

Beyond Hope

Beyond Hope:

Philosophical Reflections

By

Stephen J. Costello

**Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing**



Beyond Hope: Philosophical Reflections

By Stephen J. Costello

This book first published 2020

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2020 by Stephen J. Costello

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-6021-X

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-6021-5

I dedicate this book to my parents, Val and Johnny,
in love, gratitude, and admiration

“Hope is the thing with feathers that perches in the soul and sings
the tune without the words and never stops at all”
—Emily Dickinson

“Hope springs eternal in the human breast:
Man never is, but always to be blest”
—Alexander Pope

“While there’s life, there’s hope”
—Marcus Tullius Cicero

“Hope is a passion for the possible”
—Soren Kierkegaard

“Hope is the power of being cheerful in circumstances
that we know to be desperate”
—G. K. Chesterton

“Hope smiles from the threshold of the year to come,
whispering ‘it will be happier’”
—Alfred Tennyson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	ix
Preface	xi
Introduction	1
Chapter One.....	7
Optimism and Pessimism	
Chapter Two	31
On Hope	
Chapter Three	63
Critique of Positive Psychology	
Chapter Four.....	83
Advaita and the Bliss of Being	
Bibliography	131

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A huge debt of gratitude is owed to my family, especially my parents, Val and Johnny, to whom I dedicate this book, and my brother Simon, for their ongoing, enthusiastic support and interest in my work. I would like also to thank my friends Darren Cleary, Derek Smyth, Tom O'Connor, Emma Philbin Bowman, Ross Anderson, Sam Seary, Ronan Sheehan, Donal Egan, Sheelagh Wilsdon and Jeb Lennon who have graced me with their presence and helped in ways too numerous to mention. I need to acknowledge the input, too, of Mary Telford, Michael Ryan, and Shane Mulhall (*in memoriam*) of the School of Philosophy, for the engaging chats, thoughtful classes, and in-depth knowledge of Advaita, from which I have profited enormously, and to whom the final chapter is indebted.

PREFACE

Yin and yang (or yin-yang, pictured below) is a complex, relational concept in ancient Chinese philosophy, which describes how a seemingly opposite or contrary force may actually be complementary, interconnected, and interdependent.



To put it simply, there is no one without the other. The optimist can have a pocket of pessimism within him, and vice versa. Interestingly, when written in Chinese, the word ‘crisis’ is composed of two characters – one represents ‘danger’ and the other represents ‘opportunity’. So, much depends on the use we make of them, on the context within which they operate. Plato’s symbol of the ‘*pharmakon*’ can be translated both as ‘remedy’ (‘cure’) and poison’.

A philosophical homeopathic (*homoeo* = ‘similar’ and *pathos* = ‘suffering’) principle suggests itself: a cure through the use of similars. Like cures like.

The terms ‘optimism’ and ‘pessimism’ similarly interrelate. In what follows, we distinguish these concepts in order to unite them. We don’t move linearly from pessimism to optimism, so much as inhabit both perceptual positions. We tend to have, in Joyce’s felicitous phrase, ‘two thinks at a time’. That said, optimism is oriented to hope in a way pessimism clearly is not. If optimism suggests a belief that something bad will turn out better, hope is the conviction that life makes ultimate sense. So, in a way, if we go from optimism to hope, the trajectory is not in terms of abandoning optimism but by way of sublation, that is to say, including but transcending optimism on the way to hope.

The next question that arises is whether hope is the last word or whether there is anything beyond hope? And if so, what might that be? The Western philosophical tradition tends to talk in terms of hope and happiness as liminal concepts but stops short of exploring what we might call the transpersonal regions beyond the embodied ego, which Eastern philosophy explores, in particular Vedic philosophy, in postulating the existence of the Self which has bliss as one of its fundamental attributes. So, after confining myself to the Western philosophical tradition in the first three chapters on optimism and pessimism (Chapter One), hope (Chapter Two), and the contributions to learned optimism in positive psychology (Chapter Three), I then turn to Advaita Vedanta in the concluding chapter (Chapter Four) to argue that bliss is the ‘beyond’ of hope, just as hope is the ‘beyond’ of optimism, in that it offers something more, something richer and deeper.

