Precisely from them are generated shameful mutual human hatred, of which we are witness. The study of the nervous system, with its fiery energies, shows what an actually many-sided instrument the human organism is.

In the name of the highest knowledge, in the name of the betterment of life, in the name of co-operation, we have to acknowledge the hidden properties and possibilities in every human being. And having admitted the existence of these happy qualities, people must find in themselves the moral strength to express themselves, despite the whisperings of darkness, for the good of all, not being held back by prohibition there, where existence itself commands about the possibilities of flourishing, containment and synthesis. Especially let the youth, students from the first days of their studies, hear of the blissful synthesis, as the true mover of progress.

I rejoice to hear that you in various writings stress synthesis as the foundation of culture. Thus it is! If synthesis is pre-ordained to be vitally realized, then let the best creative elements, without dark negations, unite on the benevolent understanding of synthesis.

Thus let us keep cordially together. Let us at last expel malicious dark denials, and let us find in various fields of life, a radiant unifying concept!
besmirch constructive synthesis. Many stupidities were expressed
to the effect that Leonardo da Vinci harmed his great art by being
at the same time a remarkable engineer, biologist and philosopher.
And more than once it was hinted, in a most ignorant way,
that the art of Rubens suffered from his diplomatic career
and statesmanship. However, a mighty creativeness and a wide
mind demand multifarious expressions in varied materials and
domains. The ordinances of Eastern wisdom tell us, that even
Boddhisattvas should master at least one art and one craft. The
wisdom of ancient rabbis underlines that if the youth, besides its
main activity, will not be skilled in some craft, then it will be
like preparing them for banditry of the crossroads.

The whole of antiquity, all epochs of renaissance relate the
most striking compatibilities. Let us not forget that Cardinal
Richelieu, when searching for an active secretary, chose a man,
who was busy in many fields. And when it was hinted to the
Cardinal that this man was already too busy for a new appoint­
ment, the experienced statesman replied: "If he is so busy he
will know how to find time also for my work." The much
experienced Cardinal valued all advantages derived from the
realisation of synthesis.

We further know that Julius Cæsar sometimes dictated six
letters simultaneously. Long is the list of similar such examples
of containment and compatibilities, which but prove the inex­
haustrable possibilities of man.

We heard that Einstein, besides being a brilliant mathematician,
is also a wonderful violinist. Has music belittled his
astounding mathematical foresight? Certainly not. The harmony
of sound gave him new daring thoughts in his definition of the
universe. The remarkable pianist, Hoffman, at the same time is
also an excellent mathematician and engineer. Who will dare to
say that one or the other is incompatible and an impeding princi­ple?
Spinoza was a skillful master of telescopic lenses and besides
was known as a fine portraitist. Has his deep philosophy
suffered from this, or have his lenses become worse because of
his philosophy?

One may enumerate without end similar examples, in which
a thinker expressed himself also in different fields of creativeness
and craftsmanship.

It would seem that these facts are sufficiently obvious and
clear and that one needn’t dwell on them. But humanity up to
now strives by all means to affirm the unnecessary divisions and
perilous specialisation.

Horrors of unemployment, horrors of the inability to
properly assign one’s time and capacities, are due just to such
absurd divisions. If at the time of the Italian renaissance, Leonardo
and many other masters, who wisely contained various talents,
were recognised, than now, in spite of every kind of human
progress, this would call forth many negations and condemnations.
I was witness to a discussion that took place, as to whether the
composer Rakhmaninoff should appear also as conductor of a sym­phony orchestra. According to the opinion of a certain manager, a
good composer could not be a good conductor also, and vice versa.
Besides this the ideas of the manager were that one should not
burden the public with such compatability. As if the broad
public could in no way understand that a man can act in two
fields, if they are close to each other in their essence! No
doubt, the same manager would have condemned Hoffman for his
love for mathematics, or Benois for permitting himself to be at
the same time an artist and a writer. No doubt, a reference to
the famous Italian Vasari, who was both an artist and a historian,
would have been of small avail to persuade the present-day
ignoramusses. Someone even stated the stupidity that an artist
cannot be a philosopher, in other words a clever person, as if
creativeness were connected with idiots only! And when it
was recently printed in the papers that the Lord Mayor of Bridge­
port, who is a skilled roof layer, even during his municipal acti­vities
continues his handicraft, then the readers only smiled.
From the point of view of the disseminator and belittler this
was a proof of the uselessness of the Lord Mayor in both fields.
And what is there bad in the fact that the famous Russian
composer Borodin, of "Prince Igor" fame, was a professor of
the Military Medical Academy?

You would be horrified, if I would whisper to you several
names of persons who are very remarkable in their own line, but
who judge extremely narrowly about the ability of synthesis for
others. The above mentioned example of the cause of unemploy­
ment, as a consequence of narrow specialisation, should make
critics and deniers think, whether it is right to condemn and
limit human abilities and compatibilities. Man, as a true powerful
microcosmos, has in himself infinite expressions and many beau­
tiful qualities. Would inadaptability and limitations correspond
to the great aims of the macrocosmos? No doubt, if people
strive towards progress, then the latter should first of all express
itself both in co-operation and in synthesis.

Divisions and conventional limitations have reached incredible
absurdity. One must have a very poor mind, when one directs
humanity towards such deadly divisions and prohibitions.