EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY

ECONOMY OF TIMES

Santa Barbara 1965

edited by
Eckart Wilkens 2017

FIRST LECTURE: THE TRUE RHYTHM OF OUR MAKER

CHAPTER ONE: THE ORDER OF SACRIFICE

I

1

..a rubric, economy, city facts. Economy.

As you know, my topic is economics. And it says, "*Economy: agriculture, tourists, research plants.*"

I am not in it, you are not in it. We are uneconomical.

So that it taught me that the term "economics" today is subservient to many purposes. And certainly we do not agree on it.

I think I am in economics. But the word "economics" in my sense, in the sense in which you will have to listen to me today and the next three times, has gone stale, or has died, or is corrupted.

2

Well now, about Santa Barbara. That's a story.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY BEING A SOLDIER

55 years back, I was a soldier. I had to serve, as everybody under conscription, in the German army. And on the Day of Santa Barbara, all the soldiers had to take the oath to their weapons. It was in the regiment of the artillery. And Santa Barbara was the saint of the artillery man. And I skipped it. I persuaded the senior sergeant to let me go. A friend of mine was very ill, and wrote to me that he needed my help. And lo and behold! I never took the oath. I served six more years as a soldier, however, so nobody ever noticed it.

But I, arriving here, found myself now under obligation to do something for Santa Barbara. I had deserted her.

3

But the saint of artillery seems a far cry to the beauty here in California on this campus. How can reasonable men at the same time on one side of the globe speak of Santa Barbara as the saint of artillery, and on this campus here, advise us that it's

the most beautiful spot, even in California? There is something strange that has occurred, an estrangement of meaning, an estrangement of significations; an estrangement in language, and in thought, and in action.

One-half of mankind for a long time has seen in Santa Barbara the protecting saint for army men who have to deal with the terrible weapons of guns, of cannon. And here, you think of Santa Barbara as an innocent place for retired people, or those who want to retire at 55.

4

Really something has happened. War and peace are embodied in the two meanings of the saint, Santa Barbara. And the modern economist omits war and the sufferings of humanity when he speaks of the supermarket.

Santa Barbara, the saint, to which I owed allegiance for so many years as a soldier, asks that we are ready to die for our country, or for some cause. And that we apply to this service, or this readiness to serve, the most developed, technical weapons and skill.

We admit that engineering and machinery serves to produce more and more bombs. And on the other hand, here in Santa Barbara, we try to forget this. Man is at peace; it's a wonderful country. Everybody is here for his own best development. And there is no sacrifice needed.

II

1

What all modern science, all modern philosophy does is to omit one little thing: sacrifice. If you read all the modern philosophies of democratic institutions, the word "sacrifice" never occurs. That's too bad taste. And so, if there have to be sacrifices, as in childbirth, it's made painless, so that you cannot call it sacrifice, but a "fascinating experience."

2

Of course, of this I do not know myself.

However, I think it would be worthwhile to state here from the beginning that my topic has this difficulty from the beginning: that we speak two languages. This language of Santa Barbara as a university campus; and the language of Santa Barbara as the saint of artillery.

Every one of us speaks this. You only have to think of Vietnam to know that this is true, that half of our life is concerned with the problem of dying, and only the other half is concerned with the problem of living.

3

And this has caused me over so many years now to give thought to the relation of these two economies of our created universe.

The word "economy," as I proved to you before, is today used in a platitudinous sense as producing goods, using goods, buying goods, selling them. "Economy" today means what is dependent on your and my will.

And certainly only asses would sacrifice in economy. They want to gain.

4

The old word of "economy" on which we all have been brought up, is the economy between the old and the new covenant, between the law and grace, between the creature in us and the redeemed man, the freed man, the delivered.

You will not believe that down to the founding fathers of this country, the only meaning of the word "economy" was the relation between fallen man and redeemed man.

That is the meaning of the word "economy."

III

1

And it is very simple why this was so.

The economy was the house of God,

out of wild nature,
out of the wilderness,
and out of the desert,
and out of the forests,
and out of primeval matter.

Man, under the advice of his creator, created an orderly world. And the better he did it, the more the *oikos* - that is what the word contained in "economy," the *oikos* in Greek -- the house of God was built.

2

"Ecos" in "economy," down to 1800, always meant the task of God to convince you and me that we were not wild animals, that we had to live in an orderly household.

We were God's saints, in His house. The temple of God, or the house of God had spelled, had substituted, or had followed the house of Israel. And Israel was the chosen people who knew the order of the universe, and who therefore, even out of a desert, made an orderly economy, in the very sense in which we use the word "economy".

With a house father, every Pesah festival in the Jewish communion to this day is an attempt to represent, or reproduce God's household, with a father, and a mother, and the children knowing what's right and wrong. Using the reserves, the goods of the country, the land, and the food, and the onions, and the vegetables for good purposes.

3

The Christian economy, which took the place of the house of Israel, tried to establish the house of God in every Communion.

The whole problem of the Holy Supper, of the Last Supper, the whole problem -- which has divided the Christian sects and churches into endless discussions, and fights, and struggles to this day, is: this demand made on our belief, and on our obedience to gather, as in a household, and to sit down at Holy Communion as though at this moment the world had ceased to be a wilderness, and was a family, the household in which the things were used right, because man himself used himself right, as a sacrifice.

4

And here comes in this very unpleasant word, with which I have to bother you.

From the believing end, or from the historical end down to 1800, this country has been based on the assumption that only people who know that they have to sacrifice can be human beings. There's no other basis for humanity in this conviction.

You can be clever. You can have IQ of 170, and you will go to jail -- and rightly so, because the cleverest are always also the most terrible people.

For my cleverness, I go to Hell. Cleverness, even in a university campus, is no excuse for wickedness.

THE STORY OF THE LOEB BROTHERS

Think of the Loeb brothers, who were highly intelligent. And they slaughtered their friend for curiosity's sake, because they were so intelligent. IQ: 170.

IV

1

So the economy of our creation is a very difficult one, because it demands from you and me as a first admission, that we are the victims in the process.

God's world cannot stand without sacrifice.

And you just read the paper again, and the headline, and you know that some of our brothers and sisters at this moment have to testify to this truth, disagreeable as it may be to you to think of it.

Any policeman and any fireman who extinguishes a fire is doing exactly the same thing.

2

This is God's economy then with men, that He the one thing does to us suddenly and says, "You too are creature. You are needed in creation in this massive process of processes that go on: water running down, storms blowing. You, too, are like a natural force that has to find its proper use. And if you don't flow in the right direction, there will be a blackout of civilization."

Not just in New York. Even in Santa Barbara.

3

Now this word "economy" was unknown in any other sense than in this, as I have tried to describe it:: economy as the order under which man's sacrifice was acceptable to restore the order of the universe. The house of God is the "*ecos*," and the "-nomy"; the "*nomos*" is the law under which this can be established. By your participating in this sacrifice, the world can go on peacefully.

Otherwise it cannot.

4

Now you will admit that today nobody understands that "economy" ever had this meaning.

CHAPTER TWO: THEONOMY - ECONOMY

I

1

My friend Paul Tillich, who died recently, a fortnight ago and who has lectured here, I understand, on this campus a few years ago also rediscovered the beautiful meaning of "economics" in the Letter to the Ephesians, and waxed quite enthusiastic about this fact that men live in the economy of God. And he is instrumental to tell the theologians that they must drop the word "theology" as perfectly misstated.

2

THE STORY OF ABAELARD

It's a very short-time word. It was only invented in 1125 by Abaelard, by a heretic.

And you shouldn't use it. Mistrust people who talk of theology. "Our salvation" is a better thing than "theology."

3

And Tillich tried to erase this unnecessary word by saying, "*Call it theonomics*."

It is the law of the divine life in us.

If you compare

biology and bionomics,
economy and ecology, -
theology and theonomics,
astrology and astronomics,

you will find a very pertinent distinction between the two ways of talking.

In ecology, we are not under any obligation. In philology we aren't. We recognize something; we study something. Well, this is that; and this is that. This is Homer. And this is Pindar. And so we go on. And British literature. And there is no end to the philologists' writings, because they are not obliged to produce poetry. They only criticize it.

4

With bionomics and biology, it should be the same.

It isn't quite. I have to go onto the campus in Santa Cruz, talk there about the distinction between biology and bionomics. But I tell you one thing, in bionomics, death is included. In biology it is not. Therefore bionomics is a serious business, and biology --.

Well, I won't say it.

II

1

The same is true of what Tillich tried to convey by imploring his colleagues -- of course, they didn't heed his doctrine -- but what he tried to say all his life was: theonomics differs from theology because the man who talks here knows that he cannot talk about God.

He can only talk out of God, or against God.

But there is no way of looking at God, or analyzing Him.

That's all nonsense. Don't try it.

He's unknown for every practical purpose. And if you do not begin with this wisdom, you'll never know who He is.

So it is an amazing effrontery to have a theology. I don't believe in it.

2

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY´S AND TILLICH´S FRIENDSHIP

And so we have always agreed -- well, since 1919, we have stolen horses together, that we should not dare to speak of theology, because it is arrogant.

And this can only be idols, if we talk of God as though we knew Him, and we looked at Him, and we analyzed Him, and dissected Him.

It's all funny. How they can take themselves serious, I don't know.

But they do.

3

But in theonomics and in astronomics, we are inside of it. We know that we will be in the night as the astronomer, will be inside. We cannot predict, but we must behave.

It is a discipline for our own behavior.

So we must turn on the lights when there is night. That's all we can do about it. And the help the astronomer gives is to warn us: it will be dark, please.

The same is true of theonomy.

We know when God is angry.

4

THE STORY OF THE ANGELS´ TOE

This is much more important to know than how many angels there are in Heaven, on His left big toe, which they did at the end of Scholasticism: tried to figure out how many angels danced on His left toe. Then one other proof, it was the right leg's toe.

That's all nonsense.

III

1

But the word "nomics" then is perhaps for the next thousand years a help to our mentality. If you speak of theonomics, or if you speak of economics, you know very well that the crisis will hit you, too, that you have to contribute something.

That is, you are inside this knowledge. You cannot manipulate it, as the advisor to the president.

2

The knowledge that a living soul has is conditioned on his obedience. If a man doesn't obey, he cannot know anything important.

First you have to obey; then you are allowed to know.

But not the other way around. That's the essence of the word "economy."

In ecology it's different. If you see the meadow -- you know what ecology is, the combination of animals and plants on our earth -- you can study this, but you don't have to do anything about it. You don't have to replant the wilderness. You just know that it is one.

So the ecologist is outside the things he observes.

3

The economist never is. As soon as he thinks he is, he is battered down with blindness.

THE STORY OF IRVING FISHER

The leading economist of this country, Irving Fisher, lived to see the Great Depression in 1929. I tell you this not to harangue poor Mr. Irving Fisher, who was a very nice man, but to tell you that the use of the word "economy" has something to do with the salvation of this country and of our soul.

Irving Fisher lived to see the Great Depression in which one-third of the fortunes of this country have been wiped out. On October 29th, the great Crash occurred. And in the middle of October, Irving Fisher made a public speech in which he said that the country and the stock exchange had now reached a permanent plateau of high values and high prices.

And we call this "science."

4

It's like the *Kiplinger Letter*.

Today in this country there is a whole army of witches who tell you they know. The more people tell you they know, the more you'd better take cover. There are things we are not allowed to know, because we must support the order of things, but we cannot know it.

THE STORY OF FAMILY-LOVE

As soon as you describe your mother as to her character, and you say you know your mother with all her features, you have ceased to love her. And the family then comes crashing down. All the people who know their relatives put them in old-age pensions. You can't tolerate your family as soon as you pretend to know them. Then

you must break away from them, because to know something is to be through with it.

IV

1

Back to our problem of economy.

The term "economy" in our modern sense of goods -- this side of the grave, of living without sacrifices, of paying the price but not the penalty -- this only is the invention of the French physiocrats.

It is not older than perhaps 1780.

2

So it coincides with the days of the beginning of this republic. And that's quite important, because there is a grave distinction between the roots of this country in the economy of old, and the surface economy which you think is the only thing in this country that is so massive and imposing today.

THE STORY OF THE TEN MILLION CARS IN CALIFORNIA

The 10 million cars in California, which is imposing.

3

How did the change become necessary?

It is the content of these four lectures, where I will try to show you that the change is quite understandable, and has been even very useful. But that at this moment, the world is waiting for some reconciliation of the two meanings of the word "economy."

The Santa Barbara who asks you to become a soldier in Vietnam, cannon fodder, because she's the saint of the cannons -- and the other economy who proves to you how you can get rich and make friends, have to be recognized in some form or other as one.

4

You see perhaps from the title of the four lectures how I've tried to set out about this.

CHAPTER THREE: HOW LONG

I

1

I can only ask you to believe me that it is my own problem, my own concern which I have tried to put before you. It's nothing that I want to sell you short on.

I'm satisfied if I can understand it myself, these strange ways of providence by which for 2,000 years man has called "economy" one thing; and now for 150 years two great sects -- the capitalists and the Communists -- have tried to sell us "economy" in an opposite sense.

2

This is very strange.

So what I have tried to show you is how these two big sects have defected from the whole tree of mankind, how we can neither live as capitalists nor we can live as Communists, because the economy of our creator obviously is a little more complex, a little more difficult, a little more eternal.

It has nothing to do with the stock exchange of today or tomorrow.

3

The biggest difference between the economy of the Old and New Testament, and the economy of Mr. Irving Fisher is that Mr. Irving Fisher became the laughing-stock of this country on October 29th, after he had spoken on October 15th, and that we still today have every reason to read the Bible, although it's the most obsolete book, because it was written before people could write and read, I suppose.

It was not in print, because printing had not yet been invented.

4

It's a totally obsolete book. The only thing is that when you call it "obsolete" you can be sure that you haven't read it, because it has still the whole future in front of it.

And Mr. Irving Fisher just hasn't.

II

1

The peculiar problem is then the problem of two sizes of economy.

The economy of the World Bank, with its 84 billion capital, and outlay, is small, of the moment. And the economy of the Bible is gigantic, because it has only to do with a few people. Twelve Apostles, a few prophets, smaller and bigger prophets.

So, very small.

However, gentlemen, far-reaching, universal, absolutely comprehensive.

2

Why is this so?

Well, let me use then today only for one practical purpose. I want to tell you how it came about that the ancients were compelled to speak of such an economy, and how we lost the term.

It's a strange story.

3

You have never heard the word "economy" used in theology, I understand. I read the English books, even the theological books. And you don't run into the term "economy" there, for the divine purpose.

There is another term used. And the word is today *pale, feeble, meaningless*. The Latin translators of the Bible use the term "economy" which is found in Ephesians and in Corinthians. In a strange manner they use the term "*dispensatio*" for it, dispensation.

Wherever you read the term "dispensation" today, you must know that it is simply replacing the original Greek term "economy."

This in itself is quite strange, because we dispense with dispensation today. That is, we have ruined the term.

4

Imagine! We have made out of something indispensable the dispensation of God - we have made that with which we can dispense.

III

1

How this has come about is a long story. I can't go into this in detail, but it's certainly an original way of abolishing the tree on which you yourself sit, by saying, "There is no dispensation; we have dispensed with the dispensation."

This is a very short time, really, that it is so. If you come to New England in the 18th century, and you come even later on to Emerson, and to Herman Melville, you will find the term "dispensation" in a serious manner used.

2

THE STORY OF THE LADY IN GERMANY

A lady in Germany has written a book on the religious typology in American thinking. She came here for three years, and although she studied in Harvard, she found out about it.

And I took down all her quotation on the typology of the American thinkers in the 18th century in which the word "dispensation" occurs. And it's quite numerous.

3

The first is this Edward Taylor. Have you heard of Edward Taylor?

No, you haven't.

It's only printed in 1960, Sir. You and I don't have to really know it.

THE STORY OF EDWARD TAYLOR

It's after our days that they had discovered that there had been a man living from 1641 to 1725 who had written all his life odes and poems. And they were never printed. And he didn't even want them to be printed.

But now they have, of course, because they have to get a Ph.D. And so we know all about Mr. Edward Taylor. He wrote meditations. And he uses the term "dispensation."

4

Since it is of some importance, gentlemen -- or ladies and gentlemen, pardon me - the history of this word "economics" and "*dispensatio*," you'll bear with me if I go into this.

He speaks of the Old and the New Testament, as all these New England poets. And "*this first edition did the covenant rend with typic seals, and rites, and ceremony, that till the typic dispensations end, should ratify it as God's testimony.*"

"Till the typic dispensations end," the march in the desert, Joshua, the occupation of the Holy Land. All these great stories of the Old Testament, they're dispensations; that is, they were *stages, phases, chapters* in the preparation of the redemption of mankind.

Because the whole Jewish people, after all, left Egypt to put an example of a universal faith, at a time when all the people on this earth believed with the American Legion that they only were Americans, and nobody else should be there.

IV

1

The world is very wide, and always has been. And it took some strenuous effort to convince Pharaoh of Egypt that the non-Egyptians were human. And they called this break between the dispensation in which every country had its own gods, and the first attempt to proclaim that the whole of mankind was actually one, they called this "dispensation."

We would say today "epochs."

2

So the word "economy" -- and this is of lasting importance for your own use, I think -- the word "economy" is not composed of continents as in geography, not of things, *as gold and silver, and machinery, and land, and articles, and crafts*. When you think today of economy, it's all things. No. It were God's times.

The economy of God consists of ages.

3

And there has been a tremendous literature which today therefore in the last hundred years has never been read again. It was just all put in a corner as *annuated, superannuated, as obsolete*, dealt with the economy of the centuries.

How much time had this to last?
How long did we have to wait?
How long must we wait again?

These problems are not for serious people nowadays, because people are impatient. If you cannot prove that it can be done tomorrow, nobody's interested. Can't make money out of it. In a thing that happens a hundred years from now, even a realtor wouldn't invest. It's too long.

4

God of course is has a strange, different idea. He thinks that the world is allowed to last a very long time.

And the interest in the economy of old, therefore, and in this man Edward Taylor is still, in the old manner, interested in epochs. There are no pounds, so to speak, of weight for butter or for iron. But there are kilo-epochs, epochs of a thousand years, millennia; and they weigh.

This takes more ages than one, for example, an answer would be to the question, "When will slavery disappear?" or "When will the black man and the white man sit down together?"

You see it.

THE STORY OF THE CIVIL WAR

The Civil War didn't end the problem. It's now just a hundred years. And we must learn to look at these hundred years as one epoch. The story hasn't ended, yet; the peace has really never made.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE WORK OF REDEMPTION

I

1

Don't forget that this is all a divided soul in America.

THE STORY OF MARTIN LUTHER KING

The half of it in your textbooks says peace was made in 1865, and our friend King can prove that it hasn't yet been made.

That's why he got the Nobel Prize for peace, because he at least made an attempt.

2

So it takes much longer in the epochs of our creator to make this peace which so glibly then people sign on paper.

Don't forget that the World War has not been settled by a peace, to this day.

What you call "Cold War" is nonsense. It's just the old war that has not been settled. There has been an armistice. Don't forget this. But never peace.

And you will run into the same trouble for the next hundred years with the European -- or Korean problem for that matter -- as with the slavery issue. Because it's just no official shooting. And now there is even official shooting, because the peace has never been included.

Don't betray yourself.

This is never mentioned in our papers -- I don't understand -- that there has never been a peace between Germany and the rest of the world. And that all this ballyhoo about these poor Russians, who have nothing to eat, and are called now the "danger."

3

The danger is that there's no peace, and never peace was made. The Russians and the Americans have always been allies since they exist, as you know. They are the short-lived, the shortest-living nations on earth. They only came about in the 18th century. And they have always been allies.

4

And it's very strange to live here and to see that the Russians are considered the enemy.

The enemy is our inability to produce peace.

That's serious. And it rankles in all of us, I'll grant you. But the shouting about Communism clouds the issue.

THE STORY OF THE WORLD WAR

The issue is: peace has not ended the two world wars, with an armistice in between. The Americans never signed the Treaty of Versailles.

Don't you know that? This was the first peace that was not made. And in 1945, the Germans never signed the peace.

So where are we?

II

1

Now you cannot understand this if you will only believe in the economy of the World Bank. You have to believe that the peace of God is higher than all reason. Which it is. And the only thing you can immediately grasp is that His periods, His ages are much longer than our short-lived things.

What you think can be done in one year He thinks cannot be done in hundred years.

2

THE STORY OF EDGAR HOOVER

Mr. Edgar Hoover went in 1946 in April to Tokyo. And the headlines were, "Mr. Edgar Hoover is flying to Tokyo to reform the Japanese police." He was back in May.

Obviously, the Japanese police were (*one word missing*). Mistrust anybody who can set a speed record, even if it is 600 miles in the desert of Utah. That's not important. Because we are more and more estranged from the times of our creator.

3

The times of our creator are very difficult to learn. But they certainly have been created.

The Middle Ages,
and the antiquity,
and the Exodus,
and the time of the kings,

and when Jesus saw the tragedy of man, of his short-livedness, and that he wants to speed up, He said, "All right, we can compress the whole dispensation, the whole economy of God in one man's life," and He did it.

4

But that is only as a lesson so that you and I can understand how the long-range plan of God can even be explained in one life.

III

1

Now the first man in New England who grasped this very clearly -- that man himself hurried, and God went slow -- is a second man. Not Taylor, but Jonathan Edwards.

THE STORY OF JONATHAN EDWARDS

Jonathan Edwards is the greatest American theologian. He died in 1756. And his book was only printed after his death, in 1758. And it was printed in the same year in which the first economy in the modern sense also appeared, in the same city of Edinburgh, Scotland, by a certain man called Adam Smith. But our friend had been made president of Princeton in January, '56. He came to Princeton and obediently had himself vaccinated to set a good example for the rest of us. And in March, he was dead; he died from the vaccination.