I begin these philosophical reflections by defining our *three* terms: optimism, pessimism, and hope; the notion of bliss will occupy our attention in the last chapter. Optimism (*optimum* = best) is a mental attitude that reflects and represents a belief that the outcome of some endeavour will be good. Such *dispositional* optimism is due to biological traits as much as to environmental factors and is assessed by instruments such as the Life Orientation Test (LOT). Attitudinal optimism, by contrast, which is more of an *explanatory* style of optimism, is measured by the Attitudinal Style

Questionnaire. Psychologists tell us that optimism and health are moderately correlated.

Pessimists show higher levels of cortisol (stress hormone). Pessimism (*pessimum* = worst) is a negative attitude in which an undesirable outcome is anticipated. While the research and findings of psychology are no doubt important and interesting, this book concentrates on the ideas and insights of the philosophers.



An Optimist and a Pessimist, Vladimir Makovsky, 1893.

Going right back to the start of philosophy, we have Heraclitus, the Pre-Socratic, who wept over the world (depicted on the left below) while Hegesias held that happiness was impossible. Meanwhile, Democritus (depicted on the right below) found something to laugh at. Subsequent philosophers would follow in the wake of these opposing attitudes.



Democritus and Heraclitus, Johannes Moreelse, circa 1603.

Hope, our third term, has been defined as a confident expectation of a positive outcome. Hope creates new possibilities and solutions amid a crisis. We may recall Barack Obama's poster of 'Hope' from the 2008 American presidential campaign. The language of hope is human and universal. For Aristotle, being hopeful is part of a well-lived life; for Aquinas, hope is a theological virtue; for Kant, hope is a moral motivation. Hope is not the same as a bland or puerile, all too naive optimism. It is a virtue which sees the world as it is without fantasy or false consolation. Hope is an attitude of the mind. It cherishes a desire with eager anticipation.

Human hope leads to realistic goal-seeking and setting. These *three*, so: *goals* make us hopeful; *pathways* set out the course which help us to achieve our goals; and *agency* instigates change and control which are so important in reaching and realising our goals. Hope is a cognitive skill as much as a moral mechanism. Hope is a habit which can be harnessed, in that we can all learn to practise it more, to create hopescapes rather than horoscopes (horrorscopes) in our personal and professional landscapes. But hope is more than goal-setting – it is a meta-narrative, such as one finds in *Star Wars* or Christianity. Hope is a promise – of a better future. Hell, by contrast, is a state of non-hope with its supposed inscription at the entrance, 'Abandon hope all ye who enter here' – first found as an expression in Dante's *Divine Comedy*.

No Hope, Lost Hope, False Hope, Real Hope – these count among the forms and figures of hope. Hope, we are told, is an essential ingredient in mental health and recovery from illness.



Hope, George Frederic Watts, 1886.

The swallow is a symbol of hope, as it is the first bird to appear at the end of Winter and the start of Spring, which is the season of renewal and transformation. Hope presupposes desire in that we hope for things which we desire. Hope fulfils *four* functions:

1. It must be for something good (as opposed to fear which is of something bad)
2. Its object is in the future
3. The object of hope must be arduous to attain
4. These difficult objects must be something at least possible to obtain (for one does not hope for what one can't get)

Hope moves desire in the direction of a future good. Despair (*désespoir*) is the opposite of hope (*l'espoir*). Hope admits of degrees – it is the opposite side of dread as well as anxiety. If anxiety is the fear that the worst can happen, hope is the stance adopted in the face of the fear that the worst can happen. Hope asserts that at the heart of being, there is a mysterious principle or power at play – hope, understood here as humility. Despair, by contrast, is the deficiency of hope. Hope is audacious ('such high hopes'). Hope implores, even as it expects something. Hope has the philosophical structure of supplication. If hope is hidden in the history of failure, perhaps it is also hidden in the heart of hatred.

