

EUGEN ROSENSTOCK-HUESSY

**GREEK PHILOSOPHY 1-12**

*edited by Eckart Wilkens*

1956

## FIRST LECTURE: *THE TOPIC OF PHILOSOPHY IS WONDERMENT*

### I *THE GREEKS ARE THE PHILOSOPHICAL NATION*

1

...preamble to the total history of philosophy.

And history, as many of you know by their own attitude, if they are honest to themselves, history is despised in this country. History is bunk.

2

Now there are two nations in antiquity who have left as their national history something that is not history. One are the prophets of Israel and the other are the philosophers of Greece. And to call a course "History of Greek Philosophy" is misleading, to say the least, in this environment in which you happen to live, because it is not a history, as a history of ancient Egypt, or of modern United States, or of the art in the United States, which would be a difficult thing to write, anyway.

But "philosophy" is another word for "Greek," and "Greek" is another word for "philosophy," in our modern life. When I say, "This man is a Greek," I mean he's a philosophical mind. And I can turn this around, too. I have often written to friends in the correspondence of my life this expression, "Greek" and "philosopher," interchangeably.

3

The Greeks have not only created philosophy, but they have been absorbed by philosophy. The Greeks are philosophers, just as the Jews are the prophets.

The Jews are represented by Isaiah and Jeremiah, whether they like it or not. There is nothing more -- Moses was the first prophet, and Malachi was the last. And prophecy is Judaism, and Judaism is prophecy, and if it isn't, then we don't care. Then it's nobody's business to dabble with. The Jews outside the prophetic tradition are as uninteresting as the Sioux, or the Apaches. They are only interesting because they are the prophets.

And the Greeks are not interesting except for having been the philosophical nation.

4

So you see, that to speak of the history of Greek philosophy is really saying twice the same thing. The only thing that interests in Greece is philosophy. And what it entails.

And it entails much more than you think. It entails, of course, a tragedy. It entails Homer. It is the Greek spirit. That is philosophical.

## II *PHILOSOPHY IS FOR THE FEW AND NOT FOR ALL*

1

We shall see that this is the real problem of your own day, gentlemen.

If you want to survive as Americans, you have to get something you don't have. Something of this Greek philosophical mind. This is the most unphilosophical country in the world today. So it's quite foreign to you. You have no access to the Greek mind at this moment, although you think you have. Nobody thinks in this country for himself.

2

Because philosophy, gentlemen, has two further qualities. And the Greeks had two further qualities.

One is that *philosophy is for the few and not for all*.

That's against the American tradition. Everything has to be for everybody. Philosophy isn't. It's not for the slave. It's not for women. It is not for the athlete. It is not for everything you are. It's not for the man who wants to make money. You can't be a philosopher and become rich.

It's very disagreeable, gentlemen, to say this from the beginning. I hope that one-half of you will sign out of this course, at the end of this lecture. That would be a triumph.

3

The second thing is that you all try to make life easier. And it is a recommendation if people say that life can be made, by buying a Cadillac, more comfortable, or a refrigerator, or a television. It's nicer.

The Greek philosophy makes things more difficult. If you make the clock run down, the weights of the clock -- philosophy tries to wind them up. To wind life up, gentlemen, make it more difficult, obviously is hard. It's not easy.

4

What is sold to you as philosophy on the marketplace, gentlemen, in this country is not philosophy.

Of course, the word "philosophy" today is turned into its opposite and it means that everybody can think as he pleases, that it is easy, that it makes you win friends, and become rich quick. And don't pay taxes by being clever. That has nothing to do with philosophy. It certainly has nothing to do with the Greek mind.

### III *DIFFICULTY AND PHILOSOPHY GO TOGETHER*

1

The Greek mind has developed an attitude by which the few try to wind up the clock, which in the process of history always tends to run down.

2

America at this moment is totally run down. It has no future. It has no prophecy. It has no promise. It has no philosophy. It just exists by prosperity, which is the opposite of life.

Your whole election here in this country is fought on nothing. No issue. No question. And certainly no future for America. Just the next year. Will the boom go on?

3

Gentlemen, do you think that a great nation would have such an attitude? It's the total absence of philosophy in the year 1956 which I think makes it very questionable whether a course on philosophy, as it was created, is reasonable here.

Just as it is very unreasonable to teach about the Jewish prophets in a time when the people do not like to hear that they are doomed. Prophets of doom, again. Doom and prophecy go together.

4

Difficulty and philosophy go together, gentlemen. Well, philosophy has to do with the extraordinary thought, the unusual thought, which goes against the trend.

#### IV THE EMBODIMENT OF SAYING SOME THINGS THAT GO AGAINST THE TREND

1

I once had dinner here with the then-dean of the college. He grew despondent and took his life later, as is usual today in modern America, middle-aged people, because they have nothing to live for, so they take their life. And a few years before he did this, he had dinner with us somewhere else. And my wife was seated next to him, and he said, "How can your husband do and teach these things?"

She said, "Why not? Aren't they true?" "Yes," he said. "But they are against the trend." And she said, "That's just why he teaches them."

And he was flabbergasted. Has never forgiven me for that.

2

You cannot say anything in this country which is against the trend. Five years ago everybody here was talking about war against Russia. It was imminent. I forget. There were three students, like you, standing in the Indian Bowl next to me. And they said, "World war is coming." And I said, "No. There is no war coming. There won't be a war with Russia." And they let me stand and fled off -- as though I was pest-ridden. I could infect them with this heresy.

Well, there was no war. You mustn't say anything against the trend on this campus.

3

The strange thing of a philosopher is, gentlemen, certainly that he is the embodiment of saying something against the trend. And he says it as a minority.

4

So I sum up once more, philosophy is the power of the few to go against the trend.

## V PRAGMATISM – A GREEK WORD

1

Now as to the history of Greek philosophy: since the Greeks embody philosophy, and if you speak of a philosopher, of whom would you think of a philosopher, first place? Give me some names. (*Plato.*) Plato, first. (*Aristotle.*) Aristotle. More? (*Socrates.*) Socrates. More? Anybody else? (*Lucretius.*) Ja. Our friend Lucretius, because it's on the book list, yes.

Pythagoras, I think you also know from his unfortunate mathematical discovery.

2

Now they are all Greek names. Or they are people who have adopted Greek civilization like Cicero, and Seneca, and Lucretius, the Romans.

Or they are Jews like Philon of Alexandria who wrote in Greek and tried to reconcile his Jewish religion with his Greek philosophy.

But the contribution of the Greek element in everybody's education is always philosophy.

3

Even in our modern times, gentlemen, every school in America, which tried to rid itself of Greek influence, had a Greek name. The most famous one, which of course in the eyes of a Greek wouldn't be philosophy, is pragmatism. It's a Greek word. Knowing by doing, it means, pragmatism.

And only as long as I do something shall I believe it. If I don't do it, I shall not believe it. That's pragmatism.

4

Pragma is Greek. It has to do with -praxis, -practic, practical. It's a Greek word.

## VI ALL TERMS OF PHILOSOPHY ARE GREEK (LATIN)

1

All words which you use in your thinking, gentlemen, are Greek. The word "philosophy" itself, and the word "idea," and on it goes. And there is the word "physics," of course, the word "physiology."

And where there is not a Greek word directly, gentlemen, which is helpful -- "theology," for example, is Greek, you see. But instead of "physiology," we unfortunately say today "natural science." So that's a Latin word. But that's translated from the Greek, purely, and is a misunderstanding.

The Latins were such poor philosophers; whenever they translated a Greek word, they made nonsense. They committed a mistake.

2

So you all, who use the word "nature," as though you understood what it meant, bandy around a word without any meaning. I take it for granted, gentlemen, and you all use the word "'nature" and "natural," but I also know that not one of you knows what he means when he says "nature." Not one of you has any natural or normal meaning for "nature." It's just one of these trite words which you bandy around in order to confuse the issue.

You even think that you are natural. You, the most unnatural people in the world. Yes, you think that you are natural.

3

There's nothing natural about a Dartmouth student. It's the hybrid product of a dying civilization.

But even if I say "hybrid," I use a Greek term. All the terms of philosophy are to this day Greek, or as I said, Latin translations of the Greek. There is no Anglo-Saxon root in philosophy.

Take the word "object" and "subject." That's Latin misunderstanding the Greek. Same true about the word "materialism," or "economy", "economic materialism," or "historical materialism." All these terrible words which we bandy around when we fight the Cold War, they are all of Greek origin.

4

For this reason, the history of Greek philosophy was found necessary in the last 2,000 years to enable us to get behind our own notions, and our own terms.

## VII GOING BACK TO THE CREATORS OF THIS TERMINOLOGY

1

So gentlemen, the history of Greek philosophy is like a visit to the tool manufacturer, whose tools we need in making motors. And it is very good to go to Springfield, Vermont, and go to what's the big firm there? (J. and L. J. and L. Jones and Lampson.) Jones and Lampson, yes. And to see how these machineries which make machines, or which work in other factories are made.

2

The history of Greek philosophy then, gentlemen, has a practical purpose: to enable us to free yourselves from the accident of your usage in your mind. You use all kind of nonsensical words. If I hear American student anywhere, but especially at Dartmouth, use these terms "object," and "subject," and "concrete," and "abstract" all come from the Greek, and "infinitive," I know that you misunderstand them.

I mean, you all know that in this college, nine-tenths of the students misunderstand "concrete" and "abstract" and use it in the opposite sense. In the wrong sense, I mean.

3

You can only understand this by going back to the creators of this terminology.

And I treat this course therefore for you as a course of emancipation, a course to get rid of your slogans, of your detritus, of the dead words, dead terms, dead notions, dead concepts which you bandy around, because gentlemen, I think we can't afford any longer to be simply blindly dependent on the Greek usage, on the Greek terminology.

And if we want to become the equals of the Greek, as we have to now, for the first time in history, we must free ourselves from the accidental Greek dress which we still wear.

4

But it is so worn out that they have no longer the fresh meaning in the Greek situation. But they are useless for us.

### VIII *EMANCIPATE FROM THE ACCIDENTAL TRADITION*

1

I think we are in exactly the Greek situation of the beginning when Greek philosophy became necessary.

But for this very reason, I recommend to you this history of Greek philosophy as an attempt to replace the obsolete, merely inherited traditional Greek terminology -- replace it by your own findings, by terminology which will fit our shoe exactly as philosophy fitted the Greek shoe.

2

Obviously, if we want to have a modern man's philosophy, we must not speak Greek, because the Greeks did not speak Egyptian, but Greek. And it is to me, therefore, as though you would speak Egyptian if you now tried to carry on 3,000 years of verbiage. There is such a layer of dust, and patina, and rust on all these terms, you see, that their value may be shown in the history of Greek philosophy but at the same time, we will feel the need of retranslating them, so to speak, into our terms.

Can you see this?

3

Therefore, please accept my definition of this course then, gentlemen, as an effort to emancipate ourselves from the accidental tradition of the Greek thought, or Greek philosophy, and to get at its lasting, original approach, enable us to be as original as the Greeks.

That's the attempt that must be made in any such history. If we can equate your and my situation today in the world at large with the Greek situation, we will be as good philosophers as they were. If you, however, just let this hang around, as slogans from grammar school and high school around your neck, you will perish.

4

Because gentlemen, undigested Greek philosophy disenables men to live, because it institutes a separation of mind and body, which from onanism to homosexuality, to the enslavement of the other races, to the deprivation of women, and to mob rule, destroys your whole society.

#### IX CORRUPTIO OPTIMI PESSIMA

1

A Greek mind misunderstood, gentlemen, leads to all the perversities that surround us today. There's a strange reason, gentlemen, for this, which the Greek philosophers expressed with this very simple sentence: that the corruption of the best was always the worst.

2

The corruption of the best is the worst. Perhaps you take down this notion. And since philosophy is a very good thing, if you corrupt it, it corrupts you totally.

3

The Latin phrase of this -- has anybody in this class learned Latin by any chance? Who has? Not one? Ja, that's one of these notions of -- you had it, so you don't have to have it. Isn't that right?

This is a good maxim, gentlemen. And it is: *Corruptio optimi pessima*.

Gentlemen, if you corrupt a young man, it's bad enough. If you corrupt a virgin, it is terrible. That is, a good girl is a greater masterpiece of nature than a man. If you corrupt her, the corruption is worse.

4

Now here you have a typical sentence of the great times of Greek philosophy, gentlemen. This sentence, as you can see, applies to all fields of life: to things, to people, to our beliefs, to institutions. The greatness of this sentence, *Corruptio optimi pessima*, the corruption of the best leads always to the worst corruption.

If you corrupt here this desk, it's just an ugly desk. If you misshape Sanborn Hall -- as it is misshaped -- if you enter it, you run against the newel there, but what

does it matter? I mean, it's just Sanborn Hall. So an ugly building -- it's a pity, but not much harm is done, you see.

If you are corrupted, gentlemen, very much harm is done. As I said, if a mother of a family is corrupted, the world comes to an end.

### *X PHILOSOPHY IS NO SCIENCE*

1

Therefore, the greatness of these first philosophical traditions of the human race is that they are valid for what you call "nature," for society, for religion, for law, for art.

2

They have a validity, which your little sentence, 2 and 2 is 4, has not; 2 and 2 is 4 is just true for things, gentlemen, for dead things.

In a good company, gentlemen, you cannot number the people, you see. A crowd may be reduced to 2 and 2, maybe, when they are really friendly parties, like the Democrats and Republicans, but just there are millions, but there are just two. Their numbers just disappear.

3

Well, you don't know this, but your mind, gentlemen, is cluttered with departmentalization. All the truths which you have are only applying either to buttons, or to people, or to motors, or to one definite little field of life or the other.

All philosophical thought, gentlemen, has an infinite number of applications. I only give you this example to now make a second distinction: what philosophy is not.

Philosophy is not a science, because any science divides reality in people, in things, in plants, in animals, in metals, and minerals, in chemicals or waves. That is, all science deals with subdivisions of reality. Philosophy states which subdivisions of reality are to be made, and which are wrong, or which are limited, or which have to go.

4

Philosophy goes against the trend. Science is the trend.

XI *THE ROSE TO HIS SWEETHEART*

1

You are all under the trend. You think psychology, or psychoanalysis today, or biochemistry, or psychosomatics. Oh! You run existentialism. Philosophy sits back and said, "What a fad"? And says it is a fad. And every time has its fad, and you are the victims of this fad.

A philosopher is not the victim of a fashion.

2

This country, however, prides itself that in September that's one philosophy and next October Life will come out with the next philosophy. And if it isn't Life, it's Reader's Digest.

So gentlemen, philosophy is this side of the division of your language, of your inherited little department store of your mind. Your whole mind is subdivided. It's like a desk with innumerable drawers.

3

You think that all plants come under the authority of botanists. Now any poet of course laughs off this and says, about plants, "I, the poet, who give the rose to his sweetheart, know much more than all the botanists of the world put together."

But you don't believe this, gentlemen, because you mistake expensive flowers for beautiful flowers. You believe that if you spend more money on flowers, they are prettier. They're only pretty if you have picked them yourself. And anything you carry to Mr. Porter is just so much wasted money, for your gardenia, because you relate flowers to money.

4

That's just as bad as relating flowers to the microscope. Both is not important. Flowers have nothing to do with botanists, and they have nothing to do with Mr. Porter on Main Street.

But for you, that's the only relation you know about flowers.

You know that you have to spend on a weekend so many dollars, otherwise the girl isn't satisfied. Well, she is not a girl, anyway, if she is not satisfied. She should only be satisfied if you have picked the flower. That's the only reason why she should appreciate it. Not because you pay money for it.

## XII *NOTHING TO LEARN IN PHILOSOPHY*

1

But you are totally corrupt, gentlemen, because you have subdivided your life already into the financial department, where you are running into debt, and into the scientific department, where you look up how many leaves the flower has, and where it is classified away in the system. And that's what you call your relation to plants.

2

You have no normal relation to a plant, gentlemen. Philosophy tries to restore your immediate relation to plant life.

And what is this relation to a plant, gentlemen, which you may use to express your affection for a young lady? What is this situation, gentlemen, before a man has subdivided his relations to the outer world into these tidy compartments?

3

This is, as I said, science, and this is finance, and this is trade, and this is business, and that's politic and that's family, and that's society, and that's news, et cetera. That's how you live.

But the normal person, gentlemen -- that's why I think you are unnatural -- is not satisfied with these divisions. And the philosopher thinks he is normal or he tries to restore the norm.

4

There is one quality in philosophy, gentlemen, which I would like to mention today already to warn you: that in science you can learn something. In philosophy you cannot.

Philosophy has nothing to do with things, because we do not even know if there are things. Perhaps all this is just the skin around my body. Perhaps this is all me.

### XIII *WHAT IS NOTHING?*

1

There have been philosophers who have said the whole universe is just one big person. That's just as reasonable as to deny it.

2

All these nice divisions, because you are seated here on your fannies, and don't care for the rest of us, may lead you into total blindness, because a man who cannot identify himself with the rest of the world, probably will never understand the world. You cannot understand the world by sitting back.

If you are not part and parcel of the universe, you will have no idea what it's all about.

3

Well, philosophers don't know this. They know nothing. As a matter of fact, we'll see that the first Greek philosophers were very much bent on finding out about nothing. What nothing is. What is nothing?

Because before you can say what something is, you better watch out what's the opposite of it. Something -- nothing, you see. What is nothing? You all think you know. You have no idea.

4

Gentlemen, the sense which the philosopher tries to cultivate in us is the sense of wonder.

### XIV *SOMETHING, OUTSIDE OF ME, YOU*

1

Now there are three senses of wonder.

And you have lost two of them totally. And therefore you can hardly be expected to understand Greek philosophy.

2

There is a sense of wonder about something, outside of me and you, here.

I wonder that I have been admitted to teach at this college. They didn't know what they were doing. I wonder. I wonder: there I wonder about other people and their doings, gentlemen.

3

I can also wonder that this earth is supporting 2 billion people, feeding them, clothing them, and allowing them by and large to coexist for quite a number of thousands of years. Because as I know people, they begrudge each other's existence. They are all full of envy, and greed, and hatred, and jealousy, and suspicion especially; and suspicion begets anxiety; and anxiety begets murder. Therefore, why don't we kill each other all, just for security reasons, like Mr. Stalin at the end of his life, simply because he was so afraid. He had to see somebody die every day to make sure that he himself could still live on.

4

That happens. Persecution mania is a very, very widespread phobia.

#### *XV AGAINST INHERITED CLICHÉS*

1

So I wonder. I wonder that in the long run we have managed to be at peace. And gentlemen, don't get this talk in the newspapers wrong. I mean, they talk about war, but we should talk about the miracle that we are not at war. That's much more miraculous.

It's with a sense of wonder that I see that this overpopulated earth is at peace at this moment.

2

The have-nots have waged the last war. The Germans, the Italians, and Japanese. According to all the laws of Darwinism, they should have won the war, because they have nothing, we have too much. So why didn't they get it?

That's Darwinism, struggle for existence. No, we put them down.

So the Japanese have nothing to eat. And the Germans have prosperity.

3

And the Italians are the best of all because they are very industrious and frugal people, and they have real faith. And they have come out as the moral winners of this war, I feel. They are the only nation which has grown in size over the last 30 years. We have diminished. The Italians have grown. They are great people. Nobody speaks of them, because they are so great that they are overlooked. They are much greater than the Russians; and much greater than the Japanese; and certainly much greater than the Americans. Because they are a poor country, and they have grown, without any assets.

Who has been to Italy over the last five years? Well, haven't you found them a very splendid people, or not? What? ( { }.) Where did you go? (Rome. { }.)

4

Well, I only say this because you have all clichés inherited, so that the WASPS are no good, and the French are good. This is one of these standardized slogans in this country, but obviously the French are no good and the WASPS are very good today. And all the American tradition is the other way around.

Because you live by cliché, without any sense of wonder, you cannot perceive the world afresh. You have just inherited certain superstitions. Not by your own effort you have, but just that's the cliché, in this country, you see, that France has to be supported through thick and thin, through our wrong foreign policy.

#### XVI "YOU ASTONISHING ONE"

1

Now the sense of wonder can also apply, gentlemen, to the man who says something.

In Greece, and in Greek philosophy, the man who is a philosopher is admired, is wondered at, is a cause for astonishment.

2

The most common expression in the dialogues of the philosophers of antiquity is that he is a man who speaks -- who says something, like Socrates, is addressed as "You Astonishing One." And that is very important, because it is exactly the same linguistic root as "wonder for things." Not only is the world a wondrous world, as in Prospero's *Tempest*, but also the man who says the truth about this world is a cause for wonderment.

3

And I therefore would like you to note this: *the topic of philosophy is wonderment*, and it is wonderment in three aspects:

*wonderment about the man who philosophizes;*

*wonderment about the people to whom he turns for instruction, or for information, or for judgment, or for affection, or for social intercourse;*

*and the things which are needed for these people to live on, to live with.*

4

If you do not understand this threefold sense of wonder, gentlemen, you cannot be a philosopher.

And since in America people have the only sense they have left out of the sense of wonder is curiosity, and quiz kids, and \$64,000 questions, which excludes wonder, which is just "Information, Please," there is no philosophy in this country, gentlemen.

There is just a little bit, factual knowledge.

## XVII PHILOSOPHERS CREATE NEW SENSES OF WONDER

1

Science is dealing with facts. Philosophy is cultivating our sense of wonder.

That is, in this moment, for example, I'm dissatisfied with all the sciences, because I think that they are not dealing with the most wondrous facts. They haven't discovered them, yet.

So any philosophy, gentlemen, begets sciences and puts them to work on the next stage of wonderment.

2

When we have all the sciences of today taken together, they will not cover your or my real riddle of existence at this moment. Take the racial question. Take this future of the globe. What shall we do with the globe -- with the problem of Mars or moon, with the problem of sex? There are no sciences which really cope with this satisfactory.

Any philosophy today therefore will say: this, sense of wonder hasn't been cultivated.

3

All sciences, gentlemen, turn to a special theme of wonderment of a philosopher, and all philosophers create new senses of wonder. That's why they make life more difficult, because if the way you live, you live without wonderment.

You think that the Dartmouth Bookstore is a bookstore. I wonder.

For the last 20 years, serious people on this campus have given much thought to this fact that we have no bookstore. They could just as well sell herrings. And probably the herrings would be better than the books.

We have no bookstore, gentlemen; which is a scandal. We have no horse stable. We have no fencing master. We have many things not which we should have. The reason why we don't have a bookstore is because the previous owner of the bookstore lost his fiancée to the president of the college then, and so the president of the college felt he should at least let the poor boy should have his bookstore, because he didn't keep his wife.

So that's not a good reason for your having no bookstore here. And that's now antiquated, I think; belongs to ancient philosophy.

4

Well, gentlemen, it's a scandal that this town has no bookstore. It's just unbelievable. But of course, you don't read, anyway. This is not a bookstore. If you would, at the end of this course, understand why this is not a bookstore, you would have learned something.

XVIII *WORLD, GOD, MAN*

1

I'll tell you why it isn't a bookstore. A bookstore begins with selling one book to one person, and a book this person wants. This bookstore will not order a book unless 25 people order it. And if I put an order into this bookstore, they say, "Oh, I have to wait till I can order more books from this same publisher." That is, they treat reading as a wholesale business, like steel, or wool, or some-thing inanimate.

Now books of course are meeting with real, living people, and since they are not masters of ceremonies introducing me to Aristotle, they are not a bookstore. They're just funny. And they are really criminals on the college, because they prevent your making these contacts, these social contacts which are much more important than meeting another 2,900 -- I won't say what.

2

So then, gentlemen, there has been a very fine graduate of this college, an alumnus, who came to this town in order to create a bookstore. He is very rich, and so he could have done it. And he was talked out of this. And he does other nice things for Dartmouth College at this moment. But the one thing he set out to do, he was prevented from doing by the prejudice of this town, which has lost its sense of wonder about bookstores. And just the routine, and the trend have won out and again we have no bookstore.

3

So will you kindly then take this definition of my course, gentlemen?

The Greeks have cultivated the sense of wonder. And they have cultivated the sense of wonder

*with regard to the world, with regard to God, and with regard to man.*

What is fate, war, revolution, famine, death? What are all the powers that make our lives? I wonder.

What are you? What am I? Who speaks, who begins to wonder himself? How wondrous that man can wonder.

Even this is a reason for wonderment.

And the third: what is all this around us? The earth, and the stars, and the air. How wondrous.

4

And this frontier between Vermont and New Hampshire on the other side of the river: how strange. You know that the frontier between New Hampshire and Vermont is not the middle of the Connecticut River -- but on the other side. That's unique in all geography, in all history, in all political boundaries. The only case where the river is not separating the two states in its middle, but on one side. Do you know that?

Well, these damned New Hampshire people have done this to us in Vermont.

#### XIX DEFINITION OF THE HISTORY OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY

1

So we have a definition, gentlemen. The history of Greek philosophy is the history of that institution which cultivates the sense of wonder. And it cultivates the sense of wonder

*with regard to those who wonder,  
with regard to the subjects to be wondered at,  
and with regard to the power which rules that we must wonder, that are the gods.*

2

It is our fate to wonder: what's fate? We wonder how strange people we are. And what is to be wondered at is again the riddle of the world.

3

So gentlemen, will you kindly, therefore, see why this course is so very top-heavy, and very difficult to teach?

In America, in the last 50 years, the first heresy that has been taught is that philosophy, if it is to be any good, must be a science. Therefore, this country has no philosophy, because if it is a science, it is not philosophy.

Science is dealing with something definite. Philosophy is stepping outside all the definitions already given, and finds out an infinity of causes for wonder which the existing definitions do not cover, or misplace, or misdefine, or mutilate, or wrench.

4

Therefore, the history of philosophy is the sequence of stations of wonderment, and of people who were impressive enough that they forced their contemporaries to give room for a new sense of wonder.

## XX ENLIGHTENMENT IS OBSOLETE

1

And therefore, gentlemen, philosophy is always against the so-called youth of a country.

You have this great prejudice that to be young means to become wiser than the old. The old people you discard, and you think that just because you are born in a certain year, you must be more intelligent than the people of the year before, or 10 years earlier. This very wholesome prejudice keeps you so stupid, because wisdom, gentlemen, begins where age is of no help. Neither youth nor old age.

An old man can be an ass and an ox, and a young man can be the same. The birth certificate is no guarantee for your being not obsolete. You can be just as obsolete as a Spaniard is today. America is perhaps already obsolete. We don't know.

2

But certainly the fact that you have been born, gentlemen, has absolutely nothing to do with your modernity. Because there are whole nations where many young people live, and yet the whole country is just obsolete.

3

But there is this first superstition, gentlemen, that history is obsolete because it is older than you. That's questionable. That's very questionable. I think that many ways of your mind, gentlemen, are obsolete. If I uncover the skull of the average American high school product, I find that your categories, your ways of thinking are all going back to the year 1750.

This country is the product of the Enlightenment. And the Enlightenment to me is as dead as the dodo, is obsolete. And therefore most Americans, I think, are obsolete men, have-been men, as the Russians call them, because the Enlightenment is antiquated.

4

And it is this thesis, gentlemen, which makes this course so very difficult to teach, because the Enlightenment had recourse to the Greek philosophers, to prove its point that reason, that the human mind could dismiss all taboos, all laws between the generations, that the last generation was always the most intelligent, that progress was automatic, that you couldn't miss it, and that you could not lapse and fall from grace.

## XXI THERE IS NO AUTOMATIC PROGRESS

1

That's why we lost the First World War. That's why we had to go to the Second World War, because people were quite sure that just by sitting on their fannies, they couldn't miss out on anything. It would just always go on further, better, better and bigger.

2

You know when the different nationalities set out to write a book on the elephant, the Englishman wrote the book, *How to Hunt the Elephant*; and the German wrote a book, *Systematic Place of the Elephant in Zoology*, and the American wrote a book, *Bigger and Better Elephants*.

Because you are so sure that everything can be improved, gentlemen.

3

But this idea, gentlemen, that everything can be improved, leads to the destruction of all the things where we can hardly hope that they exist at all. Family relations cannot be improved. The important thing is that there are any family relations, and not divorce. If you get a divorce, out goes the family.

Therefore, the automatic belief in progress means, that you think you all the time can improve the family until there is no family left.

4

All the things, gentlemen, that are brittle and frail, like a flower, that wither on the stem within five minutes, like my spirit or your spirit, that are endangered by ruin, and death, and illness, and depression, and they are so tender, that your

and my belief that they will exist automatically must lead to their destruction, because it takes every effort of our imagination and devotion to keep them alive.

So if you don't water a plant, a forget-me-not, because you think that it must be more beautiful tomorrow, you will find no forget-me-not tomorrow; it will be dead. You have to cultivate this, to keep it alive just 24 more hours.

If you, instead of watering the plant, think that it will go on and be better tomorrow, there is just no plant left; there's no family left; there's no government left; there is no religion left; and that's how you have treated the human history over the last 50 years, gentlemen.

You have taken it for granted that it will exist without your devoting yourself to its restoration. It will not.

Let us have a break here.

[*tape interruption*]

I LUCRETIUS – MORE OR LESS THE PHILOSOPHY OF AMERICA

1

...material, so to speak, on which he draws.

Then there is a collection called *The Pre-Socratic Philosophers*, by Freeman. Who has all these books already? Well, so these, gentlemen, do you have these books with you today? Who has?

Nobody. Well, I hope you will show them to the others. That's very precious. It's just a collection of all the texts of these philosophers who preceded Socrates and whom we today think they were the greatest of all Greek thinkers. They founded philosophy. They they cultivated this sense of wonderment. The Pre-Socratic Philosophers.

2

Then there is the little booklet, like this, of Plato's five dialogues.

Then there's Aristotle, *Politics* and *Poetics* in a cheap edition.

And finally, there is from the end of the Greek antiquity the poem by Lucretius, the materialist, *On Nature*.

3

Every American is, I think, more or less a Lucretian today. For the last hundred years, Lucretius' philosophy has been more or less the philosophy of America.

4

We'll shall start with reading Lucretius. And on this I will spend now the next half hour, to show you why the approach from the later times of Greek philosophy is the more sound approach than to start with the archaic, first philosophers.

## II *THE INSTITUTION OF THE OLYMPIC GAMES 776 B. C.*

1

The history of Greek philosophy, gentlemen can be divided roughly into 2,000 years, not quite -- from 800 B.C., that's Homer and institution of the Olympian Games.

2

Does anybody know when the Olympian Games allegedly were instituted?

One has to know this, because all Greek and Roman chronology, time-tailoring was based on the first Olympian Games.

Have you never heard of this? Not even interested in Olympian Games, in what are you interested?

3

The Olympic Games were instituted in 776 B.C.

So there the rational history of Greece -- the post-mythological history of Greece begins. And it must be more or less contemporary with Homer, because Homer in *The Iliad* obviously alludes to the Olympic Games in a kind of underhanded fashion,. He disapproves of them.

4

So 776 is an important date in the history of the human race, gentlemen. It's the awakening of the Greek people to their self-consciousness, to feeling that they have a history of their own. Before, everything is just part of Oriental history.

## III *THALES, CICERO, PHILO*

1

Now gentlemen, this first part of Greek history goes on to 600. And that's the prehistory of Greek philosophy.

It is there wrestling with the Orient and with myth. From 600 to, by and large, the birth of Christ, or 50 after Christ, we may say, begins this astonishing history of these wondrous people called "philosophers."

2

The first whom we mention is Thales of Miletus. And it goes on to two non-Greeks: Cicero in Rome, and Philo in Alexandria. And here is a Latin and a Jew who fall under the spell of Greek thinking, and thereby show its omnipotence, that whoever is a philosopher has to go Greek, so to speak.

If he wants to share the wonderment of the Greek mind, he enters the history of Greek philosophy. Cicero and Philo.

3

And Cicero edited this poem of Lucretius, which we are going to read, because Lucretius died from something very human, from a philter of love, from trying to be either more potent, or arousing a lady's affections, we don't know. We have only this one sentence in an old father of the church, that Lucretius perished by drinking a philter of love, which arouses your appetite to know a little bit more of this strange man.

4

He died in 55 before Christ. So 12 years before Cicero. And Cicero seems to have edited his poem, because he was overtaken by this death unexpectedly.

#### *IV GREEK PHILOSOPHY COMPETING WITH CHRISTIANITY*

1

Now gentlemen, this is the center part of the history of Greek philosophy, the original part. What we call Greek philosophy was produced in these 600 years.

The times from 800 to 600 we have to speak of as preparatory, as putting the problem, that always one man should carry the ball and recultivate this sense of wonder.

2

This is after all a strange thing. In our times, you find in this country that nobody tries to develop any sense of wonder.

3

From the birth of Christ to 529, gentlemen, we get a third period of the history of the Greek philosophy: Greek philosophy competing with Christianity.

Now all this period is the period best known to us, because our source material is very rich for this later part, and most of the doctrines of Greek philosophy have really come to us in this garb of contemporary teaching with Christianity.

So that's from 50 A.D. to 529.

4

In 529, gentlemen, the Academy in Athens was closed, and that was the end of an independent Greek philosophical tradition. You have to know this. 529 is a most important year.

#### V CHRISTIAN, JEWISH, ISLAMIC COUNTING OF THE YEARS

1

By and large at the same year was introduced our Christian calendar, the counting of eras. In 534, the first man wrote a book A.D. Five hundred years this took, before the Christian era was established.

I mention this because it is interesting that the Islam era came into being shortly afterwards. And the Jewish era, too. The Christian era was created at this time when the Greek mind went out of existence.

2

The Jewish era was created in competition with the Christian era, at the end of the 6th century of our own era. And then the Mohammedan, as you know, is the third. They were all created about the same time.

3

So this very dark century, gentlemen, from 529 to 622 should become a little more interesting to you when you consider that the reckoning of time was the creation of this era.

When you read about the Jewish New Year, when is it, this year? Who knows? (*It was.*) Is already over? When was it? (*The 18th.*) And which year was it? (5717.)

Well, that's an invention of the 6th century of our era. Nobody ever thought of this counting this manner before. And it was done in replica and in antithesis to the Christian counting.

4

First comes the Christian counting, then came the Jewish counting, and then came the Islamic counting.

And I think that's quite important for you to know.

## VI THE FOUR PERIODS OF THE HISTORY OF GREEK PHILOSOPHY

1

Well, at that time, gentlemen, when the people eliminated the pagan antiquity and only had a Christian and a Jewish counting, Greek philosophy fell dead to the ground.

2

That goes together. They wanted to eliminate the Greek strand of our life. And from 529 to the days of Charlemagne, take perhaps the year 827, the death of the Scotchman, the greatest philosophy of these early days, the first great Scotchman, John the Scotch, or Eriugena, probably born in Ireland, John Scotus was the last philosopher in Christian garb, of greatness of ancient caliber.

3

So Greek philosophy competes with Christianity from 50 of our era. The first man in this line is Seneca. And then comes the so-called neo-Platonists, and the neo-Pythagoreans, all the words with "neo," that is, new, belong into this era from 50 to 529.

And from 529 to 877, Greek philosophy has to dress up as Christian in order to live. And we have two great names there, whom you must put down in your notes: the famous Areopagite, Dionysius the Areopagite, usually just quoted "the Areopagite," who wrote about 500 -- a little later or a little earlier, we don't know, and who's a forgery. These poor philosophers had to feign that they were written by a Christian author in order to be tolerated at that time, because their schools had lost their authority, their freedom of teaching.

And the same is true of John Scotus. So I put these two names down: John Scotus Eriugena. And Eire, as you know, is the official word for Ireland. And he dies probably at the end of the 9th century, supposedly in 877.

4

We have four periods of this history of Greek philosophy then, gentlemen:

*a prehistory of at least 200 years from Homer to the first explicit philosopher;*

*then we have the classical period from 600 A -- B.C. to 500 -- 50 A.D.*

*Then 500 years of competition with Christianity,*

*and then 300 years of hiding inside or under the cloak of Christianity.*

## VII LOOKING BACKWARDS

1

Now why do I say then that it is useful to go backward?

As you see, this Greek philosophy comes out of a Homeric and Oriental age. Then the philosophers get on their own. They attract even the Jews and the Romans to a certain extent. Then they have to go in hiding. They have to compete with the new force of life, Christianity, the Church, theology. And finally they are not even allowed to call themselves philosophers. They have to pose as though they were themselves Christian thinkers.

2

So gentlemen, they went underground, at the end. And they came from underground. And they were rediscovered, gentlemen, backward.

You may know that the first ancient thinker who was rediscovered was St. Augustine, who comes at the end of the competitive period where philosophers compete with the Greek with the Christian spirit. St. Augustine's pagan, or philosophical, writings were first read in the Middle Ages.

3

So the story, gentlemen, of your and my relation to this thing is very strange.

Here you have the march through time, in this direction. That's Greek philosophy historically. But if you look backward, this would be then from 1776 A.D. to B.C. 877.

Now if you look however at the Americans, at the Europeans, at the Renaissance people, at the people who founded colleges like Harvard University or even Dartmouth College in the wilderness, these people looked at Greek philosophy from the end, backward. And first, they only were interested in the latest philosophers.

4

Let me put this name. I could also put of course the name of Areopagite. If you read a book on philosophy, let's say of the year 1500, they all know every-thing about these people, and know very little of Plato or of Aristotle.

#### VIII *THE WAY OF RENAISSANCE*

1

Still, as you know, the great revolution in the Middle Ages was dealing with Aristotle. But nobody read Plato at that time. So Plato was only read after 1450. So he was discovered much later than Aristotle, 300 years later he became popular.

And in the 19th century, all people began to read the pre-Socratics, and there's a literature now on these pre-Socratics, that you just can't get through, so much ink is spilled now on the Oriental influences on Greek philosophy and the beginnings of the Greek mind here.

2

This book is most modern and fashionable, the pre-Socratic texts: Pythagoras, and Thales, and Parmenides. The leading philosopher of Europe, Mr. Heidegger, is just Parmenides redivivus. And Parmenides is much older than Socrates and Plato. And Mr. Heidegger thinks that Plato and Aristotle are just obsolete, that the real McCoy is Parmenides, who lived a hundred years earlier.

3

Now that's very difficult for you to understand, because I know a young mathematician who told me that they wouldn't read anything that was written in mathematics and was older than 10 years ago. Of course, this man can never be a

mathematician. But he can be a good American, because you also think that nothing that is 10 years old is worth reading.

In philosophy, it's the other way around, gentlemen. The renewal of the philosophical spirit has strangely enough been one of going backward.

4

I'll give you the dates.

Aristotle in 1230 was such new stuff that the pope forbids its reading. In 1265, the poor pope had to recant. It's one of the great examples, where you see that the Roman church has always changed, but never admitted it. In 1230, no Aristotle allowed to be read in the schools.

In 1265, Thomas Aquinas establishes his reputation, by doing exactly the forbidden thing. That's why it's a different story, gentlemen, from being a Thomas Aquinas and today being a Thomist. Thomas Aquinas was a bold man. And a Thomist today is a timid sheep.

So Plato was read in 1448, the pope first asked for a translation of *The Republic* by Plato. Socrates was celebrated in a famous speech by Erasmus of Rotterdam, in 1550, where he invoked him as a saint. And he said, "Saint Socrates, come to our rescue."

## IX *DEALING WITH DYNAMITES*

1

So these figures, which I put here -- the pre-Socratics, gentlemen, became famous in 1840. I should put this otherwise. Pre-Socratics.

So the Greek spirit has been rediscovered, gentlemen, by going backward. The greatest influence on all our traditions therefore has come from the late Greek thinkers.

2

And when we read Lucretius first, I want to pay homage to this our indebtedness, the way we came to be related to the Greeks. We did not beget the Enlightenment because people read Plato, or read the pre-Socratics, but because we read the Stoics. And we read Lucretius. And therefore I told you that today we have to become as original as the Greeks.

The Enlightenment, gentlemen, has absorbed the Greek mind in the wrong sequence, from the end backward. And my whole problem in this history is to make you aware of the strange result that must ensue when you absorb a foreign spirit, backward.

3

And so I think I should open your mind to this strange connection with Greece which we have entertained here in the last 400 years in the Western world by entering upon this with one example.

Our ancestors 300 years ago would first be influenced, by the late Greek philosophers first, and not by the early ones. And if I would only now give you a nice history of the Greek spirit, you would be bored.

I want to show you that we're really dealing with dynamite, that all these thinkers, gentlemen, have exerted a tremendous influence on our thinking. And on this I shall enlarge the next time right away.

4

I shall show you that since we owe our first encounter with the philosophical spirit to a time in which Christianity already was there, the Greek spirit no longer had to cover the whole ground of wonderment. It was a limited affair. It was just in competition with Christianity.

Some parts of its own achievement, were now represented by the Christian tradition of the Church. And therefore the Greek was not needed for this.

#### *X CERTAIN RULES, CERTAIN FUNDAMENTAL TRUTHS*

1

I may perhaps make the following points, gentlemen.

In the last two periods of the Greek spirit, of the Greek philosophy, another power, Christianity, had guaranteed certain truths, which therefore were no longer looked for in and by the authority of Greek philosophers. One was the equality of men and women, Number 1, as souls.

The Greeks had never assumed that. Greek philosophers assumed always that men had an absolute superiority. The injustice of slavery, or the indifference to slavery -- all Greek life was based on slavery. And slaves and free men were just not the same breed of people.

The third thing is, of course, that perversion of the sex was denied by Christianity as necessary for philosophy, or for the spirit, whereas the Greek philosophy was based on homosexuality. All Greek philosophers were embedded in the tradition that the spirit of man could only be aroused sufficiently to think, by homosexuality, by some love relation between male and male.

2

There are still colleges who believe this to this day, especially frequent in England. But I am told they exist even here.

3

However, Christianity said no spirit that is based on such an unnatural relation between teacher and student is worth having.

And so gentlemen, there are certain rules, certain truths fundamental to all of you and me who are dealing now with Greek philosophy, which the Greeks never knew in their heydays.

First, that philosophy cannot be based on slavery. Certainly the highest the knowledge of life cannot be limited to one sex. Third, it cannot be that sexual passion is needed to inflame man to think, to wonder, to get excited.

And what was Number -- wie? Well, there are -- perhaps I may add

that the thinking was not independent on any nationality, that the barbarians were just as much entitled to philosophize as the Greeks, that Greek had ceased to be the matrix, the necessary matrix of philosophy.

Just as Hebrew ceased to be the necessary language for salvation, so Greek ceased to be the necessary language for thinking.

4

The last point perhaps: all Greek thought acquiesced in war forever. There can be no world peace. Christianity has acknowledged that war exists, but the prophecy of Christianity certainly always has been that peace must ensue.

## XI *THE PREJUDICE OF JOURNALISM, SECULARISM, RATIONALISM*

1

So gentlemen, in our own era, Greek philosophy has shrunk in area. Certain fundamental truths debated in Greek philosophy have been taken over and decided by a power which superseded the Greeks and the Jews, by Christianity.

2

The Enlightenment, gentlemen, denied this. It's my distinction why I am not a member of the Enlightenment, why I do not date myself from Benjamin Franklin as you do, is that Benjamin Franklin didn't know this. He thought that the Greeks had, under their own steam, abolished perversity, homosexuality, slavery, equality of sex, and war and peace.

And the Enlightenment overlooked the contribution of Christianity and thought that by mere reason, by mere philosophizing, the Greeks had achieved all these wonderful ends themselves.

3

And therefore, all the books on Greek philosophy which you could read today are worthless, because they are all based on this prejudice of journalism and secularism, and rationalism, as though the Greek mind had to achieve everything that Christianity has achieved.

If you follow this, gentlemen, we will plunge into the same dark night which is represented by nationalism and by Bolshevism.

Bolshevism and Nazicism are pure Greek mind, without mitigation by Christianity. You can say that Mr. Lenin has tried to realize Plato's Republic. He's a good Platonist. Because if you read *The Republic*, it is just as tyrannical, just as absolute as the Communist society, the classless society.

4

For the last 40 years, I have always felt that it is not right that American students are asked to read the laws by Plato, naively, because in such an agnostic society as yours, where nobody tells you the difference between philosophy and Christianity, and where you even think that Christianity is a philosophy, of which it is the opposite, it is terrible.

When the Germans and the Russians read these books by Plato, they began to think that slavery after all was a good thing. So they have their slave-labor camps in Siberia.

How can you wonder, if you feed yourself on Greek philosophy?

## XII *SHAKING OFF THE SCALES, THE ACCIDENTAL GREEK PHRASES*

1

So I say once more, gentlemen, Greek philosophy is dynamite, if you read it out of context. And we cannot afford this. After two world wars, gentlemen, and after all the Jews in Europe have been eradicated under the authority of Plato, and of the polis, the city-state, the national spirit, and the greater power for Germany, or of the classless society, you must know that this philosophy is nothing lackadaisical, and it is nothing anemic.

What you think, if you think at all, is the truth 30 years later. Where you think at all.

2

This has never been true in America, gentlemen, because the colleges here are just of no importance in the national life. But in Europe, gentlemen, what people have thought and picked out of Greek philosophy in the last 300 years has become the political fact 30 years later in the life of the nations.

And I warn you, this course is not without its dangers. I think it is necessary for us to face up to the fact that all the slogans in all our sciences are of Greek origin. All the political slogans are Greek. The word "politics" is certainly Greek.

3

But my intent is not to make you into Greeks, gentlemen, but to make you into yourself by shaking off the scales, the accidental Greek phrases which look so innocent, because they are Greek. But in part they aren't innocent at all, gentlemen.

Homosexuality, incest, all the horrible things of Greek tradition, Oedipus complex, they are around us. Whether you take Mr. Mann, or Mr. Freud, or Mr. Gide. We have bred this spirit of pure Greek life to such an excess in the last 50 years that as you well know, Christianity has just fallen by the wayside. And you cannot cure this by going to church, because most churches are just Greek. The just teach Greek stuff.

4

The churches are no longer orthodox. They teach Aristotle, but not Christ. The Catholics. And the Lutherans teach Plato, the Protestants, but not Christ.

Everywhere in our churches, philosophy has acquired the government. I have heard many debates with good, alleged Roman Catholics where they only knew their Aristotle from Thomas, but they didn't know St. Paul and Christ. And they thought that when they quoted Aristotle to me, that they were good Christians.

### XIII *TO SAVE THEIR GREATNESS, NOT THEIR CORRUPTION*

1

You cannot fully understand this, gentlemen, but perhaps the queer story of how the Greek mind has been received by us, going backward, will warn you that today most so-called Roman Catholics are Greek philosophers. They are thinking in terms of Aristotle, and not in terms of Christianity.

And in the same way in the Protestant tradition, they are all Platonists. And Bolshevism is, as I said, just another form of Platonism. Socialism.

2

So to me, therefore, that was the reason why I have never wanted to teach Greek philosophy. But this is the last year here in this college. And I thought, "Once, I would make an attempt to put the Greeks in their place," gentlemen.

3

As I said, the Greeks are a great people. And the corruption of the best is the worst. And they have been corrupted. And we must make an attempt to save their greatness, without their corruption.

## SECOND LECTURE: *THE GREEKS ARE SACRIFICES*

### I *TRASH, ROUTINE, ECHO, IMITATION*

1

...before the human mind. Even before you.

It is for few, gentlemen, for the few, and it is an attempt to make life more difficult. Because in the atom, the electronics age, the great danger is that life is becoming too easy.

2

That's all unpopular in this country, because in this country it's a recommendation to say that things are getting easier. To me it is not a recommendation. I'm bored by anything that's easy, or I have been all my life. I'm only interested in things that are difficult.

3

So philosophy goes against the trend. If it doesn't go against the trend, it is not philosophy. Everything that's called philosophy in this country is trash, because it says that everybody can think it.

That's impossible, gentlemen. Philosophy is that which not everybody can think. Otherwise it would not be anything but the routine thinking of the common sense.

4

So there is a tremendous distinction between philosophy, gentlemen, and what you are accustomed to call "thinking." I defy you to show me one idea of yours which is your own, one thought which you have thought against the resistance of the whole world, and which you have defended by the witness to the truth under danger of life.

Before that, I'm not interested in what you say. It's not interesting, gentlemen. It's just imitation, echo of other people's thought.

*Everything worth, gentlemen, has to be personified by a whole man's life.*

## II *THE GREEKS HAVE EXHAUSTED THE POSSIBILITIES OF THINKING*

1

Now the strange story of Greek philosophy is, gentlemen, that every thought that the human mind can think up about the universe, about man, and about the direction of man's life in the universe, or the treatment of man by the universe have been thought before. And that's Greek philosophy.

So the history of Greek philosophy is like going to the system of botany, as you find in botany all the plants, and as you find in zoology all the animals, you find in Greek philosophy all the thoughts, but all the thoughts embodied by philosophers.

2

So not just some flimsy midsummer-night dream thought, what you call a "thought" in a bull session. I mean, "I had an idea." And next minute you say, "I'm sorry. I forgot it." But ideas lived by a whole man's life, and thereby impregnated and able to leave an imprint on the history of humanity.

Plato stands for the doctrine of ideas, so he's still alive. If he had just played with it in a bull session and then forgotten it next day, nobody would either know the doctrine of ideas nor would he know Plato.

3

But you all have heard at least the name Plato, and he has become terrible reality in the Bolshevik government in Moscow. They are all Platonists. Because their ideas are stronger than their practical experience.

They can put people in concentration camps because they are enemies of society, while this is their own relation. And all these real, experienced feelings do not count. Under the idea you forget even your empirical contact and feelings.

Husband denounces wife; wife denounces husband; children denounce their parents, because the idea is paramount that they are an enemy of society, enemy of the class.

That's all Platonism.

4

Well, once upon a time, this man has lived. Now the strange thing is that the Greeks have exhausted the possibilities of thinking. So the first tremendous impact of this

lecture course should be on you that there is no progress in your sense of the world in thought.

Man in the Christian era has not been able to invent new things totally. He has entered new combinations. Everything can be combined in a new thing, but the theory of the electron, which we hold today about the elements is found in Greek philosophy first. The atom theory and the idea that the whole universe consists of equal things is the oldest doctrine we find in Greek philosophy, already 500 B.C.

We have to talk about this once more.

### III *DO NOT TRY TO BE NOT ORIGINAL, BUT VERACIOUS*

1

Today I only make this first point, gentlemen: Greek philosophers have exhausted the possibilities of original thought.

2

That's very much against your idea of automatic progress. You think that because you are born younger than I, you must have better ideas than I. As long as you think this, gentlemen, you can do no thinking. He is the most original man, gentlemen, who tries to be the ordinary, the true man, who tries to think the truth. In order to think the truth, you must forget all catering to originality.

3

You will be the most original thinker under one condition: that you don't try to be original, but veracious. All the philosophers of Greece, gentlemen, tried to be the philosopher, the only one, the only true philosopher. And that's why they are marked out by great originality.

If you turn around, go to Broadway, where they have to invent something original, all these people are forgotten the next day. They may have a hit, they may create a sensation. They may tickle your senses. But it's ephemeral, because they try to be original.

4

Anybody who tries to be original, gentlemen, is an enemy of philosophy. He may be very successful in his own day. And he probably will lure the people, as in a true circus. "Never seen!" "Sensation!" "For the first time!" "Only time in the world!"

There was a department store in New York 50 years ago with a sign: "The only original cone in the world." It was a good joke. There are many cones in the world, as you know. But he was the only original cone in the world.

That's a joke.

#### *IV TRUTH DEMANDS FROM US SUBMISSION*

1

Serious people, gentlemen, want to represent the human kind. Therefore, human thought is philosophical only if it is generic.

2

If you say to yourself, "I want to think what every human being wants to think, has to think, should think," you see, "is privileged to think." As soon as you think, "I want to make an impact on the world by making something which nobody else has done," you become like this man who became famous in antiquity and he burned the famous temple in Ephesus of Diana. And the people said, "We won't fulfill this man's desire. We won't name him. We won't mention his name anymore, so that he may be forgotten, and he may not come to the goal of his ambition to be renowned for his misdeed."

Hitler, all arsons -- arson I think is an attempt to do something original. You know, there are these firebugs in the world, as there are juvenile delinquents. They want to make a name for themselves by being original. And it is nearly always a destructive act., you can be original by destroying.

3

But to be true, gentlemen, you must not try to be original. The funny thing is that Plato is highly original; Aristotle is original. But both people did not want to be original.

A good mother, gentlemen, will give birth to the best child -- tries to be just a mother. If she tries to be an original mother, she will end in Hollywood, and she'll have to adopt children.

4

That's a very strange rule, gentlemen, of truth. Truth demands from us submission, obedience to truth. Anybody who tries to be original doesn't want to obey, but to stay in command.

That's why most young men are so highly unoriginal, because in their pride, they want to show what they know, and what they have thought, and it is always borrowed, and it is always plagiarized, and it is always just repetition. Any man who forgets that it is self who speaks or thinks, you see, is on the way to truth.

In other words, gentlemen, all truth is selfless.

#### *V A REBELLION IN ALL COSMIC FORCES*

1

The relation of philosophy, gentlemen, then is a very queer one. It is the relation of the mind to truth in the form of obedience.

2

Obedience is not popular in this country, but it's the one quality without which any civilization dies. This is a disobedient country, and that's why it is so shallow, and has such a poor prognostication for the future.

You cannot talk in this country about the future, because the future can only be reached by obedience and service. It can never be reached by self-seeking or by Cadillacs.

3

It's impossible if you say, "I want this and this," to have any future, gentlemen. The first question toward the future obviously is: what did God mean as "the end of the world"? If you don't obey this end, you will miss it; you will go astray. If you ask "What do I want?" you provoke a tremendous rebellion in all the cosmic forces, because obviously you little frog, or you little bee, or you little wasp, and -- I myself the same way, we are not up against these cosmic forces.

4

We'd better obey; we are so small. We'd better find out what we are meant to do. And that's only to be found by obedience.

*VI THE TWO BIG STREAMS: THE BIBLE AND GREEK PHILOSOPHY*

1

So the first thing that will strike you, gentlemen, is that all Greek philosophy is a great act of obedience.

It has been said very simply if you want to know why you are not philosophers so far, why you are self-seeking individuals and why you therefore are not in contact with truth, but just with opinion, and with editorials, and with broadcasting, and with television, and all these fleeting, floating, indifferent fogs in which you move.

2

I'm sorry, I slipped on this in my eagerness. I can't carry -- perhaps it comes back to me.

3

The quality of obedience then is nothing that distinguishes philosophers, gentlemen, from religious man. But I made an attempt last time to put you on your guard to see that Greek philosophy is not in the same sense religious as the prophets of Israel. The Bible and Greek philosophy obviously form two big streams, two big avenues to truth, and they are of a very different character.

And although I have not completed quite what I meant to say at this moment, my next thing, what I would like to stress today is that there is a simple way of defining the distinction between philosophy, the service of truth in obedience and selflessness. There is still a difference between the service of God in the sanctuary, of prayer.

4

Philosophy is not in itself prayer. And prayer is not philosophy. But obviously both are attempts to meet the truth, and to fulfill man's destiny, to find the way, the direction in which we can fulfill our destiny, and receive the commands under which we want to act.

VII *THERE IS NO SCIENCE WITHOUT YOUR AND MY SACRIFICE FOR IT*

1

Well, I'm back now, now I can make the point.

Gentlemen, the modern scientist is perhaps the most unphilosophical being there is. That's so frightening. I mean, this is a nation of plumbers. They call themselves "engineers," and the engineers call themselves "scientists," and the scientists think that they have the secrets of the world. But they do usually not know that they obey.

2

What is the command over all science?

The imperative.

And that is the great achievement of Greek philosophy to bring this out: the imperative that is written in large letters over anybody who enters the science field is, "Let there be science." He does not question the necessity that science has to be. And science is a human creation.

There is no science without your and my sacrifice for it.

3

Now you all, who think enough to be scientific, or objective, or enlightened, or rational, or whatever you call it, unemotional, you have this big order written in front of your skull: science shall be.

Instead of the Ten Commandments, which I as a person prefer, you have this one commandment: let there be science.

4

That's very difficult for a scientist to understand that he's obeying. That is, that a scientist is God.

But you all, gentlemen, in this country, the one thing you can appeal to even with a truck driver or with a housewife is that s- -- "Oh, science? Well, we have to have science," they will admit. They will bow to it, and if they say it's scientifically necessary, they will have themselves questionaired, and analyzed, and tested, because it's science.

What can you do about it? Even if it is highly destructive, science has to be worshiped, science has to be paid for, science has to be served.

So people answer the most obscene questionnaires just from fear that they might desert the cause of science.

## VIII *THE NUMBER OF POSSIBLE COMMANDS*

1

Philosophy now, gentlemen, is the knowledge of our commands.

And it brings out, among other things, that the imperative, "Let there be science," is a perfectly arbitrary imperative, if you leave it alone.

Obviously it cannot be the only imperative. You can also say, "Let there be me," "Let there be the United States," you see. And Hitler said, "Let there be the German race". And if you push one command, obviously you go crazy.

2

The number of imperatives, as I may call it, or commands to which we owe obedience is the great problem of philosophy. But in order to know what is necessary, the philosophers must themselves act under a necessity.

3

Anybody, gentlemen, who is in philosophy investigates commands under one condition: that he knows what a command is. And he can only be an expert in investigating commands that dominate our life: patriotism, lawfulness, loyalty, reverence, love, friendship, whatever you take -- science, power, vanity, whatever you cultivate -- youth, vitality, dynamism, revolution, democracy -- he can only discuss these big gods, these idols, if he has some experience in worship.

4

And therefore gentlemen, philosophers must obey their sense of wonder. The god which the philosopher serves is his admission that this which he does not understand attracts him, and deserves his investigation, his following it.

*IX PROPHET: THE POWER IN THE BACK OF US – PHILOSOPHER SPEAKING OF THE POWERS WE CAN FACE*

1

What's the difference, gentlemen, then of this obedience of the philosopher to the obedience of a prophet like Isaiah, in the Old Testament?

I think today we shall devote a little more time to laying down the law why Judaism and Greek thought are eternal approaches to life, to truth, to reality, whatever you call it. They are eternal.

2

There is as much Jews and Greeks today as there were 2,000 years ago. We only know that they both have to co-exist, whereas the Greeks thought they could do without the Jews, and the Jews thought they could do without the Greeks.

We know better. We have to have both elements.

3

Gentlemen, the prophet speaks of the power which is in the back of us. And the philosopher speaks of the powers which we can face.

That's a very simple, I think, distinction. But I tell you, it is a very precious one. You don't find them in textbooks, because unfortunately the textbooks about Greek philosophy or modern philosophy are written by people who say that they have no truck with prophecy. And the Biblical scholars, or theologians, or preachers on Sunday school pulpits, they think they have no truck with the Greeks.

I think this thinking in water-tight compartments is silly. I have all my life not forgotten that I pray on Sunday when I thought on weekdays. And I have not forgotten on Sundays that I think on weekdays. These are two realities between which anybody has to alternate.

You too, gentlemen, whether you know it or not.

4

We always pray, gentlemen, between the beginning of an enterprise and its end, because nobody else believes us in this time. So we need some reinforcement.

You are secretly in love with a girl. It takes you a year before you convince your parents that you should marry her. During this year you have a religion. You pray to some power that may keep you afloat. You cannot prove your point to anybody. You don't even know if you are right. You are testing it. What keeps you going, this time? Why don't you shoot yourself the first day you have this unhappy idea that you should get married? Why do you brave the storms?

X *THE INVISIBLE PART OF LIFE*

1

Anybody -- take an author. Who has written a short story in his life? Not one of you?

Now, that's an honest man. All right.

Well, gentlemen, any author who conceives of a little opus he wants to write, and finishes it, is kept going, while this is working in him, by his faith. Because before he has finished the story, he cannot even prove to himself that it's worth writing. It must be there.

2

Any mother who carries a child for nine months in her womb, can only do this by faith. She doesn't know how it comes out. It may be a monster that is born. As you know, the people tell us today how many dangers there are in our genes. And so they try to frighten us. And all these poor women, if they really fall into the hands of these modern crypto-scientists, they are terrified by all the dangers they run into. Blood groups are not right, and so on, and so on. And they are all quite sure that they must die. But they don't.

3

Now gentlemen, in any process which you cannot see, you are on the side of prayer, and on the side of the prophets, and the side of mere faith, because this has to do with the things in back of us, that pushing us on.

A woman in love takes the consequences. She is pushed forward by her love until the child is born. She hardly know knows how she gets through all this. But she does. She cannot see the god who makes her bear the child. That's the invisible part of life, gentlemen. She can only know that she should obey such great urge.

4

So, gentlemen, the Bible has to do, as you know, with the invisible part of God, because God is in back of the believer. He pushes you and me forward. But if you turn around, you don't see anything. You can hear God's voice, but you can never see God.

Again, it's so funny; this isn't mentioned today.

## XI THE VISIBLE PARTS OF LIFE

1

The Greek story is the opposite, gentlemen. The Greeks say this: "What is behind you, you cannot see; but you see what is before you."

2

I've found this in an old Greek text this morning, by accident. I'm very glad I did. It's a very good definition of philosophy. Will you take it down:

*what is behind you, you cannot see; but you see what is before you.*

3

Now all Greek philosophy says and tries to say, "Make everything visible, then you will know what it is."

The Jews neglect the eye, and the Greeks emphasize it. All Greek words of knowledge are connected with the visual sense. The word "insight," as you use it yourself, is taken from "sight." And it's a very important word. The word "idea" means by and large the same: that what appears before the inner eye. An idea is that which I do not have to see outside, physically, but I still can see with the inner eye.

4

Now if you try to see God with the inner or the outer eye, you are pagan. The Jews would reject this. God must be listened to. You cannot see God.

When Moses tried to see God, God said, "It cannot be done. I'm sorry. You are my favorites, but you cannot see me."

## XII AMERICA'S DESTINY

1

And I think the whole story of you and me is this knowledge that we are moved by two different tendencies: by the attempt of making things visible, and therefore knowing them; and by our understanding that we ourselves cannot live by sight. But we are pushed forward by forces that push us forward to the famous, unknown destiny.

2

As you know, this country is so Greek that it even called the Pacific "Manifest Destiny." First it stopped at the Mississippi, then at the Rockies, and finally in California. But you know, if you overextend the idea of Manifest Destiny, you end in Saipan, and in the teahouse under the moon. And that's very bad, because obviously there is no manifest destiny for Americans right there and then.

3

And so the manifest destiny, the attempt to see the future of America in terms of visibility, I think is in tatters, is in ruin. And the sooner the American people would understand that you can no longer see the destiny of America, the sooner perhaps you may find what the destiny could be.

At this moment, as you know, since 1890, this country is torn between Puerto Rico and the Philippines, and a decent respect for humanity on the other hand. And we haven't solved it -- as you see from our treatment of the Suez Canal and the Panama Canal.

In the Panama Canal, it's manifest destiny that the United States should own Panama, the Panama Canal Zone. But in the Suez Canal, we aren't so sure, because it is outside our direction of our seeing. So we suddenly invent new principles for the other international waterway. And this we call our idealism.

4

It's a very poor policy, gentlemen, and it comes all in America from its preponderant Greek attitude in the last 150 years, gentlemen. America wanted to see the whole truth.

XIII *LOVE IS UNSEEN*

1

And my history of Greek philosophy therefore is bound to collide with your illusions that it is enough to see everything, or to make it visible.

The Greek way towards truth, gentlemen, is one-half of the way to truth. And not more. And I think any history of philosophy that tries to sell you philosophy as enabling a man to be just a philosopher and nothing else is a great cheat today. It leads into Communism; it leads into fascism; it leads into any monism, into the idea that if I see things, I already know what to do.

2

As you know, nobody is more cruel than the voyeur, as the French call him, the man who sits at a burlesque show and looks at a stripteaser. If he has any humanity, he would go to the stage and go home with this girl. Ja, that's a human action.

To be sensuously excited is not bad, gentlemen, but to be not excited enough to go home with this girl -- that's cruelty. That's staring at things that must not be looked at. That's obscenity.

3

What is obscene, gentlemen? That you are not passionate. That's obscene. That you play, joke, laugh about something that should excite you to the roots of your being.

So a reasonable person doesn't expose himself to {sexual} excitement unless he can follow it up. But to go wantonly to this, this is for old people, gentlemen, or for scoundrels, because seeing there runs away with you into realms where seeing is no good.

4

Love is not to be seen, gentlemen. Love is unseen. Invisible. If you leave it invisible and at night, you will fall very sick.

Now the whole country, as you know, America, is sick by this, what is called by the French, the voyeur. Gentlemen, "voyeur" means the people -- the people who peep through keyholes. "Voyeur" means trying to look where - there is nothing to see. Where you either have to be in love yourself, you see, or leave things alone.

*XIV NEITHER THE JEWISH NOR THE GREEK WAY ARE ENOUGH*

1

So gentlemen, the first rule about philosophy is: what can be achieved by philosophy?

And there is a limitation. Philosophy can never deal with those things which are never to be seen.

Prayer neglects the world and says, "If I have you, my God," the famous prayer runs, "What do I care for Heaven and earth?" That is, all the visible things.

2

You know this from the psalm. That's very true, gentlemen. But still it's very nice to have 10 acres of land, and a garden, and a tree. That's all visible, there's very much to be known about it.

3

So I think neither the Jewish nor the Greek way are enough. The Israelites too have now land; they have a country; they have a city; they have railroads; they have citrus fruit. They have all kind of visible things. A nation needs this.

4

So the paradox between Greek philosophy, gentlemen, and Jewish prophecy is that both are educators of the rest of humanity, and both have sacrificed their own happiness, and you may say their own fulfillment to this service for all of us.

The Greeks represent an extreme. And Israel represents an extreme. In Greece, a whole nation has been sacrificed with, and for, and in the direction of, an attempt to teach all mankind what can be made visible, and what can be learned by looking at things.

*XV PHILOSOPHY IS ONLY ONE HALF*

1

Gentlemen, the Greeks are sacrifices.

And Israel is sacrifice. The chosen people certainly are sacrificed, and the chosen minds are sacrificed for your and my sake.

2

If we today can look back at the Bible, we are very glad that we don't have to Jeremiah, obviously. But with the help of Jeremiah, we may prevent the fall of America. Jeremiah couldn't prevent the fall of Jerusalem. If you read the Bible right, you must be grateful that in one great case, you know all the consequences when people do not obey orders from the invisible.

And in Greek tradition, you can see what happens when people neglect reason, neglect the search for nature, and causes, and science, because the Greek philosophers have founded all the sciences we enjoy today.

3

This was then my first thesis today, gentlemen. I think it is important for you to understand this from the very beginning, that to be a philosopher today is never something exclusive.

The wise philosophers have known this. The stupid philosophers do not know this today. You can today in America distinguish the philosophers who know that philosophy is only one-half of the powers that lead us to truth; and the idiots who think, like the Free Masons, that philosophy can replace everything else.

4

We have then two roads. Prophecy, dealing with the powers that we cannot hope to make visible; and Greek philosophy, dealing with the powers that we can hope to make visible.

Anybody who only thinks of one of these roads, gentlemen, is already impoverished. Does not make use of a great help, of a great aid on the other side.

#### XVI SCHOPENHAUER AND DANIEL WEBSTER

1

Now, I give you a great modern example, gentlemen, of this admission of a philosopher that he's only entitled to one-half of authority and leadership in matters of truth.

You may have heard the name of Schopenhauer.

2

This is a little difficult, the man's spelling,

3

Schopenhauer, one of the few independent thinkers of the 19th century. Most thinkers in the 19th century were taken in by the bourgeois class and were, like Daniel Webster, for sale. Corrupt.

Daniel Webster is this outstanding example of this corruption by money. Was a great lawyer, and a great mind. But I think the play, *The Devil and Daniel Webster*, could be rewritten, because Webster was in the grip of the devil. And you know that's why Whittier wrote this terrible accusation against Webster. Has anybody read Greenleaf Whittier's poem against Webster? Who has?

Ja. I mean I'm always proud to think that in New England this poem was written in the lifetime of Webster, debunking him and denouncing him as a corrupt thinker.

4

Well, Webster would have said, "Oh, I'm a philosopher, and of course I'm better than even a Christian, because philosophy can explain Christianity even, so my philosophy is all-comprehensive."

## XVII SCHOPENHAUER'S TESTAMENT

1

Gentlemen, this man Schopenhauer was a contemporary of Webster, by and large. He lived from 1788 to 1860.

2

Perhaps you take his dates even down. It's quite interesting, because it is the Greek phase of Europe. That is, the renaissance of Greek philosophy which was then at its high point. It's hard to understand how much at that time Greek set the standard for everything, the model, the style was Greek classicism, you would imitate the pillars of the Acropolis.

It was the time when the Elgin Marbles were sent from Athens to the British Museum, where they still are the pride of the British Museum. This is worship of Greek spirit.

3

Well, this man Schopenhauer wrote his famous philosophy, *The World as Will and as Representation. Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung*. And he exercises an influence as great as Emerson on the world. I mean, Richard Wagner's operas were written around Schopenhauer's philosophy. And when he died, he made a testament in honor of those soldiers' widows and orphans who had died in throwing down the rebellion of '48 in Europe.

This man was so aware that he, as a philosopher, was in great danger of neglecting obedience, that he wanted to honor the obedience of those soldiers who, in a most difficult position, against their own countrymen, had obeyed the law and laid down their life for order.

4

For an American, hard to understand, the sympathy of the philosopher with people who shoot against rioters, MacArthur could never run for president, because he had commanded a march against rioters in Washington in 1932. That's General MacArthur's tragedy. That finished him politically. Because in this country, you always side with rebels. And you always think that a soldier who shoots at a striker is less good than the rebel who is shot at.

## XVIII PHILOSOPHY COMES TOO LATE

1

Now obviously, the thing has two sides. If you have no social order and if you have nobody who defends the order, then there is no order. And the obedience of the soldier may be a blind and naive one, but as long as this mortar and cement is there, you can live in peace and study at Dartmouth College. And as soon as you people stand for anarchy, and independence of everybody, and mere philosophy -- "Wait till I have thought it out" -- there would be no order in which you could follow up your thinking.

2

And Schopenhauer, in this very strange testament, which of course became quite famous, wanted to express his indebtedness to the opposite way of life, which is one of strict obedience, you see, without questioning.

And it shows you perhaps from the very beginning the paradox of philosophy.

3

All philosophers rely on other people not being philosophers. Philosophy can never be the exclusive nourishment of the human mind, for the simple reason that it comes too late. If we would have to wait always for any order of our actions, and all the actions of our sisters, mothers, brothers, until we have found our final system, we'd all be starved to death, by that time.

4

Philosophy takes time, gentlemen. And during that time, somebody else has to rule. And it's one of the amazing stories of America, gentlemen, that during the last 30 years, a heresy called pragmatism could be believed, where people lived in a fool's paradise, and everybody had thought -- time enough to think up for himself all the truth, and could sit back and wait until he had found the truth; and allegedly nothing had to be done in the meantime.

In the meantime, the people have to obey. And they have to fight wars. And you cannot go to the battlefield with the ridiculous comfort of Mr. John Dewey that pragmatism will one day tell me what I might think right.

#### *XIX IN THOUGHT, TOO, THERE ARE TWO SEXES*

1

Gentlemen, this country is very sick, because this dualism of prophecy and philosophy has been tampered with. The great inheritance of America during the last 30 -- 40 years has been thrown away. It has been based on the coalition of Israel, of the Bible, and of Greek philosophy. That's Christianity: the synthesis between the two. And during the last 40 years, you have been fed on the absolute fallacy that you could wait for the results of philosophy to live.

2

Gentlemen, while I am indulging in philosophy here, and you are here in this course, we are indebted to all those people who, while we are thinking, obey the existing order and law.

And if you do not see this interaction, gentlemen, between philosophy and prophecy, and the Ten Commandments, then every step into philosophy will be a misunderstanding, as it largely is in America. What is called in America "philosophy" is nothing but a game of the human mind. What you do in bull sessions, where you abolish God at random and enthrone Him again, occasionally.

3

Once you have understood, gentlemen, that in thought, too, there are two sexes, two genders: male and female, receptive and active, prophecy and philosophy. And philosophy is purely the male gender, the one that says, "I think," then you live in reality again. Then the brown study of philosophy will not overtake you.

As long as you think, "I think what I think," and that's the whole story, you are not a real human being, because you forget that you are only one-half of humanity. You don't have to call it even "male" and "female," gentlemen. The male and female in the flesh is only a subdivision of the truth that all truth comes to us and is begotten by us.

It is received, and it is uttered. You are impressed by the truth, and you express truth.

Where you are sitting here, I am trying to impress the truth on you. Obviously you go out, you have to say something, it will be your truth, and it will seem active.

4

Now if you think that only the active operations of your mind are the whole story, you deny your true experience, because you couldn't think if nobody had thought into you. You couldn't speak if I hadn't spoken to you, or if your mother hadn't spoken to you. You are only the thoroughfare between receiving and between giving out.

You are never the source of any truth.

## XX ABOLISH BELIEVING?

1

Gentlemen, nobody is the source of truth. We are all only in the metabolism. And you may say that you are one of those posts on a power line through which the electric cable is strung.

But that's the most you can boast of, to be one of the pillars of the power line. But you are not the power station. You do not beget the electricity.

2

And it is strange, gentlemen, that all the great philosophers who have come nearest to being their own power station, people like Plato or Schopenhauer, any really creative thinker has been most convinced of the fact that he is not really the power station himself, that he also has received in order to give.

3

So we also will respect this dualism, gentlemen. Man's mind then is: Gentlemen, bisexual. And that is our honor. That's why I am immersed in reality.

If you really thought that your mind was against the whole universe, it would be highly improbable that anything good would come out of this mind. You would be too estranged from this world, you would be just like a plant trying to grow on blacktop. It can't be done.

But that's by and large the American superstition, that here is man and there is the universe. You look at the universe and this you call your philosophy. Because you think seeing is believing, you confuse the two things. We want to abolish believing, and you want to have only seeing.

4

So gentlemen, the mind is bisexual, and the Greek philosophy is one sex of the mental process. Let us put it this drastical way, because it's a great fact that the world is not just physically sex. It is spiritually sex, too.

The creative process is the marriage of two minds. And Shakespeare knew this. That's why you need a friend even as a philosopher, so that your truth can be reflected in him and in the opposite sequence. Take Engels and Marx. Take Montaigne and Boetius.

Who has read Montaigne?

*XXI THE PHILOSOPHER MUST LOVE WHO THINKS OPPOSITE*

1

Well, the whole Greek experience of philosophical friendship is summed up in Montaigne's Chapter 28 of the first book of his Essays. Anybody who wants to give a treat to his girlfriend should read this essay. It's very simple, because he even says there, it's like a marriage of minds. It's something very chaste. It has nothing to do with your idiotic treatment of sex, but it has to do with the deep cosmic sequence that the higher we come up in the scale of creative life, gentlemen, the more polarity is needed to have life.

2

As you know, the stones do not have to divide to subsist. They are just there. Then you get the algae, they have already the division of the cell. When it comes to men and mammals, you have to have female and male.

Now if it comes to spirit, the embrace, the mutual polarization is even more needed.

You need -- for the greatest truth, gentlemen, you need enmity. Not just love. That's why Christianity, who was after the Holy Spirit, had to say, "Love thine enemy," because if you do not love thine enemy, you omit part of the truth. This, your enemy, represents also part of the truth.

3

Now, physical love, gentlemen, sexual being, that's going by attraction. So you marry, you love, you go with the person you like.

The philosopher, gentlemen, must love the man who thinks the opposite. That's much more difficult, but it's a greater result. If I do not think the truth that is opposed to my truth, I cannot grow into the full truth.

4

Isn't that obvious? Any truth that I hold is partial as long as somebody can oppose my truth.

You understand this?

*XXII TO HAVE ALL TRUTH EMBRACE EACH OTHER*

1

Here we come to the second discovery of the Greek mind.

Since the Greek mind tried to see everything, and make everything visible -- that is, act upon the truth as an agent, and not submit to the truth as a victim or as an obedient servant -- since the servant in Isaiah is the great accomplishment of Judaism, God's servant; and since the philosopher, the thinking, rational master of the universe is the Greek ideal, the Greeks had to place the bisexual element of truth into some other context.

And that's called dialectics.

All Greek thought knew that you had to have a complement to your truth. Somebody could always say the opposite. And if you didn't listen to this opposition, you hadn't gotten any valid truth.