2

And today we can learn from him. He has been rediscovered. Perry Miller has given much thought to the man's significance.

This book is full of quotations. I had it all here, xeroxed, to bring it to this lecture.

3

Now this man's book has this genius to say,

"*The life of Jesus is exceedingly short, because man is so blind, so deaf, that he will only learn the ways of God in the form of this smallness, of this little cell.*"

As if you take cellular pathology and say, "In one cell we have the whole problem of all cell life."

It's really a stroke of genius to say explicitly -- and then he does this with great eloquence, I can't go into this; it's too long -- that the miracle of the Bible story is that in one short life, in a few years, there is compressed the whole epochal length of the story of mankind with our maker.

4

This really is a stroke of genius. I've never heard it said by any other theologian or preacher, that it is *His excellency, or His sacrifice, His contribution* is that he has brought into our grasp as one man's life that what matters in the order of the universe.

IV

1

For this reason, his book, *The Work of Redemption*, is to be recommended. Because it is in fact an economy of salvation. And that's why I have taken the liberty of putting this first meeting here under the title of "*The Economy of Salvation*."

It is the idea of Jonathan Edwards, in this last, great fling at the secrets of our existence on this earth before the Declaration of Independence, before the Americans were, so to speak, dissociated from the universal stream of thought, and could go their own way as an American way.

2

This didn't exist in 1756. You had to try to remain in the mainstream of human thought.

Now people always speak of the mainstream of American thought.

But I don't see it streaming.

There is no mainstream of American thought. It's just nonsense. This is a mixture of of A & P and God. You can't do that.

Beware of these expressions. They are all obscene borrowings from theology, or theonomics, or the divine order, if you say "mainstream."

3

How do you know that there is rain? Today there is rain, yes. But the spirit, the other rain of God, that *blows where it listeth*, and not where you say there is a mainstream. Tomorrow there is no mainstream. It's just dry.

I think there's a tremendous drought at this moment, with so many students on campus. They drink it all empty.

4

These are silly expressions. And this all comes from the incredible arrogance of the economists of the stock exchange to say the other economy, the economy of creation, revelation, and redemption is unnecessary.

CHAPTER FIVE: THERE ARE GREAT STORIES

I

1

I can't go on long. But I wanted to leave one impression with you of this man Jonathan Edwards.

Jonathan Edwards said that the end of time is just as close upon us as the beginning. And he expressed it very beautifully. He said,

"*Don't betray yourself. When we say 'creation' and when we say 'providence,' it is the same. 'Providence' we say of God's creation tomorrow. And 'creation' we say of the providence of God yesterday. And it is our weakness that we call the things not yet visible to us as under God's providence. And we call the trees, and the continents, and the seas as already being created.*"

2

You misunderstand this, if you separate providence and creation. It was God's providence to create, and His providence in the end is even greater as a creative power than in the beginning.

It is nonsense to separate the two as though you could look complacently, go into the zoo and botanic garden, and here, look at His creation; and then go on to the stock exchange and speculate with His creatures, instead of continuing His creation, or being used to continue His creation, because of course you are the next creature which He tries to create.

Usually you run away from Him and are disobedient. But we are created now, and the trees were created before, and the process is going on, without rest.

3

This is Jonathan Edwards' last fling at the economy of salvation. An English theologian, great man, who wrote on the Gospel of St. John, a famous book -- Hoskins is his name; someone of you may have heard his name; it's the best commentary to the Gospel of St. John only in our own age and our own time has again restored this expression, "in the economy of salvation."

If you bear with me, I would like to read this special sentence of his. I think it was written in 1940. And immediately if you try to find something important, 25 years are like nothing.

"*In the year in which the economy of salvation, as the old Church father Origenes called it, was completed*" -- that is, in 33 of our era -- "*the high priest of Judaism temporarily recovered his power of prophecy.*"

I think you have here a strange example of a recovery of a lost terminology. You have never heard this before. In the year in which the economy of salvation, as Origen called it, was complete -- Origenes, as you may know, was a church father of 200 of our era.

And so he called the whole story already the "economy of salvation."

You'll find it also, as I said, in St. Paul.

4

I only have time to show you today that our forefathers lived on a different time axis. They had more time.

And I think they have relayed to us this consciousness, that *the epochs, the eras, the centuries, the millennia* are nothing to laugh about. They are more important than today or tomorrow.

And you can see it, that all the important, incisive things are not done when people are in a hurry.

II

1

Peace has not been concluded in our time, because the statesmen have to be re-elected every four years. On such a basis, you cannot make peace. You must be indifferent to being re-elected. Then perhaps you can bring peace.

Sometimes it is more important not to be re-elected, but to make peace.

I mean, to sacrifice your office.

2

There are great stories.

THE STORY OF THE ONE VOICE

You'll just think of the man who gave the one voice to acquit Frederick Johnson in 1867, wasn't it? Great trial. This man was never heard of again. People didn't talk of him, anymore.

He is, of course, a great man. He's the real servant of God. He's done more for the justice and the restoration of the United States to peace than any man of these blatant generals with their notations and donations.

But you hardly know him.

3

We owe it to our President Kennedy that he has been restored in his *Profiles of Courage*. That's the man now who is in the economy of salvation an important figure.

So, I'm sorry. My time is up.

DISCUSSION OF THE FIRST LECTURE

Editors' note: To the best of our knowledge, this discussion follows the "Economy of Times" lecture 1. The original tape, however, was not part of the four-tape series labeled "Economy of Times." This tape alone was loaned to Mark Huessy by Phil Chamberlain to be copied. It was labeled "Discussion," with no indication of when and where it had occurred. Phil Chamberlain's tape has since been lost. These transcriptions were made from Mark Huessy's copy. The content of the lecture shows that it was given in Santa Barbara, during the Vietnam War, and that it immediately follows a lecture on Jonathan Edwards and the "economy of salvation."

CHAPTER ONE: SERIOUS AND PLAY

I

1

It will be best if somebody had something to ask or to remark on the last meeting. And I would be very grateful if --.

(As I came first to this talk, the way in which it was, I was thinking that you were going to talk about Calvinistic point of view on economics, the way of thrift, and so forth, and how we were supposed the basis of the --.)

Max Weber's thesis.

(*Yes, yes. Exactly.*)

No, no, no. It's a bigger thing, Sir. Much bigger. It's really all mankind involved.

2

As you now see very clearly from any headlines in the papers, that we have to face reality of the whole globe. So it isn't done with any merely sentential doctrine of Mr. Calvin.

Calvin had the economy in a very profound sense, by the way, the word. Mr. Max Weber doesn't mention this. Calvin speaks of "the economy inside God." There is the relationship of the Trinity, there is an economy; that is, certain purposes are achieved through the Son, and others through the Spirit, and others through the Father.

And Calvin calls in his theology, this: "the economy within God."

That's a very profound remark. But he's richer than the modern interpreters make him. Calvin was really a very great man. And they don't believe this.

They think they are the great men. I don't believe it.

3

And the greatest thing that Calvin used to say in his writings, and which is never mentioned, is that he would not, by a mere curiosity of his antagonists, be led beyond the wall which is open to men. He will not speculate. He would try to know what can be known, but his opponents in the 16th century were the same as these same people who today say that intellectual curiosity is a virtue.

Now I don't believe that. And although it's on a campus of this caliber here, it's always repeated.

But mere curiosity -- go to the movies if you are curious. But curiosity leads you nowhere. And without love, without sympathy, without being rooted in the world of which we try to get cognizance, we cannot know anything.

4

By curiosity, knowledge is corrupt, corrupted, and perverted, all the fashions today of the perverts -- in every generation there is curiosity over-boarding. A child can be curious, but you also must admit that a child, when you talk to her -- when it is curious about love doesn't know what love is. And you can be curious as long as you have not reached maturity, and ripeness.

Let a child be curious, but when the father explains -- or the mother usually does in this country - when the mother explains something to the child, she must accept the fact that the child cannot understand it.

II

1

You will find for example, that this famous sexual enlightenment, when you give it to a 9-year-old child, is perfectly worthless. They don't understand -- you can say what you like, there. It doesn't make any difference. That something has to be said to them, I agree. But what has to be said to them is perfectly indifferent, because they forget it right away.

2

And that's my experience with all this enlightenment for children, or curious people.

3

Fairy tales of course also satisfy the curiosity of the poor about the rich, about the king and the princes. Just if you look in the fairy tale, you know that the poor man, the king, had to be much soberer in governing the country. Not as in the fairy tale.

4

So the economy of reality is really limited to serious business. And as I can only repeat my conviction, my experience in life; I have been very curious, but this can go with great reverence. I mean, you can be curious about things where you can be curious.

I would like to know how an airplane functions. This we call "curiosity". But to be curious about God, that's impossible. And to be curious about your parents is impossible. If you are curious about your parents, you have lost your parents.

III

1

So this is a great handicap today, when we discuss things, because these two levels -- I call them "play" and "seriousness". Intellectual curiosity belongs to this playlike attitude which we all have to apply for -- because life is too serious. We need this relaxation, and television. You can be curious. It doesn't matter.

But this is not serious. And you never rely on any information gotten by curiosity. You can't -- this is very different. Vietnam you can't cope with from the Encyclopaedia Britannica. This doesn't help you. So many square miles, so many people, there. Nothing said about its significance as of this moment.

2

So this is the one thing.

I'm quite glad that you brought this out, because our whole academic world is under this blight of curiosity. It's not enough. It may be a beginning.

But the teacher who gets a student to ask him a question, from curiosity, has immediately to inject a note of danger: High voltage. Or the child will not learn the difference between seriousness and play.

And I don't have to tell you in California, that the greatest temptation of modern man is curiosity, the lack of balance between what is serious and what is play.

3

THE STORY OF THE KIDNAPPERS

And some people, it seems to me that these kidnappers both, in the last week, didn't know what they were doing, because they didn't know the distinction between play and seriousness. And there's capital punishment on a kidnapping case. I'm sure these people who were now arrested, didn't know. Otherwise their surrender is quite unbelievable. They had never thought it out.

4

Now this has to do with the economy in this sense, that the economy of salvation, and the salvation of economics must have to do something with our power to distinguish serious things and leisure things, or things of leisure time that are not serious.

IV

1

If you take this town of Santa Barbara or Goleta, and you ask, "On what does it live?" you will have to find out what is serious, and what is luxury. How you can go without for a year.

And you have to strip the community first of these superfluous things, or these supernumerary things, these playlike things.

2

And our whole poverty program today, the youth corps, and also the camps, the Peace Corps abroad, is exposed, or is in this predicament to make the participants feel that it is serious and not play. A Peace Corps girl that goes out to Cambodia, because it's so cheerful, and interesting, will spoil the whole thing. She must be serious.

And how poor Mr. Sargent Shriver gets all his people to be serious, I do not know. It must be very difficult.

And the same is now true with the poverty program. It is very difficult to get a 16-, or 18-year, 20-year-old boy in this program to understand that this means business. Because they have never known the difference between business and play.

And I think many of our areas of blight come from this fact, that the slums are occupied by people who were not taught this distinction.

For example, dropping out of school can be play, and can be serious. With most of the children, it is just -- they don't know how serious it is to drop out.

If you can inject this note of seriousness, we would be better off.

3

I have given much thought just this problem of the Peace Corps at home and abroad. And I think the temptation has been to sell it to the members *as game, as play, as sport.* And I always object to this, because I think this cannot be cured afterwards. Once you have injected this note of play, I have not found that you can make the transition. Once *the child, the member, the Peace Corps soldier* is allowed to think *that's good, that's play, that's interesting, it's charming, it's good fun*, as they say, then the honor is gone.

To go to Vietnam is not fun, for a soldier. And it shouldn't be fun for a Peace Corps man to go to Cambodia.

Or the whole Peace Corps better close up shop.

4

So you have brought up here a problem which is perhaps the most serious of urbanization.

In an urbanized society, the line between seriousness and fun is obliterated. On a farm, everybody knows how serious it is to milk the cows. This is the one serious thing. And you have to collect the eggs. That's serious, and cannot be -- even if the farmer is sick, and his wife is sick, the boy of 8 has to go out and collect the eggs. That's serious, and it cannot be omitted.

And it is not true that we advance -- that you must know this, the man has been a principal of a school, God's merciful to his soul. But the temptation is to make it all play, so that the children shall not know that they are in this is in earnest.

I don't believe in this. What is important is to make it appear, the distinction between seriousness and game. I'm all for playing, but then it has to be play. And you cannot play unless there is also another region of your soul in which you are very serious indeed, or in which you know that your parents are serious. That's usually the way in which it begins.

CHAPTER TWO: LEISURE?

I

1

And of course this is the whole question of the economy, Sir.

2

I had a very interesting letter from a friend in Holland. I may bring this in, because it has immediately to do with the modern economy of salvation. And the fact that a worker can be saved, and an employee cannot be saved easily in a modern office -- which is why it is more difficult for an office worker to treat his economics rightly compared to a worker, who is working on a steel furnace.

THE STORY OF BAS LEENMAN

This friend of mine works on a computer. And he wrote to me that it was still quite unexplored, the fact that all the workers in his steel furnace -- biggest only steel furnace, as a matter of fact, in Holland, and it's a big works, and 20,000 people working there. And there he says,

"My fellow workers in front of the furnace, they are serious. They risk their health. When they come home, they must play. We, here at the computer, we play. When I come home, I must be serious. You must create something which is serious for my leisure time, because this is not serious. No risk of life and limb involved, and it is all a game."

That's why it is so terrible, this computer business.

3

So I hope I go through life without having destroyed anyone. It always itches me to do. Because it causes people to live a jocose life. That's not serious for a human being to work on a computer.

And he means it, by the way. His last letter is: he's leaving.

4

Now since I have used these very highfalutin terms, "the salvation of economics," and the "economics of salvation," I must tell you that I'm very concerned with the

impotence of modern man to discriminate between seriousness and play. And you see it in our treatment of the military, of the war problem.

II

1

THE STORY OF THE MARCHING STUDENTS

These students in Berkeley who march: I respect their opinion. But they have never thought that this might be very serious, their marching. That is not a good joke. Most of them say it's great fun. It's not a good reason to demonstrate because it's good fun, and because you are good fellows. Of course, any 2,000 people who march together have a wonderful time. But that's a very small time compared to the great moment during which they march. And there again, you have the feeling -- I at least have it -- that 1999 of these demonstrators have never learned to distinguish between seriousness and fun.

2

And of course, it is very difficult to talk at all about this, because in this country the sports are very serious. Even Mr. Paterson is taken seriously. And I can't. I'm spoiled for this.

Football and baseball, I cannot take it seriously. And therefore, I understand that I am retarded in my development.

But any country will perish where, as in Rome, the games are more important than death, and truth. And the prognostication is very poor for any country in which the games carry the day.

Anything I -- ranting, pardon me.

3

May I have one other question?

(*Yes. May I ask -- in Europe, do you know if so much emphasis is placed upon that word "leisure," as we do here? Because, for instance, New Horizons, just to pick anything, where you have leisure time, for people over, say, 45 or 50, and just in your general life, everything that we see is pointed toward us for leisure. Your leisure is made the whole thing.*

Now in Europe, is that taking place, too?)

Yes, America is contagious.

(Yes, I was going to say.)

You are right, I mean, but there is already a feeling --.

(*But we are bombarded with this. When did it start? Around -- before the First World War, that this change took place in which the parents became children and that sort of thing? Because there was a difference.)*

Yes. At the next meeting, I'll try to say more about this. You are absolutely right.

It is the very bad conscience of the industry, and that by simply shortening the working hour, they buy off this drudgery, or this meaningless existence. I think that is no solution.

THE STORY OF THE WORKER IN THE BROADCAST STATION

I have an experience -- a little experience on this.

I had to give a broadcast, and I went to the station. And I tried to explain exactly your problem, that the worker was not helped with free days off: Saturday and Sunday. In Germany, for example, we work twice. They have a second job. I don't know how far this is done here, too.

Because they can't stand it, the leisure.

3

And so I propose that every six years, there should be a sabbatical year for the worker in which he could learn something: a new trade, or perfect himself in his old trade.

And the funny result of this was that the technician who handles the machinery of my broadcast, came up to me right after it, and "That's wonderful. I don't know what to do with my Saturdays and Sundays. If we only could compound them all into one year, how wonderful this would be."

4

So this man, you see, was himself a victim of this system, and felt that there should be a way out. You should really compress this time again to a unity. Most stupidities are done from bad conscience, conscience money and so on. You know what it does; it's just wasted.

And the unions, being organized on the lowest common denominator -- because they want to have everybody in it -- had no way out. They could not start with the elite

and say, "You want to have a sabbatical." And untrained worker wouldn't be stimulated or attracted by such a program.

III

1

So after some security has been given to all, we may be able now to be more specific, and give people what they really want.

This is today the problem. Just Communism and capitalism are no longer issues. It's over with. The Russians are fed up with Communism, and we are fed up with -- I don't know.

2

But these problems are no longer antagonistic. I have found my whole life I have stood between the fronts. I have always been rejected by the old order and by the new order -- so-called new order. Because I know that these people do not say what they really feel and think. It's all in the air, to attract masses. You have to be very stupid to attract all the members of the Birch Society. And you feel very stupid to attract all the members of the union. So both cannot speak the truth. It's impossible.

3

This minority group which shall always start any new invention, any new order, through our modern mass media, you can't reach them. It's impossible to talk at the same time, to reason to 20 million people. It seems to me impossible. And we are not treated as reasonable people over the television.

THE STORY OF TELEVISION

I have for this first time in my life now in my motel a television set. I am sick. I have tried it twice. And I can't sleep afterwards, because of the advertising that goes in between. Only idiots can do this. I'm not an idiot. And --.

4

May I go on, now? -- is this satisfactory?

So please, there is one point where you can really help yourself and others, by insisting that the leisure problem is not for all the classes of our people the same.

That for a worker who sweats, who may fall sick from cold and heat, the relation of work and leisure is still genuine. For an employee, the opposite is not genuine. Because what he is aching for is something serious, where he can put his teeth in, when he comes home, because it isn't serious to do these formal things.

I always wonder what a man behind the desk at the Post Office does when he goes home, after having sold stamps all day long.

(He watches television.)

Does he watch -- he has television.

(Yeah, but I say, he watches it, for the most part, unfortunately.)

Do you think --?

(Oh yes, we're just inundated. When you talk -- just pick out anyone, but not on a campus. You're getting just a small sample of that, and you see it's just moving in on them. So with more leisure time, he would look at more television. Unless there is going to be some type of program. And how does that start to lead people, because they are being led?)

IV

1

I have a good topic for the next time.

First I would like to hear -- yes, something on your mind.

(You talked about curiosity, and you said there is a greater amount of it now than perhaps there was. I think you're asking sort of a young person's trait than an older person's trait. Eve was curious, and she ate the apple. And had she been 20 years older than she was, she probably wouldn't have tried the apple.

But why do you say that you can't be curious about God? What is this relationship of man to God? It's a very complicated thing. But why can't you be curious about God? Why can't you ask questions?)

Well, certainly, *one fool can ask more questions than a hundred wise men can answer.* That's an old story.

But as soon as somebody asks you curious questions about God, the only danger is not to answer. Gyges learned that in a curious way, it isn't worth to be answered.

2

If the child finds that a great injustice has been done in the world, and the child says, "How is it possible that the merciful God allows this to happen?" you have to answer. But that's from a real fright, from a real shock this child has received. She suddenly sees that God is not so simply explained as a good uncle. That's serious.

But even the child must have been offended by something in the order of the world, which it cannot understand. Then it is no longer a question of curiosity, but a painful search for better understanding. At this very moment, you can enter on a conversation.

Don't you see the difference?

3

I have seen cases myself -- probably, everybody will have, where the only answer is, "You are too young for this, or don't be stupid." And I'm sorry that this isn't often enough said.

There are questions that must not be answered. And the injustice lies in the fact that people try to answer what should not be answered.

(Doctor, how then would you explain our relationship with God? Would that be based more on love rather than on a theology of humankind?)

4

Well, probably, you come around to the point I tried to make last time, that theology is an attempt, really a desperate attempt in this sense; it has some significance to put the image of God before us, as though He could chart His course like a map of Africa, you can have a system of the divine. Unfortunately, at this very moment, where you try to get God in focus, He no longer is there.

CHAPTER THREE: ETERNITY

I

1

In the Old Testament, and in old Egypt, the people had a very profound insight into the divine. They said, "God is here, in back of us. He leads us; He pushes us forward."

The idea that God is made in your image, so that you can see Him like a human being or a tree is ridiculous, and is blasphemous.

The one thing that God is: not to be seen.

2

When Moses in the desert stands there, "God is only to be seen from in back." And the Bible says, "Nobody can see Him."

All the attempts to see God had led all the nations of antiquity so much astray that Jesus had come to life, because in His human figure, we are allowed to see the divine. It is a way out.

That's why the Lord came down on earth.

And all the things of the incarnation are literally true. The meaning being that man cannot see the thousands of years. He cannot see the creative process of God Almighty, who is the Lord of the eons, the Lord of centuries.

How can you see a century? How can you see a thousand years? Before God, a thousand years are as one day.

3

So the Lord came down, and in the three days from Good Friday and Easter Sunday, He made visible in the sufferings of the human heart what we call the divinity. The creative power of weakness, of death.

He became like a child.
He became a germ.
He became the seed of the Church.
He gave birth to the Church.

All these words are literally true. And the only way in which God has become visible is in a human being.

4

All the theologians, therefore -- pardon me for saying this very frankly -- are overstepping the limitations of human thinking. They are not allowed to do this.

