reached under the Commonwealth, for it was especially Puritans who believed in the power of Satan. It was partly for this reason that Charles IPs government, while not yet venturing to deny the possibility of witchcraft, was much less zealous in searching it out than its predecessors had been. The last witchcraft trial in England was in 1664 when Sir Thomas Browne was a witness against the witch. The laws against it gradually fell into abeyance and were repealed in 1736 —though, as late as 1768, John Wesley continued to support the old superstition. In Scotland, the superstition lingered longer: the last conviction was in 1722. The victory of humanity and common sense in this matter was almost entirely due to the spread of the scientific outlook—not to any definite argument, but to the impossibility of the whole way of thinking that had been natural before the age of rationalism that began in the time of Charles II, partly, it must be confessed, as a revolt against a too rigid moral code. Scientific medicine had, at first, to combat superstitions similar to those that inspired belief in witchcraft. When Vesalius first practised

superstitious kind about comets. It was only when they were found to obey the law of gravitation, and when some at least were found to have calculable orbits, that educated men in general ceased to regard them as portents. It was in the time of Charles II that scientific rejection of traditional superstitions became common among educated men. Charles II perceived that science could be an ally against the "fanatics," as those who regretted Cromwell were called. He founded the Royal Society, and made science fashionable. Enlightenment spread gradually downwards from the Court. The House of Commons was as yet by no means as modern in outlook as the King. After the plague and the Great Fire, a House of Commons Committee in- quired into the causes of those misfortunes, which were generally attributed to divine displeasure, though it was not clear to what the displeasure was due. The Committee decided that what most displeased the Lord was the works of Mr. Thomas Hobbes. It was decreed that no work of his should be published in England. This measure proved effec- tive: there has never since been a plague or a Great Fire in London. But Charles, who liked Hobbes because Hobbes had taught him mathematics, was annoyed. He, however, was not thought by Parliament to be on intimate terms with Providence. It was at this time that belief in witchcraft began to be viewed as a superstition. James I was a fanatical persecutor of witches. Shakespeare's Macbeth was a piece of govern- ment propaganda, and no doubt the witches in that play made it more acceptable as a piece of flattery of the monarch. Even SCIENCE AND TRADITION 5 Bacon pretended to believe in witchcraft, and made no pro- test when a Parliament of which he was a member passed a law increasing the severity of the punishment of witches. The climax was reached under the Commonwealth, for it was especially Puritans who believed in the power of Satan. It was partly for this reason that Charles IPs government, while not yet venturing to deny the possibility of witchcraft, was much less zealous in searching it out than its predecessors had been. The last witchcraft trial in England was in 1 664, when Sir Thomas Browne was a witness against the witch. The laws against it gradually fell into abeyance, and were repealed in 1736 — though, as late as 1768, John Wesley continued to support the old superstition. In Scotland the superstition lingered longer: the last conviction was in 1722. The victory of humanity and common sense in this matter was almost entirely due to the spread of the scientific out- look — not to any definite argument, but to the impossibility of the whole way of thinking that had been natural before the age of rationalism that began in the time of Charles II, partly, it must be confessed, as a revolt against a too rigid moral code Scientific medicine had, at first, to combat superstitions similar to those that inspired belief in

dissection of corpses, the Church was horrified. He was saved from persecution, for a time, by Emperor Charles V, who was a valetudinarian, and believed that no other physician could keep him in health. But after the Emperor died, Vesalius was accused of cutting people up before they were dead. He was ordered, as a penance, to go on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land; he was shipwrecked and died of exposure. In spite of his work and that of Hervey and other great men, medicine continued to be largely superstitious. Insanity, in particular, was thought to be due to possession by evil spirits and was therefore treated by subjecting the insane to cruelties which it was hoped the demons would dislike. George III, when mad, was still treated on this principle. The ignorance of the general public continued even longer. An aunt of mine, when her husband quarrelled with the War Office, was afraid that the worry would cause him to develop typhus. It is hardly till the time of Lister and Pasteur that medicine can be said to have become scientific. The diminution of human suffering owing to the advances in medicine is beyond all calculation. Out of the work of the great men of the seventeenth century, a new outlook on the world was developed, and it was this outlook, not specific arguments, which brought about the decay of the belief in portents, witchcraft, demoniacal possession, and so forth. I think there were three ingredients in the scientific outlook of the eighteenth century that were especially important: (1) Statements of fact should be based on observation, not on unsupported authority. (2) The inanimate world is a self-acting, self-perpetuating system, in which all changes conform to natural laws. (3) The earth is not the centre of the universe, and probably Man is not its purpose (if any); moreover, "purpose" is a concept which is scientifically useless. These items make up what is called the "mechanistic outlook," which clergymen denounce. It led to the cessation of persecution and to a generally humane attitude. It is now less accepted than it was, and persecution has revived. To those who regard its effects as morally pernicious, I commend attention to these facts. Something must be said about each of the above ingredients of the mechanistic outlook. (1) Observation versus Authority: To modern educated people, it seems obvious that matters of fact are to be ascertained by observation, not by consulting ancient authorities. But this is an entirely modern conception, which hardly existed before the seventeenth century. Aristotle maintained that women have fewer teeth than men; although he was twice married, it never occurred to him to verify this statement by examining his wives' mouths. He said also that children will be healthier if conceived when the wind is in the north. One gathers that the two Mrs Aristotles both had to run out and look at the weathercock every evening before going to bed. He states that a man bitten by a mad dog will not go mad, but any other animal will (Hist. An. 704*2); that the bite of the shrewmouse is dangerous to

witchcraft. When Vesalius first practiced dissection of corpses, the Church was horrified. He was saved from persecution, for a time, by the Emperor Charles V, who was a valetudinarian, and believed that no other physician could keep him in health. But after the Emperor died, Vesalius was accused of cutting people up before they were dead. He was ordered, as a penance, to go on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land; he was shipwrecked, and died of exposure. In spite of his work and that of Hervey and other great men, medicine continued to be largely supersti- 6 THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON SOCIETY tious. Insanity, in particular, was thought to be due to possession by evil spirits, and was therefore treated by subjecting the insane to cruelties which it was hoped the demons would dislike. George III, when mad, was still treated on this principle. The ignorance of the general public continued even longer. An aunt of mine, when her husband quarreled with the War Office, was afraid that the worry would cause him to develop typhus. It is hardly till the time of Lister and Pasteur that medicine can be said to have become scientific. The diminution of human suffering owing to the advances in medicine is beyond all calculation. Out of the work of the great men of the seventeenth cen- tury a new outlook on the world was developed, and it was this outlook, not specific arguments, which brought about the decay of the belief in portents, witchcraft, demoniacal pos- session, and so forth. I think there were three ingredients in the scientific outlook of the eighteenth century that were specially important: (i) Statements of fact should be based on observation, not on unsupported authority. (2) The inanimate world is a self-acting, self-perpetuating system, in which all changes conform to natural laws. (3) The earth is not the center of the universe, and probably Man is not its purpose (if any); moreover, "purpose" is a concept which is scientifically useless. These items make up what is called the "mechanistic out- look," which clergymen denounce. It led to the cessation of persecution and to a generally humane attitude. It is now less accepted than it was, and persecution has revived. To those SCIENCE AND TRADITION J who regard its effects as morally pernicious, I commend attention to these facts. Something must be said about each of the above ingredients of the mechanistic outlook. (i) Observation versus Authority: To modern educated people, it seems obvious that matters of fact are to be ascer- tained by observation, not by consulting ancient authorities. But this is an entirely modern conception, which hardly existed before the seventeenth century. Aristotle maintained that women have fewer teeth than men; although he was twice married, it never occurred to him to verify this state- ment by examining his wives' mouths. He said also that chil- dren will be healthier if conceived when the wind is in the north. One gathers that the two Mrs. Aristotles both had to run out and look at the weathercock every evening before going to bed. He

