

Albert Camus'nün *L'Homme Révolté*, Essais, Bibl. nrf de la Pléiade, batı âleminin manevi bunahımı üzerine yapılan en ince ve başarılı incelemelerden biridir; bk. s. 413-414, 420 ve 509. Bu eser Tahsin Yücel tarafından *Başkaldıran İnsan*, Bilgi Yayınevi, Ankara 1967 (2. basım 1975), adı altında dilimize çevrilmiştir.

Anaksimandros'un fragmentinin yorumu için bk. F. Enriques-G. Santillana, *Storia del Pensiero Scientifico*, Vol. I, Milano 1932, s. 17-19; bk. ayrıca W. Jaeger, *Paideia I*, Berlin u. Leipzig 1936 (2. Auflage), s. 217 vd.

İnsanın bilinçli düşüncesi ve tanrısal Hikmet konusunda bk. Suat Sinanoğlu, *L'Humanisme à Venir*, s. 173-174, Ankara 1973 (2. baskı).

THE WESTERN SYSTEM OF VALUES: THE NEED FOR A NEW EVALUATION

SUAT SİNANOĞLU

As it is pointed out in the objectives of this conference, the European-Atlantic world has to face a general crisis which involves all fields of human activity. The relations between America and Europe themselves are damaged by it. And beyond the frontiers of the western world, the so-called developing countries, struggling for their existence, are becoming more conscious of their interests and their power. For the first time, some of them challenge the western world with their independent oil policy. But a crisis much more serious rages throughout Europe: the crisis of her moral values. This is the problem I shall deal with.

As an introductory remark, I must say that the western community is the unique one which believes in the concept of evolution, and which owes to that belief the development of its philosophical and scientific thought, the development of its art and general culture, as well as the political, social, and economic order it has given itself. The evolution of mankind has been most marked in this sole part of the earth. Thus, the crisis of western values and the consequent crisis of western civilization means simply that mankind's process of evolution is entering a critical period. Hence the vital importance of the moral problem not only for the western world, but for mankind as a whole.

It was after the second world war that the United States, taking advantage of the winding-up of the European colonial empires, and by means of controlling atomic energy, gave up its isolationist policy and has become a world power in a conflict of interests with Russia. Squeezed between the two superpowers, European States cooperate with America for the defence of the free world, while public opinion in different European countries is becoming increasingly aware that the union of Europe is essential for the re-establishment of her political and cultural prestige. The Council of Europe seeks to restore it and to recover equilibrium in Europe's relations with the powerful American ally.

But European union is also essential for an aim which is much more important: to safeguard western civilization. Till the second world war, Europe was the unique and uncontested depository and representative of modern civilization. But today western civilization in its evolutionary process, evading the control of human will, has assumed such a form and such a content that its very essence has altered.

Scientific thought, the progress of technology, and that of the social sciences have created a new class of specialists and technocrats: this is a very crowded class, enterprising and invading. They hold the power; press, radio and TV are under their management. Social scientists, although lacking in humanistic education, dominate the field of education, lead public opinion, and spread the principles of their philosophy of life through all the social strata.

The result is a process which can rightly be called the dehumanization of the western world.

Given such a situation, there is no wonder that America puts forward its candidature to the leadership, even in intellectual and moral fields: nobody can blame it, since in the fields of sociological and scientific research, in the spirit of enterprise and organization (all sustained by inexhaustible economic-military resources) America has nothing to learn from the Europe of today. Japan too, in some fields, seems to fly by its own wings.

The result is that Europe has no more voice in world politics and is losing her prestige even in the field of humanities and ethics, which had always been her exclusive domain.

The most relevant evidence of it is the fact that Europe, in her effort to compete with America and Russia, has recognized that her scholastic institutions are getting old. The Scandinavian countries have renounced the study of Greek. Socialist countries have cast off both Greek and Latin. In the countries of western Europe, Greek is vegetating, and Latin is rapidly withdrawing. New disciplines having no educational value are introduced in school programmes, and, according to what happens in America, people are already discussing the utility of learning national classics: is it really worthwhile to learn old English only for the sake of reading and enjoying Shakespeare?