That's why I speak of theonomics. While I say "theonomics," I know that God is present.

II

1

THE STORY OF HORUS

And there's a wonderful monument in Chicago, of the god of the Egyptians, who also were pious people; you mustn't think they were godless, or unreligious. And the great falcon -- the imperial bird -- has his wings on the shoulders of the pharaoh. Many of you must have seen a copy of this. It's very famous. Mr. Breasted brought this to Chicago; it's the gem of the collection there. Horus has his wings around the shoulders and the neck of the pharaoh. And therefore he's inspired.

2

This is literally true. Never think that God can be seen. He cannot be seen.

Only most people forfeit their privilege of being God's children. The child is led in front. There are several places in the Old Testament where this is clearly expressed. I think God says to Abraham, " I will go behind you." It must be in Genesis. You can find it in the Concordance under "behind."

3

This is quite important. Early man has had the insight that we speak of the divine because it cannot be seen. This is the reason why we know there is something in the world, which doesn't fall under the category of *chairs, and walls, and stones, and trees,* because it cannot be seen. Otherwise we wouldn't have to speak of the divine at all.

4

Anything more? I would make use of this to tell you something which I couldn't say in the first lecture, but which I would like to round out now.

Are there any more questions?

III

1

You may have been surprised by my stress laid on this great New England divine, Jonathan Edwards. And yet he is the only man who has contributed something lastingly to organize our thinking through the times, and to be quite emphatic about the distinction between the times before Christ and the days after Christ.

And the economy of salvation, of which Jonathan Edwards speaks, is based on the very simple assumption. That much I said last time -- . Go and come down. I won't disappoint you. It's better not to write on, but to go on here.

2

He says the incredible story of our knowledge of God consists in this simple fact: that there are

first 6,000 years;
then there is one human life, the life of Christ;
one generation, not even one full generation, very short, half a generation;
and from then on, history, as we know it –
the first thousand years,
and the second thousand years,
and now we hope even to reach a third millennium.

3

That is to say, the whole theonomic approach to life tries to make you see the importance of time spans. Everything –

what we call "modern,"
what we call "scientific,"
what we call "worldly,"
what we call "secular" –

has to do with space, with things in space. And you all know that the law of relativity of Mr. Einstein, now the satellites which we use, all these things are based on man's secular power to subdivide space and to enlarge space.

The distances which now we can fly are infinitely larger than anything covered before. Thirty thousand miles, you see; 50,000 miles they mention; 100,000 miles.

It is the achievement of the last thousand years that we have enlarged and made smaller the units of space, of things. And that we call "scientific."

4

Wherever science is at work, it decomposes unities, and synthesizes units. And this is all things in space. From bigger and bigger, from smaller and smaller. The electronics business is smaller and smaller. Bacteria: smaller and smaller.

And on the other hand, the galaxy is no longer the limit. They want to conquer Mars and Venus.

IV

1

The religious story of mankind is the opposite one -- or not the opposite; it's correlated, perhaps, to it.

Because it had to achieve for mortal man who is like an ephemeral gnat, like a fly, goes and comes, to put him safely into one, huge eternity; an endless time.

2

For you it is no longer frightening to say that God is eternal. You sing it even, with emphasis.

This had to be done, gentlemen. Nobody in the days of Moses or Abraham or Adam knew anything of eternity.

3

The greatness of Jonathan Edwards consists in this fact, that he said, "This enlarging of time,this being sure that I am not just as of this moment, that through my relatives, through my works I can make a name for myself, or at least I can leave behind good works which will bear fruit long after I have lived."

Everybody who has children, everybody who teaches, everybody who does anything in this world which he thinks is worthwhile is in some way confident that it will bear fruit, that it will have effect, far beyond his own existence.

And the less we can know about this effectiveness, the more efficacious it usually is.

4

The people who are so vain that they have to build their monument in their own lifetime cannot expect that they are of any effect. But the people who do not want to know what's is going to happen to their good deeds, they are able to concentrate on the good deed, and on the goodness of the deed so much that they really reach posterity.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE BIBLICAL LANGUAGE OF TIMES

I

1

Which is all new, gentlemen. Formerly, if you had no carnal children, of your own flesh and blood, you disappeared. Because a man who died without his own kin, was hopelessly sunk.

2

Think of the days where there was no printing; think of the days where there was no writing; think of the days where people - just nomads - went to the land. Do you think they were different from us?

They had the same desire, but they had no certainty that there was one eternity into which their deeds would be received, and their words would be engraved into the hearts of men forever and forever.

3

Now naively as we may be today with regard to the great religious truth -- every one of us is incompetent to embrace them completely -- but this certainty we have: that we have some yardstick for time.

This is the significance of the life of Christ in the four Gospels. The infinitely small, just one human life, there has become the yardstick for whole eternity. What you do with millimeters, today, and foot, and mile in measuring space, Christ has done for the computation of eternity, what significance one single life can acquire for the whole history of mankind, which is the whole content of the doctrine about the Son.

4

There is a fabulous talent in all the professionals to hide the truth. It is very simple. It is just as discovering the yardstick of millimeters and foot, in measurement in space which Jesus has performed. He made sure that the divine can appear in one life.

Before, it had only appeared in dynasties of thousands of years: in the building of the pyramids, in human sacrifices. If 10,000 people were sacrificed, they thought it was more divine than if you only sacrificed 5,000. And a sacrifice was hundred oxen.

Who slaughtered a hundred oxen? The hecatomb, because he had discovered after all, the Pythagorean problem. Don't you know?

You should know.

II

1

Well, all the sacrifices of antiquity were meant to affect the future. They were wrong means for a proper end.

Until our Lord came into this world, the people were desperate: how to measure time, how to impress the future, how to force upon the future, the grandchildren, that we had lived, that we had left something behind us?

There is this tremendous peace that is higher than all reason today, since the Cross, that the humiliation, the criminal punishment can lead to fruit, if you accept it upon yourself.

2

This is the only theologian -- Jonathan Edwards, who has seen that the life of Christ, or the Gospel truth, is adding to the nightmare of man, that he is lost in endless time, and means: nothing in it, in this stream of time has added this clarity: it's not true. You mean something.

To mean exactly

the amount of sacrifice you sacrifice into your love, will come back on you, and more.

3

I don't know if I make myself clear. It is as simple as the relation of time and space.

If you have a yardstick, you can read the inches. If you have the life of Christ, and eternity, or the history of mankind, you have *the yardstick, the inch, the meter* by which you can measure the fruitfulness of human life.

That was lacking before. There was no such thing.

All the nations tried to prove that, for example, the Davidic kingdom came down now, centuries. In 930, we assume David has lived. I think that's by and large the

figure, or -- no, it's a little earlier, 950. And that still will -- the Davidic see - held together the prophecy given to the Jews. Christ comes. And although they prove that He comes from the Davidic family, it doesn't matter. This is not the reason why He is important.

He limits His effectiveness to this one short life. Three years perhaps He had this open service in the country see. And yet, ever since, every human action is measured by this yardstick.

4

As soon as a man doesn't measure his own actions and his enemy's actions by this yardstick, he has ceased to be a Christian. And therefore of course, there are very -- people who are Christians who go to the church - -

III

1

THE STORY OF THE MONUMENT

I just received yesterday a letter by which a man told us that they had a monument in Germany made by a sculptor, which read from the "Our Father": "*...and forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive our trespasses*," and then the dates of the two world wars. And the town had ordered the monument -- and turned it down. That was too much for them. You can pray this on Sunday at 11, but you cannot possibly have this as a monument, that you really pray for forgiveness. And the town did not establish this monument, although you must admit, it's highly orthodox.

2

And you would have turned against it, too, in your vote in the town assembly. Because why should your town confess, that you have sinned?

You can personally confess. It's much easier than to say that this good city of Santa Barbara has sinned. Nobody wants to say that.

3

So it's very acute, but still the rumbling of this presence make itself felt. The sculptor tried it on them. They have of course the right to defeat him. But they will go down in history either as the town that turned this down, or they will not be mentioned.

So take your choice. You can be there as the evil-doer in history. And yet you enter history by this one resolution.

4

It is very strange.

Any real relation to the Lord makes history.

Hitler is only interesting because of his anti-religious warfare. The rest: mankind has always been so dirty. Whether you are in the Congo or in Germany, Germany was on the level of the Congo in the year of Hitler.

But with regard of his religious hatred, he is made -- so to speak, immortal.

From this point on, we have to know about it, so that others will not fall into his trap.

It's quite interesting there for my friends, the secular historians, it's very hard going, that they should admit that even under our noses, religious history has been happening.

But Hitler is totally uninteresting except for this reason, that he defied God.

And he did.

IV

1

So what I have tried to say is -- and I think my time is up -- the only man who, probably in this wilderness of New England, being all alone, having no newspapers, having no libraries, even, had to reduce the truth to the minimum, is this man, Jonathan Edwards, by saying that the great thing of Revelation --- what we call Revelation -- is the condensation of God's efficaciousness in one life, that all the stories told about God are of a larger nature of an expanse through time.

"Of centuries" we speak of, we speak of the Middle Ages, of the Renaissance, we say "antiquity,", we say "Jewish history." We have now "American history" as far as it goes.

2

And yet we may miss a kernel, because it isn't the length of the American history that makes it important. The *Declaration of Independence* and Lincoln's *Gettysburg Address* is

important, regardless of the length of the time in which America has a history of its own.

Both, you only have to read them -- take their cue from the Gospel. They have learned it. That's the language of mankind which they had learned to speak there, and of which they had an application.

3

With Lincoln, it became obvious. You just have to study his vocabulary; it's a strictly biblical vocabulary. And I always think the *Second Inau*gural is still better than the *Gettysburg Address* for this very reason, because that is sublime, that appeals to what we know of man, specifically. It doesn't begin "Three scores and ten," but –

how does it begin with? Does anybody know? The Second Inaugural?

To me, that is the greatest piece in American prose I know. For this reason, that he quite naively puts himself in line with this language of the New Testament and goes on from there, continues it, when he says: we do not yet know if we have to give back every ounce which we have gained from the sweat of the slaves.

4

And the bill is only presented at this moment.

A hundred years the country has not made peace between South and North. We are still at war. Don't be betrayed.

The same is true in Europe. We speak of Cold War; you try to forget this war, because you try to be against Russia. But Russia and America defeated Germany and Japan. And I assure you that this is the unrest. There hasn't been made any peace.

It has nothing to do with Communism. Because that's -- as I said, that's as dead as a dodo.

CHAPTER FIVE: NOT 24 HOURS, BUT TODAY, YESTERDAY AND TOMORROW

I

1

Again, as soon as you leave the paths of the Bible and of the Christian tradition, you lose all power to go beyond your day, your 24 hours of the Barbara Times or the Los Angeles Times.

You see it. Most people have today a daily program of life, and so therefore they don't live at all, because you cannot live 24 hours. And if you try to put together one 24 hours after another -- you can add hundreds -- you lose your life.

Your life begins only if today and the day after tomorrow have a connection.

2

And that doesn't matter. If a man from Japan came to this country, he must have memories from old, and he must combine them with his life here, and he's a human being in so far as he is able to do that. In so far as he lives, this tin-can life of mass media, he is himself not alive. He is dragged on as a tin can.

And there comes my fury against seriousness and --.

All play is of the moment.

3

Now all seriousness is in the dark.

You cannot talk to any young man of his real dreams of his own future, or you will destroy them. Let him play, but don't forget that while he is playing, something is growing in him. And one day he will throw off the eggshells of his play, *of his baseball, of his football, or his rowing, or his sailing*. And he'll be somebody in his own right. And that takes time.

And play gives us the time to outgrow the day.

And this is the function of play. We must play so that the people cannot know what to do.

4

This is our secret that is preserved in this manner. The more you play, the less people know who you really are. At least it could be.

I hope it will be in your case.

II

1

My whole point today -- pardon me for delaying you as long -- is this practical one.

What I tried to say about the economy of salvation is an economy of times.

The economy of salvation means that the centuries, the ages are interconnected, and that we bear fruit in centuries to come and are the fruit of centuries that have gone by.

2

And the more we are aware of this simple fact that you are the heir of 5,000 years, Lady, excuse me, the more you live. And the less you admit this, the more you want to wear the fashions of the day, the more old-fashioned you are.

Because it is the old-fashioned who thinks he can live his own life outside this time-measurement.

3

And every one of you, by the way, if you have christened your child, or sent your child to school, or advise anybody in an illness, tries to treat him as a member of the eternity.

You can't give a good advice without this notion, that you must distinguish between appearances and the real thing. And you must sometimes give an advice: do this, although it doesn't look good. It has just to say, "You have to do it just the same."

4

Not everything that is of eternal value looks good as of the moment. And I think every one of us has to make this speech every day, that you cannot always please the

marketplace. And it isn't how it looks on State Street that is important -- oh, we are in Goleta, so what's your main street here?

(*Hollister.*)

I think Hollister is misleading. I read these signs, and very difficult to come to this university, where you always are pushed into Hollister Avenue.

And that's the same relation between seriousness and play.

III

1

Any more questions for this?

Please. If you would begin to keep this in mind, that we need for the time exactly the same yardstick as you all use for space, we would wake up to the fact that time, our living in time is itself the greatest human creation.

It doesn't exist by itself.

SECOND LECTURE: WHAT THE TWO WORLD WARS ARE ABOUT

CHAPTER ONE: TIMES AND SPACES

I

1

I'm not acquainted with the acoustics here. I have proposed that this cluster there in the last corner comes forward. It would make it easier probably for everybody to understand. Could you do this?

Thank you very much indeed.

2

Today is St. Andrew's Day[1]. That's the end of the ecclesiastical year.

It is forgotten today that this year does not coincide with the year, as you know it, January 1st to December 31st. That's an invention of the French Revolution. The Church has created a calendar with a very strange rhythm.

We are now in Advent season, from tomorrow. This means that the Church has bequeathed to the western world or to anybody who follows its doctrines, a smallest unit of time compared to eternity. And what I tried to say last time, and in various intervening meetings with some of you, was that from antiquity, mankind has inherited and tries to preserve, more or less -- despite television, and despite the radio, and despite the latest news -- the notion that a year is the minimum to figure on time. That epochs, and eons -- like the 19th century, and the 20th century, and perhaps, if we come to see it, the 21st century -- are things you actually believe in, without much ado.

3

Although it may be, if you analyze it rationally, or with the help of some modern analysts, it is sheer nonsense. How can I, being born in Germany over there, and how can you, being born or having moved to Santa Barbara, which is more probable -- figure on the same time?

Very strange, abstruse superstition. It cannot be proven.

---

[1] November 30.

4

As a matter of fact, in 1924, a Frenchman, Monsieur Alexis Carrel, wrote a famous book -- or a book which became famous, some of you may have seen it, *L'homme -- cet inconnu*, *Man, the Unknown*, in which he fabulously asserts to you and me that a child and his father -- let alone his grandfather -- have no common time, don't understand each other at all, and -- a grandfather a grandchild is just a piece of wood, or iron. Certainly nothing living, and nothing he can understand.

II

1

This could be printed in 1924. And obviously it was surrounded by two worldwide catastrophes.

Because whenever mankind abandons this unity of time sense, war and revolutions is the consequence. Mr. Alexis Carrel -- I don't know if he got the Nobel Prize, but it could have happened, because even in Sweden, the people are sometimes feeble-minded -- this man could pretend that you and I cannot understand each other because we are born in different years.

2

So the unity of time and the subdivision of time, as we believe in it, on St. Andrew's Day, at least, is very miraculous.

And I venture to say once more -- I did say it last time -- that the eras of the faith have bequeathed to us something which you well may compare to your and our modern power of measuring the infinitesimal small and the infinitesimal big in space. Millimeters and 150,000 miles is today a daily occurrence in the papers.

I don't know the distances to Venus or to Mars, but they certainly are beyond all measure, even of 10 years ago.

3

Exactly this, this figuring with the infinitesimal small and the infinitely big has been achieved for time long ago.

Ever since Christ came into the world, we take it for granted that we have some understanding of the thousands of years that had to go by before the Lord could appear. And now, in achieving His mission, we are in the midst of at least 1965 years

already, and we hope, if we do right, even to reach 2000, which would be quite an accomplishment, I assure you.

4

This is not known. And since it is not known, I brought to you the message of an old New Englander, Jonathan Edwards, who in 1758, when he already was in the grave, rose spiritually in Edinburgh, Scotland, with his book *The Work of Redemption,* in which he quite economically and really meant that we were redeemed, bought back. He called it "our purchase" -- strange expression for humanity -- that we had been purchased by Christ so that the shortness of His life illuminated all of a sudden the centuries and thousands of years of human plight and agony.

III

1

So his explanation, Jonathan Edwards' explanation of all religious tradition, of Revelation, of the Bible, is this: that already the history of the Jewish people is rather abbreviated if you compare it with the prehistory. And in the life of Christ -- three years, perhaps 30 years -- we take all His life, beginning in Bethlehem and in the manger -- still, it is the smallest unit which illuminates now all times.

And although God is forever and reigns through the ages, He condescended to become visible in one human life, short as it was, because we humans have only eyes for the day, and for the year. Neither you or I know what a hundred years is. You can think you know in the history book, or in a lesson. But we really don't know what a hundred years are.

2

In order to learn how, in a hundred years, God carries His purposes out, one man had to live the divine life in these short-range measurements. And this is the greatness of the life of Christ. God being the eternal, condescends to become very short-lived.

What I try to say is perhaps best memorized by you in this capsule form: that

everything we call "religion," we call "Church," we call "Christian era," we call "western man," has to do with times, and not with spaces.

If you go to the Space Center and -- what they call here "research centers," they all deal with things below humanity. With things, that is. And they all are things in

space. You can use them today, or tomorrow. It makes no difference, because they are dead.

3

All things merely in space are this side of humanity. They are below us. You can use them; you can melt them down; you can build them up; you can build skyscrapers.

And even if this skyscraper should last 200 years, he's as dead as a dodo as he was on the first day, this Mr. Skyscraper.

4

That is,

man dominates space.
God dominates times.

He says when you have to die and to go off the stage because you have sinned too much. We all die for our sins, because we are used up. We have contributed that amount, as any mast on the electric power line has to be renewed sometimes, so we have to be renewed, because our lot is to be here for a time.

And that all this being here for a time, for all mankind, makes sense, that is the content of the life of Christ.

IV

1

And so, ever since Him, we have a yardstick.

And the greatness of Jonathan Edwards, who lasted from 1700 to 1756, and ended as president of Princeton, is then that the discovery that the yardstick for time is a very paradoxically short one. These three years of the popular, or public, effective stewardship of our Lord, and that we have here in this smallness, in this condensed form, the essence of all times, and can explain the centuries easily.

No other theologian, as far as I know, has ever had the boldness to make this paradox stick. And to say, "This may be illogical," he says, "to make a short life the yardstick of thousands of years. Yet this is what has opened our eyes. Because of Him, we understand what it means to bear fruit in human affairs."

2

We are not surprised now to read in the Old Testament that David had to postpone building the temple, that only Solomon was allowed to do it.

We know that Abraham left his kinship and his friends, but that only Jacob was allowed to see his son go to Egypt and become a real people.

The length of time no longer frightens us, as soon as we know that the divinity of creative power has to enter every moment in order then to bring together the harvest.

3

We too, of course, who have to fight the *Santa Barbara News*, and the *Los Angeles Times*, and the *New York Times*, and all the times of Hell together, are quite encouraged by this fact, that those times in secular print are not real times. They are pure accidents.

And I assure you one thing: you don't miss much if you don't listen or don't read them. It is very surprising if you wake up after 14 years and look in the papers. Nothing is changed. It's still baseball.

4

The so-called "times" in the plural are -- as the plural says - a heap. And they don't mean anything. Tomorrow is not the son of yesterday in the Times. They wouldn't sell. They have to have a new headline without any connection. And I have always admired most here in our papers this skill: they have excited us to the limit of our imagination with news. And then it's all over. Next day, you don't see one word about the whole issue. Forgotten. The next.

This is the opposite of time. This is dealing with times and days as though they were things. Like a jeweler, who has a great selection of either rings or bracelets. But mostly just a single stone. And you can buy a ruby, or you can buy a turquoise, but together? Purely accidental.

I am afraid, in most heads today it looks like that, as though facts were 1066, and All That. You must know this famous collection of misstated events.

CHAPTER TWO: HOUSEHOLDS

I

1

The order by which the ancients achieved this, and let it last to this day is the word "economy." God's economy with us, man, places everybody in his proper time. "In the year of the Lord such-and-such, this child of God was born."

And "economy" then is the word which I use to remind you that it has a very noble origin, God's economy with man.

2

The house of God is the larger house, compared to all the other houses. And it had to be enlarged until it became the house of God.

The feeling, however, for this house, and this is now my next topic -- all this was repetition -- the feeling for this house existed obviously from the very first day of mankind.

3

You all know the famous saying, "*My house is your house*," said to any guest by the host. The house of God was everywhere, where this primitive hospitality was extended to a stranger. It is very great.

The prehistory of a catholic church, or of the Church universal, is not in sects. It is not in Egyptian or Greek hero-worship. It is simply in the act of hospitality.

Because it meant that the strangest fellow, not speaking our language, not wearing our dress, was sacred as soon as he entered unarmed -- as Odysseus, as the Phaecians -- the tent, or the palace, or whatever it was. And it is true to this day; you come to an Arab in the desert of Arabia, and he will not harm you; he will protect you against all enemies. If you come, you are sacred.

4

This ecos, this house then, already in the very beginning of our history had the character of a divine order, of an economy in which there was room for the newcomer, as much as for the native inhabitants. And this is the house of God.

However you call it, more is not needed.

Don't think of the temple of Solomon, or of the Vatican City, as the house of God.