horses, especially if the mouse is pregnant (ibid., 604Z?); that elephants suffering from insomnia can be cured by rubbing their shoulders with salt, olive oil, and warm water (ibid., 6050); and so on and so on. Nevertheless, classical dons, who have never observed any animal except the cat and the dog, continue to praise Aristotle for his fidelity to observation. The conquest of the East by Alexander caused an immense influx of superstition into the Hellenistic world. This was particularly notable as regards astrology, which almost all later pagans believed in. The Church condemned it, not on scientific grounds, but because it implied subjection to Fate. There is, however, in St. Augustine, a scientific argument against astrology quoted from one of the rare pagan skeptics. The argument is that twins often have very different careers, which they ought not to have if astrology were true. At the time of the Renaissance, belief in astrology became a mark of the free thinker: it must be true, he thought, because the Church condemned it. Free thinkers were not yet any more scientific than their opponents in the matter of appeal to observable facts. Most of us still believe many things that in fact have no basis except in the assertions of the ancients. I was always told that ostriches eat nails, and, though I wondered how they found them in the Bush, it did not occur to me to doubt the story. At last, I discovered that it comes from Pliny, and has no truth whatever. Some things are believed because people feel as if they must be true, and in such cases, an immense weight of evidence is necessary to dispel the belief. Maternal impressions are a case in point. It is supposed that any notable impression on the mother during gestation will affect the offspring. This notion has scriptural warrant: you will remember how Jacob secured speckled kine. If you ask any woman who is not a scientist or an associate of scientists, she will overwhelm you with incidents in proof of the superstition. Why, there was Mrs So-and-So, who saw a fox caught in a trap, and sure enough her child was born with a fox's foot. Did you know Mrs So-and-So? No, but my friend Mrs Such-and-Such did. So, if you are persistent, you ask Mrs Such-and-Such, who says: "Oh no, I didn't know Mrs So-and-So, but Mrs What's-Her-Name did." You may spend a lifetime in the pursuit of Mrs So-and-So, but you will never catch up with her. She is a myth. The same situation occurs in regard to the inheritance of acquired characters. There is such a strong impulse to believe in this that biologists have the greatest difficulty in persuading people of the contrary. In Russia, they have failed to convince Stalin, and have been compelled to give up being scientific in this matter. When Galileo's telescope revealed Jupiter's moons, the orthodox refused to look through it, because they knew there could not be such bodies, and therefore the telescope must be deceptive. Respect for observation, as opposed to tradition, is difficult and (one might almost say) contrary to human nature. Science insists upon it,

states that a man bitten by a mad dog will not go mad, but any other animal will (Hist. An. 704*2) ; that the bite ofthe shrewmouse is dangerous to horses, especially if the mouse is pregnant (ibid., 604Z?); that elephants suffering from insomnia can be cured by rubbing their shoulders with salt, olive oil, and warm water (ibid., 6050) ; and so on and so on. Nevertheless, classical dons, who have never observed any animal except the cat and the dog, continue to praise Aristotle for his fidelity to observation. The conquest of the East by Alexander caused an immense influx of superstition into the Hellenistic world. This was particularly notable as regards astrology, which almost all later pagans believed in. The Church condemned it, not on scientific grounds, but because it implied subjection to Fate. There is, however, in St. Augustine, a scientific argument against astrology quoted from one of the rare pagan skeptics. 8 THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON SOCIETY The argument is that twins often have very different careers, which they ought not to have if astrology were true. At the time of the Renaissance, belief in astrology became a mark of the free thinker: it must be true, he thought, be- cause the Church condemned it. Free thinkers were not yet any more scientific than their opponents in the matter of appeal to observable facts. Most of us still believe many things that in fact have no basis except in the assertions of the ancients. I was always told that ostriches eat nails, and, though I wondered how they found them in the Bush, it did not occur to me to doubt the story. iVt last I discovered that it comes from Pliny, and has no truth whatever. Some things are believed because people feel as if they must be true, and in such cases an immense weight of evi- dence is necessary to dispel the belief. Maternal impressions are a case in point. It is supposed that any notable impression on the mother during gestation will affect the offspring. This notion has scriptural warrant: you will remember how Jacob secured speckled kine. If you ask any woman who is not a scientist or an associate of scientists, she will overwhelm you with incidents in proof of the superstition. Why, there was Mrs. So-and-So, who saw a fox caught in a trap, and sure enough her child was born with a fox's foot. Did you know Mrs. So-and-So? No, but my friend Mrs. Such-and-Such did. So, if you are persistent, you ask Mrs. Such-and- Such, who says: "Oh no, / didn't know Mrs. So-and-So, but Mrs. What's-Her-Name did." You may spend a lifetime in the pursuit of Mrs. So-and-So, but you will never catch up with her. She is a myth. The same situation occurs in regard to the inheritance of acquired characters. There is such a strong impulse to be- SCIENCE AND TRADITION 9 lieve in this that biologists have the greatest difficulty in persuading people of the contrary. In Russia they have failed to convince Stalin, and have been compelled to give up being scientific in this matter. When Galileo's telescope revealed Jupiter's moons, the orthodox refused to look through it, because

and this insistence was the source of the most desperate battles between science and authority. There are still a great many respects in which the lesson has not been learned. Few people can be convinced that an obnoxious habit—e.g. exhibitionism—cannot be cured by punishment. It is pleasant to punish those who shock us, and we do not like to admit that indulgence in this pleasure is not always socially desirable. (2) The autonomy of the physical world: Perhaps the most powerful solvent of the pre-scientific outlook has been the first law of motion, which the world owes to Galileo, though to some extent he was anticipated by Leonardo da Vinci. The first law of motion says that a body which is moving will go on moving in the same direction with the same velocity until something stops it. Before Galileo, it had been thought that a lifeless body will not move of itself, and if it is in motion it will gradually come to rest. Only living beings, it was thought, could move without