The conclusion we can draw is that Europe, as she loses her intellectual pre-eminence, is harassed by a serious crisis in her traditional

values, so that she can not this time appeal to classical antiquity, as she has done before whenever she has had to face a major crisis in her history.

I am the first to recognize that moral and cultural values have to conform to the rules of evolution. But if they sink their roots not in the relative realities of a given civilization, but in those of the natural tendencies and talents of man, into the psycho-somatic realities of man, then the problem must be seen from a different standpoint.

I think that here lies the problem of a new evaluation of western civilization.

Western civilization has its source in classical antiquity. Greek and Roman civilizations have been throughout centuries overvalued as eternal models to be imitated, or (with the advent of historicism) undervalued as two ordinary civilizations among many others.

Both evaluations are wrong; Greek civilization has an extremely distinctive character: the order it has given itself does not pretend to be perpetual, to have a more or less divine nature, and it has never considered any of the levels reached as something impossible to surpass. Greek civilization is a product of human thought and itself is aware of that. Hence the concept of evolution, hence the trust in human reason, hence the concept of human dignity, hence the creativeness of the Greeks and of all those nations which have made their own these immortal principles (immortal, because they are in accord with human nature, and imperishable and unchangeable so long as human nature does not change): I mean the Romans, and, following the slumber of the Middle Ages, the Italians, the French, the English, the Germans, the Scandinavians, the Russians, and recently, thanks to the Revolution of Kemal Atatürk, the Turks. Japanese people can be mentioned at the end of the list, after the reforms dictated by General MacArthur.

We may then define Greek civilization as the civilization which is based on a system of human and rational values and as the one which gave a start to the spiritual evolution of mankind. Many European nations have contributed to it. Today, Europe is the depository of a heritage of thirty centuries, and the duty of continuing its evolution depends on her. It is her duty to integrate into the evolutionary process all the societies of the world. Indeed, if it is true that the psycho-soma-

tic tendencies and talents of man are the same for all races, the nations of all races can not but enjoy and profit by the rational principles and human feelings of the western world.

I must here remark that in a world growing smaller and smaller because of technological development, worldwide understanding is needed for peaceful coexistence. And mutual understanding between nations is possible only if all of them will accept the human and rational values of the western world, one product of which is, for instance, the charter of the universal rights of man.

So Europe must acquire a deeper (and more widespread) consciousness of her mission, which is the leadership of human evolution.

At present, a wrongly understood democratization of teaching and the necessity of satisfying the new needs of society (which demands more professional and technical training) expose to danger the safeguarding of these basic principles. Many factors challenge the moral values of the western world: progress of the sciences, technological development, the efficient spread of scientific notions which strike strongly the mind of the masses, the social sciences which consider man as an element subordinated to the social conditions and to the consumption economy rules, the new and presumptuous conception of ethics which claims to be sociological or scientific, the weakening of faith, the nihilist trend, the alienation of man to life; and, as a result of all this, the dreadful relativism which man has fallen into, having given up metaphysical concepts, so that he is now incapable of discriminating between good and evil, and of finding an aim for which he may live and struggle.

Today the problems are seen from standpoints which are narrow and un-historical. Such are the conceptions of the marxian real man and of the "social" (let me say rather: of the "sociological") man of western thinkers.

Europe needs to overcome her crisis for her own welfare and for the safeguarding of western civilization. But the nations of the Third World need too the leadership of Europe. And we must not forget that the most meaningful phenomenon of our century, even more important than the conquest of space, is that of the intervention of the Third World nations into history as an active force.

The Third World follows with disappointed eyes the conduct of the western world. At one time Atatürk had said that the Europe of

culture and science had to be considered apart from the Europe of politics. This distinction no longer applies. Various reasons can be advanced; but what is certain is that there is an evident overall weakening of the intellectual and moral side of the western world, which seems to subordinate everything to the needs of technological progress and to those of a consumption economy.

