II

Good is an action corresponding to the language (term) which expresses the value called good, but it may sometimes happen that the term come to be applied even the mental state which is the source of that action. In case of others, good is presumed according to others’ action, but in case of ourselves, we remain aware of good only inwardly as the source of our action. Therefore, the original sense of good is nothing but the expression for a certain state of action. Usually, this term is not applied to anything other than to human action. Even if the phenomenon caused by any other living creature or by natural power is similar to human action evaluated as good or evil, it is not evaluated as good or evil. In short, good and evil are terms peculiarly applied to human action.

1. Is it possible to use the evaluating terms of good and evil for phenomena caused by something other than human beings? The terms may sometimes happen to be used, but the terms have never had any moralistic meaning.
2. Can all actions of human beings be objects evaluated as good or evil? 
   No, they cannot. There are actions which cannot be named good or evil. 
   Only a part of human actions can be called good or evil.

3. What then is the distinction between one and the other parts?
   (1) What is an action which may be named good or evil?—An action 
       with intention is thus called.
   (2) What is an action which cannot be named good or evil?—
       An action without intention. An action without intention is 
       called neither good nor evil, and regarded as similar to natural 
       phenomena.

4. Can every action with intention be called good or evil? No, it cannot. 
   Some intentional actions can be called good or evil. Various economic 
   actions are called neither good nor evil.

5. What then is meant by intentional actions named good or evil?
   (1) Is an intentional action done toward oneself called good or evil? 
       No, it is not, but suicide is called evil.
   (2) Is an intentional action done toward something other than human 
       beings called good or evil? No, it is not, but when it influences 
       other persons or society, it is called good or evil.
   (3) Is an intentional action toward other persons or society called good 
       or evil? Yes, we evaluate this action as good or evil.

   In short, we use these evaluating terms to intentional actions which have 
   direct or indirect bearing upon other persons and represent the value of the 
   action.

   In human society, when an entire society opposes an individual, one of its 
   elements, or when a part and the whole are opposed, the evaluation of good 
   or evil is first made, but in case of any other opposition, for example, in case 
   of an individual vs. an individual, or society vs. society, such evaluation is not
made. Thus, when two societies are opposed, evaluation is made by the term of gain or loss.

III

A book entitled *Plato's Philosophy and Education* reads:

"Socrates does not consider it as the end of an action whether or not an action is accompanied by pleasure. Accordingly, the science of morality is by no means a metrical science of pleasure. As was stated in the previous paragraph, psychological hedonism was abandoned in his philosophy. In general, health, riches and honor are regarded as the direct purpose of an action, but they are not the final purpose. They are admitted only as a means of the final purpose. Therefore, the purpose of all actions lies in obtaining good.

What is then the standard of judgment for good or evil? It does not mean pleasure. Socrates says to Polas, 'A single affair or a single action is sometimes good and sometimes evil. On what principle do you want to judge this? He says again, 'Well, Polas, do you want to make me reply without your answering the question? Then, I will answer. When your thought have justice, your action is good, and when injustice, it is evil.'

Therefore, every action is not necessarily judged as good by the gratification of human desire. The judgment for good or evil depends upon whether the action has justice or not. Justice is the principle for judgment of action. Unless a person knows what good really means, the person cannot then pass judgment on good or evil. Therefore, an investigation of the nature of good must be the very problem for Plato.

Good and pleasure are not the same. Pleasure should be sought for good.

Human beings and all other things can be good, since a certain virtue exists in them. However, it is not by chance that the inherent virtue of all things,
whether be it that of material things, spirits or instruments, is given in this manner, but the virtue results from the order, truth or technology inherent in those things. Therefore, the virtues of all things are derived from the order or arrangement. I should think what makes a thing good is that order proper to all things.

Presumably, Plato considers, through the above-mentioned description, an organic relationship of life in which all things can be good by owing in part the good of the whole life. This organic relationship in which things can be good is not given to them from outside, but it has been directly inherent in things themselves from the earliest times."

In short, the principle of judgment for good or evil is justice and all things can be good, since justice or good owes the good of the whole life inherent in all things. But in considering this statement, can we agree with this statement? We will surely be confronted with another question what justice is.

In judging the moral value of human action by the standard for good or evil, on what basis do we judge good, evil, right, or wrong? Plato states that the good of human beings has been from the beginning immediately inherent in human beings as well as in all things, but this is a question to be discussed.

There will be little difference between this statement and the saying in The Analects of Confucius, "Do not do unto others what you would not want others to do unto you." According to the true intention of Confucius, to do to others what you would not want them to do to you, is evil, and the judgment passed on whether you want or not, can be made without it being taught. The instinct inherent in everyone clarifies it, and one cannot deceive oneself. This is applied not only to an individual but to all human beings as well as all things.

