

You say when speaking of transitions to modernism we often use metaphors comparing it to a disease or an infection as in modernism creeping in, or as warfare as in modernism taking over. To some this may sound simplistic or non-intellectual. Is it most accurate to compare modernism to these things? Or is the debate more like a reasonable exchange of ideas; search for that which fits the facts; constructive dialogue. Which most accurately describes what is happening and why?

Very good question, but the answer to it can hardly be simplistic. In answer to it we must note that there are many different situations. Unfortunately the human personality is so made that reasonable exchange of ideas is uncommon rather than common. You notice with little children: I'm right! I'm right! The other says: You're wrong; I'm right. Often they will shift position in order to be sure they are right. That's just what I said. On TV they keep showing an ad where the man says, I want 44D. O, but she says, You want something that will do such and such. He says, I want 44D. She says, Oh but you want size such and such. He says, I want 44D. It's strong, it's like 44. Then she says, That's what I've been saying, you want something that will do such and such and such. She shifts her position because she is more interested in proving she's right. But of course, it is a clever ad to get the things across. First she argues against it and then agrees with it. But it's typical of the average person's thinking. The average person is interested in == is not interested in thinking. The average person is interested in physical pleasure or enjoyment of the game which they want to win, or in the latest movie they have seen. Something like that. That's what