Hence the crisis of the developing countries, which do not believe in the western world and are torn between their desire for an integral westernization and, on the other hand, the bold refusal of everything which is the product of western thought, the western world being the imperialistic and colonialist world which has to be fought.

What makes more difficult the task of Europe at this turning point of her history is that the crisis which she is facing has (and this happens for the first time) *European* dimensions; it is a crisis which involves all the European nations. The European intellectuals are not yet aware of the mission Europe has to undertake, but the menacing presence of the superpowers, the loss of political and military supremacy and the consequent loss of leadership in world politics, have given European public opinion a shared sense of community in their destiny, whatever it may be.

But it is a mistake to take actual man as a starting point for the solution of the moral crisis. Actual man did not exist yesterday, nor will he exist tomorrow. As far as marxian real man is concerned, it seems to me that he is (though opposed to abstract man) a generalization, and, what is more, an arbitrary one. Is the western man of today merely a product of nature, or have thirty centuries of intellectual evolution contributed to his formation? If it is the second assumption which is the right one, then can not we establish what are the intrinsic qualifications of the human substance in which the process of evolution takes place? Considering these qualities would it be really arbitrary to speak about a universal man, a man who would be much less abstract than the marxian real man?

And if universal man is more concrete than the real man of Marx (as, in a certain sense, the horses represented on the front of the Parthenon are more real than any particular horse) we may conclude, on historical grounds, that the universal exists with a greater concreteness than the actual realities.

If this argument is well founded, we may then state that the human mind can find, within the chaotic world of relativity, the ground on which to build its principles, that he is able to discover the sources of the universal, outside the field of metaphysics.

We can find, within this evolving universe, within the relativistic human world, certain principles which are steady and lasting: the concept of evolution, for instance, that of freedom, and some psycho-somatic characteristics of man, as the instinct of preservation, the fear of death, the feelings of love and hatred, the sense of pleasure and sorrow. Owing to these characteristics, owing to the belief in human reason, and owing to the concept of evolution, western man has evolved, following (although with deviations and withdrawals) a given straight line for more than thirty centuries.

It is the history of human evolution which indicates what this straight line is. We can now conclude that the solution of the present European crisis is to be studied not in the framework of contemporary realities, but in that, much more complex, of thirty centuries of western history.

Only in so doing, the measures to be taken, far from being precarious and fallacious, will tend to maintain the right direction in the process of evolution and to hasten it. For, historical man is seen in his true nature, not in his attitudes influenced by incidental social conditions. And while it is easy to impose dogmas to the marxian real man, historical man offers to the dogmas no point to catch hold of.

As far as the "sociological" man of western scientists is concerned, he does not differ much from the marxian real man. For, in spite of the substantial ideological differences, both are confronted by the same contemporary problems and these problems are seen in West as well as in East Europe from points of view which are very similar.

In fact, both consider the problem of man and that of the ethics of the post-industrial era as subordinated to the actual social conditions. Social scientists think that the essential factor is the economic order created by technology and consumption industry (which develops according to its own rules and increasingly enslaves man); to this order established partly outside the control of human will, man is requested to conform. The problem for the marxist sociologist is to study the psy-

chic and physical possibilities of man to adapt himself to the order imposed by the regime (which itself is subordinated to the social conditions of the industrial world); for the liberal sociologist the question is to see what the possibilities of man are to adapt himself to work and to environment. Hence the study of his attitudes, of his behaviour, of his adaptability, and of his reactions.

Such is the attitude of sociology, which takes as its starting point social conditions and actual man, and that perhaps makes it more realistic and practical. But sociology has hardly succeeded in penetrating to the very essence of the problem.

Who sees, as I see, in the general crisis of Europe a fundamentally human problem, rather than an economic or social one, can not but remark that a very tight correlation exists between the phenomenon of alienation and that of inner emptiness which are felt by men today.

Man must ask himself why people have yielded to the injunctions of technology and industry.

It is generally admitted that industry evolves according to its own rules, that man is no more able to dominate the forces he, himself, has created, and that he is the slave of social conditions. But even marxist thought recognizes that social conditions are the product of man's activity. Then, what weakens human will, what makes man a passive spectator of events?