they knew there could not be such bodies, and therefore the telescope must be deceptive. Respect for observation as opposed to tradition is difficult and (one might almost say) contrary to human nature. Science insists upon it, and this insistence was the source of the most desperate battles between science and authority. There are still a great many respects in which the lesson has not been learned. Few people can be convinced that an obnoxious habit — e.g. exhibitionism — cannot be cured by punishment. It is pleasant to punish those who shock us, and we do not like to admit that indulgence in this pleasure is not always socially desirable. (2) The autonomy of the physical world: Perhaps the most powerful solvent of the pre-scientific outlook has been the first law of motion, which the world owes to Galileo, though to some extent he was anticipated by Leonardo da Vinci. The first law of motion says that a body which is moving will go on moving in the same direction with the same velocity until something stops it. Before Galileo it had been thought that a lifeless body will not move of itself, and if it is in motion it will gradually come to rest. Only living beings, it was thought, could move without

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

4/26 **SUBMITTED TEXT** 39 WORDS **100%** **MATCHING TEXT** 39 WORDS

help of some external agency. Aristotle thought that the heavenly bodies were pushed by gods. Here on earth, animals can set themselves in motion and (can cause motion in dead matter. There are, it was conceded, certain kinds

help of some external agency. Aristotle thought that the heavenly bodies were pushed by gods. Here on earth, animals can set themselves in motion and (can cause motion in dead matter. There are, it was conceded, certain kinds

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

5/26 **SUBMITTED TEXT** 96 WORDS **100%** **MATCHING TEXT** 96 WORDS

to dead matter: earth and water naturally move downwards, air and fire upwards; but beyond these simple "natural" motions everything depends upon impulsion from the souls of living beings. So long as this view prevailed, physics as an independent science was impossible, since the physical world was thought to be not causally self- contained. But Galileo and Newton between them proved that all the movements of the planets, and of dead matter on the earth, proceed according to the laws of physics, and once started, will continue indefinitely. There is no need

to dead matter: earth and water naturally move downwards, air and fire upwards; but beyond these simple "natural" motions everything depends upon impulsion from the souls of living beings. So long as this view prevailed, physics as an independent science was impossible, since the physical world was thought to be not causally self-contained. But Galileo and Newton between them proved that all the movements of the planets, and of dead matter on the earth, proceed according to the laws of physics, and once started, will continue indefinitely. There is no need

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

6/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	26 WORDS	100%	MATCHING TEXT	26 WORDS

scientific method. Then there are effects on technique in industry and war. Then, chiefly as a consequence of new techniques, there are profound changes in

scientific method. Then there are effects on technique in industry and war. Then, chiefly as a consequence of new techniques, there are profound changes in

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

mind in this process. Newton still thought that a Creator was necessary to get the process going, but that after that He left it to work according to its own laws. Descartes held that not only dead matter but the bodies of animals also, are wholly governed by the laws of physics. Probably only theology restrained him from saying the same of human bodies. In the eighteenth-century French freethinkers took this further step. In their view, the relation of mind and matter was the antithesis of what Aristotle and the scholastics had supposed. For Aristotle, first causes were always mental, as when an engine driver starts a freight train moving and the impulsion communicates itself from truck to truck. Eighteenth-century materialists, on the contrary, considered all causes material and thought of mental occurrences as inoperative by-products. (3) The dethronement of "purpose"': Aristotle maintained that causes are of four kinds; modern science admits only one of the four. Two of Aristotle's four need not concern us; the two that do concern us are the "efficient" and the "final" cause. The "efficient" cause is what we should call simply "the cause"; the "final" cause is the purpose. In human affairs this distinction has validity. Suppose you find a restaurant at the top of a mountain. The "efficient" cause is the carrying up of the materials and the arranging of them in the pattern of a house. The "final" cause is to satisfy the hunger and thirst of tourists. In human affairs, the question "why?" is more naturally answered, as a rule, by assigning the final cause than by setting out the efficient cause. If you ask "why is there a restaurant here?" The natural answer is "because many hungry and thirsty people come this way." But the answer by final cause is only appropriate where human volitions are involved. If you ask "why do many people die of cancer?" you will get no clear answer, but the answer you want is one assigning the efficient cause. This ambiguity in the word "why" led Aristotle to his distinction of efficient and final causes. He thought—and many people still think—that both kinds are to be found everywhere: whatever exists may be explained, on the one hand, by the antecedent events that have produced it, and, on the other hand, by the purpose that it serves. But although it is still open to the philosopher or theologian to hold that everything has a "purpose," it has been found that "purpose" is not a useful concept when we are in search of scientific laws. We are told in the Bible that the moon was made to give light by night. But men of science, however pious, do not regard this as a scientific explanation of the origin of the moon. Or, to revert to the question about cancer, a man of science may believe, in his private capacity, that cancer is sent as a punishment for our sins, but qua man of science he must ignore this point of view. We know of "purpose" in human affairs, and we may suppose that there are cosmic purposes, but in

mind in this process. Newton still thought that a Creator was necessary to get the process going, but that after that He left it to work according to its own laws. Descartes held that not only dead matter, but the bodies of animals also, are wholly governed by the laws of physics. Probably only theology restrained him from saying the same of human bodies. In the eighteenth century French free thinkers took this further step. In their view, the relation of mind and matter was the antithesis of what Aristotle and the scholastics had supposed. For Aristotle, first causes were always mental, as when an engine driver starts a freight train moving and the impulsion communicates itself from truck to truck. Eighteenth-century materialists, on the contrary, considered all causes material, and thought of mental occur- rences as inoperative by-products. (3) The dethronement of "purpose" ': Aristotle maintained that causes are of four kinds; modern science admits only one of the four. Two of Aristotle's four need not concern us; the two that do concern us are the "efficient" and the "final" cause. The "efficient" cause is what we should call simply "the cause"; the "final" cause is the purpose. In human affairs this distinction has validity. Suppose you find a restau- SCIENCE AND TRADITION II rant at the top of a mountain. The "efficient" cause is the carrying up of the materials and the arranging of them in the pattern of a house. The "final" cause is to satisfy the hunger and thirst of tourists. In human affairs, the question "why?" is more naturally answered, as a rule, by assigning the final cause than by setting out the efficient cause. If you ask "why is there a restaurant here?" the natural answer is "because many hungry and thirsty people come this way." But the answer by final cause is only appropriate where human volitions are involved. If you ask "why do many people die of cancer?" you will get no clear answer, but the answer you want is one assigning the efficient cause. This ambiguity in the word "why" led Aristotle to his distinction of efficient and final causes. He thought — and many people still think — that both kinds are to be found everywhere: whatever exists may be explained, on the one hand, by the antecedent events that have produced it, and, on the other hand, by the purpose that it serves. But although it is still open to the philosopher or theologian to hold that everything has a "purpose," it has been found that "purpose" is not a useful concept when we are in search of scientific laws. We are told in the Bible that the moon was made to give light by night. But men of science, however pious, do not regard this as a scientific explanation of the origin of the moon. Or, to revert to the question about cancer, a man of science may believe, in his private capacity, that cancer is sent as a punishment for our sins, but qua man of science he must ignore this point of view. We know of "purpose" in human affairs, and we may suppose that there are cosmic