The house of God is where the known man and the unknown man meet on equal terms.

II

1

And this was always called "economy."

The law of the ecos, of the house of God, or of the house of the chieftain, the house of the king, the house of the patrician, the house of the beggar. Because the poorest could also consecrate his own home into a temple, simply by extending this power of hospitality to the newcomer.

2

THE STORY OF THE WELCOME CLUB AMERICA

This is a very hospitable country. The eastern seaboard, as called by one of my friends when he came to this country, after four weeks of great enthusiasm, "It's a welcome club, America."

I think he has there something. I don't have to recommend you hospitality, because you know it, and you exert it, and you administer it. But don't let it be belittled into something less than religious, something secular. There is no deeper religion than hospitality.

It is un-perfect. It's only one stranger, and this little family. But the essence is the same as when you go to Communion, 10,000 people.

Because Communion is after all nothing but a stylized common meal. And that's what the Lord meant it to be.

3

As soon as the owner of a home recognizes that in the person of this newcomer, a command is made on him and has to be fulfilled, we are in the house of God; we are in the divine economy.

However, people have of course trespassed against this. They have slain their host; and they have sometimes slain their guest. Whenever such a terrible thing happens, you have a lapse from humanity, and has to be restored.

And for these reasons, the Bible reminds us of how often this command has been abused.

THE STORY OF LOT

You just think of the story of Lot, and his family, and the people in Sodom and Gomorrah, who were not willing to honor the guest.

4

As time went on, the extension, the expanse of mankind into one large family progressed. The houses became bigger and bigger, and the idea became -- absurd as it now may seem to us -- to build houses of stone, and pillars, and with tremendous paintings, and sculptures, to depict the true house of God on earth.

THE STORY OF SOLOMON

And the Jews were first not allowed to build a house, because it was superstition. And when Solomon built it, it had dire consequences for the orthodoxy of the Jews. Because God does not live in His temple. And if you look up Kings, Solomon, or the writer of Kings says very carefully, "Although I know that you, God, are not restricted to these walls, I still hope I'm allowed to dedicate to you this building."

III

1

The more comprehensive the house of God then in the visible world became by temples and churches, the more did individual houses and homes lose their standard, lose their dignity.

The story of the house of God, of this economy of the divine spirit in all of us, is a rather sad story, because we find at the end that the peasant's home, and the worker's home, and the farmer's home just became victims to secularism.

Today's house, you will have trouble to find this house with all its dignity, where the father is the priest, and the mother an elder.

2

And it is the story, with which I had to preface my talking about these two men, Marx and Adam Smith, because we shall find that they went out of this land of divine houses, or homes, and tried to find an order of the universe without houses.

The whole story of the last 200 years, since you came to this country, since 1750 is a protest against the strange idea prevailing for the previous seven or eight thousand years, that man's economy was done in homes and houses. Adam Smith and Karl Marx embody your own conviction that the world of economics consists of individuals who, we shall see next time even better, owe each other nothing, but cheat. To take advantage one of each other seems to be the healthiest attitude a man can take.

Self- interest. Sometimes they call it enlightened self-interest.

3

THE STORY OF ENLIGHTENED SELF-INTEREST

I had a friend who, when the war broke out, the Second World War, insisted to exploit his funny philosophy of enlightened self-interest, to say, "But if I die now in the war" -- he volunteered, by the way -- "then it's just enlightened self-interest." He was never able to explain to me what he meant by enlightened self-interest. I don't think that incineration is enlightened self-interest.

But you can hear this phrase here. It's an empty phrase. But people, in their fear of being anything but individuals with enlightened self-interest, will even say they must die for their country by enlightened self-interest. I thought it was a sacrifice they made.

4

But they are victims of their own little brain. You can hear this all over the country, here. Enlightened self-interest? Down you go. They are ashamed of admitting that those they love deserve their sacrifice of their own life.

But that's what they do.

IV

1

Before now going to the great upheaval embodied by these two, the capitalist and the Communist thinker -- Marx and Adam Smith -- let me once more remind you that this notion of the temple of God was visible even in our days.

I have here a quotation in which at least a modern writer, Faulkner, whom you certainly cannot date into the 17th century, speaks of the "household of the spirits." This is an ancient usage of the word "household."

THE STORY OF THE SON

Another man, who lost his father on the scaffold through Hitler's henchmen, when he was 18 and his father had been shot, or hanged, as a matter of fact, in 1945, and he wrote this seven years later when he was 18, he says -- the father was a diplomat - "You know that not his job, or the profession in itself was his concern, or his own well-being. That cannot be the aim and highest goal of life. For him, the most important thing was the relation and the bond between people; and finally between God and him."

2

The house is the seat of these bonds which cannot be paid for, which are uneconomical, and yet which make alone all economy possible.

I may remind you that the Curia of the Roman Vatican is such a house, and became the house to which William the Conqueror did take homage. At the Battle of Hastings, he became a vassal of the pope in Rome.

The same, the grand duke of Moscow, by the way, at the same time.

That is, people figured

that all human relations had to end in roles played in households.

3

Down to 1700, the political thought of mankind circled and centered around the organization of homes, of houses. The difference between an individual and a house is that in a house you don't find any human being in the center.

Let me analyze a house for a moment, because we will have to think of it in the next two meetings quite fervently, because they are destroyed today.

A house is a place in which at least two generations meet, and live together in a division of labor and of services.

And you would never call it the "division of labor" between a daughter and mother. Both serve. Helpers, you can call them. But the very term "labor" is quite inappropriate for anything that goes on in a home.

Very important.

4

The word "labor" thereby is recognized as something post-house, a term of 1750, discovered by Adam Smith, by the way.

In a house, you don't labor. We serve each other mutually. Sometimes imperfectly.

There are of course some people who allow the others to do the work in a home. *The tyrant, the pasha, the despot.*

But may I remind you that the very word "despot," which you think you know for tyranny, means in Greek simply the lord of a manor. "*Despotes*" - "des" is the *domus*, the house; and "*potes*" is the lord of the manor. And despotism in antiquity was not a blame. It has only now received a blemish by these modern economists. They want to have economy without a house.

CHAPTER THREE: THE HOUSE

I

1

Let's go back to the definition of a house.

In a house, the center is held by no visible person. Because the mother and the father: already old; the children are young. If you have grandparents, again there may be three generations in a home. But that's today certainly an exception.

Still, we may say that a variety and number of different ages are in the home in such a manner that you cannot point with your finger to anyone who runs the show. If there is one who runs the show, there is no house. Then it is a factory, or an office, or what have you.

A home is distinguished by the fact that, for example, the sick person gets all the attention, and there is suddenly a new order. If one person in the house falls sick, the others have to comply. Even *the husband, the tyrant, the despot* has to be very careful not to disturb the sleep of his little child. So he's under orders.

2

In a house, it is absolutely uncertain who gives the orders.

The necessity, the emergency, the hostile attack will set the pattern. If there are robbers, the boy who can shoot will take over and lead the defense. And if there is a fire, again, the expert, the boy who has studied chemistry, will lead the attack against the fire.

In a home, then, there is freedom of adaptation, freedom of choice of your job, of roles; there may be more or less permanent roles. But nobody can be sure that he can always play the same role. Only if there is such a man, or such a daughter, or such a mother who wants to play the same role always, you have the destruction of the house. It falls sick. It better closes up. The child will go to Bangkok.

3

The house then has something which we have largely declared to be impossible. It has an X, a Y, and a Z in the middle of its spiritual life. You try to find this center, you can't. It is not connected with any one of its members.

People always say that God is a spirit, or that He can't be seen. But they always think He is somewhere in the moon, or behind the moon. Not at all. You find Him in any home at work, because He is the dispenser -- I told you last time, the word "dispensation" is the Latin word for economics -- He dispenses with everybody's activity. And mostly only for a certain time. When the children grow up, it changes again. And the roles are all temporary roles. But they are very clear. They can't be missed. Everybody knows very well what he should do in such a house.

4

All this is destroyed today. You call this urbanization, or you call it the factory system; call it as you like. This house, in which the roles of people are distributed in such a way that the center is not to be found in any one person, is the great creation of humanity.

You find it in any tent of a Bedouin tribe, just as you find it in Santa Barbara, in any good family.

II

1

The second thing about the house is that it comprises land, walls, brick, material. It's in the material world. It's a thing in space.

The house is only there where you can get out and in.

You must be able to lock the house if you want to. You can leave it open. There is a yard around it.

2

THE STORY OF FOUR ACRES OF LAND

Down to 1500 in England, there could be no farmers without four acres of land.

Couldn't you pass such a law in Santa Barbara?

What you call "urbanization" is houses without land. That's the problem. As soon as you have this, you have slums.

No house in England without four acres around it. Why? Because man in a house is powerful, is human, if he can set the tone between the outer world and the inner world.

3

As I spoke to you about St. Andrew's Day, perhaps I may mention some other calendar secret of houses.

THE STORY OF THE TWO HALVES OF THE YEAR

In the ancient world, before the definite settlement into stone houses and cities, the people had a calendar of two half-years, in the moderate zone. One, from May 1st to Halloween, with your pumpkin, moving outdoors. Beginning May 1st, *Walpurgisnacht*, and moving outdoors under the open sky, planting, sowing, hunting, et cetera. And by November 1st, you turned inward.

The whole Latin and Greek calendar is based on this assumption, that the life is divided into two halves; one outdoors, one indoors.

Which is important for this reason, because again we have destroyed this harmony.

THE STORY OF MODERN HOUSES

Modern man builds houses now, in which you do not know whether you are outdoors or indoors. That's the newest architecture.

And this has a good reason. We have lost sight. This poor individual, this naked man with all his analyses and despairs. There is no difference today between the world outside and the home inside.

4

Very few people never have an inside. Others have no outside, perhaps. Too thin a skin.

The great secret of our human life, however, is that in a house, you very clearly can say: "Out you go, in you come." The hospitality, the service to the foreigner, can only be exercised if there is a distinction between the foreigner -- the man who comes in from the outside -- and your own house and home.

III

1

May I sum up?

The house that the pope in Rome administers, the Curia, or the house that the sacred emperor for 2,000 years since Julius Caesar administered, consisted of innumerable parts and particles inside this home.

2

May I remind you that you know this, but you never make any use of it.

You know that there were chaplains in a chapel of an emperor's house.

You know that there were.

There was a chancellery,
there was a chamber,
there was a marshal,
there was a chamberlain,
there was a cup-bearer.

That is, all the stables were under the care of the marshal; all the animals. The treasurer was in charge of the golden chains, which a singer could get if he sang right, like Homer at the court in Asia Minor.

THE STORY OF THE EARL OF WARWICK

The division went so far that the Earl of Warwick in 1500 had 30,000 retainers for dinner every day.

Because in houses, the life of the country took place.

3

This has been so totally destroyed that if you read Karl Marx, on this same fact of the Earl of Warwick, he calls this feasting in the home of this poor Earl of Warwick, who of course was eaten dry, or drunk dry there, he called it "hospitality."

Now mind you, that's a grave mistake. The Earl of Warwick didn't think that he was hospitable to these men. They belonged to his house. They were not strangers. He wasn't the host to them. He was the lord of the manor. And all these people belonged to his administration, to his economy.

4

Marx was already unable to understand the old society. In his days, she was already breaking down. Today she is gone.

THE STORY OF THANKSGIVING

Thanksgiving dinner is the last remnant, because there you try to find somebody who is not housed and give him a piece of your turkey. And if you do this, you succeed in restoring for one moment the old order of the house.

IV

1

All the history of the last thousand years, gentlemen, is not a story, as your Greek professors try to tell you, about democracy, and aristocracy, and monarchy.

Decent people have always known that all this is necessary. You can't have a pure democracy. You have here a monarchy with the vice-president. The vice-president has to be there as the crown prince of this country.

And even if Mr. Johnson would resign, he could not force Mr. Humphrey to resign, too. Mr. Humphrey is the crown prince, whether Mr. Johnson likes it or not.

2

This is very interesting, because it's the last vestige of a reasonable order of the monarchy, that you know the heir, that there is no quarrel. And you know how terrible quarrels over our inheritance are.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY´S NOT YET WRITTEN TESTAMENT

I tried to write a testament before I left here for the West Coast, because I thought this was a wild country. But I let it -- it's too difficult; I let it go at that. May my heirs then quarrel, if they want to. I don't want to say anything in advance. Because it is too difficult to order the sequence of a home.

3

Now in what you call "economics" today, there is no such grandiose order of one house of God, or of all the little houses. And this has led to innumerable misunderstandings.

I opened Karl Marxens *Kapital* here at random, and here it is. Strangely enough, it is not bound in red, but in green. And in one place, quite innocently, he speaks of Aristotle discussing prices. And he says, "Aristotle says, 'Seven beds may have the value of one house.'"

But you can't say this, because a house is something by itself. And you can't compare it to seven beds.

4

Now Karl Marx, being class-conscious says, "It must be slavery which is the reason for this."

Now obviously it's quite a different reason. It's the sacredness of a house in those days -- a house couldn't be sold on the market. You have to ask as a citizen, that another citizen took over the house. It was not a marketable thing like beds.

Karl Marx is unable to see the dignity of the house. And he's quite surprised that old Aristotle doesn't follow the argument that prices are prices. And if seven beds costs as much as a house, then a house is worth seven beds. He says, "Aristotle says, 'It makes no sense,' he says, 'to compare a house to seven beds.'"

And that makes Marx very angry. And he says, "It must be slavery; that is the reason."

CHAPTER FOUR: THE GREAT SOCIETY

I

1

I don't see how it could be. But I enjoyed very much this definite impotence of modern man to see the dignity of a house, that house is not a marketable object.

Now I dare to say it to the realtors in this town. They think it is.

2

THE STORY OF THE NEIGHBOUR "FOR SALE"

I had a friend -- a neighbor of mine, as a matter of fact, he had been a schoolteacher. At 65, he was retired. And he bought a piece of land next to my own. And he saw a sign go up, "For Sale." And then he built this house, and he moved in. And we paid him our visit as neighbors. And I said, "Really, Sir, do you mind telling me why you put up this sign, 'For Sale,' since you wanted to settle here?"

He said, "It's like that, you see. I really don't deserve this. It's too good a place here. The land is too valuable. But I said if I'm lucky, there will be no buyer. Then I can settle."

So he was dominated by the marketable character of this land, that he had felt he had no right to withdraw it from the market.

3

Now turn around. Think of the house as something never marketable, and you have that house which has given rise to the word "economy" and "economics."

The house is something to begin with. It cannot explained by things. It is something that contains people and things, that dominates space and time, in which the generations come and go. In which the seasons are alternately experienced, outdoors or indoors.

4

The house then is the skin around mankind as an orderly whole, for mankind never consists of individuals. But it consists of families, of workers, of fellows, of apprentices, of teachers and students.

And it is always the sign of the community. And what is a community?

A community exists only if it has endless time, if it is not a club for two years, but when you do not know when you hope that it will go on forever. Forever and forever. And when you also feel, "This is mine. I'll keep it; I'll retain it, whether left and right, people do otherwise, I don't care."

II

1

The permanency of the house then is the thing which has led Jonathan Edwards to believe that we had learned a lesson for good.

Adam Smith came. He lived as a contemporary of Jonathan Edwards. Jonathan Edwards died in 1756, I said to you. His book was published in 1758. In those years, Adam Smith already lectured in Scotland -- in Glasgow and in Edinburgh -- on a society which he called the "Great Society."

He's the first man to use the term "Great Society."

2

I don't know if Mr. Johnson knows it. Perhaps you tell him.

3

The Great Society is found in the book which has made Adam Smith immortal. Adam Smith lived from 1723 to 1790. And he was driven to deal with an economy without houses; without houses, even outhouses.

Perhaps some of you are interested that I'll give the quotation. In the second chapter of the fourth book of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, which was the title given to his first book of modern economics, he says:

"*The number of workmen that can be kept in employment by any particular person must bear a certain proportion to his capital, so the number of those that can be continually employed, by all the members of a great society must bear a certain proportion to the whole capital of this society.*"

That's rather trivial. But the term "great society," as far as I can make out, occurs here for the first time.

And so we have discovered where Mr. Johnson went to school.

4

All economists in this country have gone to school in the school of this Scotch professor of moral philosophy. When the houses were destroyed, were abandoned, when braceros, in one form or other, roamed the world - the daily worker, the hourly worker -- the conception of a Great Society whose members were individuals, began to grow upon our minds.

III

1

So you may perhaps bear with me if I say that for 200 years now, people have tried to explain our lives without houses.

When you open Adam Smith in other places, you will find that he means by "house" exclusively a house for sale; that is, the material building. The word "house" has, in Adam Smith's book, no other meaning but a house of stone, or brick, or whatever it is, or wood. But no organization is implied. The house has lost its dignity as having this power to bind together the outer and the inner world, and the past and the future. There are no children to be born in this house. And there are no ancestors to be taken care of.

For the ancestor, for the senior citizens, you have the movies today at reduced prices.

2

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY AS "SENIOR CITIZEN"

And it's the first time that it has happened to me in the world. I'm very old, but still I had not been addressed as a "senior citizen" except in Santa Barbara. I was very grateful. I had to pay very little. But still, I felt deranged. An old man doesn't want to be called "an old man." That's the first rule of behavior towards the old, as you know.

3

But people can't cope with children, and they can't cope with old people. And the society at 65, the man is through. If he either goes to La Jolla or to Santa Barbara. And if he's born, there are so many institutions now to shield this child from parents' complexes, that there is not the slightest danger that it can have a mother complex, ever.

4

The house is destroyed. And the economists have destroyed it by their thought, because everything -- you know this, yourself; I don't have to preach it -- everything is first in our mind before it is in our bones. You think it first, and then at the end it is there, and we treat the people.

IV

1

And this is very strange. All of these advisors of the president try to run the world as an economic chaos, or an economic order. And they have no way of seeing that there should be a place where nobody is in the center, an invisible place, where the spirit of God can move through his house, and order everybody around so that he gives up, and adopts, and applies himself according to the day's need in a very liberal, in a very constantly changing mood.

2

That is to say, the changes in the economy today are decried. People tremble from the Depression. If you had houses, you would not decry the changes; you would welcome them. You would say, obviously, sometimes we deserve better, and sometimes we earn less.

Today in this country, it is like a magic: the pretense that we always must earn more and more. Do you think that can work?

It's utter nonsense. Failures of crops is as necessary as successful crops. And it is much better to assume that within 10 years two are poor years, five are moderate years, and if three are very good years, you can be grateful. But the idea that you can have 10 better and better years is idiotic.

It's the Devil who tells you this.

All the people are devil-ridden, because they dare to write to us that they can do it. It's absolutely impossible. It would be just as saying that you never can catch a cold. You know that for humanity, that's nonsense. Sickness is a part of health.

3

Such arrogance must be dearly paid. By wars, for example.

That's one way in which God always visits the haughtiness of people. Very simple.

So we spend all our money of this tremendous price structure now in Vietnam. It will go very fast. And the reason is only not that we shouldn't try to be there, but the belief that we can do this, that it is within human power to abolish life and death.

Because death is also sickness, is also poverty, is also emergency, is also failure.

4

That's all contained in this one thing: God created man mortal.

And the idea that you can abolish our mortality is always the same crime. People have tried it. If you open the Genesis in the second chapter, I think, there they speak already of the sons of God, who marry the daughters of man and try to forget that they are mortal.

Everybody tries this. So the stock exchange now tries it.

Don't believe them. It is not necessary. You can be very happy, and just admit that you don't have to be richer every day.

CHAPTER FIVE: MORALS

I

1

Because once you destroy the house, you destroy the small form of adaptation. In a house -- if the child stutters and stammers, or is retarded, there are loving parents, and sisters, and brothers who will take care of this child, and will not kill it, and expose it, but will cover it up by their love. And then it works. And after a time, the child is just as good as any other.

That is, a house is small enough to invite everybody who is a member of this household *to chip in, to help, to assist, to equalize*. There is always minus and plus in any human society.

2

The idea that we all could be "A" students unfortunately or fortunately is not true. You want to have "A" students, you must accept the "E" students. And if you try to have only "A" students in any one institution, somewhere these "E" students will have to be taken care of. So you get finally the anti-poverty program.

Yes, because too long have the people in this country looked only in the direction of *better, and better, and better*.

Now better and bigger elephants is very nice, but what we do with the small elephants?

3

It is very strange. Marx and Smith have planned -- or "described" is better to say -- a society without families.

Allow me, since I was allowed to begin so late, may I have five more minutes? -- thank you.

I could read you of course many pages from both books. But it isn't necessary. Both men opened their eyes at a time when the only remnant of the old order of householding, *of households, of chamberlains, and marshals, and chancellors*, had shrunk into the platitudes of so-called "morals."

4

Moralia, my dear friends -- you don't know it -- are the mores in a household, the way things are done there, behavior.

You think morals or ethics is something attached to the individual.

Now I assure you, an individual can have no ethics. How do we know? Alone, man has no rules. Your love to your neighbor sets the rule, so the new morality begins between people. And the foundation of morality was the house, and all the ritual in the house.

The child had

to learn to pray,
and to learn to work,
and to learn to speak, for example,
and to learn to write,

and the three R's were at first taught in the household. The teacher was just a tutor in the house.

II

1

Morals, ethics in this country had to take the place of economy.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY´S CHILDHOOD

And I still grew up in a large household, and we were down on ethics. We felt this was cold, isolated, arbitrary. I have never believed in the science of ethics.

I hope there are no ethicists here, no theologians. But I think the Saint Alphonse of Liguori got into trouble, because he tried to have an individual ethics. It's impossible. There is no individual ethic, because the ethics, the morals -- it's a Latin word, "ethics" is the Greek word -- are the way we behave

with our comrades,
with our relations,
with our friends,
with our enemies.