2

So the Greeks, by this problem of having more than one speaking up and saying something, created this history of Greek philosophy, gentlemen.

3

The history of Greek philosophy is an attempt to have all truth embrace each other. If you have a history of Greek philosophy, and every philosopher says something opposite, you see, and you allow everyone to voice his picture of the world, you have a tremendous act of symphonic love, of mutual embrace.

One philosopher can only be a Platonist, or an Aristotelian, or a Stoic, or an Epicurean, or a cynic. But the history of Greek philosophy is the concert, the symphony of all these minds.

4

So the mystery of this idea, that we teach a course in the history of Greek philosophy is an attempt to cure the monopolistic attitude of philosophers that their active mind is the one approach to truth.

XXIII *TRANSCENDALISTS*

1

We have then two dogmas in this course, gentlemen.

One is that the Greeks represent all the attempts of the human mind to act, to react upon the universe by thought, by their own mind's systematic capacity of conceiving, of seeing, of gaining insight.

This is balanced by the fact that we do not teach here a course on Plato alone, or on Aristotle alone, but the story of the dialectics of these minds, how one begot his opponent, his enemy, so that the history of Greek philosophy in itself goes beyond any individual's action, because it has this tolerance that includes this man's opposite number.

2

Can you see this strange paradox of the history of Greek philosophy? We cannot say that Plato is right, that Aristotle is right. But we simply state what they have seen. And we may hope that the panorama, is truer than what everybody has seen.

3

So the history of Greek philosophy, gentlemen, and we need this term. I wanted to introduce it in a kind of human fashion.

One of the most difficult words of the English language -- and I hate to use it, but you have to learn these terms -- is "transcendent". You read in many books what Transcendentalism is, and we had the Concord Transcendentalists.

4

You may have heard of Emerson, and Alcott, and so on.

XXIV *A VIEW OF VIEWS*

1

Now, take it very simply, gentlemen.

The history of Greek philosophy transcends the system of any one philosopher.

It's the most primitive way in which I want to introduce this difficult term, so that it becomes quite familiar to you in a harmless manner. We will have to use it, unfortunately perhaps, again.

2

And you'll run in the literature always into these terms: Kant is a transcendental philosopher, Emerson's idealism transcendental, and then there is a difference between "transcending" and "transcendental."

To hell with all this! However I have tried to avoid this term. I can live without using the term at all.

3

But in our connection, I think it will make sense to you if you remember that any one system of a Greek philosopher tries to give his total insight. And the remarkable thing is that after the man has tried to be very explicit and very complete, up pops another man and says, "Here is my world view".

And the history of Greek philosophy tries then to be a view of views.

4

That's transcendence. Any one of these views is transcended by a view of views which does not reduce any one of these views to another view, which doesn't say, "Oh, Platon has to be explained in terms of Aristotle, and Aristotle in terms of Heraclitus," and so on. No.

We try to have a panorama in which we move on from one system to the next system, but always learning to our amazement, that they see different things. And that one is not refuted by the other.

But you and I know more after we have looked through these different glasses.

Let's have a break here.

## I SELF IS IN THE WAY OF MARRIAGE

1

...idea of full knowledge, and that we know each other, as the Apostle then says in the New Testament, fully. It means that we move as one body.

2

I have several periods in my life had this great fortune of really living with another person so that we could at long distance still know that the other person was living in exactly the same rhythm. These are very rare periods, even with your own wife, that you are in such full harmony that over long distances you respond, and you act, and you correspond over 3,000 miles of water as though you were one body.

But the whole tradition of the Church, of the body of Christ, and the whole tradition of the marriage vows, that any husband and wife become one body, is -- we talked about it yesterday night -- the condition of true love.

Gentlemen, in this country where marriage is a contract, where people give each other rights and pocket money, and think that A is A and B is B, you can never get married. Most people in this country are not married. I know mothers of 12 children in this country who never got married, because they have always kept to themselves.

3

Self is in the way of marriage, gentlemen. It is in the way of friendship.

It's certainly in the way of philosophy, because it means that you remain an individual. And that's too small to encompass any reality. Life begins only of humanity where both sexes get together, because the full man is male and female.

4

You are not complete human beings, gentlemen. You are just one-half of it. But you all pose as he-men, and think that's all.

## II WOLFGANG KÖHLER'S SUPERLATIVE CLAIM

1

Now, I give you an example of the pure Greek mind, perhaps to convince even my interlocutor of the intermission -- who was it? -- that I have an important point.

2

I have a colleague who came at the same time to this country as I did, from Germany. And he was professor of philosophy at the University of Berlin. But he really was only a psychologist. He acquired fame as investigating on the Canary Islands in Madeira the gorillas. And he knows all about them. And he came to Harvard, and he delivered a lecture which to me always has been the high point of Greek arrogance, of philosophical superstition, of what I try to eliminate from the very beginning, as an super, super, superlative claim of philosophy.

3

This man said - his name is Wolfgang Köhler - "What is my ideal? My ideal is to be able to lay on a couch in the surgical operating room of a hospital under the knife of a surgeon who operates my brain, and to be able to see my brain at the same time."

4

He wanted to be object and subject in the same person. He wanted to see it all.

### III *IN THE YEAR OF THE LORD 1933*

1

Now you can't have a clearer statement of the Greek obsession. to make everything visible. I certainly would try to close my eyes and forget all about it, if I had to be operated on my brain. I'm not interested in seeing this at all. I just don't have this curiosity of the voyeur. I think it's a perversity.

But he thought it was an ideal. And the funny thing is that he expected that everybody would share his desire, and that it was acceptable to all his American listeners as tremendous vision.

2

Here is the man under the knife, the scalpel of the surgeon, and he is able to see his own brain while it is operated on, this brain; with the powers of the brain, he can see the brain.

Now I call this schizophrenic.

3

It has been uttered, gentlemen.

This was in the year of the Lord 1933. And therefore the Second World War was inevitable, because when nations deviate from their power to love, and become so aggressive mentally that they want to see the rest of the world only, without embracing it and without obeying common orders, the war is just the expression of this total split.

This man, trying to be male and female inside himself in one, being just a philosopher, cannot pay any attention to the upkeep of the world as a loving and embracing body, obedient to the orders of our maker.

4

Can't you see that Mr. Wolfgang Köhler is responsible for the World War?

#### *IV THE INTESTINES OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER*

1

Mere Greek thinking, gentlemen, leads to war. All philosophy ends in war, because it eternalizes the separation of what we see -- the object; and who sees -- the subject.

The separation of subject and object, if you want to see your wife, you can. But you can't love her then, because to love a person is to forget the distinction of object and subject and to become one.

2

It's very important that we make this point. And I'm glad for your question, but you must see that you have raised a very stupendous question.

3

If you can see God, He will always remain outside of you, because gentlemen, the gist of the matter is: the eye-sense is given us for the outside, what is outside the skin. And if you look with an electric lamp, you still don't see the inside with these modern instruments.

4

I know everybody thinks we should all become diaphanous and see each other's intestines. First, I don't want to see them, and then nothing would be achieved if I could see the intestines of President Eisenhower. If you read the newspapers, that's all the people try to do: see his intestines and then decide whether they should vote for him.

#### V *THE POINT OF MODERN WONDERMENT*

1

Well, it has all happened. The old Etruscans, they looked into the intestines of the animals, and in their sacrifices and they thereby ran their politics.

We have now such an Etruscan. Is called Paul White.

2

This is a superstitious country as any. But it's Greek superstition: make things visible and we think we'll know them.

You know nothing by seeing things.

3

As long as you do not see this paradox, that what you see sometimes is not worth seeing, it doesn't prove anything, you have not reached the point of modern wonderment.

4

Today all thinking, gentlemen, must include Greek philosophy, but it isn't enough to imitate the Greeks. After all, we live 2,000 years later.

#### VI *WINSTON CHURCHILL, WOODROW WILSON*

1

I introduce you into the history of Greek philosophy then with the hope, gentlemen, that you can rise above it. All the people who just try to be philosophers again today,

without this one earmarking our own period as being different from the Greek, I think are monsters.

They plunge certainly the mankind into the Third World War.

2

And America is riddled of these people who say that seeing is believing.

3

I want to make one more point. The example of Wolfgang Köhler is I think an outstanding example. If I could make you shudder over the presumption of this, gentlemen, that he thinks it's the ideal of the philosopher -- that's what he said -- to see himself under the knife of a surgeon, while his brain is operated on, when you see the absurdity of this desire, you will understand the opposite.

We have here a great man on this campus, that's Mr. Steffansson, the Arctic explorer. And when the war broke out, the so-called Second World War, the "unnecessary war" of 1941, then --

who said so? The "unnecessary war"? Who has called the Second World War the "unnecessary war"? It's not my invention.

*(I mean, there was that big argument about whether that one battle was necessary?)*

Oh no. Mr. Truman is not capable of such profound utterances.

No, it was Winston Churchill. Winston Churchill has said this, the Second World War was unnecessary.

4

And you have -- but gentlemen, it will take you a whole life -- the sooner you will understand that it was unnecessary because it was only necessary because of the wrong mentality of America -- that America has produced the Second World War single-handed in 1919, then you will finally have understood Woodrow Wilson who said exactly that before he died.

## VII MR. STEFFANSSON AND THE GLOBE

1

He had the students come to his house in 1923 on his deathbed and said, "There will be a terrible war in 20 years. And the sacrifice of the First World War will look ridiculous compared to the blood, and devastation, and destruction of the Second World War. And it's all because you do not understand, because you want to see things."

2

He ended as a fundamentalist, Woodrow Wilson, because he knew that the Greeks' mind had destroyed America.

And it still does. And I'm not joking, Sir. This war is the unnecessary war if this course on the history of Greek philosophy is understood.

3

Now Mr. Steffansson knew something about these things. He's an independent mind, although he's born in Dakota. And he went to Washington and said, "People," -- in the Pentagon, he said, "Boys, what's the matter with you?" "What have you, Mr. Steffansson?" they asked quite politely. And he said, "Haven't you known that the world is round for 400 years now?" "Oh, yes," they said. "We have always known that." "Yes," he said. "But why haven't you believed it?" "What do you mean?" They were very irritated.

4

And he said, "Well, you may have known it, but you have not believed it, because then you would have put your observation planes into the Aleutians, and not into Hawaii, because you have gone to the place which is the longest distance from Japan, on the Equator. And since the earth is a globe, therefore obviously it's a shorter way via the Aleutians. Less mileage."

They had of course to admit it. And they corrected their mistake.

## VIII *THERE CAN'T BE ANY NEXT WAR*

1

Gentlemen, one of the opening shots, then, of my history of Greek philosophy is that any intellectual act has two sides to it: faith and reason. You can know something and not believe it.

2

Now, you have been brought up in this absolutely silly dichotomy, which even your ministers seem to believe, that people believe certain things, and know other things.

That is not the problem, gentlemen. Dismiss it. The problem of true philosophy is that knowledge may stifle belief, and belief may stifle knowledge of the same thing, the very same thing.

3

If you know that the world is round, you don't have to act upon it for you can store it somewhere in your brain and not do anything with it. Everybody in this country does know, in a way that a Third World War is impossible. But nobody acts on it.

They don't believe it.

The president tries to act on this assumption, but you don't even talk about the next war. There can't be any next war. If you would know this, we would behave differently.

4

But the war industry and the one-third of the American budget would go to pieces, so of course, you don't like the idea. It might interfere with your prosperity.

So there might be a Third World War perfectly abortive, and lead to the end of your civilization, because you don't believe what you know -- perhaps you are too young, but what the people in Washington already know very well.

War is impossible. It hasn't to be tried a third time. And the question is not to know this, but to believe it.

## IX WHAT YOU KNOW, YOU HAVE TO BELIEVE

1

Will you kindly then take down -- one more result, gentlemen, of this discussion of prophecy and philosophy?

*The same man must believe what he knows, and know what he believes.*

It is no longer interesting to say, "I believe in the Virgin Mary -- in the virgin birth, and I know that it is impossible". The problem is to know that the earth is round, and one, and a very small speck, a planet, and to act on this assumption in your political bearings and your thought.

2

That's much more difficult. The people in Alabama show you that it is nearly impossible. You know that man is born equal, but you don't act upon it. You don't believe it.

3

Gentlemen, faith and knowledge are the old bugaboos, so to speak, in the conflict between science and religion.

Gentlemen, science and religion are both dead. Faith and philosophy are something quite different.

The living faith of a person, gentlemen, may be stifled by dead knowledge. And mere faith may be lazy to implement it by communication in philosophical terms.

4

What I believe I've tried to express reasonably, so that you can know what I believe. And what you know, you have to believe.

You know that you shall honor a hoary head, and shall get up, and shall honor your parents. You know this, but do you believe it? It's the only interesting question. And you know that you must leave your parents and cleave to the wife of your choosing.

But do these apron-string students of Dartmouth know that their girl must be more than just a substitute for sex? Do they break away from their mother? When does it happen?

*X SELECTION MEANS TO FORGET EVERYTHING ELSE*

1

The last day I ran into this story.

A young Dartmouth boy got married. His mother, one of these possessive, wonderful mothers, all-loving, all-powerful, omnipotent. She built a little tiny apartment on top of the parents' cottage, and forced this daughter-in-law, who came from abroad, to live with them. Well, the poor girl, for a fortnight after the wedding day, had gray hair.

2

I would get gray hair, too, in such a condition. Because the boy did not know that he had no right to bring this young woman from Europe into her mother-in-law's house, that this was a crime -- he hadn't hurt, he thinks -- he goes to church even, this boy. And he had himself carefully baptized before they got married so that they could have a religious ceremony.

But it didn't help, because he didn't believe anything of the ceremony he had gone through with. So he brought this poor woman, who accepted this, and is now victimized. And all the light has gone out of her face.

How else could it be? He broke the law. He didn't believe what he knew.

3

A man who cannot stop loving his mother for 24 hours has no right to marry. He must forget his mother. Then the love to his mother will come back another time. When he has grandchildren, she will be very glad to have grandchildren. But she can only have real grandchildren if he can forget his father and his mother from love for his wife, because otherwise he's impotent. He has no power to select.

4

Selection means to forget everything else.

## XI *THE TWO ROADS: FAITH AND PHILOSOPHY*

1

When your mother says, "I'll die from a broken heart," if you really love the wife of your choosing, you must say to your mother, "I'm very sorry, but I can't change that."

She never dies from a broken heart. She knows that she has overstepped her mark. She has no right to complain when the boy finally gets a man. If she says this, she just hasn't been spanked enough in life. They all have a broken heart at random, over the telephone, long-distance.

2

But that's all done in this country because, gentlemen, there is a total distinction between faith and knowledge and seeing, and this is important. But it's a different kind.

3

The two things, the prophetic insight, that comes from obedience, that is, actualization of the truth, application of the truth, where the truth is not doubted, and the philosophical way in which we find the truth, and therefore has to be doubted before we settle on the final truth, they are in opposition as two parts of the same way.

Any truth, gentlemen, like the one, "The earth is round," has one road in which we acquire the knowledge of this truth, and it has another way into our system by which with this truth then permeates every act of our being.

4

We call this permeation by the truth, being permeated by the truth "faith." And we call the acquisition of the truth "philosophy."

## XII *KNOWN AND BELIEVED*

1

But these are correlative. Can you see that one is nothing without the other.

And I think this country is sick, and by the way the whole Western world, and that's why the Russians laugh at us, and feel that we are all decadent, because both schools, the philosophers and the ministers, have built themselves up as if they were owners of the total road.

2

The road towards truth, and the permeation by truth cannot be separated, ever.

3

So the result of all this for today, gentlemen, is something I think quite fruitful. In the history of philosophy, we must hold onto the real problem of truth in our own life, gentlemen, that it has to be at the same time known and believed. Known and believed. And you think that is not so.

4

Gentlemen, if the United States sacrificed \$3 billion for the Groves project in the atomic bomb, that's faith, isn't it? Because it's actualization. You go ahead and you give everything you have for producing it. That's not knowledge. That's faith.

### XIII *LOVE, HOPE, FAITH*

1

As I said, anybody who writes a short story, while he's writing it, acts on faith, because he doesn't know how he makes out. Nobody can tell him. And he can only prove later that he knew all the time. But hardly knows all the time, because he's sleepless, and he doesn't know. Of course, he is wavering, himself. But it permeates his system until it's out, this little child of his imagination.

The same as a pregnancy of a woman. She goes through with the nine months on faith.

2

Faith and knowledge pertain to the same content.

3

Once you know this, you are highly superior human beings, because nine tenths of the Americans don't wish to know this. They think knowledge is for one thing, and faith is for another thing. And so what has happened is, gentlemen, since you are all little scientists, you only have faith in scientific things. And therefore you think you must buy all these things that are produced, conscientiously.

4

If you would know that all knowledge, and all faith are always concerned with the same things, you might also care to know about things that deserve to be believed in, like love, or hope, or faith itself, or peace, and all the good things of the spiritual life.

#### XIV *THE SEQUENCE: BELIEVED AND KNOWN, AND: KNOWN AND LOVED*

1

But it has very much to do with your strange Greek upbringing, that you have despised things of mere faith, you have said. "Oh, we want to know."

But gentlemen, where you know, you also believe. So you can turn it around, too: perhaps where we believe, we also ought to know.

2

You know many more things, gentlemen, by faith that are worth knowing -- for example, friendship, and love, and loyalty. They'll never be commodities. They'll never be scientifically so. But one can know many things.

My course itself is an attempt to show you that this very wonderful spectrum of the human spirit first is believed. You must believe that it is worthwhile knowing philosophy before you understand a thing about it. Why are you here - just by word of mouth?

Somebody has told you it's a worthwhile thing to study philosophy. You don't know this now. I try to make you know why you love philosophy.

3

Gentlemen, all invisible things must be believed first and known later. All visible things -- the opposite is true. You can first know them and love them later. First you

see a mountain, and finally - it took the people of this world 5,000 years before they dared to climb the Alps. They were hated. They were feared. They saw them all the time. They knew they were there. But they wouldn't climb them.

Today we climb them. The love has come later to the visible things.

4

It's always this way. And the invisible things we love first, and later we come to know them.

#### *XV THE JEWS AND THE GREEKS HAD THE SAME THEME*

1

So the relation of faith and knowledge and faith is itself a problem of philosophy.

And I promise you, when we read Lucretius next time, you may be surprised to find that the ancient Greeks were not half as impotent in their thinking as modern pragmatists are, and modern American scientists. They had this great passion of reconciling faith and knowledge for the same thing.

2

The thing that has happened in the last centuries is really very terrifying, gentlemen. If I speak of belief here, today, in this country, or faith, they say it's a luxury for Sundays. And they do not know that the World War II was only won because Mr. Steffansson went down in time to Washington told them that they should believe that the earth was round, and not just know it for their geology courses. They hadn't done anything about it, so they hadn't believed it.

As you see, one-half of all your political knowledge is dead-letter -- because you don't believe it. You will pay lip service to democracy, but you worship Hollywood and rich men. Anybody does this certainly doesn't believe what he says.

3

So faith and knowledge are Greek problems. And we'll see when we read Lucretius a very exciting thing follows, gentlemen. The Jews and the Greeks had the same theme, only they arranged it in opposite order.

The Jews didn't want to forget what man believed. And then they said, "As far as possible, we must know this."

The Greeks didn't want to forget what they could see -- the world, the earth, the water around them, the things. Then they wanted to get as far as they could in their love of this, in their belief in it.

And both in a way are therefore two great experiments carried out over a thousand years for us.

4

You can learn from Judaism, and from the Greek philosophy, how far can man get from one starting point. The Greeks begin with the visible, gentlemen, so they begin with knowledge. But they never, never, never have given up the path of believing in it, too.

#### XVI ANY GREEK PHILOSOPHER ALSO REMAINS AND IS A THEOLOGIAN

1

That is, gentlemen, now comes the secret of this meeting today, gentlemen: the relation of knowledge and faith is:

*the treatment of reality as world or as God.*

2

When we believe, we have a relation to a power that is superior to us. We must.

When the earth is round, she can give us order. If you only know it, it's a world. We look at it, it's nature.

3

Now the Greeks begin with seeing, but they always worship the gods. In antiquity, there has always been the problem: how much worship besides knowledge? So any Greek philosopher

this is the formula I want you to take down very carefully, gentlemen -

*any Greek philosopher also remains and is a theologian.*

The ancient notion of philosophy is richer than ours.

4

In modern philosophy, the philosophers are nothing but philosophers. In all ancient philosophers, you find an equally strong streak of theology.

The great name of Plato in antiquity was The Theologian. And the best book on Greek philosophy written in the last 10 years is written by Mr. Jaeger, Werner Jaeger at Harvard. You may have heard of his book, *Paideia*. It's used quite much in Classical Civilization -- Mr. Jaeger has written his best book on the theology of Greek philosophers. The theology of the Greek philosophers, because they made clear that all these people tried to believe also what they knew, and tried to make us believe, in these powers, as the regulating principles to which we should owe obedience. Not just knowledge.

## XVII GOD COMMANDS

1

The world doesn't command, gentlemen. God commands.

Now the same power I can treat as the world by looking at it - I can treat it as God by bowing to it.

2

So gentlemen, the Greeks are all philosophers and theologians.

3

The history of Greek philosophy treats theology and philosophy before they are divided. And you plunge not only into philosophy when you go into antiquity, but you cannot distinguish in any of the great people of antiquity whether they are theologians or philosophers. They are both.

Thank you.

### THIRD LECTURE: *THE INVOCATION OF VENUS BY LUCRETIUS*

#### I YOU DO NOT ALWAYS UNDERSTAND

1

...with you children, what you understand of philosophy. I can teach you philosophy here. That's all.

But that's not philosophy. Philosophy is a deadly and earnest thing. You are not earnest. It would be waste to go before you in my quality as a philosopher. I'm just here a college professor of philosophy.

It's a very misshapen situation.

2

Well, really now -- I'm not joking, gentlemen. I have asked you to buy a number of texts -- all original texts. They are as difficult as all original life is, gentlemen.

All secondhand life, all derivative live, all retail store life, all commodities are easily of access. They're enticing in their wrappings. They are easy to carry away. And everything is made painless. *Greek Without Tears* is a famous book for schoolchildren. How to learn Greek without weeping. *Grecque sans larme*, the Frenchman who wrote it called it.

3

Gentlemen, I told you in the beginning, any philosophy that is genuine is difficult. And it is not for everybody all the time. And the first thing, gentlemen, you ought to confess in one -- if you want to come to life with your mind, which you haven't, yet, you are just an automat - the first thing that you do not always understand: great things occasionally we do, and occasionally we don't. That is, gentlemen, it is not possible in philosophy to advance steadily, and to understand more tomorrow.

If you open the Bible today, you may not understand one word. And you open it another day, when you are in the right despair about yourself, and you say, "How could I ever miss the point? How could I not feed on this all my life?"

4

The great sin in America is the idea that the mind, gentlemen, is a machine, which you can build up in such a way that it performs better and better every day. It's nonsense, gentlemen.

If you had cultivated your mind, it would probably work at this moment in your life much better than it works with me. The mind is an organ that is developed during the age from 15 to 25. I need character more than I need mind. My mind is pretty good, but it's going. I don't have to plant it. Your mind has now at this moment to be developed. And therefore it's at its finest.

I have written things in their cleverness at your age, or a little later, which I hardly can understand now, because they are so subtle. They are so intricate. I express myself today much simpler. And the truth is not so angular, and so conceited, and so circumscribed or circumventing, I should more say, the point.

## II *YOU HAVE TO WAIT*

1

So the mind, gentlemen, is alive. Therefore, at times of your life, it's asleep. Anything living must sleep and wake up again.

2

It's very simple. You sleep every night. That's the mind that needs sleep. Well, most of the day you are half asleep.

And we'll find that the first great Greek philosopher, Heraclitus of Ephesus, distinguished in man the few who are awake, whom he called philosophers and people able to understand his philosophy, and the majority of people who are asleep.

3

Therefore, the first thing with an original text in philosophy, gentlemen, is that it is not always speaking to you. You have to wait. It has to be in your library.

Philosophy books, gentlemen, you must own. You can't borrow them from Howe Library, or from Baker, assigned reading three days, and then give it back and you have read it. You haven't, because it isn't sure at all, that you got it in those three days, that you were ready for it.

4

A philosopher, gentlemen, and anybody who studies philosophy, must have his original companions, his original philosophers with him all the time, because it will take you a lifetime to get acquainted with them. And that's the beauty of it.

Anybody who has ever entered this field of philosophy, gentlemen, is not in a hurry. You cannot say, "I have read Plato."

### III *AS FRESH AS SUNSETS, VIOLETS, ROSES*

1

My dear people, this morning in order to comfort myself for this meeting here, I read Plato. Well, I have read him now for exactly 53 years. And it's as though I never had read him. It's all totally new.

So I was so intrigued, I got here one volume of Plato just this minute out of the library to read a commentary, to convince myself that I had understood him rightly this morning.

2

Original things, gentlemen, are exactly like the sunrise. Every sunrise is original. And again, a Greek philosopher, the same Heraclitus, my favorite Greek philosopher, said that every sunrise differs from every other, that there are as many sunrises as there are days, which anybody who has any sentiment, and any realism, knows is true.

But you don't know it, because you have learned physics. And in physics, the mind is treated as a machine, as mechanics, because in physics, you only want to know those things that are always the same.

That's why physics is so boring to me. It's not a science. It's for plumbers. Yes, it's for plumbers. That's what it is.

But the plumbers know nothing of life. They know something about water toilets to get rid of the remnants of life.

3

Philosophy, however, gentlemen, is as fresh as sunsets, and violets, and roses. Two people who look at a rose see something different. It is nonsense to pretend that the

rose is the same to you today and tomorrow. Tomorrow, you may be totally indifferent. Today you are enthusiastic.

4

So here is the text. Let's start right in. We'll read down to 101. That's the famous verse.

I don't know even which translation you have. I had to choose the one that was cheap. I have another text here, the Latin text, Lucretius. And I want to get going.

So will you kindly read it? Will you read it? (*Which place?*) The beginning of Lucretius.

#### IV INVOCATION AND DEDICATION, SCENE, WONDERS

1

*"Mother of Aeneas and his race, delight of men and gods, life-giving Venus,  
it is your doing that under the wheeling constellations of the sky all nature teems with life,  
both the sea that buoys up our ships and the earth that yields our food.  
Through you all living creatures are conceived and come forth to look upon the sunlight.  
Before you the winds flee, and at your coming the clouds forsake the sky.*

*For you the inventive earth flings up sweet flowers.  
For you the ocean levels laugh, the sky is calmed and glows with diffused radiance.  
When first the day puts on the aspect of spring,  
when in all its force the fertilizing breath of Zephyr is unleashed,  
then, great goddess, the birds of the air give the first intimation of your entry;  
for yours is the power that has pierced them to the heart.*

*Next the cattle run wild, frisk through the lush pastures  
and swim the swift-flowing streams.  
Spellbound by your charm, they follow your lead with fierce desire.  
So throughout seas and uplands, rushing torrents, verdurous meadows  
and the leafy shelters of the birds, into the breasts of one and all you instill alluring love,  
so that with passionate longing they reproduce their several breeds.*

*Since you alone are the guiding power of the universe  
and without you nothing emerges into the shining sunlit world  
to grow in joy and loveliness,  
yours is the partnership I seek in striving to compose these lines  
On the Nature of the Universe for my noble Memmius.*

*For him, great goddess, you have willed outstanding excellence  
in every field and everlasting fame.  
For his sake, therefore, endow my verse with everlasting charm."*

2

Now let me go on from there myself. We have here the dedication there, and the invocation.

3

Every word of antiquity, gentlemen, shows you its humanity and its rootedness, and that it is not arbitrary as your writing in novels and magazines. They had no magazines.

It has to have an invocation and a dedication. And then it has to give its scene.

They had no book titles. They had no covers. They had no bookbinding. They had only the style.

4

And therefore, what I tried to tell you last time was that there was no separation between philosophy and theology. And I also had told you that at our meeting before that we have three reasons to wonder:

*the things around us are wondrous, astonishing;  
my own mind is to be wondered at;  
and the person from whom I hear, that he speaks to me that he likes me,*

that she likes me, that's even more important -- or that he has something to tell me, to impose on me is wondrous.

## V THE TRIPARTION OF ALL HUMAN PHILOSOPHICAL ACTIVITY

1

So there are three reasons for wonder.

Somebody to be admired, as we say now in English unfortunately; something to be astonished by; and yourself, as a riddle. Man is a riddle to himself.

2

We use then three different etymological stems for this tripartition, gentlemen, of the human philosophical activity.

*A man who is in wonderment is a wonder to himself.  
He is wondering about things,  
and he is wondering about truth already coming to him.*

3

That he can speak Greek, or English - you should fill you with a sense of wonder, that your mother was able to teach you to speak. She is a reason for wonder. Why did she do it? Did she do it for selfish reasons, so that you might care for her? Or did she really love you? Or what did she impart, what truth to you? Did she impart the wrong language to you?

Should she have taken you to Bolshevik Russia, preferably?

4

All these three situations, gentlemen, return in the invocation, the dedication, and the scene.

The scene here is -- what is he going to sing? Has he already told us? He has told us, in the last sentence which you read. We have no manuscript in which there is -

what is in top of your book? What does it say? ("*Matter and Space.*") Oh no. The whole book, I mean. We are here in the preface of the whole book, are we not? ("*On the Nature of the Universe.*")

Now the nature of the universe is nothing Mr. Lucretius knew anything about. He doesn't say so. That's an English expression.

## VI FORGERIES

1

But he says in the last sentence which you read to us. What does he say?

"Thee I crave as partner --" I have a different translation. The Latin is

*te sociam studeo scribendis versibus esse,  
quos ego de rerum natura pangere*

"Thee, Venus, I wish to have as my companion and as my associate for the writing of the verbs which I try to pronounce on the nature of things."

2

So what you call "*The Nature of the Universe*" for the poet is still very indefinite - things.

3

What are things, gentlemen? Are they infinite in number? Are they finite in number?

First question, for example. "Things" is a plural. Very indefinite. Nothing of the universe. That's already a very modern forgery.

Most translations, of course, which you read of ancient texts are forgeries, because the modern man is too lazy to shed his modern skin and to enter really the world of the ancient mind.

So don't think that the "nature of the universe" is Lucretius' idea at all.

4

Well, I said three-quarters -- it's like food, gentlemen. The things you buy in translations, and in textbooks, it's all falsified. Everything is diluted, because the market is only to the stupid one, here.

You go to the publisher and offer him a genuine translation, which is noble and sticks to the original. He says, "I won't sell this. I have to cater to the so-called last common denominator." That is the people who shouldn't read and write. They get it.

So all the others get nonsense. And the man for whom this is done by the publisher, this universe business against things, he doesn't even read it.

The concentration is quite wrong. -- To this idiot, it wouldn't matter what he said. He wouldn't understand Lucretius, anyway.

## VII THINGS - RES (REUS)

1

You live in a absolutely, gentlemen, bewitched world. Nothing which you get on Broadway, or in New York at a bookstore, or here at Dartmouth, is of first rate. It's all third-, fourth-, fifth-rate. It's all toned down and diluted, because - I told you - the truth is difficult.

2

Now, if a man in this country says, "I will make it difficult," he's laughed at. And: "You can't do it. The people want to have it made it easy."

But a man who wants to win the mile, gentlemen, he has to run 3 minutes and 58 seconds, and that's difficult. In sports, you all agree that it has to be made difficult. But in the mind, you all think it has to be made easy.

3

I have never seen this illogic carried in any other time or country to such nonsensical lengths. In all physical exercises, you know that if it isn't difficult, the result is nil. And in all mental exercises, to use the recommendation, if the book says on its title page, "Easy Reading," throw it away. It's worth nothing, "Easy Reading."

4

But "universe". Well, that just goes over. "Things" - "rerum" is not even quite "things". It makes it more difficult because it is disorderly.

Things are all the objects for the mind. Topics, that may arise. "Res" is anything that can come under consideration of two people in a discussion. That's a "res" in Latin. A *reus*, a man accused, is a man who is said to have taken one thing, or committed a crime, a *res*. The thing is that which comes under argument. That's a *res*.

## VIII RECORD AND NEEDLE

1

So all the res -- the nature of all the things we can argue about, that would be the true translation. Not "the universe." It's quite a different conception.

2

The ancient -- look at these words - the ancients still were musical. They did not read silently. If Lucretius wrote this poem, there was nobody who could buy the book and read it. It was copied, and the slave or the owner himself would read it out loud.

3

Before St. Augustine, that is, before the end of the antiquity, gentlemen, before 350 of our era, nobody could read without lifting his voice, without speaking. "To read" meant always to read out loud.

Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, the Stoics, here Lucretius, they could never take a sheet of paper without getting going without uttering. This was nothing but held for memorizing. You had the manuscript so that you could intone and not miss out.

4

A book in antiquity was something totally different from us. It was like a record, and you were the needle.

And you had to hear it. That's why they were such great stylists, because every sentence written was meant to be heard, not to be reproduced by eyesight.

## IX POLISH THE APPLE

1

So we have:

*what is the invocation?*  
*what is the dedication?*  
*and what the scene?*

2

Well, you have just seen it. How many lines have you read? Where did we stop? Line 27.

In 27 lines the poet has done three things. That's quite an achievement. These are only three times nine lines. And in the greatest concentration : he has said

*what he is going to treat,  
for whom he is going to treat it,  
and who is authorizing him to treat it.*

3

Now, when a man here in this country writes something, in a dissertation to get a doctor's degree, he says who is his doctor father. And he says, "Mr. Kluckhorn has authorized me to write this dissertation on anthropology or Russian studies in Cambridge -- Harvard" -- or what-not: any dissertation today, and any doctor's thesis invokes the good will of the master who passes judgment.

If you write a term paper, you invoke, of course, me. You don't know it. But you polish the apple.

Now the modern slang translation of "invocation" is "polish the apple," because you deal with mortals.

4

If I, however, write an original book, gentlemen, I invoke certainly the spirit that enables me to think in the line and the great tradition of truth.

Any man who wants to sell the truth must be aware that for thousands of years people have tried to tell the truth. And I hope to be read by people who also are eager to know the truth. If I write a book, I hope that it will be still read in 100 years, at least.

And I don't care whether you read it, because I don't think that you are critics of the truth. But I do care that somebody might read it a hundred years from now who is as anxious to know the truth as I am.

*X YOU ARE TOTALLY IN THE HANDS OF THE GODS*

1

Now gentlemen, for this I need an invocation, because it is perfectly a sense of wonder that there should be somebody 500 years back and hundred years from now who would have the same interest at heart. We can't do anything about it. And all the world in as far as we can't do anything about it, gentlemen, is divine.

2

We call "divinity," whether it's the devil or God Almighty, good or bad, evil spirits or good spirits -- all those powers on which we depend for the meaning of our action, and we are unable to do anything about it.

You must understand, gentlemen, that with all your cleverness and all your conceit as modern men, for the great actions of your life, like marriage, you totally are in the hands of the gods. Whether your offspring will be blessed, or whether you make the right choice, or whether you can break through the wall of your in-laws, and free your wife from it, that's all unknown to you. You can do very little about it.

It's just, as we said last time, an act of faith.

3

The invocation, gentlemen, stresses this part of our action, which is based purely on the credit we take, the right to act in freedom and risk. Modern man, you people know so little what faith is, that I prefer the word "risk," or "daring," because it's a poorer word. The true word is "faith."

But you don't know what faith is. You have polluted it with all your prejudices, pro and con by the Church, or Christianity, or Judaism, or what-not.

The ancients, gentlemen, had never the full division of paganism, Judaism and Christianity. You could not, before the coming of Christ, either be a pagan or a Christian. You were a mixture of all -- of all these three.

4

Therefore, all Greek philosophers invoke the gods, even when this man here is an atheist in your sense of the word -- he's an Epicurean. And the whole topic of Mr. Epicure and his disciple Lucretius in this poem is to prove that there are no gods.

Isn't that a queer thing? It's hard for you to understand that all people before the Christian era were mixed. That is, the radicalism, the polarity, the opposition, the dialectics between "yes" and "no," between God and the devil didn't exist.

The devil didn't exist in antiquity to the full. The devil only exists in the Christian era, because only in the Christian era can a man be so wicked -- as Mr. Hitler. That's the new thing. The goodness of man and the wickedness of man is constantly on the increase.

Life is much more dangerous today as it was 2,000 years ago.

## XI *WHOM CAN I INVOKE?*

1

The death of souls, gentlemen, nobody could be so dead as you are and try to be made in our college education. So superfluous, so silly, so worthless, so only out for the stomach and for sex and such things. Such a humanity has not been tolerated before.

That's only in the Christian era, because the extremes of goodness, and the extremes of wickedness have much increased.

2

The invocation, the dedication, and the theme were closer in each other. As I said, the whole remnant of an invocation today is -- you dedicate a book to your parents; or you dedicate it to your wife; or you say that your teacher gave you the theme of this book, and that you are therefore trying to get a degree, or promotion, or be made a professor, or one of these external things.

3

A man who writes an original book cannot turn to any teacher, gentlemen.

If I write -- I am just publishing a big book in several volumes -- well, since I oppose, transcend and reject many of the teachings which I have received, in this book, I cannot invoke these carnal authorities, the professor in Harvard or the people who distribute the Nobel Prize.

What do I give for these Nobel Prize people? I think they are very stupid. That's not very agreeable to me. I would like to be in cahoots with them. But I can't. I think they are wrong.

So whom can I invoke?

4

The great philosopher Schopenhauer, who also was an atheist, like Lucretius, was in a quandary of the same kind. He didn't believe in God. Schopenhauer and Nietzsche - both atheists. And Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, the modern pagans, like Lucretius, chose two very interesting ways out.

Schopenhauer invoked the spirit of his father. "Oh, my father" he has in his preface, "who gave me the means for an independent life, so that I do not have to cater to

the marketplace, that I do not have to solicit the favors of the authorities of universities, or of foundations, O dear father, who has not been a philosopher thyself, thanks to you, I now can put this book before mankind which is only dedicated to the truth."

So even this atheist felt that he should invoke a higher spirit, with whom he could coincide, in his endeavor for freedom, for independence of mind. For this incorruptibility that he couldn't be bought.

## XII CHESTERTON: "WE CALL IT CHEATING"

1

In America, every mind can be bought. That's why there is no truth and you all have only opinions, gentlemen. And it's even said.

When Chesterton, the great English humorist came to this country 30 years ago, he made a discovery. He said, "The people here tell me, all with great glee, that they have now a new science. They call it psychology. And this psychology enables a man who produces a worthless commodity to sell it, just the same. They all buy it, if he uses the right means, the right tricks, this psychology. Now," he said, "it's very interesting. In England, we don't call this psychology. We call it cheating."

2

Psychology in this country is nothing but another expression for saying "how to cheat people." That's what they teach you. And you are very proud of it, and you think you are very smart.

There's only one obligation in mankind. I can cheat you. But I may not. I must not. It's forbidden. That's so very painful.

When Mr. Murray Butler, the great president of Columbia, was asked why he had loaned money to Mr. Harriman, the banker -- the father of -- I think it's the uncle or father of Mr. Harriman, governor of New York? (*Father.*)

It is the father. Well, I'm sorry to say.

They never called it back. He said it is the embarrassment -- in a gentleman, Mr. Butler said -- very English -- "It is the embarrassment of a gentleman that he can do things which he may not do."

"I could have asked Mr. Harriman to pay me back, or to tell me what the matter was, and what was wrong. But it is the embarrassment of a gentleman that he can do things which he may not do."

3

You don't understand this, gentlemen. Your whole idea is -- and that's why you don't know what philosophy is -- that if you can do something, you also may do it, and get away with it. Your only question is that you don't want to be found out. The perfect crime is your ideal.

That's called "psychology."

4

Psychology is the idea of a perfect crime. That is, how to cheat somebody else to such an extent that he thanks you profusely for being taken in.

All the products which you buy on the market are of this kind. You buy worthless things, and you thank the producer profusely, because you are allowed to keep up with the Joneses.

Go home and discount all the things which you do not need. You will be surprised.

### XIII WE KNOW OURSELVES ONLY AS CORRESPONDENTS TO THE OPPOSITE NAME

1

Now the invocation then, gentlemen, is today out of order because we don't pray anymore. All ancient men prayed, all Greek philosophers prayed, including the atheists.

Why did they?

2

Gentlemen, when a man is standing in some space here, as I do here, I cannot help being aware that this is wood, and this is my flesh, because if I am not aware, I'll get hurt. In space, gentlemen, the body must distinguish itself from another body.

In the thinking process, gentlemen, a philosopher can only be a man who can set himself off against his opposite number, who says, as in the flesh, "This is my body and this is this chair," this piece of wood, this desk.

That's to you quite normal. And you never give it a thought.

But the invocation means to make sure that my mind is not polluted with your mind, that I'm not speaking in the way of a boy, or in the way of a solicitor -- or canvassing, or a politician.

The invocation here, this man tries to say, in whose spirit, realm, or territory, or area, or eon does he want to move?

3

When you invoke, in the "Our Father," or in a psalm, the name of your maker, the reason is not that God needs to be named by you -- we certainly may give Him even the wrong name -- but the reason is gentlemen, that we know ourselves only as correspondents to the opposite name. We become always only conscious in relation to somebody else.

Now if I write a letter, "Dear Elizabeth," to my girl, I become aware by this address who I am.

This is completely lost on you, because you all are taught this nonsense that "I" is I and "myself" is myself. That doesn't exist. That's why most people in the country are so unhappy, and schizophrenic, because nobody can really say to himself who he is. We find out who we are in relation to other people.

4

You are a Dartmouth student, because I am a Dartmouth professor. That's the only reason. If there were no Dartmouth professors, you couldn't be a Dartmouth student.

You have never thought of that. But you can bring 3,000 people together, and in Dartmouth and in Hanover, and if there was no faculty, there would be no Dartmouth College, and you would not be Dartmouth students, but just a mob, or football players, or what-not, but not have the honor of being a Dartmouth student.

We give you this veneer of some education.

Of course, I know it's a lie, but you live on it, on this credit which we give you, as though you were our students.

## XIV THE GREAT CURRENT OF LIGHT AND TRUTH

1

The invocation then, gentlemen, places the man who invokes.

When Homer says -- how does *The Iliad* begin? Who knows it? Please. Nobody? Does nobody know how *The Iliad* or *The Odyssey* begin? Miller. (*I know it. I just can't think of it.*) Well, you ask the girls in Bennington.

(*I think the --*) No. Not "I think." That's always the wrong answer. Never say, "I think." Nobody will believe it.

(*Is it -- "O heavenly Muse"?*) Ja. (*"I sing the { } Achilles."*) Ja. Very good. Ja. There you are.

2

Now why does he say this, gentlemen?

The Muse is the mind of Zeus. "Muse" and "mind" is the same root, by the way. Quite interesting for you to know. The Muses in antiquity are the powers by which we participate in the divine mind.

I think we haven't reached any further insight. That's simply true. Nobody can think for himself and find the truth. The truth must be imparted.

I impart to you the truth as I have received it. It dawned on me. As we say, "It dawns on me." Very true, in the mind, the divine light dawns just as much as the sun does.

And sometimes it doesn't, as you know. It's very dusky.

3

So -- since there is darkness in the mind, off and on, there must be dawn. And the invocation then tries to make this piece of flesh that 100 cells, that it should melt, because it's a hindrance to the spirit.

This here, this container, this poor receptacle of clay, as St. Paul calls it, our body, by the invocation turns toward that source of which he wants to be filled and fed.

And nobody in his five senses, gentlemen, who knows how difficult it is to know the truth will ever imagine that he can find the truth cut off from this great current of light and truth, this stream of water.

4

Do you think Mr. Einstein could have found the law of relativity if he hadn't first studied very carefully Mr. Newton? That is, if he had not been in the great tradition of mathematics through the ages?

Impossible.

But you always mistake this, gentlemen.

In this country, the man who has an idea, as you call it, is always thought of as of equal rank of a philosopher. But a philosopher is a man who has listened to all there is to know, and then has suddenly turned to the Muse and said, "Let me hear something better. This is stale. What I have learned is not all. We must start afresh."

*XV VENUS WHO GUARANTEES YOUR DIRECT EXPERIENCE THROUGH THE SENSES*

1

A philosopher, gentlemen, makes a fresh start after he has been in the great tradition.

This is very important in the case of Epicurus and Lucretius here, because the great experience of Epicurus, the Epicureans, and Lucretius is that if we go to school, we may miss out on the most original influence, the most original experience: our five senses.

Epicure and Lucretius are famous as sensualists, as people who worship the five senses again, who want to get man to break away from the school tradition and add again his own experience of the beauty of life, the power of love, of hunger, of fear, directly -- by drawing on his own sensations.

2

They have also been called "sensationalists," in the sense that they are sensualists. That is nothing to be connected with any sentiment pro and con. It is simply their method to say, "Yes, refresh your memory by drawing on your sense experiences directly".

You have heard the interpretation of the sense experience. There is great danger that you then miss out on the sense experience itself. You can talk about love, but before you haven't fallen in love, you don't know what all the talk about love really is.

3

So this is the invocation then, of Lucretius, of Venus. Venus, who guarantees your direct experience of the senses, that's what this first 23 lines try to impose on you. In getting out of the school, getting away from books, and refreshing your voice, and your speech, and your mind by this direct, immediate contact.

But never forget, gentlemen, it's the second choice. This same Lucretius has already learned Roman and Greek. He has already read books. And this is a protest.

4

Epicureanism, gentlemen, is a protest against mental tradition. But a recourse to the body.

It's not naive. It's not the same as a pig that always is just a pig. But it is the problem of getting a man out of his brown study back into the green pastures, again.

#### XVI *ALL THE REST IS DANGEROUS ABSTRACTION*

1

This is the interesting thing about Epicure and the Epicureans, gentlemen, that they are reacting against too much bookishness, against too much idealism, against too much theory.

But you must not misunderstand them. They are not low-brow.

And Venus is this recourse to that spirit that is with man before he goes to school, that makes him turn to nice girls and beautiful flowers and sunsets, because he's out for beauty, he's out for vigor, he's out for health, he's out for procreation.

And that's why Venus appears here.

2

It's very strange: Homer, who is not high-brow, but is full of enthusiasm to become high-brow, to create poetry, turns to the Muse, the stream of reflection, the stream of poetry. Epicure and Lucretius come after Plato, Aristotle, Homer all have written. They are in great anxiety to become too high-brow. And they want to refresh their mind by bringing in the body again, a second time.

Can you understand this difference?

And that's why this invocation is so very strange, that Venus here is invoked by a man who tries to prove that there are no gods, there are no ideas, everything is physical.

It's a paradox.

3

But if you think of it biographically, here are twenty years lived by a man in physical growth and in the schools. And then ten years perhaps in meditating his theory of philosophy, and then in the fourth decennium, the Epicureans would jump back to their sense experience and say, "I must not go astray. I must stick to what I really can test every day by my palette, and by my skin, and by my hands. That's all I really know. All the rest is dangerous abstraction."

4

It is very difficult for you to distinguish, gentlemen, the doctrine of materialism or sensualism from mere sensuous living. The doctrine of sensualism is a very hybrid doctrine, because it is the third step, after you have used your senses, after you have tried to make sense of it.

But let me not forget my starting point, the senses. It's a return to the senses. And therefore it always entails a break away from the senses.

If you have returned, you also were outside of it.

## *XVII MATERIALISM AND IDEALISM ARE POINTS OF EMPHASIS*

1

Now the invocation then places the Epicureans, and especially here Lucretius, outside the idealistic tradition of the Platonists and the Aristotelians, the mental tradition. He wants to say that the mental tradition is less important than the physical.

Otherwise he would have invoked the Muses, or the ideas, or the truth.

He invokes Venus. Potency.

2

And of course, that's eternally true. Even for Plato and Homer. If you have no power, you can't become a great poet just by going into a brown study and thinking.

Potency is something that has to be applied to poetry and philosophy, too.

3

So I would like to say a word, gentlemen.

Never believe that materialism and idealism are absolute opposites. If you hear it now today discussed Americans are supposedly idealists.

I have never seen an idealist so far in this country. I have only known people who either have Cadillacs, or want to have Cadillacs. So I think this is a materialistic country, if ever there was one.

And in this moment, we say the wicked Bolsheviks are materialists, and we are idealists. It isn't so simple, obviously.

4

And one thing then we can learn from this invocation of Venus, in this preamble - and I think it's a very great gain for our days, gentlemen:

*materialism and idealism are points of emphasis, but not points of mutual exclusiveness.*

Would you take this down? It's quite important.

*The way of saying that the senses matter first, materialism, and the other: the mind matters first, the idealism,*

are not mutually exclusive. They are relative.

## XVIII THE ABSOLUTE IS NOT FOR MAN

1

Much, much nonsense would be avoided in this country, much non-thinking, if you wouldn't use these slogans.

When man speaks of idealism and materialism, stop him short. And don't listen to him. It's no use talking to such a man today. These are stale words. And they don't

contain today an important truth anymore, because today we must understand that they beget each other.

2

When you are an idealist, somebody has to be the materialist. The father is the idealist, the mother has to be the materialist. The mother is the materialist in the family, the father has to be the opposite, because these are two sides of the same thing.

We are in a world of the senses, and we must make sense.

Now if you forget one, you are an idealist, and when you forget the other, you are materialist.

3

These are dead words.

And I hope this invocation will show you that a materialist, invoking the goddess to inspire him, is still in antiquity in a much healthier balance. The people in antiquity had no absolute contrarities, contradictions, but only relative. They could go to one side of the fork of the crossroads into the other, but they never lost the power to return to the middle and start again from this total experience of reality of life.

4

And only to speak, gentlemen, is to emphasize. But it is never to say anything absolute. The absolute is not for man.

Man cannot say anything absolute. He can only say something in relation to something else. And he can only emphasize one thing. And at a time, we have to emphasize one thing against the other.

I have to emphasize certain things at this moment toward you. But at another time, I may find a man against whom I have to emphasize the opposite. And I must feel free to do this. I cannot be the victim of my having told you, at this moment, this.

I must retain my freedom to emphasize something very different to somebody else.

## XIX *THE RUSSIANS ARE IDEALISTS*

1

And so idealism and materialism, gentlemen, in antiquity are no absolutes as they are treated today, and today they have even become political slogans. And that's very bad.

They never should.

2

There is not a country that is materialistic. And there is not a country that is idealistic. And Russia certainly is the most idealistic country in the world at this moment.

You will understand this. These poor people who are not even getting razor blades from Mr. Gillette, because he can't export them. And they have buttons, and they have no sausages, and they have no cars, and you call them materialistic. For 50 years they are starving to death to build up their country as a great country.

3

Now if anybody was ever an idealist, all the Russians are. All this nonsense we talked about -- materialism.

Fifty million Russians were killed in the First World War; 25 million by and large were perhaps killed and executed in the Second World War. This country has lost 155,000 dead in the First World War, and 100,000 in the Second World War; and we speak of our idealism and their materialism.

4

But that's the terrible thing about which Lucretius at the end of the philosophic era is concerned. He wants to be back to brass tacks, to grass roots. And that's why he praises the five senses where such pretentious nonsense cannot be preached.

## XX *LUCRETIUS, THE NIETZSCHE OF ANTIQUITY*

1

The last line to which I wanted to come today is 101.

And why?

Because, just as I have to speak with the voice of Lucretius, "Come back to your senses! Don't make these ghosts out of Russia and America," or Germany and France, I don't care which country you take -- or Japan, he says, "So potent was religion in persuading to evil deeds."

2

Now I would say that in this moment, in this country, these philosophical slogans are so potent as to persuade us to evil deeds. That's the famous line of Lucretius. You ought to learn it by heart.

And it's really very beautiful in Latin, much more beautiful than in English. *Tantum religio potuit suadere valorem*. The translation is not right in my text. What is your text saying, the English? ("*Such are the heights of wickedness to which men are driven by superstition.*") Ja. That's not right. Oh, he means it literally.

3

To such extent of evil deeds -- or, such an extent of evil deeds religion has been able to suggest -- "suadere" I think is the best -- is "to suggest."

And what an ancient man calls "religio," gentlemen, is his philosophy of the gods, what we would call his philosophy of religion, much more. That is, "religio" is in the antiquity a combination of thinking and cult.

That is not without theory. The ancients did not separate, as they invoke still the gods, although they call themselves philosophers, they never quite separated prayer and systematic thinking.

4

So the last thing experienced I want you to take with this verses is that here is the great atheist of antiquity, the Nietzsche of antiquity, as Lucretius deserves to be called.

He ends, at the same age as Nietzsche, in 44 in insanity, at the age of 44, probably in the year 55 B.C. He's madly in love, the tradition says, and he drinks a cup which is poisoned, and goes insane first and then dies from the consequences of this potion.

Nietzsche broke down at the end of our era, before the world wars, prophesied the two world wars and the downfall of civilization.

And the same: Lucretius and Nietzsche are very parallel figures.

That's why I wanted you to start with Lucretius, so that you can see that Nietzsche wasn't quite wrong when he said, "There is an eternal recurrence, and I have been before." That's the strange doctrine of Nietzsche, of the eternal recurrence.

## *XXI THE ERA OF PHILOSOPHY, RENOVATED IN OUR CIVILIZATION*

1

Lucretius and Nietzsche come at the end of 700 years of philosophizing. The story of our era is in philosophy from Abaelard and Anselm of Canterbury, via Thomas Aquinas and Bonaventura to Spinoza and Leibniz and Descartes and Hegel. And Nietzsche quits it all, he did go back to the five senses. He also was a sensualist.

And Lucretius is very parallel. And the reason is probably the same: the deep feeling that the cycle is closed, that nothing new can be done in this method, and by this manner of using your mind.

2

The era of philosophy we have renovated in our era, built it into our civilization. But with Nietzsche, it breaks off. There is no philosophy after Nietzsche, in the old sense, possible.

55 before Christ Lucretius dies. This book, which you have there, is probably edited, or I think in all truth it has been edited by the famous Cicero, who was a great stylist and took a look at the manuscript and made it ready for what could be done with it. And he hasn't done a perfect job. He has mishandled a number of places here, but at least we owe him that we have it at all.

3

Now the theme I already said to you is nature. The nature of things. And the dedication, gentlemen, is to a man of whom we know that he was a very successful politician, not an Epicurean, but a skeptic.

The dedication is not to a man, Memmius, whom the poet tries to convince so much, but to confront with an opposite speech.

Very typical philosophical attitude. I told you, the history of philosophy consists of independent views, but there is a panorama. The two views together must be known before you really are fully aware of the growth of truth. Because although one view

is here, and the other is there, you have the history of these views, you know more, as a panorama does than one vision, or one insight.

4

Now the strange story about this man, Memmius, is that we happen to know that he was not an Epicurean. He was a skeptic. And therefore the dedication means always the admission, gentlemen, of man that he is a mortal, that he is not God Almighty.

A God Almighty could not dedicate his book to a man of a different opinion. You can understand this. He would have dedicated it then to disciples, or students, or obedient citizens of his community. Plato could not dedicate his book, if he believed that he was divine.

It is our humanity which dedicates, because we need friends.

## XXII *YOU HAVE TO HAVE FRIENDS*

1

In philosophy, gentlemen, I told you, the outstanding remnant of the political order in which we all live is, that the man, the philosopher has no regent over him. He has no king; he has no law; he has no judges; he has no electorate; he is not a candidate for office. He doesn't have to be popular. He even can't be popular.

But he must have a friend. The friend stands for the whole polis.

Can you understand this? With one friend, you can challenge the universe. Without one friend, they put you in a straitjacket and declare you to be insane.

I mean this, gentlemen. If a man has not one friend, he cannot defy the universe of mankind. It's impossible. But with one friend, he can. As long as your wife says, "He's all right," they can't take you and carry you off.

2

I'm quite excited: a young woman in our acquaintance here in town, in Hanover went to see the doctor. The doctor took her and said, "You are schizophrenic" -- "She is schizophrenic; send her to Boston." The husband doesn't know anything about it. Everybody is frantic. She has disappeared.

Now I think it's a terrible situation. Something that must not be. The husband doesn't think his wife is sick. But of course in America, the doctors are the high priests today.

They can do as they please, and he bows to the larger authority. I think he is wrong. I think he should run after this doctor, shoot him, and get his wife back.

That has happened two days ago. It's very exciting, gentlemen. Very terrifying.

3

The end of the story obviously isn't there in this. But there is a real problem.

A person, all alone, the object of medical care only, cannot live in this universe. You have to have friends. One person has to vouchsafe that you are all right, who is a friend. Somebody who says, "I'll be in correspondence with this. I'm exchange. He's part of me. I'm part of him." Something goes over and on.

This identification, gentlemen, is lacking in this country to a horrible degree. Everybody is friendly with everybody, but nobody has a friend.

And that this happened between husband and wife just staggers my imagination. This is a nice man, this man. And he's absolutely out of his wits. He's despondent. He's desperate. But he doesn't dare to go against the authority of the doctor.

4

So gentlemen, the dedication limits the divine assumption of the inspired thinker, or poet, or whoever it is, everybody who is inspired thinks at this moment that the whole world needs him.

This is important.

So dedication, gentlemen, humanizes our sense of importance, our sense of conceit. It is our descent. The invocation lifts us up to the gods. The dedication puts us down on earth in human society.

### XXIII *OUR CONSTANT THREE MENTAL ATTITUDES*

1

I think it's very important that you should see these three different usages of human speech, gentlemen. You don't know this.

For you, all speech has only one application: to call a spade a spade, and to say, "This shirt costs \$3.00," or \$2.99. You think only in terms of what I call in grammar the indicative. "This is blue." "An acre is so many square feet."

That to you is language. That to you is truth. That to you is thinking.

2

Gentlemen, I never think in this one-sided manner as you do. I have three attitudes in my mind. And all the Greek philosophers had three attitudes. And as long as I cannot re-voke in you these three attitudes, you do not understand Lucretius, and you do not understand Plato, and you do not understand Aristotle.

You think that a man who thinks, wants to state something in so many words: that the universe is round; or that there are no gods. Gentlemen, if the world would consist of these ridiculous statements -- by themselves they are quite wanton and ridiculous - there would be no philosophy, and there would be no education, there would be no life of the mind. No, gentlemen.

3

There are the invocation, the dedication, and the theme. they are our constant, three mental attitudes which must balance. I want to be given a task.

The philosopher is given a mental task. The legislator is given a vocal task. The strategist is given a military task. The mother is given -- well, a task to beget children.

The philosopher has to state for his time the truth in no uncertain terms. For this he needs an authority. Therefore, he has to be emphatic. That is, he has to be authorized.

4

We are all authorized versions. There is not just the King James Version. Every one of you should be an authorized version of the divine spirit.

I mean this. You want to know that you are right in becoming a doctor or a businessman. And therefore, gentlemen, in this you are excited, because you can go astray. You may be all wrong in your vocation.

The invocation gives man his vocation, his calling, his duty. But much more his duty, because duties follow after I have known in which realm my duties should lie. To become a doctor is not a duty. That's a vocation - because my duties as a doctor are only the little consequences of this big decision.

XXIV *FRIENDSHIP WITH JOSEPH WITTIG, FRANZ ROSENZWEIG, EUGEN MAY – THESE THREE RELATIONS ARE MYSELF*

1

Now gentlemen, to make this decision every day despite all and everything, I want to teach these brats here -- that is a vocation which I can only do by not being authorized by you. I must be authorized against you, because I have to tell you the truth whether you like it or not. I cannot depend on your approval for my vocation.

I want to make things difficult for you. The authority for this cannot come from any understanding of yours which you cannot have. It's too early for you. At the end you may, but not now.

2

Therefore, the invocation, gentlemen, is a constant fear and trembling, as Kierkegaard has called it. All philosophers work out their salvation in fear and trembling. You can't help it, because we don't know before the end whether we have been right.

This is the invocation, gentlemen. The pacification, the appeasement, the tranquility we get without pills, gentlemen. We don't need tranquilizer pills. A philosopher has a friend. Before - he will not settle on philosophy. It's too dangerous.

3

My awakening to philosophy was possible because we had a wonderful group of friends who all of us became something in our own right. And we left the material world all embarking on this great adventure of new truth. And one thing that will always stay with me, and I mean for what I will be known, is that I have embarked on certain human relations by correspondence and by publication, together with others, which are highly original.

I have published one series of books with a Catholic priest, another with a great Jewish scholar and devoted Jew, and a third with a worker.

4

Now these three relations are myself. They are my dedication by which I have stayed normal. And by which my truth has not been my private truth, but truth shared. And since it has been shared by three so different people, it is hoped that it is a consistent truth.

## XXV IMPERATIVE AND INDICATIVE

1

Now gentlemen, then the dedication has a soothing effect.

And if I turn to grammar, some of you may have read some of my writings on this, you know that invocation speaks to the power that can give orders to a man. That is imperative.

And there is in every language, therefore, an exchange, as in Homer's first line, "Tell me, O Muse," that's a prayer, and then when the Muse tells, I have to obey. She commands. She's in command. I have to write down what she tells me.

The indicative then, gentlemen, "This universe is green," or "Everything is water," these statements of fact cannot be understood unless they are balanced by imperative, by which the philosopher admits that he is under orders to say this.

2

You understand then, that there is quite a different mental process going on, one by which I am moved. When I say, "The earth is round," I state something. That is, I stabilize a fact, that can be repeated. I put things at rest.

When however Copernicus or Galilei hears this command, "You must come forward now and teach this doctrine," this is not a statement. That's not a stabilizing force. That's a revolutionary force. That's a force upsetting the apple cart. That interrupts the tranquility of his existence.

It's very dangerous, and it usually leads to disaster. Yet, he has to do it.

So you if you formulate the most static principle, you do something, that is quite unstatic. That's very dynamic.

3

This is overlooked today, totally, gentlemen, in this country, because you all mistake philosophy for science. Philosophy is giving in to the sense of wonder. The sense of wonder then is always threefold.

What I'm wondering at, I state in terms of an indicative. "This is so."

What makes me wonder, throws me down on the ground, and forces me to do something very disagreeable, very dangerous, highly inconveniencing my career, because all truth is against the Carnegie Foundation or the Rockefeller Foundation.

Foundations with big money cannot stand the truth. You must know this, gentlemen.

4

Power corrupts. An old saying. And nothing corrupts as much as absolute power. Money corrupts. Much money corrupts very much.

*XXVI THE DEDICATION IS OUR HUMANITY*

1

Therefore, gentlemen, it is just as dangerous to tell the truth today as it has always been, and will always be -- it must be, because only those shall be allowed to say another truth who are brave enough to say it against the powers that be.

And all the powers that be are against the truth. They haven't learned it. They have learned old ways. It isn't their business to administer anything but the old ways.

2

We elect a president of the United States so that we may have a United States. You cannot expect Mr. Eisenhower to abolish the United States.

But the day may come very soon, I have to abolish the United States. Then we'll all be put in prison here in the United States. By the president of the United States, because he is elected to administer the old way, but we are wondrous.

And you'd like to abolish this. You don't want to have suffering. You don't want to have excitement. You don't want to have anything new happen, and you always boast that yet the truth is admitted to this country.

3

It is not, gentlemen. The truth is admitted to any country only to that extent as people are willing to suffer for it, to large extent.

As soon as you want to be paid for the truth, it ceases to be the truth. Can be sure of that. That's just habit. To repeat an old formula, that's not the truth itself. That's the inherited truth. That's the old vestment of the truth, the garb of the truth, the eggshell.

But the egg is blown out in the meantime.

4

So gentlemen, then the dedication is our humanity.

Even Karl Marx had to have a friend, Friedrich Engels. He kept him sane. And he had a wife, and he had children. And therefore, if you want to know a man's right to be listened to, ask

*whether he is of God,  
whether he is of man,  
and whether he is of the world.*

As with regard to the world, he must have knowledge; he must have insight; he must have research; he must have made discoveries.

With regard to humanity, some people must have found him unselfish, and loving, and affectionate, and must have found it worth suffering with him, because he will have suffered if he is a great person.

And all these are very disagreeable things to you. You always think that philosophy can be had in a textbook without tears, and without bravery. Only a brave man can learn to think for himself.

And the third thing is: he must have had an encounter with the infinite, with the new truth, with truth yet unshaped, with truth trying to get down to earth through his mind and through his heart.

## XXVII THEOLOGY, PHILOSOPHY AND SOCIOLOGY

1

And it is, I think, a great story that the materialist of antiquity, the man who went mad because he wanted to treat only of atoms and things, dead matter, in his first 27 lines, gives you the full width of the human relations that are making a philosopher.

He must have an encounter with the divine spirit; he must have an equality, a family of friends, some kinship; and he must have something to speak about, some discovery to make, some new aspect of the universe.

2

What's the result, gentlemen?

We today say that the invocation belongs to the realm of theology. The dedication would belong to the realm of sociology, because it's a sociological fact that men

have friends, or that they are professors, or what-not, write in a group. And the theme that would be what we call today the philosophy, the realm of the natural sciences.

3

So again, what I tried to say last time returns. I told you last time that the Greeks couldn't separate philosophy and theology. In these three things, you have the nucleus.

If I invoke Venus, the consequence is that I must have some theology.

Because I have goddesses and gods and I have different gods, I can invoke here Venus.

But perhaps Plato would invoke the truth. And Homer did invoke the Muse.

How are they related, these different forces that make us speak?

4

What is then, gentlemen, theology?

*Theology is the doctrine of the powers that make men speak.*

Would you take that down? You nowhere find this definition. It's an excellent definition. Theology deals with the powers that make men speak.

*Philosophy deals with the things about which we want to speak.*

That's something very different.

*And sociology creates the environment within which we speak.*

XXVIII ANYBODY WHO SPEAKS BELIEVES IN GOD, THE WORDL AND SOCIETY

1

So here is Memmius, who must take the place of the whole Roman republic.

The Romans cared as little for philosophy as Americans. Romans and Americans are the two most unphilosophical people that have ever lived. But here and there, there is one, and he is then very good.

2

I think it is interesting that in these 27 lines of an ancient philosopher you find all three brackets: the social sciences, the natural sciences, and the humanities of today in a nutshell.

You cannot open your mouth, according to anyone who has met with original inspiration, gentlemen. Anybody who really speaks out from the bottom of his own heart, after an experience, knows that there are always three ways of truth: the theological, the sociological and the philosophical -- or you call it "scientific," I mean, it's all right at this moment, the naturalistic.

We speak about the nature of things. That what makes us speak is always the power that overthrows us, that commands. Any power that is stronger than me is not nature, gentlemen, but is divine, is Nature with a capital N, at least. And nature is my divinity, as it was for Emerson, or for Thoreau. If you write "Nature" with a capital N, then she is a goddess.

And sociology is also necessary. Man cannot speak without going insane if nobody listens. You need one listener and one man who replies, and has the right to tell you, "This is not so. Be quiet, shut up." Or contradicts me, or corrects me.

3

I think this is the best thing I can give you in this whole course, gentlemen, to make you see that in antiquity the dividedness had not yet reached the point it has reached today.

Today you can meet people who believe that they can be scientists all by themselves, never invoke the god of truth.

Most physicists in this country are so far removed from the fountain of inspiration, that they are just plumbers and they do their routines. And if you tell them that they also serve God, they laugh, and say "Never heard of Him." Poor people. They are just so far away from that fountain, which feeds their stream, that they just do not know what happens inside them.

4

*Anybody who speaks, gentlemen, believes in God, believes in the world, and believes in society.*

Perhaps you take this down, too, gentlemen. And in this example of Lucretius, you find this revealed.

Anybody who speaks or writes, gentlemen, believes in God; believes in an order of the world, of things; and believes in society -- that is, in human relations within which he is allowed to speak without going mad.

XXIX *A COMMON TRUTH IS ALWAYS DIVINE*

1

And I think that's the importance of studying philosophy at all, gentlemen, that you are constantly reminded, although you will be lawyers or businessmen, that anybody who opens his mouth admits that there are three experiences --

*of God -- gods;  
of men;  
and of the world, of things.*

You can't help this. It's always with you. God, man, and world can never be reduced to each other.

Perhaps -- this is another formula which you may use.

*God, man, and world are never reducible to each other.*

2

You can never say, "All is world," or "All is God," or "All is man." It's nonsense, because anybody who speaks needs a listener, that's his equal. Anybody who speaks needs an authority by which he makes a man listen.

If you tell a woman, "I love you," heavens! She must believe you. So there must be a way of expressing the truth. These three words, "I love you" must make sense to her. She must understand them in the same sense as you do. That's divine.

No -- you can't do anything for this, and she cannot. It's there.

A common truth is always divine, because at this moment it's too late to create language. You have to use it. Otherwise, she runs away.

3

Since most Americans, gentlemen, have never reached this point in the mountains of our experience, where these three great paths meet. The path toward things in a Macy's; and the path towards the family, get married, to found a family, or friends, friendship, or school, or whatever you call it, a camp; and the path to worship, where you find that you're doing something that has had to be done in every generation

since man has lived and died, to find the truth. You pronounce it. You proclaim it from the hilltops.

4

And so, at the end of antiquity you have in full blossom the great unity of these three truths in these first 27 lines, that I thought is important enough for starting you out with Lucretius. Because if the so-called materialist and atheist is still spellbound by this invocation, dedication and naming of the theme, we may be quite sure that it is inherent in the character of humanity.

You and I can only speak to each other because there are gods. He thought there were many gods, but there were gods. And you are so much poorer, because your question is always: "Is there God? or "Is there no God?" No Greek was ever hampered by this very much. His question was, "How many gods?"

### XXX ASSIGNED READING

1

Well, will you kindly bring all the books of assigned reading next time, because I think I should show you their use then -- we shall go over this.

There is the Homer, there is the Ancilla -- how is it called Ancilla, isn't it? -- and the Platonic dialogues and the Aristotelian writings.

2

I hope it will not be too much. Bring this little library with you. And we'll go on with a little bit of Lucretius next time.

## FOURTH LECTURE: WAR IS ALWAYS A RELIGIOUS FACT

### I THE SENSE OF WONDER KNOWS OF NO TIME LIMITS

1

...by expression of the divinity of physical love. For pigs, of course, it isn't, because you think when intercourse is described, it must always be sex. It cannot be the apotheosis of mankind.

But that's what it is here, where the goddess is good enough to bend over the lying in years. And I told you it's one of the oldest traditions of the human race, that in the greatest harmony, it is the goddess that bends over the god, and not as in the animal kingdom.

2

After this, a man comes and asks me: was he obliged to read more of this poem, or could he drop it now?

There's nothing more to be said. I'm very sorry that this man is taking the course.

If you think that philosophy can be studied by assignments, gentlemen, you are quite wrong. It cannot. It can only be done by some voluntary act.

I can lead the horse to the water. I can't make him drink. If you don't read more than I assign, gentlemen, the whole course is absolute nonsense.

Obviously, any assignment is ridiculous in philosophy, because it means that you have no sense of wonder.

3

Now I tried to sell to you this very simple idea that philosophy is a sense of wonder about the gods, about man, and about the world. If you cannot develop any one of these senses of wonder, gentlemen, just don't try to study any course in philosophy.

Because philosophy is not a science, and philosophy is not gymnastics. It is only the cultivation of your sense of wonder. Nothing else.

4

Now the sense of wonder knows of no time limits. And it knows of no assignment, because a sense of wonder takes you out of the commercial, and out of the scheduled, and out of the measurable reality. Obviously the sense of wonder means that you are perplexed, and that therefore you do not know whether you sink or swim, as the famous English love song says.

*"I know not if I sink or swim."*

That's philosophy.

## II THE SHOCK

1

Now I quite understand that you cannot share this sense of wonder from the beginning. I have tried to introduce you to it, and to show you that it is in every man's life who opens his mouth and has the boldness to say anything, that he must be surprised over his boldness, that he does say something.

2

That's the first sense of wonder about his own logos, that there is by the grace of God in him a power that vitalizes this idiot, which every one of us is, and this dirt, which we are, and this mass of clay, and that in our receptacle there suddenly lights up, as in an electric bulb, a current that is not of our making, because it has to do with the truth.

And neither you nor I know anything of the truth by ourselves. Absolutely nothing.

3

So I say it is difficult for you to follow me, except perhaps by the shock that even you yourself have already something you can cultivate. You have made remarks at home and elsewhere. What are they worth? Were they yourself? Were they just passing remarks? Do you want them to be held against you? Then were they true? Are they good enough to be held against you?

4

What I can demand from the beginning of this course, gentlemen: that you should not make it impossible for you to get into the sense of wonder.

Anybody who asks, however, "Must I read more of this stuff?" has already made up his mind that he will not get into this.

### III LOGOS, ETHICS, PHYSICS

1

Because, we shall go on from the last time, where I hoped I had made clear, that we are all surrounded by this deep secret which lies between the three divisions of this college. What is the unifying point, the center from which three divisions, as we have them -- humanities, social science, and natural science -- divide?

Show me this point, and there is where the real man stands.

2

A man is always more than a man in the social sciences. And he is always more than a man in the humanities. And he's always more than a man in the natural sciences. Well, he can create all these three.

Who is this strange animal who can go in for nature, in for society, and in for authority or inspiration, or truth?

That's our sense of wonder.

And we call this point in which the philosopher tries to render himself the point from which any moment a new distribution must be made between the forces of the logos, the forces of our ethos, and the energies of our physis.

And I also tried to tell you that what we use today, logic, ethics -- funny enough, here is the plural -- and physics, is already second-rate, and it's limited today to the much more comprehensive, original nouns of logos, physis, and ethos.

3

All philosophy, we said, has these three topics, these three themes. They can be mixed in a different way.

I can say, "My stomach speaks out of me." Then I am what you would call a clumsy materialist. I would then try to reduce the logos to an appearance of the physis.

I can say the opposite, as the idealist, and say, "All physical things are just appearances, semblances, the true meaning of it is in the mind."

And I can say that I know nothing of all these things. I only know of neighborly love, and I only know of my duties as a citizen in the polis. Then I am an ethicist like a good Stoic.

4

Today I have to make an attempt to bring this same truth home to you from the other end of the history of the Greek mind, from its very beginnings, so that you can understand why these strange three abstract things, *logos*, *ethic*, and *physics*, today still shake men.

#### IV THE ATROCIOUS ASS

1

This country is today only interested in physics. It cries out for physicists. And it asks physicists whether they believe in God, as though they knew anything about that.

Mr. Einstein is put in a window in the Riverside Church. Remarkable ineptitude. What the poor physicist who invents atom bombs knows about God Almighty, who tells him whether one can throw the atom bomb, or not throw the atom bomb?

That's a very different proposition. We all produce nonsense, gentlemen. But what to do with nonsense, that's the problem.

2

And so I asked you to bring to class the books that go before Lucretius.

Lucretius, as I said, is the Nietzsche of antiquity. He goes mad. And in an ending revolt, you may say, and also lyricism, he's the quintessence of the whole march of ancient philosophy from the traditional gods to their explanation by one man's mind, Lucretius himself.

And that's the same god Nietzsche tried: abolish the gods by making himself into a god.

3

And that's a good formula, gentlemen, that the philosopher tries the apotheosis of the philosopher, by explaining away the pre-philosophical powers, especially the gods or the authorities in the city, the kings, the tyrants, everybody. He becomes the king and the priest in his own right.

And anybody in this country who says, "I'm independent, and I think for myself," is the same kind of atrocious ass who says that he is god to himself.

4

Now Lucretius was not such an ass. He went at least mad over this issue, gentlemen. He paid with his own life, as Nietzsche did. And that's the greatness of these people, that they went to the end of the road, into the dead-end street, and warned you and me that if we follow there, that must be the result.

These great people, gentlemen, serve a great purpose, as any criminal does. Any murderer spares you to become a murderer. Any crime is there to deter you.

I'm sure that all great sinners are mighty useful in the kingdom of ends, because without the criminals we would commit all the crimes.

## V THE POET

1

So without philosophy of antiquity, gentlemen, many impasses and many dead-end streets would be traveled again.

But how did it all begin?

I asked you to read Homer. Every Greek philosopher down to Lucretius is shot through with Homer. And Homer's poetry, gentlemen, then is that nourishment out of which a philosopher tried to make philosophy. Homer deals with the logos, the ethos, and the physis not as a philosopher. His sense of wonder is there.

Any poet has a sense of wonder.