science it is the past that determines the future, not the future the past. "Final" causes, therefore, do not occur in the scientific account of the world. In this connection Darwin's work was decisive. What Galileo and Newton had done for astronomy, Darwin did for biology. The adaptations of animals and plants to their environments were a favorite theme of pious naturalists in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. These adaptations were explained by the Divine Purpose. It is true that the explanation was sometimes a little odd. If rabbits were theologians, they might think the exquisite adaptation of weasels to the killing of rabbits hardly matters for thankfulness. And there was a conspiracy of silence about the tapeworm. Nevertheless, it was difficult, before Darwin, to explain the adaptation of living things to their environment otherwise than by means of the Creator's purposes. It was not the fact of evolution, but the Darwinian Mechanism of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, that made it possible to explain adaptation without bringing in "purpose." Random variation and natural selection use only efficient causes. This is why many men who accept the general fact of evolution do not accept Darwin's view as to how it comes about. Samuel Butler, Bergson, Shaw, and Lysenko will not accept the dethronement of purpose though in the case of Lysenko it is not God's purpose, but Stalin's, that governs heredity in winter wheat. (4)

purposes, but in science it is the past that determines the future, not the future the past. "Final" causes, therefore, do not occur in the scientific account of the world. In this connection Darwin's work was decisive. What 12 THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON SOCIETY Galileo and Newton had done for astronomy, Darwin did for biology. The adaptations of animals and plants to their environments were a favorite theme of pious naturalists in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. These adaptations were explained by the Divine Purpose. It is true that the explanation was sometimes a little odd. If rabbits were theologians, they might think the exquisite adaptation of weasels to the killing of rabbits hardly a matter for thankful- ness. And there was a conspiracy of silence about the tape- worm. Nevertheless, it was difficult, before Darwin, to explain the adaptation of living things to their environment otherwise than by means of the Creator's purposes. It was not the fact of evolution, but the Darwinian mechanism of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, that made it possible to explain adaptation without bringing in "purpose." Random variation and natural selection use only efficient causes. This is why many men who accept the general fact of evolution do not accept Darwin's view as to how it comes about. Samuel Butler, Bergson, Shaw, and Lysenko will not accept the dethronement of purpose — though in the case of Lysenko it is not God's purpose, but Stalin's, that governs heredity in winter wheat. (4)

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

place in the universe: The effect of science upon our view of man's place in the universe has been of two opposite kinds; it has at once degraded and exalted him. It has degraded him from the standpoint of contemplation, and exalted him from that of action. The latter effect has gradually come to outweigh the former, but both have been important. I will begin with the contemplative effect. To get this effect with its full impact, you should simultaneously read Dante's Divine Comedy and Hubble on the Realm of the Nebulae—in each case with active imagination and with full receptiveness to the cosmos that they portray. In Dante, the earth is the center of the universe; there are ten concentric spheres, all revolving about the earth; the wicked, after death, are punished at the center of the earth; the comparatively virtuous are purged on the Mount of Purgatory at the antipodes of Jerusalem; the good, when purged, enjoy eternal bliss in one or other of the spheres, according to the degree of their merit. The universe is tidy and small: Dante visits all the spheres in the course of twenty- four hours. Everything is contrived in relation to man: to punish sin and reward virtue. There are no mysteries, no abysses, no secrets; the whole thing is like a child's doll's house, with people as the dolls. But although the people were dolls they were important because they interested the Owner of the doll's house. The modern universe is a very different sort of place. Since the victory of the Copernican system we have known that the earth is not the center of the universe. For a time the sun replaced it, but then it turned out that the sun is by no means a monarch among stars, in fact, is scarcely even middle class. There is an incredible amount of empty space in the universe. The distance from the sun to the nearest star is about 4- 2 light years, or 25 X io12 miles. This is in spite of the fact that we live in an exceptionally crowded part of the universe, namely the Milky Way, which is an assemblage of about 300,000 million stars. This assemblage is one of an immense number of similar assemblages; about 30 million are known, but presumably better telescopes would show more. The average distance from one assemblage to the next is about 2 million light years. But apparently they still feel they haven't elbow room, for they are all hurrying away from each other; some are moving away from us at the rate of 14,000 miles a second or more. The most distant of them so far observed are believed to be at a distance from us of about 500 million light years, so that what we see is what they were 500 million years ago. And as to mass: the sun weighs about 2 X 1027 tons, the Milky Way about 160,000 million times as much as the sun, and is one of a collection of galaxies of which about 30 million are known. It is not easy to maintain a belief in one's own cosmic importance in view of such overwhelming

place in the universe: The effect of science upon our view of man's place in the universe has been of two opposite kinds; it has at once degraded and exalted him. It has degraded him from the standpoint of contemplation, and exalted him from that of action. The latter effect has gradu- ally come to outweigh the former, but both have been im- portant. I will begin with the contemplative effect. To get this effect with its full impact, you should read simultaneously Dante's Divine Comedy and Hubble on the Realm of the Nebulae — in each case with active imagination SCIENCE AND TRADITION 13 and with full receptiveness to the cosmos that they portray. In Dante, the earth is the center of the universe; there are ten concentric spheres, all revolving about the earth; the wicked, after death, are punished at the center of the earth; the comparatively virtuous are purged on the Mount of Purgatory at the antipodes of Jerusalem; the good, when purged, enjoy eternal bliss in one or other of the spheres, according to the degree of their merit. The universe is tidy and small: Dante visits all the spheres in the course of twenty-four hours. Everything is contrived in relation to man: to punish sin and reward virtue. There are no myster- ies, no abysses, no secrets; the whole thing is like a child's doll's house, with people as the dolls. But although the people were dolls they were important because they interested the Owner of the doll's house. The modern universe is a very different sort of place. Since the victory of the Copernican system we have known that the earth is not the center of the universe. For a time the sun replaced it, but then it turned out that the sun is by no means a monarch among stars, in fact, is scarcely even middle class. There is an incredible amount of empty space in the universe. The distance from the sun to the nearest star is about 4- 2 light years, or 25 X io 12 miles. This is in spite of the fact that we live in an exceptionally crowded part of the universe, namely the Milky Way, which is an assemblage of about 300,000 million stars. This assemblage is one of an immense number of similar assemblages; about 30 million are known, but presumably better telescopes would show more. The average distance from one assemblage to the next is about 2 million light years. But apparently they still feel they haven't elbow room, for they are all hurrying away from each other; some are moving away from us at the rate of 14 THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON SOCIETY 14,000 miles a second or more. The most distant of them so far observed are believed to be at a distance from us of about 500 million light years, so that what we see is what they were 500 million years ago. And as to mass: the sun weighs about 2 X 10 27 tons, the Milky Way about 160,000 million times as much as the sun, and is one of a collection of galaxies of which about 30 million are known. It is not easy to main- tain a belief in one's own cosmic importance in view of such overwhelming