We are now at the heart of the matter. Modern generations are confronted with the most crucial problem mankind has ever faced: the mystery of his own origin, and that of the reason and aim of human life.

The problem is a very old one, and must be studied in the framework of the history of mankind, even if today it presents an entirely different face. Once again *sapientia* is opposed to *scientia*. Once again: humanism against science.

Evidently it was not scientific discoveries which shook the faith of Gilgamesh, the hero of the oriental epic poem, and induced him to investigate the mystery of life and death. What pushed Gilgamesh to step over the threshold of the world of the dead was the human desire to enjoy eternal life as did the gods.

But in Ionia the problem takes a very different aspect. Thinkers of a very high intellectual level succeeded, by an intense concentration of

thought, in surpassing the limits of what is called common sense (which sinks its roots into experience of the physical and human world) and to imagine a world balanced in space; to see the sun not as a god to be adored, but as an incandescent mass; to research within the multiplicity of all matter for the original matter; to consider the origin of the universe as due not to metaphysical, but to physical (i.e. natural) causes. These penetrating reasonings of a scientific and philosophical character did not spread outside the restricted *milieu* of the intellectuals, and ordinary people amused themselves seeing how these illustrious men, while observing the stars, did often not notice the open well laying ahead of their steps. We can, then, understand why this unprejudiced and atheistic conception of the universe did not rouse any moral crisis in Ionian society.

In Athens, the naturalistic thought is discredited by the sophistic current. Even Socrates, although indulgent to the study of the heavenly and underground phenomena, takes care to state that he is not himself interested in such researches. His unique preoccupation is man - human world. Plato follows his master. And Aristotle, though a scientist of nature, is not a philosopher of nature. In Athens, the scientific values are sharply subordinated to the spiritual and moral values. This subordination has lasted till recent times.

We must however remark that classical Greek society, even if not confronted by the dilemma *sapientia* or *scientia* (because *sapientia* was the unique source of its system of values), never found, in the humanistic thought of that time, the comfort of a future life. But, in spite of what one would guess, the Greek mind has never been scattered by the preoccupation of death. In any case, the great artistic creations of Greece give little or no place to such a preoccupation. Greek artists are intensely interested in wordly life; and the people enjoy such a joyous celebration of human life. When human problems are handled, the Greek mind finds a better solution to them in a human framework rather than in a divine one. People are satisfied with the moral values of a strictly human nature; for, magistracy, popular assemblies, court juries, gatherings and chats in the agora joined together with the sense of national and individual superiority makes Greek man live an intense life and he has no time to think of what will happen after he is dead. One can remark the shadow of doubt, a shadow of sadness, only on the funerary pillars (*stelai*) of

Attica. We shall come back to the origin of this very high moral conception which, interested in worldly life, does not pay attention to death.

In the Hellenistic period, when man is alienated to public life, when he feels alone, isolated, and has to deal with his daily insignificant concerns, then he begins to think on the meaning and on the purpose of his own life. This is why philosophy (Stoicism and Epicureanism above all) concentrate their efforts on the moral problem in order to alleviate the uneasiness of the public. But it is the Christian faith which brings a total liberation to the souls.

During many centuries the western world is satisfied with the Christian faith. With the advent of Humanism, the study of classical antiquity (as says Flora) "brings light to the minds, liberates them from vague superstitions, purifies religion. Philosophy and history become laic, or, as it has been said, become "secular", that is pertaining not to religious eternity, but to earthly time..." So are created the propitious conditions for the Renaissance, which later "takes away from theology the fields which do not belong to it."

The reaction of the friars and that much more frightening phenomenon, the Inquisition, have not been able to hinder the revival of the evolutionary process of mankind.

