

Insight. Preface. x

hard-headed and peremptory. Today it is apt to be thought old-fashioned and unimaginative. But, perhaps, this difficulty may be evaded by ~~giving~~ offering two answers.

To those, then, that are slow to change, I should say that knowledge stands above utility and that I have, I feel, a contribution to make principally to the method of philosophy but also, in subordinate fashion, to the theory of science, to the analysis of ordinary modes of thought, to the teacher's task of ~~managing~~ communicating insights, and to the preacher's office of directing religious feeling.

Still all are not slow to change. Indeed, it is somewhat difficult to maintain that philosophy is a merely academic pursuit when a renunciation of Marx by the Kremlin would startle the world. It is equally difficult to suppose that, if the Kremlin did renounce Marx, it would place its faith in automatic progress. After all, do we ourselves any longer believe ~~humanity~~ that progress is automatic?

Where, then, do we stand? For we are confronted by a dilemma. Knowledge is power. It is power to do and power to control. As natural science yields power over nature, so human science yields power over men. But if philosophy exists, if an organization of all knowledge exists, then it must be the basic and immanent source of the direction and control of power. Are we to say that philosophy does not exist? Or are we to acknowledge that philosophy is

the most significant of all practical pursuits?

In fact, philosophy does exist. Other departments of knowledge settle particular ranges of issues, but philosophy exerts its sway over all. The reality of that influence is not limited to such explicit and militant philosophies as that of Marx. It is merely obscured in an age that settles all ultimate issues by appealing to a philosophy of laissez faire, of tolerance, and of automatic, evolutionary progress.

The issue is not whether philosophy exists. It is not whether philosophy is supremely practical. It is whether we can succeed in so revising the philosophy dominant in the West that its essential inspiration is retained while its obvious inadequacies are overcome. We began by deserting the old political economists. Then we witnessed too many evils in too many unexpected quarters to remain convinced that progress is automatic. Now we are witnessing a challenge to tolerance itself. On the practical level there is the unpleasant question of how far we can tolerate those that seem to have no intention of tolerating us. On the theoretical level there is the power ~~of~~ over men offered by human science. Are we to suppose that that power will not be used? ~~And~~ And if it is used in a deliberate, communal making of man by man, in whose image and likeness is man to be made?

A study of human understanding is primarily a study of methods. Its bearing on concrete policies is by implication rather than by direct pronouncements. Still