statistics. So much for the contemplative aspect of man's place in

statistics. So much for the contemplative aspect of man's place in

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

9/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	263 WORDS	94%	MATCHING TEXT	263 WORDS

scientific cosmos. I come now to the practical aspect. To the practical man, the nebulae are a matter of indifference. He can understand astronomers' thinking about them, because they are paid to, but there is no reason why he should worry about anything so unimportant. What matters to him about the world is what he can make of it. And scientific man can make vastly more of the world than unscientific man could. In the pre-scientific world, power was God's. There was not much that man could do even in the most favorable circumstances, and the circumstances were liable to become unfavorable if men incurred the divine displeasure. This showed itself in earthquakes, pestilences, famines, and defeats in war. Since such events are frequent, it was obviously very easy to incur divine displeasure. Judging by the analogy of earthly monarchs, men decided that the thing most displeasing to the Deity is a lack of humility. If you wished to slip through life without disaster, you must be meek; you must be aware of your defenselessness, and constantly ready to confess it. But the God before whom you humbled yourself was conceived in the likeness of man, so that the universe seemed human and warm and cozy, like home if you are the youngest of a large family, painful at times, but never alien and incomprehensible. In the scientific world, all this is different. It is not by prayer and humility that you cause things to go as you wish, but by acquiring a knowledge

scientific cosmos. I come now to the practical aspect. To the practical man, the nebulae are a matter of indifference. He can understand astronomers' thinking about them, because they are paid to, but there is no reason why he should worry about anything so unimportant. What matters to him about the world is what he can make of it. And scientific man can make vastly more of the world than unscientific man could. In the pre-scientific world, power was God's. There was not much that man could do even in the most favorable circumstances, and the circumstances were liable to become un- favorable if men incurred the divine displeasure. This showed itself in earthquakes, pestilences, famines, and de- feats in war. Since such events are frequent, it was obviously very easy to incur divine displeasure. Judging by the analogy of earthly monarchs, men decided that the thing most dis- pleasing to the Deity is a lack of humility. If you wished to slip through life without disaster, you must be meek; you must be aware of your defenselessness, and constantly ready to confess it. But the God before whom you humbled your- self was conceived in the likeness of man, so that the universe seemed human and warm and cozy, like home if you are the SCIENCE AND TRADITION 15 youngest of a large family, painful at times, but never alien and incomprehensible. In the scientific world, all this is different. It is not by prayer and humility that you cause things to go as you wish, but by acquiring a knowledge

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

political changes. Finally, as a result of the new control over the environment that scientific knowledge has conferred, a new philosophy is growing up, involving a changed conception of man's place in the universe. I shall deal successively with these aspects of the effects of science on human life. First I shall recount its purely intellectual effect as a solvent of unfounded traditional beliefs, such as witchcraft. Next, I shall consider scientific techniques, especially since the industrial revolution. Last, I shall set forth the philosophy which is being suggested by the triumphs of science and shall contend that this philosophy, if unchecked, may inspire a form of unwisdom from which disastrous consequences may result. The study of anthropology has made us vividly aware of the mass of unfounded beliefs that influence the lives of uncivilized human beings. Illness is attributed to sorcery, failure of crops to angry gods or malignant demons. Human sacrifice is thought to promote victory in war and the fertility of the soil; eclipses and comets are held to presage disaster. The life of the savage is hemmed in by taboos, and the consequences of infringing on a taboo are thought to be frightful. Some parts of this primitive outlook died out early in the regions in which civilization began. There are traces of human sacrifice in the Old Testament, for instance in the stories of Jephthah's daughter and of Abraham and Isaac, but by the time the Jews became fully historical they had abandoned the practice. The Greeks abandoned it in about the seventh century b.c. But the Carthaginians still practised it during the Punic Wars. The decay of human sacrifice in Mediterranean countries is not attributable to science, but presumably to humanitarian feelings. In other respects, however, science has been the chief agent in dispelling primitive superstitions. Eclipses were the earliest natural phenomena to escape from superstition into science. The Babylonians could predict them, though as regards solar eclipses, their predictions were not always right. But the priests kept this knowledge to themselves and used it as a means of increasing their hold over the populace. When the Greeks learned what the Babylonians had to teach, they very quickly arrived at astonishing astronomical discoveries. Thucydides mentions an eclipse of the sun and says that it occurred at the new moon, which, he goes on to observe, is apparently the only time at which such a phenomenon can occur. The Pythagoreans, very shortly after this time, discovered the correct theory of both solar and lunar eclipses and inferred that the earth is a sphere from the shape of its shadow on the moon. Although for the best minds, eclipses were thus brought within the domain of science, it was a long time before this knowledge was generally accepted. Milton could still speak of times when the sun In dim eclipse, disastrous twilight sheds On half the nations, and with fear of change Perplexes monarchs.

political changes. Finally, as a result of the new control over the environment which scientific knowledge has con- ferred, a new philosophy is growing up, involving a changed conception of man's place in the universe. I shall deal successively with these aspects of the effects of science on human life. First I shall recount its purely intellec- tual effect as a solvent of unfounded traditional beliefs, such as witchcraft. Next, I shall consider scientific technique, especially since the industrial revolution. Last, I shall set forth the philosophy which is being suggested by the tri- umphs of science, and shall contend that this philosophy, if unchecked, may inspire a form of unwisdom from which disastrous consequences may result. The study of anthropology has made us vividly aware of the mass of unfounded beliefs that influence the lives of un- civilized human beings. Illness is attributed to sorcery, fail- ure of crops to angry gods or malignant demons. Human sacrifice is thought to promote victory in war and the fertility of the soil; eclipses and comets are held to presage disaster. The life of the savage is hemmed in by taboos, and the conse- quences of infringing a taboo are thought to be frightful. Some parts of this primitive outlook died out early in the regions in which civilization began. There are traces of human sacrifice in the Old Testament, for instance in the stories of Jephthah's daughter and of Abraham and Isaac, but by the time the Jews became fully historical they had abandoned the practice. The Greeks abandoned it in about the seventh century b.c. But the Carthaginians still practiced it during the Punic Wars. The decay of human sacrifice in Mediterranean countries is not attributable to science, but presumably to humanitarian feelings. In other respects, however, science has been the chief agent in dispelling primi- tive superstitions. Eclipses were the earliest natural phenomena to escape SCIENCE AND TRADITION 3 from superstition into science. The Babylonians could pre- dict them, though as regards solar eclipses their predictions were not always right. But the priests kept this knowledge to themselves, and used it as a means of increasing their hold over the populace. When the Greeks learned what the Babylonians had to teach, they very quickly arrived at as- tonishing astronomical discoveries. Thucydides mentions an eclipse of the sun, and says that it occurred at the new moon, which, he goes on to observe, is apparently the only time at which such a phenomenon can occur. The Pythagoreans, very shortly after this time, discovered the correct theory of both solar and lunar eclipses, and inferred that the earth is a sphere from the shape of its shadow on the moon. Although, for the best minds, eclipses were thus brought within the domain of science, it was a long time before this knowledge was generally accepted. Milton could still speak of times when the sun In dim eclipse, disastrous twilight sheds On half the