*

*

*

I was asked by a friend if I was optimistic about a vaccine for the Coronavirus, to which I replied, 'No, but I am hopeful'. Hope requires far more courage than optimism. Like courage (a natural moral virtue), hope (a supernatural or theological virtue) is more of a proactive virtue than optimism which can be quite passive. In *To Heal a Fractured World*, Rabbi Jonathan Sacks distinguishes these two terms thus: 'Optimism and hope are not the same. Optimism is the belief that the world is changing for the better; hope is the belief that, together, we can *make* the world better'. We need optimism – it is immensely valuable, but we need hope more, while realising, simultaneously, that we move in the middle-ground, in the in-between space (which Plato called the *metaxy*) between optimism and hope.

Václav Havel likewise observes: 'Hope is not the conviction that something will turn out well but the certainty that something makes sense, regardless of how it turns out'. Hope entails trust – faith, if you like, which optimism does not require. Seamus Heaney's take on Havel runs thus: 'Hope is not optimism, which expects things to turn out well, but something rooted in the conviction that there is good worth working for'. In *The Cure at Troy*, Heaney offers us these beautiful lines:

‘History says, Don’t hope
On this side of the grave,
But then, once in a lifetime
The longed-for tidal wave
Of justice rises up
And make hope and history rhyme’.

In the contemporary cultural crisis of Covid-19, we need to make hope and history rhyme once more.

Elpis (Hope) appears in ancient Greek mythology with the story of Zeus and Prometheus, who stole Zeus’ fire. Zeus was infuriated and punished Prometheus. Zeus created a box that contained all manners of evil, unbeknownst to the receiver of the box. Pandora (‘all gifted’) opened the box after being warned not to and by so doing she unleashed a multitude of harmful spirits that inflicted plagues, diseases, and illnesses on mankind as well as greed, anger, sorrow, envy, despair. Inside the box, however, was also an unreleased healing spirit named Hope, which had the power to heal afflictions and help humankind in times of great loss, suffering and pain.



Pandora engraving by Frederick Stuart Church

Hope is the real antidote to the current Coronavirus pandemic which, at the time of writing (July), has been responsible for over eleven million confirmed cases with over half a million deaths worldwide. But is forging the middle path of realistic hope between the Scylla of saccharine optimism (false hope) and the Charybdis of cynical pessimism (no hope) the best we can hope for? It's certainly a step in the right direction and no mean feat. What if we could hope for more than hope itself? What if we could access a state of permanent happiness – bliss even, what we might call the 'beyond' of hope? Is this possible? Well, a certain philosophical tradition assumes it is not only feasible but our very birth-right. This position will be considered in the final chapter.

Amid the Covidiot libertarians and deniers on the one hand, and the merchants of doom peddling pessimism on the other hand, there arises the multitude in the middle needing the sign of hope as the source of salvation, hope that ‘in spite of’ evil, all shall be well and all manner of things shall be well, in the encouraging words of Mother Julian of Norwich. But more than hoping and desiring, our nature is to dwell in this wellness which goes by various names such as being, consciousness, bliss.

Between Jesuit Gerard Manley Hopkins’ ‘Hope holds to Christ the mind’s own mirror’ and T. S. Eliot’s ‘wait without hope’, one hovers. However, if we pivot or pirouette into the larger amphitheatre of the Self then we can expect to realise the divine dream for fullness of life – one that includes but transcends hope. So, let ‘bright-eyed Hope’, as Keats calls it in his poem, ‘To Hope’, ‘see our land retain its soul’ as we await in joyful hope the coming of the ‘Great Liberty’, which will fill the skies with silver glitterings and the soul with immortal longings.