But the answer which he gives, gentlemen, is not a philosophical answer. And if he can now, by reading Homer, define his sense of wonder, in contrast to the philosophical sense of wonder, we'll know better what philosophy is.

2

So my second voyage into philosophy will come from the times when there was no philosophy.

Homer is not a philosopher. But he was treated by all the Greeks who came after him, down to the days of St. Augustine, to the end of antiquity, as their teacher. Homer is in Greek not a poet. He is *the* poet.

3

As a matter of fact, I read here a textbook written by an old Greek on the history of Greek philosophy. And the man quoted a list of books written by a famous Stoic. And I read on the right-hand side, in the English translation on Homer.

And I said to myself, "Has he written a book on Homer?" And I looked on the left side, into the Greek text, and it said, "On the poet." So then our translator in order to make clear what it was, had said "Homer," where the Greeks just had to say, "the poet."

In the Middle Ages -- if you read a commentary of St. Thomas on the Bible and he says "Apostolus," you know who is meant? (*Paul?*) Always. Paul is never quoted by name.

But it's Aristotle on the one-hand side, in the *Summa* of Thomas, and on the other hand, Apostolus. "Apostolus" is a different rank. Aristotle is just a philosopher. But Apostolus has authority. He doesn't speak for himself.

You treat Paul as Paul, and therefore you have no apostolic church left. If Paul is a man, he is of no interest to you and me. He's an apostle.

4

Well, however this may be, Homer was not Homer for the Greeks, but he was the entrance door to what made the distinction between a barbarian and a Greek. And therefore, what enabled a Greek to be a philosopher and to claim - and they did claim this, that only in the Greek language could you philosophize, and that the word "philosophy" therefore had to exist -- in 1956 in Dartmouth College, because you can't translate it.

And I'm still a member of the department of philosophy here to this day. That comes all from Homer, because Homer set apart the Greek language from any other language in the world.

## VI THE CENTER PART OF HOMER

1

We will then read a little bit of Homer in the next weeks.

Some decisive books, the second book of *The Iliad* for example, and the 24th book of *The Iliad*, must suffice. I'm sorry, I would like to read it all. Especially if you understand the second book of *The Iliad*, which the liberals of the 19th centuries

called spurious, and which we now again think to be the heart of the matter. The center part.

2

They have done with all the important books of antiquity -- in 19th century they have declared the Gospel of St. John to be spurious. And they have declared the Gospel of Matthew to be spurious, and Genesis to be spurious.

And now we think that the critics were spurious.

3

We'll see why it is not spurious, because I can prove to you, gentlemen, that without the second book of *The Iliad*, there would be no Greek philosophy, because it would not have been necessary.

We'll come to this after the recess.

4

Now I want to go to the rest of the literature.

We then will have to read some of the parallels in *The Odyssey* to show you that Homer was so powerful, because he wrote one poem on war, and another on peace. It's a little bit like the two world wars.

## VII THE FULL LIFE OF TWO GENERATIONS

1

As you know, the First World War was unable to shake America out of its deep sleep. And there had to be a second destruction of the world, with perhaps 20 more million people killed, because in this country, the people wanted to go home, and not mix and not meddle with entangling alliances. They had to go again.

Now the world, however, is destroyed. It was too late.

2

The same way, Homer is invincible and is permanent, because he has written two poems -- in my conviction, it's the same man who wrote them. As a young man he wrote *The Iliad*, and as an old man he wrote *The Odyssey*. And people are very strange in the modern world, since they all want to be boys -- up to the age of 85.

They insist that a man of 85 must have the same tastes, and the same convictions as a man of 30.

Now that's impossible.

So Homer is a true human being, because he writes two poems with two different moods. A man changes in his own life much more than two different people. But according to modern animal psychology, rats do not change.

But Homer is not a rat. He is a person who has sweated out his one poem, and therefore became free to write the second.

3

Otherwise we would never be able to explain how Shakespeare could write *The Taming of the Shrew* and *Hamlet*. If you go by psychology, it just couldn't happen. But that's the essence of man, that you can write *Timon of Athens* as a disappointed old man. If you know *Timon of Athens* or the *Winter Tale*, and you can write *Love's Labours Lost* as a young man, because it's still great fun to live, and you have still all your teeth, which in Shakespeare's days was the decisive break between youth and old age, because they had no dentist. They couldn't eat in old age.

4

Well, that's Homer. Homer is the full life of two generations, youth and old age, hovering over the mind of every Greek schoolboy, of anybody who learned to read and write Greek.

## VIII A SECOND VOYAGE

1

I have asked you then to buy this book here, which contains the awakening of the necessity to replace Homer by something different. The essence of the pre-Socratic philosophers is their struggle for a non-Homeric truth, and a non-Homeric sense of wonder.

*Poetry Is Not Enough*, you may also entitle this book. You all have it, I suppose. Poetry is not enough.

2

You may say it's a negative statement at first, but if we can understand it, then we also have learned the method of philosophy, gentlemen. Any sense of wonder must make clear what it does not wonder at. That is, negation. To say "no" to something is a condition of philosophy.

Poetry doesn't have to deny anything. You just sing. It's purely positive.

But philosophy always is a second voyage. It is always the denial of something that has gone before in my or your mind, and which we dismiss as not philosophical enough, as not-yet philosophy.

3

So all sense of wonder in philosophy, gentlemen, contains an element. It has been called "dialectics." It has been called criticism.

You have several expressions -- it's very important for you to know it today, the American mind in general is pre-philosophical, because it is purely positive. Keep up with the Joneses. It's a very good feature. This country is positive. It is not critical.

The Russians labor terribly under what they call "dialectics", because they can enjoy nothing what they do until they have proved that the wicked capitalists don't do it. It's a very hard, searching performance. They are only satisfied if their thinking is evidently critical. That is, if there is something to which they have said "no," before they are allowed to say "yes."

And therefore it's very foreign to our manner of thinking. The sun rises. We jump out of bed. We say, "It's wonderful." That's poetical thinking. You aren't surprised that I call you poets. But in a way, anybody who is satisfied with the positive statement is still in the poetical mood. To be poetic means to affirm, to say "yes" to your first impression.

4

Philosophy, gentlemen, then *deals with second impressions*.

Very important. Homer is still first impression. The philosophers deal with second impressions.

And we find there this painful road to second impressions traveled in this book.

## IX POKER FACE

1

And it's a story gentlemen, if you travel with me, you will rise to greater heights than you could personally travel, because these very great men -- from Thales of Miletus, the first philosopher of Greece, about 600 B.C., to Plato or to Socrates, to 400 -- they traveled this road which you think you don't have to travel, but which has opened to you as a college student.

2

You are all the heirs to this pre-Socratic stammering, to search for second impressions. And you all are sophisticated, because you are college students. You don't want to be taken in.

3

I have such a hard time to be understood by you, gentlemen, because I love to be taken in. I still side with the people who you were 10 years ago. Because then you were geniuses. You still lived by first impressions.

Any genius in this country is wiped out by 11 or 12 years of age. Of course, there are as many geniuses in this country as in any other country. Only after 12, we don't find them anymore. They are carefully wiped out and destroyed, because everybody is afraid to be taken in, to be called naive.

And as soon as you go to school, you mix with other people. You must look sophisticated, and you must have a poker face. And poker is unpoetic, as all card games are. That's for very old and cunning people, card games. Play bridge at the age of 95.

4

Young people shouldn't play card games. I think it is a melancholic business. You can run; you can play tennis. Don't play cards, gentlemen.

I had to play cards in the trenches of the First World War for years, because we had wet feet, and we couldn't get out. And there was no light, except a candle. And it's a very, very bad business, to play cards. Ruins your character. You have a sour taste afterwards in your mouth.

In an emergency, I don't mind.

These are not very serious things. I say it in passing. But card games are nothing for young people, except -- well, there are young people who play golf, too. I can't help that.

*X IT BEGINS WITH A BANG!*

1

Second impressions, gentlemen, and the road through these second impressions, that's the road of this book.

2

And then we come to the great men, Plato, Aristotle, the Stoics, and Epicurus, who have no longer to grope, to search for what a second impression is, how it should be formulated, what a philosophy is, that it is a second impression, and it begins with a bang!

3

The first of these philosophers is Plato.

Socrates never wrote a book, so we have no idea what he really was like. He is like a nightmare. It's a ghost. There are as many Socrateses as there have been people who have lived after him. And we shall see that Socrates is more a dream of our own times than of old Athens, because we don't know who he was.

We know so very little. We know his caricatures. We know his disciples. But we don't know him, because he was an intelligent man, so he didn't write.

But Plato was less intelligent. He was not intelligent as you think "intelligent" is. He was a poet who brought poetry into the shape of philosophy.

That's very important, gentlemen, that in Plato, the whole preamble of philosophy: Homer becomes subservient to the presentation of philosophy. The dialogues of Plato are great poetry in disguise. And therefore Plato turns against Homer and says: "In my future estates, and states, and families, and cities, Homer must not be read."

4

The first man is always the most radical, gentlemen. Christ is much more radical than a modern cardinal, or a modern Methodist minister.

And in the same sense, the first independent philosopher, Plato, was much more radical against Homer than my friend Lucretius, who again admitted him.

## XI *THE GRAVEN IMAGE OF THE GREEK MIND*

1

But the first man has to be absolutely adamant that a new day has begun, and he cannot admit this.

In the days of Moses no temple could be built in Israel. Four hundred years later Solomon was allowed to build a temple. It was no harm done by that time, they thought. Because you could again build temples as the Egyptian pharaohs, after you had established yourself.

2

The same is true, gentlemen, of Plato. If you want to know the story of Greek philosophy, always remember that it begins with Homer. That then people tried to struggle against the Homeric world of first impressions, of poetry; and tried to create a school, a tradition, a world view of second impressions, of getting behind things, of knowing better, of not being taken in.

Plato is the first who feels he has the recipe, how to get people together who will be independent of first impressions.

3

And the symptom, the seal under this new discovery, or under this completeness, this fulfillment of the march of philosophy through the Greek ages is that he exclaims, "No Homer for me. And no Homer for my academy. And no Homer for anybody who wants to be a philosopher."

That's the radicalism that is as radical as the command in the Ten Commandments that thou shalt have no other gods, and make yourself no graven image.

4

Homer is the graven image of the Greek mind.

Very important for you to know. We all have, I am afraid, graven images. If you don't know yours, gentlemen, you will be an idolater. And I'm afraid we have just as much idolatry today as we have in any century.

## XII POETRY AND PROSE

1

Your idolatry is not Homer. And your idolatry are not the graven images, gentlemen. I leave it to your own introspection to say what your idols are. But you certainly have them. And I know.

The graven image is in everybody's mind, because it hasn't to be graven on a wall. You are unfortunately the wax on which these things are engraved. And the clean slate, which the Ten Commandments try to make, so that the man can start as a new creature, they always have to go against the graven images.

2

Now in Greece, the graven image, the first image that befalls every human being as a Greek is Homer. And therefore Plato says, "No Homer." And he hides the poetical power in his dialogues in the beautiful form of his own writings.

That is, gentlemen, from Plato on, poetry takes second seat to prose.

3

And you can now reformulate our whole story, as I tried to give it at this moment by saying:

*in the first 400 years, from 800 to 400, poetry leads, prose follows;  
from 400 on, prose leads, poetry follows.*

You compare the age of Shakespeare and Milton and Spenser and your age of the Marx Brothers, and you will know that we have the same story to tell.

*Down to 1700, poetry leads, and prose follows.  
And from 1700 down today, prose leads,*

and there as admitted in The New Yorker, *ab und an* doggerel, which they call "poetry."

4

Poetry is enslaved in this country. There are still poetical natures. And there are people who write into their prose something poetical. A nice story, read the editorial in The New York Times on the weather. That is poetry very often. Clean-cut poetry, but has to hide in the form of a prose editorial.

Who knows these editorials in *The New York Times*? They are really great stuff.

### XIII COMMAND YOUR OWN MIND

1

But today, you must know this, gentlemen. Today prose leads, and poetry comes afterwards. It's a second thought.

Now I told you that poetry is formulating first impressions. And philosophy is formulating second impressions. So you can imagine that in a normal nation, poetry should come first and philosophy should come second.

And this is such a prosaic country, gentlemen, that the boys have told me that they stop writing poetry at the age of 12. That's why I say, then they stop to be geniuses, because any genius is a man who believes in his first impressions. But in a Rotary Club, you'd better not do this, because that's bad business. Because my first impression of many of my fellow Rotarians would be such that I wouldn't come again.

2

So from Plato to Aristotle, gentlemen, and to Epicure, and Zeno -- the founder of the Stoic school -- we have prose leading poetry.

But now something more happens. At this moment you have texts here to read from Plato and from Aristotle. And they are so plentiful that I advise, especially this gentleman who was so anxious about not reading even the first book of Lucretius, that he better starts reading Aristotle and Plato now right away.

3

I shall not make them an assignment, gentlemen. It is a privilege to read philosophy. It is not an assignment. And I tell you, I am not treating you as children. You are 20 years of age. You could command a battleship. Before 150 years, people of 20 did command battleships. I do not see why you could not command your own mind and read something on your own steam.

I'm not interested in any assignment. I repeat this, gentlemen, it's just up to you whether you afterward will blush and say, "I have wasted my time." You are 20 years of age, once more, I have to repeat this, gentlemen, and you will never be 20 years again. It's such a glorious moment in your life, gentlemen, that I shouldn't have to say anything more.

4

But now comes my problem, gentlemen.

The Greek philosophy is very much an American problem, because we also have 48 states. Greek philosophy has to deal with the plurality of the human states and governments and religions.

In *The Odyssey* and in *The Iliad*, gentlemen, the first impressions which the poet makes so tyrannical, so overwhelming -- Homer is a barbarian afterwards, for one simple reason: that he takes all the Greeks together on one single expedition.

And he shows them in a situation in which they have never lived in fact, together.

#### XIV SOMETHING LIKE THE TROJAN WAR HAPPENED TO THIS COUNTRY

1

If you look however - we have no map here, but I think that much geography may stick in your minds. If you look -

2

please don't smoke, gentlemen. It's too hard on my throat. I shall plead just partial, I mean. I'm terribly sensitive at this moment with my throat. So I should be very grateful if you wouldn't smoke.

3

The situation of the Homeric poems is that perhaps 271 Greek entities, the city of Sparta, and the city of Athens, and the island of Euboea, and the city of Thebes, and all the various 70 different cities of Crete unite in one campaign, on one purpose: to get back the goddess of beauty, Helen, which the Easterners have robbed.

The unity, gentlemen, of purpose, beyond the religious and political unit of one church or one state, is in our world war an experience that has been repeated. Something like the Trojan War happened to this country twice in the 20th century.

Don't forget that even the British, whom the Irish in Boston hate so much, were our allies at that time, and that we were allies of the Russians, not to speak of the Italians and the French.

4

Now gentlemen, you overlook that in peacetime, as you have now lived through the last 10 years more or less with some consciousness, it is much more normal to think of a man who lives under another constitution as an enemy. The Russians have been treated as enemies, simply by the fact that they live under another constitution.

In antiquity, such a constitution was not called just another constitution, but another religion. And our newspaper writers, and our agitators, and all the people who want to make money out of opinions have tried to tell us here too that Bolshevism was not a political thing, but a religion. Because then they could say, "That's a crusade, and we must throw the atomic bomb on Moscow." And the Catholic bishops went to Mr. Truman and said, "We have no objection against your throwing the atomic bomb on the antichrist, in Moscow."

If you can build up even the Russians, who have the same Christian tradition as all Western men, against the Chinese and against the Hindus, who are much nearer to us than any Japanese, certainly -- if you can sell the people of this country at least for three years the ridiculous notion that they are the enemies of the human race, then you can imagine how normal it was in antiquity that Jupiter, as worshiped in Athens, and Jupiter as worshiped on Crete had around them people who could only fight each other and could only cut their throats.

#### XV *POLIS IS AN ENTITY WHICH CAN WAGE WAR*

1

Now the Greeks in discrimination or in distinction, I should say, from the Egyptians, and the Babylonians, and the Jews, and the Phoenicians - perhaps not so much the Phoenicians, but certainly from these people in Asia - lived on little promontories, on little peninsulas, by the hundreds. Every of these so-called city-states, as we call them, were called a polis.

Now the Greek word "polis" has something to do with *polemos*, with war. A polis is an entity that can wage war independently.

I won't go at the moment into the details of this etymology. There is debate about this. But it is a good definition that a Greek polis is an entity that can wage war.

2

Any entity that can wage war against the rest of the world, gentlemen, must have its own religion. It's impossible not to have a religion, because religion is the power to estimate things higher than your own life. And if you go to war, there must be values that transcend your own life. Otherwise there can be no war.

3

*War is always a religious fact. A really materialistic society could not wage war.*

From this you see that the Russians are not materialists, because they have waged war, and they still are going to.

War is always a religious thing -- because you cannot bring any soldier to enter the Marines, except if he knows that it is more important that there are Marines than there is my own life, and that's why it's correct that the sergeant was pardoned.

4

That has also talked out in this last 30 years, where everything has been abandoned in this country. It is a very simple thing, gentlemen.

Any entity that wants to wage war must have a religion. Because religion is the power to conquer death. That's all what religion is. You and I die -- if we have no religion, it is perfectly meaningless. There must be something that ties us to reality, whether we happen to be out the grave, or in the grave. It makes no difference. A good man is not killed when he dies.

#### XVI FIRST IMPRESSIONS ARE ALWAYS RELIGIOUS

1

If there is no such thing, then there is no religion. And religion therefore is not a luxury, gentlemen. It is the only point in your own life by which your own existence does not depend on the accident of an idiotic truck driver, or a drunken other student who kills you.

Is this all you are? Just his own, arbitrary victim? You don't believe this for a minute.

2

But everybody of course in Dartmouth College is obliged to believe it officially, because we are under the domination of all these crackpots who say that man is just an animal. But all these gentlemen in psychology and all these other nice departments, are quite sure that there would be soldiers to defend the United States against Hitler 10 years ago.

And they all have their nice salaries and their nice houses on the basis of the fact that 100,000 boys were willing to die for their country, which makes all this talk

absolutely absurd, what these people tell you what man is. They tell you that man is, I don't know, how many electrons.

3

So gentlemen, religion is pre-philosophical. And if every city in Greece had its own religion, then there cannot be philosophy.

Because the strongest impressions on any child are the loyalties to his family, and on any citizen are the impressions made in his own city and his own country.

Now in Greece, people lived so tight-knit in these little harbor cities, like Athens, or like Argos, or Corinth, that they were quite overwhelmed with the fact that they were members of this one society. And there was the goddess of Venus perhaps worshiped in Corinth, and the goddess Hera -- Juno worshiped in Argos; and Zeus worshiped in Olympia, and Athene worshiped in Athens. And nobody knew any better, but this was their religion for which, for whom, and for whose gods it was the great privilege of a citizen to die. And to beget children, to educate them, and to dedicate them in the honor of the gods of the city.

4

So gentlemen, *first impressions are always religious.*

Would you take this down?

Again, this is today wiped out. And people give you sex enlightenment instead. They don't teach the children to pray, but they teach the children who are not interested in it at all where their genitals sit. They know this, by the way, all very well themselves.

It is very terrifying today, gentlemen. We have abolished all power to be Americans, to be citizens, because you think that citizenry has something to do with life. Unfortunately it has something to do with death, with the meaning of death.

You can't be a citizen through a good life, gentlemen. You can only be the citizen if you are willing to give your life for your country. It hasn't to be in war, by the way; but in some form. If a child drowns, somebody has to jump into the river, get it out. That's enough to show that your life is very little compared to the continuity of the entity to which you belong.

## XVII *YOUR NAME IS THE FIRST IMPRESSION*

1

This is then the first impression, gentlemen, which Homer has dinned into the ears and hearts of every Greek, that they belong to one religious community.

The first impression is not what you think, sense impressions. If this were so, of course, you and I would not be human beings, but just animals. But the first word which you have learned to speak, the first is your own name, that's your first impression.

Now you all believe that this is your real name.

2

I came at the age of 45 to this country, gentlemen. It's quite a shock when people then suddenly do not pronounce your first name as you have heard it pronounced for 45 years at home, because even a first name, as you know, is pronounced in another language very differently. It isn't Peter when you go to France. It's Pierre. So you wake up one day, and you have lost your name.

That is a shock, because your own name is the one religious foundation on which your soul rests. If your name is denied you, you can just as well be shipped to a concentration camp, where they took away all names, and made people into numbers, and then gassed them, because they had ceased to be human beings.

3

The first step always, gentlemen, is that we are numbered when people want to deny us our religious status as children of God. At every birth, we are given a name, Arkansas Number 2,400. Very dangerous procedure. Then you are fingerprinted. Then that's the end.

Man is not a number, gentlemen, because man must hear by what he is called, and he must agree to that. And this secret agreement between what people have done to him and what he knows about himself, is our first fixed point in reality, in this great universe which consists of logos, ethos, and physis.

4

If there is no name inside you, you are crazy. You are insane. You must recognize, identify yourself by a name, and it isn't of your own making. Somebody else called you by this name.

Society says, "His name was given to the sheriff, so it is true. It's his name." And you are recognized all over the globe under this name. And if you disappear behind the Iron Curtain, the American consulate will search you, and will insist, "That's his real name."

## XVIII *IN EVERY SUCH NAME THERE IS A RELIGIOUS STORY*

1

Very strange thing, underestimated today by modern rationalists, who do not live by first impressions and do not admit that everybody has a religion, gentlemen.

Your first religion is not the belief in God or Jesus Christ, if you haven't been preached this, you know nothing. But you know very well that you have a name.

2

Now a name, gentlemen, makes you a member, because anybody who has a name knows that somebody else may have another name. And we all share in Heaven the fact that every one of us has his own name. So one name, gentlemen, allows for all other names.

That's very strange, because they are all related. In English, for example, you can relate all names to each other. Where there is a male's name, there is also a female's name. You have John and Jean, or Joan, or Jane.

3

You can, of course, vary this nowadays. It is always the same problem of the feminine to John. And they all take you out of England, and they take you out of New England, because "John" and "Joan" come from the Bible. And therefore in every such name, there is always a religious story.

And if you have "Harold," even this is a religious name. People today try to eliminate the biblical names, perhaps, but then they go back to pagan names, which in this country is rather funny.

4

But what I tried to say, gentlemen, is that first impressions are names. And by everybody's name, he is tied to that society which has given him this name.

## XIX THE ARCHIPELAGO

1

Now the Greeks had this terrible problem -- and it is terrible, that they were 300 such warring communities giving their own names, but constantly trading, constantly going back and forth to Egypt, to the mouth of the Nile, going back to the Tigris, to Damascus, for example, to the trade routes of the great empires of Persia and Media, and Assyria, and therefore a Greek was a man of more than one country by actual experience.

Every Greek who is a Greek cannot be confined to his religious place. When he goes out and across the sea from one of the Greek islands -- think of all these islands, Delos, and Thasos, and Skios, and Euboea, and - give me names of Greek Islands?

2

Who can give me the name of a Greek island? Where is the island of St. John? Which is the island on which St. John the Evangelist was confined? Nobody ever read the New Testament? It's quite a good book. You don't know where St. John spent his old age? What? Nearly, yes. The first three letters are correct.

*Patmos*, yes. On the island of Patmos. Go there. It's a beautiful little island. They have a special tour now arranged for 12 interesting islands in the Greek sea. Patmos.

My first independent book was published in a publishing firm which we founded for by this very name, Patmos publishing firm, because we wanted to say that the end of the old Europe had happened after the First World War. And that's a very incisive name in my own life. Patmos.

3

But the Greek -- it's called the archipelago, gentlemen, our fundamental sea, this part of the Mediterranean which is now so much in the paper that you don't even know where it lies -- between Mr. Tito and Mr. Nasser.

This is today again the struggle for the domination of the world. And we have sold out by the nervousness of Mr. Dulles to Mr. Nasser and to Mr. Khrushchev, because we have allowed Albania to be a submarine base for the Russians. And we have Mr. Tito allowed to go without our planes and get his planes now from Russia.

It's very bad, gentlemen. Who has the Eastern Mediterranean governs the world.

4

And therefore these islands there are of no small importance to the history of the human race, gentlemen. On these islands there was bred the spirit of philosophy.

We will see that most of these philosophers have something to do with the shores of this Greek archipelago. "Pelagos" means ocean, "Archi-" the arch, the sea, the genuine sea, the most important sea. Because gentlemen, on an island, 4 -- 6 square miles big -- take Desert Island here in Maine - you cannot forget that there are people on the other side of the isthmus, on the other side of the water. You see the land.

## XX THE BATTLE OF SALAMIS AND THE QUESTION OF SHALOM - PEACE

1

Therefore all attempts of the Greek priesthood, of the Greek religious people, to confine a man's loyalties to his own homeland alone were abortive. You just could not convince a man in Athens that Salamis was not also his concern. Now Salamis, gentlemen, is an island in front of Athens.

2

Has anybody been to Greece? Where have you been? (*Athens.*) Where is Salamis? (*It's an island off the -- I haven't been there.*) Have you seen it? (*No.*) You flew. Oh, of course.

Well, the island of Salamis is quite famous, because it is the battle for freedom of Greece, which was won there against the Persians. We, you and I, are the heirs of this battle to this day.

And that there is a course in Greek philosophy is only based on this battle of Salamis.

When was the battle of Salamis?

Now, you look this up next time, and tell me. Every one of you look this up, gentlemen. You can't enter the kingdom of Heaven without knowing when the battle of Salamis was.

3

But Salamis is a Phoenician name. "Salamis" means peace, the island of peace, as Solomon.

Now in front of the city of Athens then there was an island in which the great victory was fought over the Persian king, and yet the name was not Greek. I think that's terribly important, that the Athenians had to love an island with a non-Greek name, where their mother tongue came second, came too late to replace it.

Just as we here have to put up with "Connecticut" and with all the Indian names, and try to mix "Eleazar Wheelock" in as best we can.

4

So gentlemen, the problem of Greek philosophy is the unique situation of any Greek, that he was faced with a larger universe than his political and religious loyalties explained.

## XXI *THE TREMENDOUS CONTINENT*

1

Any Greek looked beyond his state.

That's not normal. An American has places to go, from west to east, that you don't have to go abroad, you remain immersed in America without our means of transportation. Innumerable people, after they had landed here, never got out of this continent again. It was technically impossible, far too expensive. And communication before 1865 didn't amount to anything. How could you get out? You were glad that you were here.

2

And you tried -- that's isolationism. You did not look back, because you said, "It was such a costly affair and so terrifying ever to get here, I was so seasick, I shall never go back." Because seasickness for three months on a boat is quite a serious thing. And half of the people on the Mayflower died in the process. And half of the people who made the transcontinental journey, hit the Oregon Trail, they died.

In a friend's family, the descendants of the first chief justice of California, there's a private print, in which this first chief justice who, at the ripe age of 23 graduated from Yale Law School, made the journey. And he describes how they, from June to October, journeyed west. Well, out of 72 people who went on the Oregon Trail, 26 arrived. The rest had died.

That's the real story, gentlemen, of a total confinement to a religious entity called "the West."

3

So the Manifest Destiny. And such an experience is hard enough to create an American religion. It has created Mormonism, for example, which is an attempt to give America a completely separate religious status. That was the great enthusiasm of the Mormons, that they said the spirit of God hadn't made the detour through Europe. There was an American, original revelation.

Quite plausible, gentlemen, for people who had undergone such hardships, to forget the world from which they came.

4

So the American scene is not quite the same as the Greek scene. We have a tremendous continent. And we have many countries from which the people have come into this continent.

In Greece it is the opposite story, gentlemen. You have a tremendous continent surrounding you called Egypt, the African coastline, where Carthage is. Where today you read about Algier, and Tunis, Tripolis. And you have the Phoenician coast. And you have Asia Minor. And you have the big island of Cyprus.

And in between come on their little boats these Greeks, founding city after city, from Marseille to the Black Sea, where they have Byzantium, later our modern Istanbul, Constantinople and these innumerable hundreds of cities, religiously found their own temple, bring their sacrifices to their own goddess or god, and try to bring the children up in the worship of the local deity, and try to teach them that their city deserves to be defended to the last breath and to the last drop of blood.

And at the same time, these people see and live by commerce with other cities, of Barbarians, and of other Greek tribes -- Dorians, and Ionians, and Aeolians, and the people from Boeotia, and Attica who had mixed descent from these various tribes, Macedonians.

## XXII ALL PHILOSOPHY IS SECOND

1

And therefore, gentlemen, you will perhaps begin to understand that the Greeks were just as predestined to become philosophers as the Jews were predestined to become prophets.

The reason for the Jews was that they found a place at the crossroads of the old world in which they could live by themselves. And therefore, all this dispersal of many creeds and many religions was nonsense. That was the Jewish situation.

The Greeks were in exactly the opposite geographical situation from the Jews. They were not in one place united, but they were in many hundred places dispersed.

So their question was, gentlemen: what about second impressions? Is it really true that we have a god in Athens that differs from the god elsewhere? Is my language -- my Attic dialect really so different from the Egyptian language which these Egyptian priests tell their people?

2

Gentlemen, *second impressions are the necessity for the existence of the many Greek cities.*

Will you take this down? Because here I give you the material explanation, why the Greeks became predestined to build upon their first religion -- the first impression is always our religion -- on their religion a second one.

And we learn something important, gentlemen: *all philosophy is second.* It is never primary. It cannot be primary. You first have to be told. Then you can wake up and say, "But I say."

That's philosophy. That's this dealing with your second impressions.

3

When you learn by waking up that the world in which you prayed, the world in which you worshiped, the world in which you fought, the world in which you wish to die, in which you are ready to die, the world in which you think it is a privilege to give your life -- as Nathan Hale -- and you are only sorry that you have one life to give to your country, then you wake up and say, "But there are more countries. So my sentence -- I wished I had more than one life to give to my country -- must be balanced by the question, but are not there other things to be done outside my country?"

That leads you to second values, to second impressions.

4

And these second impressions, gentlemen, of philosophy then -- now comes the important statement which unfortunately our modern textbooks have embezzled:

*philosophy always presupposes an existing religious and political order.*

Law and religion must already have entered your experience before you can become a philosopher. A lawless person and an irreligious person cannot be a philosopher, because he has no experience by which he knows what has to be generalized; what has to be made by your second impression has to be extended to more than your hometown.

### XXIII EXAMPLE: CHRISTMAS IN ARGENTINA

1

The whole problem of philosophy is, to extend that which is true in your own family, and in your own home, in your own nation to more.

Because your family is not the only family; your nation is not the only nation; the geography and the climate of your own country is not the only climate; and therefore you have this problem in Argentina: when do you celebrate Christmas? Do you celebrate Christmas in the midst of summer?

It's a great problem. I don't know how they deal with it.

2

Has anybody been to Argentina? Does anybody know how these poor people do it, with the Christmas tree? Without snow? What do they do? (*Well, in Australia, the same thing.*) What? What do they do? *lamb chop, do the same thing.*) Lamb chop prize? (*Lamb chop.*) What do you mean by that? (*Well, they have trees. They have pine trees. And it's Christmas in the middle of the summer.*) They have it in the summer. And what do you say of lamb chops? (*Well, they get a big mess of lamb chops and divide them up. But it's Christmas.*) Have you lived there? (*Yeah.*)

3

Now, a philosopher, or good philosophy would enable the Argentineans to have Christmas in their winter. And say, "Our 24th of December is wintertime," because the winter is more important for the celebration than the name of the day, wouldn't you say?

So it's just superstition that they must have Christmas on that which in the calendar is called 24th of December. They have no philosophy. They have no power to get out of first impressions. Now you see what is the first impression.

I told you the names are first impressions. Your own name. All language is a first impression. That something is called 24th of December is such a superstition with

these poor people on the southern hemisphere that they cannot look through this name.

They cannot generalize the name December, and look into the meaning of the December, that it is the month in the heart of winter.

Well, I have my special ideas about the superstitions of the South Americans.

4

From this example, I'm quite serious, gentlemen, you see the quandary in which the Greeks lived. It wasn't that they had discovered so much the other hemisphere. They hadn't. But they did live in such a dispersal, and in such a variety of places, and with so many different substrata of population, they were colonials, living with people who spoke another language around them -

as the people in Trieste, who are Italians today, and are surrounded by Yugoslavs. And therefore we Americans have destroyed Istria by carefully dividing it so that it can neither live nor die.

But Trieste was the most wonderful harbor founded by Italians, surrounded by Yugoslavs, and serving the Germans in Austria. That's a typical Greek situation, as a matter of fact, the Italians of Trieste, - and Trieste and Venice are the heirs of the old Greek trade routes, and of the old problem of the city.

That's why Venice was such a proud republic in the Middle Ages, because it carried on the Greek tradition, of a city within unlimited territories of other people's government.

#### XXIV *THE REAL HUMANISM*

1

So from the problem of Homer, gentlemen, down to the geography of all philosophers after him, you see that the Homeric poetry was only possible because he showed all the Greeks united at war, and he gave them this one memory which never occurred again, that all the Greeks were of one religion, that all Greeks had the same purpose, that all Greeks died and lived for the same cause, that all Greeks could therefore be on peaceful and friendly terms with each other.

2

But we shall see that this tremendous creation of Homer's passionate imagination, that you could have one religion beyond your own temple, beyond your own priest,

which was larger than what you saw in your own hometown, that this even extended to the non-Greeks.

When we read the 24th book of Homer, we will see that Homer created humanism.

Today we have the so-called humanities, and we have rationalism, and that's called "humanism."

3

Gentlemen, the humanism of Greek brand -- the real humanism of antiquity is something more practical and something much greater. Modern humanism means you understand everything and you do nothing. But the problem of an ancient humanism was, as I told you, to see in the man, against whose city you made war, your brother.

It is very easy to love all people outside war. There are many good Americans who are pacifists and therefore think they are very kind to the human race. When it comes to war, they may become conscientious objectors, but it doesn't help anybody. The war goes on just the same.

The problem is, gentlemen, to obstruct something like *The Naked and the Dead*, and to see in the man against whom you go to war, your brother, and who is a courageous man on the other side -- chivalry is something quite different from pacifism.

It is much more difficult to understand that: when two nations go to war, they are the best people of both nations who confront each other on the battle lines.

4

When I was in the First World War, I wrote a pamphlet - I never published it, I would have been arrested -- "Soldiers of All Countries, Unite." And I wanted to unite against the profiteers at home. We were disgusted with our people at home. And so were the French disgusted with their peoples at home.

But we people in the trenches, we loved each other. And we didn't hate each other. That's only an idea of ladies at home, that soldiers hate. No soldier hates. Newspapermen hate. And people at home hate. Perhaps women's clubs hate soldiers in war. No soldier who's a good soldier ever hates his enemy. It's unknown. He has respect for his enemy. And he feels a tragedy that he should fight such a good man.

As long as you do not understand this, gentlemen, you cannot be humanists. And I think Americans are pacifists, but they are not humanists, because you think that outside the conflict, you can be of one religion.

Gentlemen, obviously if there are gods who send wars and famines and earthquakes and tragedies and death and your polio -- think only of polio. And -- didn't I tell you the story of the lady who ran away from her husband because he had polio? It's the same thing. If she cannot see the same soul in the man after he has polio, she is not a human being.

That's humanism, to see unity despite conflict.

## XXV THE DIVISIONS OF MANKIND MADE RELATIVE

1

So the Greek problem of humanism was to recognize in the enemy on the battlefield somebody who had the same merit, and the same right as you had. And wars can only be fought as long as you have this faith that on the opposite side, the people are just as good or better as you are. Because a war is not fought by people, but for causes, and for important causes.

2

And I think I have been a good soldier, and I have been a soldier a very long time. I have been in uniform for six years.

I say this to you because it is simply true, that I have never felt anger, or aversion, or hostility against anybody except against the home warriors, the people at home with the big mouth. Those I have despised and hated.

3

This is then the Greek problem of humanism. "Humanism" is the most general expression for philosophy. Any philosophy will have to bring out in you and me the power not to be confined to those who already fall in line, who already act in such a way that you can understand.

So gentlemen, the fact that you and I are immersed partly in nature, that people live in Russia and just by the land mass over there happen to be separated from us - for any mind who thinks twice, that's no good reason to be very estranged from him. And this must be made relative.

Philosophy, gentlemen, *makes the religious divisions of mankind relative.*

4

But philosophy cannot create religion, gentlemen. And philosophy can never create first impressions.

It has been said, and take this down, gentlemen, it's a very important sentence which I only quote from a great Swiss historian, Jakob Burckhardt, who warned men against their glorification of Greek philosophy in the days of Nietzsche, and rightly so. He said,

*"Not one Greek philosopher has been able to close one Greek temple."* That is, one superstitious idolatry of the many gods of Greece.

Philosophers are unable to replace first impressions.

## XXVI PHILOSOPHY GENERALIZES

1

Once you know this, gentlemen, you will not expect too much from philosophy. Nobody can live by philosophy, except fools.

2

Philosophy can extend your love and your charity and your faith and your hope. But you must first realize this faith and hope in other ways, because you cannot wait till you have second impressions. No way.

If you teach your philosophy to your child, it is this child's religion. It is not its philosophy.

3

Parents -- the enlightened people have abolished the fairy tales, and the legends, and the Bible, and tell them scientific stuff, as I said, this genital enlightenment, and so on. Well, for the child, it becomes its religion. It's usually then a valueless religion, because religion must be given us in a different manner from philosophy.

But the modern heresy is that people think philosophy can take first seat.

That's impossible. Philosophy is -- after you are committed to certain loyalties, to certain truths, to certain methods of dealing with reality then, after you have been made to share the life of truth, and the life of your neighbors, and the life of the earth

around you, and the sky around you, that then you can be taught that this isn't the whole story. There is something second. There's something more.

4

Philosophy, gentlemen, generalizes.

## XXVII *SOMETHING TO LIBERALIZE UPON*

1

The famous story with which I would like to end today:

I have a friend in Boston, who is a Congregational minister, now a very old man. When he was still serving his congregation -- the First Congregational Church in Cambridge, he received the visit of a man and his son, and the man was widely known as a free thinker of the first order and is a violent enemy of the Church. And my friend, Mr. McNair, was puzzled, because the man brought his son to enter Sunday school.

And he screwed up his courage and he said to this man, "Sir, isn't that a joke? How shall I take this? I am hesitant to accept this child from you, because you have said so often how you feel about us, that we were just monsters of superstition and obsolescence."

And the man said, "Well, it's funny. I agree. But I mean it. Don't be afraid. Take the boy. Because after much consideration, I have felt he must have something to liberalize upon."

He must have something to liberalize upon.

2

This is the problem of philosophy. Philosophy generalizes. You can also say it "liberalizes upon." But there is nothing to liberalize upon, the whole liberalization makes absolutely no sense.

And you all are the victims of a liberalization before you have ever been committed to love, faith and hope. Or to adoration of the God Almighty and His son, and the Holy Spirit.

Now that's very pure order. You are just emancipated before you are emancipated. It has come too early.

3

My son has had a case where the parents had a genius of a baby, very musical child, it showed signs of delight and enchantment when it heard music, when it was a little baby of six. So they insisted that this child had immediately to be fed music, and to know all the names of the composers.

And by the age of two it was a vegetable. They had dared to liberalize upon, before the naive, quiet growth of the child had taken place. And the child is destroyed, for good. Nothing can help it.

4

That's a tragic story. Of course, that is the maximum of idiocy and crime, committed by philosophy.

And most girls who come from our colleges are in great danger of doing this, gentlemen. You, as the husbands, must then protect your children against their mothers. They must be kept away from this idiocy, gentlemen, of enlightenment, too early.

It comes early enough that we wake up and know that our world is limited. But first give them a limited world, as best as you can.

## XXVIII *TO KNOW WHO WE ARE*

1

Woe to you if you begin with philosophy with your children. They are not to philosophize unless they do not come up to the rough corners of their little haven of certainty and security. You have first to give them the certainty.

And of course, you have to live it yourself in this manner.

2

Philosophy is the second voyage through life. It is never the first. It generalizes upon -- and never forget that "to generalize" means you must start with a particular.

And the particular is not this stone, and is not this house, and is not a thing. The particular is your commitment, that you are tied to people who tell you the truth. Your parents, for example. That is a first experience.

3

That's why I say, gentlemen, the first environment of a child is not his soil or the air or the weather. It is what he's told. Because upon any child's heart, what he is told falls as a religious revelation. And if he doesn't make this experience, that his name is true as gold -- his own name, that his parents will never give him up, because he is their child and they have named him, then the child has no religion.

4

Religion is nothing, gentlemen, which we choose. Religion is something that saves us from complete confusion, from the night, that we do not know who we are. Withdraw from a child its name, then it has no parents.

That's why it is not the same to be born out of wedlock, or in wedlock. It makes all the difference whether you have a father who has confessed that he is the criminal, or a father who doesn't.

XIX

1

It is very important to have a father, gentlemen. And any adopted child and any orphan knows this.

There are of course many orphans who make up for the father they don't have, by hook and crook, by being loved by other people. But it has to be made up in some way or the other.

This is first commitment. Because you would say philosophically that all men have one father in Heaven, that we should all be brothers.

Gentlemen, the first experience must be that you have a father, poor as he may be. A real father is still better than no father. And then the thought of a father, which would be philosophy.

2

So I hope I have shown you, gentlemen, that the Greeks were in this unique situation, to fall for second impressions. That is, they could never -- is it clear? -- be satisfied with first impressions.

3

Now gentlemen, there have been the great people, like the Chinese or the Egyptians, or the Incas -- who didn't get outside their own country, and therefore had no need for philosophy. Philosophy is only necessary whenever we go beyond the edge of our own, God-given environment.

4

At that moment, we must enlarge on those loyalties to nature, to men, and to the powers that be, who govern our steps and must try to find out when we should celebrate Christmas in Argentina.

## FIFTH LECTURE: INTELLIGENCE IS A GREAT HANDICAP FOR GETTING INTO HEAVEN

### I PURSUIT OF HAPPINESS IS A CHIMERA

1

...we are all indebted to both of them. [*tape interruption*] (*This is Side 2.*)

...carrying a burden which certainly made them into a caricature of human beings.

You wouldn't like to be a Greek, and you wouldn't like to be a Jew of antiquity. The burden was too heavy. But if they hadn't both lived and offered their prophets and their philosophers, we would be poorer off.

They are victims for your and my sake.

2

This is so very hard for you to understand because you think there are no victims, gentlemen. But your mother is the victim certainly of your upbringing.

There are sacrifices, gentlemen, and all mankind is only dovetailed and held together by such sacrifices.

And I cannot assure you strongly enough that if you want to study the history of Greek philosophy or any philosophy, you must understand that the philosopher is functioning for your sake, and therefore is an abnormal being so that you can be normal. The Greeks and the Jews are abnormal so that there might be, between these two extremes, a middle road.

You look at life just as play and think everybody can be happy. That's nonsense. In fact, I would say nobody can be happy. You can all reach your destiny. You can be blessed. You can be a saint. You can be a hero. You can be a mother. You can be a good man. But you can't be happy.

3

The pursuit of happiness is a chimera.

Goethe, perhaps the happiest man that has lived in the last 150 years, has said if he counted all, he had perhaps six years of continuous happiness in his whole life, and he got to be 84. Give that up, gentlemen, that chimera. Happiness is a by-product.

You can never aim at happiness. As soon as you aim at happiness, you are a nervous wreck. All the people who want to be happy can't be happy.

Happiness is a result of right living, but it is never a purpose.

4

And that's your impoverishment, gentlemen. You try to be happy so very hard. So you are the most stifled and frustrated people. Anybody who wants to be happy, gentlemen, is frustrated, because he doesn't aim at what life is for. He aims at a by-product. It would be, as most of you do: you go for the wrappings.

I mean, if you have a sandwich, gentlemen, you can be interested in the wrappings or in the sandwich.

*I'm interested in the sandwich - that's living.  
You are interested in the wrapping - that's happiness.*

## II HOW ALL FULFILLMENT LOOKS

1

I warn you, gentlemen. The Greeks are a tragic people. They are as tragic as the Jews. And both are tragic -- and we owe to tragedy, voluntary lived, for example, to the people in Valley Forge and to the people who died in the Battle of the Bulge in 1945 and to the boys who died in Korea - to them we owe our happiness.

You have no happiness except at a price. And the price is always paid by the people who renounce their own happiness for the sake of others.

2

And I am not going to teach philosophy here for people who have a sweet tooth and want to just to enjoy life, gentlemen. There is nothing to enjoy about life. Too serious for that.

You can enjoy it. But who cares whether you enjoy it?

But this constant question on this campus, "Did you enjoy it?" means that you can't live. Life is not here for enjoyment. Life is to be lived. It's serious business. It's an act of God. It's a government of the world. It's the creation of the world today.

And as you -- little as you are -- will ask a rose that opens its bud, "Do you enjoy it?"- she has just to become a rose. That's all there is to it. She has to fulfill her destiny, whether she enjoyed it or not, it's a by-product.

3

When Richard Wagner's Bayreuth, the famous center of art, was opened, his wife, Cosima Wagner, who was the mainspring of this great foundation -- you have heard it, it has been revived now, and many people have gone there -- spent the whole first evening in tears. And she wrote into her diary, "That's how all fulfillment looks."

That's how all fulfillment looks.

4

They cheat you, gentlemen, by telling you, "Keep smiling." And "Life is smile." Life is not smile. Life is perfectly indifferent to your weeping and to your smile. You may weep on such a decisive evening, or you may smile. It doesn't alter the fact that Bayreuth had to be constituted, opened, and there it was. And the accompaniment of the grin or of the tears of the lady concerned, or Richard Wagner, whether he felt it was a triumph, or whether he felt it was a defeat, is a very minor matter to the fact that for 90 years people go to Bayreuth. That's the important thing that matters.

### III *PHILOSOPHY ALONE CANNOT RULE*

1

And the same is true about getting a child, gentlemen. That's not an enjoyment. And it is not terrible. It's in between. Some mothers suffer terribly and have a very healthy and blissful child. And some people -- it means nothing to them, the birth, and the child is no good.

Obviously the important thing is that a good child is born. And the grin on the person's face, who happens to be the mother of the child, is quite second-rate compared to the great event that a living being enters the world.

But you only look how does the mother, does she smile? And then you are satisfied.

2

Well, I say this, gentlemen, because I have tried to write in this paper something about the tremendous jump into a new dimension which was done when Greek philosophy got started.

3

The second thing I want to remind you of: last time I tried to draw your attention to the fact that philosophy is second impression. Nobody as a boy can philosophize. It's a second thought, philosophy. After we have already been made to think, to write, to read, to live, to breathe, to shit, then we take stock and we begin to philosophize. It is always second.

You understand this. So therefore philosophy is second impressions. It is not first impression.

4

Once you know this, gentlemen, you know that philosophy alone cannot rule the world. It's an idiocy, Plato's idea that philosophers should be kings. It's a very terrifying notion.

That the Greeks in their madness went so far to believe, just as the Jews thought the prophets could run the world.

Well, they can't.

By prophecy the present day doesn't get its due. Philosophy comes too late, because philosophy is after-thought. We can't wait. The thing has to be decided now.

#### IV WE WOULD ALL SNEEZE

1

I once had a case of a real philosophizing lady. I'll tell you the story so that you may never forget the distinction between philosophy and religion -

*[tape interruption]*

...I visited a friend. And he had six children from his first marriage, and had married again, had a very conscientious lady who had of course taken all her degrees. And she had a seventh baby, that is, her own, to the six -- her foster children.

And they lived in a little cottage in a suburban housing development. And three stone steps led down from the entrance into the garden, when you went then to the street, when you came in or went out.

So when I took my leave, it had begun to rain. Not very hard, but it decidedly rained. The steps were wet. And she had her baby on her arm escorting me to the door, with her husband. In this very moment, the child began to sneeze. And she in

her great conscientiousness put the child down on the step in the rain and ran into the house to look up the book to find out what one should do when a baby sneezes.

2

That's a good story, gentlemen, and I have experienced this. She had been ruined by Smith and Wellesley. She was so conscientious. And she certainly should have gotten her Ph.D., but whether she should have gotten a baby, that's a different question.

3

I think the story is very important, gentlemen, because you always forget this. In America you can always hear people say: oh, if the people were only educated and if they only had a philosophy.

That's modern rationalism in this country, that you think by education you can cure Mr. McCarthy and you can cure the slums, and you can cure foreign policy. Just give the people an education. And if you give the people an education, the world would run riot in the meantime.

4

You all come too late. We would all sneeze -- with the mother absent looking up the book.

#### V *EXPERIENCE IS NOT EXPERIMENT*

1

Don't believe this for a minute, gentlemen.

I am a philosopher, and I know what philosophy can and what it cannot do. It cannot replace living. It's a second impression. It's a correction of our impressions and not more.

And this country is very sick, because the people have denied this since Benjamin Franklin's days, and have said, "Live by philosophy."

This is wrong.

2

And I have tried to show you why it is wrong by getting back once more to this list, and then comparing it to the relation of this tripartition to the problem of first and second impressions.

3

If I asked you at this moment, who are all in this second-impression stage -- you all cultivate second impressions, you make up your mind, you try to have bull sessions, you meditate, you have afterthoughts, you are critical of your home or of the college or of politics -- you are critical of yourself, I hope, too.

That is second impression.

And in this moment, you are inclined to say that your only friend nature. That that's first impression. And so you go into a chemistry laboratory and you think that there you have first impressions.

Gentlemen, all experiments in a laboratory are second impressions, because they are all arranged experiments, and they are all theoretically reasoned out. A laboratory has nothing to do with nature. It's second nature. That's an arrangement. Experience is not experiment.

4

But you all confuse always experimentation with experiences, gentlemen.

## VI *THE SPOKEN ENVIRONMENT (ADOLF PORTMANN)*

1

Now the decision which every man and human being today and in all ages always has had to make, and that's the decision which philosophy and the other powers of life is: What comes first? Physis, or logos, or ethos?

Is your first friend, your main problem, nature? Are you and I first, like Mr. Thoreau thought, in union with nature, seeing the sun rise? Or are we first united with society? Is society, which I have called ethos and logos together, or is nature our first impression?

2

Now this is a real problem of philosophy. And in this country it is no longer discussed, because the scientists have won out and people tell you that this is no longer a question: of course, nature comes first and society comes second.

Gentlemen, in your life and mine, that's not true. In nobody's life.

Society is your first nature, -- if we can call it this way. It's of course a misleading term. You should not use it. But we are first made by the words spoken to us. And that's what the Testament tried to hold against the philosophers.

But nobody understands it today.

3

I'll give you an example or two examples, perhaps.

One are the books of the leading European biologist. He's a Swiss, lives in Basle, in the center of Europe. His name is Adolf Portmann: P-o-r-t-m-a-n-n. I think he's a very important man, more important than Charles Darwin, certainly. And he has a great following in Europe, and he is considered the leading man.

In this country, where we always are a little in 1750, he hasn't yet been published. A friend of mine is just translating his book into English.

And while the war was raging, there was a delay in things coming to this country, so his first important book appeared in 1943. That may explain why it hasn't been received here. But I think also the whole American trend of mere chemistry and mere factory ideas, mere mechanism, is opposed to his simple statement.

4

His simple statement is that all animals, when they are born and leave their mother behind, are relatively rapidly able to stand on their own feet. It takes a few days, or a few weeks, that the nestling can leave the nest and then seek its own food. And it's a relatively short time, compared to the time of gestation that an animal is left to the help of the parents outside the womb.

Man is the opposite. If man would be an animal, without the logos, without speech, the gestation period of you and me would have to be 23 months. We are born already after nine months. Compared with the situation in the animal kingdom, we would have to be in the mother's womb another 14 months. But we aren't.

So he says, Portmann says, that's all his not my property, as a pure biologist, he says, "What's happening?"

Well, he says the mother's womb in the animal kingdom is constant. And once an elephant in the mother's womb, always an elephant, so to speak. That is, the same breed is born from the mother's womb. Man is taken out from the mother at nine months in an absolutely helpless state. He would perish, totally perish, if he hadn't a changing environment. That, if not from nine months to 23 months, there would interfere something which he calls a spoken environment, the cradle, the *pabulum*, whatever it is, what is at that moment the fashion, it can be baby food, or baby clothes. It can change. And it comes under the influence of speech.

For 14 months after its birth, the baby is introduced to a society which is held together not by physiology, not by the umbilical cord, but by words. And these words accompany everything that is given him. Whether it likes it or not, the child is surrounded by interpreted action, by directional action, because every one of these is accompanied usually with a smile and say, "Now, Johnny, come. Let's eat." "Come sit down and shit," and so on.

## VII DEMETER

1

And as you know, all mental illnesses, all neuroses of your own days, all your problems are of a vocal character. They come because speech has accompanied the action -- has either approved or disapproved of it. It isn't purely accidental, but it's always directional. Always it is said, "This is right or wrong." "Go or go not." It's forbidden or commanded.

He says that changes the whole aspect. These children of man are living in a mobile, historical environment which in every generation can be totally changed. But it can only be changed with the help of speech. It is not left to automation; it is not left to speechless dumbness, but the child is taken into the streams of speech and words and elucidation and interpretation which the adults at that moment just happen to have learned about diet, about calories, vitamins, and what-not. And I wouldn't be surprised if the first word of a human being in 10 years would be just "vitamins," instead of "Daddy."

In a way, it is completely correct to call your father "Vitamin." He has given you life.

2

It's more than a joke, because our speech places the whole world into context, the logos. What we say, is always explanatory. You can make a man into a vitamin and

another into a calorie, if you want to. And vice versa. You can call the the food your mother.

3

The Greeks did it. They called it Demeter. And they said, "It is the mother earth that nourishes us."

It's not far-fetched, gentlemen. Just as you can call your father "Vitamin," so the Greeks did call the earth their mother, although they had one mother first, the physical mother; but the wider earth, with her food, appeared as the second mother. So don't laugh at these things. It is actually possible by speech to do these things.

4

You can call all Jews "Christ-killers," then they become to the baby the Christ-killer. And are they?

They are not. But the child believes it. It's the first impression. And the first impression is that what matters.

#### VIII *ANY GENERATION CAN CHANGE HUMAN NATURE*

1

You can change the whole world by the word, for the baby, for the newborn. The power is just incredible. The child will believe -- that's why people were burned, for the religions, at stake, because you can make people believe, that they are the antichrist and the devil.

It has been done, even in Salem. Salem is called "peace," as you know, and the town in Massachusetts. And you know, all the witch-burning in Salem.

Well, these were good people. They were probably much better than we are here today, these witch-burners in Salem. And it's very easy, gentlemen, within three years I can make you all burn witches. It's easy.

Very easy.

2

Here, I met a young man on this campus. He's an instructor; he's a teacher. And he said to me he wouldn't resist totalitarian regime. Oh, his generation was wiser than

my generation. It was all nonsense. He would compromise and get by. I said, "So, would you then burn people, and gas people?" He shrugged his shoulders and said, "I suppose I would."

Teacher in Dartmouth College.

3

And you aren't any better than this juvenile delinquent. I was ashamed. I said if I had known this, I would have not come to this country -- that this country consists just of cowards.

It's very serious. This man is 26 of age. He hasn't been hurt himself. Complete integrity. His only handicap is he comes from Wisconsin. So I told him that he probably has eaten too much of McCarthy. But I'm ashamed that I call such a man my colleague, such a scoundrel!

4

The majority of the American male would tell you they wouldn't compromise, and they would prefer to make other people suffer if that was the question. So you can very well see that the modern witch-hunters are just throughout here. They are with us.

The people of Salem are nothing which you can look back to as something you have left behind.

Why is that so, gentlemen?

Because the word in any generation can change human nature. In every generation, man has a different nature. We call this the "spirit of the times". And the spirit of the times makes you a creature of your own time. And since you are the creature of your time, if you put the devil into your own time, and he rules, you become the devil's grandson.

## IX *BODY AND SOUL*

1

And the relationship of the devil's family is much more numerous than the other family, gentlemen, of the children of life. The devil's grandmother has innumerable offspring, because misuse of language is very simple, very easy: get your words wrong into your throat.

2

Gentlemen, Mr. Portmann goes on to say, and has another interesting thing. That's for you of importance.

He said all animals stop to grow when their sex life develops, when they have entered puberty. Man, the opposite. All of you have grown after you had reached puberty. Once more, you get a certain increase in size and stature. He says this way only humanity is conscious of its love. The animals are overwhelmed by this passion, but as you know the way they procreate is a blind passion. They are in heat, and they are in the oestrus, and they don't know what happens. They lose consciousness.

You have this great privilege of cultivating your affections, your passions.

3

That's why it is unforgivable, gentlemen, if you don't write poetry, and don't read poetry at your age. You have to cultivate the nobler feelings which come into you, because your body is more than your individual body. It serves the whole race.

And this is again against the animal kingdom. In the animal kingdom there is a separation of your individual growth and the procreation of the kind. Portmann says that in man, this is very strange, that he is forced in every niche and nook of his body -- in every little finger, and little toe, to feel this tremendous transformation which love entails -- affection, sympathy, friendship, passion.

4

Now I think you need this encouragement, gentlemen, there is no division between the physical and the spiritual and the mental in a real person. We love with all our hearts. If you love somebody, you love him or her, as we say in German, "hair and skin." I don't know what the equal expression in English is.

How do you say it? If you love somebody totally, I mean? (*Body and soul.*) Ja. Body and soul.

Now he says no animal can. No animal can live body and soul. We can.

## X THE TEMPTATION OF THE LAST 200 YEARS

1

Now I think these two points may show you that the relation of logos and physis, gentlemen, with regard to first impressions will make you or break you. Every one of

us can be mistaken, and is mistaken for usually for many years -- what is nature, that is, what is the prop on which he should lean on the outer world, and what is spirit, or what is logos, and what has he been told? What is in his own time the new doctrine, which calls vitamin "vitamin," and pabulum "pabulum"?

And what is really a constant outside your spoken word, like lying there on rocks, without having been articulated, formulated and abstracted and put into other labels?

2

Actually, gentlemen, we always seek reality through the labels of our parents and teachers. No escape. And it is better to admit it and not to dream up Thoreau's or Rousseau's idol, that he can commune with nature directly.

3

We can therefore say, gentlemen, that there are always two schools of thought in the world. In any moment, gentlemen, those who are willing to admit that logos in experience precedes physis, or in other words, that society is your first element, in which you bathe, before you can get outside society into what you call "nature" or "physics" -- or the other sect will always try to fight this, like Rousseau, and say, "Let's come to the bosom of nature. Forget society. You can be cleanly born and relate to nature *sans phrase*, without any spoken word, directly."

Very tempting, and it has been the temptation of the last 200 years, gentlemen.

4

But I think it hasn't helped us very much. We are now landed with an A-bomb. That's the only relation to nature that's been left to us.

This is a very necessary result, because a bomb obviously is something technological, done by mind, to nature. But it is not nature in its natural state.

## XI THE TRUE PROCESS IS THREEFOLD

1

Now therefore: if you arrange *logos, ethos, physis* as a biologist would -- who looks into what really happens to a newborn baby in society, you would come to the arrangement, the logos first, the invocation, that Johnny says, "Oh, Mother. What is true?"

That would be an invocation, because he thinks that his mother knows what is true, so he wants her to tell him.

2

We find it in Lucretius in the poem "Venus." She is of course the big mother who takes the place of the private mother of Lucretius alone. Ethos, your relation to your neighbors to whom you speak or who speak to you. And physis as a third impression.

3

Pardon me. Here.

And you can reduce this. And that has been done, I think, wrongly into just a double partition.

It has played a great part in Greek philosophy, the division, not in three parts --

*logos, the authority that makes us speak and tells us the truth;*  
*ethos, our behavior to our neighbor;*  
*and physis, the contact with the elements of reality that do not speak,*  
*that are not related to us through human speech.*

The usual division, as you also find it today with most men whom you ask is, both man is a social being and he's a natural being. He moves in society, and he moves in nature.

4

But here I may perhaps show you that this dualism, society against nature, or nature against society, is a reduction of the true process that is threefold.

And this will help you understand the problems of Plato and Aristotle. The dualism is a reduction of the real experience which any creative mind goes through, like Lucretius, when invokes the "Dear Goddess, who makes me speak," when he admits that he wants to be read by his friend Memmius. And then he speaks about certain things that are compellingly true for Memmius, and for himself, and for us, too.

XII FIVE MINUTES FOR THE TRUTH

1

If you understand that the Greek logos, ethos, and physis is richer, varied, more careful than what you usually speak about society and nature, you will understand that in this college, my department is wrongly placed. And that it is a great danger that you think natural science, and social science exhausts the field of sciences.

There must be a third.

2

I talked about this, before. I only repeat this here, because these are all very difficult things. You can't hear and think about these things sufficiently often.

3

All philosophy, gentlemen, is something that I cannot just deduct and go on the next time. These things must come to us, every day afresh. Every philosophical problem is eternal.

And what I have tried to say in the first meetings, I have now to repeat, to make you feel it's important. It is still between you and me undecided, whether we can really do with the simple division of natural science and social science, as most people try to do, or whether we haven't to ask ourselves: how come, who gives us the authority to speak at all to anybody else, and to ask him to listen to us? Or how can I request from you to listen to me?

That's authority, that's logos, that's truth.

4

I just received a letter from a person in Germany who's very downcast. And she says nobody will sacrifice five minutes or a dollar for the truth. Passion, sensation, novelty, bestsellers.

And the only thing I hear on this campus is, "It's enjoyable," "It is entertaining," "It is stimulating," and "interesting." I have not one of you really lie sleepless asking, "What is true?" It's unknown to you. You are all pragmatists. You say there is no truth, so let's ask, "What's interesting?" Or let's ask, "What is stimulating?"

XIII *TRUTH IS AS WEAK AS THE WIND*

1

Gentlemen, the truth has no helpers in this country.

Look at these elections. You don't even expect anyone to speak the truth. It's admitted. Advertising. Psychology. Everybody is out to cheat you. To say something pleasant.

I got a letter and said, "How could you say this?" the other day. And I said, "It was true." I got a letter back, "But one doesn't tell the truth."

2

It is understood today that truth has no champions, gentlemen.

And truth never wins by itself. Some people have to witness. If you don't stand up for the truth, it will not win. Truth is as weak as the wind is.

But nobody wants to serve truth in this country. They want serve their career, or a Ph.D., -- that's not truth, gentlemen. Because for your Ph.D. you carefully write only what your professor will admit.

3

I have run into this all my life, gentlemen. My first book when I was to be a professor, the faculty turned me down and said I couldn't print the book, because it wasn't scientific. So I printed it just the same. And they made me a professor, just the same.

4

Truth has no champions, gentlemen. As soon as you reduce the three-partition of logos, ethos, and physis, the behavior to your neighbor, to the truth that makes us speak, that is compelling us against our interest to let the truth stand; and physis, the things which we debate and which we cauterize, profile, with the help of our notions and our words, gentlemen - if you reduce this, as I said, to two, as it is done at this moment in the whole world or western world, then you have no way of appealing to anybody for the truth, because society and nature are just there.

They mold you. And you must eat nature. And you must have friends. So you buy Daley Carnegie. And that's cheating. I think any man who realizes that the man to whom he talks makes use of Mr. Carnegie's counsel should spit at this reader of Carnegie and say, "I have nothing to do with you. You're trying to exploit me."

XIV *THE HIGHER QUESTION*

1

I have such a rascal living in Norwich.

I know one day he wants to sell me a car. So one day he interests me in some refugee from Europe, and the other day he interests me in the harvest festival, and what-not. And I know the only reason is he is a car dealer. And his only interest in me is that I should buy a car. So but he, of course, feigns the greatest interest in some man shipwrecked on the Andrea Doria. He didn't do a thing for this man, as I found out, fortunately. But he built the case up: I should then sacrifice my money for this man on the Andrea Doria, because my car dealer didn't want to do anything.

But he thought if he could get me interested, talking to him, corresponding with him, meeting him again and again, I would finally be unable to escape his wiles for buying this car.

Well, I'm going to cheat him!

2

This I mean by reducing man's relations, to these two: society and nature, and never to ask, "What must I do?" "What am I commanded to do?" "What's my destiny?"

You understand that this higher question is a different question. Because it may be that I have to destroy nature or to destroy society.

3

Do you think that the people who declared the independence of this country, that they were just the product of their environment? They criticized the British crown and they felt that neither was the nature of America binding to them, nor the English society. They had to create something third.

4

Gentlemen, you couldn't do that, because you have deprived yourself of all the 20 years of investment in truth. You have never thought that it is necessary to sacrifice your life for the service of truth. You think we are all fools who do that.

This young man from Wisconsin whom I have to call my colleague unfortunately, he thinks I'm a fool.

XV *YOU HAVE TO BE STUPID*

1

This goes very far, gentlemen.

We have a very great journalist in this country, she is an honorary doctor at Dartmouth College, Dorothy Thompson. And she saved the life of a European. Although she did not approve of his politics, during the last war, she came out. He was to be interned here. He was a broken man and was very sick. And she saved his life, and she said frankly to the authorities, "This man is an able man. But I don't share his political views, but he doesn't deserve to be handed over to the Nazis. They would murder him. So I think it's his human duty to keep such a man here, because they would kill him, and we will stomach him, although he is not absolutely pro-American."

She was very honest about it. And she stuck her neck out. It was of course as bad then as today to do anything so difficult, so complicated. This was not black and white. He was not an angel, not somebody wonderful, all on our side, best man in the country. She saw that he was a human being, with its shades and neither white nor black, as we all.

2

Now she's of course an outstanding, great woman, I think, and quite superior person. And she came to me the other day, and she said, "You know our mutual friend?" And I knew only too well. And she said, "You know, it's funny. Off and on, he nearly weeps." The man is now very old. He's 75. And he tells her, "Dorothy, you have saved my life. And I shall never forget it. And I'm eternally grateful."

"But," she says to me, "you know, John at the same time thinks that I was a fool, because he would have never gone all out for a person to save a person. So he cannot help being grateful. He cannot help even a little bit admiring me. But he can also not help feeling that I'm very stupid."

3

The person saved, still thinks that the good angel who saved him is below his own intelligence.

I'm afraid that's a very common attitude today. You all are debunkers, and you all don't want to be taken in. And you all convinced that you wouldn't be stupid.

4

Gentlemen, in order to live right, you have to be stupid. Believe me, intelligence is a great handicap for getting into Heaven. The scoundrels are all intelligent. I don't think they could have robbed the Brink, without intelligence. So they are in prison for life.

Most intelligent people, gentlemen, can't do good because they don't want to be taken in.

#### XVI *THE WHOLE WORLD IS RUN BY XACRIFICE*

1

And this is the important thing, gentlemen, between then such a little decision. If you forget that I'm not teaching either in the social science or in the natural science at this moment here, that there is a third verse which decides how much society, and how much nature.

You take a shortcut. You get lost in one pigeonholed in these two tin cans, Sir.

And then you will react like this man -- a very clever journalist, a leading man. He knows all of Europe, he knows America, he knows all of Asia. He knew Trotsky, he knew Stalin, he knew Mussolini, he knew all -- one of these men for whom the public has the greatest respect because he has really intimate knowledge.

2

But the man's shortcoming is very simple in that he cannot genuinely admire a superior article. Dorothy Thompson to him -- it's a pity -- so please pray that some intelligent people still can be stupid.

They do what is right, whether it's clever or not. You live on this.

3

Any moment then, people would only be clever, they would never do a thing that may cost their lives, because that would be stupid. So you can't have a good soldier who defends you, because it's just stupid to be shot dead. Just stupid. It's absolutely stupid. Asinine.

4

Sacrifice is always stupid to the intelligent person, gentlemen. And the whole world is run by sacrifice. And not by ethics.

You know this very well. The real household sticks together by the one person who stays at home, when there is a pleasure at hand and looks after the babies. If there is nobody, at least the babysitter, and then there can be no integrated family life.

Is that happiness? It's the one person who can renounce happiness who keeps the family together.

## XVII TO WRESTLE WITH THE SERVICE OF TRUTH

1

Why do I say these things, gentlemen?

For the very practical reason that in our first impressions, as children, there is of course already a mixture of logos, ethos, and physics. If your parents do not pray with you, if they do not invoke the logos, if they nowhere show that they are servants to the truth, that they receive higher orders, if you cannot see your parents go down on their knees, or being contrite, or being overwhelmed by authority that is greater than their purely physical existence, you will always misunderstand life.

That's why mothers in colleges should make this decision: will they have to teach their children to pray?

They shouldn't learn chemistry. It's not very important. What they learn in our girls' colleges is just ridiculous. Sheer nonsense. The one thing they never are asked to decide: why do I must pray -- must I pray with my child? And they can't, therefore.

2

Most can't, I mean, these silly doggerels then they teach them. And it's not important that you should teach your child to pray, gentlemen, but the child must see you pray. You don't have to force a child to go to church, but the child must know that you go to church somewhere. You don't have to go to the stone church. You can go into the woods.

But somewhere you must wrestle with the service to the truth. They must know that while everything is social, natural around them, you are still wrestling with the problem how much to nature, and how much to society, and how much to duty.

3

Society always tries to talk you out of duty: "It's not necessary. Join the country club." And nature? Always unnecessary. "Go swimming. Go playing golf." These are the two simple things a child sees before its parents.

Now if it never sees that the parents renounce nature or society for some higher interest, how can they understand reality, gentlemen?

The problem is not making children pray, or sending children to Sunday school. That's the conscience money of modern Americans. They send their children to these Sunday schools. That's a scandal. That's sugar. But that's not bread of life.

4

The bread of life is when the children see that the parents are contrite, that they feel that any minute they may miss the road.

And don't we, any minute? If this is common experience of all mankind, that any minute, the happiest man, including President Eisenhower, can make such a mistake that he may jeopardize his whole salvation.

You all can, tomorrow, today you can make the decisive blunder of your life.

#### XVIII SHAKESPEARE AND THE SACRIFICES FOR THE NOBLE LIFE

1

You feel so safe, gentlemen, that you never admit to anybody else visibly that you are up in the air. This is called prayer, this being up in the air. And if you can't make the younger generation see that you are up in the air, you sin. You disintegrate society. You destroy nature, this human nature which is based on your word about reality which the child must receive from you, because it is born under the authority of the logos, and not just physically.

2

So the thing is terribly important, gentlemen. It is all lost today. It is all lost -- you really believe the humanities are a kind of decoration for social gatherings, where you play in Robertson Hall some silly fraternity play. "And Shakespeare, well, that's a kind of inheritance from Europe. We wouldn't write -- we wouldn't have any Shakespeare, but that's just an old tradition, we still play Shakespeare. Yes."

3

Gentlemen, Shakespeare is much more important obviously than all natural science taken together.

But you can't see that. To you, he is a luxury. And yet, without the emotions of Shakespeare, the sacrifices for the noble life, the perishing of Romeo and Juliet under the law of the feud of their houses, you know nothing about love, absolutely nothing. Whereas whether you know something about chemistry, you can always get some of these chemists. I mean, the whole DuPont family is at your disposal.

We these idiots who are chemists, we buy them for high money and make them rich. And that satisfies these people. Poor people who have to be rich in order to be satisfied.

Riches belong to nature, to natural man. He deals with mines, and with chemistry. Don't begrudge him his wealth. But you can read poetry, you can write poetry, gentlemen. You are much richer. You don't need a Cadillac to be happy.

4

But I have seen this, gentlemen. Here appeared a gentleman. He is called Greenwald. You know, he's the head of the DuPont concern. And this man is a chemist. And he married the right daughter, a DuPont, and so he is very rich.

And just these two facts blinded two-third of the Dartmouth students. They went down on their knees. That was their idol. And well, it's a very bad indictment against American society that 3,000 healthy college boys give a damn for Mr. Greenwald because he married the daughter of a rich man.

That happened two years ago, and then I gave up all hope that it made any sense to teach philosophy in this college.

## XIX *THE REAL FAMILY*

1

So in these little things, gentlemen, you really decide where you belong.

It's a very simple thing, the first impressions. If you arrange logos first, ethos second, and physis third, then you worship your parents because they are worshipful people. Logos.

If physis comes first in your mind, you worship them because they spank you. Not a good reason, obviously to worship your parents. But I think any child will worship

his parents and grandparents if he sees that they are worshipful, that they have reverence. I think that's the most important thing that you have to consider when you get married, gentlemen: how to make your children understand that you have reverence. That's all that it needs to have a real family.

They cannot understand you in their relation to them, to the children, unless you show that you have a relation to somebody who's your father. Without this, there's no way of their ever understanding your right in family affairs, and your duty, either, that you must educate them.

2

And then this whole problem of spanking and of neurosis and of inhibitions will all disappear.

Today, what happens if you have nature and society? Everything is psychology. Here are the two brats: the boy and the girl. And here are these unfortunate mothers and fathers. And everything is a game between these four people. And so you take out one stone there, and one pressure, and then it reacts on the other; they all get nervous all the time, high tension and blood pressure. And so the boy is sent away to college, and the girl is sent away to camp, and the father goes into a lunatic asylum, and the mother is left with the women's club.

3

Gentlemen, the healthier family -- fortunately there are these families. And I think most of you know something about a real family, and not this damned description of a family which you read in your social science books.

The real family obviously goes on like this. Here is a tradition. Here come in these parents. They get married. And they beget children. And the children have the feeling that the parents are representative, are officeholders of this great human race in which the whole truth of the human race, through the parents, reaches the children, so that the parents are nothing but the functionaries, the officeholders of the great truth of life.

The mother stands always for the church, the father always for the state; and the children receives what is true about state and church through the ages in some form or other, more or less, through these parents.

Isn't that very simple?

4

But the whole relation is not one of confrontation. That's the damned sickness of the modern American, the western society.

Freud has the same in Vienna, of course, the same problem, as though children were only looking at their parents, and parents only looking at their children. But gentlemen, they both look beyond their parents and beyond the children. Because they are only agents of much larger forces, of the logos, that goes down through the ages.

And that is not the ethos of the neighborhood. And that is not the physis of the contact, and the weight, and the calories, and what-not. But that's the revelation of our destiny, what we have to say and what we have been told.

And that's not of any origin of 1956.

Let's have a break here.

## I THE LOGOS HAS TO DO WITH THE IMPOSSIBLE

1

...in mind this problem, that logos, ethos, and physis are working constantly on us. From the newborn child to the dying moment, we cannot escape this commitment to these three elements of which we are ourselves expressions.

*What is true,  
and what is therefore represented by us?  
What's our destiny?  
What has to be done, regardless of our happiness, through thick and thin,  
because that is now the hour to do it?*

2

You may call it "manifest destiny." Or "This is the time which tries men's souls." Or you may say, "This is our opportunity."

Whatever you take -- call the logos. It is that which must be done, even though it seems that it cannot be done.

3

You may say, "*Logos has always to do with the impossible.*"

It seemed impossible that God became man. And He became man. And therefore the coming of Christ certainly seemed absolutely impossible.

Anything the logos commands us to do, gentlemen, always seems impossible before it is done. The logos has to do with the impossible.

4

Nature has to do with the possible. And ethos has always to do with the Joneses. Ja. It can be done, because the Joneses have done it. It isn't natural that you should play golf, but the Joneses play golf. So, you play golf.

## II GOD IS THE FUTURE, SOCIETY THE PRESENT, NATURE THE PAST

1

The impossible, gentlemen, is our relation to the gods. That which has never been done before is divine. Man can do the impossible.

When he can do the possible, then he's natural. And then he can do that which other people have made possible, then he's social.

2

If you use today a cocktail shaker, you make use of a social invention which somebody else did at a time when it seemed impossible to invent a cocktail shaker, he invented it.

Society makes use of former impossibilities which have become possible by our neighbors, by our brothers, by our society.

Nature is that which you feel is possible anytime, you take a stone, it's natural that it should fall to the ground. It's always possible. It hasn't to be invented.

3

Nature doesn't have to be invented. Society is an invention, a discovery, or a sum of discoveries.

God is the power to discover what hasn't been done, hasn't been discovered.

You can also say God is the future, society is the present, and nature is the past; because nature is the world before man spoke.

4

That we breathe, that had to be done before man got dress and clothes and midwives. But now we have midwives, so it is a social way of getting a child that you have midwifery, or even the hospital. Obviously that's a social invention, it's not natural.

But the logos, gentlemen, is the great hope of the world, because it means that things that have not been possible and have not been inherited as social agencies can become possible.