But in Milton, this had become only poetic license. It was very much longer before comets were brought within the compass of science; indeed the process was completed only by the work of Newton and his friend Halley. Caesar's death was foretold by a comet; as Shakespeare makes Calpurnia say: When beggars die, there are no comets seen; The heavens themselves blaze forth the death of princes. The Venerable Bede asserted: "comets portend revolutions of kingdoms, pestilence, war, winds, or heat." John Knox regarded comets as evidence of divine anger, and his followers thought them "a warning to the King to extirpate the Papists." Probably Shakespeare still held beliefs of

nations, and with fear of change Perplexes monarchs. But in Milton this had become only poetic license. It was very much longer before comets were brought within the compass of science; indeed the process was com- pleted only by the work of Newton and his friend Halley. Caesar's death was foretold by a comet; as Shakespeare makes Calpurnia say: When beggars die, there are no comets seen; The heavens themselves blaze forth the death of princes. The Venerable Bede asserted: "comets portend revolu- tions of kingdoms, pestilence, war, winds, or heat." John 4 THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON SOCIETY Knox regarded comets as evidence of divine anger, and his followers thought them "a warning to the King to extirpate the Papists." Probably Shakespeare still held beliefs of

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

laws. The power you acquire in this way is much greater and much more reliable that that formerly supposed to be acquired by prayer, be cause you never could tell whether your prayer would be favorably heard in heaven. The power of prayer, moreover, had recognized limits; it would have been impious to ask too much. But the power of science has no known limits. We were told that faith could remove mountains, but no one believed it; we are now told that the atomic bomb can remove mountains, and everyone believes it. It is true that if we ever did stop to think about the cosmos we might find it uncomfortable. The sun may grow cold or blow up; the earth may lose its atmosphere and become uninhabitable. Life is a brief, small, and transitory phenomenon in an obscure corner, not at all the sort of thing that one would make a fuss about if one were not personally concerned. But it is monkish and futile—so scientific man will say—to dwell on such cold and unpractical thoughts. Let us get on with the job of fertilizing the desert, melting Arctic ice, and killing each other with perpetually improving technique. Some of our activities will do good, some harm, but all alike will show our power. And so, in this godless universe, we shall become gods. Darwinism has had many effects upon man's outlook on life and the world, in addition to the extrusion of purpose of which I have already spoken. The absence of any sharp line between men and apes is very awkward for theology. When did men get souls? Was the Missing Link capable of sin and therefore worthy of hell? Did Pithecanthropus Erectus have moral responsibility? Was Homo Pekiniensis damned? Did Pilt down Man go to heaven? Any answer must be arbitrary. But Darwinism—especially when crudely misinterpreted—threatened not only theological orthodoxy but also the creed of eighteenth-century liberalism. Condorcet was a typical liberal philosopher of the eighteenth century; Malthus developed his theory to refute Condorcet; and Darwin's theory was suggested by Malthus's. Eighteenth-century liberals had a conception of man as absolute, in its way, as that of the theologians. There were the "Rights of Man"; all men were equal; if one showed more ability than another, that was due entirely to a better education, as James Mill told his son to prevent him from becoming conceited. We must ask again: Should Pithecanthropus, if still alive, enjoy "The Rights of Man"? Would Homo Pekiniensis have been the equal of Newton if he could have gone to Cambridge? Was the Piltdown Man just as intelligent as the present inhabitants of that Sussex village? If you answer all these questions in the democratic sense, you can be pushed back to the anthropoid apes, and if you stick to your guns, you can be driven back ultimately on to the amoeba, which is absurd (to quote Euclid). You must therefore admit that men are not all congenitally equal, and that evolution

laws. The power you acquire in this way is much greater and much more reliable that that formerly supposed to be acquired by prayer, be- cause you never could tell whether your prayer would be favorably heard in heaven. The power of prayer, moreover, had recognized limits; it would have been impious to ask too much. But the power of science has no known limits. We were told that faith could remove mountains, but no one believed it; we are now told that the atomic bomb can remove mountains, and everyone believes it. It is true that if we ever did stop to think about the cosmos we might find it uncomfortable. The sun may grow cold or blow up; the earth may lose its atmosphere and become uninhabitable. Life is a brief, small, and transitory phenome- non in an obscure corner, not at all the sort of thing that one would make a fuss about if one were not personally con- cerned. But it is monkish and futile — so scientific man will say — to dwell on such cold and unpractical thoughts. Let us get on with the job of fertilizing the desert, melting Arctic ice, and killing each other with perpetually improving tech- nique. Some of our activities will do good, some harm, but all alike will show our power. And so, in this godless universe, we shall become gods. Darwinism has had many effects upon man's outlook on life and the world, in addition to the extrusion of purpose of which I have already spoken. The absence of any sharp line between men and apes is very awkward for theology. When did men get souls? Was the Missing Link capable of sin and 1 6 THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON SOCIETY therefore worthy of hell? Did Pithecanthropus Erectus have moral responsibility? Was Homo Pekiniensis damned? Did Piltdown Man go to heaven? Any answer must be arbitrary. But Darwinism— especially when crudely misinterpreted — threatened not only theological orthodoxy but also the creed of eighteenth-century liberalism. Condorcet was a typical liberal philosopher of the eighteenth century; Mal- thus developed his theory to refute Condorcet; and Darwin's theory was suggested by Malthus's. Eighteenth-century liberals had a conception of man as absolute, in its way, as that of the theologians. There were the "Rights of Man"; all men were equal; if one showed more ability than another, that was due entirely to a better education, as James Mill told his son to prevent him from becoming conceited. We must ask again: Should Pithecanthropus, if still alive, enjoy "The Rights of Man"? Would Homo Pekiniensis have been the equal of Newton if he could have gone to Cam- bridge? Was the Piltdown Man just as intelligent as the present inhabitants of that Sussex village? If you answer all all these questions in the democratic sense, you can be pushed back to the anthropoid apes, and if you stick to your guns, you can be driven back ultimately on to the amoeba, which is absurd (to quote Euclid) . You must therefore admit that