2

And that's again, as this strange point in the house to which I tried to draw your attention, it's this invisible point from which I am placed, and the other fellow is placed.

Since there is something between us, I never get the wisdom of a moral attitude from my own thinking. If you try to be moral, you are a moron. Nobody can be moral.

All young men try, before they are engaged, to be moral. Get engaged; then you don't have to think about it.

3

There is no such thing as morals as a practical thing.

You can love your neighbor,
you can hate him;
you can hit him over the head,
or you can help him.

That's not morals in you, but that is an occasion, a situation through which you discover what is meant with your life.

You can destroy yourself, you can destroy your neighbor. But to preach this, a lonely wolf, a lonely individual, it's the unhappiest thing you can do for him. He's already burdened enough by being alone. You don't put the burden of some abstract behavior on him.

THE STORY OF THE BEGGAR

At the next street corner, there may be a beggar. He just has earned a hundred dollars, he gives the beggar the hundred dollars, and makes another hundred dollars. That's not ethical, but it may be the right thing for him to do in this moment. How can you know?

4

We don't know what we shall do tomorrow. And the Lord says so in the Gospel very clearly. *Leave to every day his difficulty. It's difficult enough to get through the next day.* If you move, however, in some order of mutual affection and love, that's different.

III

1

Now it's very interesting that the word "morals" has led into modern economics.

The bridge from the destroyed household of antiquity and of the Middle Ages to the modern economic order of things -- as the consultants to the president now try to arrange it for us -- needs the bridge of morals.

THE STORY OF ADAM SMITH

Adam Smith was a professor of moral philosophy. Isn't that strange?

And the first part of his book was just on the religious affections, and on the morality of society. And then he branched out. He traveled. He saw what was important in the new economics, done outside the household. And then he dropped even the word "morality."

2

The word "economic" is not older than 1800 -- or 1780, perhaps. And the word "capitalism" was not used before 1902.

That may interest you. You take it today for granted that "capitalism" is of an old vintage. It isn't. So long have people tried to deal with these questions in a moral way. And postponed the insight that the modern individual is not bound by household thinking, by housekeeping, by householding.

3

Adam Smith begins his book with a sentence which shows you the complete denudation, the complete godlessness, hopelessness of modern society. This is his first sentence, and then I shall have done for today.

The first three words run:

"*The annual labor of every nation is the fund which originally supplies it with all the necessaries and conveniences of life.*"

So instead of a household of three generations, instead of four yards around a house, you have here the shrunken humanity of the "annual labor." That's all that is the ground on which Mr. Adam Smith builds his palace of economics: the "annual labor."

4

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY BEING A PROFESSOR

Now if I am right, I don't belong to this. I'm a professor -- all of my life; completely useless. Some of you are students; some are here retired; some of you are just entertaining yourself as best you can. And we all do not fall under this notion of the "annual labor."

I think I'm a very useful citizen. However, I don't belong into the economic tables of Mr. Adam Smith.

IV

1

By this simple trick, gentlemen, of reducing the economic problem to the year, he has evaded the whole problem of the household. In a household, we think at least in three generations. If we don't think, it is not a household.

Modern man has no households. I admit this, because he is willing to change.

THE STORY OF ANOTHER NEIGHBOUR

I rented my house on my own land the other day, I sold it. And I visited the neighbor again. It was another neighbor, however, and a younger man with four children. And what did he say to me? "Oh, three years I may last here." He had bought the land, he had bought the house. Three years, that was the most he wanted to stay. I would have loved to eject him immediately. But he had signed the deed, I couldn't do it.

2

In other words, Mr. Adam Smith introduces to your and my life the notion that all the economic problems have to be settled within a year.

Unfortunately, as you well know, they aren't.

THIRD LECTURE: THE HOMELESS SOCIETY

CHAPTER ONE: SPACE UBIQUITOUS

I

1

...and they speak of what the government should do or not do. But they always forget that their order of the last 200 years has led to two world wars, which were one. And that Lenin, the alleged Communist, acknowledged this.

THE STORY OF LENIN

In 1917, before he made the revolution, he simply said, "My program is war-economics and Soviets."

Because he discovered that in a universal war, the energies are so compounded, gotten up, that his ideal of a united society seemed to be fulfilled.

2

Don't believe that the Russians have ever made a revolution. The revolution are the world wars, this massacre. The Russians are still attached to it with a kind of special alphabet, or special lingo.

But they haven't made a revolution.

The revolution was made by all the nations of the world who went to war.

Obviously now they live in one world, and they hate it, but they are in it.

3

Every day we learn this, that we are inside a new world which didn't exist when the First World War broke out. It's one of the facts that have to do with Mr. Marx and Mr. Adam Smith, that anybody who is simply a follower of one of the two -- and most people are -- they are either liberals and capitalists, or they are Communists or Socialists -- cannot see this.

That's why I tried to wake you up to the fact that the two defectors of the old system of houses, and of an old economy of houses of God and man, that the two have brought about now a situation in which we either have to rebuild houses, or we will perish.

4

We are homeless, today. And the proof of this is in the very word "home economics," which is utterly ridiculous, because "economics" means the order of a household. And to have *home economics* means that the household is exceptional now, to have a household. And "home economics" means that in a corner, there is a certain admission that a mother, and a father, and children have some economy to themselves.

II

1

I told you already last time that the defector, Adam Smith, who was a bachelor and a Scotchman, besides, called houses only today as the realtor, something to sell. Not something to live in. And certainly not that house from which I asked you to understand that it was a question of three generations, and a question of a division between the outer world and the inner life.

And that thirdly -- and I cannot stress this strongly enough -- that there was no point in this whole house which could be identified with any one person. Because it was all the time a relationship between parents and children, between servants and masters, between sisters and brothers, between lovers.

2

But certainly you could never point to the spirit of a house, or the soul of a house by saying, "This is he." If you could, it would have ceased to be a house, and it would be a factory, or would be an office, or would be a kitchen. There can be some soul of the thing, in one of the rooms of the house. But never in the whole house.

The whole house has a spirit, the Holy Spirit, if it is a good house; the Devil, if it is a bad house.

But that I'm talking of facts, you can see from this simple fact that this kind of a house is disappearing, or has disappeared. You can't find it in Los Angeles. The law has forbidden the existence of such an establishment.

3

To prove this to you, I will read you -- if I am allowed to move -- I don't know if this is possible -- I will read you -- two days ago in the paper, it was my good fortune to discover a story:

THE STORY OF A FINNISH SCULPTOR

"Sculptor stymied by building code Marble he can't carry; Eino, Viking blue-eyed and..."

..."is a 25-year-old Finnish-born sculptor, with a problem that weighs seven tons. He has a great big chunk of gold-leaf marble, from which he proposes to sculpt four … called 'Oneness.' But this, in its present state, the marble column is just a huge slab, and this is what constitutes the seven-ton problem. Because, claims Eino, city building inspectors have told him he can't work on it, where it is now. He will have to move it before he resumes his effort with mallet and chisel.

"'It took me three weeks just to get it into my own house,' said Eino. Here being his combination studio and living quarters at 71 1/2 Lincoln Boulevard in Venice. He bought..."

Now I won't go into the details. But he finally managed to get this wonderful material for his great scope, his great sculpture into his living.

"But" -- now comes our modern law: "*Building lords do not allow an artist or writer to work for a profit in his residence.*"

4

That is, the consumer and the producer, the two elements that make up a house, have been so separated that they cannot meet in the same place. The poor man is not allowed to produce this sculpture, which he only can produce on his own property -- seven tons, you can imagine. Nobody else would allow him in. He couldn't pay for it. But the building code says -- he understands inspectors have a job to do. Laws are laws. But he believes the rules should be bent in the interest of art.

"In my kind of work"-- in strongly accented English he speaks. He came from Helsinki three years ago --"I need to live and work in the same place."

You understand? " I must live and work in the same place," because it is so fatiguing.

After he has worked on these tremendous slabs, he goes back and forth, he takes a walk, and then he must be able to work again, at night perhaps.

We all know this, if we have real work to do. It's the same with us. Only in offices and factories this has long disappeared. The man in production has nothing to do with the man in consumption or in distribution.

III

1

The second story I would like to mention --.

THE STORY OF THE UNEXPECTED

I have a friend who worked in Madison Avenue. And since this is a mad avenue, he left it. In New York. I don't know if this is known that there is a city called New York City in the East; and there is Madison Avenue, where all the advertising agencies work. And he worked in one of these agencies for advertising. And he found he should not do this any longer.

So he moved to a farm and became the manager of a very big enterprise in biodynamic food, in genuine food production, and was very successful. However, his farm was located too close to a big city called Philadelphia. A speculator persuaded the owners of the property to speculate in land instead of producing genuine food. And so his activities were stopped.

And now he writes me from this place where he's still living, but only living as a consumer. I think it's an exciting letter.

"I feel diminution in my own stature and scope. A year ago, I would have told our Dutch friend..."-- who is a mutual friend, who is out of work -- "to come to Golden Acres"-- the name of this place -- "and then look for work. But now I do not have that support behind me. Our British friend, Ralph Gardiner, often mentioned an economic base for our beliefs. And now I realize how much Golden Acres gave me which I just can't pump up out of myself. There was always room for the unexpected. Food, freedom, a worthy endeavor. Like the cherries left at the top of the tree..."

(I told him the story that in my home country, in Bardinia, you could not harvest a cherry tree without leaving one branch unharvested. That was for anybody who came. But you couldn't rob this tree of some of its cherries just for your own profit.)

"Like the cherries left at the top of the tree, there was something left to chance for which no accounting was necessary. Much more than a business disappeared when the farm was sold. I feel this, a diminution of my own stature and scope."

So the same man living in the same place, once had a house and now hasn't.

That's why the very word "home economics" bears witness to this fact that the rule and order of 8,000 years under which people lived in tents or houses, and had an economy, trying to depict the house of God in some way or other -- like the tent of the Jews in the desert, which was before they built the temple of Solomon, every

house an equivalent of God Almighty's order of the universe -- that this has disappeared, forever.

2

Every one of us is included in this fact. My friend cannot even pump out of his own consciousness, out of his own will this existence of a house. Although he knows the secret. It's gone without his doing, because, as I said, the center of the house is not any individual.

So this strange world today, without any spiritual center, is called the modern world. And it is worthwhile to look at their achievements, the greatness of this world in many respects. Even though it has led to this world-wide catastrophe, to this massacre, we cannot forget what we owe it.

We all live in it. We can't deny it. We can't abolish it.

3

THE STORY OF GIORDANO´S

I was taken this morning to Giordano's, and was allowed to admire there the fruits, vegetables, all the edible goods laid out there. You know the outlay is very beautiful. The organization testifies to the fact that even Florida is represented in Giordano's, even the enemy, or the competitor. Everything is there. The world has become a world market. Or better, the town has become a world market.

And instead of a house, we have markets.

And we have supermarkets.

And I think the best expression for our present day is the term "*supermarket*," because it means that the goods proposed to you there, trying to seduce you, are not from the surrounding villages only; they are supermarket goods; they come from the whole world.

4

THE STORY OF VERDUN

Years ago, while the World War was raging, I was quartered in front of Verdun, in a little town called Dun, on the Meuse River. I have not forgotten. There was a good library. I read a book there, a French book, on economics. Written perhaps in 1905 or '06. I Have forgotten of course the year. It's long ago. First World War. And this man

described how in Paris the goods of all the world competed. And there was no distinction, he said, whether they came from the Loire, or from Toulouse, or whether they came from Brazil. The greatness was that there was no distinction between the goods from home, from nearby, and from far away. And he said, "That is the achievement of our economic order."

And he's right.

CHAPTER TWO: THE INFINITE AND THE POWER

I

1

The space of man has become ubiquitous. And Mr. Lovell and Bormann testify to this. It's one space.

Only you remember in any home of people and houses, there is a wall between the inner and the outer world. We only live in the outer world.

THE STORY OF MODERN ARCHITECTURE

If you look at modern architecture, the one thing they all try to do, to put the beds on the verandah. That is, they call it a house, but it is outdoors.

If you look at the modern window, the whole modern problem is to identify the house and the landscape in some strange manner.

2

Because we don't know the distinction between outer and inner anymore. We try to abolish it. You see it from our linguistic capacity to replace the word "people" by the word "public."

That goes very far. And it tells you exactly what has happened. The public is always out in the open.

3

THE STORY OF A JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

A justice of the Supreme Court could afford to write a book, which was a bestseller, *The Public and Its Government*.

Now mark you, there are two interesting things in this. One is that he calls the American people the "public." And the second interesting thing is that he calls them "it." The Public and Its Government.

I would have loved to write a book on *The People and Their Government*. That makes quite a difference. Because that part in you which is public is gullible. This is not the best in you if you sit in a concert hall and listen.

You are much better when you make a sacrifice, sometimes even when you write an exam.

Pain is a part of belonging to a people.
Enjoyment is the part when you belong to the public.

Because you can dissolve the bond immediately. A public doesn't last beyond the moment of pleasure. Then you go home.

4

So public -- look there, I mean, it doesn't exist. It's a dream.

For writers, of course, of the modern century, it is their desire to meet the public. I've always tried to meet people.

It's not the same.

II

1

You can heap examples of this confusion between public and people by the million.

THE STORY OF PIERPONT MORGAN´S

When Pierpont Morgan's was warned that he shouldn't abuse his financial power, he said, "I owe the public nothing."

He couldn't have said, "I owe the people nothing." He was very wise that he said this. So he wasn't burned at stake. You can defy the public. Well, that's courageous. But you cannot defy the people.

2

This confusion is all over the place. All our academic teaching is in this confusion. You make no distinction between "public" and "people."

Now people are from eternity to eternity; and public are, I'm afraid to say, from 4:00 to 5:00.

You are, Sir, public at this moment, here. If you are not more than public, it would have to be shown after this lecture. At this moment, I've galvanized you into a

sedentary position by speaking to you. But that can be hypnotism. We will know only ten years later if you have done something with the things I say now. Before, it's ambiguous. It can just be a publicity stunt.

3

In this term "public," every layman has a very good means, a very good drug, to know where he is. Is he at home in the universe of his creator? Or is he on Madison Avenue, or on a long telephone line organized by Madison Avenue? Any university -- any order of society today is between these two situations.

In a factory, if it is a good, spirited factory, the people feel at home, and they wouldn't call themselves "a public," they are the crew, they are the men of this firm. If by a public speaking arrangement, they can be hypnotized and smoothed up, and so, it's a very external thing.

4

So I offer you with this word "public" a kind of mechanism to know where we are. Here are our two authorities. And it is quite interesting.

It's even touching to see that these two authors, Smith and Marx, both defied public opinion. They themselves were not the slave of that situation which they depicted or advocated for the rest of the world.

III

1

Perhaps you will bear with me, when I read to you from the preface of Karl Marx's great work, the *Kapital*, written in London, July 25th, 1867.

He knows, of course, that he will arouse enmity. And he says,

"*Every opinion based on scientific criticism I welcome. As to the prejudices of so-called public opinion, to which I have never made concessions, now as aforetime, the maxim of the great Florentine is mine.*"

The Great Florentine is the exile from Florence, Dante, who, because he didn't care for public opinion, had to eat the bread of exile. And that's the Italian verse: "*Follow your own cause, and let the people talk.*"

2

So it is quite interesting that Marx and Adam Smith still were at home in the temple of our Lord, where the truth comes first, and public opinion is not important. Where would we be if anybody who has something important to say would care for public opinion?

Anybody who cares for public opinion has forfeited the right to be listened to.

3

Give you an example.

THE STORY OF THE VETERANS

The Second World War, the end of the First -- the real World War had happened. And I was invited by a friend to speak at Harvard at the club of young historians they had founded in honor of their teacher, Samuel Eliot Morison, who is a great man and a friend of mine. And it was this way that it happened that I was invited to speak there. This was the year of the Lord, I think, '47.

Could be '46, but I guess it was '47.

There were 25 men, all veterans. Some wounded, and all trying to get their famous Ph.D. in the graduate school of Harvard, in history. And they told me after I had delivered the goods -- my goods, they told me in conversation that they had just sent off to the Ford Foundation a request for a stipend.

I said, "For 24?"

"Yes. We thought they have so much money, we must help them along, and to get rid of it. And we have found a way in which they should pay to every one of us $5,000 a year for three years. That would be very nice."

At that time, the money was still considerable.

Now of course, here in California, that's nothing. But $5,000, that was my salary at my college. So I was quite surprised. And I said, "Well, do you mean that this work which you propose is important, and should be done by 24 people?"

And they said, "Well, one of us hasn't signed up, the 25th, because he also had misgivings about this. But we think if we milk the foundation, nobody can begrudge us this. That's our privilege."

I said, "It will take you ten years before you have made up for this in your own inner life. Perhaps never."

And left.

4

I would leave again. These poor people had sold out to the Devil. They did something that no scholar is ever allowed to do.

It's happening now, day and night, in this country. And you will have much money, but no scholarship. The modern harlot is not women but men. And they have sold out to gold.

Very simple.

IV

1

Gold is immediate power.

A baby needs no gold, because it has endless time. It will perhaps be 70, 80, 90 before it is recognized for what it is worth. Anybody who needs gold now wants to shorten the process of living.

Where you have gold,
where you have government,
where you have troops,
where you have Mr. McNamara,
where you have power,

you always find that it is a curtailing of the time-span that is needed in a normal life. If you must buy love, it's very expensive. If the girl loves you, it's very cheap. Because love is eternal and lasts.

Power? - That's of the moment.

2

This is unknown in this country where power is often adored. It is the most lamentable thing, if you need power.

A normal person doesn't need power. He's liked, he's trusted, he's needed. All kind of things. But if he is just tolerated because he has power, that's very little.

We have power for our government to defend us

against dangers,
against enemies,
against the criminal,
against arson,
against earthquakes,
against the Chinese.

There we need power, because we cannot wait before we have made friends with these enemies. One day we may be friends. But we cannot wait.

3

It's very strange that in our modern sociological books on government and what-not, this simple solution or equation of power is not mentioned. Power means there is no time. Where you have infinite time, you need no power.

That's why Christ didn´t have to have power. He has endless time.

The whole essence of Christianity is this equation.

I haven't invented this. Only the power of the clergy has led them to forget that the eternal needs no power. It is only that which is abrupt, which is brusque, which must act now that needs power.

4

I also need power against the hail, and the snow, and the immediate dangers, that don't give me time to cope with it. If I had time, and could always move to California, as I have done this fall, and then I wouldn't have to dread the snow in Vermont.

CHAPTER THREE: ENDLESSNESS IS AN ATTITUDE

I

1

What I'm trying to do, and that's why I had to bring together Jonathan Edwards and his house of God, and the modern economy with the home economics in a corner -- because I would like to make you feel that we have created a very interesting society, where space is *ubiquitous, gigantic, covering all, all-embracing*, and where nobody has time, where everybody is in a hurry.

2

The relation between the time a hermit on the Nile in the desert believed to have, 200 A.D., and the belief of a modern manager of the time that is at his disposal is in a remarkable conflict.

THE STORY OF THE PEOPLE IN THE NILE DESERT

You know these people in the desert went out there and sat there, and they took some of them 12 hours to reach the river from the desert, bring back a hatful, or a kettleful of water. Bring it to their comrades, drink it there. And then another man had to get up already to make the same walk, because it was so far distant to the river. So some good sports, and some clever people proposed to them: why didn't they move to the Nile River?

"Well," they said, "Then the whole merit of our life in the desert would be gone. We have to prove that God created the desert as well as the river valley. It is easy to live in the golden wheatfields of Egypt, "and the fleshpots of Egypt, where Cairo is, and Luxor, and all these cities, where the water is, of the holy Nile water.

To this day. An Egyptian doesn't migrate, and doesn't drink any other water but Nile water.

3

THE STORY OF THE NILE WATER

When I lived there, we offered them from the Chicago House in Luxor water to our servants, to the maid, et cetera. They wouldn't touch it. It was well water. We of course were hygienic, and it was poisonous clean water. And the Nile water is terrible, but it was sacred. And they all drank it.

Well, only to make you understand that these hermits have taught us that no one country can be put on a map by itself, that the mountains, and the deserts, and the rivers, and the gaps in the map are just as much part of our creation as we now believe it to be.

4

But it was done by hermits, who had infinite time, so much time that 365 days they spent on getting the water from the river to the desert, to prove their point that the desert was as divine as this fertile valley where *houses, and palaces, and temples* were abounding.

II

1

This is not a pious story, but a very practical story. It means that

you cannot take the next step before you have not endless time.

That's why the Peace Corps is very right in saying, "If you don't go out for two years, please don't." And we had before the Peace Corps a very nice and generous enterprise.

2

THE STORY OF THE JAPANESE TRUCK GARDENERS

The Quakers, the Society of Friends had work camps in summer. My own son worked in one of them in San Pedro here, in Los Angeles, with the Japanese truck gardeners. What was the distinction? It was a vacation job. They had no time. They had just six weeks.

In six weeks, you cannot reform the world, and you cannot re-organize it. The kindness of the Friends is beyond criticism, and their good will. But the one element that makes our acts serious is time.

That now this Peace Corps of Mr. Shriver demands two years, is the first step into the recognition that if a man has not more time than at first he would think he has, it isn't worthwhile.

That's why marriage is so interesting, because it can, except in Hollywood, last forever.

3

The endlessness of time is the condition that there is any time.

Endlessness is an attitude, is not something you can measure.

THE STORY OF MR. WAGEMANN

As a matter of fact, an engineer of one of the greatest engineering firms in Europe, a Mr. Wagemann, became a friend of mine. He had written in 1912 -- before I knew him - a book in which he proved mathematically that in order to change anything in this world of ours, of a finite result, you had to make an infinite effort.