Don't smoke, please.

### III THE WILL TO CARRY ON THE WAR

1

If you now reduce this to the problem of the Greeks once more, I told you in the beginning -- last time, as best I could, that the Greeks had a weak society, a weak first impression, a weak speaking because the world in which they lived was so much larger than the little city in which their children were born.

And therefore I said the first great logos for the Greeks has become Homer, because he took all the Greek cities together and made them feel a common purpose. So that every Greek, when he read Homer, could feel that he lived in an environment which was larger than his eyesight, larger than his little city; all these cities together formed Homeric Greece.

2

Now let's take the second book of *The Iliad*. Please. I hope you have it. It's worth your while, gentlemen, to represent to your mind a little carefully why Homer has remained the teacher of the Greeks for a thousand years. And why, for an American, Homer still has this same appeal.

You don't read Homer, gentlemen, but the songs which list all the 48 states, or sing, "From California and New England," and so, do just what Homer did. They enlarge the nature and the society around you to such an extent, that you can try at least to forget the rest of the world, and to imagine that this is all you have to care for.

So that your first impressions might coincide with that universe to which you have to pay attention. Then you would have to have no philosophy. You wouldn't have to have afterthought. You wouldn't have to have any criticism. You would be perfectly happy to move within this one world, your mother's world, the mother country.

3

And so Homer has created a mother country large enough to make the citizens of these tiny little units feel that they have a worldwide home.

Let's begin on Page 52. "The royal " -- on the last line of 51:

*"The royal chieftain of the king's council bustled about,  
marshalling the troops and with them went Athene."*

You have a divine power creating this social universe in the feeling of every reader of Homer ever since, especially in Greece.

*"Marshalling the troops, and with them went Athene of the flashing eyes, wearing her splendid float, the unfading, everlasting aegis from which a hundred golden tassels flutter, all beautifully made, each worth a hundred head of cattle. Resplendent in this, the goddess flew through the ranks, urging the men forward. And in each of one, she inspired the will to carry on the war and fight relentlessly. Before long, they were more enamored with the thought of fighting than with that of sailing away to their own country in their hollow ships."*

4

In this we have disparaged war very often in this country by pacifism.

Gentlemen, without war, there would be no nation, as we know, the history of mankind. The only way of creating larger countries has been in this manner, that people overcame their sense of private happiness and were willing to sacrifice their lives for their country. And all countries, that have been created to any size have been built on this power of man to seek this larger unit.

#### IV "LIKE COUNTLESS FLOCKS OF BIRDS"

1

Will you kindly now Prenzler go on reading? (*Sir, I do not have the place. No, I have the book. But I don't know --*) Page 52. (*Well, I have a different book. It's Book Two, right?*) Ja. (*And what line?*) Well, I must take my Greek. (*Did you start at the beginning of the book? Book Two.*) 486. Second Book, verse 484. You have it?

The poet is so overcome with the importance of the scene that he makes a new appeal, a new invocation to the Muses.

You have it? David? No? Richard. (*No, I don't.*) Who has it? Duke. All right. Ed. Go ahead.

*"As they fell in, the dazzling glitter of their splendid bronze flashed through the upper air and reached the sky. It was as bright as the glint of the flames caught in a distant spot, when a great forest and a mountain pike is ravaged by fire. Their clans came out like countless flocks of birds: the geese, the cranes, or the long-necked swans that forgather in the Asian meadow by the streams of Kayster. And mill about, molting, flapping their wings, and filling the whole meadow with harsh cries as they came to ground on the advancing front. So clan after clan poured out from the ships and huts onto the Plain of Skamander. And the earth resounded solemnly to the tramp of launching men and horses' hooves. As they found their places in the flowery meadows by the river, innumerable as the leaves and blossoms*

*in their season. Thus --"*

2

Now gentlemen, these great similes of Homer show you something –

who is in English? Who is majoring in English? Any one of you?

The assumption today -- or the Greek assumption, or the Homeric assumption that metaphors come late in life -- in language. Here, the soldiers are, as a matter of fact, compared to the leaves, because Homer wants to create the impression that this society is a natural one. And we have to say a word later on these metaphors.

3

The place of metaphor in human speech is distinctly different in the Bible, and distinctly different in Greek tradition, in philosophy. And you will have to make up your mind whether metaphor is elementary way of speech, or whether it is really only an afterthought.

And I only point out this, because these are very famous similes, and there is a deep, philosophical problem involved.

Could you and I commute, parents and children, for example, or I and you without metaphor? Is this a primary necessity, that we speak in metaphors? Or is it a luxury?

4

The Homeric text brings this up, but it's a question that goes through all philosophy.

You think that if you have a semantic positivist, who says, "A equals A and B equals B," that this is somewhere wiser as when he says that the eagle of Zeus governs the mind of governors of states. And you think that the symbol for the lion, or for the evangelist of St. Mark is just a very dry simile to you.

The question is: can we human beings say anything to each other without metaphor? It's not so easy to decide this. You will be surprised if we analyze this later.

## V THE NECESSITY OF RISING TO THE OCCASION

1

But I want to draw your attention to these very famous similes in which the poet achieves one thing, gentlemen. In this nature simile, bees and leaves, the differences of these various cities disappear. They all look like one.

And that's the Homeric problem, to make all Greek as one. That's the appeal. That's the patriotic appeal. And that's the cement, the mortar around this variety of men.

These innumerable, different shades of religions, of cities, of settlements, of forms of constitution.

Aristotle wrote 258 different constitutions of Greek cities.

2

Now Homer, in these similes, achieves unity by saying, "They all marched like," "natural birds," or "natural flowers," or "natural leaves." Now go on.

*"Thus these long-{} soldiers of Achaea were drawn up on the plain,  
and facing the Trojans with slaughter in their hearts,  
as many and as restless as the unknown flies that swarmed around the cow sheds  
in the spring, when pails are full of milk. And now  
with practiced ease, with which goatherds sort out their wandering flocks,  
when they have mingled in the pastures, the captains brought their companies  
into battle order. And in among them moved King Agamemnon,  
with head and eyes like Zeus, the thunderer; with a waist like the war-god's waist;  
and a breast like Poseidon's. As a bull stands out from the cattle in the herd,  
conspicuous among the grazing cows, so on that day Zeus  
made the son of Atreus stand out in the crowd and eclipse his fellow kings."*

3

Here again, perhaps you understand, gentlemen.

If I have listed the Russians, and the Americans, and the British, and the French fighting in the last world war, the commander-in-chief, and the chaplain, and the newspaper writer, and the historian, they all have to find some language which is neither Russian nor English nor French nor American. And in any such moment, you need metaphor.

The first metaphor offering itself is nature. He's like a bull, in front of the rest. Because bull is not social, and society is divided, in many societies, many cities.

4

You can here study in this great famous prooemium, the necessity of rising to the occasion.

It was the handicap of the Western allies against Hitler that he could always speak of the Germans without metaphor. He said, "I mean you, the Germans." Then they asked him, the Germans themselves -- to take in the Ukrainians, too, to promise self-government to the Poles, to be reasonable, to unite Europe.

He said, "No, because I want to have the first impression. You have learned that you are Germans. I'm not going to let anybody in into the company, because then I would have to use a second language, an abstraction, like NATO."

And you must admit, NATO is a very poor word. Nobody wants to die for NATO. And therefore NATO is nearly at this moment, because it has not risen to the power of the Homeric speech -- eagle or bull or the leaves of the field, or any such metaphor.

#### VI TO FIND A COMMON LANGUAGE

1

So please, especially the gentlemen who intend to write short stories: get a certain respect for language. Language is under the logos, that is: don't say anything that isn't necessary. But under the logos, always something new has to be said. And therefore something so far impossible has to be expressed by your next creation.

Any short story, even, has to say something that hasn't been said before. Because it is necessary to say this.

2

And Homer has to say something new, because he has to tell these Greeks, that they are one. They mustn't every one go to their own country. He wants to unite them.

And the whole poem is written around this problem. And for this you have then to find absolutely new terms.

Can you understand, that you couldn't appeal in 1943 to the Russians, fighting for the capitalists, for the bourgeois, the citizenship of the free world. And you couldn't appeal to the Americans for saving Bolshevism. So it was terribly difficult to find any common language. And I think it has been the handicap of the whole war, that it was a speechless war.

And so poor President Roosevelt, when he was asked what the name was to be given to the Second World War, made this terrible surrender to impotency, to weakness.

But what could he do? He said, "*It's a war of survival.*"

3

But gentlemen, never has anything less inspiring been said about any war. All wars are wars of survival. But that doesn't signify any one war. If I don't kill you, you kill me. That's war, isn't it? The "war of survival" just means, "Let's try to survive, although it is a war."

That was the official term in this country. And I think later generations will say that the war has died in the hearts of men, because it proved impossible to find a common language, which inspired men to see that this war was something natural, and something necessary.

4

I think war is dying. But war is dying for the symptom of it is that it no longer can be named. You can't name a war a "war of survival" and ask soldiers to die for it.

I wouldn't die for a war of survival. That's good for a cattle-yard. Any flea tries to survive until I eclipse it.

## VII A NAMED WAR

1

And this is very serious, gentlemen.

The "War of Secession," the "War of Independence," the "Revolutionary War," these are all very good terms, very understandable. But you cannot call a war a war of survival without defeating your own end.

And you know how Churchill called the Second World War? Is that not known? It's terribly important, because with Homer, the period of named wars begin.

2

What is a named war, gentlemen? A war that is not looked upon only from one side of the fence, from the people -- the little group who goes to war on one side, so that

a war -- if our history is a book - is an event that both sides, vanquished and victors, will call with the same name.

Otherwise you have no human war. Otherwise you have your slaughter, or butchery, or whatever you call it. Animal kingdom.

3

Now modern war has reached its extinction, nearly, because what happened in Homer was the Trojan War, it was a war that could be quoted by Trojans, Orientals, and Greeks with one and the same name.

Today Churchill has called the Second World War, "*the unnecessary war*." That's his official term. The unnecessary war. And Roosevelt has called it "the war of survival."

Both names, gentlemen, are pre-Homeric.

4

And I'm very serious in reading with you, and we must devote the next meeting to this again, -- I'm reading with you this second book, because it is the moment in which wars were christened, were baptized, were named.

And what is a named war? A war that can make sense for both parties, victors and vanquished.

## VIII YOU CAN MAKE PEACE BETWEEN TWO ENEMIES

1

That's something new.

The old Egyptians, the Babylonians, they wipe out the opponent. He doesn't live to see it. All the people, the women and children were made slaves, the men were all killed, as with the Indians.

The Indians also here had to kill their men at the -- how do you call it. How do you call the -- wie? (*Stake?*) At the stake. -

2

The Homeric war is a great invention, because it gives man a consciousness of life beyond the limitations of his own society. All wars of the last 3,000 years, as you have to learn them in the history department, in your textbooks, have a name by which both parties will recognize the same event.

Which means, gentlemen, that both parties have survived the event.

Before Homer, the enemy -- one of the two, disappears, and he is wiped out. That's the idea. And the thing goes on until he is wiped out.

3

Homer learns for the first time that you can make peace between two enemies. That's the world in which so far we have lived.

Today I think the time is coming where we must have one world in which there cannot even be war. So we already are launching into this adventure, because we can no longer name the last two wars.

The "unnecessary war," and the "war of survival" - to hell with that. I don't want my son or my grandchildren to be mobilized for an unnecessary war. So that's defeating one's own ends. If the leading statesman, if the prime minister of England says to his own countrymen: "This is an unnecessary war," they'll say: "Now, please avoid it."

4

You can't mobilize people for an unnecessary war. And you can't mobilize people for a war of survival, either. Or you get into this archaic situation, that the others have to be wiped out. And so you got the feeling in this country that the Germans should be wiped out.

Many in '45 felt that these were no longer human beings. They were beasts. So -- no Germany. But the Morgenthau Plan.

This is the consequence, when you have no power to name the unit with which you together form the society and the nature around you.

*IX HOMER'S ACTUALITY*

1

So don't think that Homer is without its actuality. In Homer, the first war has been named the Trojan War for both, people in Asia Minor and the people in Greece.

I'm sorry, we have to stop here.

## SIXTH LECTURE: THE FIRST MEANING OF THE WORD "COSMOS" IS POLITICAL

### I WHERE HOMER AND PHILOSOPHY SEPARATE

1

...and one American who's known as John Smith, of the famous family of Smith, as against physis, or whether this course, which has scalped you of your name, John Smith, and treats you as an individual, and tries now to remake you into a person who will do something out of this abstract shadow of the dead, and -- what is an individual?

An indifferent thing which I can crush. An individual is somebody I can kill. It's not my brother. It's just an individual.

Now, individual fleas, individual flies, individual chairs, I can all burn them, kill them, mistreat them, gentlemen. There is no obligation for me to have any respect for individuals.

2

I thought I should mention this, here, what's this desperate attempt of Dartmouth College to get you back out of the shades, and the Hades, the underworld of philosophy.

As soon as philosophy is not dealing with second impressions, but has taken root in you so that you think that's your first knowledge of reality, you are unable to live. And this college course won't do you any good, I'm sure, except perhaps enrich some psychoanalyst.

3

Now let's go back to Homer. I can show you today the point where Homer and philosophy separate.

I have brought with me also here *The Republic*. And we'll see the point of divergence, from the Platonic view, and from the Homeric treatment.

Let's go back to 486, I think it was, in the famous catalog of the ships. Here the Greeks are marching up like the flowers, the buds in spring -- or as the leaves. Then we went on, about the thousands of peoples. 470 -- -69. Now we come to 484.

We have read this. Will you kindly read it? (*Now I have a different book. I have to have the page this time.*) Would you, Richard? Where the invocation to the Muses comes. "Tell me, now, you Muses." You must have this. Ja? Would you read it?

*"Tell me now, you Muses, who have our homes on Olympos.  
For you, who are goddesses, are there, and you know all things.  
And we have heard only the rumour of it and know nothing.  
Who then of those were the chief men and the lords of the Danaans?  
I could not tell over the multitude of them nor name them,  
not if I had ten tongues and ten mouths, not if I had a voice  
never to be broken and a heart of bronze within me,  
not unless the Muses of Olympia, daughters of Zeus of the aegis,  
remembered all those who came beneath Iliion."*

4

One moment. That's the invocation, once more.

Now the strength of the thing: the poet has begun his whole Iliad with the famous invocation *andra moi ennepe*, where is it? One moment -- *tell me the wraths of the son of Epilus, o deity.*

So that is the first invocation.

## II MYTHEIN = TELLING THE TRUTH

1

Now in the middle of the second book, that is, after a thousand verses, he is so impressed by the difficulty of his undertaking that he invokes the Muses again, and he uses a word which I think you should put down, gentlemen.

He says, "I shall not be able to tell," your translator says, now this is the word used: "myth."

2

You know there is a tremendous discussion today raging on mythology, on myth. Everybody talks today about myth. Nobody seems to know what he means by that.

Since we are philosophers, we have at least to clarify our vocabulary.

3

In Homer's days, gentlemen -- perhaps you take that down, this word "mythos," m-y-t-h-o-s, or "myth," simply means a tale, something said. And so Homer thinks he is telling the truth, the real truth, when he now lists the catalog of the ships, the catalog of the Greek contingents, and he says therefore, "I shall not be able to tell," and uses the word "I shall not be able to mythologize," to myth. You see, he thinks it's the highest grade of truth.

You take myth always as something in shambles, something rotten, something wrong, something pseudo, a dream, a fantasy, and you try to debunk myth.

4

Gentlemen, any limited statement is mythical. We'll perhaps have later an opportunity to state this.

This course isn't meant to clarify the problem of mythology in the modern slang. But I warn you, if you go back to the sources, the word "myth" is an honest word. And it just means the word to be said, naively, without criticism. Poetically, statement of fact, narrative.

You can say - I think you should keep this in your vocabulary -- "mythos" in Greek begins its career simply as "tale," and to "*mythein*", which is the Greek word for it -- I'll spell it in -- in the modern way, "mythein" simply means to speak the truth, and not the untruth.

And we are really up here against the terrible wall of infamous arrogance on the part of modern man, who thinks that he is without mythology.

### III MYTH IS STRAIGHTFORWARD SAY-SO

1

But gentlemen, in the Greek sense, you are much more mythologists than Homer is. You are full of myths.

One is, for example, democracy. It's a myth. In Alabama as you know, in Mississippi, there live hundred percent inhabitants of so-called citizens -- 51 of them cannot vote. But you can call this "democracy." That's a myth. And that's a lie. That's not honest truth. We live in a mythology.

2

Every human being lives in a mythology. You also think that you and your family are excellent people. Nobody knows. They may be, but it's a naive tale. It's uncontradicted.

As long as any word is without second thought, it's a myth in the Greek sense. A naive tale. Folk tale, for example.

3

So take this down, gentlemen: *myth is a straightforward say-so*. Hearsay also, later. Anything that hasn't gone through the mill of a second thought, of an afterthought.

And obviously, nobody can live if every word would be an afterthought. I'm still speaking spontaneously to you here. So I'm telling myth.

4

I warn you, because in the modern literature, in every newspaper, magazine, all these people who write in America are totally superior to myth. They all look down on myth and say, "I warn you against myth".

Well, I warn you against these infamous people, who don't know what humanity is like. Humanity lives wrapped up in decent convictions, that it knows already a little bit of the truth and it speaks naively its mind. That's always mythology in the eyes of these superior swines. They all have after-thought.

When a mother gives a kiss to her son, she has an Oedipus complex. That's their mythology, the psychoanalysts' mythology today, that everybody has an after-thought.

#### IV SONORITOUSNESS

1

Myth is an honest situation out which we cannot live. It's a first-impression speech, the first way in which we present say, "This is my mother, and I love her dearly. I want to embrace and to kiss her. But I don't want to go to sleep with her as a lover."

But there come these pigs, and that's their myth then. Everybody else is a pig. And they are allowed to slaughter the pigs.

2

So here we have this word, mythism -- I can't tell you how important it is for you to know that this is an honest and innocent word. No folly without myth, gentlemen.

How can you go to Dartmouth? The whole Alumni Fund is a myth. But a good one. Everybody has to be grateful.

We will see if you have to be grateful. It's not yet decided.

3

Now go on from here, please. The next. Here, your neighbor with the beautiful red --.

*"As for the rank and file that came to Ilium,  
I could not name or even count them."*

That's again mythesomai. Yes. I just said this.

*"Here then are the captains of the fleet and here are the ships from first to last."*

*(Do you want to start reading them?)*

Well, that's what we're here for. That's the great story. That's the important thing.

*"First the Boiotians, with Peneleos, and Leitos, Arkes- --")*

May I ask what your difficulty is? (*Pronunciation.*) Well then, pronounce it wrong, but pronounce it.

*("Arkesilaos --")*

Arkesilaos. In Greek, every syllable is pronounced fully. It's still a phonetic language. It's very euphonious. Very beautiful sound. Arkesilaos, und Prothoenor, und Klonios. Go on.

*"They come from Hyria, and stony Aulis, from Schoinos and Skolos,  
from Eteonos, where the hills run high; from Thespeia and Graia,  
and the spreading lawns of Mykalessos. With them--"*

Mykalessos. Not MY-kalessos. Mykalessos. They are very beautiful words, you know, all these. The modern poets, Swinburne, Hölderlin, Blake -- they all have made use of this tremendous sonoritousness of the Greek language. Ja. Go on.

*"With them were those from Harma, from Eilesion --"*

Eilesios.

"*Eilesios, and from --*"

Erythrai.

4

Now this you'd better note. "Eruthros" in Greek is "red" in our language and "ruber" in Latin. It's a very interesting etymology. I may use this opportunity.

"Erythros" in Greek becomes "ruber" with a "b" in Latin, but "red" again in Germanic languages. The "th" in Greek is a "b" in Latin and a "d" in English. The same word. The Red Sea, you have heard of the country Erythrai, perhaps.

That's the country of the Red Sea which the Italians had as their colony down to 1945, when they lost it again with Ethiopia, with Abyssinia.

So Erythrai, a very common place name in antiquity because of the red rock, the limestone, the red lime-stone visible far across the ocean. Erythrai.

So the Red Sea in antiquity is the Erythron, that's red.

It is worth your while to keep these connections. Eritrea, as the country on the Red Sea, and Erythrai Pelagos, the Red Sea, as an ocean in all textbooks of the 18th and 17th century would find still this word "erythrai" used.

I don't think there exists in America an Erythrai. But you have to consult the Post Office catalog. There's no place name, that does not exist perhaps in the United States somewhere.

Go on.

## V FAMOUS NAMES

1

"*Eeleon, and Hyle*")

Hyle.

(*Hyle.*)

That means wood, or forest. "Hyle." That's an important word, gentlemen.

Perhaps you take this next to "myth," because for the people who believe in the word "matter" is expressed with "hyle," wood. So a man who is a materialist in Greek is called a hylozoist. That is, a man who believes that all life is just material.

So the word "hyle" is an important word. Hyle, wood, and then from there extended into being all materialism. And if you are a hylozoist, you say all life is purely material. There is no mental life. There is no spiritual life.

2

*"-- and Peteon sent their -- their men. So did Okalea --"*

Okalea, ja.

*"Okalea and the stronghold of Medeon. Kopai and --"*

There's a famous Copais Lake to this day in Boeotia.

Has anybody an intention to go Greece? Who would like to go to Greece?

Well, come with me. I go next year. And I shall go to the Kopais See. Because that's the great thing in Boeotia. We are still in Boeotia, there's one single landscape which yields you all these independent republics.

And that's why we must read this, gentlemen, that you get some picture of the pettiness of Greek settlement, and Greek politics, in order to understand the importance of their philosophy.

We are still here at the lake of Kopai.

Go on.

3

*"Kopai, and Eutresis, and Thisbe rich in doves. They con- --"*

Well, that's the famous name, of course, from which Pyramus and Thisbe has been taken where do they play a great part, Pyramus and his Thisbe? (*Midsummer Night's Dream*.) Exactly. There -- that's the Greek name Thisbe, here.

Go on.

4

*"They come from Koroneia too, from grassy Haliartos, Plataia, Glisa, and the strong men of Lower Thebes."*

Now anybody who later on in Greece read any of these names of course remembered tremendous battles fought there.

Kopai was the first settlement in Boeotia, which used Egyptian means of irrigation. The Copais Lake is an artificial lake.

Plataia is the battle of course of 479 against the Persians, the final victory which threw out the Orientals. So Plataia is a great name in Greek history.

Now go on.

## VI COMPARISON TO CONGREGATIONALISM

1

*"From holy Onchestos with Poseidon's sacred wood, from Arne, where the grapes hang thick, from Mideia and holy Nisa, and from Anthedon, on the borders of beyond."*

Now Mideia is important, because King Midas is the one to whom everything turned to gold. You may remember the myth, the story.

And Nisa is probably baptized in honor of Dionysus because there was an attempt to connect Nisa with "Nysos", which is wanton, but in these kind of etymologies the people have always in Greece excelled.

Go on, yes.

2

*"All these in 50 ships, with 120 young Boeotians in each."*

Now how many men does he assume that the Boeotians send into the war? Would you kindly make up your mind, Sir? You read it. Can't you multiply?

*(Yes Sir. About 6,000 -- a little over 5,000.)* Just, please. Precisely. *(Six thousand.)*

Yes. Why didn't you stick to your first guess? See?

Too humble.

So this region Boeotia is not quite as large as New Hampshire, yielded 6,000 men. So it was rather densely populated for those days if the navy would have 6,000 men leaving the country and going there.

They are summed up then, gentlemen, these many different cities, in one militia, in one division, the New Hampshire division. Otherwise you cannot strongly enough understand and represent to your mind the fact that all these names mean sovereign, political units. None of these cities has to give orders to the other.

3

So you see that for the purpose of the war, the poet imagines that there has been unanimity, agreement, but otherwise congregationalism. Just as the Church in this country, that's called Congregational Church, doesn't allow any central bishop or organ to run the local church. Even the Creed is under the responsibility of the congregation.

In this same sense, to compare these old cities to congregationalism is right in more than one sense.

4

I have tried to tell you, and you always forget it and I must therefore repeat it, that the state of affairs there is that religion is part of the state. There is no separation of state and Church in antiquity. So if I say that every one of these cities formed a congregation, I am much truer than if I would say they form a state, because they all had a religion at the bottom of their unity.

They were first congregationalists and had their own worship. They had a big, sacred wood probably to attract pilgrims called in honor of Poseidon.

Which line was this? Where is Poseidon mentioned? Thank you. Ja, the famous grove of Poseidon.

And there is especially mentioned that it is a sanctuary. Obviously there are people in Onchestos who had an open house and attracted pilgrims from afar, because they are not called a fortress; they are not called a city; but they are called especially a sanctuary.

VII IN ANTIQUITY: THE RELIGIOUS FORM FIRST

1

However then, the main point I wish to make is, gentlemen: these were congregations under their own steam, sovereign in their religious charter, and therefore also of course very much according to the divinity they worshiped, also their organization would run.

The Church in this country can be Episcopalian. And yet you can be a Democrat. But an Episcopal Church has a monarchical head, one bishop. Therefore we have contradiction in the constitution of a church and of a state.

Not so in antiquity.

If you had a bishop in your temple, you also would have one ruler, a king, in the city. If you had Presbyterian government in the religion, you would also have the nobleman, or the selectman, or the lord, ruling the city. A minority of aristocrats - you would be an aristocracy. If you had congregationalism, in the modern sense in America, you would be a democracy.

2

So you must always see that the order of religious worship determined the constitution.

This is to you difficult to fathom.

But as you know, the Episcopalians, including George Washington, could never win the confidence of the people. The Jeffersonians always won out, because they have nothing to do with the Anglican Church, and the Anglican Church implied a king in her bishops. And that was against the spirit of this country.

The political constitution here in 1776 took the lead and said, "Congregationalism." Congress is congregational. That is, every man a vote.

3

This for you is very useful for you once to look through.

In the '80s the Episcopal Church of this country, which comes right from the Anglican Church via Scotland into this country, had an interesting session. They said that they could not resist the democratic trend in this country and therefore the lower house of the Episcopal Church had to be run on congressional lines. And as you know in this country, therefore, the lower house of the Episcopal Church is

like the House of Representatives, and consists of laymen. Not so in the Anglican Church in England, where the laymen to this day have very little to say. And so in this country, even the Episcopal Church has been modeled, more or less - also the Lutheran Church, by the way - after the model of democracy, because in our country the secular form of government leads.

4

Not in antiquity, gentlemen. All ancient city-states put the religious form first.

When the Romans threw out their kings, who were also their high priests, they had to have immediately a new priesthood. And they took the chaplains from the army, the pontifices, the people who were the experts, the engineers for building up the Roman camp, that's the meaning of "pons," dry camp -

how do you call the duck? The ducks -- here on the campus when it is mud time. How do you call it? (*Duckboards.*) Ja.

The word "pons" means duckboard. And the pontifices in Rome, the Pontifex Maximus was the man, who could build duckboards in for the Roman camps. So they could be put on an island, or in a swamp, defend itself against the enemy. And he had this technical knowledge.

## VIII INTRODUCTION INTO THE REAL ANTIQUITY

1

Now I only mean to say in Rome, when the kingship went and the presbyters took over the senate -- "senate" meaning presbyter. That's Presbyterian. Senate comes from "senile," from "senectitude," from "senescence," from being the the elder statesman.

Now when the senate began to rule, they had to have there a new priesthood. And they took it from the army, because the senate took over the command of the army, and the king had to stay home. And to the end of the republic, the king and his priests, the flamines in the city of Rome remained in the city of Rome to keep peace with the old gods, and the *pontifices*, and the consuls, and the praetor marched out and fought the battles. And of course, the man who wins the war is made president.

So you cannot be surprised if Mr. Eisenhower and the Senate became stronger compared to the old royalty in Rome.

But in antiquity, the commander-in-chief needed his priest immediately. His religious organization was decisive, and that there was a pontiff enabled the republic, to replace royalty.

2

In every way, gentlemen, then let us repeat this, that theology and religion are not separated from philosophy and nature in antiquity. The constitution is intertwined and insoluble. One - it is a religious society, a religious state.

And of this is here a good example, because here you have the mentioning of Poseidon.

3

Now let's go on to the next. We must go on. I cannot spare you this, because I think it is your introduction into the real antiquity, and their real concern.

Will you kindly read? Yes, Sir. No, I mean you, the gentleman with -- what's your name? (*I don't have a book.*) Then borrow one. That would be an easy way out. 511. Mr. White, just help him. White -- would you help him? He can't read.

"{ } Aspledon and Orchomenos who were Askalaphos { } Ialmenos, sons of Ares, whom Astyoche { } in the palace of Aktor from { } --"

Look, my dear man. Everybody wants to listen to you. But you must enable them to do so.

"Where the gentle maiden went in secret to an upper room and slept with the mighty { }. { } 30 hollow ships. Um - Schedios --"

4

So which country is this? Where are we? Any sign?

Well, they are still one part of Boeotia, but that part which is under the Minyais. The Minyai are thought of as the oldest inhabitants of Greece, previous to the Indo-Europeans. And they are sons of Ares, and there is now given the daughter - the story how one woman received from the god of war -- although she was a respectable lady, and conceived -- and had how many boys?

Who are these sons of the god? How many? (*Two.*) Two. Quite.

## IX HOW MANY SHIPS

1

Now go on.

"*Schedios and Epistrophos, sons of the magnanimous Iphitos, son of --*"

Iphitos.

"-- *son of Naubulos, commanded { }, who lived on --*"

Phocaea. Ja. Gentlemen, that's quite an interesting town because Marseille, the ancient *Massilia* in France was founded by them. They were very bold people. They went all around the Mediterranean. And their daughter city, Marseille, is to this day after all a flourishing harbor.

So these were not small people. They were very enterprising. Here they were in this little corner of Greece preparing themselves and their other daughter cities of Phocaea. So Phocaea was a great center of immigration and settlement.

Go on.

2

"-- *commanded Phokeians, who lived in Kyparissos, and rocky Pytho, the sacred Krisa, and Daulis, and in Panopeus, { } Anemoreia and Hyampolis, the lovely waters of Kephisos, by { }.*"

What the --?

"-- *Where Kephisos rises. Forty black ships traveled with these --*"

Now Kephisos, if you had lived 50 years earlier, you would all know by now what Kephisos was. Many poems have been written in all languages of the world on the river Kephisos, and his waters, because at his water Socrates and Plato philosophize.

So it's not a despicable little brook. It has become very famous, just as the Thames or -- what's the river on which Cambridge, England is situated? (*Thames.*) Ja.

If you ever -- has anybody ever read Rupert Brookes? Who knows Rupert Brooke? Well, he has very beautiful poems on the river Cam.

So if any Greek, or any Roman, or any medieval man, or any man going to the a prep school in this country, or to a college down to 1910, if he read this word "Kephisos," he felt that it was something very important. That was the ancient river of Oxford and Cambridge, of higher learning.

3

So go on.

"Forty black ships traveled with these, too, under whose commander Phoceans seemed --"

Now Lilaia on Sicily, there is a derivative, Lilibeum, from this city of Lilaia. And it's situated at the source of Kephisos.

Now, how many? These leaders were followed by how many ships? (Forty.) Forty.

"Under whose commandment Phoceans fell in and took the battle stations { } Boiotians on the left."

4

Ja. Perhaps the next takes over. Ja. Will you?

"Leading the Lokrians came the fleet-footed son of Oleus, the lesser Aias, not such a man as Telemon { } by far { }. { } or Achaian { }. His { } had come from Kynos, Opoeis, and Kalliaros, from Bessa, and Skarphe, and beautiful Augeiai, from Tarphe and Thronion, and the banks of the river Boagrius. Forty black ships had set out under him, manned by the Lokrians, who live across the strait of Euboa. Euboa has --")

One moment. Euboa then is this large island to the east of Greece, east-northeast of Attica and Boeotia.

## X WAR AND PEACE AND THEIR DIFFERENT ORDER

1

Gentlemen, if you now look at the order a little more closely of what we have read so far, how are these cities listed? Not all just by the place name. But there is another principle that crosses it nearly out.

We are mobilized. We are at war. Gentlemen, when you belong to a company, how is your company quoted? In whose name? (*The commander who leads it.*) The captain. And the word "captain" is an immortal word. It means the head man. Caput, capitaneus.

2

And you cannot be simple enough and mythical enough about it. It's a typical myth that in a company, you feel greatly honored if you are named by your commander. It means that he is a good man and if you say -- "Company Captain Smith," then the commander of the division knows exactly for what use he can put this company,

because he can't put it to any better use than this captain is capable of. If it is a poor captain, he'll keep them in reserve. If he has the luck that this is an excellent man, he can use them as a { }.

And it is -- to this day, gentlemen -- will you take this down? -- *that the head man in war designs a contingent, a troop.*

3

In peacetime, you can give the space name. And here you have the first problem of any philosophizing about government.

We have two states. In war, the whole group has to be quoted by its living commander. You settle down, you disperse into your settlement, you can quote the same group as Thebans, as Boeotians, as Lokrai, as Phokeians. And this song is divided in this.

Now don't think that's a minor matter, because as soon as you have two notions for the same group, one under the aspect of war and the other of peace, philosophy, second impression is of course the search for the third name, which would embrace both.

And there you see how you can be correct in embracing both notions: the war side and the peace side. Or in getting a thin abstraction and giving something that omits the war situation and the peace situation. That would be a wrong generalization.

4

Now the whole problem of Greek, of our modern politics, gentlemen, of your teaching of government is of course very often handicapped because they omit the war situation of Americans, totally. You can learn government today and know never what it really means to be a soldier and under the command of a wrong captain, of a very poor captain, which is the real tragedy of any army.

There you are. He could throttle you, my dear man. You still have to obey him. That's your real problem. Wrong leadership, poor leadership.

Today they call a captain a "manager." They think the army can be managed. Well, no doubt, that means that hundred thousand of American boys will be slaughtered in the next war, because a manager cannot lead people in battle. It's nonsense.

General Patton can lead men in battle, but Charles Wilson cannot. He's a manager.

## XI HOW THEY SWING THEIR LANCES

1

And today in this country, total confusion between war and peace because, gentlemen, all our definitions of government are based on peacetime experience only. So they think that Mr. Charles Wilson can govern America.

Gentlemen, it's the end of America. It already is. He's a manager. As soon as managers try to govern people, instead of cars, you have no government.

2

This is very shocking today, but you here see the whole problem.

Even Homer is alternating. Here he gives the local name, and the place name. And obviously that was his first idea -- 495, I think the whole first thing is more or less localized. Then we are already advancing. He gets more poetical. He gets more direct, and with the Lokrai, it's already Aias, Aias, the great hero.

And that's inspiring, that they have such a good general. And they forget all about their locality. And it's all the leadership which counts.

3

Go on, with 536, please.

*"From Euboa itself sent the fiery Abantes, the man of Chalcis,  
Eretia and Ist- --"*

Eretria, yes.

*"Eretria, rich in vines, of seaside Kerinthos and the high fortress of Dios,  
and those who had their homes at Styra and Karystos,  
these were all called captain by Elephenor, offshoot of the war god, son of Chalkodon,  
and chieftain of the gallant Abantes. His followers were quick on their feet.  
They wore their hair in locks at the back. They carried ashen spears  
and wished for nothing better than to lunge with them,  
tear the corselets on their enemy's breast.  
Forty black ships came under Elephenor's command."*

Well, that's even more pronounced. If you compare these lines, gentlemen, if you go back to 506 where Poseidon's sanctuary and his grove is described, that's peacetime order. But if you come to this one chapter on Euboa, all we hear is the greatness of the soldiers, the strapping men, how they swing their lances, their

spears, and how they're out to kill, with courage in their heart, and we know next to nothing told about their home situation.

4

And now we come to the great Athene.

You have no book?

*"Next Athenians in their splendid citadel around the magnanimous Erechtheus,  
the child { } by Athene -- Athene, daughter of Zeus,  
established by her Athens in her own rich shrine.  
Her { } around { } by Athenian youths. These were commanded by --"*

Now here we have another situation, the religious order of Athens.

You can think how the Athenians - through the centuries, they became the leading city of Greece - would read these lines, in which for the first time they get their due. They get just in the middle of the story, they are listed.

The assumption has been made that the order of this list came from the fact that the Greek fleet gathered in Boeotia, in a harbor of Boeotia, in Aulis -- A-u-l-i-s.

There are many famous plays on Iphigenia in Aulis, because there she was slaughtered, the daughter of Agamemnon, for the fair wind, and then was taken to Tauris and the several modern, and several ancient plays have been written around her fate.

You have heard of Iphig-- -- how do you pronounce it in English? (*If-eh-gen-eye-ah.*) Ja. Terrible. I once had to give Greek and Latin lessons to an American girl. She was 16, and I was 14. We couldn't get along, except on the English, because our pronunciation was so different.

So come on. I still can't get "Iphigenie."

## XII THE OLDEST SONG

1

So this is Athens. And there comes now a famous verse in 557, which gave rise to great discussion.

Was Salamis -- with the Phoenician name, Salamis, peace, the island in front of Attica, was it really in the days of Homer already a part of the Attic community, or was it not conquered later by Solon? And therefore, there was great talk about the genuineness of the next verse, if you read it.

*"Out of Salamis Aias brought twelve ships  
and placed them next to where the Athenian battalions were drawn out."*

So here is not subjection of Salamis to Athens, but at least cohesion. They are allies..

2

Now on this verse, the ancients I mean waged many mighty philological battles. Some people said that the Athenians forged this verse. They put it in to state their claim that Salamis was in a life-and-death alliance, in with Athens.

Only to show you the importance of being listed in this catalog, and how to be listed. It was the charter of Greece later on, for hundreds of years.

3

This little catalog of which you think nothing, because you don't know with what a feeling people would hear the first poem, the first secular poem in any human language coherent. Not a liturgical song, not a psalm to the gods, but a song in honor of the heroes.

4

That's the oldest song we have for any human order on earth, and already shifting between the religious order, the geographical, the local order, and the military order.

### XIII HOMER'S FOLLOWING THE FIRST IMPRESSIONS

1

Would you kindly now read on? I can't help you, gentlemen. It is my purpose not to amuse you here, but to tire you out, because you must see that the encyclopedic character of this, that it is in duty bound to be exhaustive.

You think of course such a schedule or such a charter is boring. It wasn't for the Greeks. It was their entering into a common spirit.

So please bear with me if I ask you to go on, 560, please. Here is your neighbor.

*"From Salamis Aias had brought twelve ships and --"*

No, we have read that. (Oh.)

*"The citizens of Argos and Tiryns of the great walls,  
the men of Hermione and Asine, down from the great, deep gulf of the sea,  
and Troizen and Eonai, and from vine-clad Epidauri,  
with the Achaian youths from Aigina and Mases  
were led by Diomedes of the loud war cry, and by Sthenelos, son of famed Kapaneus;  
high-born Euryalos, son of King Mekisteus, son of Talaos;  
and { } them { } man, but the warlike Diomedes was in charge of the whole force  
and 80 black ships set sail under him.*

*"The troops that came from the great stronghold of Mykenai,  
from wealthy Korinth, and good town of Kleonai,  
the men who lived in Orneai and lovely Araithyrea,  
in Sikyon, where Adrestos had reigned in all the years;  
and Hyperesia and the steep Gonoessa, and Pellene  
and around Aigion; and all these the length of the coast and broad land of Helike,  
these and their hundred ships King Agamemnon, son of Atreus, led.*

*The following was by far the finest and most numerous.  
It was a proud man who took his stand among the people,  
armed in gleaming bronze, the greatest captain of them all,  
in virtue of his rank and as commander by far of the largest force."*

2

Now one moment, gentlemen. You can learn something for your English.

This is the heart of the matter, Agamemnon. He is the commander-in-chief. He is not placed in the beginning, as any logical system would say. Commander-in-chief, he comes in later. Any artistic organization never has a happy ending in your sense of the word, that the last kiss - and then the curtain falls. But in real art, gentlemen, there is a climax, and then you keep the height of tension, and then there is a finale, as in any opera, also; there is a music that goes after the main event.

3

In the same sense, you see here that he has led up from the place, Boeotia, where the navy gathers, and is enlarging his horizon, and here we suddenly are told in the middle of nowhere, that these were the best men, and this was the commander-in-chief, and he was the greatest of them all, because we have been taken gradually into the beehive, into the dynamics of the whole army.

It's very hard for us to reproduce this. You are all second-impression men. That is, you organize your material logically. And there you say who was the commander-in-chief, biggest contingent, hundred ships: he has to come first. Where Homer was still dealing with first impressions, and therefore he hasn't taken stock of everything

first, and then divides it logically, with A, B, C, D. But he goes into it, in his imagination as he would walk through this.

And there is Boeotia, and there are the Boeotians, because they have first access to their own harbor. They were there first. And then come all the boats that came there, across the sea to join them.

And so he finally reaches the stately headquarters of Agamemnon.

4

You can study here, gentlemen, that Homer's heart is in following the first impressions also in the physical, in the real life. He's not systematic. He's anti-philosophical.

Because a philosopher must have all his material gathered before he can subdivide it. Therefore it's always a second impression, it's an afterthought.

#### *XIV UP AND DOWN THE CLIMAX*

1

Once you understand this, gentlemen, you know how boring most poems in America are, who list all the 48 states or at least 10 of them. You know all these patriotic songs which list the cliffs in Oregon, or the sand in Texas, and the oil wells in Dakota, et cetera.

I would still prefer the oil wells in Texas.

And they make now a habit. And they tell you that you can make this poetical, if you talk of the various states. You cannot. Because anything is unpoetical that already knows the whole and then subdivides it. No first impressions.

2

And therefore, Homer is a great lesson for you.

Hollywood mostly sins against this principle. They know too much. They are so sophisticated. They bury the poets. They hire them, let them smother them somewhere in a corner in Hollywood. And then they have their producers and directors, and they are so smart. They know everything ahead of time. And the innocence is lost.

And they dismiss you with the high point of the story, without any finale.

But any man who is really impressed by a great event, gentlemen, then wants to have some swan song, wants to have something declining.

3

So what I have tried to build -- to show you here, how he builds up to the climax, would also apply to the end. You go down from the climax.

Opera still has this, an opera or a symphony always has a finale. You cannot be dismissed with a high point. But I think the more you get modern techniques, the more the people think they must dismiss you with the climax.

That's very bad taste. Just sensation.

4

Now from there or from Agamemnon, I won't go on now with this all in detail, but we will only read the end.

There is still a tremendous, long list. And we begin perhaps -- it doesn't matter, really. Let us begin at 730. (*What are the first lines? We don't have it in our book.*)

Trikke and Ithome.

*"The man --"*

No, perhaps we have to go back to 720, just before. I'm sorry. Lemnos. That's quite an interesting thing, because it's an exceptional line. 721.

*(Start with "Those from Methone"?)*

Ja. Very good. Begin there.

*"Those from Methone, Thaumakia --"*

Methone, pardon me. It makes no difference. But it happens to be very long: Methon-ne. Ja?

## XV COSMOS: A CITY BEAUTIFULLY ORGANIZED

1

*"Methone, Thaumakia, Meliboia and rugged Olizon were brought by the great archer Philoktetes --"*

Now, everybody has to know Philoktetes. There's a great, famous tragedy of antiquity, by Sophocles, Philoktetes, where his cries -- he was poisoned -- fill the air through the whole drama.

Just as it was with music played in antiquity -- all ancient tragedy is opera. And so the great outcries of Philoktetes go through all ancient tradition. And here Philoktetes is the great archer, comes with a very small troop. Only seven ships.

2

But now you go on.

*"-- { } in seven ships, each manned by fifty oarsmen trained to go to battle with the bow. But their commander lay in agony on the lovely isle of Lemnos, where the Achaian army had left him suffering from the poisonous bite of a malignant water snake.*

*So he lay there, crying, so the Argives by their ships were destined before long to {think} once more of {King} Philoktetes. Meanwhile, though his followers missed their leader, they were not left without a chief. They were commanded by Medon, the bastard son of Oileus, whom Rhene bore to Oileus, the sacker of { }."*

Now one moment. I have to charge you with another word.

"They were not without a leader, although they were desirous of their old leader." You read this. And then they said, "Medon was in command."

Now the word which Homer uses here is a very important word. And if you at this moment learn it, you will see the whole problem of logos and physis, which is the topic of our whole lecture course, in a new light.

3

You have heard what a cosmic order is. We use the word "cosmic" for the universe. Before man enters it. You know what the word "cosmology" means, ja. The order of the universe. You may hear modern astronomers speak of the cosmological problems. That is, the origin of our world.

The Greeks were very much concerned with cosmos, in the same sense. Cosmology is one of the fundamental things of physis and physiology, you can also say cosmos and cosmology. It would mean the same. And many Greek writers didn't write on physis, on nature, but on cosmos.

4

But gentlemen, this word still has the law which I tried to emphasize, that it comes first from human society. And later only from the nonhuman world, because "cosmos" here in this sentence means -- *kosmein*, exactly like "mythein," "kosmein" means to be in command of a human cosmos, of a beehive. You can use perhaps the word "hive." "Cosmos" means a wreath, a garland, an order.

And therefore, the first meaning of the word "cosmos" to your and my surprise is political. The meaning of a city, beautifully organized. And only later was it taken out and carried into the nature, of the universe. If nature is a cosmos, it means that it is as well organized as human society.

#### XVI THE SUN DOESN'T UNDERSTAND MATHEMATICS

1

Now since all our problem here is to settle in the history of Greek philosophy our own problem and in our own mind, what is first in our own impression, in our own experience? Human society, or nature; that is, the nonspeaking world, you remember? The world which is not governed by human speech, by the word.

It is terribly important for you to look at this point into the Greek language and to know the word *erkosmesen*, "he commanded," really means "he ordered." *Cosmos means order* -- will you take this down? -- *and it means first, political order*. And second, all other order which forms a semblance to the political order, which is equally harmonious, equally lawful.

2

So you all think that the law of nature is older than the law of man.

Obviously that isn't so. Nature doesn't know anything of laws; just is as it is. Chaotic, you may say. We have made laws first, and then we have also tried to discover the similar laws in the universe.

But the idea of a law came to your and my mind only because we were under law. And these were statute laws. They were formulated, articulate laws.

3

When Mr. Newton articulated the laws of Heaven and earth, he imitated human language. And he used mathematics, because he knew, the sun couldn't understand English. But it can hardly understand mathematics.

The mathematical laws of the universe are then, gentlemen, second-impression laws. And the word "cosmos" yields us this great secret, that in Homer, it is simply the order set up by humans among themselves. And the word "cosmos" today to you has lost all this intimacy.

4

If you wish to understand the importance of this, gentlemen, I'll tell this you right after the recess. How much depends for your and my bliss and beatitude on your clarity about this history of all these terms, like "myth" and "cosmos"?

But let's have a break first. Five minutes.

*I THE COMMANDS OF OUR HEART WERE THE FIRST*

1

...at this moment there is a tremendous temptation all over the world to breed people like cattle, to forbid miscegenation, to lay down the rule by which blood groups you are allowed to marry another lady, because otherwise your child may die, and to make all kind racial laws about the race. And the doctors, and the natural scientists write books on heredity, because they know absolutely nothing about it, and so they sell very well.

And you believe all this stuff, gentlemen.

2

Now what's the argument?

Gentlemen, when you believe in humanity, and when you believe in the experience of the human race, you would say that obviously the feeling of affection and love and the falling in love between a man and a woman is the first guide for our first impression, and the first guide to our knowledge about mating. Because people who really love each other form good marriages. That's the normal thing.

And then we try to find it outside in nature, for the bulls and the wolves, an application of our own experience, and mate them, and breed cattle accordingly, and birds, and what-not. Whatever we try, and finally, hybrid corn.

And so we have cultivated the earth by applying our own experiences about breeding and mating to the outside world.

3

This means that our inner cosmos, the commands of our heart were the first, and the application of these commands into the outer world to whose hearts we cannot look, came second.

Always when you have done this long enough, the devil comes and says: "Transfer the experiences of the outer world into your human heart, and ask the human beings to behave like cattle." That's the moment today.

We have read so much science that today they try to tell you that you must not marry for love, you must not marry for desire, you must not marry for affection, but for the genetic reasons of Mr. Such-and-Such, some outsider who sells sperm to a Hollywood lady from a well-bodied student.

Well, that's what they do, after all. They sell sperm. That is, they transfer literally the experience of bulls to humanity.

4

That's going on in this country. It's not forbidden.

I would expel these people. I would ship them across the ocean. Send them to Russia. It would be better in love affairs.

*II DO WE CARRY EXPERIENCES OF SOCIETY INTO THE NATURAL WORLD OR VICE VERSA?*

1

Gentlemen, it's a great scandal of this country. Goes on under your nose. You know that thousands of boys do this, and give their sperm to a woman they have never seen and whom they don't love, and they think that will be good offspring, because cattle is produced this way.

2

This is your temptation, gentlemen. In every way of life, you can look at the beehive and try to understand it from your own experiences, or you can look at the beehive, which you only see from the outside, and be ruled then by imitating the beehive.

And every one of you, gentlemen, before you came to this class, were quite unaware of this constant ambiguity, how to judge the outer world and the inner world, what makes law.

3

It is terribly important, gentlemen, that you keep in mind that all of you are philosophers. As soon as you get outside your family, your familiarity into something outer, and you have the ovibos, here the musk ox coming to Vermont.

Did you read the story of the musk ox? Whom they brought at great expense from the Arctic down to Vermont? They want to tame it.

4

Now, do we carry over our own experience of familiar, and domestic fact, to this musk or do we take { } about getting us wild? That's always your decision.

So -- it is the issue before humanity in 1956, and it will be for the next hundred years: do we carry over the experiences of the natural world into society, or the experiences of society into the natural world?

### III *EXPLOSIONS FAR REMOVED*

1

Take the fertilizing problem, gentlemen; take the chemical problem.

2

I just read an article this morning, that wherever you spray the trees and the bushes, the bees die. And first they go crazy, and then some of these bees murder the others. They don't die directly, but they go crazy and they denaturalize their stock. The discipline goes, my neighbor lost his bees this way from spraying his trees this summer.

We are destroying constantly life because we do not go from our inner experience to the outer world. But we allow us to be more included in the natural principles of chemistry, gentlemen.

3

Chemistry deals with the deadest things in life. Chemicals are dead. If you explain life by chemistry, you will soon be chemical. And you have poison gas, and you have genocides, and you have the atom bomb. That's chemistry.

Don't be surprised, that the atom bomb is around after a century of chemistry.

4

Obviously the whole problem is to reverse the process and to say, "Since even a mother-in-law doesn't try to be an atom bomb in the family of her daughter-in-law, let's arrange the world so that the destruction, the Vesuvius, the explosions are far removed from the center of human society, and that the heart of our cities cannot be destroyed by bombs, as we did in central Europe."

*IV INTERESTING ARE THE SMALL THINGS ONLY*

1

And very wantonly, just because the air marshal thought it was a wonderful proposition to bomb Dresden -- we are held up among Russians and among the satellite states every day over the radio as barbarians, because Dresden was perfectly wantonly, without any usefulness for the war effort, destroyed by the Royal Air Force, and the Americans later on.

Very interesting, it's now admitted that the strategical bombing chose the wrong targets. It didn't take the bridges and it didn't take the railroads, which some reasonable people tried to suggest in '43, but all the targets that were just conspicuous, that were big.

2

Which is very inhuman, because the human is for the small things. The soul of man is invisible; a baby is very small; the limbs where you can really feel an order of society, they are all tenuous, delicate things, headquarters and such things.

If you want to go out in nature and imitate Vesuvius and Etna, then you will take the big targets.

It's just an example of what happens when you go from nature into human society. These were very small units here, these people. You couldn't judge them from the ocean.

3

You are all for bigness, gentlemen. That's why our life is so boring. Interesting are small things only.

A group of 10 people is much more interesting than a country of 160 million people. You think the other way. And wherever you have bigness first, gentlemen, you kill life, because bigness is only for the human eye. Your private experience is always only dealing with small things.

Pétain, the marshal of France, said once, "I can only really know 10 people. Therefore government must be organized in such a way that I have to deal with 10 men. Because then I know they are doing. Everyone must deal with another 10 men. And on it goes. But my fiction, that I deal with 40 million Frenchmen, is just impossible."

4

Smallness must even exist in government, gentlemen, and in our commanding armies. It's no good that the general commands 4 million people. He cannot do this. But he must have 20 men around him whom he can trust like the apple of his own eye.

V HOMER DEALS WITH THE NAMED ENTITIES

1

But this choice can only be made when you know that the logos, the intimacy of the group with whom you are on speaking terms, can never be replaced by a natural order, where you count apples.

And this is now my task, gentlemen, to come to the conclusion here of this catalog.

2

The step from Homer to philosophy can now be exactly defined, because you have here a list of cities, every one being very small and keeping their own name. I don't have to repeat any of these names, but I just put here the word "name," the term "name."

Homer deals with named entities.

And although we list them in a unified effort, everyone keeps his name to himself, and it is even stressed by the name of the captain, its overname, so to speak. It has two names: the local name; and that name which is even more alive, because it's a living man, at this moment, who is leading them.

3

Now if you come to Plato, if you come to any philosopher, gentlemen, he does not list the many cities by their name, and then lump them together, as the "Greek navy."

But there is one little step in Plato. Anybody who happens to have Plato here can look up the 10th book of *The Republic*. You have it there. I brought it specially to class here -- and Plato rages against Homer. And that's why I bring it up right away, because it's Plato's attack on Homer. Very famous.

He wanted to forbid the reading of Homer to his students.

Of course, he couldn't do it. But he made an attempt. And he begins with the famous statement: "We can no longer go on allowing the people to read poetry." That's the first sentence in the 10th book of *The Republic*.

4

You have it there? Page 595. Everyone perhaps bring this next time and looks it up himself. Page 595 in the old Stefanos edition. That's the general way of quoting all the Greek texts from the 16th-century editions and their page numbering.

So it's always printed here on the side, and you have it on top of the page. Yes, it is. I know it. (*It says Book Ten on top of the page.*) Oh, no, Sir. Here. Yes, I'm right, and you are wrong.

## VI THE GREAT FALL OF PLATO: FROM "HE" AND "SHE" TO "IT"

1

So page 596 is the great fall, the transition from poetry to philosophy made, because there Plato says, "Our task of thinkers -- of philosophers is *to think about all the many things which may be called by the same name.*"

Will you take this down, gentlemen?

Poetry never thinks about all the people who come under the same name, but poetry has to keep the individual names of every one city here. And then try to bring them together in a unity, without what I call scalping their name.

It is not enough to say, "the Greeks." The whole catalog stands and falls with our interest in the captains, you see, of every individual city. That's why the Greeks read it, and thought it was great poetry.

2

Now Plato says, in this whole page -- as you really add a note to your Homer edition, that Plato attacks the catalog of the ships. He calls the poets "imitators" of the cosmos of politics. They let the people stand under their own name, as a way they call themselves. They have humility of the poet who -- if Mr. Smith is called "Mr. Smith," lets him be called "Mr. Smith."

Plato says, "I want to get behind the secret. I want to have second impressions. All tables, they are not to me the ebony table and the acorn table. They are just tables." And he says, "I therefore list all and everything by one name."

3

And there is this little step done, gentlemen, which distinguishes poetry, animism, living with people, and philosophy, speaking of things.

Homer deals with all the many cities of men. Plato deals with all the many things.

4

That's a strange transition from "he" to "it," from "he" and "she" to "it." Plato deals with every man as though he was an "it." And he comes out with cattle breeding for marriage, because he doesn't see why he shouldn't decide on me and you as though we were things, "its," all to be called by the same name.

And that's the terror of Platonism, that we are all his ideas, and he thinks about us, where we aren't present. And we cannot complain if he calls us just, "male" and "female." And you cannot say, "But I'm John Smith; and I'm not Jean Smith."

## VII THE REAL STEP FROM POETRY INTO PHILOSOPHY

1

So gentlemen, we have here a great lesson and a great comparison to make. Plato makes a desperate attempt to delete the political self-consciousness of the people of whom he is speaking, to give to them his judgment on their order. His second impressions. And denying their right to go on under the impact of their first impressions, their own laws, their own names, their own dialect, their own religion. That's all to be wiped out, because he knows better.

And he says so by saying in this 596, Number 8, there is this strange sentence: "We have agreed that this is an idea, which shall call *idea*, that which we get accustomed to put on all the many things to which we put the same name.

Don't you understand this?"

"*I understand.*"

2

So there are many seats. There are many tables, he says, but the idea is one and the same, there is only one seat, one idea of a chair, and one idea of a table.

Here you have, in a seemingly harmless little paragraph, the real step from poetry into philosophy, from first impressions to second impressions.

The man of second impressions, gentlemen, pays no attention to the self-naming of the people concerned. He wants to penetrate behind their consciousness, and he strips them therefore -- I call it: "scalps" - of their name. Because my name is more even than my headdress. It is my headdress, as a matter of fact.

3

If you strip a battalion of the name "Philoktetes," you don't have the same battalion in battle.

And so the man says, "Philoktetes was left behind, but they had another man keeping the order, Medon." We just read this.

Now can you also take away Medon and say, "There are just 500 Greeks"? Do you still have the same order? Do you still have the same thing?

Plato would say "yes". Philosophy will always think that it is well organized when it goes by its own concepts. It doesn't wait for the agreement, gentlemen, of the ordered. Philosophy never waits until you have said, "But I call myself miserable. You call me happy."

4

Modern state has very much of managerial society. All the managers rent buses, pack all their workers on Saturday evening in a bus and say, "Aren't you happy?" And then they have to answer, "Yes."

But that's just a glue put on from the outside, gentlemen. They aren't happy, but they are made to behave happily.

#### VIII *THEIR SELF-NAMING IS LOST*

1

All our whole modern mass movement. All these broadcasters, they all tell you that you have to be happy. And you -- no resistance. No contradiction accepted. Then you just drop out and won't listen to the broadcast. They say, "I'm sorry. Can't do anything for you," because these mass media are not at your disposal.

They are at their disposal.

And you are just -- how do you call it, if you prepare your little victim by licking it with your spittle so completely that it finally goes down your throat very nicely? We have a word in German, a verb, where we describe this process of first getting

enough saliva around the bit before devouring. How would you call it? "To salive" you can't say. Wie? (*Salivate?*)

2

Can you? Ja. Well, terribly important, gentlemen. The step from the many people to the many things. There's a great difference, gentlemen.

If you treat people as things, they lose their own names.

Their self-naming is lost.

3

And that's the whole problem of philosophy to this day, gentlemen. Philosophers will organize and logically deduct, to use the order of the universe, with one little loss. The way people think of themselves doesn't enter the picture.

They are all men, for example. Or they are all Europeans. Now, ask a man in Holland. He'll never think himself -- of a European. He's a Dutchman. Oh, but you say, "I go to Europe," and to you, Holland is just one little enclave. You pass it in half an hour by car. It's so small. To a Dutchman, it's terribly big.

Who has been to Holland? Don't you think? (*Yes.*) Ja. And if you bicycle, it takes quite a time. And they all bicycle. And 92 percent of the Dutchmen bicycle.

4

Now, that's a different country in their own consciousness. A country which you measure by bicycle is a different country from a Cadillac country.

But philosophy in the abstract sense doesn't take any notice. It says, "Here are Dutchmen. They also have two legs, and a head. They are human beings. And they live in Europe. Therefore they are Europeans."

#### IX EUROPE ONE OF THE MOST BASTARD ABSTRACTIONS OF PHILOSOPHY

1

Gentlemen, Europe is one of the most bastard abstractions of philosophy.

Except for the French who invented the term in order to be the greatest nation of Europe, the rest of Europe doesn't give a damn for Europe. They want to be Dutch. They want to be Germans. They want to be Belgians. They want to be Danes.

2

But one thing they don't want to be. They don't want to be Americans. Ja, if you make them into Europeans, you make them simply into second-thought Americans, with ice cream and Ford cars, because the condition under which they could become Europeans would be that they would become a second America. That's the one thing they don't want to become.

3

In America the continent is older than the individual part of the continent. In Europe, that isn't so. In this country, you have no dialects. But every valley in Europe speaks a different language. And there the individual order comes first. This is still -- like this catalog of the ships - Europe. And it is not the abstract entity with the numbering, as we have it, Arkansas Number 10, for my baby, if I happen to have a baby born in Arkansas and then fingerprinted.

What's your number?

4

Well, it's very serious, gentlemen, because I think at this moment, America is faced with the issue: do we want to go poetical? That is, do we want to go down to grassroots and brass tacks, despite our big cities, despite our technology, and therefore give everybody a character of his own?

Or are we forcing the rest of mankind to follow our example of mass production, and insist that it's the only way of life? That would be the philosophical way of life.

#### *X WE ARE RULED BY PHILOSOPHY*

1

You haven't solved this yet, gentlemen. America is torn between the grass-root democracy of Jefferson with private property, which means grassroots, my own home. My house, my castle. And the modern mass state with a secret police allowed to enter and take your best friend from your home, because you no longer protect him by your hospitality.

2

I'll give you this last instance for this.

I always put the question to my classes: when you have a friend, and he is seeking the protection of your home, and you happen to have a home of your own, and he wants to spend the night in peace there, and the police comes, and asks you -- can they arrest him, will you protect your child or your friend, or will you protect the police?

And I always got the classical answer: if it is the sheriff, we'll protect him. If it is the FBI, we'll extradite him.

3

There you have the two Americas. The first is the grass-root America of 1750. If a man was in your home, he has the name of your friend. This was John Smith, and you had an intimate and personal relation to him. And therefore you could not be put to shame by giving him over to a police force.

But today, you live in an abstract tenement house. And even in the country, you are just city -- there are just city money, and there is nothing concrete, and nothing direct. And so, if the FBI comes, you surrender.

4

That's happened in Russia, gentlemen, and it's happened with us here. And we aren't less abstract than the Russians, because we are ruled by philosophy.

## SEVENTH LECTURE: THE CULT OF FRIENDSHIP THE SERIOUS SUBSTITUTE FOR THE CULT OF THE LOCAL GODS

### I *THE CODE OF CHIVALRY*

1

...in its real, ancient meaning. We saw that it meant admiration for opposite orders of societies, or the men moving in these inimical orders. And we said admiration then is a philosophical virtue, because it means that we live in separate worlds, but admire the fellow who does his part in the opposite world.

It is the relation towards enemies who at this moment have to behave as enemies.

2

Gentlemen, on you the term "humanities" and "humanism" is mostly lost. You think it has to do with fiction, or music, or the arts.

But humanism is that faculty of you and me in the encircling gloom while the world is not finished. And while we are of course weak in spirit and really devote all our efforts to make our own country, or own profession win - to keep a yardstick of behavior toward those who oppose our ends is very important.

3

Christian love does not fight, so that ends the whole problem of the struggle. But humanism adheres to the fighting here and now, and says, "On the other hand, this man is admirable." And so it creates the code of chivalry.

4

All chivalry, all international law, all behavior of truth between modern lobbies, farmer's union, Republican Party, bankers' interest, are still based on this humanistic creed that there will be a limit to their mutual slander and the pursuit of their interest.

## II *NO EDUCATION WITHOUT ADMIRATION*

1

So gentlemen, it is one of the most important things that you see that humanism has something to do with mutual admiration. And this virtue in ethics is never mentioned.

2

I read all the textbooks of my friend and others here in this country, and oh, in Europe it's even worse. Admiration is considered usually a poor virtue.

3

Gentlemen, it's a central virtue for everyday living. People who do not admire cannot be educated. You cannot educate a child without admiration. If a child doesn't know whom to admire, you cannot raise his sights. Then you can only speak in the abstract, of all the powers that are invisible, and there is nothing in between which at this moment already raises his sights.

You cannot educate a child without admiration.

4

They try hard in the last 40 years, so the children remain uneducated, and become juvenile delinquents. Well, whom do they admire? The robbers. If you do not make them admire the right people, they will admire the wrong people.

That's what they do in this country. They admire Al Capone, or wild Western films, and all these comic strips. And it's very terrible, gentlemen. You have, in this country, just a wrong scale of admiration.

And for what reason? Because it has been said to you, "Don't admire." Well, nobody can live that way. So then the people go and admire something -- the Hollywood stars.

So -- since you have no women whom you are allowed to admire, you admire the pseudo-women. That's what they are, the pin-up girl, and so on. It's nothing to admire.

### III TO ADMIRE ONE'S FOE

1

So we have done something terrible to this whole sense of admiration.

And it is fundamental, gentlemen. If you become scientists instead of philosophers, as you all try to be, then you throw out all admiration for people, and you only have a sense of wonder perhaps about facts. And you want to learn the facts and buy the Encyclopaedia Britannica. Or you subscribe to Science, or you subscribe to Life, to be posted about the newest facts.

2

I could tell you that this is a very one-sided misunderstanding of the sense of wonder. The sense of wonder is triplicate.

*You have to admire the power that makes you understand.*

*You have to admire the thing which stops you, because you don't understand it.*

*And you have to admire the power that makes you able to communicate with others this admirable faculty that we are meant to understand the universe, to move in it with clear-headedness, and do something about it.*

3

But I come back to my tripartition, logos, ethos, and physis here once more.

But I thought the last lecture tried to show you that Homer instituted for these envious knights of Greece, they were barbarians as anybody else, the code of wonder, because he drew them out of their small, little confines of Podunk, and Delaware, and Rhode Island and Vermont and New Hampshire, and put them in this mighty wide world of a common enterprise.

Like the Crusades, something like that, in the Middle Ages. You may compare the Crusades with the same spirit. And just as the Crusades created the code of the Pilgrim, which you still have in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*, and the code of the crusader, the code of the knight in shining armor -- there were no such things before. But this great common enterprise of the Crusades drew people out into this new humanity.

4

So Homer did this for the first time in human history, that he drew the people out, and he did so well that he did better than the Crusaders, because he made them admire their foe. He made them admire Priam. And Achilles and Priam look at each other -- behold each other with astounded eyes.

#### IV *THE ADMIRABLE MIND*

1

Now gentlemen, for all the future of the Greek spirit and humanism, it has remained then equally important that the philosopher remain somebody to be admired more than that what he says. The philosopher himself is an object of admiration, alternatingly.

The simpler the world which he explains -- like if you explain the whole world to be atoms, then the world is not very admirable - but all the more the mind is admirable who can say to you, "The world is very simple."

2

So when Democritus said the whole world consisted of atoms, the sense of wonder migrates to the philosopher and rests upon him.

3

All realists, all factualists, gentlemen, in philosophy, all the people who say, "This is nothing but" simply mean to tell you that you shall admire them more than the things. And all the people who say, "Really? This is great. The galaxy of the heavens is really the expression of this harmony of the spheres, is divine," as Plato said, this makes you concentrate your sense of wonder on physis, on the things of the world.

4

And therefore, you may be allowed perhaps for a while to forget the philosopher, or your sense of admiration for the philosopher.

V ALL GREAT POWERS ARE LIMITED

1

So gentlemen, the sense of wonder migrates or shifts or oscillates, according to any system of philosophy, because the wonder is something of a limited -- how shall I say -- existence.

You have not unlimited power to admire. Either you admire the riddle of the universe, or you admire the man who explains to you the riddle of the universe, or you explain the power that asks us to move in a hidden universe with our simple brains.

You are either overwhelmed by the wonder of God, or by the wonder of society, or by the wonder of physis.

2

This is very difficult for you to believe, gentlemen. You cannot have endless admiration. Admiration is not unlimited. No power of the human soul, even love, is unlimited. You cannot love your neighbor more than yourself. That's a sin very often committed in this society.

People try to love their neighbor more than themselves. It never works. That's idolatry. Husbands worship their wives more than they love themselves. So of course it ends in disaster. It's not good for a woman to be adored. She has to be told the truth.

3

So gentlemen, admiration, as all great powers in life, are -- how do you say? -- limited -- is that the right word? -- confined, restricted. They are not available in abundance.

You live in a fools' paradise, because you do not know that your mind and your body, and we all live in a wonderful economy of powers.

"Economy" means that every post in the budget is limited. You are told by naive ideas that you can make friends with everybody.

Gentlemen, don't believe it for a minute. Friendship is limited. If you try to make friends with everybody, you can't be friends with anybody. But that's a modern gospel, that you can make friends with 2 billion people on this globe. Don't try it.

4

It's nonsense. The powers, gentlemen, which come to play in your life in this universe are -- give me the right word -- economical forces. That is, you have to economize them. You have to know there are problems of distribution. They are not there in unending measure.

#### VI TH LIMITATION FOR PHILOSOPHY

1

The man who has imagination in great wealth, he cannot have the same sagacity as a usurer. The usurer has no imagination, but he has sagacity. Sagacity and imagination usually exclude each other. You must not then bargain one for the other.

Either you are a poet and use your imagination and write Shakespeare's play-- as I think the man who inspired Shakespeare's plays was a great spendthrift and never had enough. I don't think that Shakespeare, the sober citizen of Stratford-on-Avon is the author of these plays.

But that is a minor matter, and I don't hold a brief for this. But only to tell you that I think that wherever you have great passions and great virtues, you cannot have the same energies also in the opposite camp.

You understand this. But it is one of your illusions that you can.

2

Now the history of philosophy is the revelation of this great law of economy. The whole history of Greek philosophy shows you that you have to choose what to admire most, physis, logos, or ethos. And you can't have it all three ways.

3

The second thing about humanism then, next to admiration, was that humanism is a second hammer throw, because first we are thrown into our own group -- family, state, community, church. Humanism tries to widen this group. And the second problem of humanism is not this problem of distribution of admiration, but: how far can we go in forgetting our first impressions, our first loyalties? How far is this transfer to a wider circle permissible? How far is it not destructive of our first bonds?

4

You see this very clearly when you ask our attitude of a cosmopolitan philosopher in times of war. He knows both sides, obviously many people in this country knew very well that there was a relative right on all sides of the question in 1917. Yet, when the war breaks out, everybody has to stand behind the decision of the president who takes the country into war. So all their cosmopolitan knowledge, all their philosophy, for the time at least, is suspended and put in waiting.

This is the question that faces every man who uses his mind, gentlemen, that at one moment in his life, his mind is no good. That is, his mind has no right to command his actions. This I mean by "his mind is no good."

So where is the limitation for philosophy?

## VII *HOW MUCH TO FIRST IMPRESSIONS, HOW MUCH TO GENERALIZATIONS*

1

This is the second problem immediately put by the very fact of philosophizing. Philosophizing, we said, generalizes primitive, first-rate loyalties.

Now the question is: how far can this generalization do without the first loyalty?

2

You all live in this fools' paradise. Most people talk in abstractions, as for example, friends.

But gentlemen, if you have never made a friend, the buying of the book of Dale Carnegie, *How to Make Friends*, won't help you. The first friend must already have occurred in your life before you can transfer this same experience to others. And that's an immediate experience, and it can't be made on a basis of a book, because if it is only by the book, you will never know whether it is a real friend or not.

You have to go buy Dale Carnegie, and I think he has only customers, and no friends.

3

Well, most of you live in this second-hand world, with your mind. Fortunately not in reality, gentlemen. Your mother writes, "You come home for Thanksgiving," and you do. Why, you don't know. You may be disgruntled because you wanted to go elsewhere, but you just go. And she is an authority. And no philosophy helps against that.

But where's the limit?

4

Philosophy of course then, gentlemen, has to solve this second problem: how much to first impressions? How much to generalizations?

That's the second topic, also clearly already developed in Homer.

### VIII *SOMETHING THIRD ALWAYS PRESENT*

1

Now I got this question from one of you. It's a good question. I want to start with this right now.

2

After we had dealt with the catalog of the ships, as the great example of generalization, of living generalization which did not kill the patriotism of the local group, but took all the groups in a common enterprise, every one, however, retaining his identity.

We went over to the scene between Priam and Achilles over the corpse of Hector. And we saw that great passions there were overcome by this admiration, by this astonishment that a greater thing could have happened, that Priam could return alive from the tent of the slayer of his son. And we saw that the creation of this admiration was possible by the appeal to the fatherhood in Achilles' father.

3

And you see therefore that in humanism there is something third present always between two men.

In America, you have this example when a rich man meets a beggar. In good America, the rich man treats the beggar so nicely, humanly, because he doesn't exclude the possibility that one day he might be a beggar himself.

As soon as the rich man doesn't do that, he will treat the beggar inhumanely, because the functional approach will not be there, that he can, in his imagination, take the place of the beggar.

4

You have two classes of rich in this country. You have the unfeeling rich, who think that this can never happen to them, and they will always have enough. And you have the good rich, who never forget that from shirtsleeves to shirtsleeves, there are three generations; and one day he himself may need the same appeal.

Do you understand the great difference of attitude?

To one, his social status hangs around lightly, and he doesn't give a damn to the fact that he earns a million dollars a year, at this moment, because he foresees the vicissitudes of fortunes. And I always think that if you want to melt a manufacturer's heart, even of the National Association of Manufacturers, you just have to remind them that their own daughter may have to become a secretary and a typist. And that should melt everybody's heart about labor conditions. Your own daughter is involved in the game. There is no security. Nobody can say that his daughter may not have to earn a living herself. Nobody can protect in modern times a member in the next generation against such necessity.

#### *IX NOT OTHER WAY OF TEACHING EXCEPT BY EXAMPLE*

1

Now if this is so, gentlemen, then the question is legitimate: how much is Homer a philosopher? And what right do we have to say that Homer is not a philosopher, that he is a poet?

This was my question.

2

After all, we found in Homer already these typical two situations which we have determined as philosophy. The answer is, at this moment, as far as I can give it to you -- you know not enough yet about the whole story -- complex. And I don't see why I should oversimplify it.

It is the beauty of dealing with real texts and real people, gentlemen, that things aren't so simple as you would like to have them for a final examination.

3

Homer is the teacher of all the Greeks. To teach is always to generalize. You cannot teach without going beyond the immediate moment, with specificity, as people say today, the specific moment.

When a mother says, "Bring me this basket from the attic," that's a specific command. The child will obey. But when the mother teaches the child, and tries to say, "Commands of parents have to be obeyed," you will understand that's always a philosophical element, because it generalizes.

4

So teaching is always philosophical. There is no other way of teaching, except by example. But example has to be interpreted. And the interpretation then will have this generalizing element, always.

The command, the example, and the teaching -- the indoctrination are threefold, and the indoctrination is always a philosophical element. In all instruction, in all teaching, you cannot help it.

#### X SCIENCE CANNOT BE TAUGHT SCIENTIFICALLY

1

Modern scientists are enemies of philosophy, great enemies, and destroyers of philosophy, because they only want us to deal with things. And want to be objective. They do not want to cultivate the admiration of the person.

But gentlemen, you cannot teach mathematics mathematically. You have to teach mathematics enthusiastically. Otherwise it won't stick. If a teacher of mathematics cannot make you feel good about mathematics, he cannot teach it.

2

You see the difference?

*Science cannot be taught scientifically.*

Will you take this down, gentlemen? You either have to admire the teacher, or you have to love mathematics. Both are simply emotional situations.

3

It's one of the dreams of America with these objective examinations, but I hope that one day there will be riot and they'll all be destroyed. That's a scandal. These so-called "objective" examinations seduce you to believe that the learning process is something quite different from what it is. It makes you think that you can do without these translations.

That's a widespread superstition at this moment, in this country. But without somebody interesting you, and getting you interested in mathematics, there are no mathematics.

4

So gentlemen, there is in all teaching a philosophical element, because we have now learned already that the sense of wonder may also apply to the teacher. If he has a very boring subject and he can keep you interested, you begin to admire him instead of the boring subject. But it works. It keeps you together; it keeps you awake.

#### XI ALL PHILOSOPHY SCALPS NAMES FROM THINGS

1

In teaching then, there is also this element of wonder, either for the teacher or for the subject. And in as far as Homer is a teacher of the Greeks, we cannot get around the fact that he is partly a philosopher.

2

That's one perplexity, and Plato says of himself that Homer has been his teacher. Thereby he admits that there is an element of philosophy in Homer. Then he turns against him in this 10th book, which I asked you to read, and where he says, "I turn against the imitator" -- as he calls the poets.