proceeds by selecting favorable variations. You must admit that heredity has a part in producing a good adult, and that education is not the only factor to be considered. If men are to be conventionally equal politically, it must be not because they are really equal biologically, but for some more specifically political reason. Such reflections have endangered political liberalism, though not, to my mind, justly. The admission that men are not all equal in congenital endowment becomes dangerous when some group is singled out as superior or inferior. If you say that the rich are abler than the poor, or men than women, or white men than black men, or Germans than men of any other nation, you proclaim a doctrine which has no support in Darwinism, and which is almost certain to lead to either slavery or war. But such doctrines, however unwarrantable, have been proclaimed in the name of Darwinism. So has the ruthless theory that the weakest should be left to go to the wall, since this is Nature's method of progress. If it is by the struggle for existence that the race is improved—so say the devotees of this creed—let us welcome wars, the more destructive the better. And so we come back to Heraclitus, the first of fascists, who said: "Homer was wrong in saying 'would that strife might perish from among gods and men.' He did not see that he was praying for the destruction of the universe. . . . War is common to all, and strife is justice. . . . War is the father of all and king of all; and some he has made gods and some men, some bond and some free." It would be odd if the last effect of science were to revive a philosophy dating from 500 B.C. This was to some extent true of Nietzsche and of the Nazis, but it is not true of any of the groups now powerful in the world. What is true is that science has immensely increased the sense of human power. But this effect is more closely connected with science as technique than with science as philosophy. In this chapter I have tried to confine myself to science as a philosophy, leaving science as technique for later chapters. After we have considered science as technique I shall return to the philosophy of human power that it has seemed to suggest. I cannot accept this philosophy, which I believe to be very dangerous. But of that I will not speak yet.

men are not all congenitally equal, and that evolution proceeds by selecting favorable variations. You must admit that heredity has a part in producing a good adult, and that education is not the only factor to be considered. If men are to be ally equal politically, it must be not because they are really equal biologically, but for some more specifically political reason. Such reflections have endangered political liberalism, though not, to my mind, justly. The admission that men are not all equal in congenital SCIENCE AND TRADITION 1 7 endowment becomes dangerous when some group is singled out as superior or inferior. If you say that the rich are abler than the poor, or men than women, or white men than black men, or Germans than men of any other nation, you proclaim a doctrine which has no support in Darwinism, and which is almost certain to lead to either slavery or war. But such doctrines, however unwarrantable, have been proclaimed in the name of Darwinism. So has the ruthless theory that the weakest should be left to go to the wall, since this is Nature's method of progress. If it is by the struggle for existence that the race is improved — so say the devotees of this creed — let us welcome wars, the more destructive the better. And so we come back to Heraclitus, the first of fascists, who said: "Homer was wrong in saying 'would that strife might perish from among gods and men.' He did not see that he was praying for the destruction of the universe. . . . War is common to all, and strife is justice. . . . War is the father of all and king of all; and some he has made gods and some men, some bond and some free." It would be odd if the last effect of science were to revive a philosophy dating from 500 B.C. This was to some extent true of Nietzsche and of the Nazis, but it is not true of any of the groups now powerful in the world. What is true is that science has immensely increased the sense of human power. But this effect is more closely connected with science as technique than with science as philosophy. In this chapter I have tried to confine myself to science as a philosophy, leaving science as technique for later chapters. After we have have considered science as technique I shall return to the philosophy of human power that it has seemed to suggest. I cannot accept this philosophy, which I believe to be very dangerous. But of that I will not speak yet.

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

12/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	154 WORDS	98%	MATCHING TEXT	154 WORDS

has existed for about a million years. He has possessed writing for about 6,000 years, agriculture somewhat longer, but perhaps not much longer. Science, as a dominant factor in determining the beliefs of educated men, has existed for about 300 years; as a source of economic technique, for about 150 years. In this brief period, it has proved itself an incredibly powerful revolutionary force. When we consider how recently it has risen to power, we find ourselves forced to believe that we are at the very beginning of its work in transforming human life. What its future effects will be is a matter of conjecture, but possibly a study of its effects hitherto may make the conjecture a little less hazardous. The effects of science are of various very different kinds. There are direct intellectual effects: the dispelling of many traditional beliefs, and the adoption of others suggested by the success of

has existed for about a million years. He has possessed writing for about 6,000 years, agricul- ture somewhat longer, but perhaps not much longer. Science, as a dominant factor in determining the beliefs of educated men, has existed for about 300 years; as a source of economic technique, for about 150 years. In this brief period it has proved itself an incredibly powerful revolutionary force. When we consider how recently it has risen to power, we find ourselves forced to believe that we are at the very beginning of its work in transforming human life. What its future effects will be is a matter of conjecture, but possibly a study of its effects hitherto may make the conjecture a little less hazardous. The effects of science are of various very different kinds. There are direct intellectual effects: the dispelling of many traditional beliefs, and the adoption of others suggested by the success of

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

13/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	26 WORDS	100%	MATCHING TEXT	26 WORDS

scientific method. Then there are effects on technique in industry and war. Then, chiefly as a consequence of new techniques, there are profound changes in

scientific method. Then there are effects on technique in industry and war. Then, chiefly as a consequence of new techniques, there are profound changes in

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

14/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	118 WORDS	89%	MATCHING TEXT	118 WORDS

political changes. Finally, as a result of the new control over the environment that scientific knowledge has conferred, a new philosophy is growing up, involving a changed conception of man's place in the universe. I shall deal successively with these aspects of the effects of science on human life. First I shall recount its purely intellectual effect as a solvent of unfounded traditional beliefs, such as witchcraft. Next, I shall consider scientific techniques, especially since the industrial revolution. Last, I shall set forth the philosophy which is being suggested by the triumphs of science and shall contend that this philosophy, if unchecked, may inspire a form of unwisdom from which disastrous consequences may result.

political changes. Finally, as a result of the new control over the environment which scientific knowledge has con- 2 THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON SOCIETY ferred, a new philosophy is growing up, involving a changed conception of man's place in the universe. I shall deal successively with these aspects of the effects of science on human life. First I shall recount its purely intellec- tual effect as a solvent of unfounded traditional beliefs, such as witchcraft. Next, I shall consider scientific technique, especially since the industrial revolution. Last, I shall set forth the philosophy which is being suggested by the tri- umphs of science, and shall contend that this philosophy, if unchecked, may inspire a form of unwisdom from which disastrous consequences may result.