What then is justice? It is not truth. The standard of judgment for justice or injustice is as follows: in case of the opposition between the whole and a part,
the gain of the whole is esteemed as public gain or public benefit, and the
gain of a part is despised as private gain or self-interest.

To the question of what good is, an extreme individualist will answer that
good is to love oneself, and a Christian will answer that it is to love others.
Thus the answers are not necessarily agreeable. They are rather contrary. How
can we make them harmonious? In ancient Greece, the word standing for
good means strength, bravery and generosity. The Latin word for good means
strength and bravery, and old French word for good means bravery. Thus, the
old interpretations were considerably different from that of today.

However, the ancients must have thought it to be the true interpretation of
good, because society at that time was in a primitive and restless condition
and human beings were obliged to be extremely strong and brave to survive
in relationship with nature. Therefore it is obvious that the meaning of good
is not eternally invariable, but changes along with the changes of social
conditions.

Among these changes, however, it is consistent and invariable that the
meaning of good is determined by the social background. Good can be
established only by society. Gain and beauty are individual values, and good
is social value. The reason for the superiority of the latter can be ascribed to
the fact that the evaluating subject who realizes and obtains the values of gain,
loss, beauty and ugliness is an individual who is an element which composes
society. Therefore the values of gain and beauty have indirect relationship and
influence through the individual on society which is a group of individuals.

The value given to the same object of evaluation and which is universally
valid for each individual as gain or loss cannot be of the same kind when
viewed from the standpoint of society which evaluates such value that is
obtained, realized and generated. The values of gain, loss, beauty and ugliness
are directly related to the individual, but sometimes generate the contrary
result (evil) to society, though these values are usually related indirectly to society. In other words, gain and beauty can be good or evil by whether an individual who makes good or bad use of them, because the relative force proper to an object remains within the limit of each individual who is an element and cannot overstep it.

On the contrary, the subject which evaluates good and evil, public gain and public loss, is society itself, and not each individual, who is only an element of the society. Again the object to be judged as being good and evil is nothing but the intentional behavior of each individual, an element of the society which is the evaluating subject. Therefore, good and evil bears indirect relation to gain, loss, beauty and ugliness.

**Paragraph IV Aesthetic Value**

I

What is aesthetic value? What are the features which distinguish it from the values of good and gain? Let us mention these features which distinguish aesthetic value from other kinds of value as far as I have experienced, reflected, meditated and grasped them in my inner mind. We give the name of beauty to such sensory objects that generate a light feeling of wonder to our spirit and change us to some degree. But we pay no attention to such objects that change us to a slight degree which is not enough to generate a feeling of wonder. We overlook them as they are common and usual things in the environment and do not generate our attention and interest.

However, the occurrence of the feeling of wonder is limited to such kinds that stimulate a sense organ which is only a trivial part of life. When stimulus grows to a considerable degree, we need to react with our more emotion and volition, we cannot afford to react with a pleasant feeling or appreciate it in
the state of ecstasy. In that case, we must be ready to take precaution against it in order to defend our life rather than to enjoy a pleasant feeling. Under such circumstances, any aesthetic feeling remains no longer and a feeling of anxiety occupies our consciousness instead of it.

Theodor Lipps limited aesthetic value to material objects and considered aesthetic value in the limited meaning of sensory objects. As a natural consequence, he excluded such objects as beautiful actions and beautiful souls because they are not material objects. According to our actual experiences, some human actions as well as material objects can be objects of aesthetic feeling. Therefore, we must not exclude them hastily. I believe it more valid to extend and grasp the concept of beauty in order to include them as well as material objects.

Some actions which are included in the word of praise 'beautiful actions' have also moral value and it is difficult to distinguish each other. Some actions are categorized as interesting actions which are directly remote to morality and which become themes in battle stories, comic monologues and novels. They become obviously objects of aesthetic sense and have been handed down to posterity, and captivate a large audience.

II

What is an object from which is derived the stimulus generating a pleasant feeling which we call interesting? It is somewhat different from the object which generates a feeling of beauty. Common affairs or daily occurrences, for example, a stimulus of drinking plain hot water may not generate an unpleasant feeling, but at the same time it does not generate a pleasant feeling enough to be remarkable to our consciousness.

However, when a material object, even of the same nature, gives a little stronger stimulus and generates a light feeling of wonder, it generates a
special interest for us compared with the reaction to an object of daily life. The antonym of ‘interesting’ is ‘uninteresting’. If we are asked to define this adjective, it may be said to be a boring state on which a common stimulus can no longer have influence. The term ‘uninteresting’ is sometimes used in the meaning of ‘somewhat evil’ if compared with ‘good’, but it is not its original meaning.