3

Homer imitates. And that is the poetical element. And we shall call this element, gentlemen, "*the element that lets things be called by their own name.*"

I call the process of pure philosophy, Platonic philosophy, with a hard word, but I think a word which is drastic enough to stick in your mind:

*all philosophy scalps names from things.*

If I say, "It makes no difference whether a man comes from Thebes or from Athens, they're both citizens," I have killed, I have murdered, I have shorn citizenry of Athens and of Thebes. And therefore I have impoverished the citizens of Thebes and the citizens of Athens of their feeling towards their one and only city.

4

All philosophy, gentlemen, scalps.

This Homer does not do. In this sense, then, I would like to insist that Homer is not a philosopher.

In as far as he makes us see wider than in our own city we have been looking, he is a philosopher. In as far as he demands from us to give still every one item its own name, the name of its first impression, of its first community, he is not a philosopher.

## XII HOMER CANNOT ADD ANYTHING TO THE CULT

1

Now the third step, gentlemen.

Homer is more a philosopher with regard to the gods as with regard to men. With regard to men, he is a poet. That is, he makes men great. But Homer makes the gods small. And he has always been reproached with this irreligion -- also Plato does it -- because the gods look funny at times in Homer. They look small.

2

There's a simple reason for this, gentlemen.

In order to inspire the Greeks with this one spirit of all being Greeks, of all being allowed to participate in this one great enterprise of one humanity, he could take every one out of his confines and give him a larger scope. He could not enlarge the scope of the gods. The gods were gods. And gods are always transcending your and my confines, yours and my bailiwick. They are always gods, which means they participate in the universe.

All gods in all tribes never believe anything else what the textbooks say; all gods have represented the whole to us little members of the fragments of the universe.

3

And therefore, Homer could not aggrandize the gods. But he wanted to talk about them.

So, as those of you who have read Homer -- *The Odyssey* for example -- know, at places he is rather irreverent of the gods. He shows that he thinks that the gods are

envious, jealous, wrathful, and just human beings allowed to live forever, and therefore immune against death.

The non-dying quality is the essential quality for Homer's gods, because he cannot add anything to the cult.

4

The poet has one stumbling block.

What is the social situation of a singer, of Homer? Where does he appear?

And this is important for us. The social situation of Homer is that of an after-dinner speaker.

### XIII AFTER DINNER: A SECOND-RATE REALITY

1

Now after dinner nothing is serious. So Homer is handicapped with regard to the gods, because the gods are the one aspect of reality whom we can only entreat when we are serious. And Homer is in the desperate situation that he has to speak of a gods in a situation which is on principle, by establishment, not serious. After dinner nothing is serious.

2

Ever heard an English speaker after dinner? It's just terrible. It's as bad as a comic strip. There is no seriousness in an after-dinner speech.

Have you heard a typical after-dinner speaker? Who has? Well, as you know, there are books who give you all the off-color stories you have to tell then.

3

So no wonder that Homer also tells an off-color story about the gods, there is the famous off-color story on the gods in *The Odyssey*. Which book is it, do you remember? (*In the first book.*) Well, you'd better look it up right away at home. And bring it next time to class; we'll have a look at it.

4

Well, I mean to say, gentlemen. The poet is in a non-serious situation. He cannot help this. His public is relaxed. His public doesn't want to act. His public doesn't want to go to battle while he sings. It does want to digest. And it is just as little serious as *The Reader's Digest*.

All pieces of literature live in a second-rate reality.

#### XIV WITH REGARDS TO THE GODS HOMER IS A PHILOSOPHER

1

So Homer can speak of man and things in the right style. They are not harmed if you look at them with a sense of relaxation, recreation, distance, and even humor.

But as soon as you speak of the cult of your city, gentlemen, with a sense of humor, you are no longer contributing to the lifeblood of the cult. And gentlemen, who is a god?

God is a power that is present at this moment in this classroom. If God is omnipresent, I cannot blaspheme. And I hope I do not blaspheme. I am serious. I am aware of the fact that even our playful classroom here is under His augury.

2

The poet must try to get the gods into his speech, into his fire-side talk, and so he speaks playfully about them. And with regard to his theology, I would then sum it all up: Homer is a philosopher.

That is, he speaks of the gods as his second impressions. They are all after-thoughts, his thoughts about the gods. They are not his first thoughts. They are not the words of prayer. They are not the words of Revelation. They are not the words out of a Book of Psalms, but they are the off-color stories.

They are the second-rate, the anecdotes, the legends about the gods.

3

So with regard to the gods, Homer is a philosopher. And he has made it inevitable that the Greek philosophers distance, remove themselves from the cult of their individual city.

When we come to Plato and Aristotle and ask ourselves: whose cult was important for them, was central for their own existence? -- you will come to the strange answer, gentlemen, that the cult of friendship was the serious substitute for the cult of the local gods, for a Greek philosopher.

Aristotle prayed to his friend. That's a great example of the seriousness of friendship, gentlemen. Whenever you get into the arts and sciences, you will find that they are not serious about the religion of the tribe, or of the country. But they must have some full devotion. And it is usually the devotion to their friends, which knows no bounds and where they go to any sacrifice.

4

If you look at the French, gentlemen. In 1789 France built in the two religions. One, the religion of the republic, and the other the religion of the Catholic Church.

It's the tragedy of France that you have no Protestants in France. You only have free-thinkers, so-called, and Roman Catholics.

The country has perished, by and large, from this split between red and black.

## XV *THE CULT OF FRIENDSHIP*

1

Now if you want to define the cult of these two groups, it is very easy. All the free thinkers of France have a cult of friendship - and an absolute, infinite one. There is an absolute solidarity which you do not know.

2

On Montmartre, or in the salons of France, the one thing that is absolutely reliable is friendship. People who are poor themselves will pay rent to a friend so to support his work and his genius. And they will say nothing about it. And it will be concealed in him.

There is a solidarity and a taking care of talent and friends in France.

Quite unknown in this country. Here there is general charity, yes. But there is specific cult. My friend is given me as a unique creature. It cannot be replaced by 10 other friends. Not at all. This creature is not a generalization. It's still a religion.

3

Will you take it down, gentlemen: that *where philosophy does play around with the gods in Heaven, in the sky over a city, of a local community, there still is the cult of friendship.*

And that goes through all Greek philosophy, and is meant, what I called to you the dedication.

But we have an altar built by Aristotle to his friend. We have the cult of Plato himself in his Academy. We have the cult of Socrates to which Plato dedicated himself. And if you read the best elucidation of this cult of friendship as a serious business, not a sense of humor and friendship, gentlemen, all what you think is necessary.

4

Friends -- there's no sense of humor. A friend who goes astray makes you cry. You can't laugh about him. It costs you heart-blood, if you see him perish.

Now this cult of friendship, which is lost in this generation, on yours -- I always pity you. I see thousands of Dartmouth graduates graduate without having a friend, you have only classmates.

#### XVI THE CULT IS A NECESSARY INGREDIENT OF LIFE

1

The best description of this friendship of antiquity - I think I mentioned it to you already - is in Montaigne, the 28th chapter of the first book of his essays, the great Frenchman. He has given the simplest expression to the cult of friendship. That is, when you throw out the sense of wonder in the logos, of the whole universe or of your city in the cult of the Catholic Church or of the pope, you have to introduce another cult.

And never believe a free thinker when he says he has no god. They all pray for their friendship. And all France is then in these two parties: the cult of friendship on the one-hand side, and the cult of Mary and her Son on the other hand.

2

And you must know this. Otherwise you are betrayed.

You think there are atheists in the world, gentlemen. That doesn't exist. I've never seen an atheist. A Communist, doesn't he believe in the party? I mean, everybody has his cult. It is one of the greatest nonsenses.

You can, of course, have a cult of yourself, you can have a mirror on your desk. And the famous saying about a chancellor of the Russian Empire in the old times, they said he has such a cult of his own personality, that he -- *il se mire dans son l'encrier*. That is, he uses his ink stand as a mirror for the beauty of himself. He looks even into an ink stand, only to get his own picture there, aggrandized.

3

Gentlemen, the cult is a necessary ingredient of life. And you can test this, gentlemen, when you ask yourself: what keeps you going between the start of a difficult enterprise in your own life, and its end? That's the god whom you worship.

Take somebody who decides that he wants to woo the daughter of a rich house. And he's far from being sure that she wants to marry him. She may spend a weekend with him, but marriage is a different matter. What keeps him going? What gives him the faith to carry through this, while nobody is allowed to know it, nobody else -- that's always the test -- is then the god whom he worships.

That's either his own beautiful self. He's a movie star who thinks he's just irresistible. Well, then he's his own divinity. Or it is another conviction. His good star. That's an astrological deity, a very minor deity.

4

Or you write a book. You begin in 1956 to plan this book. You can only publish it in 1963. Gentlemen, what keeps you going during these seven years?

All these seven years everybody thinks you are a fool. You cannot prove to anybody that the book will be a success. The people think you should invest in something better than your own manuscript. You destroy your career, perhaps, because you have to write this book.

Now, the power that keeps you alive in these seven years, that's your divinity.

So it is simply a lack of intelligence if a man says there are people who do not worship a god. The difficulty is only: which god? You can worship a very limited god, or you can worship the true God. That's the only distinction.

## XVII WEAK AND STRONG

1

Now in Homer then, there is this great problem, that since he is an after-dinner poet, he does diminish the seriousness of the gods.

That is, the first impressions of the cult in which we grow up, are reduced there; and some people have felt, as Plato, that they are reduced to shambles. And Plato's hatred of Homer comes from this fact, that he said, "This teacher is not a teacher of good things," because by imitating, by becoming an after-dinner speaker he makes the gods out to be foul creatures.

And so Plato's hatred comes from the lack of reverence of Homer for the gods.

2

The strange thing is, gentlemen, that Plato of course is not deeply interested in the Homeric gods, that you cannot get a lesson in polytheism and the cult of Athens when you read Plato. And most of you will think that after all, philosophers never worship.

I warn you against this. It is not true about antiquity. We have already seen this about Lucretius. The thing is much more complex, gentlemen.

3

Perhaps at the end of this course you will understand that cult and philosophy are like breathing in and breathing out, that you can't have one without the other.

Just as your friend believes in you while you are despondent, and inspires you in this sense, you still you can get your breath back, so the cult always enters your life when you are weak. And you always dismiss the cult when you are strong.

When the god enters you, and you are inspired, you feel good, then you are in power. But we aren't always in power. Most of the time, we are sound asleep. So then we must hope that somebody else looks after us.

4

Another Frenchman -- all Frenchmen know about the cult of friendship so well - the famous Exupéry - what's his first name? (*Antoine.*)

Antoine d'Exupéry, yes. He has written that the simplest cult of friendship was in the fact when one pilot and another were together, and one has fallen asleep, that his friend would simply push his arm under the other's neck so that he might not wake up with a stiff neck when he wakes up from sleep -- and that this gesture of sympathy or of help was the tenderest expression of his cult of friendship.

A very important notion.

Don't look too far for your own cult, gentlemen. It's much nearer to your heart than you think. You don't have to join a mighty church of 400 million faithful so that you have religion. Everybody has religion. There is just nobody who hasn't.

## XVIII METAPHOR

### 1

So the relation of Homer to philosophy perhaps has been clarified.

It is complex. With regard to the gods, he does philosophize more than with regard to things, and to men.

But now comes the fourth point. The fourth point about Homer is, gentlemen, that he introduces to you and me something which we take today for granted, but which is an invention of Greece. That is the metaphor.

Homer's poetry is famous for its comparisons. We have already read one ourselves, that Achilles gets up, compared to whom?

Anybody remembers last time? (*That was Agamemnon --.*) (*The lion.*)

Like the lion.

### 2

Now you say, "Well, that's just a simile," or a metaphor, whatever you like to tell it. A simile. And the similes are strewn like diamonds throughout Homer. And the similes are much longer very often than just this, we have already heard of the simile in the catalog of the ships, where man is compared to what? (*Bees.*) To the bees. Or to the leaves, or to the buds.

Gentlemen, you all use in English these similes. And I think in creative writing you are probably taught quite a bit about it.

3

Now will you kindly understand that first impressions never speak in similes, but mean what they say. The language of the cult, which speaks of God's heart, or God's wrath, or God's right finger, means exactly what it says. God's right finger and nothing else. That's not a simile. That's not a sublime figure of speech.

I always would like to kill the man who speaks of the liturgy as sublime figures of speech.

4

I read yesterday a sermon of a friend of mine, a good liberal man of the Enlightenment. And he shouldn't have become a preacher, because he destroys the liturgy, if these are just figures of speech.

We speak of God as we must speak of Him, or we shouldn't speak of Him at all. There's no embellishment about: God's right finger is pointing towards you, or we shouldn't speak at all.

#### XIX ALL ORIGINAL SPEECH IS METAPHORICAL

1

There are no such figures of speech, gentlemen, in our first-impression society. In the group in which we grow up, it is simply so that we have to use these terms and there are no others.

Gentlemen, in any real society, there are no synonyms. Will you take this down?

2

*In all real societies there are no synonyms.* You cannot call the president of United States "a great chief." He is the president of the United States. The great chief is not a synonym for the president.

If you don't call him the president, you make him into a tyrant, perhaps, or the king of England, or what-not. He is the president, and that's the only legitimate expression.

3

Now "president" is a metaphor, because it means somebody who sits in front of the table, you see. But it is a necessary metaphor, and that doesn't deserve any more the term "metaphor," because it's the only way in which we can speak.

Gentlemen, *all original speech*, if you want to have it this way, *is metaphorical*. And there is no other speech.

If I say that the king has to have a scepter in order to be able to command silence, or that we are under his hand, or under his care, that's a necessary way of speaking. There is no other way of saying the thing. The law says that he wields the scepter of this country. And that's all there is to it.

4

You will never understand speech, gentlemen, if you do not understand that first impressions have to be expressed in an unshaken terminology.

You cannot say to a child that the father of Jesus Christ is a supreme being without poking fun at the fact that you ask this child to pray to "Our Father in Heaven." He is either "Our Father in Heaven" or He's nobody.

He's not "the supreme being." That's a philosophical term good for Free Masons. It's a second-rate expression. All philosophy has called God a supreme being. It's always the end of religion.

God is not a supreme being. It's a nonsensical expression.

## XX HOW POETRY ENTERS THE SCENE

1

I've written a whole book on this. And my paper, which I gave you, contains the reasons why it is not a good idea to call God "the supreme being," because "being" is just a word good for the nursery. It is not for serious people - call anything "being."

2

My paper has just this purpose, of shaking you up so that you know that philosophical language is second-rate. All philosophical language, because it reduces first-rate language to generalizations, has to admit of poetry as a refresher course.

After you say that Achilles was just a man, in order to rebuild Achilles in your estimate, you have to say he's like a lion.

However, if you live in a family and your father is just your father, it is not necessary to tell the child that his father is like a lion. He knows very much how powerful the father is. He is just himself. He is the father, and that is a lionlike situation.

And the metaphor only comes in after the child has heard in school that his father is just a man like everybody else. Then it is very necessary that the mother, when the child comes home and the son is disrespectful of the father, says, "But your father is like a lion, and watch out. His paw may come down on you."

3

So, gentlemen, metaphors come only after philosophy has entered the scenes. When we generalize, or after we begin to rationalize, you have to bring back by poetry the original power of your first life, of the golden age of youth in which you have no such doubts, and have no such belittlements of your environment, where you don't call your mother, "The Old Woman" or the "Old Lady," but you say, "She's my mother."

As long as she is your mother, no room for metaphor.

4

Metaphor -- it is like this. In our first impressions, we are immediately related to the divine as it comes to us in our family or in our locality. The whole divine spirit is upon us. It is not compared with anything else, we aren't frustrated by saying, "Oh, we are just one out of a million."

But once you begin to say these blasphemous words, "I'm just a human being," by which always your philosophizing begins today, "I'm just a human being," there you dismiss yourself out of the whole inspirational environment.

What your father and your mother have said, what the teacher has said, and what the church has said, the local church, is always missed, because you now are generalizing and say, "I'm just a human being."

In this moment you are powerless. In this moment, you are deficient of grace. And in this moment, poetry enters the scene and tries by metaphors to bring back the same.

## XXI THE DIPLOMAT'S STORY

1

So we start here on a certain level of power in the family. Then we dismiss it, and poetry tries to rebuild it.

*Poetry is then, gentlemen, in intimate relation to philosophy.*

*Philosophy is reducing first impressions.*

*Poetry is bringing back first impressions.*

And the means by which poetry brings back first impressions is metaphor, simile.

2

After Achilles has become "just a human being," he must be compared to a lion to bring him back. But gentlemen, in the first cult -- pick an Indian tribe, the man wears the mask of a lion and speaks like a lion and roars like a lion, because he is not like him -- he is the lion, his name is called "Lion."

That's not a metaphor. That's a way of trying to say who he is. It's an attempt to identify him.

3

Now nothing is more vicious today as your treatment in literature and English departments and French departments and humanity departments of this whole *rubrum* of simile and synonyms.

You all think that man can live by synonyms, gentlemen. Synonyms are second-rate. Every child should grow up with "spade is a spade" and "yes is yes" and "no is no." And "no" is not a synonym for "yes."

You know the famous story of the lady and the diplomat. Who does know this story? Na ja. Will you tell it? (*Sorry.*)

Well, they think your "yes" is "no" and "no" is "yes." Isn't that true? But everybody laughs because everybody feels that these two people are outside the pale.

The diplomat deals with the external society only. Therefore nobody can expect him to speak the truth. He must have synonyms. Well -- does everybody know the story? (*No.*)

Well, who is willing to tell it? Oh, many -- 20 or 30. Sir, you tell the story. (*Well --*) Get up and tell it. (*I'm not sure if I remember the context.*)

*A woman, if she says "no," she means "yes."*

No, "perhaps", she means "perhaps."

*She means "maybe."*

*If she says "maybe," she means "yes."*

*If she says "yes," she's no lady.*

*On the other hand, a diplomat, if he says "yes," he means "maybe."*

*If he says "maybe," he means "no."*

*And if he says "no," then he's not a diplomat.*

4

It's a very great story.

Thank you. Let's have a break here.

## I THE COUNTRY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

1

...immediately given in the Greek world. Once you have to generalize, you have to replace the loss of warmth and energy by poetry.

2

It's very strange. The arts and sciences go hand in hand.

If you take sciences in the plural as a force that makes for philosophy, philosophy is the unifying link between all sciences. And the more you generalize, gentlemen, the more you have to build up the energy lost in this way for your first impressions, for your heart, by poetry.

And that's why metaphor and simile are the lifeblood of poetry.

3

But don't mistake poetry for first language.

A psalm is not a poem. I always read this in liberal literature today. A psalm is not a poem. And a poem is not a psalm. And you stand on your head, and you can never get the two things into the same bracket.

A psalm is -- Ja? (*Isn't Homer something between a poet and philosopher?*)

Ja, ja. It is an incredible creation. But the tragedy of Greece is that their state and their church were losing in power. And they are the country of the arts and sciences.

4

That's why the liberal arts college is based on the Greeks. They have given us the arts and the sciences. Because they are the greatest poets and the greatest philosophers.

And you cannot say that they are the greatest builders of empires, or the greatest builders of churches.

Neither have they given us a true religion, nor have they given us a true state. As I said, they have never abolished slavery. They have never been able to make peace, 300 cities. To the end of their Greek independence, they would all go to war against each other.

Even when the Romans were already conquering Greece in 146, the various cities of Greece were at each other's throats. They couldn't unite. They had to be conquered from the outside for this reason.

## II PRAYER

1

It's a little bit like Europe today. The Europeans are the Greeks.

Beware of the Greeks in this sense. For politics, they aren't just no good.

You see it in France. You see it in Germany. You see it in all European countries. Not even Holland and Belgium and Luxembourg can unite. They cannot. They are full of philosophers.

But philosophers are impotent to create first the obedience, the loyalty which come in the first order of life. They cannot. They are only there for generalization.

2

*(Could you go back to your distinction between a psalm and a poem?)*

A psalm is necessary for my soul. A poem is a delight for my mind.

That's a great difference.

In a psalm, I find myself - gentlemen, it's not my business in this course, but perhaps I simply shall define what I mean by this. Very simple, gentlemen.

In a prayer the man who prays, recognizes himself. If you say "Father," you know that you are a son. If you say "Brother," you know that you are a brother. A sister is only a sister as long as there is a brother, for example.

If St. Francis prays "O Brother Sun, and Sister Moon," that is for Francis important.

That's why we have to pray.

3

We praise the Lord, gentlemen, so that we know that we are His children.

Do not think that you can add an inch to the grandeur of God. But you can add very much to your own grandeur by praying to your creator. That is, gentlemen, man

knows in earnestness who he is by the way he speaks to others. Your addressing anyone gives you status.

If these damned representatives from the South in a Senate committee dare to talk to the Brotherhood of Pullman Porters only by first name, he feels very good about it, because he gains status, this Southern gentleman, by calling any colored person with his first name. That's what they do. That's one way of asserting white supremacy.

You see how important it is. If this man would have to say, "Mr. Smith" to this man, he would come down from his pedestal.

Very simple.

4

And that's how simple life is, gentlemen. You look far too far for your religion. Every day that you talk to a man, you give yourself status. If you say, "Mr." or "Professor" to me, you are a student. And on it goes.

Now prayer is an attempt to find our ultimate status. I cannot depend on my talking to you, or my talking to Mr. Prenzler, or my talking to any one of you, for getting my status.

Prayer is then the desperate attempt to get out of all these accidental statuses which you give me, and my environment gives me, and the president of this college gives me, and the tax collector gives me, and to find out who I really am.

It's a desperate attempt, prayer, gentlemen, to sing yourself into your proper place in the cosmic order. That's why it is inexorable.

### III *PRAYERS ARE NOT PRINTED, POEMS ARE*

1

Everybody prays. The apes pray for their own grandeur.

I mean, these atheists, these sociologists, the psychologists whom I know, they are constantly trying to assure themselves that they know better, that they are superior. Nobody knows why. But they all tell you so, that they look into the secrets of human society.

By some trick. I don't know which trick. You find this is the scientist's greatest temptation, then. Because he knows something, he is therefore superior. And knowledge is power.

It may be power, gentlemen, but it usually is also wickedness.

2

Prayer is a very simple attempt to find one's bearings.

Poetry is not this, Prentiss, don't you see? A poem is in addition to my status, an expanse of feeling. And it is therefore not my prayer, a poem, but it is written -- it's a generalization on this state of despair, in general.

I do not expect from a poem what I expect from a prayer. From a prayer, I expect to be answered, my dear man. But for a poem, unfortunately I expect to be read, which is a very different aim and purpose.

*Prayers are not printed, and poems are. That's the whole difference.*

3

There's a very good law in our churches that a man may publish his sermons, but he may not print his prayers. I had a friend here, you'll remember him, Dr. Vernon, whose prayers were the excessive greatness in his services here. And he was a preacher here in Hanover. And his sermons were good, but there was nothing extra. But his prayers you could not forget.

And I owe it to him that he says, "Prayers are unprintable." They are not to be printed. They come once from the bosom of your heart, and never again. That's why they are specific. They are not general.

4

And the greatest character, gentlemen, of the specific, of the concrete is that it cannot be repeated. A poem you can read 20 times. The same prayer is not the same prayer if prayed at another occasion. It just isn't. This word comes upon your mouth at this moment, with necessity and urgency. So a real prayer of a real preacher is once forever.

#### IV THE CURSE ALL OVER THE WORLD

1

Gentlemen, the greatest things are the frailest things. Anything that is as big as a dreadnought is not important. Dreadnoughts are not important. But a baby is important. It's so frail.

And that's true of a prayer. It's like a breath of life. And the breath of life cannot be repeated.

You cannot buy it, gentlemen. You cannot put it in a safe. You cannot have a bank account. It's now or never.

2

All first impressions, gentlemen, then have this quality, that they cannot be repeated. They cannot be put on ice.

The proper prayer on Armistice days can only be said once by a nation. And since we didn't celebrate Armistice Day this war, we are cursed.

3

This country has not been able to pray for the end of this war, and there is no peace in the world to this day. And this is the curse all over the world, gentlemen, that the two world wars ended without prayer. They have not ended, yet. They are still there in the hearts of men.

You don't know it, gentlemen, that you are mentally all sick, not as persons, but as members of nations who did not know how to end war. It's a deep mental sickness all over the world for this reason.

4

You can philosophize about peace, gentlemen. That's not meaning making peace. That's not concluding peace. Concluded peace has to be concluded by the serious words spoken of by the political and religious community now.

And it was missed. And we are dragging this chain of not making peace to this day.

And the whole world is sick with it. They call it the Cold War. But it is much deeper, gentlemen. It is an impotence of your spirit to allow the statesman to say this one word.

Everybody had some general ideas, gentlemen. That's not how nations live. They don't live by general ideas.

*V TO WORK AND PARTICIPATE*

1

We live in a philosophical and poetical universe, gentlemen, without the power of creating peace. Very simple. Because peace cannot be made by poets and cannot be made by philosophers.

Once you understand this, you understand my whole course, the Greek philosophers could not make peace. They had eternal war. And they ended as non-Greeks. They were just swallowed up.

First by Alexander the Great, and later by the Romans.

2

The more you cultivate one-sidedly pagan philosophy and art, gentlemen, the more you deprive yourself of your power to educate your children. Because children want the faith, and they want the law. They don't want embellishments and doggerels and comic strips and movies. That's utterly unimportant for children. You all overfeed your youngsters.

They don't need this entertainment.

3

A decent child doesn't need to be entertained. Life is so interesting for a young child if you allow him to work and to participate. The rest is all nonsense. And the child wants to learn. You don't allow the child to learn. You always force a child to play. A child wants to enter serious business.

So we live now -- no, I won't go into it.

4

What I try to do, gentlemen, is to show you the achievements of the Greeks. I'm certainly a great admirer of their achievements for all of us, and their limitations. You have to see both in one, which is difficult.

VI *PARMENIDES*

1

Now, the second phase from Homer, gentlemen, to Plato is a very precise phase.

The Greeks' philosophy, the first half or the first third consists in the attempt to try: how far they can do without first impressions. How far can they reduce -- can they scalp all first impressions? And how far can then generalization go?

2

It's like a great intoxication, gentlemen.

From the first philosopher, Thales of Miletus around 500 A.D. to Plato, 200 years are devoted to the problem: how far can we do only with generalizations? And the entering the high point of this period is the name Parmenides.

3

Parmenides is a great man. You know it already from my paper, and you have to read it till next time, please, every one of you, so that I can base my next lecture on this assumption, on the fact that Parmenides says, "I will talk to people who forget their first impressions. I can only talk to people who forget their first impressions. I shall talk about being. That is, I shall scalp all verbs, all men of their proper title or name. I shall only talk in pronouns."

Well, only say, "he" and "she," and "it," and we'll see how far we can get.

It's an attempt, gentlemen, to erase the political community from the minds of the thinker. And is an attempt you all make to have a clear slate in your mind and begin from scratch.

A great temptation.

4

The first man who tried to do this is Parmenides. So compared to Homer, it's just the opposite, Homer is in love with all the Greek cities, and says, "Forward to unity." Parmenides says, "My unity is only to be had under the condition that none of you is a member of any one city in his memory anymore." That we have a clean slate.

## VII *DESCARTES*

1

You are all Parmenideses, every one of you is as a product of an American high school or college has this vague idea that it would be best if his mind would be made into a clean slate, so that all his new concepts are correct.

2

And just as Montaigne has written the high song of Greek friendship, so there is a famous biography of Descartes, Descartes, in his little booklet, the great Frenchman Cartesius has said, "If I only could have a mind swept clean from all the cobwebs which were put on it in the first 20 years of my life."

That's a very good explanation of the Greek ideal, to have not lived in the first 20 years under the erroneous first impressions.

3

Now anybody who can fall for this and doesn't laugh at poor Mr. Descartes, gentlemen, is a real Greek. I laugh at Descartes. I think he's ridiculous. I owe everything to my first 20 years. And I wouldn't give it for anything in the world.

And to say that I should awaken to my thoughts to twenty years, I know that I would just be a brute, terrible man, a monster. And like mathematicians, they're usually human monsters.

4

And it is an incredible idea, that these first wonderful twenty years should not have allowed me to enlist the impressions of the morning star and of morning glory and of my parents and of my sisters -- this is just incredible. I can't understand even -- the man is insane to me.

## VIII *TO KNOW WHAT YOU ARE TALKING ABOUT*

1

But there are two parties, gentlemen. I think in this room, if we take an impartial vote, 98 percent of you would vote that Descartes and the Greeks have a good idea

-- Parmenides, in this attempt to wipe clean the slate from the impressions of the polis, of the community.

2

What is the polis?

Environment. Everything that has worked on you, and to begin from scratch. You would have nothing to work with.

In order to generalize, gentlemen, you have had to have particular impressions. Otherwise you don't know what you're talking about. A generalization, gentlemen, without a root, a stem on which it is built up as the bud of this stem, and has no roots, is lunacy, real lunacy.

Most people, gentlemen, whom we call "lunatics" have generalities in their minds without the first experience, the first impression. "Lunacy" is a very good word for this, a moon is up in the air. It has no roots in reality.

3

This is a very practical question for you, gentlemen. For all your decisions, can generalizations be arrived at without experience? That's the problem of Greek philosophy.

And in the first two hundred years, people think they can. The idealists: we will create a world of generalities without experience. And Plato and Socrates is the breaking point, in which this flood, this tide is stemmed, and there comes the sobering up. And then they say, "Look, there is a limit. Man must be good if ideas shall have any value."

That is, what is goodness: first impression, first attitude, a direct relation to life - not a secondhand one.

4

So the history of Greek philosophy, gentlemen, runs from Thales to Socrates in the attempt to forget first loyalties. I will now not say "first impressions." You will understand why not.

To make a man a member of the sect of philosophers, by erasing his membership in the previous community of his little hometown, by saying, "Forget that you once were coerced by the policeman of your little town and learn that you couldn't make a noise at midnight in the street. That's not necessary for your philosophy."

Gentlemen, it is necessary. I assure you. You must have made the experience of a police force first, before you can judge about the best state, whether it should have a police force or not. You don't know what you're talking about, otherwise.

## IX A POLITICAL FORCE

1

Now the practical question, gentlemen, is: what was the fruit of this tremendous assault of the sons of man, of these titans of the mind, to do without their city?

It's a great story. And to give you today only an introduction - we will deal with here Miss, the lady's very good book.

We know very little of these first thinkers. But they must have made an admirable impression in the great plight of the Greek cities against this great power of Persia, and the Oriental empires, these many cities of the Greeks.

2

As we find in the battle they try to build up something that would unify them. You must understand that this is a political aim, although it seems that it is only an aiming for truth.

But if I replace my Miletian or Ephesian religion or whatever the city is from which they come, by some generalization, I still say it in Greek that I want to appeal to all the Greeks that we can agree, and of course then also come to common action similar to the Trojan War, and resist the Persians.

And you must never forget that from 582 to 410, the battle against the Orient ennoble the zest for a Greek philosophy. The Greek philosophy seems to be able all this time to replace the little home city: "If we can get a common doctrine, if we got a general philosophy," these people feel, "then we are Greeks against Persia."

That is, this little group of 500,000 people, perhaps, can then feel that it has a front against these millions on the mainland of Asia.

3

So philosophy is at that time a political force. And to prove on my point, I am going to give you my explanation of the philosophy of Thales.

If you open the book here by Mrs. Freeman, on Page 18, you will find that we know very little. But we know one thing, that he must have said that everything is water, that he reduced then all the distinctions of the universe to one source element.

Just as we would say today: "Everything is electronics." The people say it without understanding what it is. Nobody knows what an electron is, but it sounds very good if you are up to date, if you say everything today is electron.

4

Nothing is said with it, to tell you the truth, except that you create a common religion for Russians and Americans. If everybody says, "Everything is electron," we are outside the polis of Russia and America. We talk about something third.

That's very helpful, because we can do this without hitting on each other's head. The Russians say, "Everything is economics," I don't know what Americans say. They think everything is dollars. It's not much difference in my mind. But still it sounds different.

But if you say, "Everything is electronics," you have already a common vocabulary.

#### *X TO IMITATE FRESH WATER CULTS*

1

Now gentlemen, with Thales, who said "Everything is water," it is not only the greatness of the conception that the whole world was one, but I'll tell you very practically how important this was.

2

The Greeks lived around the salty sea. The great civilizations of Babylon, Assyria, and Egypt, who had invented all the sciences -- writing, and reading, and astronomy, and agriculture, plows, the building of temples, the stone masonry, all the surveying power, all the arithmetic and geometry known in 700 to the rest of the world - that was all Egyptian, and Assyrian, and Babylonian. And it was all based on civilizations that cultivated fresh water -- river civilizations.

3

Now for a man who lived on the Mediterranean, the first attempt had been to imitate these civilizations, and to build temples to Zeus for his rain, as giving water to the earth, Hera, and to imitate the cult then, in some form or other, I won't go into details.

In my course in 58, we go into it in great detail, but we can't do it here.

To imitate these freshwater cults of agriculture in the smaller way, in Athens, and in Sparta, and everywhere.

4

Anybody who reads a Greek tragedy will find vestiges of this imitation in their religion.

Also in Homer, there is a great story, the great metaphor in *The Iliad* -- will you do me the favor, these four people there, and look up the place in *The Iliad* where Hera and Zeus are in the terms of Homeric poetry entering their sacred marriage? That is, the embrace of Heaven and Earth so that the earth may bear fruit.

That's a cult of Egypt.

Now Thales breaks with this cult, because he says that the saltwater, and the ponds, and the rain, and the fresh-water -- it's all one.

#### XI EGYPTIANS ARE PRE-PHILOSOPHICAL TO THIS DAY

1

That's a tremendous achievement, which is never stressed in our modern books, on Thales and the Greeks, that to call all these waters fundamentally one is already one great logical achievement. Because originally the water of the Nile is a totally different water from the water of the sea. It's just different -- it hasn't even the same name.

2

If you ever come to Egypt, gentlemen, you will be impressed by the fact that wherever the Americans dig a well in Cairo or somewhere else in Egypt, they assume that this wonderful sanitation will impose on the Egyptians so that these poor fellahin will run and get the artesian water, because it's sterilized, and has no bacteria.

Oh, lo and behold! Not one of these Egyptians is ever going to touch artesian well water. They run down to the River Nile, with all the dead crocodiles in it, and drink it, because it's sacred. Because Nile water cannot be replaced by any other water.

3

In other words, gentlemen, the Egyptians to this day are pre-philosophical. They cannot generalize Nile water by putting it one category with other water. Its just is a thing by itself.

And I mean this. I have seen it with my own eyes. I have talked to these men. I have tried to persuade them to drink the water of the Chicago House in Luxor. And they laughed at us, and said we were just these barbaric fools. We didn't know the qualities of Nile water. Nile water is just not water.

4

To you this is very difficult, gentlemen. But if you want to understand real, human thinking, you cannot distinguish sharply enough between concrete experience and what you call "experiences."

Yours is all abstract. You go to 16 countries in Europe. So you never go to any one of them. Because if there are 16, you never have the quality of any one of them by its own name. Austria, it's not the 16th country of Europe. But for an American, it probably is the 16th country of Europe.

And you know the two Americans came back, they got quarreling. Had they been to Austria? And the one man said, "Yes, we have been." "And how can we prove it?" said the other. "Because the porter at the hotel wore a blue cap." That was the only specific notion they had of Austria.

## XII OKEANOS

1

You can't think in specific terms. To you, the whole world, gentlemen, is just a philosophical universe. To you, the generalization comes before the specific.

We are a strange humanity, gentlemen. We are a second growth.

2

Chesterton once said, we are children of a second birth. We are post-philosophical.

The world of the Greeks has perished, in which second thought came after first thought. You are all brought up in all our schools by second thoughts. So you think, "All men come first, and then there is United States." But for the child of the Nile

water, the water of the Nile is something that is clearly a different item, a specific. You cannot subsume it under "water".

If you cannot understand this, you cannot understand the driving force of Greek philosophy. It has given us this aloofness. That even what your five senses perceive to you is no longer a swallow. It's just a bird. It's not a swallow.

But for a Greek a swallow is not a nightingale. A nightingale is not a swallow. And the general expression "bird" -- very doubtful. They don't care for that. They speak of real animals by their own name. An elephant and an insect cannot be both lumped together as animals.

That has to be learned, and can only be carried to a certain point. Otherwise it becomes meaningless.

To you, that isn't true. You call everything a "thing." You are already thing-thinkers.

3

Therefore, we all -- I too -- have a trouble in knowing that we owe it to Thales that the generality "water" was created out of the water in the sky, and the water in the pond, and the water in the ocean, and the water in the sea. He made one, which already abstracts.

That this is already an uprooting of man's religious relation to the god of water, to the god of the ocean, who was the greatest god, even in Greek religion. He was the father of everything else.

But that was all saltwater. Very specific water. It had nothing to do with the Zeus water, which was rain. Okeanos, the ocean, was the first god of the Greek theogony of the explanation of the order of the universe.

4

So this is what I have to say today, gentlemen.

I cannot go into all these first Greek philosophers with the same eagerness. I cannot admire them quite so much as Thales.

But Thales had been to Egypt. We know this. And Thales had studied Egyptian priest lore. And Thales knew the importance of the Nile water, which is a great mystery, because it rises in the summer, when all other rivers dry out. It never rains in Egypt. You must know this, too. So for a man who came home to Miletus, in the middle of the Mediterranean Sea, he brought a great news: "Gentlemen," he said, "We do not have to think that the Egyptians have a total advantage of us. They have a world by

themselves. We can look into their laws, and priest lore and try to get something we have in common. Because if I have discovered that when they owe everything to the Nile -- we have similarities. We can penetrate into the common denominator."

### XIII THE COMMON DENOMINATOR

1

So gentlemen, Thales discovers what you take for granted, *that there is for all things a common denominator.*

Perhaps you take this down, gentlemen, that you should learn from the first philosopher of whom we have the name and the personality, what it means to create a common denominator, where there hasn't been one before.

Nobody had before dared to call Nile water and rain water with the same name because one was Zeus' gift, and the other was the gift of the Nile. One was from the sky, and the other was from the bottom up.

2

The common denominator gives you a good label, a good emblem for the first achievement of philosophy. Therefore for us and you and me it doesn't matter that he calls "water" the common denominator. The important thing is the idea of a common denominator.

You can shift then. You can say something else is the common denominator. But you still have now the notion that you can reduce all concrete things to one common background, to one common denominator.

3

And there you see the scalping of names. The Nile goes. Down to Thales of Miletus - - let me finish this as a very flagrant example.

The Greeks had tried to imitate the Egyptian cult, and had given to a little river, for example, a little brook in Boeotia, near Thebes, the name "Nile." That is, as you have "Norwich" here and "Hartford," and you have it in Connecticut, you have it in Ohio, the same name was made to migrate.

Thales said, "Don't do this anymore. You don't have to call the river in Thebes 'Nile.' It just doesn't play the same role as the Nile in Egypt. That's just an illusion. Look, in Boeotia the rain from Heaven gives you the fertility. Therefore, arrange your cult in a different manner. Do not cultivate the cult of the Nile."

4

The common denominator then, gentlemen, indeed frees from imitation. And when you read in Plato's Republic, in the 10th book, that he turns against the imitators, you see now why. An imitator in Miletus, another man like Thales, would have said, "We must have a Nile in Miletus if we want to have the wisdom and the quality of the Egyptians."

A man who invents the common denominator can ask, "Which other form of water plays the role of fertilization, that the Nile does in Egypt?" And so you penetrate behind the word "Nile."

Thank you.

## EIGHTH LECTURE: TO REBUILD THE NECESSARY TENSIONS IN A SOCIETY

I OH, NOTHING BUT -

1

...acting as the teacher of philosophers in Greece. He is not a philosopher in the sense that he wants to strip individual cases of their proper names.

We have talked about this. And that's the essence of philosophy, to generalize, to subsume more than one differently named thing under the same heading, as you all do, every day.

You are all philosophically inclined. You want to generalize.

2

You say, "That's sex," and thereby you destroy your personal relations to your girl, because a girl is unique, and if you call it "sex relation," there is no relation, to speak of, left. That is not a relation with a girl. But that's a naturalistic relation, because this girl has a proper name. She is Elizabeth Smith. And Elizabeth Smith has no sex relations. But she either loves you or she doesn't love you. If you don't have the power to let her and this relation stand in its own right, you can never live. You'll remain a psychic case for the analyst.

Most of you crave this. You want to be somebody else's case. You want to be judged by some man or your mother who can chaperone you through life -- and "Oh, this is nothing but."

And we said that all philosophy tries to say of all disturbing events, "This is nothing but."

3

If Dante had said, "Beatrice is nothing but a girl," he would have never written *The Divine Comedy*.

If Washington had said, "This is just a rabble in arms" at the Boston Tea Party, he would not have ceased to be an English gentleman and become president of the United States, which nearly cost him his life, because he hated the rabble and all their works. And he was not a rebel, and not a rabble. And he didn't belong to these bankrupts who started the rebellion in this country.

4

And therefore, gentlemen, you make life just as impossible as The Dartmouth when he today writes that this country, which is in a sound coma, is taking a decisive step by taking unasked and unrequired the case of Israeli to the United Nations. Have you see this ridiculous statement in The Dartmouth today? This man should be spanked. Who writes this stuff? Who? (*I did.*)

You did? Well. Courageous man. Decisive.

We should be ashamed of such action. Nothing what these lawyers in Washington know except to talk. They have been warned for a whole year that this is brewing. And now they feign as if they are surprised.

It's a great scandal, that the greatest country of the world knows nothing but to weep like an old woman. Old women, that's what we are in foreign politics. And old women do not want to see that a new thing has happened. They always reduce everything to precedent, to something that happened before.

And that's philosophy, gentlemen, which wipes out this event as a unique event and says, "That comes under Paragraph Such-and-Such."

## II POETRY ONLY THERE TO ENTERTAIN

1

We said, however, there is one item in Homer, where he really opens the way to this onslaught on all personal life, which is philosophy, because Homer is an after-dinner speaker. He cannot get his audience in the temple or in the assembly or in the army or in court or in the family -- the bedroom.

2

He can only get his audience where? Where does a singer -- where does an epic -- where is it sung?

At a festival. And that's an unreal situation, because it's not even at the cult of the festival, but at the end of the festival, when everybody is making merry.

3

And gentlemen, you must understand that there is a limitation of art. The public for art is not serious.

The only person serious in Hamlet is the poet, Shakespeare. But you, who buy a ticket, gentlemen, you are not possibly serious because you want to spend a pleasant evening. That's not serious. You are not willing to do anything but being amused. You want to be entertained.

So the entertainment industry, gentlemen, has its limitations in the desire to be entertained by the people who buy the ticket.

4

And that is Homer's far-reaching first step. There have been, as far as we know, no such things in the world before, a poetry, which was only there to entertain. All former poetry, gentlemen, has still connection with prayer, with cult, with war, battle song. That is, it had a serious purpose.

For example, you take a battle song. That's the marching order. That makes you march. And soldiers fight better. So it is not disconnected with serious business.

You understand the difference?

But your pinup girl, in the barracks of an army camp, that's different. That's for your entertainment. And that therefore undermines morale. They say it enhances morale. I don't know, maybe. But certainly it is not serious for the army as such. It's your private business.

### III THE PEOPLE CAN WAIT - THE PUBLIC CANNOT

1

*And so the first public, gentlemen, out of a people is created by Homer.*

And perhaps you take this down, because in this country there is today a sad confusion between public and people. And any philosopher must know the difference.

2

A people is -- you and me in serious business, at an election, at a marriage, at a funeral, in court as a witness. This are the people.

Today in America, however, you get away with murder if you pretend that the public is the people. The public will not stand it. Gentlemen, the public is not the people, because the public is the irresponsible mob that wants to be entertained.

And a statesman has to go for the people against the public. And to live by public opinion, gentlemen, is a bad policy, and I'm afraid you see at this moment, Sir, a great example of this going on in this country.

The country can only live through people. It cannot live by the public, because the public is nothing but sand dunes. It is shiftless. Has no root, has no time sense. It is in a hurry. It is sensational. It's Hearst.

3

We have this reputation in the rest of the world, did you read this kind of name-call, about the Asiatics and the Africans, why they hate us, because they say we are only out for sex and murder. Any headline here is "Sex" and "Murder."

That's for the public, gentlemen. Obviously it's not for the American people.

And woe to you if you insist that the newspapers give you a cross-section of the people's opinion. We are lost. You can only hang our head in shame and you can expect the rest of the other four continents marching into this continent, destroying it and its wealth, just from hatred and contempt.

All the goodness of the American heart is absolutely camouflaged by this idea, a man in India or Indochina forms of America, that it is only interested in rape and in murder and crime. What else can they? Marilyn? And such -- I won't say what I mean, your heroines, gentlemen, they are scandalous in the eyes of other people.

The lowest of the low.

4

The public looks at the posterior, at the sensational, at the dirt. And the people have to live through the ages. And the great difference, gentlemen, and the simplest for you to remark is: the public has to be entertained now. The people can wait. The public cannot. -- Here, we are assembled. I have to entertain you.

If you take this as entertainment, as some of you do, then you will not have any gain from this class, because the gain should come in 10 years from now. Then you are as real people. If you, however, forget this -- when you leave this class, the whole thing has been a mistake, because you would be much better entertained on the other end of Main Street, in The Nugget.

IV HERE AND NOW VERSUS: FROM ADAM AND EVE TO THE LAST DAY

1

So there is a great difference, gentlemen.

We in this college, we should appeal to you as people. And in The Nugget, they appeal to you as public. And I'm afraid we have very bad precedents.

There's a book in this country on politics, which makes the public the hero. It's written by a justice of the Supreme Court.

2

*(people -- as individuals?)*

Whatever.

You can be a friendly group. Can be a fraternity, in which you call dirty stories. That's also the public, because not one of these people lives here, my dear man. You are twentyone, now. You have a decent background. Your parents take trouble and finally you end up here.

Anything that enters your mind which is going to procreate in you the power to keep a people, this nation going, goes to you as a people.

Anything however, that goes cross-sectionwise to entertain you at this moment -- here are the seven fraternity brothers -- in as far as most of the fraternity brothers, if they are any good, know a little bit about each other's background, and help each other pass their exams, and spend their week-ends, and meet their families, they are people.

In as far as they can be put together, at this moment, the more momentary their gathering is, you understand, the more this is public.

3

So we all, at every moment, gentlemen, are torn. The public is that which is here and now. The people is that which is from Adam and Eve to the last day. Because the public reforms any moment.

Public opinion is like a woman that is for sale. You can buy public opinion, you can cheat public opinion. You can impress public opinion, because it is out for sensation, can be tickled. It can be stimulating -- you even say so of a lecturer. This unfortunate man, you dishonor him, you treat him like a harlot. You say "He's stimulating."

Well, heavens! Young men haven't to be stimulated, gentlemen.

4

I think I've told you this before. I have all my life, I am now nearing seventy, gentlemen, the only question I have to ask from my environment is: Heavens! not to stimulate me. I am stimulated enough.

Are you so bored that you have to be stimulated?

#### V *WHAT IS THE BROTHERHOOD OF PHILOSOPHERS?*

1

But gentlemen, I am driving at something which has to do with philosophy.

Philosophy is hard-put, because it is second impressions. And all philosophy has to look therefore for a new, special group, as we have it here in the liberal arts college now, finally, as its outcome, which is gathered and convened, and driven together to listen to philosophy outside the first-impression orders, outside the Church, outside the school, outside the grammar school and the nursery -- outside the family, outside the court, outside the nation.

Philosophy is international. It is interfamilial. It is interlinguistic. It is inter-, you see, inter-, inter-, inter-.

Because it is second.

2

And it is that which every one of us wants to know besides the immediate order in which he knows very well when to get up, and when to go to work, and when to vote. It's all this realm of second thought where you say, "Perhaps I wouldn't have to get up in the morning" - and: "Perhaps I wouldn't have to vote in Podunk" - and: "Perhaps I could emigrate to China," and: "Perhaps" and "Perhaps".

All the perhapses of your mind get organized in philosophy.

3

Therefore, in Homer already there awakens this tremendous problem, gentlemen:

Who are the people who philosophize together? What is the brotherhood of philosophers? Where do I meet the other men?

And in this sense, then, the public of Homer is the first attempt to create an audience outside the responsible barracks of the army, or the responsible place of a court with all the jury.

4

To speak, gentlemen, you must understand this -- to you all this is so natural -- to speak in freedom and irresponsibility, anything that crosses through your mind, you need an undangerous environment.

You cannot in a little town say anything that is true about your neighbors. They will otherwise lynch you.

## VI *THE SAFETY VALVE*

1

Most people in a little town know so terrible things about their neighbors that they feel they can never talk in this town about them. They have to go to some place in Florida. And then they can tell the stories they know about their neighbors, without giving their name, I suppose. But it's very entertaining, if they tell all the stories they know of what has been going on in their town.

They cannot tell it in their town. That's absolutely impossible.

If you want to live in your family, you cannot tell all the stories about your family -- to these members of the family. They don't like to listen to these stories, that they have been in jail. But they have been in jail. And they have been divorced. You cannot talk about it.

2

Have you ever met this problem of meeting divorces -- and the husband and the wife in the same room? Or to talk about the sacraments with the divorced couple? Or with one partner, what you believe in, the sacrament of marriage. You can't tell them, you better keep quiet.

You may keep your conviction, but you can't spread it there without wounding these people.

3

There are any number of things which in our vital relations, gentlemen, we can neither think nor say.

It is no good, gentlemen, to think of the Oedipus Complex while you are with your mother and your father. If you are lying on the couch in an analyst's room, no harm done. You are in a second world.

Well, that is the creation of philosophy, gentlemen. There would be no analysts if there hadn't been philosophers in Greece who at one time said, "We must create for any mind a realm, a room, a space for second impressions."

But he must never bring these second impressions in confusion, in cahoots with the first impressions. For heaven's sake!

4

So any analyst is very careful to create this second space, where nothing what you say about your first impressions ever leaks out. You couldn't live with the people of whom you tell all your first impressions to this man in the realm of second impressions.

It's very serious, gentlemen. Anybody who burns through this safety valve, this fuse, goes nuts.

## VII A COLLAPS

1

A young man in Manchester, New Hampshire, of Greek Catholic origin had a father and a mother who were still practicing this religion. And the father, as a matter of fact, is a Greek Catholic priest. And there were also sisters. And the boy was the youngest, and -- you may say - the least gifted - wasn't directly feeble-minded. But it seemed wise to have him go on a farm on Long Island and milk the cows. Which he did, to everybody's satisfaction.

Then the war came, the Second World War. He went out with the boys and suffered from being strange, from not belonging to the ordinary religion -- here, Roman Catholic or Protestant, but being a Greek Catholic, of course that was for him too much of a nonconformism.

And he said to his father that he wanted to become a Roman Catholic. And this father was very cheerful about it, and said, "Oh, that's all right."

But unfortunately the parents were prevented, and also the sister, from attending the ceremony. The boy was just as good as gold. And he is still a pre-philosophical mind where "Yes" is "yes," and "No" is "no." And so the Roman Catholic priest made a terrible mistake. He baptized this child of God again. That's in itself forbidden. But the Roman Church has this rule that you cannot be baptized twice. But in case -- they call it a conditional rebaptism.

2

But in this case, gentlemen, now I beg you to be very serious, because most of your sisters and brothers are destroyed by the American childishness and indifference in these matters. Well, this boy -- he was 18 or 19 -- no, no, 21, when this happened, 21 -- something like that. But being very simple-minded.

3

When he heard that he hadn't been baptized before, that he hadn't been a Christian, that his father was denied the privilege of being a priest, of having standing, and he was not just a layman, as you think, this good father, whom he had worshiped. It was his competition between the American army and this serious environment, and the comradeship in the army and this very good parenthood, this very good background in his family -- when this word "baptism" and this word, "I hereby baptize you in the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit," when this was spoken again over him, and he suddenly became aware that in the eyes of this Roman Catholic preacher, he had been a pagan, his father was a pagan, his father was not a Christian - he collapsed.

He had to be put in a straitjacket, and he has lost his mind.

4

That is the human relation to the word, really, when it is still unspoiled. That's the relation which you find in an Indian tribe. That's the relation which you find in all real societies, which are not as degenerate as ours, where words mean nothing, where you cannot reach a child or a person by just calling his name and thereby building him into society.

### VIII *DYNAMITE*

1

This is very serious, gentlemen. The man has lost his mind. This could have been prevented if the parents had been present at the ceremony.

And the Catholic priest has repented. He asked his father to go with him into the cell of this unfortunate victim of his stupidity and crudeness. And of course, to this poor Irish young priest, this was all new. He had just done what was routine. And he hadn't known what a human soul is.

You find many theologians who don't know this.

And the coarseness today is very much with the theologians, gentlemen, that I have to tell you frankly. It's terrible. They don't know A from B. He just thinks that this is something in itself, and doesn't have anything to do with your and my daily life.

2

But you also live by certain words, and if you would be put into a concentration camp, gentlemen, would be given a number and would have to live for five years without anybody recognizing that you have a name, you probably would also break down under the strain.

Because to have your own name is the recognition of the unity and continuity of your existence. And this cannot be discussed. There cannot be a second impression replacing the first impression.

3

I want to threaten you with these two examples, gentlemen, that you must take the problem of philosophy as one of dynamite. This is not a pleasure to philosophize.

The Greeks had to philosophize in order to be Greeks, in order to live in a world of mighty empires under the impact of trading with the enemy constantly, with people who believed otherwise. But once you omit this addition that any man needs these first impressions to bind him to his sanity, to his friendship, to his kin and kindred, you do not see that philosophy is not anything that you can put over on a 1-year-old baby. But that it is a second experience, and therefore is lacking always in stringency. It is always a step outside the soil in which you must remain rooted.

4

And here is this great story which proves it.

Will you kindly read this 8th book, where this begins?

You have the real -- Page 129. Prenzler. You have it? (*The eight--*)

Oh, keep your legs. They are wonderful. No objection. Who has it? Nobody brought *The Odyssey*, I suppose. (*Oh, The Odyssey?*) Yes, Sir. You? (*What page, Sir?*) 129. No Homer? No *Odyssey*? Who has *The Odyssey*? Please. (*At the point where- --*). "Presently."

*"Presently the bard's fine voice was heard above the music of his lyre.  
His theme --"*

Turn around. They have no books.

## IX INDIGNITY AND DIGNITY OF THE STORY

### 1

*"His theme was the love of Ares and Aphrodite, of the beautiful crown.  
He sang of their first and stealthy meetings in Hephaestus' palace,  
of the many gifts Ares made her,  
and the dishonor he did her to King Hephaestus' bed.  
But the son, {Islay}, went on to tell, had witnessed their loving embraces,  
who came to inform Hephaestus, who when he heard the galling truth,  
went straight to his workshop, with his heart full of evil thoughts,  
laid his great anvil on the { } and forged a chain network  
that could neither be broken nor undone, so as to keep them prisoners forever.*

*His fury with Ares inspired him as he worked.  
And when the snare was finished, he went to the room  
where his bed was laid, and threw the netting right around the bed posts.  
A number of further lengths were attached to the rafters overhead,  
and hung down light as gossamer, and quite invisible,  
due to the blessed gods. It was a masterpiece of cunning work.*

*When he had thus surrounded the bed and set his trap,  
he made a pretense of leaving for the pleasant town of Lemnos,  
his favorite spot on earth. Meanwhile, Ares of the golden reins  
had not kept watch for nothing. Directly he saw the master craftsman leave,  
he made his way to the great god's house,  
filled with a passionate desire for Scytheria of the lovely crown.*

Ja. That is Venus.

### 2

*Now she had lately returned from a visit to her mighty father Zeus,  
and had just sat down when Ares came in at the door,  
grasped her hand, and saluted her fondly. "Come, my beloved," he said.  
"Let us go to bed and lie in each other's arms, for Hephaestus is no longer about.*

*He has gone to Lemnos I think to visit his friends and listen to their barbarous talk."  
 Aphrodite desired nothing better than to sleep with him,  
 so the two went to the bed and lay down. Whereupon  
 the netting, which Hephaestus' ingenuity had contrived, fell around them  
 in such a way that they could not move or lift a limb.  
 They found too late that there was no escape. And now  
 they were faced by the great lame god himself, for the sun --  
 acting as a spy -- had given him word. And he had turned back  
 before reaching the island of Lemnos, and hurried home in anguish.*

*Standing there in the entrance, he was seized by a spasm of rage,  
 and raised his voice in a terrible shout, so that all the gods might hear him.*

3

Would you go on?

*Father Zeus, and you other happy gods who live forever.  
 Come here and see a comic and cruel thing.  
 Zeus' daughter Aphrodite has always despised me for my lameness,  
 and now she has given her heart to this butcher, Ares,  
 just because he is good-looking and sound of limb,  
 while I was born a cripple. And who am I to blame for that,  
 if not my father and my mother? I wish they had never begotten me.*

*But you shall see how these two have crept into my bed  
 and are sleeping in each other's loving arms. The sight cuts me to the quick.  
 Yet I have an idea that they won't be eager to prolong that embrace.  
 No, not for a moment, not for all their love. Theirs is the sleep  
 that both will soon be tired of. But my cunning meshes  
 are going to keep them just where they are, till her father hands me back  
 every one of the gifts I made him to win this { }-faced hussy,  
 who may be his daughter, and a lovely creature, but is the slave of her passions.*

*The shouts brought the gods trooping to their house with the bronze boar.  
 Up came Poseidon, the earth-shaker, Hermes the bringer of luck,  
 and the archer, King Apollo. But the goddesses, constrained by feminine modesty,  
 all stayed at home. There they stood then, in front of the doors,  
 the immortals who are the source of all our blessings.*

*And when they caught sight of Hephaestus' clever device,  
 a fit of uncontrollable laughter seized these {happy} gods.*

4

Now, let's stop here. Gentlemen, the indignity of the story and the dignity of the story, I recommend to your attention. I hope you will read on yourself.

It's of course a famous example of the reasons for Plato's hatred of Homer, or his great love, admiration, turned into fear and terror of the consequences of this treatment of the gods.

If you ask yourself -- this is a very famous story -- what is dignified about this is, it is the genuine mistreatment of this polio-stricken Hephaestus, whom his wife betrays.

#### X HOMER SIDES WITH MEN AGAINST THE GODS

1

I just got some news today that a good woman gave birth to a boy -- her father lives here in our town and is deeply polio-stricken. He is a complete cripple. His first wife ran away from him when he got polio. This woman had the courage to marry him, and they are very happy. And -- here is this child born to them.

And you can imagine then that there is a great tragedy involved when such a cripple is betrayed by his wife in favor of a strong man, exactly as it is described here.

2

This is much more horrid than when two real rivals of the same physical status are one winning out over the other. It's a much greater moral injury. And I think Homer stresses this point very beautifully.

And I think that is that aspect of the story by which it is made tolerable, because we have not just a joke and not just a farce, but we also have the cutting pain of the cripple.

3

And therefore this story is not to be dismissed lightly. It is a great example, gentlemen, how Homer sides with men against the gods. He humanizes the gods to such an extent that even Hephaestus is not just a clown, but a semi-tragic figure, because he deserves better.

He deserves real love, and not this Hollywood love.

And on the other hand, gentlemen, the divine majesty of the gods is missed. If you humanize the gods, then the gods cease to be gods, to a certain extent. All you can say is that they are at least human.

4

It is important since we have these three words, of the logos, the ethos, and the physis, you must see that Homer does humanize the gods. And what he takes away from them in majesty he adds to them in humanity.

You can see that the ethos of Hephaestus is perfectly accessible to you and me.

## XI *THE SOCIAL PREVAILS*

1

Now I would say that this is a typical attitude, gentlemen, of any such social intercourse, as in your fraternity, as in an after-dinner speech, as in the theater. Anything that is not totally serious will always take the world above us, and the world below us, and make it for us into some human thing.

You have a social gathering, and you will treat the dog fight and the roosters' fight and the bull fight as a social entertainment, you will in a way humanize, domesticate the world below us, too. You will have flea races, as they have in Florida, I'm told.

Is it true? Flea races, no? F-l-e-a. Isn't that correct?

2

I have a friend who has made all his money by bullfrog races. Also in Florida, there are the stupid ones, and they are bored.

It's very strange, gentlemen, and may help you to see the impact of what I am trying to develop here before you, that if you are in the non-serious situation, if you don't have to plow the land, then you can treat the ox as an object of a fight. But if you want to plow the land, you better don't do that, because you need the bull.

3

We live today in such an apartment and skyscraper world that it is quite hard for you to see that at any minute, gentlemen, when people gather in a carefree mood in a bar, or in a club, or in your fraternity houses, or at Mac's, or whatever it is, that they really do something to the world beneath us, the world of nature and the world of things, and to the world above us. We humanize both.

The way of any social intercourse is that the ethical, or what you call "the social," prevails and absorbs all considerations about the powers above and below.

Look how you talk about a revolution or a civil war at a bar. You say, "Oh, it will be quite exciting to see a revolution."

4

Now gentlemen, in a revolution, in Budapest, many tears are shed, many lives are destroyed. Many hopes are buried. But in a social gathering, as a paper, for example, is -- I don't know if your paper brought this terrible news: first that Hungary would go to the Olympics just the same, and said second that two of its first-rate athletes were killed in the rioting.

Now gentlemen, I was wounded by these two news at this moment. It's after all much more important whether the people of Hungary get their liberty than if the Olympics take place. To hell with the Olympics, compared to this. One is serious, and the other is not serious.

In this country, of course, the Olympics is serious, and the fate of Hungary: who cares? That's how you treat play in comparison to seriousness. And at least the papers play it up for all it is worth. The headline is: "Hungary Goes to Olympics."

The headline is not: "Let's Fight for Freedom."

## XII *INSISTING ON THIS*

1

That was different a hundred years ago. All this treatment of the events in Hungary, gentlemen, when Kossuth died under the same Russian gunfire -- or he didn't, but his cause died in 1850 -- was very different.

Kossuth was a great national hero in America, as you may have heard. And Kossuth suffered this very fate that the people in Budapest have suffered. The Russians intervened. The Hungarian rebels had conquered their freedom against the emperor of Austria. And then, to their dismay and shame, the emperor of Russia offered brotherly help to the man in Vienna and marched in, and the Hungarians were overcome by Russian arms.

2

And that makes the whole thing in Hungary today so very difficult for the Russians. They know very well how they are hated, for this memory of 1850.

But the papers here are so ill-informed, they have mentioned even the monument, and the holiday of 1850. But they have never said that it was the Russians who

defeated the revolution. They only talk of the Habsburgs defeating the Hungarian- -- no, the Russians did it in 1850, and therefore every Hungarian at this moment feels that this gruesome game must not be repeated.

I hope they will not trust any offers from their so-called government.

3

But the massacre is already wholesale. And at such a moment, pardon me for insisting on this, it is bad taste for the Americans to mention the Olympics, and not to say that good people fighting have died in Budapest, but to pick out the one athlete who's killed and give him a special space when he is dying, together with the rest of his people.

So that the people here get the picture, that the only thing that matters in Hungary: will the Olympic Games remain intact?

But that comes from after-dinner.

4

*(Sir, I think you'll find that if you read a few other newspapers, the one newspaper you read is only one, and there are probably hundreds across this country that are describing thousands of other Hungarians who are being killed.)*

Well, I have seen these headlines, Sir. I have to tell you this. By the way, your newspapers are far from reflecting the serious people in this country, as you know this, too.

But I think it is sad that our public opinion does not reflect what really I think the people at this moment is feeling. They don't. They are scared to for any real broader sentiment.

### XIII NEVER CONFUSE SECON AND FIRST PUBLIC

1

But this is an inevitable situation, gentlemen. Philosophy must look for a second public.

And the Homeric public is the first public that has been formed around something that is not serious, and yet is mental. The mind here goes for a walk, but it is not a solitary walk, but people get together on a certain theme.

2

And since most of you are not accustomed to understand this difficult problem, gentlemen, of living in a society of direct action and immediate responsibility of mores, and another society of mental reflection, I have to draw your attention to the fact that this second social world has been created by the Greeks.

3

And for example, the Russians try to destroy this. There shall be no such second world. They to make the philosophical world into the serious world.

That's why they are such poor Platonists. They are really Greek philosophers who want now to make their plan, their abstract picture of society their utopia, their republic, their laws, their Platonic dialogues, their "dialectics" as they call it.

They want to penetrate the home so that the child must denounce the parents, if any word is said that isn't Marxian dialectics.

4

So you see it's of very practical impact that you understand that philosophy is only in a second realm possible. If you make it identical with the first, hell breaks loose. And if you don't have it at all, the little groups stagnate, and you get the uncivilized Indian tribe, where there is nothing but serious life, and there is no meditation and no reflection going on in public.

#### XIV THE RELIEF OF TENSION

1

So the formation of a public, gentlemen - it's very hard for you to understand - is necessary.

*Where you have only the people, you have primitive life.*

*Where you have the public, you have reflection.*

*Where you have only the public, you have tyranny.*

Because you destroy these groups that can afford immediate action, undoubted action, immediate integration, celebration, ceremony, ritual, and liturgy, divine service, what-not.

2

And the constant problem of mankind is, gentlemen: how much public, how much people?

Whenever we philosophize, we gather with people with whom we do not live day by day. We gather with a public that stretches out through universe. You can also say, gentlemen, that from Homer's burlesque fear about the gods, the problem of philosophy has been: to ennoble the public so that it ceases to be just entertained.

3

Philosophy is an attempt to make out of this after-dinner audience of a public a second world, a second realm, a second citizenry of spirited people, who -- although they are on stilts, although they live in a second community of thinkers, of grownups, of people removed from their immediate community, will only be entertained by a reflection on these serious things, and not be only interested in letting their hair down and cheapening the seriousness.

4

In Homer's Achilles and Ares, gentlemen, what happens?

The tone is lighter than it is in the morning, when the priest offers sacrifices to the gods.

You can see this. This is laughter. This is joke.

Well, it's like an after-funeral, when the gay music sets in. You cannot weep all day. So at the funeral, you are serious. You come home. Then at a military funeral, the music, returning from the cemetery is always required to play a gay melody.

That's a very wise custom. You have to return to life by this relief of tension.

And that's the same with an after-dinner speak, after a big festival, after a great celebration, you get humorous, and you let off steam.

#### *XV REBUILT UP AGAIN TO A HIGHER PRESSURE*

1

Now this then is the problem of philosophy since Homer. You can see that if all the activities of a group like the Greek people roaming the seas, coming to foreign places, would be to go in Hoboken into a bar and to get drunk and to dismiss

authority, dismiss seriousness and just joke about it, that there would be a total loss of energy. And you must think of it in terms of physics, of the law -- how do you call the law - entropy -- a loss of energy, loss of heat.

If our society would always give off steam and never rebuild it, then we would of course be faced by a tremendous loss, and then every Indian tribe and every Mau-Mau group would be perfectly entitled to cry out against colonialism, to say, "Let the English go home, because they destroy our mores, the things become less serious, we now see that things are not so decisive, so important as we do them."

You can do them differently, so people will stop doing anything. They will become indifferent.

2

Gentlemen, if we had only Homer, all over the place, and Broadway, our life in this country would lose too much energy.

Now philosophy is the strange attempt to use this leisure to build up energy into these private homes, into these courts, into these barracks, into these army places, into the White House, and not to play golf with Cola-Cola people, but to listen to a seer, or to a poet and to be inspired again, and not to relax.

We always hear in this country only that people who are busy must relax. I think they mustn't relax at all. They must be rebuilt up again, to a higher pressure. But always you hear in this country that these poor businessmen have to relax. That's not true that this is enough.

They have to get on a higher pitch than all the businesses: life. They must then come in to their business from a higher point of view, and not from a lower.

3

And it is just as important, gentlemen, to rebuild the necessary tensions in a society, than always to say that they must be dismissed.

4

This is what I regret to say about this business of Israel. For one year, we have been forewarned, but since this country wants to sleep out its prosperity, you can't find anybody who will do anything or sacrifice anything for this peace outdoors. It's too hard a life out there. Most Americans have to return from Palestine, because they just couldn't stand the life there. It's too hard.

XVI *LEISURE USED FOR INCREASING THE TENSION*

1

So gentlemen, philosophy is against Homer in this sense, that it wants not to relieve the tension, but to build up a higher pressure tank.

You know of these water systems where the pressure tank is put in the attic and then the water runs down.

2

The problem is then, for philosophy to build this attic, where you can put your pressure tank so that the rooms in which the people normally live, can receive the water with new pressure.

3

It has never been solved by philosophy, but it is its ambition. It's Plato's ambition. It's Aristotle's ambition. It's the ambition of the Stoics: couldn't they find an avocation, a treatment of the public by which the public would be so ennobled that it would impart to the people in their daily activities a better life.

And I think anybody who studies philosophy must have this dream in his mind, gentlemen.

4

Philosophy is an attempt to use the leisure not for relieving the tension, but for increasing the tension.

That's for you perhaps a little difficult to understand, but it should make clear the paradox of philosophy.

Since the Greek days, gentlemen, the Greek philosopher says, "Here I take advantage of leisure. Homer has created the good use of leisure for entertainment, for humanization. Into this niche, into this nook, I also march in. And I'll get my public, then to replace, with the background of their family life, with the background of their laws, with the background of the universe, with the real order.

## XVII TO WHOM PHILOSOPHY CATERS

1

*So, leisure ennobled - that is the social task of philosophy.*

You will admit that it is the critical point today: you get a four-day week, what are you going to do with your leisure? If you treat it as merely non-serious, you will get just murder. You will get every day a fantastic crime, because people will not know what to do with these three days.

2

It's a very serious problem. How can you treat 160 million people to a four-day week if they don't know at all what to do for the rest of the time.

And there will be so many perfect crimes, because that will be the only thing that will come to mind.

3

Well, that's serious, a very serious business, gentlemen. Heaven knows what is going to happen. The pious one may go to the mosque on Friday and to the synagogue on Saturday and to the church on Sunday. But there will be very few people who want to do that.

And what do you do with the rest?

4

This is not wanton, gentlemen. You must think in these very practical terms of today. There were no three days, but the rich had leisure. They had slaves, in Homer's days as today. And it is to the people who were liberals in the ancient sense, that is, who had no work to do, who had other people to do their work to whom philosophy caters.

## XVIII AVANTGARD OR EPILOGUE?

1

And this Homeric story here therefore has much more than meets the eye. It is the constant problem of our time today.

We are all now through the machines in the place of the people in Greece who indulge in philosophy. They either indulged in philosophy or in sports or in orgies, in debauches, in all kind of nonsense, in self-destruction.

And we have the same situation today, because a whole nation today is freed from chores through our machinery.

2

And very few who could philosophize in Greece are nothing compared to a nation that is -- how many horse-powers are behind every American? Does anybody know? (*Potentially four.*) Fifteen years ago it was already 31 horsepowers behind every American. Talking about the machinery. (*You're not talking about the development of the body itself?*) But you are not a horse. (*No. But the human body is --*)

No, I mean the electric power, the steam power, the gasoline power, the combustion engine, all the horsepower that amount to, I think, 111 or something like that for every American at this moment. Working in your service, Sir. You have it. Every American -- I don't know the figure, by the way.

Does anybody know? Who is in Tuck School? None of these economic slaves?

3

Well, look it up. It's a most fascinating story. You must think that every one of you, as we sit here, have 111 horses constantly serving us 24 hours a day.

Well, have you ever thought that this is really true. We are all drunk with this power. All the accidents on the road teach you that the temptation of having 300 horsepowers at your disposal goes to a man's head. We all are today great captains, because every one of us has a whole army, at least a company backing him up.

4

For these people, philosophy is the problem, gentlemen. If you have power, and if you have time, what to do with it. All people under the necessity of life don't need to philosophize, because every day, the laborer knows that if he doesn't work, he will starve.

That's very simple, gentlemen. Ten hours a day work, no philosophy, but leisure.

The problem, gentlemen, of philosophy is: can leisure be treated as the avant-garde of life, or is it the epilogue of life, of your weekly life, of your daily life?

And for most of you, it is the epilogue. But it should be the avantgarde, it should be the prelude.

Leisure is a seed, gentlemen, and not the dregs.

That's a great problem.

Let's have a break here. But only three minutes, please. I have to go on.

## I THE PARADOX BETWEEN SKEPTICAL AND ORTHODOX TODAY

1

...the first thousand or 800 years of Greek philosophy -- who dies and whom I call the Nietzsche of antiquity.

2

Nietzsche comes at the end of the story of modern and medieval philosophy. He is, compared to Abelard and Thomas Aquinas, a man who explodes philosophy. And he is, as he called himself, at least, a materialist, however doubtful that may be. And he is an atheist.

And yet, if you read Nietzsche - has anybody ever read anything by Nietzsche?

3

There has been no such religious philosopher in the last thousand years, Nietzsche, because the death of God is his great cry. "Where is God?" so to speak, you can ask. His whole work is centering around the death of the divine inspiration, the divine spirit. And so he has this paradoxical situation then circumscribed in which you and I find ourselves.

The more skeptical we are, the more we will represent today the divine spirit; and the more orthodox, and routine churchgoers we will be, the more we will contribute to the death of the spirit.

That's a paradox.

4

Every Sunday when I go to church -- I preached last Sunday in our church - it is quite a pain in the neck, because you are not sure that this is the place where the spirit today lives.

This paradox exists from time immemorial, and in antiquity, I made you read Lucretius to see that the same tension that we find in Homer: the gods, and men, and the gods critically humanized, and the man exalted by a greater unity into this tremendous effort of the Greek spirit in this common enterprise, and this common enthusiasm -- that this is at the end of the era the same.

## II *THE GREAT INCOGNITO*

1

Lucretius invokes the gods, speaks to Memmius and deals with matter as the only power that is needed to explain everything.

That's paradoxical.

It's like Nietzsche, who assures you that Christianity is dead, and when he goes mad, breaks down with signing himself, "The Crucified," because so much was his Christianity awake in him that he only lived with the great incognito, because the gods, gentlemen, can only come to life if we do not blaspheme and do not quote them too early.

2

The man who says, "In God's name," usually doesn't act in God's name. But you may very well act in God's name without saying so.

3

This is the same paradox in Lucretius. And I cannot explain this to you, because you stand partially before life. But I have to arouse you to this sense of wonder, that an atheist in antiquity invokes the gods.

That's strange.

But it is not stranger, gentlemen, than that you should honor your father and your mother and love the wife of your choosing. Any man who has to go through this has two religions. And he has to unify them.

4

That will seem to you strange. But we live by contradiction. We don't live in a very nice, settled system. But we try to make contradictions, live in us in harmony.

That's the problem of man. We are not mathematical examples, with 2 and 2 is 4. But we have two prime numbers inside ourselves. Let's take 37 and 31. And you have to harmonize the two of them.

### III THE LIMITATIONS OF SCIENCE

1

Every one of us has contradictory genes in himself. You have to be your father's son, and your mother's son, and you have to be your wife's husband and your children's father, and you have even to be a member of a party, and you have to be citizen of the town, member of a church, and it doesn't end in an equation of mathematics, gentlemen - most contradictory.

2

And therefore philosophy is only honest when it begins with a contradiction, Mr. Leibowitz. And I cannot tell you, as in chemistry or in medicine, that 2 and 2 is 4.

3

I read a letter in church last Sunday. Since you are a pre-med student, I'd better give this to you, where I say the scientists today lose their heads, totally. They won't wonder anymore. They say that they are only scientists, these doctors. And they kill their patients.

Science in this moment in America kills medicine. And a friend of mine left this college because he thought the medical school was just absolutely bent on science. And he's son of a doctor, and so he has some good tradition in himself. And he went to another medical school. And he wrote me the following letter:

*"My professor gave us a first lecture today on medicine. And he said,*

*'A doctor who is honest must know*

*that he can comfort everybody,  
he can relieve numerous people,  
and he can cure a very few.'*"

4

The modern doctor who is science-drunk, thinks that he's only there to cure. And he gives up to relieve, and he gives up to comfort. Such a doctor doesn't know the limitations of science.

*"`You must know, my dear students,' he went on to say, you must comfort everybody. But you may relieve some, and that you may cure indeed very few. And if you don't, you don't know the limitations of your science.'"*

#### IV *TODAY PHILOSOPHY MUST ATTACK SCIENCE*

1

Now, in the same sense, gentlemen, philosophy wants to show you your limitations, Sir. And as long as you do not wake up to the fact that philosophy is not a science, gentlemen, you are not philosophizing.

