I have been distinguishing primary emotions without which we cannot adequately envision what survival means for persons. Three other prominent emotions—sympathy, wonder, creativity—are generally derived from other, unlearned tendencies. Difficulties regarding nomenclature aside, I suspect that the failure even to consider that emotions like sympathy, wonder, and creativity are unlearned stems in large part from the assumption that the appearance of an emotion at a later stage of a person's cognitive development means that it is an acquired expression of unlearned motives. Unhesitatingly I grant that none of these emotions (as I shall define them) can exist in a being incapable of the self-consciousness and the cognitive abilities that make their appearance as a person matures beyond infancy. All
along I have submitted that cognitive developments are intrinsic to unlearned emotions. In forwarding these three emotions as primary, I continue to distinguish the meaning that defines each as an irreducible qualitative tendency within the matrix of the being-becoming person.

1. Is there any predisposition that "cements" persons together, that relates them by its tendency to "care" for each other when they are conceived to be suffering? Nobody denies that persons cannot survive without each other, but the question remains: Is human togetherness and community fostered by any distinct, emotive, cooperative tendency? It is fascinating to note the length to which philosophical and psychological egoists have gone to explain the "cooperation" that persons do expect from each other to ward off danger, let alone to pursue some quality of survival.

2. Thomas Hobbes--to take a classic example--insisted on each man's innate "right" in the "state of nature" to ensure his own existence by any means. But bowing to the fact that no man has an adequate defense against death at the hands of others, Hobbes went on to argue that the only reasonable thing each man can do is to sacrifice his native right to a State that will be strong enough to protect him against the "right" of every person. This means that the "social element" that binds people together is the fear of being overpowered--no more, no less. The State thus exists to