That the relation -- he proved it with cosines, and tangents and I'm not a mathematician; I can't tell you the story -- but it was very convincing that in order to produce any little effect in the universe, men or plants -- the tree, as you see, that bursts open his seed - has to make an infinite effort in order to produce a finite effect.

4

I'm convinced that he's right. Because I know from my own life that only those things have been worthwhile where I made an infinite investment, infinite effort. Whenever I thought I could say beforehand, "This will take me two hours," I just as well should have left it alone.

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY´S WHOLE LIFE

If you deliver these goods left and right -- as we deliver lectures, but I hope I am not delivering this lecture without an infinite effort -- because obviously, I may not boast of this, but you may trust me that it is my whole life, an infinite experience which is at your disposal at this moment.

Otherwise I wouldn't dare to stand before you and talk about war and peace.

III

1

Anybody who speaks of such inflammable material as government, war, peace, order, beliefs, has to make an infinite effort.

And now you know perhaps why a public isn't good enough for me to speak to. A public is not to be reformed. A public will not share my life. I go home. They have bought the ticket, and that's all I can have from them. This is not my hope.

2

I hope that we meet in 50 years, somewhere in Hell or Heaven, that we remember each other. That's infinite.

And that is the reason why the Church has always spoken of eternity, and of Heaven and Hell.

They exist, my dear people. You can think they cannot be painted; that may be. But anybody who wants to live without the notion of Heaven and Hell *cannot rule, cannot teach, cannot beget children and educate them*. He's unfit for society.

The infinite is the condition of our finite actions.

3

And this is denied by Mr. Marx and by Mr. Adam Smith, and the society which he describes.

Now in order to do justice to them, let me go back to their achievement.

There is infinity in their approach.

It's the infinity, as I said, of space.
It's the infinity of a world trade.
It's the infinity of a universal economy.

There is only one economy. Where there is a market -- if you can buy coffee from Brazil, buy it. If you can get a whale oil from the whalers in Norway, chase them. Buy them. The infinity of space is what is the grandeur of the last 200 years.

4

The world appeared in 1700 as halfened: the known and the unknown. One-half of the world was still unknown. And the greatness of Adam Smith and his followers has been -- not just Marx, but all the other economists, too -- that they said, "Embrace the infinite space. Go out of your friendship," as Abraham went out of his friendship --"and go to New Zealand. Discover if there's something that's cheaper in New Zealand, more readily to be had," than something at home. "Trade with everybody."

Free trade, after all, was Adam Smith's great slogan, great discovery. An embracing movement to get hold of the whole world, discovered and undiscovered. And you must think very little was known. There were very many white spots on the map of the world when I was born.

IV

1

Mr. Sven Hedin was the man who was a Swedish explorer. You have perhaps heard his book on Tibet. Well, Sven Hedin was very self-conscious, and he said of himself, "I am the man who have wiped out the last white spot on the map of the world."

It's quite something to do.

But this explains the emphasis of this belief in an infinite harmony, if only we can get hold of all the treasures *of all the climates, of all the mountains, and all the rivers, and all the oceans*, then we only will know how to organize the exchange of all the goods. Because then only will we know that oranges from California are the best.

2

This has been done. We thank these people, these teachers, this courage to say not the milk produced in your own barn is the best milk. We must get the best milk.

THE STORY OF VERMONT

And of course, I have a song to sing of my little state. When I came, there were more cows than people in Vermont. Now there are neither people nor cows. There are only city people, summer guests, who come skiing.

3

You also know of the devastation that this modern market economy can produce, that settlements are simply abandoned. And we haven't yet solved this question, which you will have to tackle, that everywhere in the world where it is livable, people must live.

It's no solution to say it doesn't pay.

THE STORY OF NAPOLEON IN DALMATIA

When Napoleon came to the Austrian frontier in Dalmatia, and he looked at the sterile mountains which now are modern Yugoslavia, he is supposed to have said to his generals, "What does the emperor of Austria pay to his subjects so that they live here?"

It was such a sterile and hard, harsh country.

4

He has a point there. We probably will have to pay people to keep the whole globe peopled. It cannot go on like this that a state like my own, this Vermont state is without people, real people.

CHAPTER FOUR: PURPOSE AND INTENT

I

1

THE STORY OF SWEDEN

Perhaps it is interesting to show you that the Swedes have solved this long ago. Sweden is a very large country, compared to its few people. It's 9 million inhabitants, but I think it's larger than California -- quite considerably larger, and the distances are immense, from Stockholm or from Malmö to the north. However, the law says there that the telephone in Haparanda, which is the northern town, or Kirkenes, is the same -- cannot cost more than in Stockholm. It's one country.

The outlying districts are underlying the same law, being a Swedish part of Sweden. It's as important that people should live in the North of Sweden than they should live in Oslo.

And you can see, since Russia is their neighbor, they are very right. The country up there must be peopled, must be kept inhabited.

2

THE STORY OF ELECTRIFICATION

With this notion, I went before the power commission of my own state and tried to convince them to bring electricity to sixteen outlying farms of my little town who needed -- thirty years ago, it was -- who needed electricity in order to compete on the milk shed of Boston. They had to have electric equipment.

You take this for granted. But thirty years ago, this made news, that you had electricity. The farmers hadn't had it. They didn't get it, because the power commission said, "We don't care. We sell in one block of Boston more electricity than we ever will sell to these sixteen people."

Well, so the government had to step in and create the Rural Electrification program.

I still think that my banker, and the head of the power commission -- he's now president of a university, of course -- that they just were wrong. They had just the wrong picture of the home in which we live, that this globe has to be made into a home, into a house.

And if you treat the various rooms in a house as not being of that same house, you are just in error. A room in a house in which one person lives is just as important as

the nursery in which six babies live. There's no difference. They both have to be heated. They both have to have electricity.

3

Now if it was just a lack of imagination if these people cannot see that this is one house. Our mountains in Vermont gave this electricity, sent it down to Boston. And this electricity originating next door to these sixteen farmers, was denied them.

This is one of the difficulties of the modern political system.

Our parties are obsolete, because they have drawn up their programs in 1865, or some time about that. That has nothing to do with our reality.

That's expansionism -- was right at a time when the world was not yet discovered, when there were white spots on the map, and where competition was the only way to find out what was still to be had, if you went beyond the existing order.

4

Y0u just open a paper, and it bears me out that this is today the debate which is going on.

You have people who deny that there has to be any debates.
And then there are people who are willing to debate.
And then there are people who already have made up their mind that we have to go forward.

And time will tell.

The speed in which anything is done in the world of course depends on the good will of the people concerned. And you just have to win as many as possible.

But you can't win de Gaulle. That is, there is always some lag, some block who live in the previous age.

And this is the justification of the ardor of Marx and Adam Smith. They still had against them all the people who were homebound and believed in the old house order.

II

1

May I therefore read to you a really earthshaking story?-- I hope I can find it -- in which Marx quotes the report of the English Parliament on the fate of child labor in England.

2

THE STORY OF CHILD LABOUR

Now mind you, this was the Parliament itself, in session in 1865 or '66, investigating this treatment of children in factories. And you can imagine that this can be bad or good, reasonable or cruel. But what you would not expect, and what is today forgotten totally -- and that shows you how fast history marches -- is the fact that the Parliament said, "It is easy to deal with the employers. They understand that children cannot be abused and exploited. But it is impossible to deny that the parents of these children are their worst enemies. There is no limit to their greed, and they will allow their children to work 23 hours a day."

You wouldn't believe this. But it's a fact.

3

This only is to be mentioned to show you that the old house had lost its functioning capacity, that there had something happened by industry, by the separation from factory, and production, the place of production from the place of the kitchen, and the bedroom, where you consume, that these parents had lost their character.

They were no parents. They were vultures.

4

This is never mentioned, because we are all so pious. We think parents are always wonderful. That's not true. Children are not wonderful. That's not true, either. They are both horrid, unless they live in a real house. Unless they believe that this house has a claim on them, without a demand made on people, they all malfunction. Every one of us.

Take away the discipline, and we all are just pigs.

And I am told that pigs are very nice people, so I take it all back. And so we are not even pigs. We are just brutes.

III

1

Now Marx knew that the exploiters of the labor, of these children -- although their own parents could lose all character -- and that's why he did not see any salvation or any solution in housekeeping, in households, and said, "The proletariat has it all. The dictatorship must come," sweeping everything aside --.

But you know what his ideal was? I have used it as a motto to one of my books on the decentralization of industry, which I wrote forty years ago, in which I quote Marx as a motto at the beginning, because Marx has said something you wouldn't believe:

"*Finally it shall be shown that mankind does its old work now again in its old manner.*"

2

You think he's a bloody revolutionary. He was a very tender father of his family. He lost his wife and his children from undernourishment. And nothing was farrer from his mind than to invent an order which should be inhuman.

He is not responsible for this war-economy of the Communists. They have always excused themselves by saying, "We are the least-developed country in the world. Therefore we must do things, stunts, which have nothing to do with the full-fledged industrial system."

THE STORY OF ODESSA PEOPLE

I had a friend who traveled in Russia in 1931. And he came back, very excited, and said to me, "Listen. I met in Odessa people who could speak German. And the wife of this friend of mine whom I made there, an engineer, said to me, 'Imagine! If we proceed with our program sufficiently and energetically, the world revolution may come in 20 years.'"

3

THE STORY OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION

This is not known in this country, that the Russians have never claimed to make the world revolution. They were quite clear in their own mind that they were behind the times. And they had expected that Germany and France would make the revolution. This was the great objection in 1917 and '18, in Russia itself, that they said, "We can't do it. We have no factories. You send us factories so we can make a revolution."

4

All this is strangely unknown, because you are all hipped on separating revolution and wars.

This is not so. Wars can be revolutions.

IV

1

And certainly -- we just look at our budget; our economy is half a war economy. In Russia, it's nine-tenths a war economy. In China, it's 100 percent a war economy.

Because this we know how to do. We don't know yet to build a peace economy in which everybody is at home, because the discovery of the rest of the world is just over. And what happens in the Amazónas Valley in Brazil is not yet under our control.

You know very well that the exporting countries of raw materials get poorer every year. And we, the manufacturing countries, get richer every year. That's not our purpose.

2

That's not our intent. We are not evil-doers. But that's what we do. It's very strange. There is this bifurcation which you also have between the agriculture in this country. The man who gives you the eggs and the chickens, he doesn't get richer by all this his great egg business. The city does.

3

This is a deep secret.

And it will be my duty next time to say how it comes, that when you begin with gold, and power, and goods, the world does not offer at the end a spectacle of peace.

4

But it offers still a strange spectacle of either massacres, as you see in Vietnam or in the World War, or injustice.

FOURTH LECTURE: TOWARDS THE PLANET

CHAPTER ONE: THE NEXT GENERATION

I

1

Today is the 14th of December.

It doesn't mean much to you. But it happens to be the day on which the Congress of the United States required from the secretary of state a report on measures.

And I have mentioned in the title of this lecture this fact, that there was in this country, in the year of the Lord 1819, on December 14th, a request on the part of the Congress of the United States, to learn something about measures.

2

These lectures here I've tried to build around the fact that in the 18th, and 19th -- and till now -- to the 20th century, man has learned to measure space *ad infinitum*, quite literally so. We are told that 130 million miles are flown by Gemini 6, or 7, or 8.

But our budget is calculated for one year. One of the silliest things you can have, that a mighty nation figures its existence *per annum* and complains that this is 100 billion high, when nobody knows what is lumped together in these hundred millions.

Don't believe one word of these hundred millions.

3

The whole Social Security is involved in this. Has nothing to do with an annual budget.

And this comes from the British crown, and the imitation of everything English in this country, including the Congress itself, has led to this worship of the budget. You can't learn nothing about the finances or the economy of the United States from the American United States budget.

I warn you: don't try it. You will become a professor of economics.

4

That is, we said -- this was the content of these three lectures – that man, under the guidance of Adam Smith and Karl Marx,

has unified space;
has established a worldwide economy;
has equalized the people at home and the people abroad with regard to their market behavior on the marketplace;
has set in motion a tremendous trade and traffic, what we call a worldwide economy.

However, all the houses of men have been destroyed. In a corner, there they speak of "home economics," as though this was just a subsidy to the rest of the economy -- *home economics* is not the home of mankind; the home of mankind has retreated into little corners. The poor countries get poorer all the time. The richer countries get richer all the time

The economy is in chaos. Then there are conferences on this, and then they will come home and say, "It's still in chaos."

II

1

The reason for this is that there is no measurement. You remember that in the superstitious times of faith, people did not believe that man lived by factories and education.

I cribbed years ago the rather petulant verse:

"*They really try to run a nation*
by factories and education."

2

You can't. Because since God created the world, He is occupied, and preoccupied, and very busy in making marriages. Marriage founds houses. Factories are not based on sex, but on the brain and on the hands only.

That is, on the very mortal and unimportant part of us.

And therefore you cannot run a nation by factories and education. This is the product of the teachings -- or the image in which Adam Smith and Karl Marx, the liberals and the Socialists, have created the universe.

3

THE STORY OF ROBERT M. HUTCHINS

You have a man here in this town of Santa Barbara, a Mr. Robert M. Hutchins, who have expressed this very neatly in the sentence which I read today: "We can make anything work, except our society. We can understand everything except ourselves. We cannot look to science and technology to tell us what to do about ourselves and about society. They can't even tell us what to do about science and technology, themselves."

4

Now the wide world was the target which had to be encompassed by the new doctrine of a worldly economy.

III

1

And it has been.

Between the Old World in which Marx and Smith conceived of this wider world, and the wide world itself as in South Africa, and South America, and Asia, lies this country, America.

And I have chosen the report on measures by the future president of the United States, John Quincy Adams, who at that time was only secretary of state -- but perhaps more successful as secretary of state than later as president -- because America has been, during these last 150 years, an in-between, between Europe and the world to be discovered.

It was discovered. It was settled by Europeans, with all their hopes, and all their traditions, and all their festivals of home brew. Therefore, the disappearance of the house on the world markets had to hit the Americans more than any other region, because it shared the traditions of feudal and house-like Europe.

2

I brought to you not only this remembrance of the date of the 14th of December, 1819, where the Congress, rather embarrassedly asked the secretary of state to tell them something about how to measure things in this unlimitable continent.

I brought you also an unprinted something, which a friend of mine gave me to read. And it is from California. And it dates to the May 15th, 1849. And it parallels the impression I would like to convey from John Quincy Adams' reply and report.

"There was a man, Miles Searles. He had graduated from Yale College. He became the first chief justice of California. And he wrote in his diary on this May 15th, 1849, that he had gone here to see the elephant California. And he says, 'Are we led on by a kind of indefinite wish, to roam over creation's broad expanse, without any particular object in view? Or are we led on by the all-absorbing mania for getting gold? Or by the more laudable one of seeking for knowledge at her primeval source? Of surveying and admiring the majestic work of providence as displayed in their native grandeur?'"

3

Very beautiful text, but you see the fiction of the American mentality reflects very much the picture of Adam Smith or Marx about man: he's alone; he's an individual. He says, "Are we?" - but what he describes is only one man's fulfillment, or one man's vision.

There is no home in this.
There is no country.
There is no nation.
There is no house of God, no temple.

Yet it's a wonderful text, very eloquent.

4

But the fact that this country has been built by congregations; the fact that this country has been built by mutual help and brotherly love, in the educational textbooks on America, goes unmentioned.

There have been homes in this country, and this country couldn't have existed one day without a deep wisdom of parents to their children -- and let me say this, in addition, because it is not done in Europe -- a great wisdom of the children toward their parents.

IV

1

THE STORY OF A STUDENT

I myself had a student who was quite a rather wild man. And he seems to be doomed by his arrogance, and his pride, and his recklessness. Gifted boy. This is long ago, 25

years ago. But how surprised was I when this American, who could have written this text of Miles Searles, which I read to you, went out, dropped all his own ambition and slaved for three years for the one purpose that his father, who had not had the means before, should have leisure to write a novel.

You can go all over Europe and not find such a son. A son who sacrifices his own growth, and his own future, because he feels this father has something, and he has to get this done.

And the father wrote the novel. By the way, it was a successful novel.

2

I take my hat off to this boy, but I say there is no room for what he has done in the imagination of modern psychoanalysis, where you have to kill your father and sleep with your mother. It is quite different, in fact. You can't find more devoted children than in this country. But it isn't mentioned.

Of course, they are certain times very disagreeable, because they try to educate their parents. That has to be admitted. However, these parents exist as real people to them, and not just as authorities.

3

So the picture given in the texts, the books written on this country, and the facts of life are very far apart indeed. And therefore, I think this country is -- as Robert Hutchins shows in his quotation there -- more in dismay, that the vocabulary used in our daily papers, and message to the Congress by the president of the United States has little to do with the real problems of our future.

Much less than you think. It doesn't matter whether this budget says $100 billion, or $105 billion, or 95 savings or waste. All this is not important, compared to the real much more greater things of investment in the future, in the next generation.

4

THE STORY OF THE WORLD POLICY

I once was asked over in Europe what was the most urgent question today. The society which called me to speak there was called, *For the World Policy* -- and in economics, by the way. And I said, "To be practical for a hundred years to come."

CHAPTER TWO: PRODUCTIVE AND UNPRODUCTIVE

I

1

Obviously nothing that we do today is practical for a hundred years to come. It's practical for tomorrow. And that's unimportant. If you can't be practical for a hundred years, then don't try at all. Because who cares what's tomorrow?

It is very important, however, whether the Argentina people love us in a hundred years. Even if they have to go through the hardship of now being disciplined perhaps for one year.

I don't know that they have to. But I mean, this could be.

2

It's the same as with children. You can't educate children if you ask for their approval today. You must ask for their approval when they have their 70th birthday. Then they must look back and go to your graveyard and say, "My parents were right and I was wrong." That's the only thing that is important. Whether these children are satisfied tomorrow is utterly unimportant.

Or they are no parents, but just apes for vanity, and want to be pleasing. This is not interesting, whether you are satisfied with what your father forbids you to do now. You must be satisfied 50 years from now.

3

So the long-range view, as it is called, was the concern -- all these 150 years with all the people who had to struggle against the frontier spirit, against the Gold Rush, against the immediacy of action. That they had no foot to stand on, because the term "individual" -- which is a nasty term and a useless term because it just means you cannot be divided -- dominated everything.

The result of the individualism has been that now we teach that everyone is divided; everybody is divided against himself. We are all double. Our analysis shows that we are one-half this, and the other the other; and now you are not modern if you aren't schizophrenic.

4

That is, the individual doesn't hold water.

As soon as you try to make man the cornerstone of reality, he busts; he splits; he is halfened, at least, usually quartered. Because he is -- I assure you, and now I'm going to be serious -- he is

as much of his mother,
as much of his father,
as he is his son
and his daughter.

We have indeed the whole future and the whole past of the human race at heart. The heart is eccentric, so that we may be reminded of this fact that at this moment, whether we open our mouth very loudly, or whether we whisper, the whole humankind demands to be represented by what we say, what we think, and what we do; the whole past, and the whole future.

And this little pouch here, and this little stomach, and this little hand, and this little brain are no good if they are not in the service of this long-range conversation through the ages.

And that is certainly not an individual, but it's a highly divided person.

II

1

It's a person who must depict, whether the housing authorities like it or not, the human house. Because in the human house, there also are represented at least two, possibly three generations. There are represented both sexes, and they are represented in two different age groups: the parents and the children. There are sons and daughters.

And these sons and daughters have again a problem of being brothers and sisters. And there must be another house out of which the bride can come, and the bridegroom.

2

And you cannot discover a country in the world which can build an economy out of individuals.

That's impossible. It has to be built out of houses, und their intermarriages. And if you don't do that, you will have the plague on both your houses, as Shakespeare has rightly described a situation in which the houses can't get alone with each other.

This is very simple.

3

And let me return once more to the report on measures, first, to see how a wise man, John Quincy Adams, was so well instructed by his father -- the second president of the United States, John Adams -- that he tried to persuade the Congress that measures of time were not under the command of mathematics, of abstractions, of the new metric system -- this new-fangled idea of the decimal system used in France since the Revolution, and therefore very infectious indeed, and very attractive to the freemasonry of the beginning of the 19th century.

It seemed so obvious that we should have a decadic system, and we shouldn't have the mile, and the foot, and the inch; but we should have kilometers, and meters.

So he had been asked to report on what was true. And he said then:

"*Thus then it has been proved, by the test of experience, that the principle of decimal divisions,*" which is the abstract principle of mathematics, "*can be applied only with many qualifications to any general system of metrology. Its natural application is only to numbers. Time, space, gravity, and extension; and people inflexibly reject its sway.*"

4

That's a remarkable sentence, because there are very few people today alive in the world who would even understand how you could state such a thing, because you all are ten times as abstract as the members of Congress in 1819.

"*Nature has no partiality for the number 10. And the attempt to shackle her freedom with them will forever prove abortive.*"

III

1

I think that's quite a sentence, because it applies also to physics.

Physics deal with the speechless and dead universe. Now you and I happen to be full of speech -- at least full of the power to listen. And we are not speechless. And therefore physics have nothing to do with you or me.

2

If the physicist tells me that you are just a rotation of electronics, that can't stop me from writing a poem to you. However, electronics cannot understand this poem. And therefore it is a fabulous contradiction today on the one-hand side: the physicists tell you that you actually are just a skeleton of rotating electrons. And then you write a poem to this lady.

Where are we?

Obviously the abstraction has to fall by the wayside. It's an error to say, "You are a rotating skeleton of electrons." You are, if nobody stops this physicist from pretending this. If he can build you into a corpse, and make mincemeat of you -- as Hitler did in his concentration camps with people -- then the whole physicist is just somebody who describes from far away what the not-living part of you and he may be called, and be used for. He treats the universe as absolutely dead and frozen.