The term ‘uninteresting’ appears to be the antithesis of “interesting”, as in the case of ‘not beautiful’ vs. ‘beautiful’, but it is not so strongly or so directly opposed to ugliness. It simply denies the meaning of a positively pleasant feeling, such as ‘interesting’. The term ‘ugliness’ not only denies beauty, but also expresses an unpleasant feeling which is negative and hated.

III

‘Unconcern’ which is one of the features of aesthetic evaluation does not appear to be an accurate expression, because evaluation itself implies concern. Unconcern is synonymous with unconsciousness, and we cannot recognize a thing of which we are unconscious. Once a thing has been recognized and evaluated, it is not proper to say that we are unconcerned with it.

If unconcern should mean that a thing fails to become an object of desire, it would be better termed ‘low concern’ or ‘little concern’, because these words express the degrees of concern with which a thing does not become an object of desire. A thing neither generates the degree of concern with which it becomes an object of desire, nor is it below the threshold of consciousness.

An explanation of a psychological fact that a thing endowed with such and such conditions generates an aesthetic feeling, cannot be said easily a norm of aesthetic evaluation. However, a thing endowed with certain conditions generates a feeling of beauty irrespective of person and time, it may be
said safely that it has universal validity and such conditions can be named aesthetic law which is appropriate to be a norm of aesthetic evaluation.

Even if this aesthetic law is abstracted from a variety of aesthetic phenomena and is approved by society, it cannot directly be a norm which has power to order an artist 'not to do'. However, if an artist desires to create beauty and comes to realize clearly that one cannot create beauty unless one observes such aesthetic law, the artist naturally observes this law. The artist gives spontaneously authority to the law out of desire to create. Thus the law of ‘Sein (existence)’ becomes the norm of ‘Sollen (ought to)’. However, beauty is based not only on the nature of an objective material thing which is evaluated but also on the evaluating subject. Therefore, the above-mentioned deals only with the objective nature of a material thing, and does not refer even in the slightest to the true nature of the subject.

However, just as we are convinced that the nature of an objective material thing is similar to those of other thing, we are firmly convinced that the nature of a subject is common to all human beings and there is no one who does not want to observe the law unless the one is extremely abnormal. Therefore, the law of Sein becomes the norm of Sollen.

IV

As was previously mentioned, objects to be evaluated as good or evil are none other than human behaviors. Lipps says that a good deed equals a beautiful deed. Can such an interesting action as so-called ‘action beauty’ be called a good deed? No, among those interesting actions which should be called action beauty, there are many evil ones. In ‘The Unity of Variety’ which is an object of aesthetic, there are probably many evil behaviors enough to be noticed by spectators. How should we call these behaviors? Should we call these behaviors ‘action ugliness’? Behaviors taken by evil
demons and devils sometimes appeal to human interest, and good deeds are not necessarily called beautiful behaviors which generate a pleasant feeling to human beings. What behavior can be an aesthetic object? In order that every material object, may it be a sentient being or a nonsentient being, can be an aesthetic object, there must be a unity of variety as was advocated by aesthetes. Therefore, the behavior must exceed a certain degree of change without disturbing the unity. In order to be an aesthetic object, good or evil is not concerned. A behavior should not be a common one. An important condition of being an aesthetic object is the large or small of the amplitude between opposites, for example, success and failure, pleasure and pain, the prolongation and shortening of life.

Among those which are evaluated as good, there are those which are evaluated as beauty.

However, good deeds are not necessarily beautiful deeds, and beautiful deeds are not always good deeds. Both of them happen to be greatly different from each other. But in most cases, ugly deeds seem to agree with evil ones. Is there an evil deed which is not an ugly one? I have never seen one. We can often find various eccentric deeds of a fiction writer. Among the many persons, there are those whose behavior is more interesting than novels. It can sometimes be an object of an artist. In this case, when an evil deed is described in such a way it will generate the reader to feel antipathy or sympathy, even a deed without a moral purpose can called a beautiful deed.

Actually, an evil deed and an ugly deed are one and the same. Artistically, there can be interesting deeds among ugly ones. A weak, neutral stimulus to our senses which generates not enough to feel beauty or ugliness and only to feel uninteresting is a mere object of intellectual recognition. However, when this stimulus moves from such a state of recognition into a series of the category of judgment such as beauty or ugliness and gets qualification to
be an object of aesthetic evaluation, it must conform to the unity in variety within the scope where it does not make feel any fear of harm, at least for the preservation of life.