The conflict between *sapientia* and *scientia* breaks out vehemently at the Renaissance period. The "rhetoricians", imbued with Greek spiritualism, fight against the philosophers of nature, which Averroism nourishes and to which the antihumanistic philosophy allies itself. (The majority of humanists do not deny theology.) But the conflict is going on on the level of intellectuals, and the masses continue to undergo the influence of the Church. On the other hand the scientific discoveries of Copernic, Leonardo, Leon Battista Alberti are not so exciting as to impress public opinion.

The conflict between - as says Flora - "rhetoric, the depository of the word of God, and feeble scientific reason" has no hold on public opinion which leans, as at the time of Saint Augustin, and according to his own words, "magis ad poëtas quam ad physicos" ("to the poets, rather than to the scientists"), *De Civitate Dei* IV 32.

The principle of secularism established by the democratic regimes gives a new and more vigorous impulse to scientific research and, since the French Revolution, scientific progress affects increasingly public

opinion. People, even if not yet faced by the dilemma *sapientia* or *scientia*, are more and more impressed by scientific truths. They can not be disputed and affect man's subconscious as well as his conscious mind. The attention of the western world is concentrated on scientific progress, and people are convinced that the time is not far distant when man will conquer the universe; this makes them lose their faith in any divine intervention, and in any divine teleology. Men are lonely and lost in the boundless space of the universe. They feel free from every moral obligation, for they have destroyed the traditional sources of the Christian moral. And they have lost the sense of what is good and what is evil. "When crime puts on the spoils of innocence, by a curious reversal which is proper to our time, it is innocence which is bidden to supply its justification" says Albert Camus.

When man has no superior aims, he is carried away by his own wretched egoistic interests. A new generation has come to existence which would like to enjoy life in an unscrupulous and foolish way. But life is hard, and has its exigencies: life requires subordination to certain rules which regulate social relations; it demands work, for where there is no production there can not be consumption; and, although the feelings of anger, revolt and destruction have been exaggerated, life demands love. Today, man rebels against the established order and fights harshly. But is it worthy of wasting all his life fighting, when man knows that his life will end and he, himself, will be reduced to nothing? So why revolt? Man in revolt does not believe in the existence of absolute and perpetual values. For him all is relative, all is subjective. On such ground, man can not build new values. With such dispositions, in this inconsiderate nihilist atmosphere, it is impossible to establish any ethical system. "Can man, averted from the sacred and from its absolute values, find the rules of conduct?" asks Camus. But he forgets that the Greeks had found them. "Two centuries of metaphysical or historical revolt: this is the topic on which we have to reflect" continues Camus. But the impression is that only a few have reflected on it.

Modern generations are, consciously or unconsciously, nihilist and it is this nihilist atmosphere which ensures that the course of events is no more controlled by human will; this is why power balance competition is going on; atomic energy aims not to serve mankind, but to

destroy it; and consumption economy grows, rendering man a cog in the industrial machinery and a simple factor of consumption. The result is a more exasperated alienation of man from his traditional values, from life and from himself.

This seems to me to be the real source of the general crisis of contemporary Europe.* Actual thought can hardly deal with the problem, since it is far behind scientific and technological progress and far beyond the established social order, which reactionary forces strive to preserve at any cost. The novelty of the situation is that this time the crisis is not the crisis of a particular European nation, but of *Europe*, and the whole of Europe has to face it.

An unconditioned return to religious faith seems to me impossible, for man can not ignore what he knows and is aware that he knows. And we must confess that holy books are in flagrant contradiction with scientific data. What is more, since remote times common sense has noticed that the natural order does not at all harmonize with the moral order human beings aspire to.

At present, information media bring scientific discoveries to the knowledge of the public; nobody today ignores the disintegration of the atom and the way atomic energy is going to be employed; every individual is interested in the most recent discoveries in the field of biology. The masses have reached such a level of intellectual maturity that they can make the point of the situation by themselves. Then, they can no more accept events which, however attributed to the inexplicability of divine Providence, are – from the human point of view – evident examples of indifference, injustice, and cruelty. Thus, in the subconscious of the masses there is no more a place for metaphysical