And I hope you and I treat the universe as a very hot potato. The warmth of life has nothing to do with physics.

3

THE STORY OF JOHN QUINCY ADAMS

And this is the immortal wisdom of John Quincy Adams. He was a very important man, as you know, because we owe him the Smithsonian Institute. Thirty years after this, his report was reprinted. A great honor for an official report, as a book. So famous was it in Europe. The Europeans wanted to read it, too.

But not this alone. Before he died, he composed the statute for the first scientific institution of the United States, the Smithsonian Institute. He knew in a long life -- he was born in 1770; he died in 1848 -- he knew what long time is, what it means to be practical for a hundred years. He had incredible patience.

4

And how human he was, I'd like to tell a story, because it shows you also that this country really has been built up by houses.

THE STORY OF THE NORWEGIAN EMIGRANTS

In 1825, the first Norwegian group of emigrants came to this country. They came on a boat, because of religious persecution at home, which was too small for the law of this country. There had been so many accidents that the government in Washington

had passed a law that you had to be of a certain size before you were allowed to land in New York.

Now these poor Norwegians, under the leadership of their minister, arrived in 1825 in wintertime, and it was found that the measurements of the boat were too small. Which meant that they had to pay a tremendous fine of several hundred dollars, and the boat had to be confiscated.

This would have ruined them totally, because the simple reckoning had been: we have this boat, we'll sell it in New York, and with the money made on the sale of the boat, we can then travel into the interior, into Ohio, and begin to live there. So there they were, bankrupt in wintertime.

A merciful master in the harbor took the case to the president of the United States. And he was John Quincy Adams. And he relented. And the upshot is that the first Norwegian colony, and all the Norwegians of Minnesota owe their flourishing state to the understanding of John Quincy Adams, that a congregation arriving from Norway, even though breaking the American law had to be helped.

IV

1

Before advancing to some request, or some tentative answer of how we should go about in fathoming the living quarters in which mankind is asked to move in its thinking from this world market, and this open sky under which we have boom and bust, I may give you perhaps some quite impressive quotations on the situation.

THE STORY OF MR. MARTIN

In 1963, there was an international conference on the world's economy. And the leading speaker said, "Economic phenomena chop and change to such an extent that any attempt to grasp them is like grasping a handful of water."

I think it is remarkable, that modern man tries to build his order on such a thing that is like grasping a handful of water. If you listen to Mr. Martin, and the advisors of the president, you know that this man has not exaggerated. Every 24 hours, you can either uppen or down the discount trade. Nobody knows.

2

I think the expression is very eloquent. It's of course an Englishman who has spoken in this manner. It's like Shakespeare. "They chop and change to such an extent that any attempt to grasp them is like grasping a handful of water."

If you want to follow this line, and see that I'm not exaggerating at all, you must look into the bookkeeper accounts in any factory and any shop. From times immemorial, it seems -- at least from 1700, I have found -- they divide the wages paid to the people who work in their place, in the factory today, between productive wages and unproductive wages. That is, the wages you see done on the piece, are called "productive." And all the wits, the inventions, the care for re-arranging these lathes, or these machines are called "unproductive wages," and put on top.

So you have, for example, a production which needs ten men, then the wages paid to these ten men on the machine is figured as "productive." And the office, including the accounting office itself, and including the work of the president and the inventor, etcetera, is called on top of it, "unproductive."

3

There have been protests on this in the last twenty years. And it's diminishing now, and with automation it can't last, because there then will be no wages paid on productive work, because the machine will do the work, and all the allegedly unproductive work will have to be called just "work," because that's what is left, on top, the arrangement and the re-arrangement of the automats.

But it is significant for the absolute blindness of the 19th and 20th century in this respect that you could call the weaver's work, or the lathe-man's or the millwright's work "productive," and the engineer's work "unproductive," because he was not directly handling this piece of metal, and this piece of work.

4

It gives you the best picture of the victory of Adam Smith and Marx, who both said, "All production is labor, the fruit of labor; and what isn't labor is unproductive." That's -- as I told you, the first sentence of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. And from there, all these errors have sprung.

That we have to know now for five minutes what is productive. Obviously.

God is not productive, because He created the world for millions of years. That's too long for the bookkeeper.

He has to know it for 60 minutes. So then he can put down -- he can see it -- that something changes at this machine. That's productive. Of course, it may be just waste. It may be very unproductive.

I assure you, in this modern economy of ours, I won't say how much I think is unproductive; but I think even Christmas cards may be unproductive today, because there are too many.

CHAPTER THREE: ENDOWMENT

I

1

That is, to call "productive" that which has immediate market is no argument at the throne of God.

You may be a very faulty servant indeed, if you only do this kind of measurable work. If you remember, I said in the beginning, in the first lecture, that mankind had received a measure for time. In the last hundred years, people only have wanted to know measures for space, things in space. And therefore they seem to have lost sight, that the measurement in time have to be related to eternity, to our distinct destiny.

2

Two hundred years from now, we will see whether on State Street in Santa Barbara, most of the things bought there were nonsense or meaningful. You can't know this, and I can't know this. Time will tell. You may pay much money for it, but perhaps you are quite wrong. How can we know today? You do it.

3

Now the secret connected with this is that only where there is an unlimited investment is there any real fruit, is there any real outcome.

The factory doesn't live by the wages paid, or by the salaries paid, or by the dividend paid out - that's only as apparent. It only lives by the worries, by the dreams, and the sleeps of the inventor, of the manager, and of all the people who do Sunday work, who do unsigned work. Not one little item in a home -- every housewife knows this -- can be done simply by reckoning, by calculation. You and I -- believe me, you all live by incalculable effort.

And all the measurable things are second-rate.

THE STORY OF THE PIECE OF CHOCOLATE

Of course, we buy a piece of chocolate and I give it to my grandchild. But obviously my interest in my grandchild is much more important than this piece of chocolate.

It can be replaced by anything else. The piece of chocolate doesn't prove anything.
A foreigner can buy the piece of chocolate.
An enemy can poison the child by the chocolate.

I can ruin the education of the child by buying against the will of his mother -- as I do.

And so the value of this piece of chocolate is absolutely incalculable.

4

So calculable things are the shadow, the projection of incalculable life. And any society has at its future only that amount of investment in incalculables that will make all things that can be bought inferior -- "subservient" is perhaps the best word - instrumental.

II

1

The instruments of life can only be estimated rightly if you know the goals of life. And therefore, to go hungry for a student is an all-right thing, if by this means he can study. And he is much better off in his hunger than the man who earns $10 an hour, and has nothing to look for in the future, and doesn't use these $10 an hour as a preparation for his real aim in life.

The whole scale of values has nothing to do with the scale of money. The poorer we are, the more hope is that we use our things for better.

Poor Mr. Getty has now written a book *How to Be Rich*, because it is very difficult to be rich and not go to pieces. Most people go to pieces by being rich. It certainly is no goal to try to be rich. Next day, you won't be rich.

2

This is so simple, one is really ashamed to say it, but it seems if you compare the amount of nonsense and lying about wealth that is going on in the advertising business and on the marketplace, that I have to say that these trivialities which every one of you carries out every day --.

Every one of you does not live by money values.

Every one of you relies on the fact that I'm not going to lie to you. Why should you otherwise listen to me? And why should I make an effort to tell you the truth, which is most disagreeable?

It's a miracle. We believe in miracles. Everybody does. Everybody believes that a man will be such an ass to be disagreeable, because it's the truth. You can't explain

this. We are inexplicable. Fortunately. Man is much more of a miracle than you seem to think.

3

Now, as to measures.

We still have some inkling of a real world in which we call things by their names, because we want them to be members of the household of man. We still speak of a flower as "*forget-me-not*," which is utter nonsense in botany. Because in botany it is classified. Because anything that is classified is nameless.

And we still speak of "gold," and we still speak of "water," but we should only call it "H2O."

Now you can't write a real poem on H2O. You can write a doggerel. And the quandary of this marching in a real world which has names, like "foot," and "hand," and "arm," is given expression here in a new poem which was not printed in 1819, but imagine!--in 1965. And although it is also a doggerel, on this attempt to make everything numeric and measure everything in terms of figures, it is quite witty.

4

"*If of old, measures were foresakers*
Gone: rods, perches, poles, and acres,
Gone: the gallons from the inns,
Gone: quarts, pints, firkins, nipperkins..."

Does anybody know what "nipperkins" is? It's in English. It's not in American English? What is nipperkins? Does anybody know?

"*Gone: quarts, pints, firkins, nipperkins,*
If on our standard progress pounces,
And gone: pounds, hundredweights, and ounces,
How describe it? There are cries for metrification:
Metricize! Now in powers" –

that's the government

--"*corridors, technologists make laws*
For proper English. And they state a preference for:
Metricate. And who against their taste would go of
Mr. Cousins and Lord Snow?"

These are the officials in England who now imitate the technocrats in this country.

III

1

How important even today measures can be, let me illustrate by a funny example.

THE STORY OF FIVE FOOT AND TWO INCHES

Here is a book by Simone de Beauvoir and the Marquis de Sade. Of course, on the Marquis de Sade, one really cannot speak in public, but I will do it just the same. Marquis de Sade is the hero of Madame de Beauvoir, or Mademoiselle de Beauvoir - I'm not quite sure -- and she has her book, *The Marquis de Sade*, an essay, by Simone de Beauvoir, translated into English.

And this unfortunate translator translated it literally, not thinking that there could be any foxholes, and any dangers in translating literally. And so he made the Marquis de Sade five foot and two inches tall. Now, if that was true, then the Marquis de Sade would have been a dwarf. And all his perversions wouldn't have been very interesting, because such an unhappy creature, running around in society where the ordinary man is five foot six and seven, or more, would explain without much ado his whole fate.

I looked it up, the original, in French, and now the English translation. And I found that to this day, a French foot and a French inch has quite a different meaning from an English. The man was not a dwarf. He was -- according to our reckoning in this, he was exactly 1 meter, 68.5 centimeters large, which is quite an ordinary height, I think, because he was even larger than I. And so, only I mention this, because when I read the book in English, I was flabbergasted.

I wrote to the publisher; I wrote to the author. And finally I went to the dictionary and I found out that the French foot to this day has a different length from the English foot. And so all the people in America get a wrong picture of the Marquis de Sade. And the funny thing is that the publisher and the author found it of no importance that I tried to correct this. They said it made no difference.

I think it makes all the difference in the world in this special case.

2

What I'm trying to say with this example is that fortunately measures still can be very *personal, national, local*; and that we should not so easily dismiss this fact of a native thing, that we pay a very high price for abstraction.

It is not good to call water "H2O." Any conservationist will mobilize all your emotions so that you protect the water. And you can't be aroused, really, if he calls

the water "H2O." He has to apply your memories of water, just water, *in poetry, and in drinking, and in using.* And water is not H2O.

3

And you will never convince me that it is.

Of course, I can foresee a hundred years from now people will be burned at stake or sent to lunatic asylums who protest and say, "I won't call water H2O. Because of course technocracy is on the march, and we will be condemned to use probably these terms very soon. Then I hope you will prefer to go to the lunatic asylum before you fall for these people.

4

It is quite serious. If we don't resist this idea that the world around us, our women and our children can be scientifically known, we'll all become instruments of a plan. And we'll never be the authors of anything lasting, or important, or unique. The instrumentalism, pragmatism -- call it as you like -- that we know how, but don't know what, is the result if you treat your home as just a province on the map of the world, of the world market.

THE STORY OF COFFEE AND ABALONE

You can treat this town of Santa Barbara like it was the jungle of Brazil. And you can say, "Brazil furnishes the coffee, and here we have the abalone. Abalone costs that much; coffee costs that much; therefore we import coffee and we export abalone."

That's very nice for the trader. But woe to you if you think that this solves your problem whether to drink coffee or to eat abalone.

IV

1

The trade, the offer, the cheapness, the possibility of having coffee and abalone doesn't solve our real problem, whether a house can be peaceful in which people drink too much coffee. They'll quarrel. That is, all these economists can say to something, "It is useful." But they can never say, "It is meaningful."

And they don't even try. I must say they are quite honest in this respect. They leave us alone.

2

The house of mankind was discovered by the father of John Quincy Adams, of this very man who wrote this wise report on measures, in which he said that time cannot be measured by the metrical system.

THE STORY OF JOHN ADAMS

He went to Holland as an ambassador of the United States, before the Peace of Versailles was concluded in 1783, with the English. It was a dangerous time. Everything was in abeyance. The Americans didn't yet know that they would inherit the whole continent from the English. But these men, John Adams, and John Jay, and Benjamin Franklin over in Europe, were resolved not to give in before the whole continent, at least to the Mississippi, was given over by the English to these thirteen colonies, who were not then thirteen colonies but empire-builders. Because they meant business. They wanted never just to be independent of England, but they wanted to decide the fate of this world here, this New World.

And as you know, they did.

Well, looking at this tremendous endeavor, this endeavor in space, they had of course to fathom the question: What house they were to build, what home they were to strive for.

And John Adams wrote a letter home, a report -- an official report, mind you, which is in his diplomatic papers -- and he said, "In Holland, you know, the Stadhouder" -- that is the House of Orange, the governor, prince -- "Stadhouder" is the official Dutch word -- "considers the country as we would a daughter. The relation is that of a father to his daughter. And that rules the whole relation of this man who is not the king. He is not elected president. He is hereditary. But he treats his country as a father would treat his daughter. And a father treats his daughter in full freedom."

3

He wrote this home, and at least I am a reader who has been struck by the fact of his prophetic insight. If you look around in what makes this country at this moment survive all the chops and changes of the economy, for the worker, it's the motherly care of the Union. For you and for me, who speaks here, it's the endowment of the foundations.

The word "dowry" comes from the daughter's treatment by her father. It's not as a son stands to his father that we are endowed. But the filial quality of a daughter relies on the father's willingness to endow her.

And though you mustn't take this just in money values, it is the true relation of any willful, hard-working, rational man that he will have in his heart and in his actions this interest to endow.

A woman who comes after him, not one whom he wants to go to bed with, but who he wants to have grow, and be beautiful, and exist, and shine in future generations which he is not going to see for himself.

4

The word "endowment" needs a better treatment in our books of ethics and economy than it is given. It is something quite irrational, fortunately; and only the irrational is valuable.

You cannot explain why a father cares to endow a daughter. It is perfectly unreasonable, because she will waste it; or her husband will waste it. Or in her fourth divorce, she will waste it. He can't help it. He endows her. At every risk, it is certainly not as intelligent as paying in a life insurance policy.

If you read the ads, the only thing you can do is put all your money in life insurance.

Now, I won't. If I had a daughter -- I haven't -- I would probably invest it in her, because it is so wonderfully irrational and un-sensible. But it's worthwhile. And life insurance is not worthwhile.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE CROSS OF REALITY

I

1

Well, this is just the beginning of your – perhaps -- permission to me to think in terms of a house of a family of more than one generation, and more than one sex, as a very practical help in life. The figure of the endowed daughter may show you that even at this moment, in a marketplace society, with economic statistics intoxicating us, the real problem of a human being is: Is there anything he likes to endow?

Because then this anything would be somebody. It would be a human being, absolutely priceless, un-statistically, registered somewhere in his heart and not in his brain.

2

And our heart -- don't think that it is anti-intellectual. It is very wise. It is much more clever than the brain. The brain can only -- as John Quincy Adams wrote to you in this report of 1819 - the brain ends always in figures. It doesn't give way before even you are expressed in so many inches, and feet, and pounds, et cetera.

That isn't you. That's just what the state of Arkansas just stamps on you when you are born.

THE STORY OF ARKANSAS

You know, in Arkansas, every man born there gets a number. And then he is for the rest of his life he is Number 21 in Arkansas.

He isn't very much when he is 21 in Arkansas, I assure you. He can't live on this. That's good for the state of Arkansas, but it's not good for the man. He must never consider himself Number 21 in Arkansas.

This is clear. This is something so utterly futile. They really number the people in Arkansas.

So I won't live there.

3

It is the surface of things, which you can scratch by numbers. You can never *express, name, label, handle, treat, speak to, listen* to something that is only captured in your brain.

You can learn physics, but the physicist has no means of telling you anything important about what you should do tomorrow, that you should jump into the water and save a child from drowning, because that has nothing to do with numbers. It defies numbers, because it's very dangerous. You might drown, yourself. And the physicist would tell you, "Don't jump". But somebody else will tell you, "Jump."

And I hope it will be yourself.

4

And at this very moment, you discover that we have a steering wheel in our midst, the human heart, which is connected with mankind from the beginning to end.

I have expressed it in many books in an attempt to bring the house into your own private property.

We all are a fragment or potential of this house.

II

1

I have called this the "crucial" existence of man, between the past and the future, and between the outer and the inner world. We have a cross of reality inside of you, which is like a compass needle.

2

You know very well how much to give to your parents,
and how much to give to your children.
You know very well how much to give to the outer world in their drives,
and how much to give to the peace at home.

Everybody has to decide at every minute.

And if he isn't married, he still has somebody who takes care of his room. And he has to treat her not as a cleaning woman, but as a human being. And in this very moment when he uses this word, "human being," all the question of how much he pays her goes overboard. She just has to recognize that he is a decent fellow.

And that comes first. And whether he pays her $1.25 or $1.50 per hour, quite negligible. Second-rate. He'll do what he can.

3

Therefore, we ourselves are not doomed by having to speak of ourselves as statistical numbers. We have in us this very strange arrangement, that the past and the future are demanding on you and me to be represented at this moment.

Thinking, speaking, singing, playing,

everything is a decision:

how much of the past has to be kept;

how much of the future has to be introduced anew, against the hindrance of the past:

how much of the outside world, the traffic on the street, has to be respected: we don't want to be run over;

and how much of the inner man has to be kept intimately with your own poetry, and your own songs, and your own love?

4

Gentlemen, the house of mankind cannot be shut down because of economy. The economy of the marketplace is not the real economy.

The real economy is you and me.

You give here an hour. It makes only sense if you have time enough to make any use of what I'm selling you.

Perhaps 50 years from now.

III

1

THE STORY OF ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY´S BEST STUDENTS

My best students have been those who have woken up to what I have told them, 20 years after they have left college. That's early.

Abolish all the examinations in this college. Terrible. Because they think that you can know the next day.

You know nothing of a good teacher's teachings the next day. Absolutely nothing. Quite the contrary. It will itch you, and you buck against it, and you will say, "This cannot be true." And all of a sudden, a few years later, it comes to you: of course it was true.

And that's the moment in which teaching bears fruit.

2

So don't destroy your beautiful University of California by the shallow idea that an exam proves anything. It neither proves anything for the teacher nor for the student.

They have to be, I admit, but they only have to be for the trustees.

Between teacher and student, they mean nothing. I don't say that they have to be abolished. I used to give them all -- they could take all the notes to the exam. So it wasn't so very terrible to write the exam. Because it is not a question in learning by rote, learning by heart, and knowing something. Why shouldn't they take their notes?

And I assure you. The poor students made a mess of things, because they had all the notes, and hadn't understood them.

3

Why do I say this, gentlemen?

Because the long-range problem is the serious problem of the future of mankind. If you say that these things have to be solved within one year, or two years, or three years, or five years, we must perish. And the nuclear bomb will be thrown. Because in such a desperate straits, when you think the decision has to be made today or tomorrow, our foreign policy must run amok.

I assure you, for any person who still has something he loves, there's always plenty of time.

4

And this is then the upshot of what I have tried to say: there is plenty of time.

IV

1

And you know what the expression of this plentifulness is?

That you can begin to speak to the people who seem to stand in your way. There's a new language on foot. And that's perhaps quite comforting.

Here, this is your own paper, which made a real effort towards peace by having a headline: "Ho Chi Minh Responds to Pauling's Negotiation Plea." It's the first time in years that I read this national hero's name in a paper.

2

THE STORY OF HO CHI MINH

I'm not for Ho Chi Minh. But I know that he's a national hero in Vietnam, and that we have to talk to him. And not of "Viet Cong," which is bestial. Nobody dares to mention a person. You only want to have "two battalions of Viet Cong." And these statistics on "hundred people shot of Viet Cong" and so, make my blood boil in disgust.

Is this still an American, civilized newspaper, in which you read every day how many half-men are killed, or murdered or probably wounded? I've never heard of such a thing. In no war of decency is there any such reporting of figures, because man has a name. He is spoken to. And if you do not speak of hundred Viet Cong.

3

I think you would feel the same if your boy or your brother was shot there and it was one of 23 half-Americans maimed in battle.

But this is progress. If you call a man "Ho Chi Minh," with his real name, he may be your enemy -- we all have enemies -- but in this country, the press seems to believe

that when we shoot at a man, we can't make peace with him, the better the man, the more it's worthwhile to go to war with him.

Is General Lee not the better man because we have to speak of him as Lee, with great honor. Didn't he shoot? And didn't Grant shoot? But because there was this honorable man, Lee, that's why there could be still a United States at the end.

But if you only had spoken of the Ku Klux Klan, you cannot make peace.

It's very simple.

4

Everything that is "Ku Klux Klan" is physics, is just things. And the same with "Viet Cong." Anything that's called "Ho Chi Minh," may be your enemy, but he may tomorrow become your friend. You may make peace with him. Because the wonderful thing of the house of mankind is that peace reigns within.

CHAPTER FIVE: TOWARDS

I

1

I had a letter from Sargent Shriver, the head of the Peace Corps, and -- let me close on this note. And I had sent him a book which was called *Service on the Planet*. And he said in his letter very briefly, without any emphasis -- perhaps even unknowingly -- he said, "Oh, very nice. *Service towards the Planet*."