INTRODUCTION

‘Turning and turning in the widening gyre,
The falcon cannot hear the falconer;
Things fall apart; the centre cannot hold;
Mere anarchy is loosed upon the world,
The blood-dimmed tide is loosed, and everywhere
The ceremony of innocence is drowned’.
‘The Second Coming’, W.B. Yeats

The Optimist and the Pessimist

What is the difference between a pessimist and an optimist? It sounds like the start of a joke, but that is the question. Is the difference one of age or attitude, type, or temperament? In relation to the former, Mark Twain voiced this: ‘The man who is a pessimist before 48 knows too much; if he is an optimist after it, he knows too little’. Perhaps a pessimist is an optimist with more knowledge or information to go on? Oscar Wilde once observed that we’re all in the gutter but some of us are looking at the stars. So, what makes some people look upwards to see the stars? By contrast, why do some people stand among roses in order to water the weeds? Charlie Chaplin opined, ‘You’ll never find a rainbow if you’re looking down’. Outward perception is the outlook of the optimist. If the pessimist sees the world through a kaleidoscope, coming to know only a universe anterior to itself, the optimist is one who sees the world through the long lens of a telescope, exterior to his ego. Winston Churchill summarised the differences between the two succinctly: ‘A pessimist sees the difficulty in every opportunity; an optimist sees the opportunity in every difficulty’. Being an optimist or a pessimist is also, therefore, a matter of perception.

The optimist feels he lives in the best of all possible worlds, while the pessimist fears this is the case. Of course, these two philosophical positions can vie within us for ascendancy and

attention. Thus, Antonio Gramsci, the Italian philosopher, writing from prison can say: 'I'm a pessimist because of intelligence, but an optimist because of will'. Man can do what he wills, but he can't will what he wills. It's easier to be a pessimist in thought than action, at least I would have thought. The optimist says there's light at the end of the tunnel; the pessimist worries it might be the light of an oncoming train. 'Things could be worse', the optimist opines, while the pessimist proclaims, 'and in many cases they get worse'.

They talk about the luck of the Irish, but there is also the adage of Murphy's Law, concerning the perceived perversity of the universe: if anything can go wrong it will, at the worst possible moment.

Pessimists have everything to gain; optimists have a fifty-fifty chance of being disappointed. An optimist believes in the optimal usage of all options available. An optimist is a proactive realist. The pessimist, too, believes in the optimal usage of all options available; he just isn't impressed with what's on offer. A pessimist is a reactive realist. He always looks both ways when he crosses the street. 'What a pessimist you are', Candide says to Martin in Voltaire's novel of the same name, to which he replies, 'That is because I know what life is'. For Arthur Schopenhauer, the German philosopher, life is like being a lamb gambolling in the pastures under the eager eye of the butcher. Of course, pessimism can become a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Witness these lines of Oscar Wilde's who, in *The Importance of Being Earnest*, writes: 'I hope to-morrow will be a fine day, Lane'. 'It never is, sir'. 'Lane, you are a perfect pessimist'. 'I do my best to give satisfaction, sir'. Humour always permits the pessimist to smile wryly and the optimist to laugh loudly. In *An Ideal Husband*, Sir Robert Chiltern enquires: 'But may I ask, at heart, are you an optimist or a pessimist? Those seem to be the only two fashionable religions left to us nowadays'. Mrs. Cleveley replies: 'Oh, I am neither. Optimism begins in a broad grin, and Pessimism ends with blue spectacles. Besides, they are both of them merely poses'. Sir Robert Chiltern: 'You prefer to be natural?' Mrs. Cleveley: 'Sometimes. But it is such a very difficult pose to keep up'. The pessimist sees the world through grey

spectacles, the optimist though rose-coloured, tinted glasses. We see what we want to. But what is that?

Optimism can be as anodyne as annoying. There are times when a sunny disposition is depressing, and one wants to hear the rants of a good-natured gruff like Schopenhauer or be confronted with the cheerful pessimism of a Freud. Perpetual pessimism, however, strikes a morose and morbid chord, just as upbeat, unbounded optimism can appear, at times, as unjustifiably and horribly hopeful.