* It is evident that the fact that I am considering the European crisis from the human point of view puts me in a contradictory position to the general trend, and the question is if a non-metaphysical conception, analogous to that of Anaximander, can really solve the moral problem of Europe and if this solution can be the propelling power capable of leading western world to a new stage of evolution. I think that man is driven firstly to work to satisfy his natural needs, but that the need for inner harmony too is a compelling one, for which evolved man seeks intensely. In any case, such a need becomes imperative when his natural needs are satisfied. It is well known that since a certain time labour in western countries maintain alive class conscience by putting forward not exploitation or salary problems, but the quality (the mechanical quality) of work they do. And this is not an economic, but essentially a moral problem.

beliefs. Once again *sapientia* and *scientia* are dissociated from each other. And for the first time in the history of mankind *sapientia* has been subordinated to *scientia*; and people have become conscious of this subordination.

Epicure did not deny the existence of gods, but he thought that they were not interested in men's destiny; men have to solve their problems by themselves. The nations of Europe at every critical turning point of their history have appealed to classical antiquity and the dialogue engaged has every time been fruitful. Even today Europe would benefit from such a dialogue, but, for some time, classical thought has been neglected and despised. It is time now to give up polemical attitudes, indignant remonstrances, and unadvised activism, and to undertake with serenity and objectivity the study of the present situation. The tragedy of Europe is that at the very moment when she needs more than ever the help of classical thought, she has lost her trust in it.

Once, in Oxford, I asked an eminent English humanist how he could harmonize in his mind *sapientia* and Christian faith. He frankly answered that every true humanist can not but refuse the results of metaphysical thought, and therefore he is obliged to sacrifice a lot of his faith. But the humanists from the Renaissance until today have never destroyed moral values; on the contrary, they have been the builders of the highest moral which mankind has ever given himself: the moral based on the reality and the dignity of human feelings.

The Greeks themselves (and the Romans), because of their beliefs, which took from them any hope of a future life, were never pessimist, did not suicide, did not revolt against moral values; they were people controlling their passions, abhorring cruelty, tortures, and any act which hurt human feelings. They were just and generous, and seeking for moral and material decorum.

The conclusion we can draw from this consideration is that the failure of the values led by humanist thought is not due to the fact that the support of faith is missing today, but because of the fact that our scientific notions are set up on the original crude human nature, which has not been re-fashioned by humanistic education. And the recent history of Europe reminds us that learned man, professionally shaped, technically equipped, is a brute much more blood-thirsty than primitive man.

Modern man has been diverted from a consciousness of the history of his own evolution. He has been deprived of his second nature (that given him by a liberal education). Reduced to his original nature, man is caught again by the irrational fears which are characteristic of primitive minds. He wanted to get rid of his destiny, but now sees himself reduced to a joke at the mercy of hazard. He has revolted against God and by denying God he has denied any solid ground on which to build new moral values, and this has pushed him to deny life and himself, being unable to find an answer to his very question: that of the revolutionary who does not want life, but wants to know the reasons why life is, as Camus rightly understood.

I think that we can not disregard a truth which becomes more and more evident: secularism, which at first aimed at freeing the *raison d'Etat* from the influence of the Church, and which has become gradually the base of the whole of social order subordinating even the actions and the behaviour of man in his daily life, has invaded the intimate conscience of man, has broken into the field of the relations between individual and God, which until today had been categorically reserved to faith. Seeking for total freedom, the individual has found himself facing God. Mass conscience, collective action, ideologies can not help him. This is a question that every individual has to study and answer by himself. It seems that modern man (whose material needs technology and cybernetics are going to meet in an automatic way), if he wants to safeguard the sanity of his spirit, is bound for a harder task than that undergone for the sake of nutrition.

But just at this stage man is despoiled of his humanity and alienated from any cosmogonic feeling. In old Greece *mousikè* and *gymnas-tikè* had sufficed to develop and to preserve during many centuries the democratic order and such a regime of freedom that Aristophanes could present antimilitaristic comedies while his fellow-citizens were fighting the most rash war of their history. The education of the Muses was essentially based on the Homeric poems. Today modern man, alienated as he is from nature and therefore from his own intimate nature, needs a systematic, complex, longlasting, and refined education in order to be able to reacquire the human qualities which characterized the Greek of classical times.