2

We know certain things in philosophy. I know what a syllogism is, for example. And such simple and minor things. But they are of a subordinate nature.

The great power of philosophy is to check every one of your blasphemous arrogances in your own proper field, as a doctor, as an engineer, as a statesman, as a mother. You all go haywire because you think that you are God Almighty, if you follow the procedure of his business; 150 years ago, a father thought nothing of spanking his son. It was within his rights and there have even been Spartan fathers, who would prefer to kill their son against letting pass disobedience, a lack of discipline.

3

Now we don't think this anymore. So here's a family, by a sense of wonder the part of philosophy had to be put in a new light. The rules of the family no longer are the same, because we have upset them.

4

Today, I think, philosophy must attack science, because science is haywire. It's absolute megalomania, as you see from the atom bomb. All philosophy centers around the fact that we have to tell physicists that we are not interested in their findings, or only in a very limited way they help us. And that they have nothing to say.

And as long as you go to the physicist, in asking for political advice, this country is at the brink of disaster.

#### V *SOCIOLOGY OF SCIENCE*

1

Philosophy has to do this, or it's no good. Because the sense of wonder must always make you attack the god of the day.

The sense of wonder has nothing to do with your toothache or with minor matters. The sense of wonder in philosophy is wondering about the *shibboleth*, about the dogma of the day.

For example . I can't go into the details of this today -- if philosophy has any future, it will have the future of criticizing science, of saying that science is only possible by scientists, and scientists are people who still have a sense of wonder, and therefore you cannot streamline men, and you cannot buy men, and you cannot have science through money.

2

And then I read such statements that in 20 years we can harness atomic energy economically, I hope that this will break down, gentlemen. I do not think that you can predict for 20 years any such thing.

It's just ludicrous.

Well, that's just one example of what we're up against the megalomania today of sciences, who, however, have been produced by philosophy persuading the older order of society, the priesthood, and the family and the nation to allow these scientists. Now they've gone too far. We now have to call them back.

*Formerly they burned the witches. Now the witches burn us.*

Well, these aren't these producers of atom bombs and bactericide -- are they not witches? They are. That's all they are.

3

So, Mr. Leibowitz - this will not satisfy you.

But I had to defend my position, why I had to show you that in every generation, in the first of Greek philosophy as much as in the last, at the end, in Lucretius, there is still a contradiction.

It isn't so simple as you would like to have it, as you can have it in a special field of a science.

*Philosophy protects the living man who can produce sciences -- perhaps you take this down -- of various kind, who has created one day chemistry and the next day sociology and today a science protecting us against science.*

We call this today "sociology of science," which would be an attempt to confine, or to show what the scientist can do and what he cannot do.

4

The place of science in society would be the sociology of science.

You can see that this is a new science -- it wasn't necessary 500 years ago, when science had to be created, to talk of the sociology of science, because we had just to think of getting science.

But today, we must know what a physicist can do and what he cannot do.

## VI *A TREMENDOUS SIMPLIFICATION*

1

Only to show you, gentlemen, that philosophy is the perpetual sense of wonder to distribute in us our power to find new truth, our power to get along with our fellow man, and our power to dominate dead matter.

And to distinguish what is dead matter, what in you and me, for example, is just routine, is a question of our changing concept of nature, our changing concept of theology, and our changing concept of ethics, or of mores, or morality of the social sciences.

2

Now this was my justification towards you.

Let's look up the text of this very good book by Mrs. Kathleen Freeman, and let's read -- or let's at least speak of the people who turned from Homer's attempt to joke about the gods to the opposite attitude to become serious about things, and to try to find the divine in the cosmic order of the universe.

And we had already Thales of Miletus crying out, shouting that everything is water.

3

The two next men we have next to no fragments from them: Anaximander and Anaximenes, gentlemen, tried to correct Thales in a certain way.

Thales says, "I have my first common denominator. I'll get my Egyptian friends and my Mesopotamian friends and ourselves on the salt lake of the Mediterranean and the people far away on the ocean all together in the recognition that water is one, and that probably all earth and everything comes from water."

Now, he is not very far from the truth, because we supposedly have the same blood as the fishes, because we used to live in the water. And saltwater still today is the curative for your eyes for this reason probably, because if you put saltwater in your eyes, any inflammation will immediately disappear.

That's a very strange fact, because fishes or sea animals would have their eye in the water and therefore feel the saltwater sympathetically as the best environment they can be in.

4

It is very hard for you and me to understand why this man Thales should be so important, if we only know this one thing: *Everything is water.*

However today, in the first half, I made an attempt to remind you of this fact that in leisure people should also try to get up steam, and not to get off steam. And if everything is water, you can see that all the partial civilizations of the Nile and the cult of Osiris and the cult of Poseidon -- which is the god of the salt sea -- suddenly appear in a new light.

And these cults can be purified, and can be regulated in the various cities of Greece, in the light of this recognition -- Heaven, what man wants to worship is his common origin, the original force. And it doesn't matter that one is Osiris and one is Poseidon; a tremendous simplification sets in, and as far as people give in to this consideration.

## VII HUMAN SACRIFICES WERE ELIMINATED IN GREECE

1

And here you have the power of a generalization, gentlemen, and that power of generalization may free you from local, parochial anxieties. And since everybody says today we should get out of our anxieties and the "Age of Anxiety," Thales is important and made this tremendous impact on tradition that Thales is called the beginner of all Greek philosophy, because he shows the driving power towards generalizing, towards finding a common denominator.

2

If you can find a common denominator, people of different origin and background can be united in some common effort, some civilizing effort. They can go home, everyone in his different cult, into his different city, and do something in the same direction, although what they have to do in the cult of Poseidon and what they have

to do in the cult of the Nile god will look different, you see how the application of such a generalization is individual.

3

But the principle is identical, and you can therefore imagine that people would travel to Thales and get indoctrinated, to take home something everyone would have to apply in a home town, in his own way.

You cannot talk to a worshiper of the sea god in the same terms later on, as you talk to the worshiper of the Nile god. But you can in both cases perhaps tell them that they don't have to sacrifice human beings.

And it seems, as far as we can see, that from 600 B.C. to 400, more or less, *human sacrifices were eliminated in Greece*. Under the impact of such teachings, the local cults lost their stringency, their severity, and people wouldn't dare to risk their all, life and death, on these cults. The cults themselves lost their severity.

4

That's just one aspect of this.

We are told that Thales traveled, went to Egypt. And you see immediately that once this process is set in motion, the next man tries to improve on it in an opposite direction.

Thales thinks, in your eyes, materially: *water*.

To me, it's a great spiritual step, the unification of different phenomena.

To you, he will appear perhaps just as a hydrograph, a man who worships water, and a materialist.

## VIII FROM PHYSIS TO LOGIC

1

Now Anaximander of Miletus, the same city on the coastline of Asia Minor - all three are of Miletus on these pages of 18, 19 of Mrs. Freeman here -- says the non-limited is immortal and indestructible.

It is very hard for us to understand what the non-limited is.

2

But one thing is clear. This second man tries a logical category instead of a physical, non-limited.

You cannot define it as water. You cannot define it as earth. You cannot define it as Heaven. You cannot define it as fire. Anaximander feels it is indefinite.

That's perhaps the best translation. I think the "non-limited" on page 19 here is not the best translation. There has been much debate of what is meant by that which has no boundaries, no boundary line, no borderline. You cannot define it. So I think the best translation is "the indefinite."

Or "the indefinable" comes closest in my mind to what he tries to say.

3

He says, "Behind all the things we can define, because they compare and can be opposed to each other, there has to be something common."

If you get earth and water, and you try to get down to the common denominator, Thales says it's all water. But he lets still one of things of our immediate experience stand, one first impression.

4

Now the great step, gentlemen, of Anaximander - and I hope Mr. Leibowitz, you will see what a scientific progress there is in this - is: I must also sacrifice the water. I have reduced everything to water. Now I must take the final step and must say, "That source material cannot even be called water. It must be called the indefinable, or the indefinite. That which is the matrix out of which all these elements disperse. Therefore I construe a background thought, which I nowhere find in reality."

Because the great idea of this man is that this which is in back of everything remains in back of everything, in the sense that "I can only think it, but I cannot present it," because "I must reduce everything that appears in the phenomenal world, in the physical world, in the world of my five senses, to something as we do today exactly with atoms or electrons.

It is a constant quest of our nature that we want to penetrate behind that which is of the moment, because it is passing; it is transient. It is not the very thing.

So the step from Thales to Anaximander is one from physis to logic.

## IX THINGS CLOSE DOWN

1

Now we get the third man.

If I read him right, Anaximenes of Miletus coming 15 years later.

2

Fifteen years in the life of the mind, gentlemen, are as much as thirty years in the life of the body.

When you come to Dartmouth College, to any college or any university, you will find that it has to be refounded every fifteen years. Human beings change their nature every thirty years.

It is unknown in this country, which has no intellectual experience, that things of the mind have to be revamped every fifteen years.

3

You cannot send your child to a school which you haven't known for 15 years. You have no idea what quality the school has. It's just prejudice that you think still it's a good school. Everything changes in a school within 15 years.

That's very important to know for you. Don't send your child to a school unless you have made sure that its reputation is not dated. I don't wish to slander any schools in the land. But I could give you chapter and verse on some interesting institutions of high standing in the hall of glory of this country, but they just have lost their power. And they still live on their old names, like the Saturday Evening Post.

That's a similar example. They should have shut down a hundred years ago.

4

Gentlemen, *all spiritual enterprises should have a limited lifespan.*

We once founded a magazine which is now very famous in hindsight. And we said it should not last more than four years, which it did. And then we had spent our energy and our faith, and we had said what we wanted to say, and that was it.

In America, this technicality, that everything of the mind is treated as though it was like a legal corporation, to live forever, is very bad. Things close down just as much as they have to be founded.

## X MACROCOSM

1

I have a friend who in his youth founded a fraternity under the condition that it had to dissolve after one term, and then be refounded by fresh blood the second. He said, *"It will only be good as long as we find people who, in the same spirit, will have still the same faith as I have now to found this time, this fraternity."*

2

He exaggerated, I grant you, but it was an expression of his real understanding of the laws of the spirit. He did not want to rely on mechanics. And he didn't want to see the spirit die.

And I ask you to consider this seriously in your own groups, gentlemen. You haven't to refound everything every term. But to let things just go on because they are there is a very poor reason. It's really no reason.

3

So Anaximenes, gentlemen, tries to vivify, to ethicize the universe, because he says,

*"As our soul being air, holds us together, so do breath and air surround the whole universe."*

That is, he tries to treat the cosmos of reality, the whole world of reality as a living being, as somebody like you and me, as ourselves written large. It is the first idea of the macrocosms, which penetrates and prevails in all Greece.

4

But you see here that it is still done in exactly the order which I have tried to make important for you, which any modern man forgets: that nature must be judged by society, by the polis; that philosophy is a second experience for the man who has grown up in a community. And so he says, *"As our soul, being air, holds us together, so do breath and air surround the whole universe."*

## XI THREE STEPS

1

So gentlemen, if you say microcosm is man and macrocosm is the universe, you usually think that we are the second edition, the pocket edition of the universe.

Now Mr. Anaximenes of Miletus on page 19 here says the opposite.

2

What does he say? He says that the universe is what? Do you have the text? Who has this book?

Well, what does he say, if you read this sentence? Who is the analogy of what, of the other?

Here is an analogy. One is like the other. Well, who leads, and who is compared? (*He is comparing himself with breath, and the breath is surrounding the universe, making the universe in other words within man that is around the universe.*) So who comes first? Whose experience is the older one? (*The man.*) The man.

"I know of myself that my breath keeps me together. I die if I don't breathe."

You see, "holds together" means simply, "keeps me going." That would be the better, little too slangy, translation. As our soul being air keeps us going, so the universe is kept going.

3

Now obviously this is terribly important, gentlemen. Anaximenes is an ethical naturalist. Anaximander is a logical physicist.

And Thales is quite drunk with the *physis* itself. He generalizes water, all matter into water.

Anaximander generalizes the logical expression: "I must be careful; the primary thing cannot be called even water. It must be called that which has no name, yet, that is not yet gone in any one direction. That is not visible, that is not definite."

And the third man says, "If I want to understand the universe, I must have an analogy from my own life breath. It's a living universe."

4

Now all these three things, gentlemen, today are lost on you, I'm afraid, because we live in a dead universe. Modern physics, gentlemen, and ancient physics -- I've said to you this before, but it's terribly important for you never to forget it. Physics today is a special science. And the ancient physicists were philosophers.

Therefore, the ancient philosophers always knew that there had to be life inside that which they define as physis. The modern physicist is a specialist, and he has to do with dead things, electrons. He is not responsible for the spirit of the physicist himself.

He has not to explain Mr. Planck. But Mr. Anaximander has to explain Mr. Planck, and Mr. Anaximenes. And so Anaximenes then says, "*As I live, so the universe lives.*"

This is still a valid statement, gentlemen.

## XII THE LIVING UNIVERSE

1

L.P. Jacks -- has anybody ever heard the man's name, L.P. Jacks?

2

A very great Englishman who died at the age of 96 last year -- a friend of mine whom I owe that I lectured at Oxford at his invitation. And I owe him a deep load of gratitude. He wrote a very wonderful little booklet -- he was very popular in this country -- which is called "*The Living Universe.*" And he is the editor of the great Hibbert Journal -- or has been, he's dead now for 30 or 40 years.

Has anybody seen the Hibbert Journal? Who has?

Oh, gentlemen! Well -- Hibbert Journal is the great cultural center of English theology and philosophy. And it just shows where Dartmouth lives: not in the living universe, that not one of you has seen this.

It's of course lying on the shelves here. Do you never look at these magazines at all? You only read sports? Reader's -- why is this magazine room there?

3

Well, "*The Living Universe,*" gentlemen, shows that the philosopher has quite a different universe at heart than the physicist. The physicists deal with the little

element in the universe, those things as a very great Frenchman has called it, "which have already died."

The physics deal with the corpses in the universe.

The stars - it has been even said that all oxygen in the universe is dismissed from our living bodies. And when they die, this oxygen streams out into the universe and fills the dead spaces.

That's Félix Ravaisson's doctrine of how oxygen came to exist, because oxygen, this fiery element, generates in living creatures. And when you find it outside the living, you ask: How does it get there?

4

So the physicists deal with the corpses. They do not deal with the beginning of life, but they deal with the remnants of life, with the relics of life. And therefore, you have the wonderful primary story of man.

### XIII BREATHING

1

I'm always overcome myself by the sense of wonder, that Thales, Anaximander and Anaximenes take the three steps to interpret the universe so that any man in Egypt, in Mesopotamia, in Persia, in Asia Minor, in Greece can prove,

*one:*

*that all matter is one;*

*the other:*

*that this source matter should not be called with any specific name, but should have a general name;*

*and third:*

*that if we want to understand this universe, which the two others try to develop and to make plausible as one universe, that it should at least have the quality of a living, breathing, living universe.*

2

All these three things, gentlemen, come to me to this day with a stroke of genius, and with a great challenge -- if you could today bring Anaximenes of Miletus to life again and lead Félix Ravaisson's doctrine to victory, that physics deal with the corpses of the universe, with the dead aspect of the universe, and that this is a

posterior situation to the creation of the living universe, the whole world would look different, and we could even make peace among ourselves and with the Russians, because you are hampered today in all your thought about reality, including the news in the papers, gentlemen, with your idea that we live in a technical, physical universe.

3

We don't.

We live, as Anaximenes said, in a universe that does breathe, and draw air as our soul.

Thank you.

## NINTH LECTURE: *NOBODY KNOWS ANYTHING WHICH HE DOESN'T LOVE*

### I *ONE SUCH INSIGHT FOR A WHOLE LIFETIME*

1

...way into all human wisdom, Parmenides and Heraclitus. If we had not these two men, we would not understand what Thales of Miletus, Anaximenes, and Anaximander really were after, as we have only fragments.

2

And I showed you on page 19 of this book here, which you kindly will open now, that there is very little. We can only wonder that a life of a man was remembered for these very sayings.

Obviously their attempt today would be ridiculed, because today people write an article per diem, for money. You can buy the modern philosopher -- there is a famous pamphlet written by an Italian in French, which I recommend to your attention. It is called "*Les Philosophes Salariés*," the philosophers which one can buy. It's the average idea of the American businessman that one can buy college professors. Everything in this country is for sale if you only offer enough.

Bernard Shaw has said in his play -- one of his plays, *Major Barbara* -- who knows the play? -- that everybody has his price. You remember?

3

Now gentlemen, it is very hard for you to believe -- there is no place in this country really which gives you reason to believe that wisdom is not for money. The whole problem of these men, which always strikes us today with great wonder on the one-hand side, even doubt on the other, is: how come that these men, for their devotion or for their integrity and for their single-heartedness and their purposiveness were able, with one sentence, with a few doctrines, to get the attention of centuries to come?

Why are these people remembered?

Everything today is forgotten. You have so many wits on the television sets. One chases the other. And who are these wits whom you listen to? Just farcical characters. And they have to have a very simple name, Bob or Alan, or something like that. They can't be called Anaximander, and Anaximenes, and just say, "Warn you."

4

That it is enough to have produced one such insight for a whole life, and that it is a practical problem of real wisdom, gentlemen, to get after such a thought and to enhance it to its full power.

If you think of the withdrawal of the Russians from Hungary today, and you read the sentence of Anaximenes, "As our soul being air holds us together, so do breath and air surround the whole universe," it will not dawn on you that the implication of this total defeat of Russia is already stated by Anaximenes, that one has to treat the remaining universe as much alive as we are ourselves.

## II DEAD MATTER AND LIVING MATTER

1

The Americans are at this moment finished in Europe the same manner, because we have treated the whole universe as too alive. We have not considered the dead regions of the world as having lower standards of political power and right than the fully integrated one. In this country, one -- *The Silent American*, you know perhaps this novel by an Englishman, because he is naive because he thinks that everything is water.

Even Egypt is as good as the United States or as France. And that's a similar naïveté, to judge the world by one preconception, by one dogma.

But I mean to say that Russia has really tried to treat the rest of the world as not breathing, as being able to be dominated as a cemetery, as a graveyard.

2

We have treated every part of the world as already fully alive. You call this self-determination of nations. It's equally naive.

You have to distinguish between dead matter and living matter, gentlemen. It's the whole problem. And parts of the universe are much deader than you think, and other parts are much more alive than you would care to admit.

I mean, because you treated Germany as dead matter, the reeducation of Germany backfired totally. And every American whom I talk to now, quite wrongly by the way, even exaggeratedly, is ashamed of this attempt to reeducate Germany within five years. And now every American tries to forget it, because they treated the Germans as just so much dead objects, dead matter.

3

"As our soul being air holds us together, so do breath and air surround the whole universe." You think that's not an important statement. But gentlemen, we live by deciding: Where is air in life, and where is dead matter?

And in a time of H-bombs and machinery, I assure you, your American psychology at this moment, for example, draws the line of dead matter far too much inside the human being, far too much parts of us are called manageable and manipulable. They even try to manipulate generals, and to psychologize leadership, because they do not know that these people have to be judged as we ourselves would like to be judged, the psychologists themselves. They would like to make a career, and get rich, and have a beautiful wife. And we allow to follow their whims.

But if it comes to treatment of other people, they think they can recommend recipes, machinery.

4

You are all imbued with this idea that very far into man you can expand the idea of a dead universe, which is not as much alive as you are.

So we destroy the soil by chemicals, because we think you can treat the soil as not alive. And we'll die from nervous exhaustion, because the bread and the eggs and the milk and everything we produce is pasteurized; it's killed.

### III *DEPARTMENTALIZED, APARTMENTALIZED, DEMENTALIZED*

1

Gentlemen, what is alive can spoil. And this whole country wants to have food that cannot spoil. So it can't get food.

That's not food what you eat, gentlemen. You have to eat so many calories, 3,000 and more than any other person in the world, because most of the food you take in is dead, absolutely dead.

You don't believe that the universe, according to Anaximenes, has to be treated as alive, and not as dead.

2

That's a very serious question today for the future of the human race, gentlemen, that you are all inclined to forget that the air which you breathe must also circulate in

the soil in which you plant. But where there are chemicals, it's all burned up. You have to have rain worms, instead of chemicals, if you want to have a soil which heaves and which breathes.

I'm quite serious. And there are very many serious people, gentlemen, very much concerned with your apartment way of life. You are departmentalized and apartmentalized today. And therefore you are dementalized.

3

So I only want -- before going on to Heraclitus and Parmenides - to tell you that these little phrases contain a whole world view. You don't have to write a long book in two volumes, *The World as Will and Representation*, as Schopenhauer, or System, like Thomas Aquinas in 49 volumes.

Thomas Aquinas is not a greater philosopher than Anaximenes of Miletus. And that's very hard for you to understand, because you only live by quantity. And you say even, when an author comes to this campus, poor Mr. Cerf tonight, you say, "He's the author of 13 books." Put them all on the scales and weigh them. Well, the more books, the more scandalous.

4

What does this mean?

Author of one book is enough. Author of one sentence is enough. It can make you immortal.

If you really follow it through. If you do, if you think, if you act -- and this is the great lesson of the Greeks, gentlemen, that in their beginnings, they were so overawed by the common power to generalize, that we know of these people only one generalization.

And yet, I assure you, and here I get back again to Mr. Leibowitz, in the history of philosophy, you must come to learn that none of these philosophers is dated. None of these is obsolete. None of them is swallowed up by the next philosopher, as you always think, in your naive idea of progress. That's not true.

Philosophy is completely immortal.

## IV CHRONOLOGY

1

The first philosopher, Mr. Thales, is as creative for your and my mental education as he was 600 B.C. If you don't believe this, gentlemen, you don't understand why philosophy has to be taught as a history: of the human mind.

Every one moment of this history is equally alive today, as all the others. It's quite new to you, because you think history is bunk; history is that which has gone by.

It isn't, gentlemen. Just as little as Homer is in any way made obsolete by Mr. Hemingway. He isn't. He's much greater than Mr. Hemingway, the less he wrote for the day. The more you write for the day, the more obsolete you will be.

2

That's with Parmenides now, as the ethical, physical, and logical attempt of the first three men is reached, Parmenides, who is printed here a little too late on page -- where is he? -- on page 41, is given here a date which I think is exaggerately low. I would put him into the year 490.

3

And let me say here a word of technical explanation of these dates in this book.

When you have to work for your term paper, look also a little bit on the chronology of Greek philosophy.

Now if you read this book through, you'll find that one year is placed with every one of these men as their being in their prime. It's a little doubtful translation of the Greek word "*akme*." "Prime" I think in your consideration would mean your own age. Aren't you in your prime? But for the Greeks, it was a little later. They had some time to think. And so the *akme*, the flowering of a man is in his 40th year.

And so the later Greeks, the Alexandrian scholars, who look back at their homeland in Asia Minor, and Italy, Southern Italy, and Greece from afar, in perspective, when they came to the Ptolemaic court, where also the Old Testament was translated, where there was a great center of the library in Alexandria, in this place, they carpentered, they conceived of a chronology to make the mutual dependencies of these philosophers consciously known. And they simply put every man to his 40th year.

4

Now obviously man is not mechanic human being. And some people have even some ideas at my age. It's rare, but it happens. And the others begin at 20, and have big ideas at your age. That doesn't happen, either, often.

So the chronology of the Greek tradition in Alexandria which you find preserved in this book, is pretty arbitrary, because if you have always the year 40, you do not know the interrelations of these men. Sometimes the man of 20 may already criticize a man of 40; or vice versa: a man of 60 may criticize a younger man, who comes up chronologically after him.

## V EPHESUS

1

Now this is exactly, it seems to me, what has happened with Heraclitus and Parmenides. And that's why I have given you this book, my pamphlet to read, so that you can study.

In this book here, Heraclitus is on page 24, and Parmenides is on page 41. And yet I insist that many of the fragments of Heraclitus are written against Parmenides.

And that shows you the dangers of this mechanic placement here, because Mrs. Freeman says that Heraclitus had his prime about 500 and Parmenides about 475. So the superficial reader is led to believe that they follow each other without any inner contact, and any dialectics, any dialogue, any dispute between them.

This cannot be true. It is obvious that they had a very lively duel carried on between them.

2

As Ephesus and Miletus are neighboring cities, and both of great importance in the trade and in the religion of the Mediterranean.

Where is the city of Ephesus still very famous at the end of antiquity? Whence do we know something about Ephesus? Who lived in Ephesus? Well, where do you meet Ephesus in non-Greek sources which were known to you? Mr. Miller? (*I was thinking Saul. But I'm not sure.*) Saul? Well, I call him Paul. (*Paul?*) Yes. So? Why do call him Saul? (*I'm sorry.*) No, you don't have to be sorry. You have some good reason for this, too.

3

But when he was in Tarsus, which is in the south of Asia Minor, and went to school there -- probably to the liberal arts college of Tarsus - I think he was a very good student there, which is always underrated. He had of course a full Greek education, Paul. He called himself Saulus from Tarsus. And then he went on and wrote a famous letter to the Ephesians.

Never heard of it? Where can you find the letter to the Ephesians? Where is it printed? (*In the Bible.*)

Yes, in a book quite well known formerly. Letter to the Ephesians. And what's the story about his own experience in Ephesus? Where do you find the experience of Mr. Paul von Tarsus in Ephesus? It was very unpleasant. What? Yes, Sir, yes. And what happened? Well have you never heard of the great outcry of the mob against Paul? *Great is the Diana of the Ephesians?* Never heard of this? {*None ever heard*}? Well, it's remarkable. The real religious revival in this country.

4

Gentlemen, Ephesus is a very great place. I hope it's all before you; at the age of 50 you may begin to read the Bible. And then you will find that the Apostle St. John lived in Ephesus, that Paul was persecuted in Ephesus and had a tremendous clash with the great cult of the Aphrodite or Diana of Ephesus, the goddess with the innumerable breasts, this fertility goddess of all Asia Minor, a tremendous cult.

You find in Naples, for example, in the museum, a wonderful, marble statue of this Diana of Ephesus. Nobody can see this without being deeply impressed about the fantastic imagination that worked these people up to throw their all and everything into these cults. Men were castrated -- the whole religion of eunuchs and castrates comes from this fact that the god of fertility had to receive the breasts of the women and the penises of the men to increase his fertilities. That's quite some sacrifice. That's worse than life, the human sacrifice.

Don't think it's anything ridiculous, Sir. It's quite serious, gentlemen. And against these mighty cults which intoxicated people, and led them to real sacrifices, it is very hard to fight with a sober religion, gentlemen, because religions only impress people when they ask for great sacrifices. You have no religion as long as you don't know that "religion" and "sacrifice" is the same word.

Religion is nothing nice, is nothing peaceful. It certainly is not for the peace of mind, or the peace of soul as modern bestsellers try to make you believe. But it is worship. And the service of God is a very severe service, gentlemen. And your God demands sacrifices from you.

## VI EQUATION OF THE PHYSICAL AND THE POLITICAL UNIVERSE

1

And since this country is told by its rulers -- yesterday in an after-dinner speech at 7 o'clock - that this country does not live by sacrifices, this is in a very bad mess. Every drop of blood shed today by the Israelis, the English, and the French is to be laid at Mr. Dulles' doorstep. He is responsible for all the bloodshed. But here sit the Americans back and say they want to stop the bloodshed which they have caused.

It's very scandalous, gentlemen, because you are not serious in these matters. And therefore you do not understand these philosophers of antiquity who had to fight against tremendous odds, against the severe cults of their cities -

no, no smoking:

and that's the sacrifice I have to ask from you.

2

And it is still astonishing how these men could stick their neck out and be heard. And we still listen to them. And I think the only reason is this deep desire to find men who were not totally encased in their nation, in their city, in Greece.

The word in Greek for the political unit is "polis." And our word "politics" comes from this word, which means the city-state. Of course, it was a city within walls with some fruitful territory around it. And the cult was always one of fertility god, as in Ephesus, of the Diana. And therefore all the people in all these cities for which these philosophers thought, were exposed to tremendous hardships, to tremendous sacrifices.

To sacrifice your firstborn and perhaps to castrate him in honor of the goddess -- that's not a small thing for a father. It's just as bad as the slaughter of Isaac through Abraham.

3

And you must think that the very abolition of human sacrifice, which the Old Testament tells you about - Abraham - and which you gloss over now as a minor thing, means that in all other tribes and cities, except Judaism, the human sacrifice still exists.

Why is it told in the Old Testament? Because Abraham is acquitted from this sacrifice, this bloody sacrifice. But all the Greek cities had it. And therefore all these

philosophers, try to find a way out of this anxiety of every individual, political order of every one polis to go it alone.

4

They tried to generalize, they tried to find some principles which would not make it necessary to be totally engulfed within the precinct and the walls of one city, in one's own mind. It is an attempt to unfetter the mind so that the physical universe and the political universe come to an equation.

## VII *ONE STORY FROM PARMENIDES TO HEGEL*

1

We still try -- laboring for this. Today it's a crisis which shows you how difficult it is, how you can overshoot the mark, and how the American idea -- everything is water -- does not immediately equate the real political situation of today with your ideal.

2

You want to live in a fools' paradise already. That is, you say, "All the whole globe is peopled by civilized nations, and therefore no war." Gentlemen, then you eternalize all tyranny.

If the Hungarians had said, "No bloodshed," as Mr. Dulles says, or through the mouth of Mr. Eisenhower said yesterday -- because I'm afraid our president says nothing on his own, so then you say, "No bloodshed."

Gentlemen, that's nonsense. You can't live that way. Tyranny cannot be eternal. Should the Hungarians not stone their tyrants? Isn't your heart uplifted by this fact that people with bare hands and naked fists can throw out a terrible tyranny?

But if you read the official statements in America, then any bloodshed is wicked.

It's nonsense.

There's good bloodshed and wicked bloodshed. It's both. You never know which is which. But certainly to say, "All bloodshed is wicked," is absolute nonsense. There would have never been a United States if the people had said this here.

And this deep sickness of your soul, gentlemen, is really something to behold, because you believe already that the physical universe is the only universe that exists, that the polis is already totally abolished. You are philosophically corrupt.

3

Now Parmenides is a great name, gentlemen, before Plato, who came forward -- and I had a friend who always said: it's one story from Parmenides to Hegel, from Parmenides to William James, from Parmenides to modern philosophy. It is always the same thing. Nothing much has been changed.

That's quite a challenge.

4

What did Parmenides? After these other people - there are a few other names whom I can pass over - had tried to encourage the youth of their cities with the idea that the mental world was wider than the world of their cult, and their city, and their military duty, that the right and wrong had to be thought outside the city walls, also.

After these people had stated -- stammeringly, you may say, and stutteringly -- these first possibilities, Parmenides comes and says, "All first impressions are wrong."

I have talked to you about first impressions and second impressions, have I not? And I said first impressions are those which ask for our immediate loyalty, which cannot wait.

When a house burns, you cannot doubt whether you should help putting it out. You have just to extinguish it.

Therefore your first impression must unleash an immediate act. You can see this. And if a man doesn't help extinguish a fire, he's a coward and he's a scoundrel. And no philosophy can ever justify it.

## VIII THE TEMPTATION OF THE INTELLECT

1

First impressions demand immediate action. They are not wrong impressions, but they are compelling impressions.

Against this, Parmenides is the first philosopher who has said, "*All phenomena of this world, including the political phenomena of the city, are to be looked through as wrong, as pseudo, as lying to our senses. And everything realized before I wake up to philosophy, all these first impressions are to be called cheat, illusion, lie.*"

He's the first who says that the phenomenal world is a world of what the Hindus would call -- how do the Hindus call this world of illusion?

2

Oh, you have heard of this, some of you. Mr. White. (*Nirvana?*)

Oh, a little knowledge is a bad thing. Terrible. It doesn't matter for you. Nirvana is just the opposite. Nirvana is the freedom from illusion. (*Karma.*)

Karma is your character. No, it's called *maya*. Have you never heard of *maya*, this appearance, the world of apparitions?

So really, this *nirvana* of yours is the sleep before one wakes up. Nirvana is the sleep after one has suffered too much.

Really, don't use words without context.

"Maya" is the illusion against which the philosophy tries to wake you up.

3

So Parmenides, gentlemen, is the first man who has the courage then imitated more or less by later philosophers, for example by the Frenchman Descartes, who says the first impressions are bad. They are wrong.

We should get rid, at your age, of all first impressions. I love my mother: illusion. Hated my father: illusion. I played games: illusion. I ran around with boys: illusion. It is a defiance.

4

This moment of the awakening of the intellect is of course for all of you a temptation. You really think that you can abolish God and the government by discussion. If you think so, if man is independent, you think you can forget that you constantly must breathe while you are thinking, so certain life processes have to be carried on.

Any man, gentlemen, whose mind is alive, goes through this phase of temptation where he tries to get outside the world by his mind, with the help of his mind, and make the mind the judge of all these previous impressions, and say, they may all be wrong.

## IX PARMENIDES

1

This is Parmenides, gentlemen. Therefore he has become - and you must keep his name carefully in mind, gentlemen - he is the prototype of pure philosophy, because he takes the philosopher for the first time outside the seriousness of the responsibility of the citizenry.

He says the philosopher must not be tempted by the illusions of the city in which he grows up, of the temple in which he worships, of the schools in which he is taught, of the parents whose heir he is. He must free himself of his environment in space and time.

And Parmenides therefore is the first man who tries to penetrate against his own local and his own temporal limitations. And it is the first radical statement of the ambition of all philosophy, gentlemen.

2

And Parmenides therefore is in a way more important than Plato. And more than Aristotle, because there is laid down the rule that the ambition of philosophy is to slay the dragon of times and spaces, and to discover, what is true outside your time and outside your space.

It is still your ambition, and you are much more Parmenides than you think. You are. Parmenides is perhaps nowhere more alive than in America.

3

How does he do it?

Parmenides is also the first man of whom we know in philosophy that he based his community on homosexuality. That is, he created an artificial home for the mind, where men and young boys could live together without any political need of marriage, of all the needs which would make these first impressions so utterly valid.

If you have normal life, the problem of childbirth and of parenthood immediately occurs, and then it is laughable to wait for philosophy until you can lay down the rule. You have already to comply.

But if you pervert man and make him autonomous, even in his lust, even in his sex, then you can create this fools' paradise of a philosophical club in which people are self-contained. In which they therefore do not have to comply with the laws of the city.

4

This is a deep problem, gentlemen, of homosexuality and mentality. And that's why it always creeps in where you get big bunches of boys -- or young men, students in Oxford or in Harvard. And the temptation is then always to become autonomous.

This is very serious. And you know how serious it is from very commiserating cases.

### X DISAGREEABLE THINGS

1

Homosexuality is the consequence of an abundance of mind, of an abundance of intelligence, waiting for second impressions, and stripping yourself of these so-called illusions, or first impressions, as not valid. Because in all these first illusions, there are certain laws that incest is forbidden, or perversion is forbidden, or whatever the obnoxious thing is, that befall the man who steps aside and begins to play in his mind with all possibilities.

It's possible to play -- to sleep with a cow, but it isn't right. It is forbidden.

Now if the mind is left to its sovereignty, the first thing is: nothing is forbidden. You can see that this is the first answer.

2

Therefore, gentlemen, all philosophy in Greece is tainted by this thing and we hear, from Parmenides that he already was a sweetheart of an older man, and that he had gathered around him many men. We don't know how much this was pure sex, and how much it was just sympathy; but it was this incredible tenderness, which you still find in Oxford and Cambridge permeating the whole atmosphere between the dons and the boys, and depriving the English home of much of this same fascination.

An Englishwoman always seems to me a very poor person, because she's deprived of these tendernesses which men in England extend to each other. They haven't to be homosexuals. But there is a spirit of sympathy and manly friendship in all English political life, too, in the Parliament, and in the colleges, which has been stolen from the hetero-erotic life between the sexes, which we would expect as going on between girl and boy, and husband and wife.

3

And England is a very good example of this possibility of transfer. The whole English political life is based on this strange transfer of the Eros from the life between

the sexes to the life between friends, between political or scholarly friends. It doesn't exist, I think, in any other country to that extent.

Here it is more just a vice. I mean, senators of the United States Senate have often been found guilty of homosexuality. But I think these are just frustrated people who never had the courage to love a woman. And it seems sometimes to be the line of least resistance, homosexuality.

It has many reasons. It is just sometimes frustration.

But not so in England. In England, it isn't very often homosexuality in any physical sense. I know a case where a young girl came to me in her plight in England. She loved a very beautiful man -- that's already very dangerous, if they are too beautiful. And he was in politics. All his ambition in politics. And when they were together, he would beat her up and only talk to her about his next speech in Parliament. That is, his love song was in Parliament, and with her he was just cruel until she had to run away from this man.

That's not rare. It's an old story in psychiatrics, that there is a whole tradition of flagellantism in England.

4

I must mention these disagreeable things, gentlemen, because Greek philosophy is an attempt to get outside first impressions, and that always means to get outside the city. And that always means to try to do without the community and its austere rules of chastity, and of probity, and of honesty.

## XI WHAT IS WRONG ABOUT ROBINSON CRUSOE

1

You can take different steps. A cynic would try to go it alone, and the Parmenides group would try to go it as a club. And so you can have various ways of escaping.

Or you can go on a desert island with your virgin -- *Paul et Virginie*, in an idyll, and have a couple set aside and live like Robinson Crusoe, or *Paul et Virginie*, the French novel, which according to the French is much more reasonable because it doesn't omit womanhood. *Paul et Virginie* is much nicer than Robinson Crusoe.

The English thought up Robinson Crusoe with a man helping him. What a boring island! That's typically England. And it was written in the high days of the development of the English character, and -

2

when was Robinson Crusoe written? It's very important. (*Actually the end of the 1700s.*)

I think 1718, something like that, if I'm wrong. About this time.

3

You know that all our economic theory is based on this, *Robinson Crusoe*.

4

It is very harmful, this world of mere men, because the economic man is in reality, gentlemen, the father of a family, a husbandman, who has a wife, and children, and sons who waste money, and daughters for whom you want to spend as much money as possible. And therefore in the real economic world, gentlemen, even the dollar-man, the man who is out for the money is...

*[tape interruption]*

...not even allowing her son to go to the doctor, because it would have cost money, so he remained a cripple all his life. You must read her biography. It's a great story}, where a woman takes over the function of the husband, to look out for the wherewithal.

## XII THE PARMENIDES DIRECTION

1

Now gentlemen, if a man in the family is out for making money, and the daughter is asking him to make her presents, and the son is out to making debts, running into debt, and the mother is there to economize with what is there, make both ends meet, you have a normal, human society.

But if you get a theory like Robinson Crusoe, then everybody is asked to be a Robinson Crusoe in economics, following only self-interest, and you get a mad society, which we have at this moment at the stock exchange.

2

I have this privilege quite often to talk to New York brokers. They strike me as the most insane group of people. They are absolutely insane. They think it is normal only to see the whole universe, and I talked to a bank economist four days ago.

Well, the man is absolutely crazy. He said, "Every year we gain by 3 percent in wealth and efficiency." And such mechanic ideas about human life.

3

The world is, in this country, full of these Parmenideses in economics.

And everything is artificial, because they only can see that every human being is like them, whereas the beginning of wisdom is to say that to philosophize, gentlemen, is something very eccentric, is a function for the community.

And I tried to show you from the beginning the nobility of philosophy is that it adds something to the orderly processes, because they do not suffice. They are deficient.

4

But if you say, "That's all," you go into the Parmenides direction.

### XIII *SPEAKING FOR SEVERITY AND AUTHORITY*

1

Now against this, Heraclitus stands up, and therefore I think he wrote against him, under the impact of this terrible danger, that there would develop a philosophic community, which would simply criticize the whole political world as insufficient; therefore would undermine morale.

It would be like the Alger Hisses in this country would anticipate a world state and would undermine the defenses of the United States in the meantime.

2

We had the same problem in the last twenty years. Whereas the Parmenideses in this country said, "Well, we already envisage a world society, therefore we have to give away all secrets of the United States to Russia."

This is all very practical, gentlemen. It's the total temptation always to think about your second thoughts as though they could abolish our first thoughts.

3

And it is very hard for you to believe -- that this is impossible, that children have to be educated with severity and with authority. You have to tell your children what is true and what is right. You can't get out of this and you can't say, "They shall find out themselves."

That's nonsense.

Then they will be monsters, like the Loeb brothers, who tried to find out themselves the perfect crime.

4

But this is still the theory in this country, the idea that the next generation can find out by themselves. Then you wouldn't be in this college, gentlemen. There would be no college, because this college is waiting for you and expects you to come.

Isn't that all prearranged? Isn't that all an attempt to save you much trouble?

#### XIV ERANOS

1

Now you can see, gentlemen, there is a long way from the Parmenides group, the first liberal arts college in the world, to us. I always simplify matters by saying, "No homosexuality on this campus." That's the distinction between Greek philosophy and modern philosophy. We cannot pay this price for thinking.

2

Once you look this through, you will find many other problems in this college already solved, which the Greeks could not solve in their philosophical clubs. They called these clubs love-meetings, *eranos*. And the word "eranos" is spelled this way: e-r-a-n-o-s. And it contains of course the word "eramai", I love. And is in the word "eros." And you know eros is the love, regardless of where it falls, whether between man and woman, or men and men, or women and women.

"Eros" is the word for the passion of the heart as well as of the body. It is not sex. You cannot translate "eros" with sex. That would be really an injustice to the Greeks. They have never fallen so low to call, to divide men. We are units, and if I love, I sing, and I want to embrace. But I do not separate my body from my soul, when I am in love, as you try to do.

Sex doesn't exist for decent people. That's for the animal. But eros does. Eros is the driving passion which makes us overcome our mutual shame and resistance and drives us into each other's arms.

3

So "eros" and "eranos" are connected.

The word "eranos" is the official term in Greece all these centuries for the friendly group in which people converse on problems of truth.

And there is today in Switzerland a yearbook, which is called Eranos, in which the leading people like Mr. Jung, the famous psychologist in Zürich, publish their findings, or poets like Hofmannsthal and Rilke. It's called Eranos, and is published every year, because this is the immortal term for the loving conversation between men. Eranos.

4

It's not argumentation. It's not discussion. It's not debate, what you think. It's not a lecture meeting where people then ask questions. But eranos is what you find in your book, *The Symposium*, of Plato. The Symposium is a one-evening eranos.

Eranos would be a constituted situation in which people meet twice a week at a symposium.

So the Platonic philosophy also climaxes in such an eranos.

## XV THE ARROGANCE OF THE PHILOSOPHER

1

So Parmenides is a terribly important figure for this reason, that he says, "All political impressions, and all first impressions," gentlemen, are as the translator "opinion," by which he means "worthless," "appearance," just "sham." And creates now a second term for the real, for that which is true.

2

And here is his famous word which today gives so much headache to the existentialists, and in my paper I have dealt with it, too. That is the word "essence." He says, "There must be behind all these semblances of political orders and technical laws the real world, which we cannot see. Behind water, there must be nitrogen."

He didn't know what nitrogen was, but he tried to penetrate into the elements and into the lasting truth of everything. And therefore, he said, "Opinion is what we receive first." And most people get stuck in opinion. "I, however, with my boyfriends, I devote my life to stabilizing the lasting truth against this passing truth of time and space."

And you get here this arrogance of the philosopher to tell you that he knows about the things outside time and space, whereas the ordinary man is blinded by time and space.

3

Now of course, you would admit that Mr. Parmenides never got outside time and space. He had to love his boys. And he was loved by his boyfriend himself. And therefore, he was very much in time and space. It is the illusion however, of most high-brows and most intellectuals that somewhere, through a oophole, they have escaped, like the devil out of the chimney from under the roof of common humanity, model humanity and they look more clearly, with a bird's-eye view.

Oh, "your survey courses," they are kind of this devilry still. They give you the impression that one can survey things.

4

Gentlemen, *nobody knows anything which he doesn't love.*

And all the attempts -- when I see these "individuals and society" people stream out and into this cave there, to this prison, I pity them. Nothing enters their heart. Therefore, they can understand nothing. Everything enters their brain.

It's a mistake, this course, a grave mistake. It's an illusion. Everyone of them should go on a farm or in a workshop and work one day, and he would know more about the individual in society than sitting there in this hall. You can't do it. It's impossible.

#### XVI WE ARE NOT OUTSIDE TIME AND SPACE, EVER

1

It's the great temptation of the Parmenideses, gentlemen.

The Parmenideses do think that outside the polis, outside the city is the proper place to philosophize.

Well, that's all right, to add second impressions, criticism; I'm all for it. But they go further and they say, "All the first impressions are wrong, and we are somehow outside space and time. We are idealists. We are in this famous second world" -- the ivory tower some people call it -- "where we can look down on the rest of the world -- through a telescope, as though this was another planet."

2

You well know that this is an illusion. We don't get outside our own planet. It's not true.

But this illusion feeds most philosophical tradition in the world, that the philosopher deals with all the passing units in space and time from some telescopic viewpoint, which tell us what space and time are.

That's not given to mortals, gentlemen. We are not outside space and time, ever.

Ever.

But philosophy has always, since Parmenides, tried to prove this point. This very point. And we come later to Plato's ideas and the ideas are somewhere immune against time and space.

It's very tempting.

3

And anybody who is out for the truth, gentlemen, must of course try to find some such foothold in the eternal, in the everlasting, in the unchanging, in the outside-space-and-time. Every one of us, I included, are always trying to persuade myself that I do not fall for the transient, for the mortal, for the corrupt, for the momentary, or the purely parochial.

Not one of us want to be provincial, gentlemen, but we all are.

But we can divide the world into those who say, "We are provincials," and the others say, "But we are not."

Now I side with those who say that they are provincials, preferably, to those who say they have no prejudices, and they are not dogmatic. Because that's their dogma.

4

Most philosophers you can trap because they say, "I have no dogma." That's a dogma. Nobody can live without certainties, gentlemen. It's impossible.

You live in some city. And if you don't live in the real city, you live in this dream city of nice students and as we try to live here in Dartmouth. And it's a pseudo-city.

This is an artificial existence, gentlemen. I can tolerate this and you can tolerate it if you say to yourself, "It is an artificial existence." Then no harm is done. If once you say, "This is normal, and the other people are all fools," then we go wrong. Then we must turn values topsy-turvy.

## XVII LIKE ANY MEDICINE

1

I think it is necessary for us to go through the hardship of this isolation for four years. That's a good training. But you must know that it is not the law of the universe, this separation of the sexes, here, these four years in Baker Library. Then, it can fulfill, like any medicine.

2

You don't say of a medicine that it is the norm, that it is the daily food. Yet you will not deny that medicine is a very good thing at times to take.

And so I feel that the liberal arts college is a medicine which should be swallowed as something that is in its own day a cure for the excesses of the human mind at the time when it begins to grow in you, and otherwise would confuse you.

And this community is an attempt to make you see that the mind is given us to pool our energies for the purpose of unanimity, for the purpose of common understanding, of fellowship, and then it does its thing.

3

There you see again, that Parmenides, as all great people, combines greatness and truth with falsehood. His perversion of the natural love between men and women is something we cannot imitate. The loyalty between these people to find out truth is something very much worthwhile. And the insistence only is that many of the first impressions need reprobation, or need criticism is also nothing to be followed up.  
*All freedom, all progress has been based on his power to get outside his own city.*

And it's very interesting, gentlemen, he was an American. He came from Elea to Southern Italy. And Southern Italy was a colonial state from Greece. And the Greeks settled there in Southern Italy and Sicily at great danger, because there were the Phoenicians, the Puni from Carthage, who were competing with them. Many of these harbors were in the hands of the Phoenicians at that time. Like Sardinia, that was totally Punic, Lilybaeum, other cities in Sicily. And so the Greeks came there under great danger.

This is a kind of situation as between the Spaniards here in Florida, or in Texas, and the Anglo-Saxons in the North. A similar, bloody competition. And there were many terrible events between Spanish settlers and Anglo-Saxon settlers for 300 years.

4

Now in the similar way, the Phoenicians in the south of Italy, and Sicily competed with the Greek settlers. Therefore these Greek settlers were pushed forward to modernize and streamline their thought as well as their civilization.

And in Parmenides, we have a man of the new type, a pioneering man who wanted to do away with these prejudices as living in a new-founded state and said, "Let's philosophize straight. And let's consider everything under general denominators. Let's forget our first loyalties. Let's not be prejudiced by any other, older religious cult."

So he goes so far to say, "All first impressions are illusions." Page 41, gentlemen, it is shortly stated there in small print:

"He wrote a poem in hexameter verse addressed to his pupil Zeno." You can also say "his sweetheart Zeno." "It was divided into three parts: the Prologue, the Way of Truth, the Way of Opinion."

Now it is just as queer as the Lucretius in that it invokes the gods, in the Prologue. But it then tells what is real being, what is the essence of things, unchanging, forever the same. And then says, "*But in order to condescend to you, foolish mortals, I'll show you how your way of opinion looks if I judge it, if I describe it.*"

## XVIII THE WAY OF OPINION AND: THE WAY OF TRUTH

1

And I have done the same now. I have just published two volumes of a sociology in German. And in my first volume, I deal with the illusions of the space-thinker. And then in the second volume, I try to tell my truth in terms of time-thinking.

So obviously the Parmenides situation repeats itself in every generation, that to a certain extent, one has to write with the Eros of one's contemporaries, in order to convince them that one is just as able as they are, to follow through their illusions, their prejudices.

2

And so I feel very strongly for this man, Parmenides, in this sense that I also have two volumes.

*The Way of Opinion* is my first volume, and *The Way of Truth* is my second volume. And the way of opinion is in my case the ephemeral way of momentary sensation, stimuli, impressions, and news; and the way of truth to me is the man who is able to represent three generations in his thinking, and has his father and his child in mind just as much as himself.

And you can see, these are two different people. The man who in any act thinks: how does this compare to the values of my father and of my son? -- will act very differently in his lawgiving and in his rules than a man who is swayed by the latest fad, about vitamins, or about the Mormons, or about some fad, as most of you think you have to.

3

And that is to me the way of truth and the way of opinion.

And therefore, the division of Parmenides is a stroke of genius. But we have a hard time to understand that to him the way of opinion was the way of my local environment, of my five senses. And the way of truth remained forever unchanging.

4

His difference is change, as the fools who run after change in space, and I tried to say yesterday to my class, that to you, gentlemen, who run always with opinion, who do not know that there is truth against opinion -- every three months you have a different truth, and you are very much insulted if a man already speaks up for the truth of your next three months, which is not very difficult to know. But you are insulted.

XIX *THE TRAGEDY OF HUMAN BEINGS*

1

I never forget when I was standing in The Wigwam -- what's it called? The Indian Bowl? In the Indian Bowl -- at that time, it wasn't called the Indian Bowl. It was before its first bankruptcy, and it was called The Wigwam. And there was the war announced under Mr. Forestal's secretaryship between Russia and us. And I was just sipping a cup of coffee. And next to me the student of Dartmouth elaborated on the fact that now there would be war.

And I said to him with a very quiet tone, "There will be no war."

And I was a leper to him at that very moment. At that time, you had to say on the Dartmouth campus that there would be war. Today everybody has to say the Americans will not be involved. Three months from now, they will be involved.

2

But this is just how this country lives.

On September 4th, 1939, I have heard the president of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, say over the radio, "There shall be no blackout of peace in America." And five months before, he had said to a friend of mine that this time, when the European nations went to war, the United States would have to go into this war within six months.

That's politics in this country.

But the whole country loves it. You eat it all up. "No involvements," headlines in the papers.

Is this politics? This is just for children. Children. How can a great statesman know what's going to happen? He can say, "I pray that we may not have to be involved." Never can he say, "There will be no involvement." That's more than human beings can say. That's forbidden. That's blasphemy.

That's God's will, and not human will.

So you elect a president 1916. He kept the country out of war so that he might take the country into war the next day. That's American opinion, gentlemen.

3

And that's exactly what Parmenides attacked. And therefore, Parmenides has an eternal position in your own breast, gentlemen.

If you will have to live this silly life of hunting opinions down, of chasing butterflies, which you think is the life of the informed mind in this country, who knows nothing, but is informed every day about something else, then you think of Parmenides, who was fed up with this and said, "I distinguish the way of truth and the way of opinion. And I cannot worship at the shrine of opinion, because I become the laughing stock. I become nauseated with myself. Shall I believe every three months something the opposite?"

That's no truth, gentlemen. That's silly.

And the childishness of this country has reached an all-time high, because you don't mind being sold down the river every three months for a different subject.

You think that's the way in which things have to move. You do not even want to be remembered -- or reminded, I should say -- of the fact that three months ago you believed the opposite.

4

So gentlemen, the Book of Truth and the Book of Opinion are enemies today, as they always have been. And therefore with all my regrets about Mr. Parmenides' homosexuality, I forgive him much, because probably it was at that time the only way of getting outside the fog. And a kind of violent medicine was taken.

The means was as atrocious as our H-bomb is, the homosexuality between teacher and students, gentlemen.

But it worked. It has had the tremendous merit.

And it is very strange: we have to say that we owe the Greeks a contribution which probably no other group could ever have made. On the balancing, on something unnatural, and counter-natural, they yet did something, and there we look into the tragedy of human beings.

## *XX THE SORE SPOT OF AMERICA ARE YOU - NOT YOU, YOUR EDUCATION*

1

If there is great corruption, the medicine is often corrupt, too, because two minus give us a plus. And the corruption of the individual passionate city who run to their

self-destruction in one war after another, led these philosophers to use desperate means.

2

Fortunately I think we live in a world in which the means don't have to be desperate.

But gentlemen, if you don't have to have homosexuality, for telling the truth, or knowing the truth, or learning the truth, sacrifices are still needed; courage is still needed.

The cowardice which prevails on this campus at this moment, gentlemen, and the timidity of your mind will destroy the colleges. I think -- 50 years from now, the colleges will all be abolished as perfectly unnecessary, because they no longer serve truth. They just serve opinion.

3

I'm very serious about this. Over the last twenty years, the American colleges have destroyed their right of existence.

If you want to hear a very distinguished American speak his mind about this, read Samuel Eliot Morison's, the great historian's of Harvard address in Kingston, Canada where he speaks out against that trash which today is called "truth" in your education. It's just appeared. I'd advise you very much to read it. "Freedom and Higher Education" it is called. Samuel Eliot Morison.

Things are in very bad shape, gentlemen. The sore spot in America are you. Your education. Not yourself. You are very innocent people, gentlemen. But what you do not contribute to the truth, you only contribute to the opinion.

4

For this we don't need colleges, gentlemen. Opinions form in every city, anyway. Opinion is that which is the gist of daily life, the routines of life. If you only repeat these routines yourself, if you do not obstruct them, if you do not appraise them, if you do not outgrow them, then why should there be a college?

Why should you have just the same life in an easier way of the plumber and the man at the filling station?

You must oppose their opinions to find out the truth. That's at least the idea of the liberal arts college as it was founded by Parmenides.

## XXI THE TWO WAYS OF CHRISTIANITY AND PHILOSOPHY

1

Now comes the dangerous result once more.

The essence says, "This group can forget about the city. It has no duties in the realm of first impressions."

That's Parmenides, the pure ivory tower concept.

Against this, Heraclitus says, "*We have to find the truth within the first impressions,*" and that's why the fathers of the Church called Heraclitus "the only Christian in all Greek philosophy."

2

Why?

Because the Christian suffers within his congregation and within his community for the truth. He doesn't go outside. But he is redeemed, to look through the opinions of the day, because he's willing to suffer.

3

Gentlemen, *anybody who is willing to be the underdog, who is willing to suffer, can know the truth.*

I have here a colleague, I told you this in class, who has shocked me terribly, because he said under any dictatorship, he would comply, because he couldn't suffer. And he would certainly have helped to extinguish the Jews in Germany; and in Hungary, he would have shot down, as the secret police, the peasants, because he would go with the power. He has no guts to resist evil.

I said to him, "Do you know that you then commit evil?"

"Yes," he said. "Maybe I have to admit it."

And I said, "You are much worse than the evildoers, because the lukewarm are always the ones who make life impossible." The lukewarm are always the majority, and they are the real guilty ones. Because the evildoers are punished by their wickedness; but the lukewarm think that they are not punishable, if they have done nothing wrong. They have just followed their so-called enlightened self-interest or what-not.

4

Now this colleague of mine, gentlemen, is a very important example of one fact: if you are willing to suffer, you can know the truth inside the existing orders. As long as you do not identify yourself with the powers that be, the full realm of truth is available, because the truth is between the culprit in court and this district attorney. Neither has the district attorney the full truth nor the criminal. But if you could take the two together, you would have the full truth of the case.

That's why Jesus sided with the culprits, because the district-attorney wisdom He had anyway. He was innocent. But if He was also on the side of the culprits, He represented the whole truth of human community life.

That's why it is equally important that Jesus was innocent, and that He was found on the side of the sinners. Because by innocence, I share the insight into the righteousness of the law, but by siding with the sinners, I also see the incompetency of the law, that the law is never enough, that the law doesn't cover all the facts of life. It's always limited.

So gentlemen, *he who can suffer, Christianity says, can know the truth.*

Philosophy says: *he who can get outside can know the truth.*

These are the two ways of philosophy and Christianity, and they are always in opposition.

## XXII ANYWAY

1

Now I now may ask you to have read next time this paper of mine.

Who has read it already?

2

Well, I make this point that this word "essence," is an attempt to sanctify the easy talk of boys outside the city. In the city, there are no such pronouns and proverbs, like "being." In the city, you only know that war is raging, a pestilence is coming, a ship is landing, prices are high. That is, events which you can name. There all named events happen.

And in a symposion, in an eranos, we can talk about essences, abbreviated, as you talk always of God, "the thing," or "something."

3

When you try to explain what you do not want to name, you speak always of "something," or "anyway".

Most people say, when they mean God, "anyway." You can test this out. It's very strange. When you find people are quite serious, "I have to do this anyway," they mean, "It's the will of God that I have to do it. I wouldn't like to do it."

So you all use these very same abbreviations which I pillory there in my letter.

And Heraclitus -- as a major elder statesmen in Ephesus - tries to say exactly what the Christians say. If a man would see its own opposite in his own opposite in the city, he would not have to get outside. If he would have the wits, which later Christ had, to pray for His enemies, because they don't know what they are doing; if you could see once your own opposition, your own enemy as comprised in one unit, the district attorney and the culprit, you would see the full workings of the universe.

4

And as fire and water are needed, and air and earth in their contrast to support us, and woman and man, and friend and foe, we cannot abolish these contrasts.

### XXIII THE WAY TOWARD AN THE WAY BACK

1

You live here in a world which preaches: all men can be friends, there don't have to be foes. It's an error. You can only have friends as long as there are foes. It's not possible, if everybody's a friend, nobody's a friend. And then enmity will break out in between friends, because opposites are necessary.

*You have to have enmity in order to have life.*

2

So Heraclitus' deep sermon is against the Parmenideses and their juvenile henchman: "Don't set up this second community."

Of course, he went unheard, but he made a tremendous impression.

3

Plato, gentlemen, is the combination of Heraclitus and Parmenides, because Parmenides says, "Pure essence. Outside experience. Forget your first experiences. Begin from scratch."

Heraclitus says, "Nonsense. Truth is inside our deepest experiences."

We only are too short of breath. We only say—what shall I use as an example? -- "Well, I go in this direction; I go from Elea to Miletus."

A man who is wise considers that at the same moment some person must go from Miletus to Elea. He makes the very strong point that to every achievement there is the way toward and the way back.

It's one thing to climb a mountain.

4

Who has climbed a mountain? I suppose you all have. Gentlemen, some of you will admit that the way down sometimes is much more disagreeable than the way up. And if you only consider the time it takes to climb a mountain, you are utterly wrong. It is just as much a problem to come down without sore feet.

#### XXIV TOO MUCH MONEY INVESTED IN THE WRONG DIRECTION

1

He has this great picture, Heraclitus. And he says,

*"The way up and the way down are the same way, but they look utterly different."*

And most people in your own desire, try to get somewhere, gentlemen. But all human ways have also to be evacuated.

2

It's very nice to become president, gentlemen. But it takes great wisdom not to stand for re-election. That's a way back. That's just as much God-given, gentlemen. And that is, of course, in Christianity called the wisdom of death, that we have to die to our ascent.

Death is the most general term for this way back. We get up, but for Mr. Rockefeller, it was one thing to acquire the millions. It was just as difficult for him to get rid of

them. And so he pays all these idiots for their Rockefeller stipends and makes great havoc in American civilization, because all kind of nonsense is produced now on account of this money. It's called beneficial. It's a bribe.

3

You simply don't think about this, gentlemen. My consequence of Mr. Rockefeller's foundation would be that he should never have acquired so much money in the first place, because now it has to be invested in this dead weight, in this dead-hand of a foundation and put to all kind of obsolete uses. And that's not good.

I would consider then therefore a legislation justified which would prevent any man to make so much money as Mr. Rockefeller.

That's my logic. Because I see how all research today is handicapped by these foundations who are full of old-time prejudices, all the heads of these foundations are anxious people who don't want to make blunders. And will never support a bold venture in thinking, but will always support the most stupid and old-fashioned kind of inquiry and research.

4

The money that is spent over the last twenty years on cancer is all wasted.

Why?

Because people twenty years ago thought that cancer had to be something like Pasteur's infectious diseases. And therefore all the money was spent in imitating Mr. Pasteur, who did his experiments in 1878. And the cancer research has been delayed for a whole generation because of too much money invested in the wrong direction.

Anybody who tried to say in 1920 that cancer was not such a disease could not become a professor of physiology in this country, or in Europe for that matter. And all the money of the foundations was thrown behind the people who had the obsolete, aping ideas of saying it was something like hydrophobia.

Isn't that the word for the dog disease?

And so we are very far behind what would have been possible if people hadn't had this foundation money.

## XXV HERACLITUS

1

So the way back, says Heraclitus, is just as important as the way in.

How do you get out of any fixation?

2

Take the Constitution. It's very nice to have an ironclad constitution which you can never change. But gentlemen, it can lead to great disaster if in a decisive moment no constitutional amendment can pass through the two-third of the states, or how many have to be? Three quarters? (*Three-quarters.*)

Well, don't you think that's a very dangerous proviso? In a decisive moment, that can lead to the destruction of the union, because the amendment is not passed in time.

So the way back, that is the power to alter what we have done, is very important.

Same problem with any new human vow. Very nice to say "no divorce." If you look into real life, there are marriages that are such hell that you have to find a divorce. That's also a way back.

3

Now Heraclitus says, "While you are in for one thing, you have already to allow the community to have an ordinance which also allows you to get out of this again."

This seems very simple, gentlemen, but you all live only in one direction always. Every opinion means, "Today is everything. I'm only looking in this direction".

Real philosophy would mean that although you are allowed to go full and wholeheartedly in one direction, there is some mechanism which protects you against the Dionysian orgy of your will and mine -- and says later, "Now come; we'll get you out of this trap."

4

So you see perhaps that Heraclitus is the wiser, the older type of man. He is the type of elder statesman.

And that's why I think that he wrote to Parmenides after he was dumbfounded by the boldness of this new approach of Parmenides, who declared that truth can only be had through people who get totally out of the city, totally out of the laws of the times and out of politics, and looked at the world from the outside. And he says, "You can have this if you are wise inside."

And that's the only way in which we can really have wisdom.

## XXVI EXISTENTIALIST AND ESSENTIALIST

1

So you can see why Plato is a combination later of Heraclitus and Parmenides. Parmenides he follows in the purity of his search, outside the passions of the city. But the content of his thinking is dictated by Heraclitus. He says, "I must find the real city."

Parmenides is not interested in the city at all. He negates it. He wants to have the truth of the essences, of being outside any human political intercourse. He has his autonomous world. And Plato, he wrote a Republic, because in devotion to Heraclitus, he knew that the real human wisdom could not remain outside the affairs of men.

2

Perhaps we read now a few fragments -- on page 41 - so that you can see the difficulty for our friend Parmenides to formulate that which has been the bugbear of all future philosophy: What is essence? What is being?

3

For the last 30 years in France and Germany, there rages a battle between existentialists and essentialists. The existentialist is a Heraclitean, who says, "I know nothing but actions, certain days and acts of my life." The essentialist is a man who says, "I can penetrate behind space and time."

All Roman Catholics today are much less Christian than they are essentialists; they are philosophers. It's a very strange turnaround. Most Catholics I know are philosophically corrupt by Parmenides, because they believe in essences.

4

Now it's not a crime of the Christian faith to believe in essences, but that's what most of these educated Catholics unfortunately believe. Thomas Aquinas inherited from the Greeks this tradition.

And therefore people perorate in Manhattan College in New York with great eloquence on essences. Following Parmenides.

Before Parmenides, nobody ever knew what an essence could be.

## XXVII FROM ACTION TO THOUGHT

1

Will you kindly read -- we have still 10 minutes -- 7 and 8 on page 43 -- oh no, Number 6 on page 43. Who has it? Will you?

*"One should both say and think what being is.*

*But to be is possible, and is not possible.*

*This I command you to consider.*

*For from the latter way of search first of all I debar you.*

*But next I debar you from that way along  
which wander mortals knowing nothing.*

*Two have perplexity in their bosoms, their intelligence astray.  
And they carry along as deaf as they are blind,  
amazed, uncritical, by whom to be and not be  
are regarded as the same and not the same.*

*And for whom in everything there is a way of opposing stress."*

As in two minds. Which is a much better translation.

Go on. Do you have it? Ja.

2

*"For this view can never predominate, that that which is not, exists."*

No. That that which is not, exists. It is difficult, I grant you. Ja. Go on.

3

*"You must debar your thought from this way of search,  
not let ordinary experience in its variety force you along this way,  
namely that of allowing the eye, sightless as it is,  
and ear, full of sound, and the tongue to rule.*

*But you must judge by means of reason, logos.*

*The much-contested proof, which is astounded by me.*

*There is only one --"*

There you have it. The five sense are rejected.

You may also say, gentlemen, that if Parmenides, and all philosophers, who move into their ivory tower of pure thinking, one thought must beget the next thought.

In normal life, here I think something. If I go out the door, I have another thought, because while I am going out of the door, I have seen something and I have made a different experience. All our thinking of normal human beings occurs this way.

We do something. Strikes us such-and-such. Then we go on to another action. And again we have a thought. That's the way I live: going from action to thought, from action to thought, from action to thought.

4

Philosophy however, in Parmenides reaches a point, and that's in this paragraph, it's a little difficult for you to grasp. What you think is correct, that a syllogism, as in mathematics can proceed without further experience in their meaning. That is, I have grasped one clear thought, let me say that all is just one space.

Now the philosopher tries to deduce his next thought. If there is only one space, all men are contained in one space, and should live in one world state. That's what most philosophers conclude.

The logic is that it is more normal to live in one state than in many, if you start with the assumption that the world is one space by the nature of things.

#### XXVIII MOST PEOPLE THINK SPORADICALLY

1

This is the typical philosophical conclusion, whereas gentlemen, when I conceive of the sun shining here and say, "Oh, the universe is wonderful," and then I stumble

out of this room and fall over the staircase, I say, "But this room is fully built," I don't connect in my experience the problem of the sun shining over the universe, and the space here confined to my political entity.

I have no such theory that the whole world should be one world state, because I do not conclude from one logical basis other assumptions.

2

Most people think erratically, sporadically.

3

Now the whole problem of Parmenides is to persuade his henchmen, to persuade the student, as Mr. Mandelbaum does it in his class, and every one of us in our department does it -- that it is possible and worthwhile to have a maxim, to have a basis of thought, one assumption, and to build on this assumption certain waterproof, logical conclusions, without intervening new experience.

That has been the temptation of all systematic philosophizing.

I think it goes against all first impression. All the first impressions of a child are that it does something. And then it says, "How strange that I did this". Then it does something else again and again it says, "How strange that I did this." But it's a very far way of demanding from a normal human being, a taxi driver, to connect all these afterthoughts, after any one of these actions to a well-rounded system.

And your mother never achieved this and had never any intention of achieving this. She's quite a reasonable person, but she's far from ever having the idea that all her thoughts had to form a logical whole.

4

This is however Parmenides' assumption. Once you get outside the light of first impressions, of first actions, of first responsibility, of direct obedience to law, then you have to embark on the center of this ivory tower, that on this first thought you must build more thought.

*XXIX ALL OR NOT AT ALL*

1

So you can say, gentlemen, Parmenides is

*thought upon thought upon thought.*

Once you understand that this is not the normal life of man, you see how artificial philosophy is, and how dangerous it is.

2

I do not say that it's always wrong. You can reach certain conclusions. But certainly it's a second way of life. And you can never wish that any child, for example, should ever become a philosopher throughout. It's impossible. It would damage his responses.

3

Now let's still read the last paragraph, and then have done. But that's quite important. Here, the next. "There's only one other description." Would you? Your neighbor? You read it?

*"There's only one other description of a way remaining.  
Namely, that what it is, is.*

*In this way, there are very many sign-posts,  
that being has made coming into being no disruption.  
For it is whole { } without motion and without end.  
{ } together was, or will be, because it is now.*

*A whole, all together, one continuous for what creation of it will you look for?  
How, whence could it have sprung?  
Nor shall I allow you to speak or think of it as springing from not being."*

That's our conception of creation out of nothingness. He denies this, as an impossible thought. Everything has been there all the time. It's this.-- Ja?

*"For it is neither expressible nor thinkable that what is not, is.*

*Also what necessity impelled it, if it did spring from nothing,  
to be produced later or earlier.*

*That must be absolutely all or not at all."*

4

That's a very good sentence to sum it all up. He says all these appearances, winter and summer, behind it is weather, behind it is some state. Winter is changing. Summer is changing. But there is something in summer and winter which I call

being. That's behind these opinion-creating semblances of warm, or cold, or sunshine, or rain, or snow.

And we haven't reached any further perfection.

If you ask me what's behind the galaxy, behind the firmament of stars, there's no answer. Why are they there? We still have to accept that there must be some meaning in all these tremendous movements in the stars' being. What it is?

XXX

1

Nobody has ever expressed it better than Parmenides. And also, if you read it now, it sounds very hollow.

Yet it is a challenge. You see the sky move.

2

The people in Argentina see the sky move. And we all see it in different times, and different stages. "What is it in essence?" Parmenides cries.

*"What is the essence of all this?  
And what is not opinion about it?"*

*So far as that is concerned, justice has never released being in its fetters  
and set it free, either to come into being or to perish,  
but holds it fast.*

*The decision on these matters depends on the following:  
that's the way of truth, or it is not.*

*It is therefore decided, as is inevitable, that one must ignore the one way  
as unthinkable, and inexpressible, for it is no true way,*

*and take the other as the way of being and reality."*

3

Now the strange thing is that everything the normal child of God calls "This is," he calls "Not being".

"This is sweet." He says, "That's a delusion, because for somebody else it may taste sour. Therefore I will not give the predicate "sweet" to anything except in the realm

of illusions, and the chemist will bear him out today and say, "We have penetrated behind sweet and sour, and we know that these are just degrees of some, order in the composition of things. It's just expressed by numbers.

*"How could being perish? How would it come into being?  
If it came into being, it is not.*

*And so too" -- because then it hasn't been at one time –  
"if it is about to be at some future time.*

*Thus coming into being is quenched and destruction also into the unseen."*

4

Will you kindly take the trouble and read for the next time the pages 44 and 45?

## TENTH LECTURE: A SECOND REALM OF AFTERTHOUGHT

### I THE WONDERFUL COMA

1

If you understand the entrance of Parmenides and the so-called Eleatic school into the history of the human mind, you will find that Parmenides, living in the then-America of Greece, in South Italy, across the ocean, across the sea in a colonial environment, for the first time reversed the order of first and second impressions, and said in so many words, "The cults of the gods of my home city, and the legislature of my constitution are unreal compared to the insight I can get of the lasting character of the natural order," of physis.

2

This has been the tenet of all philosophy ever since, that the first impressions have to be brushed aside or scrutinized by the second impressions to such an extent, gentlemen, that we should try to forget what we have experienced in love, in faith, in hope, in traditions, in law, in justice in the first 20 years.

It is a horrid claim. And it is always again being defeated by wiser philosophers. But it is repeated time and again.

The whole American enlightenment of the last 200 years -- I just happened to read in an article in the Journal of Higher Education in which this man says, and Mr. Eliot Morison, I told you, Samuel Eliot Morison repeated it -- this article in the Journal of Higher Education came right after the Second World War -- he said, "America is drunk with the idea that the laws of a Mau-Mau tribe and the laws of the United States are of equal value compared with the nature of my mind. I can look objectively at these things."

3

Now gentlemen, no man in his reason can think for one moment that this is true. But it is taught this way, that the law of the land is purely historical, purely evolutionary, purely passing, and the laws of nature, however, of the atom and of your mind are eternal.

This megalomania of philosophy, gentlemen, is paramount in your own brain. Most of you are the victims of this idiocy. And that's why I have to show you the relative grandeur and the relative misery of this position.

4

If first impressions, gentlemen, become the football of second impressions, of what we have called "philosophy," by a group of onlookers, then the whole history of philosophy is set in motion down to the destructive character of Mr. John Dewey's philosophy of pragmatism; then everything is pragmatic; then the means are more important than the ends; and then you understand the American household, bowed under the installment plan, where a man has an income of \$500, \$400 are earmarked for the rest of his life with mortgaging his future, and his house is cluttered up with unnecessary things.

Because then, tradition is nothing. Debts have not to be paid.

We live exactly in 1928, gentlemen, today again in this same fools' paradise, that all the old laws of the ages are abolished, waste is better than saving, death is abolished, madness is abolished. And so the country is exactly today as you know, in 1956, again in this wonderful coma that the laws of the city have been abolished in favor of some philosophical trick by which you can expect a pay raise every year, automatically. There will be no crisis. There will be no war. If there is a war, the little schoolteacher of America will lift her finger and say, "That's very bad, very nasty," and you will vote for a government that promises you elimination of all hardship, of all sacrifices.

That's philosophy of pure nature, gentlemen.

## II ROME FOUNDED BY ENLIGHTENMENT

1

Parmenides is already anticipating, gentlemen, all later schools of philosophy, as I want to show you. If you take the result of Parmenides' secession to the sacred mountain -- 20 years later in the city of Rome, they had the famous secession of the plebeians from the aristocrats.

Who has heard of this secession of the plebs? Has anybody? Well, that's all that you know still from history.

2

Well, it is said that in 496, in the days just of this same South Italian upheaval of the mind in Parmenides, the plebeians already tried to secede from the old traditions of the Roman city, and went to the sacred mountain, to the Mons Sacra, and the famous story then it was told to them, when they were asked to return -- do you know the story?-- told to them by the aristocrat Menenius Agrippa that they were the stomach of the city, because they were the toilers. They produced the bread.

And of course the stomach one day was very angry, because he had to serve all the other limbs of the body, so he went on strike.

But then Menenius Agrippa shows very nicely that the poor stomach could not live without the limbs, and could not stay outside the operations of the heart, and the brain, and the speech, et cetera.

3

That's the famous first attempt to secede. And I'm quite sure, and I think as research goes on, and we will come to see this more clearly, most of the constitution of Rome, gentlemen, was worked out under the impact of the South Italian philosophers.

And there are many other signs that the whole Roman constitution already was largely influenced by the philosophies of Southern Italy in the 5th century. That makes Rome so such an interesting community, because Rome is already founded not simply by tradition, but already by the Enlightenment.

Very much as this country. Rome is the Jeffersonian democracy, so to speak, of antiquity. And it also had originally a very weak government, for one year only. And two consuls, competing with each other.

It's very much like the Congress and the president, checks and balances.

4

And -- well, I'm not going into this, but I only want to point out that Parmenides already sets the pace for an influence of philosophy on the political practice of the communities. And although this is as yet not accepted, I think it is most probable that the results of this man in Elea, which is a little south of Naples, already had an impact on the whole of Italy, especially the Roman republic and its neighboring cities in Latio.

### III *PHYSIS A PRIORI?*

1

More clearly you can see, gentlemen, that with Parmenides, there is set in motion a whole chain reaction. First, the second impressions of the natural world are more original, somebody will hold, than the laws of any city.

The laws of the city are arbitrary, what Rousseau said.

2

You have heard that much of Rousseau. He says, "Man in a state of nature is good; the laws of the city are all pseudo. They are all forgeries. They are all misnomers."