In his *Meditations*, Marcus Aurelius advises us to dwell on the beauty of the world and watch the stars set in their course and see ourselves running with them. The clouds which the sky carries are both fluffy and rain-filled, like our days. 'What day is it?' 'It's today', squeaked Piglet. 'My favourite day', said Pooh. The secret, as A. A. Milne recognised above, as did ancient Stoics such as Marcus Aurelius, is to stay in the day and obey the call of the hour, resting in the immediacy of the instant, while resisting being elsewhere. 'There's never enough time in the day', says the optimist. 'Every day is too long', says the pessimist. And we vacillate, like a pendulum clock, between the two of them, depending on context and circumstance, seesawing rather than steering a straight course through the harbour of life, if I may mix my metaphors.

What's the point of being a pessimist? Pragmatically and productively speaking, it's not much use. Pessimism produces poison. As Bernard Shaw observed: 'A pessimist is a man who thinks everybody's as nasty as himself, and hates them for it'. But the optimist can sound saccharine with his emphasis on limitless potential and rejection of all that is dark and destructive in the human heart and world. If this world, with all its sin, suffering, stupidity, and sadness, is the best of all possible worlds, it begs the question: what are the others like?

Positivity can deny, debase, or discard the tragedy of life. Pure pessimism, on the other hand, may be the unpardonable sin, as G. K. Chesterton thought, but there are nuggets of truth in both attitudes/outlooks. To take the clichéd example of the glass: the optimist sees the glass as half-full, the pessimist as half-empty. It's a litmus test to determine one's perception of reality. Situations

may be seen in different ways. Perception is one person's interpretation of reality. But if the glass is half-full, it is also half-empty and vice versa. It has never been the case of one or the other, but rather reality has the logic of 'both ... and', rather than 'either ... or'. The former is realism (ambivalence), the latter is splitting (extremism). It's ultimately about thinking dialectically rather than dualistically.

'As you thinketh, so you shall become'. I like this Biblical proverb very much. Marcus Aurelius tells us that happiness depends on the quality of our thoughts. It all begins with the mind, with our spiritual *attitude*. What you think about, affects who you are and who you will become – and how you see. So if you start the day by reading all the stories in the newspaper that deal with wars and famines and stabbings and kidnappings and murder and then turn to the obituary columns and read about all the people who have died and then get stuck in to your toast and tea before you face the day, is any wonder that you feel down or depressed, lethargic or lost? Who wouldn't? We need to be careful about what we think. We need to stand guard at the door of our mind. We need to be aware of our griping and complaining and criticising and moaning and whining too – what the monks call the vice of murmuring. Pessimism and optimism are both attitudes of the mind. Pessimism is a deadly disease; by seeing only the bad, it robs the mind of meaning, hope and fortitude. The poor pessimist lives half a life, seeing only what's wrong and delighting in difficulties. He looks through the window and sees the specks not the sunset. Why do some people see the glass as half-empty while others see it as half-full? Why, in other words, does the same measure affect us differently? Because it all depends on how you look at it and, mostly, we see where we are, through the prism/prison of our own projections. Our lives are affected by what we give our attention to, by the quality of our thoughts and inner attachments, by the way we think, therefore, about things. Everything begins with concrete consciousness.

Hope

Hope is a third way beyond gloom and gormless grinning, caught as we frequently are, between the devil and the deep blue sea, a rock and a hard place.



Henry Fuseli's painting (1794/6) above portrays Odysseus facing the choice between two mythical sea monsters – Scylla and Charybdis, and noted by Homer in his epic poem, *The Odyssey*, where Odysseus makes the journey home to Ithaca.