Then, the intervention of the gods into the actions of men, the frequent mentioning of the forces of nature, by constituting the fra-

mework for the heroes of the Iliad, gave a universal dimension to the acts and to the words of the heroes and man assumed a cosmogonic role: hence the value of the human being, the sense of human dignity; hence the whole of human and rational values. Modern Europe in many fields is still behind the level reached by classical antiquity. The Iliad— an epic poem of more than 15 thousand verses sufficed to produce in Athens citizens conscious of their right and duties. Today to make man feel himself moving on cosmogonic level the Iliad is still necessary, but does not suffice. Modern man needs a complex humanistic education joined to a rich scientific training.

Democritus says that nature and education are, in a sense, similar, for education gives man a new nature, which is different from the original. Democritus is right: this is why I consider as monstrous a teaching where little or no place is made for “education” understood in its true meaning. And this is why I think that technical and professional teaching is based on human nature in its original and primitive state. The psycho-somatic inclinations of man will strive a great deal to find a way to express themselves and to develop, crushed as they are under the heavy heap of professional notions and by an environment which is entirely artificial. (There is every reason for planning museums of nature, where flora, fauna, air, shape of the soil will be preserved in their natural state!)

Connected with the topic we deal with, the imposing figure of an Ionian philosopher of nature, Anaximander, rises in front of us. One of his sentences, difficult to interpret, meaningful and suggestive, expresses in a few words the heroic and dignified attitude of man face to face with the mystery of the universe. What the fragment means is roughly this: “The fact that things have an origin is the reason why they come to an end; because they must expiate, in the regular flow of time, the unlawful privilege of having evaded the uniformity of the original matter and of having assumed a different and independent existence.” Anaximander finds that there is order and justice in the universe. For the sake of such a justice all things, having an origin, must end. As far as man is concerned, man is the matter which has the virtue of being able to investigate matter itself, and this makes his situation the most privileged among all: he, thus, is condemned to expiate it by returning to the original matter. The mystery of life

and death, the end of man are so explained. This vision of Anaximander gives modern man the way to an heroic understanding of life, which is a struggle for truth, beauty and happiness. Man can find in this vision the meaning and the aim of life, and feel that death is not a degrading condemnation which impels him to despair and revolt. And I think that an heroic moral is the one best fitting with our age of space conquest.

It is evident that such a man will see problems from a very different point of view than that of the actual, consciously or unconsciously, nihilist man. Having appeased his feelings of indignation and rebellion, sustained by the consciousness of being the most evolved reality on this earth, capable of reflecting on his own origins, man will be reconciled with himself, his destiny, his life, and will be able to find, in his reconquered *joie de vivre*, the solution to his present crisis: he will take the most adequate measures to eliminate any motive of alienation, to fight pollution and preserve nature in its integrity, which he needs in order to cultivate his cosmogonic feelings, and, by that, to reach the consciousness of being (as the semidivine homeric heroes were) a factor of cosmogonic importance, and — incapable as he is of maintaining his faith in metaphysical principles— to get rid of his desolate loneliness by becoming one with the universe.

It is interesting to notice that at the Renaissance period, too, the discovery and study of the human mind was considered as a return to nature. This is what Flora says: "And this return to antiquity was to attain *nature*, as Giotto did, deserving to be called —as Vasari says— 'pupil of nature, not of men'."

The alternative to a sociological-scientific moral (which is in reality the denial of any moral) is, thus, still a humanist moral which refuses every compromise with metaphysical thought and sinks its roots deeply in the ground of the sciences, and therefore is totally secular.

The evaluation of the actual moral crisis as the source of the general crisis of Europe may seem to be abstract. But if it is true that social conditions, though affecting man, are essentially the product of human activity, we can expect from the formation in Europe of a new consciousness of her historical mission, a total renewal of the western world leading to a new stage of human evolution. This is a topic which has to be treated apart. Suffice it to say that, in my opinion, Europe, with