3

And so you get instead of mind and Heraclitus, definite loyalty to first impressions, that first the cult and the law, that is, Church and state, of the city have to be upheld and must not give way to second impressions -- you get immediately after Parmenides, gentlemen, the new order.

4

If the first impressions are all semblances of reality, if they mislead us, as Parmenides-to-Hegel people teach, then obviously nature is first -- physis is first, as you may say physis is *a priori*. And the city comprehended in the term, "the law," as you find it also in the Bible, "the law." The world of the law -- of human law is second.

Greek, this is "nomos." You have heard of "economy," which means the nomos, the law of the ecos, of the household -- its husbandry, economy. You have heard of "bionomics," perhaps. Nowadays Mr. Tillich in Harvard speaks of "theonomics," of the law of God under which our own will is revealed as His will.

#### IV MEN'S LAWS ARE BETTER THAN NATURE

1

So "nomic," "nomos" is a very important word, which I recommend -- take it into your notes. In Greek, the word "law," Latin, "lex", is expressed by the word "nomos" as we have it today in "economics."

And you need this word to understand now that what I have called "ethos" so far, in the reversal, by the philosophers, now becomes "nomos." And "nomos" means in their eyes human invention, human doing, human position.

The Greek word for position is "thesis." "Thesis" means it is put on, by my will, by my rationalization.

2

And it is very strange, gentlemen.: if I meet an American boy discussing these problems, he always thinks that that's just human fallibility or wrong law, that his reason is infallible, and he can judge the law.

Since I'm always been an arch-reactionary in political thinking I have never understood how all the students in the whole world always have this brazenness to say that their reason is excellent. But the reason of all the legislators is just arbitrary.

And if you could only educate these benighted people who have blue laws, who have censorship for obscene movies, or who have laws that there should be no work on the Sabbath, and the people who burned the witches in Salem -- if you could have only enlightened the legislators with your own light, then all these terrible laws would never have happened.

When I then talk to these people, I'm very happy that these reasonable people are not legislators, because I find their mind absolutely incapable of formulating any law.

I don't think there is any one boy in this class who could formulate a law for human society. You're totally unprepared for this.

3

Yet you trust your philosophical mind to sit in judgment and say, "Nature is better than men's laws."

Gentlemen, to me this is utter nonsense. Men's laws are better than nature. Because I'm a piece of nature, and the most extravagant piece of nature. God created me to help nature.

And obviously, gentlemen, I still think that the Assuan Dam is better than the Nile, if it could be built. And that the George Washington Bridge is the completion of human nature crossing from one side to the Hudson River than the whole Hudson River itself. And Erie Canal, too, is better than the Lake Erie.

4

So I don't understand you. And I don't understand this kind of American philosophy which really thinks always the light of the critic who writes on Homer -- about a play, or a law, or a political party or so - is perfectly inhuman, is infallible. But the things he judges are humanly so frail, that they are less than he.

V MR. PARMENIDES' ATTITUDE

1

It is absolutely ridiculous to me, but this is the American heresy, that every later-comer has a better mind than the people who pass the law. To my mind, it is obvious that my mind, since I have not suffered as the people who fought in the Civil War, and went to war there against slavery, obviously they are more competent to judge the question of slavery than I do.

But you don't think so. You always think because you are born later, your lazy mind is more alert than these people who have decided to lay down their life for a new law.

2

Have you decided to sacrifice anything for your judgment? Always ask yourself the simple question, gentlemen: How much is the critic willing to pay for his truth?

Then you will know how true he is.

And if you read Mr. Atkinson on the new play in The New York Times, that's utterly ridiculous to trust him, gentlemen. But you all read only book reviews and judge all the books by book reviews.

The general plebiscite in this country among the college students is that the critic is cleverer than the poet.

3

Now who suffers in writing this poem -- if he is a poet? The poet. The critic is paid for passing silly judgments. Costs him nothing. Absolutely nothing.

That is Mr. Parmenides' attitude, however. You go outside the city. You look at these laws, and you declare them to be second-rate. Because "I'm communing with nature."

We had such a gentleman here. He was quite famous on this campus. When you met him in the middle of the talk with him, he would simply stop and fall silent. And you would be very surprised. It was rather impolite, after all, you were in the midst of a talk. And after a minute, he would speak to me and say, "Oh, pardon me. I had just to commune with nature."

Yes! Imagine!

4

Now here he was, condescending to the pigs and leaving me alone. And I'm a human being.

Well, you find this nonsense. It comes from Rousseau. It comes from Thoreau. You commune with nature. Costs you nothing, because nature doesn't answer you. It's a waxen nose.

He stood there on campus, and probably just yawned inside -- and that he calls "communing with nature," no resistance.

I offer him resistance. So he didn't like me. It's very simple to commune with nature. It's just vacuum.

But all this nonsense, you can hear in every Pentecost divine service on a mountain here with frozen noses.

Yes, or Easter is even worse, because it's still colder. Yet that's how they try to captivate you, the modern church, by pulling you out into the cold there on an Easter morning and selling you this as communion with nature.

You shall not commune in the church with nature. You shall commune with your creator and your brother man.

But this heresy is all rampant, gentlemen. This kind of detrimental church service is a typical capitulation to the philosophers who say, "Nature first," gentlemen; that is, the dead things first. And man is no longer in nature, but he's just a fallible lawgiver who runs after nature and is less than nature.

## VI DIRTY PROCESSES

1

So gentlemen, the problem since Parmenides is that philosophy tempts any man to say, "I must get out of politics." Well, you hear so many people say this, "Politics is dirty. This is just politics."

2

Gentlemen, a man who gets out of politics because it is dirty just doesn't know himself how dirty he is. So what else can politics be but dirty? Don't you know how dirty you are? You have to shit. And well, what is shitting, gentlemen? It is a problem of consumption. It is a problem of goods. It is a problem of your daily bread.

Isn't that very serious? That's nothing to laugh about.

3

So politics have to deal with these dirty processes. Because we are greedy. We are afraid if we aren't fed well. You are dissatisfied if your father doesn't buy you a car. That comes from somewhere.

And it comes from an attempt of politicians to satisfy your nature by articulating something that will coerce your nature so that you don't destroy the city.

4

Now obviously, their law is a little better than your own natural instincts. It may not be good enough. You may improve the law. But you cannot improve the law by saying, "My instincts are better than the law."

That's however the general gist of modern Americanism. That's called "pragmatism." First my desires and wishes, and then I frame the universe after my wishes.

## VII PUT ON BY MAN

1

Do you think there would be any government in the world if this has prevailed? Neither the United States forged in Valley Forge nor the state of Israeli could exist for one minute on your philosophy. It is contemptible. It's an old-women philosophy.

2

Yet it prevails in this country. And there sit these people and cry out, because the Israeli broke through these fetters of a constant deadly threat of their existence. That comes first.

3

But here you are, and it leads immediately -- will you take it down? -- Parmenides leads for any philosophical group, for any high school, for any college, for any university to the temptation to say, "The laws of nature are better as we find them -- as observers -- than the laws of men." Therefore, the relation is no longer that, as I put before you, *logical, ethical, physical*.

But as soon as you give the little finger to mere philosophy, not in a balance to your divine service, to your religious loyalty, or political loyalty, but if you say, "I'm first a philosopher," then you get into this situation that you will call the ethical, gentlemen, the "merely political," or logical -- or *nomical* -- or positivist.

4

That's the best translation of "*thetical*," of "thesis. Put on by man. What Hegel or what the Marxian calls the "thesis," and the "antithesis," and the "synthesis." It's what I do rather arbitrarily, and thereby challenge to be resisted and contradicted by the antithesis.

## VIII EPICURUS

1

As soon as you therefore, gentlemen, see yourself safe outside the city, with your homosexuality, your independence of marriage, of children, of the whole growth of wisdom through the generations, if you have your second world to yourself, as in ancient Greece these people did get it, Mr. Henry Miller has now construed, I am told, the same thing at the Pacific Coast, you get the reverse nature-physis. Nature is first.

2

We may call it with the learned expression, the *a priori*. That is before I wake up to think. And the second is, the world in which I actually grow up is then the *a posteriori*. It comes later. That is, it's second to my own mind, and I judge it as merely nomical, or thetical, or positive. That is, it is not a part of the created nature, but it is just done by human wit.

And this human wit is then under my judgment more than nature. To natural law I have to bow; but human law, I can sit in judgment and criticize.

3

Now gentlemen, the schools of thought that has streamed out of this Eleatic school is tremendous. Let's put this word -- you have to learn this, the Eleatic school -- you find in your book of Mrs. Freeman's the list of all these names.

And I still take it that you have learned how to read and write, and I'm not going to take from you the duty of reading these names yourself, Theophanes and Zeno, and the other adherents of this school.

4

It's not important, those names. But it is very important that you understand that at the outcome, Epicurus, the Epicureans, and the Stoics are immediately born much later -- 250 years later -- Epicurus says, "Therefore my relation to nature is all that matters, and there is no loyalty to the city needed. My private bliss taking to the hills, when the draft calls you, is all that matters."

That's Epicureanism. He was a very noble soul, but it was a life for him alone, which he recommends. The world is so nomical, so abused by politics that he says, "Not for me." And the perfect bliss of the Epicurean is to enjoy in wisdom, by the way, and in great subtlety, you may even say, and refinement the goods of life and the being alone, perhaps with his friends.

But without responsibility for the whole of the world which cannot be helped, anyway, which is going to the dogs, as all Republicans thought under Franklin D. Roosevelt.

## IX *THE STOICS AND THE WORD: COSMOPOLITAN*

1

You talked then to a businessman, "The country's always going to the dogs." It's a general practice of the defeated party to say that the country is going to the dogs, because it is going to the other party.

Well, that's Epicurus, gentlemen.

At the same time, the Stoics said, "If you penetrate deeply enough into nature, nature will serve you with laws which are the best for the real city of man."

2

The Stoic lives in nature as his city. He is a cosmopolitan. "Cosmos" and "polis" grow together there in this wonderful word "cosmopolitan". The physical world is the polis of the wise.

Therefore you see that already in Parmenides the much later school of the Stoics is raising its head.

3

Parmenides didn't say this, because he had just to conquer a way of life outside the city. But if can you see immediately in the history of philosophy that if you

think this through to all its consequences, it means that I can create out of my head the real city. And this real city must coincide with physis, with the whole natural world.

Therefore I can only be a citizen of the world. And "polis" and "cosmos" coincide in the word "cosmopolitan."

4

And therefore you see that at the end in the Stoa, in the Epicurean world, man is alone. And here "physis" and "nomos" coincide. That is meant by the word -- those of you who write on the Stoa can see there the seed of the great Parmenidean conception of freeing myself from the immediate appearances of my environment.

It leads then to the reversal of the order: the cosmos is the only city that counts.

#### X *MARCUS AURELIUS*

1

Marcus Aurelius, the emperor, who was the last philosopher king in antiquity in 180 A.D., he wrote in his diary that Zeus was the king of the city in which he, the emperor, lived. That's the good expression of this cosmopolis, where he tries to see that he is a citizen of the world.

2

A very American expression and very American conception. A great desire of man, to arbitrate between the discord of one political society, like the United States of America, and the whole world, here they now use the United Nations for this kind of smokescreen so that every American can at the same time be a good American taxpayer, and at the other hand, feel very good as a cosmopolitan citizen of the whole world.

I don't like it. If you had no United Nations, this country would have to act much more realistically. It's a smokescreen for your conscience. It doesn't do any good to have the United Nations, as you see in the last days. But it helps to avoid responsibility and to pass moral judgments, who in any family quarrel are only poisoning the atmosphere.

But that's your decision. But you see at this moment very much the Stoic attitude.

3

This man, Marcus Aurelius, I told you this before, is the most tragic figure of antiquity, because he was the perfect philosopher on the throne. He was a Stoic. Physis dominated nomos in his mind up here. And therefore, he believed that he was an emperor of cosmopolis, of the universe.

On the other hand, he destroyed the Roman empire, because he had become emperor as the adopted son of Antoninus Pius, because he had the qualities to be adopted. His father had been adopted; his grandfather had been adopted, because the great wisdom of the previous emperors has been to see to it that by adoption you can have all the benefits of republicanism, because you could select your successor by virtue.

4

And here comes this man, who writes this great diary on cosmopolis, and always poses in America and in Europe and in schools of Enlightenment as the great philosopher. And he allowed his terrible son, whom he had produced from his loins, his carnal son, to follow him, and thereby destroyed the empire, and overturned all the philosophy of a whole century of reign, of adopted governors, by this one weakness.

And this one weakness I think is much more important than all the philosophy with which he plastered his diaries.

## XI TO WALK A TIGHTROPE

1

There you can see again the weakness of mere mentality, of mere philosophy. He convinced himself every day in the evening, as you probably do, too, by keeping his diary, that he was an excellent man, and an excellent philosopher, and a cosmopolitan, and followed the laws of nature.

2

But the one difficult law of human society, which is not natural, that you adopt your successor and frustrate your carnal son from destroying the empire, you cannot find this in physis. Nature doesn't know adoption. Nature doesn't know the spirit. Nature doesn't know self-denying ordinance of abstemiousness. Nature is not ascetic. Nature cannot renounce any claim.

3

And therefore you have the real consequence of philosophy, which puts nature before human law, because he succumbed to nature. Here was his physical son. And this man had not the guts -- as so many thinkers and many reasonable people don't have the guts -- to resist their own family. And he couldn't tell his wife that her son was not the right successor. Probably he would have to put up with his wife, more than with the son in this case. And so she might have murdered him, and of course put her son in.

If you can't risk being murdered under the laws of the city, you are not a good citizen.

4

Nature, it's like my friend Adelbert Ames communing with nature. Nature doesn't contradict you. So let Mr. Ames here on this campus commune with nature. And Mr. Marcus Aurelius, emperor of Rome, could commune with nature, and leave his succession, the most important decision of his life, to accident.

Because the law established, since 96 of our era, that the emperor should designate the best man in the state to be his successor. That would have asked for a loyalty to a political decision.

You understand the difference? A political decision cannot be proven from the texts of nature. You walk a tightrope.

It's like the decision of Mr. Truman to dismiss MacArthur, or to resist the North Korean aggression, or to have Greece and Turkey defended against Communism;; or to have the airlift in Berlin. These are the vital decisions. He cannot base them on anything natural. They are perfectly unnatural.

## XII *THE SOPHISTS*

1

There is nothing in nature which gives you any clue to what to do. And as soon as you believe in nature, gentlemen, you are misfits for politics, absolute misfits, because in the history of the human race we live by precedent. And precedents are irrational. They have happened. That's experience. That's empirical.

And you have to believe your ancestors, that they had some wisdom. And you have to learn by looking up to these heroes like Mr. Truman who said, "I read, because I couldn't play sports, because I had poor eyesight, I read history. So I read how Mr.

Lincoln dealt with McClellan. And then I knew how I would have to deal with a disobedient general."

2

And you don't.

Sunday I preached and then after church, we had an old leading woman of the church talking to me. And I had talked about these historical predecessors, these forbears who create our values. You remember. And well, she came to me. She's our most conservative lady. And I could tell many funny stories about her, but she groped for understanding, and she said, "Yes, I look up to my father. He was a deacon of the church. And then I had my great, heroic example."

Well, I didn't want to educate her, because it's hopeless. So I didn't say that she should learn to look up to people who were not carnally related to her. That this would only save her. She could not naively look at her own flesh and blood as the examples. That's too simple, her own father; that's how she glorifies herself only.

And so this girl cannot be helped. She has to die out, because like Marcus Aurelius, she cannot take the step out of nature into the risky selection of her values by mere historical wisdom. By simply saying, "Lincoln is my man, although I'm not related to him."

3

So Marcus Aurelius is the great example, gentlemen, of the last consequence of Parmenides.

Before we come to these, I want to put on you this further list however of successions from the Eleatic school.

The first consequence of the Eleatic influence, when it came back to Greece and Asia Minor, was to say that therefore we can treat the city as accidental. And the group that said so are the sophists.

What is a sophist? A sophist is the man who has already learned from philosophy, gentlemen, that the mind is eccentric to the city, that with the help of your mind, you can be the critic of the city. And the sophist says, "Ooh, well, then I'm superior. I can play a trick. I can beat the stock exchange. I can make money on the Depression."

4

I had a gentleman for a lunch the other day. And I really had a great impression. It's a man who lost all his money in '29. He was on the right side, on the bearish side in '29, but when he sold short -- you know what that is -- then he had to cover two days before the Black Friday and lost his shirt. And ever he was a rich man, and he has never forgiven himself and nature that this should have happened, he nearly was a rich man, very rich indeed. Put all his gold on this bet, and he was right, but only by two days, wrong.

And so ever since, he has been a poor man, and he drives an English car, which he disapproves of. And so he can't get over the fact that he is in reduced circumstances.

So he came to me and said, after all -- the country was very much in the same situation as in '29, only this time not from the money side, but from the side of commodities, the installment buying, and the debt. And everything pointed to the similar crisis. And now how could he pull off this time the stunt the right way? Recoup?

Well, he was a pathetic case, because after all, 1929 and 1956, I wouldn't live hipped on this for 27 years. It's a little startling to find an old man of 60 just hell-bound, petrified, I mean totally hypnotized by this one, great semi-mistake in his life.

Because he wasn't wrong. But he just had bad luck, by two days.

### XIII WE LIVE TODAY AGAIN IN THE AGE OF THE SOPHISTS

1

And the sophists then said, "I can take advantage of the second-rate nature of the city." That's I think the simplest definition of a sophist. "I can take advantage of the transparent, second-ratedness of any city." And so the sophist became a wandering troop of rhetors, of people who resold the wisdom of how to circumvent, how to play with the laws of a city.

And when you read the Platonic dialogues, and when you read the history of the 5th century -- it was repeated in the 13th century in Italy, exactly the same phenomenon -- the so-called "humanists" in the 13th, 14th century available, because they knew how much in these small communities bribe and persuasion and coteries and cliques could be operated, and how you could twist the law and give it a waxen nose.

2

Sophistry -- you all know this term -- is a natural feeling of power. It's what you call today Madison Avenue. That's sophistry.

I have written in a questionnaire sent out by a philosophers' association in Yale. And we had to make a very brief statement of what we wanted to say. And I said, "We live today again in the age of the sophists." And they printed this and said to me they were very much startled, but obviously it was true.

But nobody is allowed to say it loud today in this country. We have exactly the pre-Socratic situation of sophistry. And you don't even mind, that everybody tells you openly he's out to cheat you. But they do. They say this. That's exactly what the sophists did.

And so the excess of freedom, gentlemen, begotten by Parmenides, is with you. And therefore you need a mild dictatorship.

3

A sophistry, gentlemen, always begets dictatorship, tyranny. It can't be helped, because it's abuse, and any abuse must be right. You cannot.

If you have expensive spending at this moment, and television, and all this business because of Madison Avenue, then you have to have an Addison Avenue. You have to have another avenue to life which offsets this, and that has to be severity, very strict measures.

It's very strange that you could believe that you can get away with murder. You may get away, but your daughter will not. She will reap the fruits of your murder -- in the economic sense. You're selling out, you're selling liberty short.

4

Anybody who is impressed by advertising, and by the television, and by the modern mass media, gentlemen, sells short his freedom. Because there is a relation between truth and reality, gentlemen, if you eliminate the truth as of today, it has to be paid back with interest, and usurers' interest, 54 percent per annum the next day.

## XIV ZENO

1

Therefore gentlemen, Parmenides is followed by sophistry. That are the immediate successors, because they eliminate the unconditional loyalty to one's own city. They already straddle the way between the cities. They migrate, they become a group -- well, in the now modern days they were called intellectuals, or intelligentsia, but it is much too weak an expression.

They are the whole philosophical group who say, "We have a wisdom that transcends the laws of the city."

2

I don't think that it is at this moment for you and me of great importance to go into the individual sophists. But you know, one of the sophistical theories is a famous one. The tortoise and Achilles. You can prove by sophistication, that when the two run the race, Achilles can never overtake the tortoise.

You know how the argument runs? Can you tell us? Get up and tell us.

*(Well, I'm not sure, Achilles runs twice as fast as the tortoise, but he always only runs half the distance, so he can never reach the tortoise.)*

Ja. Well, it is funny, but by sophistry, you can prove else. I think the argument must be in the book. You have it there?

3

I never think it is worth a man's dignity and a man's mind to have much dealings. Our students seem to be very interested in this kind of sophistry. But I have always despised them so deeply that I have never given it a moment's time to stop.

I know that Achilles can overtake the tortoise, and I do not see why I should read the sophisticated argument that he can't. I still don't see it. Where is it? Zeno. (145.) *(There's something on Sophists. No, 79.) (No, not there, either.)*

No, I think it's still a different place. Who can find it?

4

Well, of course you get first Zeno. He's very famous, Page 47.

You want to make an impression in Smith College, learn these things by heart. Well -- for example, take Number 4 on Page 47 -- this typical sophisma.

*"That which moves, moves either in the place in which it is, neither in the place in which it is, nor in that in which it is not. So therefore movement is impossible."*

Well. It is this tremendous overrating of reason, as against facts.

You know what the young lady said to her fiancée, "Don't bother me with facts. I have made up my mind."

But here, it is: "My mind construes the world, and therefore the world has no law except I mentally approve of it."

## XV THE ANCIENT CITY

1

The Greeks however, must have been rather intoxicated because of this, because you must imagine that these philosophical schools and these migrating sophists enabled a man to feel that he was at home in a wider world than his small city.

2

Has anybody ever heard of Chrystel de Coulange, *The Ancient City*? Who has? It's a very famous book by a French, Chrystel de Coulange, *This Ancient City*, in which it is shown how cruel, how severe, how integral the existence of any ancient citizen, before Christianity came in, was, because Church and state were identical. And therefore the cult of the gods was in the hand of the rulers of the city, and woe to you if you did not comply with their double role of priest and statesman, you just couldn't move.

And there everything was as under the same tyrannical discipline as here the Puritan rule was for the man in the little town. You could not work on Sunday or Saturday afternoon. Everybody had to behave according to the common law, and the common discipline, and the common cult.

3

And wherever you have this total duplication, that the man who commands the earth also commands the heavens, the individual has absolutely no space for his own thought or his own freedom.

4

The Sophists were the first to persuade every citizen of Athens or of Elea or of Miletus, that they could devote their mind to second thoughts as much as they could send their triremes, their ships, across the Mediterranean. That there was then outside their own city a second realm of afterthought.

#### XVI *THE LOANED EXPERTS*

1

The second part, gentlemen, of the Sophists was: the Sophist is the man who questions the wisdom of the city in which he moves. He questions it. He asks questions, and is willing to answer any question which he is asked. And they are the advisers of the citizens, therefore, and perhaps I should stress more, that they are asked to give advice.

They are hirelings, they are experts hired by each individual government, just as Syria or Albania now hire experts from the United Nations. Very similar. They are, the UNESCO group of the 5th century, because the smaller cities can ask for these accomplished minds to get some advance report, and advance knowledge.

2

And these Sophists were partly -- let me stress this -- they were partly great experts. If I have said negative things at this moment about the Sophists, perhaps I did this in order to help you understand the discredit into which the word "sophistry" today has fallen.

But originally the Sophist was needed by the smaller communities who had no intellectual group, in order to bring a fresh wind into their little cities. If you think there were 300 -- 400 such cities, you can imagine that many were without high schools, were just like Podunk. And you just had to get somebody from the outside to improve the city's laws. Or to say, "This is obsolete. We no longer have human sacrifice," or "You don't have to pledge your whole fortune when you enter a contract of buying or selling".

All these very crude first rules of commerce could be mitigated by sophistry.

So the Sophist was the loaned expert without roots himself. He was the man from outside who would move through one city without being asked any questions, "Whence do you come? Where do you pay taxes? Where do you belong?"

3

Of course, he paid very dearly for this, sometimes he was exiled from the city where he was used. The mob would storm his house and would say, "This is a bloody foreigner." And he would also suffer for his courageous intervention.

The important thing which you have to keep in mind is, gentlemen, that *the Sophist sanctifies questioning*. And that is step which is already implicitly to be found in the story of the mind from Homer to Parmenides.

But in sophistry, it becomes so paramount that you and I have to ask what it is to ask a question. You never think about this. It is one of your birthrights that you think any child can ask any question and has to be answered.

4

The first answer Heraclitus would give is that stupid questions must not be answered, that question is a revolution of the human mind which puts the man who's ignorant in a position to exercise power over the people who are knowledgeable, who are in the know.

You don't see this, gentlemen, but one fool can ask more questions than hundred wise men can answer.

Most questions, gentlemen, should not be answered, because they are wrong questions.

## XVII SOCRATES

1

And this I'm going to prove now, till the intermission in the next 10 minutes, gentlemen.

The process which Parmenides sets in motion, and which is signified by the problem of the Sophists has later been concluded by Socrates.

Socrates is not a Sophist anymore, but as you know, a philosopher, although he ranked with the sophists, and he was killed as a Sophist. He was killed for that which he tried not to be. But Socrates drank the poison as a Sophist, and that's the important thing, that in Socrates the problem of the question is changed.

2

If you want to understand Socrates, you now must understand what I'm going to tell you about the Sophists. We shall then see that from Socrates there are two ways possible, one into Plato and one into Aristotle.

I have tried to show you that from the Eleatics there is one way to the single man in Epicurus, and one to the whole city of nature, or nature as a city, in the Stoic. But in between, we have the great climax of Greek philosophy: Plato and Aristotle.

And before we go in detail in this, I want to give you the whole road map.

3

Why is sophistry and Socrates the evolution of the Parmenidean scheme?

Parmenides says, "The only real thing is that which is not given me by first impressions: the prayers that my mother teaches me, the awe that my father teaches me, the military service that I have to perform for my country: they are all semblances. One day I have to go to war, the other day I have to go to court. Ha! Everything changes. Everything is -- what is all this? Here I marry, and there I bury. That's all semblance. There is an eternal universe with its laws that I am interested in, the being. All the rest is just New England weather."

The Sophists say, "Therefore after Parmenides has said so, I can question everything of these transient things. I can question whether the war should be fought," like the Labour Party in England now. And "I can question everything. Authority is ridiculous. Law is for the asking."

And therefore the Sophists ask any questions.

4

Now gentlemen, before Parmenides, and before you were born, in a normal community, gentlemen, of red Indians, fighting for their life, or Eskimos, of any group not sophisticated, as we rightly say, all the people you think are primitive-- these people are not primitive, but they are integral and they are primordial. And they are out for the minimum conditions of any good human society.

What is this, gentlemen?

*The minimum is that those who know are considered to be inside. And those who have to ask questions are considered to be outsiders.*

When I come to a foreign city, and I ask a man, "Where is the commons?" I suppose that he knows, and that I don't know. And why do I think he knows? Because he has moved across the commons, and I haven't. I'm a newcomer to the society.

### XVIII TO ASK MEANS TO TRY TO JOIN THE GROUP

1

And therefore, will you take this down, gentlemen?

Originally, *to ask a question means to try to join the group*. Anything you ask means that you are less familiar than the family. You ask, "How many daughters do you have?" Well, the father knows very well how many he has. And the mother knows. But you don't know.

Therefore, gentlemen, you have completely forgotten that he who asks and he who knows or answers, live in two different societies. One is inside, and the other is outside.

2

Now America, which consists of outsiders, doesn't understand this, because here everybody's an outsider.

But that isn't normal. And you still find in the small town that it isn't handled that way. The man who asks questions there is immediately spotted as an outsider. He doesn't even know, basic. He doesn't know A from B.

So he cannot become selectman. He cannot become mayor, even if he has paid taxes there for five years, the people feel -- he asks too many questions. He doesn't take the folk ways as the only ways, just going on as always. We know. They don't ask questions. They know. But he, this disturbance, he asks questions.

If you want to serve up in a new community, never ask questions. Always claim that you know all -- how it is done. You have to show that you are one of them.

3

You know Willa Cather's book, do you? *One of Ours*? Who has read it?

Gentlemen, that's one of your tragedies. Who has read Willa Cather's book, *One of Ours*? But gentlemen, Willa Cather is one of the great souls of the last 30 years. But you only live with the last moment.

How can there be any American literature field if a person like Willa Cather is not familiar to you?

Gentlemen, you can buy the legs of Marilyn by the dozen. They're valueless. Why do you do that? Who has read any book by Willa Cather? That's all? What have you read? (*My Antonia.*) Ja. And what have you read then? (*Same one.*)

It was prescribed reading in high school.

Well, she has written this very wonderful book, *One of Ours*. Gentlemen, the problem of the *One of Ours* is that no questions are asked. You are unquestionably in. You don't have to ask.

4

Gentlemen, if you would understand -- who is taking English as a major?

Now for you, it is of some importance, as it is also more important still in the law, and in history, and in logic, if you take the sentence, "The commons lies east of the church," well, this makes only sense in a certain town with the name of Podunk. Or New Town, Newton or whatever it is. That is, it is only true in a concrete situation.

You can now put your linguistic sagacity to work by questioning any one word of this sentence by putting in a question: "The what? -- you have not heard the sentence -- "lies," and on it goes, "east of the Church." You have not heard the word "commons." So you ask the "What lies east of the common?" Then you can ask, "The commons does -- what?" And then you question the verb. East of the commons. Well, it lies there. It doesn't march.

In this case, of course, that's a poor example, but in this way a living thing. If you say, "The militia," then you could have "The militia marches," or "The militia runs," or "The militia waits," or "The militia camps," you could alternate the verb. And so instead of "what?" you would here ask, "behaves how?" Then you have the question "where?" And there you have the question "whither?"

If you have any longer sentence, gentlemen, you will see that to question means to take a full sentence and to have at one point of the sentence a lacuna, a gap, which our words, "what," "whither", "whether," "who," "how," try to even by sound, try to articulate as less-articulate, as it's a hyphen. All the words of interrogation, gentlemen, are semantic blanks.

And these people had no writing at that time, and so they invented in all languages -- German, Greek, Latin, Spanish, Hebrew -- wherever you go, the words of interrogation are so-called *enclitica*, spoken with less power, a fall of the voice, because you are ashamed that you don't know. And you ask the other fellow to whom you put this question, "Would you kindly help me in, and complete this

sentence?" I say "how?" I say "why?" I say -- "what?" Would you kindly put in the verb? Would you put in the noun? Would you put in the preposition? Would you help me to say the full sentence?

That's the essence of a question.

## *XIX QUESTIONS THAT CANNOT BE ANSWERED*

### 1

Therefore any question presupposes an answer. Therefore, you cannot ask the question, "Who is God?" You cannot ask the question, "Is there a God?" It's all nonsense, because God is the power that makes you speak.

Including asking questions. That we call God. You cannot question Him, because He puts the word in your mouth that you ask Him, if you aren't the devil.

And then again, the devil only exists by the mercy of God.

### 2

So there are questions that should not be asked.

Most of your questions, gentlemen, are so silly, and since nobody in this country is spanked, that they shouldn't be asked. And they are just asked in America, because there is no one who stops you and say, "This question is nonsense."

Most of your questions in all your bull sessions, whether the will is free, or man is immortal, and all this nonsense, you know all the answers beforehand in your heart.

But your mind is just like Achilles and the tortoise, occupied with sophistry.

### 3

Three-quarters of the questions asked in Dartmouth College are questions that cannot be answered. Because questions can only be derived from answers, from positive statements. People in a society must have said certain things. That's what you can question. Other things you cannot question. At least not at first sight.

And there we come to Socrates, later.

4

So the first thing is, gentlemen, that when the Sophists asked any number of questions, there was absolutely no discrimination between questions that can be asked and questions that cannot be asked, sensibly.

There are innumerable questions which your children will ask you, and you have asked your parents, which the parents should not answer.

The one of the insanities of this country is that every stupid question is answered. The first education of a human being is that it is told that there are questions that don't deserve an answer. In this moment, you are only free as an educator. As long as you try to answer every question of a child, you are their slave, but not their educator. Because there are wrong questions and right questions.

Certain questions can be asked, and certain cannot be asked.

I am not against asking questions, but I'm asking for the very strict weeding of the questions.

#### XX YOU CANNOT QUESTION THE LAWS OF THE CITY

1

And this is probably the most difficult thing for you to understand, gentlemen, that philosophy in the long process had to weed out wrong questions.

And that is the second step after Parmenides and the Sophists: to know what can be asked and what cannot be asked.

2

And here we come to Socrates. Socrates appears to the citizens of Athens as a Sophist, that is, as a man who asked wanton questions. And to himself, he appears as a man who overcomes the Sophists, because he asks them.

All the books of Plato are questions put by Socrates to the Sophists, to the questioners, to these people who ask simply arbitrary questions. And he puts them into the wrong, because he points out that their questions are wrongly asked.

Has anybody read a dialogue by Plato so far? Who has? What is it you have read? (*The Death of Socrates.*)

That's not a dialogue. *Criton*, yes. Well, here you see that he bows - to what does he bow in the Plato? (*Whom he bows to?*) What does he bow to? That's a question which I can answer, because he does bow. (*The will of the city.*)

To the law of the city. The law.

3

And there you have the answer to sophistry. There is a restriction on questioning. You cannot question the laws of the city.

That's his answer to the Sophists. It's a very pathetic answer.

I told you perhaps that this sentence of *The Criton*, in which he says this, is the motto of my first book which I wrote as a young man, my book on the basis of which I made my whole career, 1914. It just quotes *The Criton*. You strike out any number of questions once you say the law has to be obeyed. And especially when it would be to my advantage to disobey it, then you have to obey it. You can perhaps disobey the law, if it is to somebody else's -- to your friends' advantage to disobey it. But you cannot when it is your own.

There he turns against the Sophists and says, "This cannot be questioned, obedience to the law, in the case of my own sentence." You understand? And that is the greatness of *The Criton*. Only a few pages, gentlemen. And nothing has been more beautiful to me than the sentence in which he says -- who has the text here? Has anybody the text of *The Criton*?

I have put the Greek words from the end. Here.

"This, I assure you, my dear comrade Criton, if what I seem to hear the laws telling me." And now comes the words I have quoted in this, "*So in my ears the sound of these words keeps coming and makes me deaf to other things. As far as I can see, you may be sure that whatever you will say contrary to this, you will say it in vain.*"

4

The vanity of a human question when the sentence is known, gentlemen, that's of sublime greatness, and that puts a stop to the realm of sophistry, gentlemen. Here a man accepts death because the laws of his city, the first impressions, have spoken. The polis is still alive.

XXI *SOCRATES ASKS THE QUESTIONER*

1

And therefore in Socrates, gentlemen, we strike an equilibrium between the questions that the sophists have asked and the first impression that must remain. And therefore, Plato and Socrates, gentlemen, put a stop to this flood of questions, set in motion by the physicists, by the people of being, by the people whom I have described in this letter of Heraclitus to Parmenides.

2

Who has read this letter in the meantime?

Interesting. Wouldn't the other gentlemen proceed to do that, too? Or, at least give me back my text?

I don't see why I should give you this as toilet paper. Why don't you read it? It's hopeless. I know nothing of the assigned readings, gentlemen. I treat you as grownup people. But I thought that if I give you a text which is not even published, yet, you will be curious enough to read these few pages.

So bring it back next time. I want to collect them again. They are precious to me, if they aren't precious to you.

3

Heraclitus, you see, is the man who already anticipates Plato because he says his first loyalties cannot be destroyed. And the whole century from 500 to 400 consists in a mad race of philosophy against first laws, against the laws that can even bury a Socrates under their debris, because he has no right to question them.

4

Now what does Socrates do, gentlemen? Socrates, I told you, asks the Sophists. He reverses the process. He asks the questioner. And therefore, you will never understand the Socratic method if you read Mr. Will Durant.

Who knows this book? Ja.

Well, he shouldn't have written it. He doesn't know what philosophy is. He doesn't take it seriously. He thinks it's what everybody does, gentlemen. Your little mind is also called a philosophical mind. Will Durant has this American assumption that everybody is a philosopher.

XXII *PLATO'S BEING ABSENT AT THE DEATH OF SOCRATES*

1

I have told you in the beginning that there are few philosophers, that philosophy is difficult, and that it is always against common sense. You may not believe me, gentlemen, but my course is given under the assumption that this is so, and that Mr. Will Durant therefore is wrong, because he thinks he can make it a bestseller.

Philosophy must never be a bestseller. If it is, it has ceased to be philosophy.

I'm sorry. That's just what it is.

2

And as a proof - I mean, you haven't read my paper. Two-third of you didn't even bother to read this, because I've made it an assigned reading.

Gentlemen, philosophers are not read because they are assigned. They are read because they are difficult.

If you cannot appreciate difficulty, gentlemen, don't come to this whole department of philosophy. I'm not here to smear pap around your mouth. It's nonsense. I mean, if you do not want to learn to think, please leave this room right away.

I'll give you a B in this course for truthfulness and veracity. It is contemptible to take a course in philosophy and to think that I have to think, and you have not.

3

The problem of Socrates was to reverse the process -- the question had degenerated. Everything could be asked. Is this law reasonable? If it isn't reasonable, don't obey it. Escape, cheat. Do something around it. Circumvent it.

Socrates says, "There is a compromise. We have to find the equilibrium between the existing order and the workings of our mind." And so he prefers to die to this rational escape which his friends hold ready -- you know, they have already hired the ship to go where? Did they tell you? Isn't this the story in Criton?

You know, it has been said that Plato was reproached by all his friends, because he did what Socrates didn't. Plato was not present when Socrates died. You know where he had gone to?

Didn't you take Philosophy -- Humanities 11? Who did take Humanities 11? Well, there they tell you this. Classical Civilization, too.

4

Well, he went to Megara. And in Megara there was a famous school of philosophy, too, similar to Elea. That's why it was interesting. He went to his philosophical friends in Megara, that is north of Athens, and it has been said that he wrote all his dialogues and established his Academy as an act of repentance against his absence from the death of Socrates.

And I think it is a trauma -- what they call now in psychoanalysis a "trauma." There must have been a kind of deeply felt wound, that he was abandoning his teacher at that moment, at this decisive moment.

However, that's a wanton guess, because we simply don't know why he went or we have no inkling.

### XXIII *THE SOCRATIC METHOD*

1

But it is remarkable that he writes the story of Criton, but has to admit that was not the Criton. And if a man writes all his life on Socrates, you of course wonder what's the relation of his existential position to Socrates and his professional writing.

And I think it's a very profound question, because in human psychology, I think it is true that if you have omitted an act, you have to repeat it endlessly, in order to try to say that it has happened. I mean, "I have not been present at the death of Socrates, therefore I must circle around the death of Socrates unendingly."

That is, there is a deep problem between Socrates and Plato, because it is otherwise hard to understand why Plato should have never seceded from this umbilical cord with Socrates.

2

The point I have to make today is very simple.

The point is that Socrates stopped questioning in one direction by reversing the direction of the question. You ask the man who puts all the questions, the Sophist, and in this very moment, you have a dialectics to the second degree.

If I ask the man who puts the questions, then we have a certain freedom now. The questioner is not always superior to the man who is questioned.

3

The laws of the city have yet a chance, for the first time. If I, from the realm of nature, communing with nature and Mr. Parmenides, who is with my young friends, they sit in judgment in the stadium or walk on the philosophical avenues around the city and say, "Laughable, these hidebound citizens of this Podunk here, we are superior. We can criticize all these." And if they are suddenly caught in the same process of questioning, and Mr. Socrates want to ask Protagoras: How did you spend your time? Why can you corrupt these young men? - then you see that freedom is reestablished, the real freedom, because these men are also under the law.

And Socrates includes, gentlemen, the newly created realm of the mind into that reality which has to be investigated. The man who abuses the city, as well as the city, now come under scrutiny; therefore you always hear about the Socratic method.

4

And the Will Durant book, it is the most shallow thing I can imagine. If this is the Socratic method, it isn't worth anything, and wouldn't have taken tears and bloodshed and execution and martyrs to establish it. Gentlemen, the Socratic method doesn't consist of a little schoolteacher asking a child, "How much is 2 and 2?" - and then getting the wonderful answer that it is allegedly 4, which is of course untrue.

And you can never know what  $2 \text{ and } 2 = 4$  is in real life. That's an abstraction.

#### XXIV THE ONE BOTTLE QUESTION

1

I once was asked this question by a famous theologian, by Karl Barth, if  $2 \text{ and } 2$  is always 4. And I said, "No, it isn't. It can be 5, or 7, or 3 in real life."

And he said, "How come?"

Well, he had this problem that five people were marching through the desert. And they had only four bottles of water. And one bottle was just sufficient to save a man's life, so that he could make the exit from the desert. It was so hot and -- all our assumption lies in his question. And it's the diabolical, real Sophist's problem, like Achilles and the tortoise.

And he said, "Now, what do these people have morally to do? Five men, all doomed if they can't drink water. And four of them have a bottle. And the fifth has none. And who gets the water, and how do they get out?"

2

And what would be your answer to this tempter's question? Lead us not into temptation, is the only answer.

But it was here really put by this rascal. They wanted to print the answer. He asked all his friends. What's your answer, Mr. Wynant? (*Well, one man would agree to sacrifice himself.*) Who has to sacrifice itself? (*-- to go around and eliminate one man.*)

3

Now the sun is very hot. If you idle away the time, it's only 10 minutes, you get 10 minutes later and you can't make it. Therefore any such stop is already murder for five of the men. Because the condition is so clear that only now if you immediately act, can you make the exit from the desert. So if you spend now time idling and quarreling, and arguing, just everyone is lost. You just get more thirsty, the water gets hotter, et cetera.

*(I'm not sure what I would say about the conditions in the desert, but looking at it from the viewpoint that we now have outside of the scene, it would depend on what type of system of morals you had. If you were a hedonist, or something like that, I suppose you would have to say that you have to drop out, because you couldn't live with yourself afterwards. In other words, you would have to take the route which would give you the greatest amount of pleasure in the long run, even it meant sacrificing your life.)* You mean, that in the long run you sacrifice your life. (*Well, I'm saying if you believe in this type of theory. I wouldn't say, my own personal feeling is --*)

I agree with you. I think it's a funny expression to say that the man who will live shortest has the greatest pleasure in the long run. Because you cannot use the word "sacrifice," that's not used in American colleges. So you have say, "pleasure in the long run." It's a funny expression.

He has to sacrifice himself, my dear man. That's all.

But can the others accept the sacrifice? Could you live with knowing that one man has given his life for you, because you were such a bastard? (*Don't they all have to sacrifice?*) Of course, they all have to smash the bottles and make it, because they will be so enthusiastic, because they smash the bottles, that they'll have twice as much strength as they had before, because man has a second wind.

*(Do all five men get out?)* Because all this assumption is all nonsense. What did you say? (*He wants to know if all five men got out.*) All five will get out. And the weakest one will be carried by the others. The whole assumption is - Explain. (*He wants to know why I laugh?*) Yes. (*I think the assumption you're giving is ridiculous.*)

Sure, it is.

4

Because the Sophist exactly as in the tortoise and Achilles, thinks that space of the tortoise is in tidbits, so if I here run 20 centimeters, the tortoise will run 10 centimeters. And if he runs another 20, then again 10. So he always is a little ahead of him. It's all nonsense. He just overtakes her.

The same thing is if you assume that five human beings are just moral spinsters, who sit in judgment on what is right, you just abolish reality, because every man can have an increase of power by sacrifice and by courage. Everyone.

And the greatest temptation of course to be overcome is such an idiotic question. And the idiotic question is paralyzing him. And in order not to be paralyzed by this terrible temptation to weigh the evidence: who's worth more, who should survive. You have to smash these bottles, because otherwise you will destroy all your stamina.

But these questions are asked every day by Dorothy Post. Or what's her name? Dorothy Dix.

#### *XXV THE PROBLEM OF THE QUESTION IS THE QUESTION OF QUESTIONS*

1

This is the terrible of ethics in the abstract. It's just shocking -- and this goes on in all America. All these quizzes are of this nature, all these moral questions. There are no such answers.

And again, the United Nations are so idiotic that they do not see that a country that is in life-and-death struggle has of course to create a new situation first of all, before it can talk business in terms of the corporation lawyers like Mr. Dulles, who always have a voting majority on their side first. But Israel has to get a voting majority before it can -- that has never happened to Mr. Dulles that a minority is in the right. He always thinks the majority is right.

It's ridiculous.

2

How can you say that a majority is right?

All your aunts are down on your engagement, and you know that you are right. Do you think the majority then can rule that you cannot marry this girl? You are the only person who's right, and all the aunts in the whole family are wrong. The uncles, too. You act on these assumption every day.

And yet when it comes to politics, you want to change the whole universe, because of your timidity of sophistry.

You are all in the spell of Sophists.

And Socrates is the man who asks the Sophists. "Ha! Sir. What is your credential? What do you do to these young men? What do you do to this city? What's the consequence of these judgments?"

3

So I only wanted to say today--I hope I have achieved it, gentlemen -- that the problem of the question is the question of all questions. The pre-Parmenidean situation of the questioner is that he is outside, and therefore inferior to the people inside. He has to wait for their answer in order to know.

The Sophist says, "I question these four insiders as to the legitimacy of their answers. I question everything."

That's what you do, gentlemen. And that's what the American brat is taught to do in school and at home. And the complete decadence and degeneracy is the consequence, because once you are allowed to ask the fundamentals of your family life, gentlemen, you have lost your family. Because the family is authority or it's nothing.

The family is either so as it is, and the child has to stomach it; or it is nothing. If you have to explain and to justify yourself to your child, it isn't worth that you have any. The child cannot understand it. It has first to experience it.

And years later, it can understand why there is a turkey at Thanksgiving. First it has to be there at Thanksgiving. The child cannot go on the Wednesday before Thanksgiving and say to the father, "Why don't we throw out the turkey?" It cannot. It has just to happen.

And you cannot say when the draft comes and say, "Wouldn't it be better to escape to Megara?" And not to serve? First, you have to serve. Later you can criticize the draft.

4

I've made it a law in my whole life, gentlemen: I will not criticize an institution of which I have not been a member. I can here criticize a college and the university, because I have been a full-fledged member of it, but not otherwise, because I don't know what it is.

*You can criticize a thing if you belong to it, and have done it.*

And Socrates' criticism of the laws of Athens are acceptable to me, because he has died under them. That makes sense.

But the man who criticized the laws from the outside, I'm very doubtful, because he doesn't know what even a just law is.

## XXVI THE REVOLUTION REACHES FULL CYCLE

1

And so Socrates, gentlemen, reverses the problem -- that's the Socratic method: question the questioner. That's why most of his dialogues have a name in their head, Protagoras, this great Sophist, for example, and Theaetetus and Ion and all these other dialogues. They always ask the asker.

And this is your own question, gentlemen. Ask yourself, "Who asks?"

And you do it, by the way, in a sound instinct.

2

Most of you are much better than you think you are, because most people well know when a man is purely argumentative and asks questions for questions' sake, and when he is entitled to ask the question. We are quite well aware of this fact.

But it has to be formulated.

3

And the history of Greek philosophy, gentlemen, then is that in Socrates, the revolution of Parmenides reaches full cycle. It comes back to the tempter, that he himself is tempted. Socrates puts Parmenides, the Parmenideses under contribution. He says, "Let me hear Parmenides." He has written a dialogue "Parmenides," has he not? And he has not written a dialogue "Heraclitus."

4

And perhaps that's the end of what I wanted to say today, gentlemen.

The Socratics reconcile Heraclitus and Parmenides by writing dialogues on all the people who are not Heraclitus. And coming back to Heraclitus' position that there is

a minimum of loyalty, a minimum of devotion, a minimum of existential identity with the things discussed, which Heraclitus set up and which Plato then inherits, and Aristotle, in Heraclian strength and the Parmenidean, meet, in a very subtle way because the questioner is now questioned.

And therefore, he doesn't go back to the Heraclian conservative of one-city order. But it's the wider realm consisting of cities and intellectuals. And Socrates encompasses both. He questions intellectuals and he questions the laws of the city.

And therefore you have in Socrates for the first time the new public of Parmenides brought under discipline. For the first time the question arises, "What's the minimum standard of morality, which the Sophists themselves, these freelance intellectuals have to give proof of?"

For example, what is the minimum morality of Dartmouth College? Because we are the heirs of the Sophists, gentlemen. But we are under certain Socratic criticism. You cannot settle anything here. It has to be in relation to the laws of a good city. It can be critical of the city.

I'm very critical, as you know, of the city. But I'm under scrutiny myself, too.

What is the price I'm willing to pay for my truth?

Can you see the difference?

**ELEVENTH LECTURE: *PHILOSOPHY IS THE EDUCATIONAL FERMENT OF THE NATIONAL LIFE***

I NOT TO GO INSANE IN TIMES OF DOUBT AND DESPAIR

1

...I tried to show you that the line was such that in Parmenides, there is already anticipation of two solutions:

*the soul alone, that's Epicurus;  
and the soul eagles the world;*

and the second, the Stoic wanted this world as one soul. That's to the Stoa. That's a cosmopolitan solution, and that is the peace-for-yourself solution.

The take to the hills, so to speak.

2

It's eternal, gentlemen. At times you will all be Epicureans in the deeper good sense. And in the other, you will be Stoics.

That is, gentlemen, these two philosophies are constant moods. And perhaps the deepest thing you should know about the history of philosophy is that it does display in its course your and my mental moods.

3

They are not the truth of the matter. But they are great auxiliaries, means for your and my mental survival not to go insane in times of doubt, in times of despair, in times of lying low, in times of waiting.

Philosophy, gentlemen, is not a luxury. Everybody has a philosophy.

*But philosophy is much more a companion of life than an interpretation of life that holds water. You have to shift.*

4

I suppose any man who lives today, from now on will have several philosophies at his disposal. Because his despair will come from various directions.

Sometimes he will -- what does a poor Hungarian do today? He needs some philosophy at this moment that hasn't to be valid forever. But it must carry him through the day, so that he just can still speak, gentlemen.

## II *THE UNIVERSITY IS ESSENTIAL TO A NATION*

1

You watch, gentlemen, the end of a thousand years of the history of Hungary.

Hungary was founded in 1002, with the baptism of St. Stephen. And Cardinal Mindszenty, by going to the American legation, ended the history of the crown of St. Stephen. And this is a very cruel millennium. It opens up the end of the march of nations, gentlemen. There will be no nations in the future- -- there will only be world powers.

That has been in the making.

2

I have seen this coming. America delays this. You are still all for small nations. You are even for Egypt, which is not a nation. But you think everywhere there exist nations. It's just an absolute, atrocious idea.

Only in America you don't believe it. You have wiped out all the American nations. There you have no feeling.

But in Europe, you assume the nations -- that's all nations. Well, they are nations, but gentlemen, the Christian nations of the Occident, they were nations because they were parts of the Church. They were all church-nations.

There can only be nations with a spirit of their own. The nations of the Moslem world just don't have that. That's why they are no nations. Syria is the only exception in the Arab world, because it has Christians.

3

The reason for this is, gentlemen, that in the history of the Church, the nations became articulate as members of their councils. And the Church used to vote on its last councils by nations. And these nations therefore got representatives from big universities. And the university is essential to a nation.

Paris is the greatest nation of Europe, because it has the oldest university.

4

So gentlemen, perhaps you take this at this moment, it's a very tragic, and very solemn moment and just a European like myself, one cannot sleep. One just lies sleepless every night over this fate of Hungary.

And all my news from Europe are to the same extent. The people of Europe are sleepless, because the whole history of Europe draws to an end at this moment.

And America just can't do anything, I mean. It just -- it's a --.

So the mourning goes very deep.

### III A NATION HAS A SPIRITUAL CENTER

1

But perhaps for your illumination, gentlemen, in passing I may say this, because it has to do with our Greek tradition and with the history of philosophy: *a nation in Europe has been, since the year 1000, a body of people who have a spiritual center.*

It's not a group of people who speak Apache or Sioux.

2

You -- in your terminology, just as you think that an individual is a philosopher, and -- so you break down the barrier between a real philosopher in his own right who speaks to remedy some foggish situation in his generation, and the people who read books on philosophy and have their own opinions on something, since you always mistake this and say that every American has a philosophy, instead of saying that he uses a philosophy, that he chooses a philosophy, but he hasn't made it -- so in the same sense, you think anywhere, in Libya, or in the desert, there live nations.

That is not true, gentlemen. A nation is a unit of man plus a spiritual center, which contributes something to the common belief of mankind.

3

Any university is such a center, or should be. At least in Europe it was. Paris or Salamanca or Naples or Salerno. Those of you -- who has taken Philosophy 10 with me?

Well, you know that this has been developed there at some length without stressing much the result for the nations that participated. But that is the trouble with India.

And that's the trouble with China. They are not nations in the European sense. They are something quite different. They're imitating now the English.

India has no such spiritual center. And it's still to be seen how it will get one. It is very hard-put. It can hate the English, but that's not a sufficient basis, the hatred of the others.

4

You assume that India is such a unit. It is not. That's one thing that is certain. And Mr. Nehru had to shoot, just as the Russian now shoot in Hungary, you just don't like to see these things happen, but they were in the papers, even. He just had to shoot. And he'll have to shoot much more in India.

You are not at the end of the bloodshed there, because he's of course not the real ruler of India. How do you think -- 325 million people -- he's an accident. Very passing accident, Mr. Nehru, Mr. Mennon and all these sheiks. But in your eyes, you don't understand that, because you think a nation is a collection of people who vote for a selectman.

That would be no contribution to humanity. Without the Declaration of Independence America wouldn't amount to anything, and without the churches here it would be a bunch of people, but this wouldn't be the biggest nation in the world as of today.

#### IV *WE NOURISH THE GOVERNMENT*

1

You have to contribute something to the common faith of mankind. That's why, if you separate Church and state, that doesn't mean that you can be a nation without a church. They are separate.

2

But you only see now today the Congress. Gentlemen, the Congress is a very barbarous bunch of fellows. Well, I have seen five senators competing with five quiz kids on television, not on television, on the radio, because I haven't seen that, television. That was before the days of television -- 10 years ago. Five senators.

Well, dyspeptic old gentlemen. This is not the nicest -- the cultural aspect of America -- our government, gentlemen, but what is going on in every American home, the good life that's led here.

And that doesn't come from the state. It comes from quite other resources. That isn't nourished by the government, but it nurses the government.

We nourish the government, and government doesn't nourish us.

3

How do we do it? Well, from resources that make us into civilized people.

And therefore I think it is important for you to notice that the Hungarians always knew this. Their pride was the national museum and the university in Budapest. They would show this to everybody.

I have lectured in Budapest as a professor. And I was very much impressed with this - when that was destroyed now, the national museum of Budapest, I knew that was the bullet into the heart of the nation.

4

So gentlemen, the nation has received this power from the Greeks, because the Platonic tradition, that the good city has to discuss with the intellectuals from all over the world its own affairs, this international forum within a national territory, which you have in Harvard, and which you have in Yale, which you take for granted, but which is very artificial, and which -- as you know, Mr. McLeod in the state department and Mr. McCarthy in the Senate nearly destroyed if they could.

#### *V A CHALLENGE TO THE LOCAL PREJUDICE*

1

This international discussion in a nation is a part of the national life. That means that the nation has a window into the world of the mind open. And this mind is not of the city, of the polis, of the nation, but is admitted into the city, as a ferment and as a correcting thorn in the flesh.

And this is what the Greeks have imparted to the rest of mankind, that you cannot be a nation, gentlemen, without receiving into you as an article of faith that there must be a platform in the nation, in which the nation is in a conversation with the other nations.

2

You must always see that this is not natural. The Russians don't have it. And they crush the Hungarians for this very reason at this moment, that they think they can without your -

-- what is it? (*Just chewing gum.*) Two years old? Well, has nobody a piece of sugar for the man?

So to come back.

Why is it so important, gentlemen?

3

On this road from Parmenides to Epicurus and the Stoa the Greeks outgrew their own nation, their own polis. And their eternal contribution is that they have now been admitted in the form of colleges, in the form of books, in the form of encyclopedias, which wouldn't have to exist, gentlemen.

You must always forget that at this moment in the year 2000 of our era they tend to disappear.

I have cooperated at an American People's Encyclopedia coming out in Chicago, gentlemen, in which the Catholic readers are so anxiously catered to by the editors that abortion and all such things, or homosexuality -- these catchwords couldn't appear in this encyclopedia. My own articles have been dissected and revamped. Anything disagreeable to any reader cannot be printed in this People's American Encyclopedia. So it cannot contain the truth.

Because in America, there are 160 million people -- potential readers whom this man wanted to catch. If he pays attention to every crackpot's ideology and prejudice. But he tries to. This is a remarkable editor. He lives in Chicago. So they do that there. And of course the truth is abolished.

If you leave the Encyclopaedia Britannica for a another edition in Chicago, you won't hear the truth anymore. It is already deteriorating in this new edition. Don't buy it, please. It's a very poor encyclopedia, because in Chicago there are so many commercial pressures on. This group will not buy it. And this group will not buy it. And then you cannot print it.

4

There perhaps you see the greatness of philosophy, gentlemen. *Philosophy is a challenge to the local prejudice. And it sells its truth regardless of the trend.*

Did I tell you my experience with a dean of a great university? Mrs. Huessy was having dinner and myself with this gentleman in another house. And he said, "I don't understand your husband at all. What he's doing is against the trend."

And she said, "Yes. That's why he is doing it."

And he was at a loss. He had never heard of such a fool.

## VI EASTERN WIND

1

Well, that's my business, gentlemen. I am a philosopher. So if I am not against the trend, I sin, I am a criminal. That's what I have taken an oath of as a doctor, to tell the truth against the trend.

It's not interesting to be with the trend, gentlemen.

2

Didn't I tell you, that I was statistically unimportant? That's the business of philosophy, gentlemen, to be statistically unimportant, because otherwise the statistically important ones would have no future, because they would then live from one trend to the next. And the trend would be not of their own making, but they would always just be-trend it.

In other words, if you go by the trend, you live by accident. You become not master of your destiny. And this old word which today is quoted, but never acted upon, "You are the captain of your soul," means exactly this attempt to be free from the trend. To win against the trend.

You have to know the trend, sure. But you have to laugh at it. And you have to bring yourself in a position so that you can survive it.

3

*(Must the trend always be wrong, Sir?)*

No, but as a trend it is wrong. If you only do it because it is a trend, this is nonsense. You must have made the trend. If it is your trend, then you can triumph.

Oh no, nothing is good or evil. Thinking makes it so.

You know that. What do you say about an eastern wind? It is neither good nor evil. So you won't go against the eastern wind. But you will also not go with the eastern wind. You tack. It's not you. You cannot say that, as here in this country, where everybody feels that he must be part of this eastern wind.

Or at least feign that he is. I think most people are so incredibly adroit that they go to church because of Mr. McCarthy, and then they stop going to church when Mr. McCarthy has no power. That's what happened - and this whole thing is called a religious revival.

You have forgotten this, perhaps. But it's only four years old. People suddenly got religion. At least on Sunday.

4

*(Sir, if you continually go against the trend, why are you not forming a trend of your own?)*

No, no, Sir. My dear man, you know this very well.

The difference between a hybrid corn and weeds. The corn is meant to grow one day. But it doesn't grow as a trend. It grows by a slow process of weeding. The weed would be the trend. Any cultivated plant -- it has to grow and also respect the season. It needs sunshine, rain, et cetera, Sir.

But you will never confuse wheat and weed.

## VII CONVERSATISM

1

*(Well, what I was thinking -- if you make it a habit of going against the trend, you do generally make a habit: I must go against the trend.)*

No. Oh no. Well, that would be a negation that would make you dependent on the trend.

Oh, heavens! Oh no, my dear man. Certainly you can't misinterpret me this way.

There are deeper resources for knowing your direction. But any mere trend is destructive for the community.

That's why the country was very wise and has now a Democratic Congress and a Republican president. I think that's an attempt of the Americans to get out of this trend business, because no great republic can live -- the more foreign policy we have, the less we can afford to be swayed in one or the other direction. It is impossible.

2

It's called "conservatism."

In this country there has never been conservatism in the mind -- there couldn't be. And the problem is, there have some voices in the last 10 years trying to establish an American conservatism.

But -- has anybody read this book by a gentleman called Kirk? Who has read this? Is it popular?

Well, poor man. He tried to be the standard-bearer of a new conservative party in the United States, and you haven't even heard of the man.

Well, gentlemen, you are so reactionary, you don't have to.

3

And this is a conservative country in a way, but the main essence I wanted to say about conservatism as a definition is, that it tries to cap the trends so that they cannot go out of hand. Whereas the left people are inclined to let the trend rule them. They are for the news, they are for the progress.

And I think this is the real difference. The reactionary would be a man who just stops progress. That's not interesting, always only a few. But the conservative already sees the next and the next trend. And therefore says, "Not one -- or any one of these trends must ride the crest of the wave totally."

I think it's a very good definition of conservatism, if you do not see left and right as opposites, as you think, like a tug-of-war, one saying, "Go forward," and the other saying "Go backward."

That's not the problem of a conservative party in England, for example, or of Disraeli, who was a real, great conservative. But the problem of the conservative is that he can -- because he is his father's son, and because he remembers his grandfather gladly -- he can see that what is of the day is not of the generation; and what is of the generation is not of the century, because these little crisscross of trends, per diem and per annum and per generation, they cross each other out. And if you go totally in the zig-zag of the trend, you waste an enormous amount. You have to burn, and you destroy what you have to rebuild the next time.

4

And as Robert Frost said, "I couldn't afford to be a revolutionary in my youth, because then I would have had to be a reactionary in my old age, and I was afraid

that that will happen". You understand. So that is why Robert Frost is a conservative. That is, he wants to conserve the continuity, despite the trend.

## VIII PHILOSOPHY AS VACCINATION TO THE CHRISTIAN NATIONS

### 1

These are after all important things, because you can see under what immense hazards the element of free criticism, the element of philosophy, this element of the autonomy of second impressions, of criticism, had to be implanted into every city, and that at this moment, we feel -- and that's I think the greatest danger we face today, and it isn't resolved at all, yet -, that the Russians have declared they are a philosophical government, their government has a philosophy, therefore nobody else can have a philosophy, because they have the right philosophy.

So in Russia, you have pure Platonism, pure Parmenides ruling. It's a philosophical government. Its whole *raison d'etre* is philosophy, but if you make philosophy the basis of the government instead of the basis of the school or the academy or the philosophy criticizing the state, you get tyranny. You get a terrible state.

### 2

You must never forget that Bolshevism is a philosophy. And we cannot shun the responsibility for it. It's Platonism.

The Russians are Platonists to a great extent. All that tyranny can be derived at by reading Plato's Republic. I would forbid the reading of Plato's Republic for the next hundred years, lest we lose our democracy, because Plato justifies every measure of violence against disobedient citizens in no uncertain terms.

Fortunately the philosopher, because Plato says, "If the philosophers become kings, then everything is fine." Well, everything is wonderful then for his philosophy, but everything is terrible for the man who has to live by it and doesn't agree.

Because the one philosophy which is the mold of the mind governs, then all the other molds of the mind are just excluded.

### 3

This point is as important. There are two things that I wanted to start with then today.

One is that the Greek element of philosophy had to be added to the Christian nations. They had to be vaccinated or equipped with this thought in order to become a

civilized nation. And there is a defined term to a nation, gentlemen, which you always omit in this country. And that's why you cannot deal with these problems of the Arab states, or the problems of Africa, or the problems of South America.

Bolivia and Paraguay are not nations, that is utter nonsense. They may be governments, and certainly misgovernments, but they are accidents, yet. They are not necessary to the human race. They have not proved it, because nothing happens there in the conversation between ultimate truth and politics, they are not part and parcel of the whole group that moves forward in a common struggle. And as long as they aren't, they must be conquered. They must be ruled.

They must be determined by others.

4

Your idea of self-determination stems from groups like the 13 colonies who have no security, gentlemen. That's why a small handful of gentlemen in this country makes America into something different from the five nations of the Indians. You can sink down to this very soon. Just overnight you can. You think it is granted to you that you are in the best of civilization.

Gentlemen, that's not true. In the last 10 years, America has been in great danger that this would not be true any longer. You can castrate your mind, and you can destroy the window through which you converse with the rest of the world. If you have not this decent respect for the opinions of mankind, as in the Declaration of Independence, this country is just as powerful as any other.

In itself, a parochial group does not deserve to be spared conquest.

#### *IX BELONGING TO THE TREE OF THE WHOLE HUMAN RACE*

1

You must understand that the world is made only for those people who belong to the whole of mankind, the human race. They must do something about it. Just speaking, what you call "English" in Chicago through the nose, you are not citizens of the world. That's just a group language, gentlemen. That's parochial.

And any group gentlemen, that separates itself from the tree of the whole human race has to be wiped out. It has been wiped out, that's the story of mankind.

2

You do not think that the aborigines in Australia can live on. The Easter Island there. These people could not find any translating process by which they revamp their five nations for the future of human society.

That's very difficult -- the life of mankind, gentlemen, isn't as happy-go-lucky as you think.

3

Please look at the tragedy of the red Indians in this country, and look at the Incas, and look at the Aztecs, and Montezuma.

And now look at Hungary, gentlemen.

The danger at every moment is tremendous. Whole parts of the human race are wiped out.

4

Well, one of the ways of preserving the human race -- I won't say it's the only one -- has been this international power of philosophy.

It's only in addition, as the big word "international" shows you, to the life of the nation that you need this. "Inter-national" after all is only something that is second. You never think that international powers can take the place of national powers. I know that. But a civilization is a nation that has international processes into its own education, for example.

If you have a history book in the United States which is pure propaganda against Russia, you will admit that you are beginning to cease to be a civilization. Because in this history book you cannot afford it -- although the Russians would not interfere, you can, but you may not.

## X TRUTHFULNESS

1

So gentlemen, philosophy tries to inculcate into the educators and the rulers of any polis of any political unit -- I must introduce this word. It means just as well the United States as it means Athens, or Sparta, or Rome.

The philosopher introduces into the polis a standard of truthfulness. And therefore insists that many political acts can be done, but they may not be done. And the important acts which cannot be done, which a philosopher intrudes, inculcates are those which do harm to other people.

2

Because, as you know, the priests of any religion in your own country cannot resist that temptation. All people preach to those who are in church. And those who happen to be absent or belong to another church are never dealt with fairly.

But if the historian knows what the truth is, then he will not write a textbook in a school which could be introduced gladly but may not be introduced for the human history.

Some of the textbooks used in our schools, gentlemen, are certainly not good. But they are recommended by Mr. McCarthy.

3

In every minute, gentlemen, this process happens. You think there's progress, and these things cannot happen to us. Gentlemen, they have happened -- in the last five years there has been a considerable recession in truthfulness, in veracity in our textbooks. That is, certain things have been said a little less, a little less, and other things have been said a little more loudly, et cetera.

For example, I have always puzzled with the tradition in this country about the 300,000 loyalists which left this country. They were all the good citizens living in America at that time in 1776. Now you know what happened to the president of Columbia University at that time?

Who is from New York? How was Columbia called at that time? And what happened to the president? Do you know?

Well, he had to jump out of the window and run for his life. And he went to Canada.

It would be just the same as if President Conant or President Dickey -- if he, in such a crisis - it didn't happen to him. You can hardly imagine, because you seem that you people will always be on the right side, because you are such conformists today. But then all the good people were on the wrong side. All the Dickey's.

And we lost a president of Dartmouth College -- when did we last lose our last president for a political affair? (*Civil War.*)

Who was he? Nathaniel Wood Lord. Why? Because he was for slavery. Proved it from the Bible. Oh ja.

4

I feel the textbooks should be full of these examples, to show how difficult life is, how grave the decisions are.

If you live through the 4th of July all your life without hearing that 300,000 of the wealthiest, best, and most important citizens had to leave this country, lost all their fortunes, their houses were broken – burned, their belongings were destroyed. If you never see this plastically, see this happen, how do you know what the price of a revolution is? How can you esteem what the founders of this country ever did? And how can you ever get out of your own softness?

Why is America so soft? Because of the schoolbooks. Because of the little schoolhouse. Because of the sweetness and light in these houses.

With some spanking, you would know how hard it is to live. But you never are spanked.

## XI *WRONG EDUCATION*

1

A friend of mine who went to England after the war -- she was a German, the girl and a daughter -- the granddaughter of a famous scientist -- they came to a Quaker college, Woodbrooke. And she was very well received. And one day, however, it was in 1920, only two years after Versailles and after the First World War, and so people were still quite exasperated in many respects, and so people pounded on the Germans, and she got very mad. And when one of these sweetness-and-light girls from this Quaker college said something nasty about Germany, she slapped her in the face.

Silence. Quaker college, I'd never heard before. No resistance.

So she locked herself into her room for three days and shoved some tea into it. And after three days, Miss Judge, that's a famous Quaker family, the principal asked her to come down and, tears in her eyes, Miss Judge said, "Now, my dear Miss Henning, what are you going to do? This has never happened in Woodbrooke, and I'm terribly sorry. And what do you say?"

"Well," Miss Henning said, it was very simple. "Miss Judge, have you ever felt like slapping anybody in the face?"

And Miss Judge said, "No."

And Miss Henning said, "That's the whole story."

That's the whole story. Story ends. Ja. Exactly. Wrong education.

*(I went to a boarding school --) Ja? Where? But you see my point. (Yeah. I see your point.)*

2

Well, the 300,000 loyalists are people who represent the roughness, the toughness of real life, of passionate life, because the people slapped these people in the face. They did, indeed. And that's the price for the revolution. And it's the price for any revolution, gentlemen.

And that you can found states without war or bloodshed is nonsense.

And that is probably now what is destroying Israeli, if Mr. Eisenhower gets through his made proposal that it is mad. The Americans are just as cruel with their morality as the Russians. In other ways.

3

I'm gravely concerned with this, gentlemen. States have never been founded with rosewater. They cannot. It's an act of violence, that others wake up and admit that they are states.

I'm sorry, but the pope -- Pius II, a pope after all, wrote in 1464 the great sentence, "*Now the truth remains, that never has a state been founded, nor shall it be founded without war.*"

That's a pope's statement. And he knew what the world was like. And he said it when he convened the princes of the Western world against the Turks. It was after the fall of Byzantium, of Constantinople to the Turks. And he said, "You are all pacifists now, gentlemen, but if you want to save the Western world, don't have illusions about the basis of nations, about national life."

This illusion that you can send a corporation lawyer to draw up a contract, and now have the Gaza strip or the desert or something, as the frontier, that's all nonsense. You have to be there.

And you have to take a beating. And you don't like to hear this, most of you, because you have dreams about grandeur without grandeur, of peace without war. It doesn't exist.

Peace and war are mutually relative terms, gentlemen. Peace is senseless without war. And war is senseless without peace. I grant you that. If you fight a war in order to have this problem of this war, you must always end in a peace.

4

The Americans have never given up territory conquered in war.

## XII THE DISAGREEABLE TRUTH

1

Now philosophy, gentlemen, is therefore the disagreeable truth, if it is anything. The disagreeable truth.

2

That can be disagreeable in various respects.

You can say the earth turns around the sun. That was disagreeable to the people of the days of Copernicus. That is, you can change the local aspect, the space aspect of the universe, or you can change the judgment of the times over its own goodness. It can be an ethical judgment, it can be a logical judgment, it can be a physical judgment which you disprove as not valid, although it is parochially felt.

3

So there is an eternal fight against the trends in society, in religion, and in the natural science of his day. And that's why I insist, gentlemen, that there cannot be common sense philosophers.

One of the most frequent -- how is called this? -- reverses, I would say, of the definitions of philosophy at this moment rampant in America. There are even some books, they are called *Common Sense Philosophy*.

Gentlemen, philosophers have come into the world against common sense, because common sense is the philosophy of yesterday. What you call "common sense" is the inherited philosophy.

But it was common sense of 1600 to say the sun rose. And it was against the common sense that Kepler said that it didn't, or Galilei.

4

Gentlemen, your common sense is the common sense created into you by historical tradition. Every sense that anything makes to you is common sense, because you have inherited it.

But don't forget that all your values have been created by philosophers, that is, people who have stood on their head and said what the common sense was of their days, that it was not good enough.

As long as you think 160 million Americans can philosophize or are born philosophers or all men are equal with regard to philosophy, I'm very sorry for you, gentlemen. You haven't looked through this constant fight between common sense and abstruseness.

And what is abstruse to you today is common sense tomorrow. But it can only be common sense tomorrow if it appears at one moment as abstruse.

It isn't so very difficult to understand this, gentlemen, that philosophers therefore must remain in the minority, that they must not become kings.

### XIII *TWO TIME PHASES BETWEEN PHILOSOPHY AND THE NATION*

1

And what I'm doing today is to recapitulate now the story of Parmenides, and the Sophists, and Socrates, with regard to the attempt which we find in Plato and in Aristotle to connect the nation, the polis, be governed by the philosopher.

2

That is Plato's dream. And you always read in the textbooks that "unfortunately, it was aborted." It's very fortunate that it was aborted.

Philosophy is an additional function that is needed. Don't misunderstand me. But it's so difficult for you to understand, that it must never lead to the shortcut that the philosopher becomes king.

Then you get the Bolshevik government. Mr. Lenin was never anything but a parochial man. He was an international philosopher, and therefore he was so cruel, so brutal. No resistance.

Because if you have not philosophy as a second order in which your mind is trained, then you use this mind to overrule all the facts of life, all the rights of other

individuals, all the given conditions of community. You just ride roughshod with your mind.

3

And since we have philosophical government, gentlemen, we have today to divide again philosophy and government, and that's why I feel very strongly on this business of Platonism which is rampant in our colleges -- that can't go on, gentlemen, because Plato proclaims that philosophers should be kings.

Now it would be very nice for me if this was true, gentlemen. I would feel aggrandized. My whole class would go up.

But it is not so.

Just as there is a division between Church and state, gentlemen, there has to be interpolation -- how shall one say? I think that's the best word -- interpolation of two time phases between philosophy and the nation.

4

Philosophy is the educational ferment of the national life. It is anticipatory of change. But it is not able to rule itself.

It must be sifted through all kind of very difficult processes until it has conquered the minds of men. Otherwise there will be bloodshed. Otherwise there must be barricades.

Otherwise there roll tanks and destroy Budapest.

You see, what's the good conscience of these ideologies? What does this tyrant proclaim, Mr. Zublov, and Mr. Kadar, and all these people whom one doesn't know why the sun shines upon them. How can they kill all these people?

Because they say, "There must be a communistic state."

Now what is a communistic state? It's a state sold to a philosophy of history, to economic materialism, historical materialism however you call it. Economic -- historical. And therefore that's the only justification. Who does not believe -- who does not think as we deserves to be killed, and deserves not be allowed to send his children to a higher school. If you are not a Communist, you have no right that your child should get an education.

All this follows by the nature of philosophy if you put philosophy into the government of a country.

## XIV A HODGEPODGE OF COMPROMISES

1

*(Don't you think that a democratic government is also based on a philosophy?)*

Ja, but the self-denying ordinance of a democratic government is that the ruler must be an average man, and not a philosopher. It's a difference between the American democracy, or Swiss democracy on one side and Bolshevik government.

2

The party in Russia is exclusively known for the strictness of its party line. That is the reason why a man is in power there.

Here the reason is, that even the party with some platform has to look for a popular man who is not sold to the party line at all: Woodrow Wilson wasn't. Roosevelt wasn't, but the party machine in this country cannot nominate a machine man for the president of the United States. Because the people wouldn't vote for him. It has to be a free man, who is not subservient to any such formal statement even of the party.

And the party is already a watered-down philosophy -- and contains innumerable contradictions.

3

So the Democratic Party and Republican Party, they really have not a homogeneous philosophy. It's a hodgepodge of compromises, of concessions to this group and the other group, et cetera, an attempt to put this compromise in such a frame that it looks as though it had any logic in it. And then comes the party leader, the modern Republican, and says, "Sorry, but the whole platform is not for me," and he's elected.

So you see the freedom of the president in the United States is a very real thing, that he is not fettered by what we would call a real philosophy. He is fettered of course by promises he makes, by situations he faces. It is understood how we'll cope with certain situations. But that's not philosophy in the abstract.

4

If he was sold to any maxim like eugenics, or mercy-killing, I wouldn't vote for him. Heaven forbid that we ever get a vegetarian president! But you understand.

And the gravest mistake in the history of the United States was the Prohibition issue. Why? Because that is a philosophical decision.

There you can see, what happens when women go to college.