Towards.

2

I recommend this word to you wherever you want to survive the stock exchange and its crises, and all the pretense that comes from these importance of the commercial lines, texts. Then think of the word "towards." The word "toward" --

Some of my friends for the last twenty years have founded a movement, *Towards Peace*. It's not pretentious as Peace Society or Peace Organization. We cannot make peace. A home is not by the will of its inmates peaceful. It's a gift of the gods if a husband, and a wife, and the children, and the grandparents can establish peace in a home. It's not their doing.

Remember, a home is a place where the central point is empty, where God's spirit, the Holy Spirit, cannot be placed inside any one of its members.

3

Therefore, Mr. Shriver, as head of this gigantic Peace Corps, feels that he cannot say, "I make peace." Peace cannot be made like buttons. But we can keep open towards peace.

4

The whole future of mankind depends on our power, despite all our economic interests and crises -- which everybody has -- to know that these are very instrumental things, subordinate to our goals. And our goals are not of our own free will. They are of our obedience towards peace.

II

1

I think the word "*towards*" makes all the difference between a house and a marketplace.

Thank you.

CONTENTS

NAMES

THE STORY OF …

Verdun III, 1
Vermont III, 3

(73)

SENTENCES

A house is a place in which at least two generations meet, and live together in a division of labor and of services.

All play is of the moment.

And I hope you and I treat the universe as a very hot potato. The warmth of life has nothing to do with physics.

And play gives us the time to outgrow the day.

And you cannot discover a country in the world which can build an economy out of individuals.

Any real relation to the Lord makes history.

Anybody who cares for public opinion has forfeited the right to be listened to.

Anybody who speaks of such inflammable material as government, war, peace, order, beliefs, has to make an infinite effort.

Because Communion is after all nothing but a stylized common meal. And that's what the Lord meant it to be.

Because death is also sickness, is also poverty, is also emergency, is also failure.

But Hitler is totally uninteresting except for this reason, that he defied God.

Everything we call "religion," we call "Church," we call "Christian era," we call "western man," has to do with times, and not with spaces.

First you have to obey; then you are allowed to know.

For my cleverness, I go to Hell. Cleverness, even in a university campus, is no excuse for wickedness.

God is not productive, because He created the world for millions of years. That's too long for the bookkeeper.

I assure you, for any person who still has something he loves, there's always plenty of time.

In a house, it is absolutely uncertain who gives the orders.

Man dominates space. God dominates times.

Now all seriousness is in the dark.

Now the secret connected with this is that only where there is an unlimited investment is there any real fruit, is there any real outcome.

Our parties are obsolete, because they have drawn up their programs in 1865, or some time about that. That has nothing to do with our reality.

Pain is a part of belonging to a people.
Enjoyment is the part when you belong to the public.

Sometimes it is more important not to be re-elected, but to make peace.

Take away the discipline, and we all are just pigs.

That all human relations had to end in roles played in households.

The endlessness of time is the condition that there is any time.

The amount of sacrifice you sacrifice into your love, will come back on you, and more.

The economy of God consists of ages.

The economy of salvation means that the centuries, the ages are interconnected, and that we bear fruit in centuries to come and are the fruit of centuries that have gone by.

The enemy is our inability to produce peace.

The house is only there where you can get out and in.

The house of God is where the known man and the unknown man meet on equal terms.

The house of God is where the known man and the unknown man meet on equal terms.

The house then is the skin around mankind as an orderly whole, for mankind never consists of individuals. But it consists of families, of workers, of fellows, of apprentices, of teachers and students.

The infinite is the condition of our finite actions.

The more comprehensive the house of God then in the visible world became by temples and churches, the more did individual houses and homes lose their standard, lose their dignity.

The one thing that God is: not to be seen.

The revolution was made by all the nations of the world who went to war.

The whole house has a spirit, the Holy Spirit, if it is a good house; the Devil, if it is a bad house.

There are questions that must not be answered. And the injustice lies in the fact that people try to answer what should not be answered.

We know when God is angry.

What you think can be done in one year He thinks cannot be done in hundred years.

You cannot take the next step before you have not endless time.

Your life begins only if today and the day after tomorrow have a connection.

(45)

LETTERS TO GEORG MÜLLER

623 *Four Wells Norwich, Vermont*
15.X.1965

Lieber Georg,

Heut kamen die Mitteilungen: sehr reichhaltig.

Thraedes zweiten Aufsatz kenne ich nicht. Wenn Du eine Fotokopie oder von ihm selber ein Separatum erhalten kannst, wird mich das sehr freuen.

Etwas verdutzt war ich über die „Erstlingsschrift" Königshaus und Stämme.

Es war mein viertes rechtshistorisches Buch, was man nach Doktorarbeit und nach Habilitationsschrift eines Mannes Professorenwerk nannte, nämlich das, unter dem ihn die Welt fortan anerkennt. Nur der Kriegsausbruch brach das ab; und so nahm ich von meiner romantischen Schule mit ihm Abschied, indem ich ihre Dogmen in diesem Bande transzendierte.

Es ist kein Erstling, weil ich die neue Zeitrechnung der Sohm Spengler H. St. Chamberlain in eigener erdnaher Forschung selber einsetzte: der Bruch liegt nicht 1517, sondern 911. Karl gehöre ins erste, Heinrich II. aber ins zweite Jahrtausend. Die Ottonen waren die ersten auf nie römisch gewesenem Boden etc.

Deshalb ist der Band noch nicht veraltet, sondern sogar heut noch tiefer blickend als die Tellenbach Weisgerber, Schramm etc.

Deshalb werde ich die Thesen seines letzten Kapitels: Ausblick in die Staatslehre, das ich Dir empfehle, in Santa Barbara im November in neuer Anwendung auf die Heilsökonmie und die National-Ökonomie neu lehren.

Zu dem Zweck lese ich gerade Jonathan Edward´s *Economy of Salvation* und Adam Smith´s *Economy of money*. Es wäre schön, wenn mir dies noch gelänge: die Ökonomen nach den zwei Jahrhunderten Kapitalismus und Sozialismus, heimzuholen in die Heilsökonomie!

Dein Eugen

624 *Four Wells Norwich, Vermont*
18.X.1965

Lieber Georg,

C. Russ Keep, mein Geheimverleger, ist hier, mit seinem 10jährigen Stammhalter, ebenfalls C. Russ, und er geht eben hinüber nach Hanover, um mit dem Bibliothekar über meine „Nachlässigkeiten" d. h. meinen eventuellen englischen Nachlaß zu verhandeln. Da sind z. B. mehrere hundert Vorlesungs„bänder".

Weiß der Himmel, wie Freya Moltke das alles dereinst regeln wird. Allein die vielen hundert Rosenzweigbriefe stellen eine Hürde dar.

Deine Mitteilungen kamen. Sie sind ja äußerst reichhaltig.

Schicke sie doch bitte in einem geschlossenen Umschlag als persönlichen Brief (sehr wichtig) an den neuen Herausgeber der „Geistigen Welt", Hans Eberhard Friedrich.

An Irrtümern im letzten Blatt verzeichne ich: Des Christen Zukunft hat als Untertitel: Wir überholen die Moderne. Von Bastian Leenman weiß niemand, daß er nicht Amerikaner sei; so fehlt die Pointe, daß da ein Holländer sprach. Es fehlt jede Angabe, wie man Mitglied wird, wie man die Mitteilungen erhält, wo Du, wo Potthast, wo Ballerstedt postalisch zu erreichen seien. Vermutlich gibst Du aber Eure drei Namen zu dem Zwecke an, damit der Leser es sich aussuchen kann, zu wem er sich ein Herz fasse, um ihm zu schreiben.

Sage mir, ob Du Hermann Rauschning Deinerseits die Mitteilungen schickst; dafür wäre ich Dir dankbar.

Eben kamen aus Santa Barbara meine Vorlesungsankündigungen. Du wirst sie haben wollen:

The Salvation of Economics
4 Lectures to be given at the University of California in Santa Barbara in November and December 1965
I. The old Economy of Salvation (bis 1758)
II. The Two Defectors: Adam Smith and Karl Marx
III. Gold, Goods, Governments or, The Massacre
IV. The Report on Measures by John Quincy Adams (1819) and its promise for the Planet.

Ich werde noch viel Not damit haben, aber die Heimholung der Ökonomie in den Bibelbereich ist seit „Königshaus und Stämme" aufgetragen; lies einmal den „Ausblick in die Staatslehre" darin.

Ich lege Dir persönlich ein Blatt bei, das ich aus einem von mir erbetenen Festschriftbeitrag für Kohlhammer herauslasse, zu Deiner Unterhaltung.

Dein Eugen

630 *Santa Barbara, Cal. 14, 122 West Cabrillo Boulevard*
17.11. 1965

Mein lieber Georg,

Hat „Scientia" Aalen Dir „Königshaus und Stämme" gesendet? Sonst fordere es Dir in meinem Auftrag und auf meine Rechnung ein.

Dir sende ich diese lustigen das Buch bestätigenden Verse des einstigen Staatsanwalts, der 1935 via Tschechei und Schweiz nach USA vor den Herren Ley und Göbbels entkam.

Ich bin mit Freya Moltke im Westen gelandet, nehme Jos Nervenmittel, hatte gestern die erste Vorlesung – anscheinend wohlgelungen, mit einer merkwürdigen Entdeckung begann ich:

Der größte amerikanische Theologe Jonathan Edwards (+1756!) hat seine „Ökonomie des Heils" darauf gebaut, daß die göttliche Geschichte aus drei Teilen bestehe: 6000 Jahre, Incarnation, 3000 Jahre. Das Wunder Christi aber sei, in ein Menschenleben unsere ganze Geschichte so zu verdichten, daß sie unserem kurzfristigen Blick sichtbar zu werden vermochte!

Ist das nicht großartig?

Wir bleiben hier bis Mitte Dezember.

Dein Eugen

auf die Rückseite von:

11.11.1965
Lieber Eugen:

Herzlich will ich mich bedanken
für die Schwaben, Sachsen, Franken
und wie all die Stämme hießen
die ein REGNUM wachsen ließen
Das für tausend Jahre ragte
bis den STATUS es zernagte –
will die Zeiten man verstehen
muß man die Gezeiten sehen

Dein alter Jürgen (Jürgen de Riel)

Du bist also wieder in Californien, wie damals als wir uns in L. A. sahen. Alles gute, und mögest du Einen Studenten finden!

632 *Apt. 14/122 West Cabrillo Boulevard,*
Santa Barbara, Cal.
29. XI. 1965

Lieber Georg,

Jowo von Moltke schreibt heute, er sei bei Dir abgeblitzt. Seiner Bereitschaft, in Sachen Roland zu helfen, habest du ein dezidiertes Nein entgegengesetzt.

Wie betrübend.

Bitte sage Deiner lieben Frau, ihre Schätze reichten wohl für die ganze Zeit im Westen; sie möge bis auf weiteres nichts mehr schicken. Ich nehme fast täglich ein wenig, aber da es drei Riesengläser sind, wird es reichen.

Da Manfred Erle völlig schweigt, so weiß ich nicht, was Ihr aus meinem

Mihi est propositum

macht.

Dafür schrieb Thraede einen Brief, der zeigt, daß er unseres Geistes ist.

Sorgen hat und macht Bastian Leenman, in seiner Generation wohl der echteste Erbe des Logos (Du findest im „Dienst auf dem Planeten" die herrliche Weihnachtsgeschichte aus seiner Familie). Er gibt aus guten Gründen der Ehre, aus Solidarität mit einem ungerecht Entlassenen, auch seine Stellung im Computerwesen des Stahlwerkes auf.

Hätte unsere Gesellschaft die ihr unbedingt notwendigen Mitteil – statt daß ich die Mitglieder praktisch saboeutioniere – dann müßte er „Missionar" des Kreuzes der Wirklichkeit werden.

Das liegt mir gerade nahe, weil ich hier

die Ökonomie des Heils und das Heil der Ökonomie

doziere in sechs Vorlesungen. Ökonomie im Neuen Testament ist immer Heilsökonomie. Moderne Ökonomie ist nun das volle Gegenteil, nämlich hausloses Wirtschaften, nach der Zerstörung des Oikos!

Bisher habe ich Freude an der nicht zahlreichen Hörerschar. Die besten sind Franziskanermönche. Sie haben die Ehre, daß Santa Barbara 1786 als Franziskanermission entstanden ist!

Es wird Dich interessieren, daß ich versuchen werde, das Kreuz der Wirklichkeit als ein in jeden von uns hineinverlegtes Haus zu kennzeichnen, mit seinen mindestens 2 Generationen und Innen- und Aussenwänden! Nachdem den Haussegen, den

Feudalismus die feindlichen Brüder Kapitalismus und Sozialismus zerstört haben, muß jeder Einzelne statt eines Individuums ein Kreuzträger werden!

Es ist waghalsig, was ich da übernommen oder unternommen habe. Aber es wird auf Band aufgenommen und wenn es wider mein eigenes Erwarten gelingen sollte, wäre es ein wirklicher Schritt in ein weder kommunistisch noch kapitalistisch zersetztes Denken.

Eion hiesiger Büchersammler hat mir ein Manuskript von 1070 gezeigt, in dem Christus in der Mitte statt der 4 Evangelisten der 4 Elemente und ihrer Zahlenwerte thront.

2x2x2 = 8
FEUER

2x2x3 = XII *CHRISTUS* *2x3x3 = 18*
AER *AQUA*

3x3x3 = 27
TERRA

So früh also hat der Hellenismus sich bereits des Biblischen bemächtigen wollen! Die Zahlen stammen aus Macrobius, aber letzten Endes aus Platos Timaios!!

Wie wahr ist es aber, daß von 1050 bis heut die „Weltweisheit“ das Gottesgeheimnis hat illuminieren sollen! Auch meine vier Evangelisten:

stehend, liegend, knieend, sitzend

kriegen angesichts dieser Überflutung der Evangelistensymbolik ihre glänzende Rechtfertigung .

Im I. Jahrtausend dienen die 4 Tiere des Cherubs der Erklärung der 4 Evangelien

Im II. Jahrtausend die vier Elemente.

Im III. Jahrtausend die Begeisterung von uns Menschen selber.

Denn zu uns selber kommen wir immer zuletzt!

Doch ich breche ab, wollte Euch aber zur Auswahl der beiden Sprecher am 8. I. besonders Glück wünschen.

Dein Eugen

bis zum 28. XII. in Santa Barbara

636 *Santa Barbara, Cal.*
Dec. 19, 1965

Lieber Georg,

Du mußt als erster wissen, daß und wie unsere Saat endlich, e-n-n-n-ndlich aufzugehen scheint.

Nicht nur soll The Christian Future in der hier sehr populären „Torch" (= Fackel) Reihe von Harper und Row demnächst erscheinen. Ein an die Alabama University Press in dem schwärzesten Süden verschlagener, alter Schüler, der mich seit zehn Jahren schon die Biographien für sein Konversationslexikon schreiben ließ, Francis Squibb, traf als den Direktor der Press ein Mitglied der Familie Seemann, Ernest Seemann, der deutsch kann.

Damit war unser Glück gemacht. Seemann verliebte sich in „Dienst auf dem Planeten" und bietet an, beide Bände Soziologie und beide Bände Sprache englisch herauszubringen. Das wird zwar riesengroße Arbeit machen und wir müssen Übersetzer finden. Denn mit 77 kann ich 3 bis 4000 Seiten nicht selber bearbeiten. Aber immerhin: Ernest Seemann will nicht ein Buch, sondern den ganzen Mann!

Nach 32 Jahren hier lande ich also ein zweites Mal! Denn ich bin ja noch immer total anonym hier.

Dies nur als Weihnachtsgruß.

Heut besucht uns eine Enkelin von Harry Armine, dem von Bismarck vernichteten, weil er Hohenzollernblut hatte und Reichskanzlerkandidat schien. Ihre Mutter schrieb das vor 1914 berühmte „Elisabeth´s German Gaden".

In dieser Ultima Thule treffen sich die unglaublichsten Leute, z. B. gestern ein Neffe von Ludwig Beck, ein Pagenstecher.

Euch wünscht ein gesegnetes Fest

Dein dankbarer
Eugen

NOTE OF THE EDITOR

1

In his letter to Georg Müller from October 18th 1965 Rosenstock-Huessy wrote the plan of the lectures in Santa Barbara:

The Salvation of Economics
4 Lectures to be given at the University of California in Santa Barbara in November and December 1965
I. The old Economy of Salvation (bis 1758)
II. The Two Defectors: Adam Smith and Karl Marx
III. Gold, Goods, Governments or, The Massacre
IV. The Report on Measures by John Quincy Adams (1819) and its promise for the Planet.

You can see how the lectures were planned and present long before the first word was spoken.

2

Here is the transcription of what was spoken as transcribed by Frances Huessy, with the following changes and additions:

1. Commonplace phrases as "you see", "so to speak" are eliminated. Where the speaker corrects himself within the same sentence, only the corrected version is kept.

2. Additions:
paragraphs,
chapters with titles scooped from the text,
Roman numbers for the four parts of a chapter,
Arabian numbers for the four parts of the parts of a chapter,
titles for the stories – which are marked by color – which communicate either a personal or historical event,
sentences are marked in bold print, which are as a sum of thought and to be kept as taken for themselves,
indices of contents, names, stories, sentences.

3

All these additions try to give to the reader what the listener gets by change of tone and rhythm, the inner order of speech which – according to Rosenstock-Huessys teaching of the cross of reality – has a progress through the four stations or modi:

I and 1, title: opening a new time between speaker and listener,
II and 2, names: finding a common ground between speaker and listener,

III and 3, stories: commemorating a common detail of history which invigorates the common trust between speaker and listener,
IV and 4, sentences: stating a truth which is true even outside the occasion of this speech.

4

It is rather astonishing how clear the text becomes according to this mode of giving, so to speak, a score of the speech, which otherwise – and Eugen Rosenstock-Huessy wrote on paper as though the shortage of paper for writing during the First World War continued throughout his life – seems to be too multicolored and changing most boldly and swiftly.

5

As you can see in the letters to Georg Müller: the initial preparation of the speech is firm and at least in a deciding detail new, here the study of Jonathan Edwards book:

1)

Zu dem Zweck lese ich gerade Jonathan Edward´s Economy of Salvation und Adam Smith´s Economy of money. Es wäre schön, wenn mir dies noch gelänge: die Ökonomen nach den zwei Jahrhunderten Kapitalismus und Sozialismus, heimzuholen in die Heilsökonomie!

To this purpose I am reading Jonathan Edward´s Economy of Salvation and Adam Smith´s Economy of money. It would be fine, if I could achieve this: to bring home the Economists into the Economoy of Salvation after two hundred years of Capitalism and Socialism.

2)

Der größte amerikanische Theologe Jonathan Edwards (+1756!) hat seine „Ökonomie des Heils" darauf gebaut, daß die göttliche Geschichte aus drei Teilen bestehe: 6000 Jahre, Incarnation, 3000 Jahre. Das Wunder Christi aber sei, in ein Menschenleben unsere ganze Geschichte so zu verdichten, daß sie unserem kurzfristigen Blick sichtbar zu werden vermochte!

The greatest American theologian Jonathan Edwards (+1756!) build his "Economy of Salvation" on the fact, that the divine history exists in three parts: 6000 years, incarnation, 3000 years. The miracle of Christ being, to condense the whole history into a singular human life, so that it could become visible to our short-dated sight!

3)

Das liegt mir gerade nahe, weil ich hier

die Ökonomie des Heils und das Heil der Ökonomie

doziere in sechs Vorlesungen. Ökonomie im Neuen Testament ist immer Heilsökonomie. Moderne Ökonomie ist nun das volle Gegenteil, nämlich hausloses Wirtschaften, nach der Zerstörung des Oikos!

Bisher habe ich Freude an der nicht zahlreichen Hörerschar. Die besten sind Franziskanermönche. sie haben die Ehre, daß Santa Barbara 1786 als Franziskanermission entstanden ist!

Es wird Dich interessieren, daß ich versuchen werde, das Kreuz der Wirklichkeit als ein in jeden von uns hineinverlegtes Haus zu kennzeichnen, mit seinen mindestens 2 Generationen und Innen- und Aussenwänden! Nachdem den Haussegen, den Feudalismus die feindlichen Brüder Kapitalismus und Sozialismus zerstört haben, muß jeder Einzelne statt eines Individuums ein Kreuzträger werden!

Es ist waghalsig, was ich da übernommen oder unternommen habe. Aber es wird auf Band aufgenommen und wenn es wider mein eigenes Erwarten gelingen sollte, wäre es ein wirklicher Schritt in ein weder kommunistisch noch kapitalistisch zersetztes Denken.

This suggests to me immediately, because I am teaching here the Economy of Salvation and the Salvation of the Economy in six lectures. Economy of the New Testament is always Economoy of Salvation. Modern Economy is the complete counterpart, operating economically without any house, after destroying the Oikos!

Until now I rejoice in the not numerable audience. The best are Franciscan monks, they have the honor, that Santa Barbara originated 1785 as mission of the Franciscans!

You may be interested to hear, that I shall try to signify the cross of reality as a house which is put into everybody with its at least 2 generations and its walls of Inward and Outward! After the hostile brothers of Capitalism and Socialism have destroyed the house blessing, the feudalism, every single man has to be a cross-bearer instead of being an individual!

It is bold, what I have taken over and undertaken. But it will be saved on tape, und if it should succeed against my own expectation, it would be a real step into a thinking not corroded by communistic nor capitalistic thinking.

6

Encouragement and consolation are the tenor of the whole speech: ***I assure you, for any person who still has something he loves, there's always plenty of time.***

March 8, 2017
Eckart Wilkens