

A naturalistic morality the reasons for altering them
and the way to do so both become clearer. But even
with our present resources and command over nature
it is universally agreed that intelligence and good will
could contrive that no man should be so situated as to
be deprived of all the generally accessible values.
The clearing away from moral questions of all
ethical ^{discussed and cumbersome article} Lumber and superstitious interpolations
is a ~~very~~ long overdue. But until it has been
carried further, it is not wise to make oneself busy
with such unpractical activities like art or criticism.
This is true enough doubtless of some who so ~~busy~~
busy themselves. But it is not true that criticism is a
luxury trade. The rear-guard of society cannot be
extricated until the van guard has gone further. Good
will and intelligence are still too little available. The
critic is so much concerned with the health of the mind
as any doctor with the health of the body. To set up as
a critic is to set up as a judge of values. For the art
are inevitably and quite apart from any intention
of the artist an appraisal of existence. Matthew Arnold

~~problem of morality then, in fact~~
~~to obtain the greatest possible value from life, becomes~~
~~becomes~~
~~problem of organization, both in the individual life~~
~~and in the adjustment of individual lives to one another.~~
The problem of morality should be discovered from all
non-psychological ideas, from abstract goods and immediate
convictions, which incidentally help greatly to give
unnecessary stiffness and fixity to obsolescent codes,
without system, needless to say, value vanishes since
in a state of chaos important and trivial & impulses
alike are frustrated.

no one
It is clear that ~~the~~ no one systematization can
claim a supreme position. Men are naturally different
and in any society specialisation is inevitable. There
are evidently a great number of good systematiza-
tions and what is good for one person will not be
good for another. A sailor, a doctor, a mathematician
and a poet can hardly have the same organization
throughout. With different conditions different values
arise. Doubtless conditions may be, and too often are,
such that no life of high value is possible. ~~was~~
with

(4)

Art and Morality

Before exploring the precise rationale of the relationship between art and morality, it is imperative to define what exactly we mean by morality. We should, ~~therefore~~ ^{survive} first of all, outline a morality which will change ^{is when} as circumstances alter, a morality free from ^{mysticism} ~~absolutism~~ and arbitrariness. It will be a morality which will explain, as no morality has yet explained, the place and the value of ^{the} arts in human affairs. What is good and valuable is the exercise of impulses and the satisfaction of their ~~appetencies~~ ^{appetencies} ~~desires~~. When we say that anything is good we mean that it satisfies and by a good experience we mean one in which the impulses which make it are fulfilled and successful. But there is a necessary qualification that their exercise and satisfaction shall not interfere in any way with more important ~~than other~~ impulses. Importance is a complicated matter, and which impulses are more important than others can only be discerned by an extensive inquiry into what actually happens

nature - an understanding of which is of primary importance to students of society and politics. In other words, the study of literature should be an intimate study of the complexities, potentialities and essential conditions of human nature.

Yet, there is another kind of difference between the Marxist attitude to literature and that of Eliot. It is true that Eliot stresses the social aspect of creative achievement as the Romantic attitude did not, but it allows for the individual aspect more than the Marxist does. Without the individual talent there is no creation. While you are in intimate touch with literature ~~no~~ amount of dialectic or of materialistic interpretation, will obscure for long the truth that human life lives only in individuals. The truth is that it is only in individuals that society lives. What is significant is that thinking about political and social matters ought to be done by minds of some real literary education, and done in an intellectual climate informed by a vital literary culture. Literature yields to the sociologist or anyone else what it has to give only if it is approached as literature. The literature is something in the

concept. Eliot believes that an individual writer is to be aware that his work is of the literature to which it belongs and not merely added externally to it. A life's work must be thought of as essentially something more than an accumulation of separate works: it has an organic order and form, in relation to which the individual writer has his significance and his being.

Anyone who is seriously concerned with literature must conform to the broad ideas of Eliot. The ways in which it is at odds with Marxist theories of literature are obvious. It stresses, not economic and material determinants, but intellectual and spiritual. Thus it implies a different conception from the Marxist of the real relation between the present of society and the past, and a different conception of society. It assumes that, as material conditions count, there is a certain measure of spiritual autonomy in human affairs, and that human intelligence, character and will do really and effectively operate, express an inherent human nature. There is a human