## XV WHO IS A NATION?

1

*(I don't understand the distinction you make, Sir, between on the one hand, the Russians crushing the Hungarians from a philosophical point of view, and the point of view that we would be justified in conquering Uruguayans or the Ecuadorians because they are not in a real sense a nation.)*

I haven't said that we should conquer them. But I doubt that they can govern themselves.

Tin governs Bolivia, and that's a very poor government, I assure you. The speculative dependency of these poor countries on some economic hazard is very tragic.

I think the history of Paraguay is the most tragic history of any country in the world. Have you ever read it? I recommend it to you. It is unbelievable. The history of Paraguay is an example of what happens when the usurpation of state rights by a territory that is not able to claim it - what then happens?

2

Who has been to South America? Where have you been? (*Venezuela.*)

That's not far enough south. I unfortunately have never gone to Paraguay.

I have friends who settled in Paraguay -- the famous Hutterites, that are pacifists. They came here first from Germany. They were friends of mine in Germany. And then they went to Paraguay when here the Second World War made it plausible that they would have to take up arms here. Very good people.

And also the consul in Paraguay is a friend of mine.

And so at least I have some direct connection -- but I have also studied the history. At one time there were perhaps two dozen males in Paraguay left. The rest were women and children. They had all killed each other off, in 1846.

3

This history of Paraguay is really something you ought to study, gentlemen, if you want to be cured from your incredible optimism. You all on the one-hand side think you cannot be taken in. On the other hand, you all believe in words, in mere words. If somebody calls himself a nation, you believe it.

If Paraguay says, "I am an independent republic," you bow and say, "Well, then it must be so."

If Nasser says he's the legal government of Egypt, you accept it.

And we haven't broken up diplomatic relations with Hungary. Mr. Kadar, this butcher, this provincial governor of a Russian province, will now pose as an independent government. I'm sure he will.

And you accept and say from now on, we will play even in Melbourne with these rascals in the Olympics, because it would be bad -- why doesn't the American Olympic team leave Melbourne right away? No, that would spoil the game.

4

But you are word realists. That is, to you, a name, if it is not, is real. The word "nation," self-determination of nations. Instead of asking, "Is this a nation?" That's the main question. "Who is a nation?" you should ask.

## XVI *OUT OF REVOLUTION*

1

That's why I threw out my definition. You can only grant rights of nations to people who belong to some commonwealth of nations.

But if you take in Liberia, as we did - when was it founded, Liberia? With this rotund Mr. Tubman. Has a wonderful name. I always think of a tub. He's president or ex-president of Liberia. They have slaves, these Negroes in Liberia. The Americans didn't even want to look into the matter, how these American Negroes exploited the African Negroes: worse than any colony.

But you say, "Liberia is a free republic," but the good treatment of the natives by the English administration, that doesn't count for anything. That's colonialism. But be quiet, because the people who govern Liberia and abuse it are black.

Tyrants they are. Horrid.

2

We have done it. We have founded this state. And there are two classes. One is the American Negro in Liberia, and the others are the colonials. But nobody is allowed to mention this.

In every European geographical magazine, you can see that the worst part of Africa is Liberia. But here it mustn't be said, because how can it? It's all wonderful. It's an "independent nation." It's the worst part of Africa.

The Belgian Congo is Heaven against it. But if it comes to an issue, you will vote for Liberia and against Belgian Congo. One is a colony, and the other is a free country. God help you.

When will you wake up to know what a nation is, and what a government can be, and what it is not?

It's all just words.

3

And therefore I think the definition of a nation -- I have given this in a work called the *Autobiography of Western Man* -- is very important, gentlemen. What has been sanctified in the law of nations and in the treatment of nations as a nation is a part of the history of the church, of Christianity.

And it is very fashionable today to dismiss missions, to dismiss Christianity, and to dismiss Church as obsolete.

I warn you. In politics it's still a very important practice to ask if any country on the globe has been educated by the freedom which only comes when you separate Church and state. Because only in this separation, which has been produced by philosophy, you can speak of a civilization.

As soon as Mr. Nasser is at the same time the religious leader of his people, you get an impossible situation. You can't cope with this man. He's a fanatic.

The religious leader of the Moslem world has said to a friend of mine that every Israelite -- I think I told you this -- child and baby in mother's womb has to be murdered. He says this now for seven years to everybody who wants to visit him, day after day.

4

Why isn't this printed in great letters here? That's a declaration much more than war, but of destruction. And that goes on day after day.

Did I tell you this before?

(No. Abdel Nasser is not the religious leader of the Arab people -- not by a long shot.)

Well, he has tried now to inherit this. Oh, yes. You don't know this, but even the Vatican has made a pact with him on mutual toleration against wicked Communism.

Six years ago, that was very unfortunate. The pope -- and Mr. Farouk entered into such a mess. And Nasser has inherited it. You read his proclamations; his whole appeal is to the Moslem world.

So you may say he is not qualified by the tradition of Moslem, which has never recognized this. But his language -- he has no other, since he has no legal basis for his government.

All illegal governments must make some spiritual claim. They have to have some basis. And Nasser has absolutely no right to govern, except a coup, a *coup d'état*. He just went there and dispossessed the king and said, "Now, I rule." Then he dispossessed the first prime minister, whom he nominated and his Mr. Naguib, to whom Mr. Dulles gave a silver pistol as a present -- as an invitation to shoot.

## XVII THE INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

1

Well, this is a quandary, gentlemen, of our times. A philosophical quandary of a definition of a state, of a modern state, a modern polis, a modern nation.

And you have to distinguish between statehood, that is, some political concern like -- where shall we turn? -- like Panama, or Guatemala, and a nation. I think even you would doubt for a minute if I said, "Is there a Panama nation?" Of course, there isn't. There is a state. It's a vassal state of the United States. That's all that is.

That's not so little. But it is nonsense to say that the Panamese form a nation, because some hirelings from America set up their government when we needed it. It's an artificial thing, it is not a nation, gentlemen.

2

If you bring yourself, which is nearly impossible, it seems to me, in your mental processes, to say, "Panama is not a nation," you have advanced to the necessary degree to understand the function of philosophy, because I told you that you cannot call everything a "nation" what you please to call a nation.

What you want to call a nation, that you have to give it a certain minimum of reality.

3

Now in the history of the human race, gentlemen, the nations of the Western world became nations, threw off the yoke of pope and emperor, when they implanted into the heart of their own territory an institution of free criticism, an international institution. And that is called, gentlemen, the institutions of higher learning.

The word "higher" implies today what the Greeks intended first by philosophy and later by the academy, and later by this *eranos*, this group of lovers.

4

Gentlemen, the word "higher" means sovereign. And a school of higher learning is sovereign with regard to the laws of the state in which it roams. It can criticize them. And therefore *a state plus an institution of higher learning* -- that's perhaps the simplest definition -- which it tolerates not only, but which it recognizes as necessary to its own improvement. Such an institution is a nation.

That's that minimum of separation of Church and state, of separation of reverence and criticism, without which you don't have to have great respect for the boundaries, which you dispose of.

#### XVIII *SOME HIGHER AREOPAGUS*

1

Now the Americans will be challenged to dispose of Trieste not only, but of the Polish issue, of the German issue, everything is brought to the Americans, if you have no criteria to judge these issues, if you do not at least understand the distinction between a batch of people who live in a suburb of the world, like Alexandria or Cairo, and a nation.

And a nation must have an institution of higher learning to criticize its own laws. Before, it doesn't participate in the community of nations.

2

And that's much more important, in the long run, gentlemen, than having embassies. You can imitate all these things. You can put Mr. Tubman, president of Liberia, into a tuxedo, and then say, "He's president of Liberia."

But that's your own illusion, gentlemen. And it will be to our own disadvantage if you are hoaxed, coaxed into these errors simply by the usage of words.

3

Now, why do I say all these things, gentlemen? I say it in preparation to the tremendous function of Greek philosophy in forcing the individual city to criticize its terms, to define its terms.

You say always, "Define the terms."

Now that's a philosophical victory over the city. When you are one of ours, when you are just a member of the parochial community, you never have to define your terms, because you speak as everybody else does. There's no necessity of defining your terms. The term, "Define your terms," in other words is the way by which the city has lost her sovereign jurisdiction to some higher Areopagus, judicial court, but in front of which it has to justify itself.

4

And gentlemen, don't forget that this decent respect for the opinion of mankind is a strictly philosophical expression. The United States, when they were born, were born as a part of a world in which a conversation goes on between the minds. And you cannot set up house.

A son cannot set up house if he denies that he will be one house in the community, and therefore take over the orders of his father's house, to a certain extent into his house. You cannot claim, without recognizing other people's precedent.

Marriage is impossible, gentlemen, if you do not accept for yourself the obligations to do likewise, to set up house. And a nation cannot set up house if it doesn't accept to do likewise.

#### *XIX A SCANDAL*

1

You know the problem of Spain: protestants cannot live in Spain. That's for our notions impossible. You cannot leave the Catholic Church in Spain. There's the border, and that's why Spain to a certain extent is not a civilized nation.

It isn't. It is a fossil. It's purely accidental. Everybody there is a Roman Catholic. I would say, therefore nobody is a Christian. Because you cannot only be a Christian if there is a possibility of being not a Christian.

2

In New York, they called a school Steppinat School. Have you heard of this? Who knows the Steppinat School in New York?

Well, I just talked to a man from Croatia, whose mother was forced by Mr. Steppinat's archbishop of Zagreb to become a Roman Catholic by violence. He was here. She was left alone there, the old woman. And they said to her that she would have to migrate on foot, 500 miles to Serbia, unless she became -- she was a Greek Catholic, she was a good Christian -- a Roman Catholic. And she was one of thousands and thousands.

3

Now the Americans are so stupid that this bloody great inquisitioner, who should be burned at stake himself, this Mr. Steppinat, is worshiped as a saint in New York City. Well, that's the electorate in New York. These are the voters of New York, the most unenlightened group I have ever known.

Steppinat is a saint in New York. A man who forces people -- now for New York, that means something. That's the issue of issues in New York, that religions should be free, isn't it? Even Mr. Spellman has to admit it - comes hard to him.

This is a scandal, gentlemen, and nobody has protested in this country. But I have a friend whose mother has been forced to change her religion - and a school in New York is called after this tyrant.

4

So wake up to the fact, gentlemen, that we are very backward, gentlemen, that philosophy does not play the necessary role at this moment in America.

But you take everything just at face value as a journalist does. And journalism, gentlemen, is the curse of this country. All the news are wrong. They are all right and wrong, but they are not true, because the words -- the Hungarians are called "rebels" and "insurgents" in this country.

Can you imagine what harm has been done by this simple use -- in The New York Times - of the word "rebels" for the Hungarian people? How can we call them "rebels"? Against whom are they rebels? Against the Russians. Is this rebellion?

## XX PRAGUE

1

If you don't define your terms, gentlemen, if you have no philosophy, the city is lost. And poor Hungary. I think you might have gotten the Americans to do something if the telegrams hadn't been all slanted and all for a fortnight now only said that rebels were insurging in the streets of Budapest.

It was a legitimate government of Mr. Nagy who's fighting. And you call these people "rebels." And that goes on here, and nobody says anything. Everybody eats up these drugs, this venom and this poison, because these newspaper people can do with you what they please. What comes first into their ink stand, it's done.

2

The Europeans have never done this. You see the demonstrations in Paris, and the wreckage of the Communist headquarters in Paris today in the papers.

I get my news of course from my homeland, from Germany, and I get it from Switzerland. And I get it from England, by the way, accidentally, too. All Europe is in an uproar. But of course, these people are never mentioning that these people are rebels. They are the legitimate citizens of Hungary and the legitimate government.

*(What would you call these people they call "rebels" now? ...)*

Exactly. Would be a much better word. Of the citizen army, whatever you cannot call them rebels, because you have brought up the people here, they are such conformists now. Rebels -- sheesh. "Unfortunately we can't do anything, because the legitimate government is putting down a rebellion." That's within the international law.

Don't you see the difference? As soon as you call them "rebellions," we have no ways of saying to the Russians, "Stop it." A rebellion has to be crushed, any rebellion.

*(What about "revolutionary?")* It's not a revolution. If you throw out an invading army, that's not a revolution. *(Well, when you have the original government { } these people { } and now being put down { }.)*

3

Now, that's of course a very involved and very long story, because we allowed against Churchill's advice -- we sacrificed the whole east of Europe. If we had remained in Prague, all this couldn't happen. The Americans after all have done this all. We were in Prague. We had conquered Prague, as you may know, and with

Prague -- "He who has Prague has Europe" is an old saying, which unfortunately no American schoolchild ever learned.

And since the Russians have Prague, they have Europe. And we have done this against the warnings of everybody on the continent of Europe.

4

I have a friend from Germany, Count Moltke, who went '44 to Constantinople, at the risk of his life, which was then in the German orbit, trying to see Americans to tell them that there was still a chance to keep the Russians out of if they only would land there in the East. And then they could own the whole of Europe.

Of course, he wouldn't get through. The hatred was far too much to listen to such an argument. A memorandum brought out only a very short time ago into this country now. Nobody -- the FBI simply didn't -- the agents of Mr. Allen Dulles didn't think fit even to communicate with such a reasonable proposal.

So it's all our own making, gentlemen. Hungary would of course be in our camp to this day. And perhaps not Warschau, that is hard to say. But certainly there would be no Eastern zone of Germany, if we had just done what our military power demanded us to do. You know this, that our troops were in Prague.

#### XXI MR. KADAR'S PEACETIME IDEOLOGY

1

So "Who has Prague has also Budapest," that's the real thing.

That's why you asked me about the legal government. It's after all an occupation army. Never forget this. And everything that goes in under an occupation is not legal. It's just there, it's *de facto*, such a thing is called. It's a thing of fact, but not of law.

2

Now all the government there derive their power therefore from this military occupation, which was a joint occupation, after all, of Americans and Russians. And how we divided it is another matter. But that's how it was done.

So this joint occupation of Europe by the victors, America and Russia, broke down.

And I read it three weeks ago when it showed that our *plein pouvoir*, our decision to let the Russians do as they please in the East of Europe came to an end, because

the people of Hungary wouldn't stand it. And so they set up a government, which was recognized by the Russians, -- it was. They dealt with Mr. Nagy as a legal government.

At that moment, I think you had the first postwar government of Hungary in its own right. That it was felt. It was the awakening, just as Eden's -- and Alphonse or Mali's own step in Suez was the awakening of Western Europe from the servitude to the United States.

So in the East, Poland, and Hungary, and Tito woke up and said, "After all, we have some life of our own --".

3

And therefore I feel this is the legal government. And then for reasons which I cannot distinguish or cannot tell you, and probably nobody knows, the Russians suddenly veered in the opposite direction and said, "That's too dangerous for us. That sets an example which we cannot possibly tolerate," and they have made no bones, that this new government is of their making.

Now, you can of course claim that they still have the rights of an army of occupation, but they don't claim that. That's the interesting thing.

Yet, I would say, "Well, the victors, it's the same situation in '45." But strangely enough, the Russians -- these new Hungarian tyrants, as Mr. Kadar, as far as I can make out, does not claim that this comes all from the Russian occupation in the war. So he has given up the only possible logic which would make his government into an understandable government. And he makes no bones that he is simply there at the behest of the Russians as a Communistic government.

So that's a civilian ideology. That's a peacetime ideology, Communism. That has nothing to do with conquest.

4

Now, strangely enough you will say I'm a strange fellow. I think that in a war a victor is entitled to set up a government. I don't think that's the essence of war, that leads to such things. Whereas, I hate to see a philosopher set up a government because he's a Communist.

## XXII COMMUNISTS ARE TOTALLY INDIFFERENT TO NATIONS

1

So I think the Communistic government which now says it is there because Russia cannot tolerate a non-Communistic state, is infinitely more cruel than the reason that "I have been provoked by Hitler," as he certainly was "and I have invaded his satellites and I have set up a government in Hungary in order to fit my victory."

This I think would lead to a better treatment of Hungary, mere occupation, than the harsh brutality of a philosophy of government.

2

But the strange thing is that this is claimed by the Russians, and by the new -- these -- and their henchmen in Hungary, that they have to be there because they have to have Communism. No military security adduced. Just Communism. And that's why I warn you: a philosopher as king is the worst man you can have.

*(Did you say Mr. Kadar is a traitor to Hungary?)*

Oh, my dear man. You don't know how I feel about this word. They just published three days ago in Germany two open letters of mine about this term "treason." I still haven't heard of the reaction, but it's quite a document.

3

You know, treason has occupied my own mind for the last 35 years very deeply. And -- since 1918 -- how long is this? -- it's nearly 40 years, isn't it? - and at this moment in Germany are two little volumes in circulation and have been sold out like hot potatoes on treason. And they have lumped together all people, who have ever been suspected of treason in the last 30 years, which is quite a number, in all countries of Europe.

And Ezra Pound is in it, too, for example.

And so the issue which you raise is a tremendous issue.

When is the loyalty of an existing order exhausted?

Mr. Kadar was formed in Moscow.

Now the one thing the Ignatius Loyola school of secular Jesuitism in Moscow does is that the first doctrine is that nations are there to be used as tools, that you must have yourself complete indifference to any national issue. Therefore they take Hungarians

under one condition: that they cease to be Hungarians. They take Germans -- same, Americans, under one condition: that they rise above the nation, because they say - - and I think that's very logical, and I think you can't blame them -- "We are a world revolution. The condition of our victory is that our staff, the Communists, are totally indifferent to nations."

4

And that is such an urgent matter for the Communists, because in 1914, gentlemen, all socialist parties, all Marxian parties on the continent of Europe voted, including Mr. Kerenski, for the national war.

Mr. Jaurès, the one French leader who was against the war, was shot dead on the eve of the outbreak of the war. The German Social Democrats, who were violently anti-militarist, voted for the credits for the war. The English Labour Party did. The Italian socialists did.

That is, in all Europe, the socialist parties proved their patriotism, and went with the existing order. Lenin, and the so-called "Group of Zimmerwald," in Switzerland, that was a small group of 12 international Communists said, "Therefore the Second International has betrayed the workers. The workers are against war for capitalistic, nationalistic reasons. Therefore"-- that was in 1916 --"we have to get together and found a Third International. And the Third International is based on one, and one sole item as against the Second, that not one of us must be interested in nations."

Therefore, when Mr. Kadar goes to Moscow, it means that he ceases to be an Hungarian, but becomes qualified to govern Hungarians, from the viewpoint of the Third International.

Therefore you can hardly ask me, "Is he a traitor?" the question is "When did he become one?"

*(He's a philosopher.)*

Ja. Exactly. You understand. He doesn't become a traitor now.

### XXIII YOU POISON OR BE POISONED

1

And that's I think why we are right to say a member of the Communist Party plots the downfall of the American government. It really does. Or it is not a member of the Communist Party. It's begging the question, what you are asking me.

If you are a real Communist, not a run-of-the-mill Communist, but a trained Communist, the first thing is, that you are circumcised and that the term "nation" will find no echo any longer in your heart.

Can you see this? (Yes.) No, who asked the question? (I did.) Oh, you did. I thought your man in front of --. (He's also not a member of Mr. Nagy's government.)

Kadar wasn't. No. So he was not in this government. He was before. Gero and Kadar were the Moscow-instructed people, and as far as I know. I will not quibble.

Do you think Kadar was in his government? (I think he was. { } was the party secretary or something like that.)

2

Well, I don't know the details -- you, of course.

Did you know that in the Russian system, the janitor of the embassy is always more important than the ambassador, because he's the man who spies on the ambassador. It's true.

So I don't know the details of their order. But if Mr. Nagy had to keep Kadar -- it showed the weakness -- probably that he felt otherwise the Russians would march in. He probably had him as a safety valve. But then he was overthrown by Kadar.

3

Well, gentlemen, I have tried to tell you or to warn you that this history of philosophy has to deal with the very practical issue: the globe is peopled today by states who are civilized in as far as their civilization - what we call "civilization" - comes from "city." Never forget that. From the ancient city of the Greeks, polis.

"City" is the translation of "polis."

Most people -- you squander this term "civilization." It's something rather simple. A group of civilized people is a people who have made special arrangements, that the talk of the town shall contain an element of international conversation. Of inter-town conversation in a serious way, not gossiping, not talk, not news. But so that the viewpoints of the rest of the world are heard in the education of the citizens.

And it always can be lost every minute, this qualification. And it has to be restored all the time by philosophers who are beheaded for this purpose, usually, or as Socrates have to drink the cup of hemlock.

4

Don't believe that you will be spared, gentlemen. You will either poison or be poisoned. Nobody can be impartial in this game of civilization, gentlemen. Don't think that at the end of your life you can say, "I did nothing bad and nothing wrong." You'll either have helped this international conversation to continue or to be bettered and improved and sharpened, or to have it less effective and go parochial.

And nobody is neutral in this. With every decision -- to which school you send your children, how much money you give to the schoolteacher - you decide these issues. Because the way you treat your schoolteachers, these poor people have to dance at your whistle, at your whim.

I mean, there is no independence of the schools in this country. The school boards rule them from their prejudices. And there are no institutions of higher learning that are really free.

A man like Mr. Oppenheimer could be excluded from the councils of this nation just like that, by whim of the president. Our president doesn't see philosophers. He sees presidents of Coca-Cola companies. He doesn't speak to any man of weight, of insight, of wisdom, of independent judgment, of international judgment. He doesn't want to. He doesn't read books, he doesn't read papers. So he is very much immunized.

And if I had had a free ballot -- of course, I couldn't do it -- I would have voted for Sherman Adams.

Thank you.

## TWELFTH LECTURE: THE SUEZ CANAL AS A FUNCTION OF THE UNIVERSE

### I *THE CITY OF MAN*

1

...and you may say that this may not be lost on you, gentlemen, that if you take in Greece alone around 400 poleis, and every city with its own law and cult and severity and directness, and you get then the Sophists and the philosophers trying to generalize; and we have today, for the whole globe, instead of for Greece, perhaps seventy nations, that this is already a tremendous streamlining process achieved through philosophy.

Because obviously, the modern nation is the sum of many cities, of many poleis, and is infinitely larger. But it still has this one element which is irreducible.

As long as there is a nation, it must have its own philosophical, higher institutions of learning.

2

And I warned you that you don't misunderstand this and therefore you lump up Hungaria -- Hungary and Libya in the same category of independent nation.

And we are already in the deepest of troubles because people think that the Sahara Desert is just as much a national territory as Hungary is, which has a center called Budapest, and which has a record of religious and other mental problems, law problems, for centuries.

3

Without a mental struggle, gentlemen, no nation.

And America is the one, big territory in which all this is denied. If you get here the individual American mind, and if you get here the city of man, called the "United States of America," then you think that here are the individuals, and among them everybody, are the philosophers.

But if, for the real understanding, gentlemen, of the workings of the political map of the globe, as between the laws of a country already controlling, checking your destiny, giving you your name, your private property, your security, your civil rights, your schooling, and the function of philosophy, the situation is very different.

4

Any city of man, which we call, as I said, today a nation - that's the technical expression for the city of man - this nation must have institutions of such a rank that they can philosophize within the limits of this nation.

And therefore, it is not true that the philosopher ranks with the individual. But that which the ancient philosopher in antiquity represented was the first attempt to have an institution of higher learning that had to be tolerated by the individual city or nation as a criticism of the nations' institutions, and not of your individual whims.

And since you are stubborn individualists, this is very hard for you to admit that a country is higher, more structurized, much more complicated than your own brain and your own mind.

## II *YOU MUST BE MORE FRUITFUL*

1

And so, as I said, America has this great visitation to undergo with the idea that philosophy can be commonplace. Then it is no longer philosophy.

Philosophy is only necessary as a criticism of commonplace and common sense. Because commonplace and common sense is the result of our living in routines of daily life, where things are done in a certain way, where everybody moves in a certain manner, and where you even think in a certain pattern.

2

You all have pattern thoughts. We all have. I too. We all are patterned according to our daily mass media.

And I'm always delighted when I meet a man: I can always know whether he reads The New York Times or the Herald Tribune, and he always sells me the editorials of these two newspapers as his own opinion. Nothing more funny. Any American will always say it's his opinion. He's just reverberating what he absorbs every day.

And you can always find people who will say "no" to what they read. But the wrong question formulated by your newspaper dominates your thinking, even if you deny the answer given by this editorial, because what is asked and what is the topic of conversation, you get every morning served. That's what you talk about.

3

Now gentlemen, anybody who wants to bear fruit in the community must not think on the same themes on which these mass media think. You must be more fruitful. If you think how much time you waste by talking about things you cannot change, wouldn't it be much more useful if you would begin to think something which starts a new trend of thought? And a fruitful one, and a positive one.

Why do you think about all this ugliness which you read in the papers about? Even if you say, "We should do something against juvenile delinquency," you still think about juvenile delinquency. Now wouldn't it be much nicer if you would think about a life savior, or the saints?

People thought in former days that it was much more useful to meditate about the saints than about the mishaps of daily life. But you are so absolutely in this gondola exposed to the wind as in any wild-chase balloon in the tempest of time, that you are absolutely unable to think about any subject which isn't mentioned in the paper.

4

Now it doesn't matter, gentlemen if you give the opposite answer from your favorite paper. Your paper may be for Stevenson, and you are against Stevenson. Gentlemen, you are still for and against something raised by the paper. In fact you are just absolutely in servitude, in mental servitude to the things broached by these mass media.

And I still have to find a young student, gentlemen -- there are two on this campus whom I know in all Dartmouth, two I know -- they will think on more fruitful things. They will think about the Greek tragedy or about the Greek lyrics. And that's worthwhile thinking. And they are the only men of whom I expect something in the future.

Of you, I do not expect anything, because you only discuss the trash of the day. And I care in the least what you think about the day. You can, as I said, offer a variation to the Herald Tribune. That isn't the important thing. The Herald Tribune forces down your throat every day what you have to think. Or it can be The Valley News or it can be the WBS, or whatever your station is.

### III *THE GOLDEN MEAN?*

1

But gentlemen, the institutions of higher learning which today take the place of the philosopher, Thales of Miletus or Empedocles, are people who say that their train of thought runs on an independent line.

And that is absolutely unheard in this country, because even the professors at Harvard and at Princeton and at Yale willingly comply with the mass media. They talk -- and I do prove -- I've talked to you in class about Hungary. Terrible, all wrong.

I'm not a philosopher in this sense. I may vindicate myself now by taking you back and showing you --

2

*(Sir, if the questions such as juvenile delinquency are of utmost importance to the stability of our society, how can we get { } if people who didn't consider them or think about it not necessarily be { } --)*

But before you know how society should look, how can you know what to do about juvenile delinquency? Perhaps you have to throw up your hands in despair and say, "The times command now that the juvenile delinquents have to become more numerous." I mean, don't you see that juvenile delinquency's importance can only be stated after you know what's important?

*(Well, certainly. But where is this to be had? I mean, evidently even the situation in Hungary is of sufficient, moral importance today that you --.)*

Too late.

If you had kindly thought about this twelve years ago, the mothers of America might not have allowed your older brothers to go home so quickly. We have now betrayed the Hungarians, because we come eleven years too late.

In 1945, we couldn't get anybody to say that Europe hadn't been delivered at all. It had just been handed over to the Russians. That's all we did. And now we complain.

3

*(But that was the topic at that time.)*

Well, it was the topic of conversation after 1918, and nobody wanted to discuss such a serious thing, and as you know when Bill Mitchell tried to tell the American people that they weren't through with the First World War, he was court-martialed. And I think if more people had been court-martialed, we would be better off. I mean, because there would be genuine martyrs.

If there had been ten Bill Mitchells, they would have stopped court-martialing people and they would have done something instead.

4

(*Sir, don't you think the Greek mean { } apply here?*) - *from both sides { }.*) What is it? The Greek -- ? (*The golden mean of the Greeks. Aristotle's mean {of proportion}.*)

Well, there are two means in this moment in this country. The one say, "Don't get excited and compromise." And the other says, "Go to both extremes, and then you'll know what the golden mean be."

In this country, you can't have the golden mean, because nobody ever goes to any side. How can you have a golden mean, if you don't know what 100 percent left and 100 percent right really means, Sir?

Your golden mean is just talk. You have no idea that Aristotle means by the golden mean that you first have to have somebody who goes to one extreme, and the other to the other extreme.

And you get Stevenson and Eisenhower.

(*I'm talking here about --*)

Well, are they golden means? They are just leaden means.

That's the opposite from the golden mean, Sir. The golden mean means that the philosopher and the king of a city must be at odds, at loggerheads. And then the citizens can strike a golden mean.

If the teachers, and the ministers in the church of a nation, and the people in government are at loggerheads, then the citizens can vote right. If however the ministers only kowtow to the president of the United States because he has joined their church, then it's the end of civilization. Because both powers -- the philosophical power, and the critical power and the legal power -- are in cahoots.

That's what you have here in this country here today. They are in cahoots.

#### IV TOTALITARISM ON BOTH SIDES OF THE GLOBE TODAY

1

The physicists cannot do any research -- unless they are paid by the government. So they'd better play ball. For example.

All our natural scientists are slaves of the government, because for all their means of research, they depend on the government. So what else can they do?

It happens like Mr. Oppenheimer. They are just secluded. He can sit in his ivory tower in Princeton, but fortunately there are still some other means. But this real research he can't do, because too expensive. It costs a billion dollars a year.

The power is only with Admiral Strauss.

2

You have no separation here any longer from Church and state in the deeper sense at this moment. You can't call this the golden mean, Sir, because the golden mean is a result of tremendous suffering on both sides, wincing under the criticism on the part of the governors and your having to accept it, and on the other hand, the critics being in real danger for their future, and sticking their neck out.

But if you recommend that nobody should stick his neck out, you can't get a golden mean.

3

Would you agree with me?

This is the bitter lesson, gentlemen. We have totalitarianism on both sides of the globe today. It is much milder here. It's an effete conformism, gentlemen, but if you don't talk like the stock exchange, you're just out of luck here in this country. Even the president of this United States kowtows to the stock exchange.

And think they are insane, because they live day by day. To them, the selling of oil is the main thing, of oil stock. It is not very important, gentlemen, whether oil is up or down. But in this country, it's rated as the first-rate news.

Wasn't it in this class that somebody said now, the Suez Canal may be blocked, how could the English and French do this -- they brought a harm to themselves? Well -- didn't we talk here about this, that the long-range issue of such a thing for the next 100 years is something quite different from a blocking of the Suez Canal for the next six months.

And that this country -- if it wants to decide such an issue on the surface of things as for today, because now, at this moment, there is a tanker sunk in the Suez Canal, you'll never be able to have a future for this nation.

4

For a superficial thing it seems to be then the golden mean to do absolutely nothing, and keep the canal open so that in five years it is blocked.

## V THE ARCHIPELAGUS

1

Let us open this *Ancilla* today and do something very practical. I would like to impress you with the history of the Greek philosophy.

2

Do you have this? Well, gentlemen. Don't be so lazy. It only weighs not even a pound.

If you open the pages, gentlemen, of the table of contents, what I would like to ask you to do, and since you don't have it here, do it to the next time, add to every one of the names given in this table of contents on the page Roman vii, viii, and ix, the city, the homeland from which these people came.

3

You remember that I spoke at some length and great emphasis, I hope, of the catalog of the ships. Now if you fill out your own table of contents in this book here, you may find that the philosophers respond by their springing up in all these many places in Greece, to the catalog of the ships in a peculiar manner.

What there was anticipated by the poet as a political unity of Greece, which probably never existed, it's a dream of Homer, that they ever went to Troy together. I don't think forever. But he had this vision and projected it backward. It's a kind of prophecy in reverse. That the response was not ships in the physical sense, gentlemen, but ships of the mind. And the ship, the navigation of the Greek philosophy amounts to a kind of seafare in the physical sense.

4

And there's a great poem in German by the greatest German poet of the 19th century, Hölderlin, which he called "The Archipelago." Now "pelagos" is the Greek word for "sea." And "archi-" -- I have not to translate it, that just means "arch."

And the sea between Greece and Asia Minor has this official name, the Greek Archipelago to this day. You look at a map which distinguishes the various parts of the Mediterranean Sea, the part between Crete, Greece, and Asia Minor is called the archipelago. The arch sea, the most genuine sea.

## VI THE LIST OF PHILOSOPHERS AND WHERE THEY DID COME FROM

1

And you can say then that these philosophers, gentlemen, formed such an archipelago. Whether you could compare them to ships or whether you compare them to islands, it is the catalog of the ships come into that shape, incarnating becoming embodied in thinkers who impart as associates, as allies to each other this mental power in every generation, one coming from Asia Minor to Greece, and one coming from Italy to Greece.

2

And we have to distinguish here three -- this is Sicily; this is Calabria; this would be Italy; here let's put Naples, by and large; this would be Tarentum; this would be Elea. Naples is this meant to be.

Pardon me, but I'm a very poor designer.

You have here Greece. This would be here Corinth. This would be Athens. This would be Argos. This would be Sparta. This would be Olympia, where the famous Olympic Games were started. But up here would be the Olympic Mountains, where the name of all Greek religion comes from, including Olympia.

So the story of the Greek spirit -- and then here's Asia Minor. Here are all these islands in tremendous numbers. Here is Crete. And here is the coastline of Asia Minor with Miletus and Ephesus.

3

Now, in order to understand the history of Greek philosophy, I think you have to understand this table of contents. You will be surprised, if you really try to follow out from Orpheus to the anonymous writer, quoted by Iamblysus on Page 162 -- on 160 pages you find 90 people, no more, because you see some of them are two in one line.

You find as Number 10 the Seven Sages. You find under Number 19 Califord and Dimocedes. You find in 39, Pelleas and Hippotamus. And you find on Page 46 Archipos, Lipsylesus and Opsimus. You find on 53 even more astonishing: one, two, three, four, five names. And Page 54, one, two, three names; 55 two names; 56 seven names.

You will kindly then furnish me the next time, every one of you, with a list -- I only have to ask you, because otherwise you won't do it for yourself. And put the cities

in your own table of contents. I think you own this book by now. On the installment plan, I suppose.

4

Write this in. For a history of Greek philosophy, this march through the cities of man, through the cities of Greece, is of first-rate importance. You should see, that the lines of force of Greek philosophy mean a constant exchange from Elea to Miletus, or Ephesus.

Here is Heraclitus, here, on one end, barely holding his own, the city of Ephesus, against the Persians. And here on the other hand is Elea, facing the Tyrrhenian Sea, and Rome, very near to Rome, being the northernmost post just south of Naples where there also is then later the famous Paestum.

You may have heard of the Temple of Paestum, the one temple in Italy still visible from antiquity. That was called Poseidonia in antiquity. Today it's called Paestum. And Elea is very close by.

Here is -- who has been to Italy? Have you been to Naples? (*Yes, I have.*) Well, you know where Paestum is? South of Salerno. Then you go further south, you come to Elea. (*I didn't get that far south, unfortunately.*) Oh, no. Nobody does. Nobody studies philosophy.

Here is Reggio. That is on the transit from Messina, the Sicilian city of Messina, here Syracuse, is which is famous because Plato went there and tried to convert the tyrant of Syracuse to his philosophy. And there is Agrigent, where Empedocles lived, and jumped into the Etna trying to investigate the earthquake.

## VII TO DEVELOP PHILOSOPHY ON ISLANDS

1

Well, why do you laugh? Modern man is vaccinated and dies from yellow fever. Have you seen *The Yellow Giant*? Who knows *The Yellow Giant*? Isn't that the same heroism? Why do you laugh?

*The Yellow Giant* is a play by Sidney Howard, in which he describes the victims of the first vaccination against yellow fever, which enabled us to build the Panama Canal. And some doctors volunteered for the vaccination and died in the process, and thought it was all in vain.

2

You had a question here?

*(Where was it that Pythagoras founded the Orphic colony in Italy? It was a colony that was patterned to Orphic religion. Somewhere in Italy, I think I remember reading { }.)*

Better inquire. Why should I tell you? You mean Pythagoras or whom do you mean? *(It was Pythagoras. Yeah, I'm fairly sure that it was Pythagoras that found -- of course, he's known for his numbers.)*

All right. You are right, Sir. The city is called Croton. Here. There are many such city-states through philosophers. Croton is the city of Pythagoras.

3

Well, not philosophy seems to dabble in geographical problems. Yet it does.

Gentlemen, the great flowering of the Greek spirit in its renaissance in Europe depended totally on the existence of these many independent spiritual centers in Europe.

If you take Heidelberg, of which even you have heard, and Leipzig and Prague, and Vienna and Innsbruck and Padua and Perugia and Bologna and Paris and Bordeaux and Cambridge and Oxford, this map, in the Middle Ages, drawn between 1200 and 1600 or 1650 by and large, corresponds very exactly on the continent to these island philosophers, who had the ocean instead of the railroad.

4

Modern man doesn't have to develop his philosophy on islands. But they had to, because their communication depended on the sea.

On the continent, if you look at the prairies of Kansas City -- no mind has ever existed there and can never come to fruition there. You can grow wheat there. And now they drill oil in Kansas. But no mind of any description. They haven't even a competitive newspaper in Kansas City. It's a very great place, where one paper has a monopoly for 3 or 4 million people. Very significant for the Middle West. No mental competition. Just economic competition they have there. But nothing mental.

What's the name of the famous Kansas --? *(Kansas City Star.)*

Quite. It's quite an enterprise. If you don't read always the Kansas City Star, you're just out of luck there.

They declined even to accept advertising ads from people they didn't like. That's the typical state of any continental prairie, gentlemen, that's the problem of Russia; that's the problem of Siberia; it's the problem of European Russia.

Where you have just vast land masses, gentlemen, mental competition is out of the question.

## VIII GÖTTINGEN

1

The great invention of the Middle Ages was that the gaze of the Mediterranean and of the Northern Sea and the Baltic Sea were impressive enough to force even the people inside Europe to treat their universities in such a way as though they were islands.

And that's why you had 1500 independent principalities in Europe in the year of the Lord 1800.

2

That's unknown to you, gentlemen. There were 1500 states in Europe. And that has made Europe great mentally, because every one of these university centers was in a different state, and therefore enjoyed relative independence. If you can criticize 1499 principalities because you are situated in the 1500th, you can understand how mental life can flower there.

They couldn't criticize the own prince, but they could criticize all other princes. So that Catherine of Russia didn't give a damn what her own nobleman ever said in the 18th century. She was a great tyrant, but she thought she was a very enlightened princess. So she said always when she passed a law or did anything, wrong or right, she said, "What is Schlözer in Göttingen going to say?"

3

Now Göttingen is the university of the Hannoverian dynasty in the kingdom of Hannover.

And we are again Hanover. And here is no mental dynasty. But there was.

Göttingen was an independent mental center, and still a great center of higher mathematics. All the leading men who have designed the bomb here come from Göttingen, and got their mathematic training in Göttingen, including Mr.

Oppenheimer, by the way. And he would have never amounted to anything if he hadn't studied in Göttingen.

And modern America lives still by these people who have been brought up in Göttingen. Heaven forbid, what's going to happen if these people grow up in Princeton, directly, a place where nobody can think. The climate is just adverse to thinking in Princeton.

4

So you are here for this reason. You can be very proud, we have a man -- his family is living in Princeton, but he preferred to come to Dartmouth.

#### IX *FANTASTIC POLYPHONY*

1

Now I'm not joking. Gentlemen, this is your problem, it will be the problem of the next 50 years, whether America is going to kill science and thinking, or whether it's able to preserve it.

2

You can't do it by money. Don't believe for a minute that Rockefeller and Ford can do anything but kill science. Money is not inducive to thinking. It's the opposite. With money, you cannot buy thought.

But you believe you can. And that is the great mistake. You can only buy thought by a noble competition of free spirits. And you can only do it by political plurality.

As soon as you have a world government, gentlemen, out goes thought. That's why it's such an abominable thought, that there ever should be a one-world government. I'm all against it. That would be tyranny. And fortunately there is no prospect that we'll ever get it.

But you all dream of it. And you think all mathematically correct that one government is more economical than many governments.

3

Gentlemen, governments are nothing that have to be economical. It's one of your funny ideas that you judge the great issues of the spirit by money. You say it is cheaper to run one government, perhaps, than many.

Gentlemen, that would also lead to the abolition of the sexes. It would be much cheaper if you wouldn't have to buy a diamond necklace for your wife. But it would be very ugly if you would have to love yourself.

Life is anti-economical, gentlemen. And philosophy bears me out on this. The higher life of the spirit, these higher institutions of learning will never be economical. They'll never pay, because life is something that is beyond pay.

4

And therefore I think this map begs for your understanding. I think you will understand this perhaps a little more clearly than all theories I can put before you.

The life of Europe and the life of Greece have flourished because of this fantastic polyphony, orchestration, the endless competition between hundreds of little centers. If you abolish this, gentlemen, if you get state colleges and state universities, like Ohio State, which to me is -- who's from Ohio? Cleveland? Well, that's a better place, because it has no real schools - but I mean, the University of Ohio is going to destroy all higher thinking.

#### *X ANYTHING PRECIOUS IS PRECIOUS BY ITS SINGLENES*

1

And I'll tell you why.

There is one building now constructed by the University of Ohio. And it shelters 350 professors of English. If you have 350 professors of English in one university, you abolish English, you abolish professors, you abolish all nobility of thinking. You can have here a professor of English; you can have there a professor of English. But you can't put 350 professors of English into one room in one house without reducing the dignity of teaching English.

It's a necessary thing, but if 300 people teach the same thing, glorious subject as it is, in the same house, every one of them thinks of himself as a little smaller.

And therefore we reduce constantly by these large numbers of our state universities the dignity of this teaching. If you have to teach 10 students, and are the only philosopher on campus, you can think that is tremendous. But if you have 10,000 students and 500 professors teaching philosophy, it's worth nothing.

This is the opposite from your mass production.

2

And I have to open your eyes to this fact, gentlemen, that these philosophers in Greece were so terribly important because they lived in very small centers in which they were the only representative. And that makes a man big. If you have to represent the whole of wisdom, you probably make an effort to be really wise. If 249 other people do the same thing, you don't feel that is very important what you're doing.

And you don't know this great danger, gentlemen. You smother people today with bigness because the business community, gentlemen, lives by the opposite principles, and must live by the opposite principles from the mental community.

And in this college the trustees of Dartmouth College are selling us down the river by saying it would be good to have ten professors with 1,000 students each in their classes. And they have these "yes" and "no" examinations. This man is -- well, I won't say who he is. But you all know it, I suppose.

3

*(I'm just wondering -- having only one philosopher in a community why wouldn't it be just as bad as having one newspaper in Kansas City?)*

The great thing is that Kansas City has too much territory. Four million people. If you had one philosopher in Norwich, and the other in Hanover, no harm done. It has to be small. But weak.

It's like a good flower, like an orchid. One orchid is enough. And you don't have to have a big collection of orchids. If you give your friend an orchid or a gardenia, it isn't improved at all if you give her a hundred gardenias or a hundred orchids.

*Anything precious, is precious by its singleness. Anything useful is precious by its mass.*

Since you come all from mass production, you carry over the values of useful things to the value of precious things. A diamond necklace is not improved if you have 99 diamond necklaces. You must have one which is beautiful. As soon as your wife has a hundred necklaces, she will not be as fastidious, she will not give a damn for any one of them. Because overeating does no good.

But from the point of view of the factory that turns out diamond necklaces, all now, "the more diamond necklaces the better." But that's a very wrong viewpoint. One diamond necklace is much more precious than a hundred diamond necklaces.

4

If you can't see this, I can't help you. That's why one wife is better than a hundred wives. That's why a harem is not an ideal.

It's also very hard for you to understand. Most of our businessmen are all Moslem, and they wouldn't like to have any number of wives. It's not a good idea. Why is that so? Why are a hundred wives poorer ruling than one? You can't prove it to me from any economic viewpoint, because your and my life, Sir, is not ruled by economics. It isn't.

Economics are for the earthly things, but neither for you or for me. It's better to have one friend on this campus than to be on good terms with 2,999 students. Why that is, so, I can't tell you, Sir. But it's the law of the universe.

One friend is better than 2,900 chums.

Prove it to -- I mean, you can say, "I don't understand." Then I have to say, "You live on another planet."

#### XI 10 PROFESSORS OF ENGLISH HOUSED IN A GROUP

1

That's why the essence of thought is its rarity. You must appreciate one truth so that you can stand still and say, "I can't rush on to the next truth. I can't buy the next New Yorker. I'm still occupied with repeating this one tremendous truth all my life."

2

And of course I'm sure I cannot succeed with you, to sell you this idea that to be astonished has this great beauty that you never have to end to be astonished.

You have abolished astonishment. You are astonished over nothing. You say, "I don't care," "So what?" - anybody who says, "So what?" has to rush on the next.

Anybody who says, "Indeed?" gains time, because he will stand there and still think about it and the next day and the next day and the next day. All this is connected, as you will see. It must be rarity in time and rarity in space, in place.

3

You have 350 professors of English in Ohio State, English goes out of the window. It just sounds silly -- this is mass production. Shakespeare loses all importance.

It is just the result of observation. You can see it around you.

*(What would you suggest in a case like that, where there has to be a big English department, there in a big school like that? Merely the housing of them in separate quarters, or something?)*

Well, Sir, this should be even in California, they have decided to make three colleges. There is no reason that Ohio State has to be one school. *(There're five of them.)* What do you mean? They overlap? The university of Ohio? *(The university system, yeah.)* Where? *(Athens, Miami, Kent State.)*

Divide them again. Send them out again.

And certainly I would then form units in which one professor of French or 10 professors of French, 10 professors of English would be housed in the same group, and would form a kind of humanities center. And I would never think that 350 professors of English would be together. I would then make some French, and some English, and some history professors get together so that they can exchange, that they can become more fruitful in their talking to each other.

4

Because 350 professors of English, every one, dealing with one page from Keats or from Wordsworth, different pages, must just go nuts. And they will become smaller, and smaller in their thought. They'll just talk personalities and in editions, and footnotes.

*(Presumably, though, if they're professors, they're going to not be limited by the physical environment in one building. And they'll be able to cross the street to the French department building where there are 300 professors of French. It really doesn't seem to make very much difference whether they group them together this way or in another way?)*

Oh, I am not sure - you underrate the effects of all this, of environment, on me and you.

## XII ECONOMY AT THE CROSSROADS

1

*(In Europe now, Sir, there's this new university of Europe that's dedicated to ruling Europe under one government. Do you think it's better to rule, in this case, Europe under economic principles?)*

I don't think there will be an economically independent Europe. We are part and parcel of it. And most big factories in Europe are owned by Americans anyway. That's all American money.

2

I think that economy doesn't have to be tyrannical. The difference between a state and a church, and an economy is, that business doesn't have to claim this mental obsession, this mental power.

We see from Mr. Khrushchev, even if they want to be liberal, they can't. I mean, just crushed, instead of Krupp.

3

Economy is at this moment, at the crossroads. The Russians have totally misunderstood the economic issue. They have built a state instead of an economy. And they said the state would wither away; instead the economy is withering away.

That's really the funniest thing. The Russians are very much concerned with this deficiency of their own theory that they have built up a tremendous government instead of building up a tremendous society.

It's anti-Marxian. the only anti-Marxians in Europe are the Russians, because they have not emancipated the economy from the overweight on the state.

You haven't seen this contradiction. It's very strange.

4

Economy in itself can be pluralistic -- and by pluralistic, I mean it doesn't have to be religion or conviction or world view or philosophy in itself. And we are on the crossroads at this moment, before mankind there is the tradition that there is only state and Church. People finally here have separated them.

But we haven't yet settled the question where Mr. Charles Wilson goes. So we put him in the defense industry.

I think that's a big misfortune. I think that Mr. Wilson is perfectly disqualified to be in politics. And he is on the best of destroying the power of the United States.

### XIII *STATE, CHURCH, ECONOMY*

1

To give you an example: as an economist, he knows the large production centers are economical. He produced tanks. And he was warned by the experts that the production of tanks must be dispersed. That would be more expensive, but it would be secure, and if the United States were bombed, obviously the destruction of one tank factory wouldn't matter so much.

He instead said, "I'm Charles Wilson of General Motors, and therefore, I have to be economical -- I have to economize." So he put all the tank production of the United States into one place.

In normal times, such a man would have been impeached for high treason. Because he couldn't do anything more advantageous for the enemy. He's a man in the wrong place. As an economist, he's right. As a statesman -- absolutely different viewpoints.

For a national policy, economy is a very poor advisor. For an economist, it's the right advice to be cheap. If somebody else has to tell him that for the security of the nation, cheapness is no argument, absolutely no argument.

The opposite is true. He had prevented all decentralization of industry in this country, saying it was too expensive.

2

Gentlemen, for the future of America nothing is too expensive. You are all siding with Charles Wilson against me, gentlemen, but I think he is a great -- to this country. And we will have a terrible awakening.

It's very bad that such a man is allowed to have anything to do with the state. He doesn't understand anything of government. He understands production. And these are two absolutely different things, absolutely contrary principles, because the statesman has to look for the existence of the United States in the year 3000, of which you are not fit at all. Does it represent a power that deserves the sacrifices of free men for centuries to come? That's the only good reason for the existence of a republic.

The production of motor cars is of absolutely unimportant. That's good for the economy. That's not good for government.

3

There you have a very clear instance, gentlemen, that we are also in this country at this moment undecided where economy stands. If you get the three things, gentlemen:

*the state*, that is protection against foreign enemies;

*the Church*, that is the setting up of the goals for which we should strive against enemies, despite enemies, where we get direction of life;

and then you get *the economy*, that's the know-how.

You see, our problem is this: the state was, since ancient days -- let us put it here, into Athens or into Croton where Pythagoras lived; or to Elea where Parmenides gets up; or into Syracuse, or into Ephesus.

Here, I have put in the wholeness of cities.

And the Church was strictly local and became wider and wider through the movement of the spirit, criticizing the local government, criticizing human sacrifice. And in the person of Christ, this inroad against any political, limited set of values became universal, and we have today the idea that all churches are larger than all states.

4

No state can afford a real state religion, because the religion of any state today must also be able to please another state. Christianity, you can have a Roman Catholic Church in Spain, but even the Spaniards -- they hate to admit it, that the pope in Rome is also a Christian. If the Spaniards had their way -- they have, through the last centuries, always denied that the pope in Rome was a real Catholic. They always said the archbishop of Toledo was a better Catholic. It has been a real battle.

You don't understand this, but it's just as bad as with Protestants in the Roman Catholic Church. It's just an illusion of yours that you think that the Spaniards obey the pope in Rome. They don't. They force his hand.

When Phillip II of Spain died, the pope in Rome had the greatest joy of his life. And all the bells of St. Peter were chiming in to celebrate the death of the king of Spain. That's an important fact. That was an act of deliverance for the pope.

And it would be good for some Irish people in this country to know this.

#### XIV ECONOMY NOW LARGER THAN STATE AND CHURCH

1

Now gentlemen, the economy was never run in the days of Pythagoras in Athens. It was run in homes. And all economists were home economists, in antiquity.

That is, gentlemen, the economy was smaller than the city. You could run a farm which was self-supporting. You could run a business, which seemed more or less self-supporting, with your fruit garden and your vegetable garden and your cow and your pig in the back yard.

2

Gentlemen, the one thing which has happened in our time is that the economy today is larger than Church or state.

We are interested in Afghanistan not because we share their statehood, or we share their churchhood. For Heaven's sake, we don't. But we share their economic problems.

*The economy has risen from being the smallest unit in the universe to be the largest.*

And in antiquity, this didn't exist. So if you compare antiquity and the times -- on one side, down to 1900, gentlemen -- it is so that the economy is smaller -- you know the mathematical sign for "smaller than"-- is smaller than state or Church.

3

Our problem is that for the first time in the history of the human race, gentlemen, state or Church, whatever you turn to, also the Christian churches, also the Buddhist churches, also Islam, they are all smaller than the economy.

And therefore, philosophy is in a new chapter today.

That's why for the first time the Greek way of questioning the universe is no longer in order. Where we have to think "new." It's a new situation.

Can you see these two entities? Can you see my scheme here?

4

This is quite important for your understanding, gentlemen.

Before 1900 A.D., and in this sense, all so-called "modern" philosophy in this country or in Europe goes on the Greek side. Plato, Aristotle, Hegel, Nietzsche, William James are still all thinking in such terms that the economy, in their mind, at least, was smaller in its area, than state or Church.

After 1900, we cannot afford this fiction, because today you just have to think of the oil in Arabia, it's a very practical example, the economy is larger than state or Church.

#### XV TO COIN A NEW LANGUAGE

1

Therefore, gentlemen, I give you a history of philosophy which is in this sense obsolete.

That is, I think it is not obsolete. It warns you that all your terms: *democracy, freedom, education, universities, idealism* -- they all come from a time in which man's economy was smaller than his state and his church.

You have to coin a new language today. We are working on this. And that has been my problem all my life. I grew up like you with the naive idea, that one thinks in political terms, and one thinks in religious terms. And then one masters the economy. Now this is impossible.

2

We first live under a worldwide economy. And inside of this, there are some remnants of Church and state, which are smaller.

And we have then to try to find a language of philosophy, of criticism, of freedom, which stands up under the impact of one economy.

We have already one world order, which is not one state, and it is not one church, but is one economy. And that's already there.

And one economy doesn't mean, gentlemen, that one administers his economy. But if you hear this talk about oil, you see how united it already is.

3

The same is true of the Suez Canal. One economy means that the Suez Canal is a function of one economy and has nothing to do with the state of Egypt, or the state of England anymore. You can't judge the Suez Canal in terms of politics.

If you do, you get into trouble, as we are now in.

On the map of the globe, gentlemen, the Suez Canal holds a functional place as allowing Europe, Asia, and Africa somehow to have traffic. That's its importance. Whether this is called Egypt, or whether it's called Palestine, or whether it's called France, or whether it's called India is an absolute second-rate matter compared to your and my problem to think of the Suez Canal as a function of the universe.

And I think you should know this.

4

The one man who anticipated this, who entered a new chapter in the history of philosophy is the famous Count Saint-Simon.

We owe it to Saint-Simon that the Suez Canal was built. These disciples of Saint-Simon were not bankers and were not socialists. But they were called Saint-Simonistes. And they had this great idea that the Panama Canal and the Suez Canal would force the people of this world to think in terms of one economy. Not of one state, and not of one church. But of one economy.

And therefore, the Panama and Suez are really great motors for revolutionizing your and my thinking. It doesn't help you at all to think of the Suez Canal as part of Egypt. And it will not help you to call it later a colonial enterprise of the people who built it. It is something new, utterly new.

It's one place on the map of the world that is functional, just like your larynxes, or your pharynx. The pharynx cannot say, "I am alone". It has to breathe. And the pharynx has to eat, has to swallow. And if it doesn't, it is not a pharynx.

And all the other questions are absolutely minor, the self-consciousness of the pharynx, or the self-consciousness of the Egyptians -- it's absolutely second-rate. Not important.

## XVI NATURE AS AN IMPERATIVE

1

Now we can't think this out today, but I wanted to draw your attention to the fact that the old, ancient philosophers, gentlemen, took that place which modern economy does take.

They stood for the unity which the economy did not yet offer, and which they anticipated in their mind.

2

I come back to my demand on you, gentlemen, to be very critical against your use of the word "nature."

You all think that nature is given, that nature is first and that the laws of the city are second. And I've tried already to impress you with the fact that quite the contrary, your society, your family is your first impression. And that nature is what you see out of the window when you look out of your family living room.

That which is not your immediate self you call "nature," which is separate from you, which you can only see with the help of your family through their eyes, through their education, and through the faith they have implanted in you.

3

Here you see that ancient philosophers, gentlemen, did anticipate the unity of the universe, which we today call the economy, or the globe, when they spoke of nature.

*Nature was an imperative to be achieved.*

And the first people who tried to conquer this unity of an economy in which all men were to participate are the Greek philosophers. They did it through the mind, while we do it with oil tankers.

Therefore everything today is different. You live without philosophy, but with the World Bank. The Greeks couldn't live without philosophy, because the philosophy gives them direction.

4

The philosophers were the first to tell us what to do with the nature. That is, with that part not yet inhabited, not yet politically ruled, not yet unified with the outside world, as we also say.

Gentlemen, today there is no outside world. You have no outside world left. Where there is economy, there is no outside world.

If you take oil, today that's not outside anymore. It's economized. Anything that enters the *oikos*, the household of man, gentlemen, is no longer in the outside world.

Of course, the whole declamation of the Russian Revolution has been to this extent. They said deserts should be treated for their content of sand. You shouldn't rant, and write poems on deserts, but you should say, "What can I do with the desert?"

## XVII FROM PHILOSOPHY TO THE REALM OF PRACTICAL ECONOMY

1

Now in this word "nature" then, of antiquity, gentlemen, there is always this tremendous program: what is man demanded to do with nature? What are these things implying?

And they imply that the little state is too small, that the gods are too narrow, that the world has to grow. So nature is a growing concept, a dynamic concept.

2

And as long as you treat nature as a growing concept, you will be in the Greek tradition; and you can't go wrong, because then you will welcome this transformation into an economy, that man is the husband-man of nature.

But if you think of nature, as most of you still do, as something to be just looked at, irresponsibly, enjoyed, exploited -- like the American farmer who could afford to buy one farm after another and squeeze it dry, and then throw it away, and live then in his old age in Los Angeles on the income which he had wrested from these poor, destroyed farmlands, then you mistreat the Greek term "physis."

3

What I'm trying to do is to show you that the march from nature contemplation, from Thales of Milet -- from philosophy to the realm of practical economy is the true fulfillment of this adventure of the Greek mind.

Whereas if you get caught in the word "nature," you are in great danger today to take it as a cold, unchallenging, purely descriptive thing that doesn't make demands on us.

Well, all the natural sciences, in their application of our findings, show you that I'm right, because natural science has led to technology. Technology has led to this economy. So practically, the natural sciences have exactly acted in treating nature as that which was not yet under the sway of economy.

That's why I'm stupefied when I see that people immediately build now planes or rockets to go to the Mars, so that this poor, unsullied nature immediately is treated as something to be projected into, to be shot at, to be aimed at, which is certainly not contemplation, but conquest.

4

But the fiction of your poetry and your use of the word "nature" is as though nature was something not as a challenge, but something lying there in quietude and calmness, and without arousing in you immediate action.

This is not so. The so-called objective statement about science, gentlemen, is the unphilosophical treatment of this. Nature, the concept of nature in the sciences is that nature looks at things and tells you how they are.

Practically, what really happened is: *nature is the challenge which has asked men what to do with it.*

This is something quite different.

## XVIII CONSTELLATIONS MIRACULOUSLY AND RHYTHMICALLY PERFORMED

1

*Physis is a command much more than a fact.*

And for the Greeks, the nature was not fact, gentlemen, but it was *fiat -- fiat -- fiat.* Let us do something to it.

2

And you are very badly put as regard to facts. You believe that science deals with objective facts. It doesn't. And it offers you opportunities. It offers you the possibility of shooting a rocket to the moon. What the moon is for, science doesn't tell you at all.

I know more about the meaning of the firmament when I at night look up at the stars and admire them.

And I have a much deeper insight than all the astronomers put together, if I allow myself to be astonished. These astronomers -- they are far too practical. They are already on the way of conquering the stars. And I doubt that by conquering the stars we do them justice.

That's obviously not the only purpose, that we should fly to these stars.

3

I always think that the deepest insight you can gather from wondering at the stars is that we also should form such beautiful constellations on this earth, that our free associations should also be constellations miraculously and rhythmically performed. And if you could construe and dissolve all your human associations in such noiseless manner as the stars, there would be great peace and harmony on earth.

As you know, people break up their homes and get divorces and certainly don't constellate with their beloved ones.

And I only throw out this, that there is a way of dealing with the universe as part of you and me, if you don't treat it as nature, but if you treat it as teachers, if you treat it as home.

4

You can at every moment, gentlemen, treat the world outside as your homeland, as creation. God's creation -- you are creature. These are creatures. We are already at home.

All you can do as a Greek philosopher who say, "I have a homeland. That's my city. And I set out to conquer the rest of the world, to subdue it and make it into my homeland".

## *XIX THE JEWISH, THE BIBLICAL VIEW*

1

And you must see, gentlemen, that the Greek mind is a conquering mind, that the scientific mind is a conquest of the world outside, to make it a part of the inside world.

With the philosophers which we have in this book here, they have tried to tell you of the universe.

They have told you what to do with the universe, so that it may become inside.

And our world economy is the result of this tremendous mental struggle to subdue it.

2

But there is an opposite attitude, the Jewish attitude, the Biblical attitude, which always has to strike a balance, gentlemen.

The Jewish attitude says, "I'm not interested in the laws of gravity. I'm not interested in the law of chemistry. I'm not interested in the astronomical arithmetic. I'm interested in the fact that God created first the stars, and then me. And that therefore I and the stars are both His creatures."

That's equally true, gentlemen. And it means that in the historical sense, man is the latest. And therefore if he could only behave as harmoniously as the sun, he can learn from the sun. And he has to be, therefore, grateful that he is the newcomer to this whole galaxy of stars and creatures.

3

So if you put man in the middle, gentlemen, you can look back at creation and say man is the latest creature.

Or you can take the opposite view and say, "Man is a political animal. Here is his polis. He looks out of the window of his polis, and he tries to subdue nature." He goes out and tries to make nature -- we can translate with "outside world"-- he wants to transfer the outside world into his polis.

So everything in the world becomes a political issue. Coal becomes a political issue. Oil becomes a political issue, the air space over your head is a political issue.

4

Can you keep a jet plane out your land? Unfortunately, you cannot. It's a purely political question.

A hundred years ago, if you had asked a man, a lawyer, he would have said, "Of course, you can shoot him down. It's your private property."

We have a new notion of private property even in the United States, the most reactionary country in this respect in the world. You cannot exclude a man from the airspace over your own land.

But I assure you, when I grew up, all the lawyers in the world decided that you could. You could forbid an airplane to fly over your heads.

You have given up this right just like that. It has never really been disputed. Very interesting, the new invention just brushed aside all old concepts of air space.

## XX SUNDAYS AND WEEKDAYS

1

So in any moment, you and I, gentlemen, are therefore standing between our cult in our own community, where man has to know that he is a creature among other creatures and between the conquering mind which says, "There is an outside world which hasn't yet come under our servitude, under our service, under our understanding, and we technologically will take it in."

2

So the two worlds, political and physical, are in constant antagonism.

If the political is the analogy of the created world of God, then we have peace -- we are not in a hurry. We are already -- Heavens! There are thousands of years that have gone by and we are the latest.

If the technological world takes over, we are in a terrible hurry, so that the oil isn't wasted, and that everything is made use of, the masses, people, and that the stratosphere is filled with our noise.

3

What comes first is decisive in your own life, gentlemen.

On Sundays, we think that the right treatment of our political behavior is what we should be taught. That's the meaning of the church service.

On weekdays, we are taught how to go out and get the physical under our domination.

And this has been the problem between Church and state. And all this today is new.

4

I had a lunch with one of you just now, and he asked me how to study theology.

Well, I think the answer is, you can't today, because today the ministry of the Word is against the economy of the world. And to be a minister within a state or within a church is a very minor matter compared to this great question: what has anybody still to say when all the wheels are spinning all over the world as though we were just one big machinery.

Where machines hum, there is nothing to say. They are too loud. You can't speak in a factory. They're too loud. They're performing.

## XXI *THE REAL ISSUE OF OUR TIME*

1

And the voice, gentlemen, of philosophy therefore has never been so weak as it is today, I think for this very reason.

In a state, you could still have a philosopher. Franklin D. Roosevelt would still listen to philosophers. Our president doesn't. He's in this big wheel within wheels already of a world economy.

The Second World War has unified the world to such an extent that we people move just under the impact of a tremendous machinery, tremendous juggernaut, tremendous change.

2

And you live in this new climate, gentlemen; and I have to tell you that between you and me, there is a total chasm in the educational feeling and the feeling. We still thought that by our talking philosophy, we could influence the Church and the state.

I think in your generation the economy has really become such a giant, that you have a deep feeling that talk won't help, because these big machines -- the bulldozers just won't listen to human voices.

3

This is, I think, the real issue of our time.

The Greek philosophers have won at the price of going out of existence themselves. They have unified physis. They have unified nature. And the cities from which they have sprung, these tiny little islands, in which they became vocal, are all swallowed up.

We said last time about Hungary.

And Heaven -- if you know this, gentlemen, you will be very serious about the future of the human race. There are great issues before you, very great issues; and your generation has to do a tremendous job all over the globe.

4

It has not even been started. And you go and think that you have an education.

Quite a new education has to be begun. We cannot rely on the old ways at all, because what you learn as an American, gentlemen, or as a Presbyterian just isn't good enough today. You have to be able to speak, to criticize something that is already as big as the universe -- at least for human conception.

\*

I have sinned because I didn't give you a break. And I'm very sorry for this. I intended to. I will not repeat this onslaught on your health.

But now, it's too late. So you allow me, we may break off a little earlier. I'll go on another ten minutes. Because I want to show you now why I had to deal with this.

I *HE, SHE, IT*

1

In the history of Greek philosophy and in Empedocles and in Parmenides and all the later ones, there is one word which plays a tremendous part as the goal. In this goal, they tried to reconcile the smallness of their political outlook and their political system and their political boundaries and the challenge of the created universe.

And this word was the word for universe, the word "*pan*". From "pan".

2

Perhaps you take this down, whether you know Greek letters or not, it doesn't matter. You need this word at least once "*pan*," the whole.

In Latin, the "*universum*," and now today "the universe" was the war-cry of the philosophers after Parmenides, gentlemen, with which they definitely changed the traditions of all their fellow citizens, by the simple trick of calling it "the universe."

3

In Latin and Greek and German and French -- not French, but Latin and Greek and German -- there is a difference between the three genders of a noun. You have "he," and "she," and "it." And it is very important, gentlemen, that whereas the polis is feminine, and the gods are masculine, the "*pan*" -- "*to pan*" is neuter. It has no life. It is an object.

And all what you call today "objectivity," and "object," comes from this little trick, that since 500 -- not in Heraclitus, who is an old, still-believing pre-Christian Christian and a non-Jewish Jew, so to speak -- but in all Greeks, all of you, too, there is this surreptitious little sneaky step. By speaking of the universe as though it was a neuter.

It was neither "he" nor "she." You cannot say "the universe who," and you cannot say, "the universe, she." You say "*it*."

4

And that's a very little trick, gentlemen, because the word physis is still feminine.

In Shakespeare before 1650, also in English, the word "nature" was feminine. It doesn't cease to be a feminine before 1650 in English language.

What does this mean, gentlemen?

It is alive. Something that is "she" and "he" is as much alive as you and I. And therefore, it can serve as an educator, as a brother, as a sister of you and me. If it is "that," if it is a thing, it is an object of my exploitation, of my engineering, of my planning.

And today, the Greeks, the philosophers have so completely flooded your brain that most living processes, gentlemen, by you are qualified as "its."

## II *YOUR BODY IS NOT AN OBJECT*

1

Now anything which you call "it" has no right to talk back. If you say, "God is something," God has ceased to speak. You can never say of any speaker that he is "it."

That's impossible.

The word "infant" in Latin is neuter, because an infant is he who does not speak. "Fari" means to speak. "Infant" is somebody who does not speak. And that's the word for child, the non-speaking. Therefore it is "it."

2

That is, gentlemen, "hes" and "shes" have voices and know better who they are than you and I. "Its" have to be investigated by you and me, and examined, because they have no self-consciousness.

Therefore, gentlemen, the scientist who deals with an object knows more about the object than the object. But if you deal with me, Sir, I will always talk back and say, "But I know better what my interest is than you do, even if you 10 times tell me that you really have only my own interests at heart. I simply won't believe it, that I shouldn't know, too".

3

This is the whole problem of human freedom today. If you have one economy - - Mr. Khrushchev said, "I know what's good for these Hungarians. They don't know. They must have a socialist government."

Don't you see, that's the logic, if they are just "its."

If the universe is "it," gentlemen, then all events in the universe are also objectively knowable. And most of you are dedicated in a way to this superstition that everything can be treated as an object. And you try even to treat your own body as an object.

4

You will always go wrong on this, gentlemen. Your body is yourself. It's not an object. It's sacred. If you treat it as an object, you will kill it. You will go

schizophrenic. Your body is not an object. You can't treat it objectively. It's just no way of doing this. The body is just one form of your own existence on this globe.

### III RESPONSIBILITY

1

So it has tremendous consequences, what I have tried to show you. If you treat nature as that outside world which has to be brought under your domination, of great appeal to any male, to any man, this conquering attitude, you get very far, except for the fact that you choke this genuine life, and the highest life of any such object is its own speech.

2

You have now all the Indians on the reservations, gentlemen, because you have treated them objectively, but they have no longer anything to say. They are without real speech. It's just a *patois*, a lingo. You have deprived them of their vote, in the deepest sense of the word, of their vocality. They haven't been asked. They have been driven out into their reservations.

The treatment of the red Indian is a result of treating them as objects. Whether it's maternal care or whether it's exploitation, the Department of the Interior in the United States has tried to help these people as objects. And others have tried to destroy them as objects and exploit them. It works both ways.

As long as they are objects, they will wither on the stem. Their life will leave them and they will become deader and deader all the time.

Now they are so dead that nothing can help them. We have killed them.

3

The treatment as objects, gentlemen, is then -- will you take this down -- a decision. *What we treat as object, and what we treat as vocal, as "he" or "she," is the perpetual decision which we make about the purpose, the destiny of the universe.*

And you can do it with flowers. You can do it with wild animals. It's the way we now exploit the tigers and the lions, and allow these Chicago businessmen to shoot down all the lions in Africa - it means that we think they are objects.

Are they? I think they are part of our creation for whose survival we are really all responsible. There have to be tigers. You can't shoot them down.

4

Why? It's very hard to say. It's a decision. It's an intimate belief that we know only of ourselves if they are our brothers, our antecedents, our ancestors.

All people are good Darwinians -- do you think that Mr. Darwin invented the idea that we have pedigree? The Bible says that first the plants were created and then the animals and then men. And always we have respect for the lion and for the elephant as tremendous protagonists of men.

#### IV PERVERTS

1

If I may here today listen to an American boy, you really think that Mr. Darwin discovered that there was creation, and that these great animals and mammals came before us. Everybody knew that that most people are just gorillas.

That's nothing new. The problem before 1859 was only, how to avoid of remaining a gorilla.

And after 1859, the great question was how to become as rapidly as possible a total gorilla. Yes, that's all. This is your decision.

You have managed very well. Most people I meet strike me as gorillas. And you know *The Hairy Ape*.

2

Who has read *The Hairy Ape*? That's the application of Darwin to modern times. Who wrote it? (O'Neill.)

It's a very good play. It's a very serious play, gentlemen.

3

But this is not new. The funny thing which is hard for me to understand is that Darwin today strikes you as the discoverer of man's being part and parcel of the natural universe, because that's old. But the great dignity of man was that he had to show that he was the last primate; therefore, had to do better, and to outgrow the gorilla. And couldn't be reduced to his previous form, because he had left behind us.

4

So you perhaps see now, gentlemen, that to call the universe "it" meant that everything met within the universe was in danger of becoming an object of the mind. And as soon as my own sister and my own mother and my own sweetheart and my own child could be treated in this sense objectively, the Greek philosopher was in great danger of becoming a pervert.

And as I have tried to tell you, they all were perverts, because homosexuality created for them the second world, in which for themselves the laws of the universe did not apply. They were a law to themselves.

They lived in this academic ivory tower, which was pestered with vices of the most terrible kind. And that's a condition of treating the universe as the universe.

#### *V THE CHOICE OF A METHOD*

1

You will find it true inside yourself, gentlemen.

If you go all out for philosophy, the whole rest of the world, including myself, including your friends, will tempt you as though you could treat them as analytically as objects of your understanding or of your statistics or of your mastery or of your exploitation or of your treatment. You will psychologize; you will say, "This man I treat with this psychological trick," and "The other man I impress in this way," and "I'll show interest in his business, and then I'll make friends this way". "I only make objects, because I take it upon myself to treat all these things."

2

The universe, gentlemen, then is the sum of all these things. And things are a method of treating the universe as being outside of me.

The political treatment of the universe is the opposite: treating even the stars as part of me. If I look up to the sun and say, "Dear Sun, shine," I call the sun, as St. Francis did in his famous hymn to the sun, "my own brother," and the moon "my sister."

Now you are not in this poetical mood, you may not like it. But gentlemen, a flower in the garden, you will admit -- or a bird whom you protect against your cat -- you do treat as some living being that has as much right to exist as you yourself.

3

In a political treatment, gentlemen, we ask ourselves: how much right have I to exist? And I can't have any more right than all the brothers and sisters around me. In the naturalistic approach, gentlemen, in the physicist's approach to me I think this is an outside world which has come under my domination.

4

So the use of the word "universe," gentlemen, is the choice of a method. It is a decision. It is not an objective fact itself, to use the universe as something objectively given.

My protest against this is that this is not so.

Anybody who speaks of the universe therefore says, "I can deny the living soul around me," he denies God. And the other who affirms God may deny the laws of the universe, of nature.

Both is impossible.

## VI FELLOW OARSMEN

1

Gentlemen, life consists of breathing out and breathing in. It consists of constantly shifting between treating the outer world as object and as subject. There is no other way of living, gentlemen.

In any one moment, here I speak to you, I treat you as fellow creatures.

Next moment, I run into you, we are just bodies colliding. Obviously, I cannot afford then to forget my own body. I have to save it. I have to save my skin. They are outside each other. And I treat you as an object that has to be gotten out of the way.

And I shall.

2

But that's your difficulty then, gentlemen. You are inclined not to see the dilemma of life.

*The dilemma of life is constantly to change between treating the outer world as object and as brother.* There is no way of treating it as one only. It's impossible.

Obviously this furniture is so much less alive, it doesn't matter. We stand it up and put it in the chimney, and get a good fire to keep warm. Of course, the treasurer of the college wouldn't like it.

3

On the other hand, you people and I, we are in the same boat, in the same sense we are fellow oarsmen. So I cannot throw you into the fire to keep warm.

So the decision between universe and divine life, gentlemen, is a decision which draws constantly lines within the outer world. And all the time we have to distinguish what is on our side as living beings, as vocal beings, as having as much right for existence as we, and those things which we have to make subservient to our existence like fuel and coal and air and such things.

4

And then there is no preliminary, dogmatic decision possible. At any one moment, you may sing to the air a poem with just as much sense as you may breathe it in and use it for oxygen. Your idea is that there are certain things that are constantly dead.

It strikes you as funny, that a poet shall write a poem to the air. I'm sorry for you. You must take up in yourselves this creative power that even the air and the stars deserve a song. Even they deserve to be spoken to.

If you cannot practice this poetical being, I will not trust your philosophical or your scientific one.

## VII *HOW CAN ANYBODY LOVE US?*

1

You must keep this quest in your heart that at no moment is it clear to you where life and where death is. Gentlemen, the thing is the decision over life and death.

That's the gist of the matter.

The word "universe" is a decision in favor of death. If you say "universe," you say, "I preferably now treat the universe as deader than myself, as object." An object is deader than the subject.

But if you sing to the air or to the gods, you treat the universe as more alive than you yourself. And I think sometimes that's very much in order, because I feel very often that I am deader than the rest of the world.

2

I hope you will feel this, too, at times, because otherwise you can't come to life.

You have to reject your own decadence, your own stupidity, your own boredom. And you can only do this by coming down on you and saying, "I am dead, and the rest of the universe is much more alive."

3

Now I don't see that I can convince you of this so easily.

But anybody in love knows exactly what I mean, because the first thing a lover says is that he feels he is not sufficiently alive, and he cannot compete with his sweetheart with regard to her loveliness. He doesn't deserve to be loved.

I challenge anybody, that he cannot be in love if he doesn't admit that he doesn't deserve to be loved.

Now God deserves to be loved, because He's only life, without death. But you and I are so much death, and dirt, and filth, and what-not that we feel very definitely that we don't deserve to be loved.

How can anybody love us?

You say by this, "I am a mere object. I'm not sufficient of a person that I really deserve to be loved."

4

So in this sense, I think every one of you makes this experience as a very practical matter.

If you only could see the word "universe," gentlemen, comes from a logical dichotomy. There is no objective universe always. But universe is an attempt to look at the reality around us in a certain manner.

Thank you.