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

15/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	17 WORDS	100%	MATCHING TEXT	17 WORDS

The dispelling of many traditional beliefs, and the adoption of others suggested by the success of

the dispelling of many traditional beliefs, and the adoption of others suggested by the success of

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

16/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	26 WORDS	100%	MATCHING TEXT	26 WORDS

scientific method. Then there are effects on technique in industry and war. Then, chiefly as a consequence of new techniques, there are profound changes in

scientific method. Then there are effects on technique in industry and war. Then, chiefly as a consequence of new techniques, there are profound changes in

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

17/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	36 WORDS	80%	MATCHING TEXT	36 WORDS

political changes. Finally, as a result of the new control over the environment that scientific knowledge has conferred, a new philosophy is growing up, involving a changed conception of man's place in the universe.

political changes. Finally, as a result of the new control over the environment which scientific knowledge has con- 2 THE IMPACT OF SCIENCE ON SOCIETY ferred, a new philosophy is growing up, involving a changed conception of man's place in the universe.

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

18/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	88 WORDS	82%	MATCHING TEXT	88 WORDS

deal with different aspects of the effects of science on human life. First, he shall recount its purely intellectual effect as a solvent of unfounded traditional beliefs, such as witchcraft. Next, he shall consider scientific techniques, especially since the industrial revolution. Last, He shall set forth the philosophy which is being suggested by the triumphs of science and shall contend that this philosophy, if unchecked, may inspire a form of unwisdom from which disastrous consequences may result. 8.5.2 Comprehension 2: The

deal successively with these aspects of the effects of science on human life. First I shall recount its purely intellec- tual effect as a solvent of unfounded traditional beliefs, such as witchcraft. Next, I shall consider scientific technique, especially since the industrial revolution. Last, I shall set forth the philosophy which is being suggested by the tri- umphs of science, and shall contend that this philosophy, if unchecked, may inspire a form of unwisdom from which disastrous consequences may result. The

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

19/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	102 WORDS	99%	MATCHING TEXT	102 WORDS

The autonomy of the physical world: Perhaps the most powerful solvent of the pre-scientific outlook has been the first law of motion, which the world owes to Galileo, though to some extent he was anticipated by Leonardo da Vinci. The first law of motion says that a body which is moving will go on moving in the same direction with the same velocity until something stops it. Before Galileo, it had been thought that a lifeless body will not move, and if it is in motion it will gradually come to rest. Only living beings, it was thought, could move without

The autonomy of the physical world: Perhaps the most powerful solvent of the pre-scientific outlook has been the first law of motion, which the world owes to Galileo, though to some extent he was anticipated by Leonardo da Vinci. The first law of motion says that a body which is moving will go on moving in the same direction with the same velocity until something stops it. Before Galileo it had been thought that a lifeless body will not move of itself, and if it is in motion it will gradually come to rest. Only living beings, it was thought, could move without

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

20/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	39 WORDS	100%	MATCHING TEXT	39 WORDS

help of some external agency. Aristotle thought that the heavenly bodies were pushed by gods. Here on earth, animals can set themselves in motion and (can cause motion in dead matter. There are, it was conceded, certain kinds

help of some external agency. Aristotle thought that the heavenly bodies were pushed by gods. Here on earth, animals can set themselves in motion and (can cause motion in dead matter. There are, it was conceded, certain kinds

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

21/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	94 WORDS	100%	MATCHING TEXT	94 WORDS

to dead matter: earth and water naturally move downwards, air and fire upwards; but beyond these simple "natural" motions everything depends upon impulsion from the souls of living beings. So long as this view prevailed, physics as an independent science was impossible, since the physical world was thought to be not causally self- contained. But Galileo and Newton between them proved that all the movements of the planets, and of dead matter on the earth, proceed according to the laws of physics, and once started, will continue indefinitely. There is no need

to dead matter: earth and water naturally move downwards, air and fire upwards; but beyond these simple "natural" motions everything depends upon impulsion from the souls of living beings. So long as this view prevailed, physics as an independent science was impossible, since the physical world was thought to be not causally self-contained. But Galileo and Newton between them proved that all the movements of the planets, and of dead matter on the earth, proceed according to the laws of physics, and once started, will continue indefinitely. There is no need

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

22/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	140 WORDS	96%	MATCHING TEXT	140 WORDS

mind in this process. Newton still thought that a Creator was necessary to get the process going, but after that He left it to work according to its own laws. Descartes held that not only dead matter but the bodies of animals also, are wholly governed by the laws of physics. Probably only theology restrained him from saying the same of human bodies. In the eighteenth-century French freethinkers took this further step. In their view, the relation of mind and matter was the antithesis of what Aristotle and the scholastics had supposed. For Aristotle, first causes were always mental, as when an engine driver starts a freight train moving and the impulsion communicates itself from truck to truck. Eighteenth-century materialists, on the contrary, considered all causes material and thought of mental occurrences as inoperative by-products.

mind in this process. Newton still thought that a Creator was necessary to get the process going, but that after that He left it to work according to its own laws. Descartes held that not only dead matter, but the bodies of animals also, are wholly governed by the laws of physics. Probably only theology restrained him from saying the same of human bodies. In the eighteenth century French free thinkers took this further step. In their view, the relation of mind and matter was the antithesis of what Aristotle and the scholastics had supposed. For Aristotle, first causes were always mental, as when an engine driver starts a freight train moving and the impulsion communicates itself from truck to truck. Eighteenth-century materialists, on the contrary, considered all causes material, and thought of mental occur- rences as inoperative by-products. (3)

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

23/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	36 WORDS	95%	MATCHING TEXT	36 WORDS

The first law of motion says that a body which is moving will go on moving in the same direction with the same velocity until something stops it. 2) Before Galileo, what had been thought

The first law of motion says that a body which is moving will go on moving in the same direction with the same velocity until something stops it. Before Galileo it had been thought

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

24/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	35 WORDS	97%	MATCHING TEXT	35 WORDS

Before Galileo, it had been thought that a lifeless body will not move, and if it is in motion it will gradually come to rest. Only living beings, it was thought, could move without

Before Galileo it had been thought that a lifeless body will not move of itself, and if it is in motion it will gradually come to rest. Only living beings, it was thought, could move without

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

25/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	34 WORDS	100%	MATCHING TEXT	34 WORDS

to dead matter: earth and water naturally move downwards, air and fire upwards; but beyond these simple "natural" motions everything depends upon impulsion from the souls of living beings. 4)

to dead matter: earth and water naturally move downwards, air and fire upwards; but beyond these simple "natural" motions everything depends upon impulsion from the souls of living beings.

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf

26/26	SUBMITTED TEXT	32 WORDS	93%	MATCHING TEXT	32 WORDS

In the eighteenth-century French freethinkers took this further step. In their view, the relation of mind and matter was the antithesis of what Aristotle and the scholastics had supposed.	In the eighteenth century French free thinkers took this further step. In their view, the relation of mind and matter was the antithesis of what Aristotle and the scholastics had supposed.

W http://groupelavigne.free.fr/russell1953.pdf