Hope is ultimately about acknowledging and coming to know the world as it is (epistemological realism), rather than recalibrating it according to our dictates, demands and desires (ontological idealism), while having a confident expectation in eschatological triumph. The pessimist's position is cynical. The optimist's outlook is outrageously ill-equipped to deal with disaster and blows of fate. Mark Twain gave voice to the realism of the 'in-between' when he opened *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* in 1885 with these famous lines: 'It was the best of times, it was the worst of times, it was the age of wisdom, it was the age of foolishness'. As Jesuit theologian, Henri de Lubac, observes in *Paradoxes of Faith*: 'suffering is the thread from which the stuff of

joy is woven; never will the optimist know joy' (de Lubac, 1987, p. 17). No, but the hopeful person will because he knows that, in the final analysis, happiness is founded on *acceptance* of that which is rather than *avoidance* through fear or fury, fight or flight (forms of evasion) or freeze (paralysis).

The beyond of even hope requires that we inhabit the present moment and come to know the bliss of our unbounded Self.

Anti-Method

My way of proceeding is to move around optimism, pessimism, and hope, as well as happiness, joy, and bliss – to encircle these themes. My approach is to let the philosophies presented here speak, breathe, communicate and radiate their insights and revelations ('Surely some revelation is at hand', W. B. Yeats), to criss-cross each other in a spirit of play and paradox rather than obey the strict Aristotelian laws of linearity and logic. My hermeneutic hope is that the topics considered in this work will afford some meaning and offer some solace in the present troubled times, when wisdom appears to have waned and where, to quote Yeats, the best lack all conviction, while the worst are full of passionate intensity.

CHAPTER ONE

OPTIMISM AND PESSIMISM

Hope is the ‘beyond’ of both weary pessimism and naïve optimism, but it carries within itself components and characteristics of both. It is in short supply these days and sorely needed.

In this chapter, we briefly consider Voltaire’s rejection of Leibnitz’s unbounded optimism, before paying particular attention to Schopenhauer’s dour pessimism.

Optimism

Optimism, as we defined it in the opening pages, is a mental attitude or worldview that interprets situations and events as being best or in an optimal state. It is affirmative and includes the attitude of hope that future circumstances and conditions unfold optimally as well, that the future will turn out just as favourably as the present and the past.

In physics, ‘Hamilton’s Principle’ views all of nature – past, present and future – as operating by laws of optimisation, which states that everything is as it should be. An optimist expects the best possible outcome from any given situation. To a small extent, optimism is a biological trait, but it has much more to do with environment (nurture) than endowment (nature). Largely, it is a learned trait.

Philosophically, optimism has been linked to Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716), the German philosopher, who held that we live in the best of all possible worlds; God created a physical universe that obeys the laws of physics. The philosopher, Voltaire (1694-1778), candidly mocked this Leibnizean position in his satirical novel, *Candide*. ‘Panglossianism’ refers to the baseless optimism of the sort epitomised by Pangloss, a character in

Candide, which runs counter to the pessimism of Martin, his fellow traveller. Paradoxically, the term ‘panglossian pessimism’ has been deployed to describe the pessimistic position that, since this is the best of all possible worlds, it is impossible for anything to get actually better.

Candide was brought up in Westphalia; he was ‘a young lad blessed by nature with the most agreeable manners. You could read his character in his face’, we are told (Voltaire, 1947, p. 19). He proved that there is no effect without cause, and this in the best of all possible worlds. Things can’t be other than they are ‘for since everything was made for a purpose it follows that everything is made for the best purpose’ (Voltaire, 1947, p. 20). His philosophy: all is for the best and he maintains this throughout all his ordeals such as exile, being robbed, flogged, court-martialled, through travels, travails, and tempests. To his friend Martin, with whom he is reunited, after everything he has been through, he still manages to say: ‘All is well ... and the outlook is as fine as possible’ (Voltaire, 1947, p. 111). He meets up with his old tutor Dr Pangloss, who addresses him thus at the end of the book, posthumously as it were, after the good doctor had been hanged, dissected and beaten unmercifully, after Candide asks him does he still think everything is for the best, Pangloss replies: ‘I still hold my original views ... for I am still a philosopher. It would not be possible for me to recant, especially as Leibnitz cannot be wrong’ (Voltaire, 1947, p. 136). This is optimism gone mad; Martin, by contrast, espouses his philosophy thus: man is born to suffer ‘from the restlessness of anxiety or from the lethargy of boredom’ (Voltaire, 1947, p. 140), and work alone makes life a bit more bearable (see Voltaire, 1947, p. 144). Ironically and interestingly, this extreme optimistic outlook offers no hope, excludes all consolation, as it has no answer to the meaning of suffering. It was the callousness and shallowness of this perverted so-called ‘optimism’ that so infuriated Voltaire.

