

Underwatts' Laws

D.B. Underwatts lived in England around 1600. In a volume of his extensive work (Writings V, 17), the following proposition was found.

Life

Law I: The being will maintain his attitude unless he is acted upon by a judgement.

Comments: Each individual is characterized by a constant relation between judgement and evolution which is called being. The attitude is the untangled conjugation of being and living. The interaction between the individual and the cosmos brings it out a new quality, i.e., god. Its meaning is intrinsically equivalent to that of being.

Law II: The progressive change in attitude arises from the judgement.

Comments: The untangled conjugation of being and evolution is given by the progressive change in attitude. While being arises from a dynamical relation, judgement over evolution, god arises out of a cosmic static interaction.

Law III: To a judgement, another one corresponds, equal and in opposition.

Comments: Naturally, to the quantitative equality, equal judgements, a qualitative inequality is established, in opposition.

.....

The author then turns into describing concrete cases in which the three laws

are applied therefrom resulting sometimes startling and incongruously real predictions.

I shall not deal with such cases because other is my purpose: a brief analysis of Underwatts' laws taking into account both my impressions and those collected elsewhere.

The accusation of Newtonianism is unfounded, for obvious reasons. I. Newton (1642 – 1727) was not yet born in the times when Underwatts lived. The opposite is presumed to be true (Lix 1909), i.e., Underwattsianism underlies the whole of the work by the academician from Cambridge.

The laws reveal a conceptual structure that contributes less to the literary originality than to the possibility of practical application. Incidentally, that seemed to be Underwatts' original intention, a sort of latent feature of the text itself. Some examples may also be found in the contemporaneous essay entitled *Death in Underwatts*, by B. Dreher.

It is by now well recognized that the being is not constant for a given individual, as stated in the classical presupposition (see comments on Law I, and Law II). The being changes for high stages of living. The classical analysis (constant being) would be valid for a given life period of the individual.

The equivalence between god and being, assumed natural, necessary, according to Underwatts, turns out to have major importance following mystics of our era. That comparison is not to be taken as simply inevitable, intrinsic to man and the reality around him, but has fundamental reasons, speak them out.

Some, in the briefness of Underwatts' laws find the peeling off of traditional holy works, and of millennial ethical codes; other, use the same scheme to cast light over a myriad of classics of laic composition.

Ultimately, heresiarchs emerge that disbelieve the formulation of classical life according to Underwatts and preach its neglect on the grounds that it is *inappropriate and unsuited to the behaviour of men*.

Domingos S.L. Soares
v1.0 - 25/07/1979
v2.0 - 02/11/1999