Nevertheless, there is some research which shows a relationship between what I call ‘positive’ as distinct from ‘pathological’ optimism (Pangloss’ type) and mental and physical wellbeing. So, optimism, it would seem, has a positive impact on the person but an optimism tempered by robust realism rather than the naive optimism variety.

Pessimism

In *The Ballad of Reading Gaol*, Oscar Wilde penned these lines:

‘We were as men who through a fen, of filthy darkness grope;
We did not dare to breathe a prayer,
Or to give our anguish scope:
Something was dead in each of us,
And what was dead was Hope’.

As Charles Dickens reminds us: ‘Hope, hope to the last!’. Pessimism attests to a world without hope. It is an attitude of mind which anticipates undesirable outcomes or the belief that evil outweighs good. Philosophical pessimism is the idea (more than an emotional disposition) that challenges the notion of progress or perfectibility. Some philosophical pessimists are existential nihilists, believing that life has no intrinsic or inherent meaning, purpose, or value but is only of instrumental use. (Of course, their response to this may well be life-affirming). It was first used by Jesuit critics of Voltaire’s 1759 publication, *Candide*, we looked at briefly above, whose full title is *Candide, Or Optimism*. Voltaire felt that optimism concealed indifference and inertia; he argued that the ‘all turns out for the best’ philosophy is an utterly and patently puerile and inadequate response to human suffering, and to natural disasters (he had in mind the recent earthquakes of Lima and Lisbon) not to mention disease and war. The book earned him international acclaim but also a flogging and exile, as well as two stays in the Bastille for his pains. In the novel he whisks his young hero and friends through a ludicrous variety of tortures and tragedies in the company of Dr Pangloss, a ‘metaphysico-theologico-cosmolo-nigologist’ of unquenchable optimism. It stands as a marvel of eighteenth-century satire, as we just saw.

Philosophical pessimism faces up to the distasteful realities of the world. Ideas which prefigure this philosophical position can be seen in an Ancient Near-Eastern text entitled *Dialogue of Pessimism* (written 1,000 years BC in Mesopotamia) as well as in *Ecclesiastes* in the Old Testament, which it parallels, to a certain extent. The dialogue takes place between a master and his servant,

which expresses the folly and futility of human action. In each of the first ten stanzas, the master proposes a course of action, for which the slave provides good reasons. Each time, however, the master changes his mind and the slave provides equally good reasons for not pursuing that course of action. The courses of action are: driving to the palace, dining, hunting, marriage (building a house in some accounts), litigation, leading a revolution (committing a crime in some accounts), sexual intercourse, making investments (planting crops in some accounts), and public service. The dialogue runs thus:

I: Drive to Palace

- Slave, listen to me!

- Here I am, master, here I am!

- Quickly! Fetch me the chariot and hitch it up. I want to drive to the palace.

- Drive, master, drive! It will be to your advantage. When he will see you, the king will give you honours.

- O well, slave I will not drive to the palace!

- Do not drive, master, do not drive! When he will see you, the king may send you God knows where. He may make you take a route that you do not know, He will make you suffer agony day and night.

II: Banquet

- Slave, listen to me!

- Here I am, master, here I am.